

# CHRISTIANITY TODAY



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

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

Published monthly by  
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND  
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO., Inc.  
525 Locust Street, Phila., Pa.

JANUARY, 1936

Vol. 6

No. 8

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

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

## Editorial Notes and Comments

### OUR LORD'S CENTRAL AND ABIDING PURPOSE

**T**HE central and abiding purpose of our Lord has never been expressed more accurately or more succinctly than in the saying, current in the early church, and quoted by Paul in his first letter to Timothy: "This is a faithful saying, and one worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."

This saying, be it noted, does not square with an assumption widely current today. It affirms that Christ Jesus *came* and so denies that He is a product of the forces that ordinarily energize in this world, that heredity plus environment afford the needed explanation of His person. It is in full accord, however, with the assumption common to all the New Testament writers, viz., that He had existed prior to His birth in Bethlehem and that at a definite time, for the accomplishment of a definite purpose, He left the sphere where He had existed "before Abraham was" that He might enter into the conditions of earth.

Just now we are concerned not so much with the fact that this saying tells us that Jesus *came* as with the fact that it tells us *why* He came. It will hardly be denied that the presence of such a person in this world calls loudly for an explanation—and that whether we regard His presence here from a predominantly intellectual or a predominantly ethical point of view.

If we regard Christ's presence in this world from a predominantly intellectual viewpoint, we will probably be concerned most of all over the obvious fact that His coming, as well as His activities while here, involved a break in the order of nature. It is doubtless true, though not as true as many would have us believe, that this difficulty is more felt by the twentieth century than by the first century man. Modern science insists, and rightly insists, that we live in an ordered world, a world that is ruled by law and not by chance, a world in which there is no place for caprice. In Christ, however, we are clearly face to face with a miracle of fact—whether we consider the purity of

His character or the greatness of His personality. It should be plain to all that the presence of an absolutely sinless being in this world is as much of a miracle of fact as one who by his own power is able to still a tempest or raise the dead. Such a break in the cosmic process demands an explanation. The saying we have cited supplies the needed explanation. Christ Jesus came to save sinners. If sin had not entered this world, Christ would never have come; but sin being here as a dread and curse-bringing reality, His coming was necessary if men were to be saved, if a lost world was to be restored to its God.

Whether or no we will judge it believable that the Son of God actually came into this world hinges largely on what we think of the world's moral and religious condition. If we think that the world is in a normal condition—normal for its present stage of development—we will think it more or less unbelievable that a divine being should have come into this world because we will not be able to discover any real need of such an act on His part. But if we are convinced that this world is in an abnormal condition; that it is a world gone wrong, seriously wrong, so wrong that it is a lost and condemned world; then for those who believe in the existence of a good and loving God, the presumption is in favor of the thought that He will intervene, that He will act for the restoration of this lost race. Such an act on His part would necessarily be miraculous.

To reject the miraculous is, therefore, to reject the whole scheme of redemption; it is to deny that God has wrought in history for the salvation of His people. It is the man who has no deep sense of having gone wrong, who has little or no consciousness of sin, who is disposed to reject the miraculous. The man, however, who is conscious of his own sin and helplessness, who realizes that, left to itself, this is a lost and condemned world, is disposed to give due weight to those considerations that indicate that it is indeed true that God so loved this world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him might not perish, but have everlasting life.

The moral problem raised by Christ's presence is perhaps not very keenly felt by hosts of modern men, because of their lack of any deep consciousness of sin. None the less, it is easily possible to suppose the existence of men today



concerned not so much to account for the break in the order of nature caused by the coming of Christ as to account for the presence of one who was holy, harmless and separate from sinners in a world that so reeks with iniquity and blasphemy. It would seem at any rate that it was this latter thought that was uppermost in the minds of the early Christians who coined this saying. They were apparently thinking not so much of a change in space on Christ's part as of a change from a sphere of light to one of darkness, from a world of purity and holiness to one of impurity and unholiness. What could account for the presence of such a person in such a place? The saying we have cited supplies the needed explanation. He was not here because He had any sympathy with or found any pleasure in sin. Far from it. He was here because His presence was a necessity if He was to accomplish the work given Him to do, viz., the saving of sinners. We might indeed suppose, without reflecting on His character, that He came into this world to judge sinners. This saying, however, contains the joyous thought that it was to save sinners that Christ Jesus came into this world of sin and iniquity.

There have been those who have held that Christ Jesus would have come into this world even if sin had not first entered, though not as a suffering Saviour. The Scriptures nowhere discuss this question. Everywhere, however, they ground the coming of Christ in sin. Everywhere we are taught that it was the needy condition of men that led Him to forsake, for a season, His throne of glory. "The Son of Man came to seek and save that which was lost." "I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." "They that be whole have no need of a physician but they that are sick." "To this end was the Son of God manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil." "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him might not perish but have everlasting life."

To maintain that it was specifically to save sinners that Christ Jesus came into this world is not to maintain that this was the only end He had in view. At the same time, if we are to be true to the emphasis of Scriptures we must ever maintain that it was the chief end He had in view. It is true, for instance, that He came to reveal God, to be the light of the world in things moral and spiritual. It is true also that He came to reorganize society, to establish a kingdom on which justice shall prevail, in which love shall be the law and happiness the universal condition. But important as are these and other purposes that Christ had in view they are subordinate to the great central purpose of His coming. To regard any of them as of primary importance is to misunderstand the purpose of His earthly life; it is to exalt the corollary above the main proposition; it is to value the by-product above the principal product. It is especially important, in this connection, to keep in mind that it is only as Christ saves from sin that His work as prophet and king becomes effective. It is sin that lies at the roots both of our moral and spiritual ignorance and of our social maladjustments, so that it is only as sin is

eliminated from our lives that we are able to profit by the knowledge that He brings us as well as to conform our actions to the requirements of that kingdom of love and righteousness He came to establish.

There is wrapped up in this saying not only the thought that Christ Jesus came into this world to save sinners but that He proved sufficient for the task. It is conceivable that one should have come into this world to accomplish our salvation who proved unequal for the task and so went down to terrible, even though glorious, defeat. No thought, however, was further from the minds of those who framed this saying. His resurrection from the dead confirmed by what He had wrought in their own souls convinced them that He had proven wholly sufficient for the task He had attempted. It was basic to their whole outlook not only that Christ Jesus had come to save sinners but that He had accomplished His self-chosen task.

### THE MANDATE OF THE 1934 ASSEMBLY

**W**E HAVE held from the beginning that there is room for difference of opinion among sound Presbyterians as to the wisdom of organizing the Independent Board. We are not as sure as we once were, however, that there is no room for difference of opinion among such Presbyterians as to the legality or constitutionality of said Board. It is at least certain that some of those whom we rank among the soundest of the sound question the right of its members, in as far they are members of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., to do what they have done. It at least seems clear that it is an over-statement to say, as some of its advocates have said, that the right to form and operate such a Board is guaranteed by the Constitution and hence that its members are being prosecuted *merely* because of their loyalty to the Bible and the Reformed Faith or differently expressed *merely* because of their loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ.

But while there is room for difference of opinion among loyal Presbyterians as to the wisdom and legality of the Independent Board we are as fully convinced as ever that there is no room for such difference of opinion relative to the Mandate of the 1934 Assembly despite the fact that said Mandate was confirmed by the 1935 Assembly. Both its unwisdom and its unconstitutionality or illegality ought to be clear to all.

It hardly seems open to doubt that the Assembly was badly advised when it adopted this Mandate. Unquestionably it has added to rather than relieved the unrest and turmoil in the Church and thereby turned the thought of the Church away from what should be its main interest. Even from the viewpoint of its sponsors it has proven unwise seeing that it has (thus far at least) helped rather than hindered the Independent Board. In fact, there is every reason to believe that said Board would have failed through lack of support had it not been for the interest in it aroused by the Assembly's Mandate. Apart from the effect it has had in influencing Presbyterians to transfer their gifts from the old to the new Board, it has led many




to either transfer their gifts to non-Presbyterian organizations or withhold them altogether because they resent the effort to *compel* them to give through the official Board. A more short-sighted policy or one better fitted to dry up the streams of missionary benevolence could hardly be imagined.

The unconstitutionality or illegality of this Mandate is as obvious as its unwisdom. Apart from the fact that the General Council acted in an unconstitutional manner when it proposed and in effect initiated disciplinary action against members of the Independent Board—a power that is denied it by the Constitution—the following considerations among others make clear that the General Assembly exceeded its lawful authority when it adopted the Mandate in question: (1) it denies to sessions the right to apportion undesignated gifts among “other benevolent and Christian objects” as well as among “the Boards of the Church” as well as the right of sessions to authorize Sabbath Schools and other societies and agencies of the churches under their care to take collections for “objects other than those connected with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.” (Directory of Worship, Chap. VI, Sections III and IV); (2) it makes support of the benevolences of the Church a matter of compulsion rather than of free will contrary to the Bible (II Cor. 9:7) and the Constitution (Directory of Worship, Chap. VI, Sec. III); (3) it places the authority of a human council on a par with the Word of God inasmuch as it affirms that Presbyterians are just as much under obligation to support the authorized missionary work of the Church as they are to observe the Lord’s Supper (1934 Minutes, p. 110); (4) it even places the authority of a human council above the authority of the Word of God inasmuch as it demands an implicit faith in the decisions of the General Assembly by demanding that Presbyterians support not only the existing missionary program but whatever future program the General Assembly in its wisdom (or lack of wisdom) may authorize, in opposition not only to the Biblical demand that we obey God rather than man but in opposition to what the Constitution says about the authority of human councils and freedom of conscience (Confession of Faith, Chap. XXXI, Sec. III and Chap. XX, Sec. II).

It may or may not be true that the Independent Board is an unconstitutional or illegal organization. Be that as it may, the Mandate of the last two Assemblies is itself unconstitutional or illegal and as such null and void. The question of the legality of the Mandate is quite independent of the question of the legality of the new Board. Disapproval of the Board as illegal, therefore, does not carry with it approval of the Mandate as legal. One might as well argue that lynching is legal provided the person lynched was actually guilty of a crime that called for a death sentence. Even if the members of the Independent Board have acted illegally—it is by no means certain that they have—that does not justify the Assembly in proceeding against them in an illegal manner. Neither does it justify the Assembly in making illegal and unconstitutional demands on Presbyteries, churches and individ-

uals. Whatever may be thought of the Independent Board the Mandate of the 1934 Assembly should be rescinded or rather declared unconstitutional.

## DECISIONS HANDED DOWN BY JUDICIAL COMMISSION OF THE SYNOD OF PENNSYLVANIA

 ON NOVEMBER 19th, the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania made public its decisions in twelve of the cases that had been argued before it the month previous, as was reported in our last issue. These decisions, for the most part at least, were such as to rejoice the hearts of the bureaucrats rather than the defenders of liberty in the Presbyterian Church. It may not be out of place at this time to offer some comments on two or three of the more significant of these decisions.

1. The Commission dismissed both the complaints that had been filed against the Presbytery of Lackawanna because of its action concerning the Rev. HENRY W. CORAY, now a missionary under the Independent Board. The first of these complaints was against the action of the Presbytery in refusing to dissolve the pastoral relationship between himself and the West Pittston Church in order that he might accept appointment to labor as a missionary under the Independent Board and the second against its action in dropping his name from the roll of Presbytery on the ground that in going as a missionary under the Independent Board he had become an “independent.” It seems to us that the Commission was quite right in dismissing the first complaint on the ground that there can be no question “as to the jurisdiction of presbytery over a field of labor and its authority to direct where a member shall labor” and hence that “the Presbytery was entirely within its discretionary rights in refusing to dissolve the pastoral relation and to give Mr. CORAY the privilege of laboring in another field”—whatever may be thought of the use it made of that discretionary right. On the other hand it seems equally clear to us that the second complaint should have been sustained in view of the fact that Mr. CORAY expressly denied that he had any intention or desire to become an “independent” in the sense of the Book of Discipline, Chapter VII, Sec. 2b. No doubt Mr. CORAY subjected himself to discipline in going out without the consent of his presbytery, but his presbytery had no right to erase his name from its roll without trial and conviction.

2. The Commission sustained the complaint against the Presbytery of Chester for deciding to take no action against Dr. Wilbur M. Smith because of his failure to sever his connection with the Independent Board on the ground that the Mandate of the 1934 Assembly is unconstitutional and ordered said Presbytery to proceed in obedience to that Mandate to institute action against Dr. Smith. “We hold that the Presbytery of Chester was wrong, and the Studies of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., as found in the 1934 Minutes of the General Assembly, clearly show that for a lower judicatory to assume the right of censuring the actions of a higher judicatory



is a gross abuse of power on its part, and a nullification of the Constitution of the Church"—so reads the decision. This case concerns one of the most important issues now before the Church. In view of the fact that the Presbytery of Philadelphia North recently refused to try two of its members who are members of the Independent Board and in view of the fact that New York Presbytery (not to mention others) has taken no action in the way of instituting proceedings against one of its members who is chargeable with the same offense, it looks as though this case may assume outstanding importance. The Commission, we understand, even declined to hear argument on the point involved on the ground that the Presbytery had no right to raise that question. In our opinion, this decision of the Commission is without merit. It seems to us to proceed upon at least two false assumptions (1) that the deliverances of a General Assembly have the standing of constitutional enactments and (2) that the decisions of the General Assembly sitting as a deliberative body have the same binding force as its decisions when sitting as a court. Only enactments adopted by the Presbyteries have the standing of constitutional articles while decisions of the General Assembly are binding only when the Assembly sits as a court. It is the right and duty of Presbyteries to institute disciplinary action against their members if they think membership on the Independent Board an offense, but, in our opinion, they are under no obligation to do this in obedience to this Mandate of the General Assembly.

3. In a number of the cases before the Synod an issue involved was the right of presbyters to fully question candidates for licensure and ordination as a means of arriving at a decision as to their fitness for the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. We are disposed to agree with the Commission in its decisions of this point. To cite the Commission: "There are two separate and distinct steps in either licensing or ordaining a candidate. First, the members of Presbytery have a right to ask questions fully and freely on all matters that may tend to throw light on his fitness for the ministry, and second, 'if the Presbytery be satisfied,' it shall then proceed to license or ordain him in the prescribed manner, in the course of which the moderator shall propound to him the constitutional questions." The Commission, however, did not confine itself to this point. In the FULTON case at least it went far beyond it and maintained that a Presbytery could not be constitutionally "satisfied" as to a candidate's fitness unless the candidate be willing to pledge loyalty to "present and future decrees of the General Assembly," i.e., unless he profess an implicit faith in the commandments of men—a thing that is expressly condemned in the Confession of Faith (Chap. XX, Sec. 2). To again cite from its written judgment: "The Commission holds that the Presbytery of Philadelphia in licensing candidate JOHN W. FULTON erred 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. . . . There cannot be evolved under government by graduated courts any system of inverted government by which the higher court judicatories

are made responsible to the lower, and by which any action of the higher judicatory can be subject to revision or annulment by a lower judicatory. This is what the Presbytery of Philadelphia has attempted to do in licensing a candidate who refuses to be bound by the mandates of the supreme judicatory of our Church. . . . Nothing but discord can result from the action of a presbytery in licensing a candidate who will not pledge his loyalty to the higher councils of the Church and to the present and future decrees of the General Assembly. Such a candidate is sanctioning in advance possible rebellion against the higher judicatories of the Church." In our judgment the Commission erred and erred grievously in this part of its decision. To affirm that a Presbytery cannot lawfully license or ordain one who will not pledge an implicit faith in the deliverances of Assemblies and undying allegiance to the Boards and agencies of the Church is to change the constitutional terms of licensure and ordination. Moreover it is calculated to keep all worthy men out of the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. No man who places loyalty to God above loyalty to men can possibly make such blanket promises no matter how fully he may approve of things as they *now* are. Any man who pledges undying loyalty to Boards and Church councils in order to get into the ministry makes clear that he is unworthy of the office to which he aspires. This decision hits not only members of the Independent Board but all who believe with the Confession of Faith that "all synods and councils since the apostle's time, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both" (Chap. XXXI, Sec. 3).

### THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AND THE BARNHOUSE REPORT

**I**N OUR last issue we printed that part of DR. BARNHOUSE'S report of his investigation of the Presbyterian mission stations of Asia that set forth his general findings and conclusions. The limits of our space, however, made it necessary for us to postpone until now the publication of that part of the report in which, perhaps, many of our readers will be most interested—the part which contains the evidence he adduces of Modernism among missionaries of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. "of which our Board is reported to have full knowledge." In addition to printing the remainder of DR. BARNHOUSE'S report among the pages devoted to contributions we have printed in our news columns both the comments of the Executive Council of the Foreign Board on DR. BARNHOUSE'S report and the action taken by the Board of Foreign Missions as a whole relative to DR. BARNHOUSE'S report. The action of the Board as a whole was taken subsequent to the action taken by its Executive Council.

It will be noted that the Executive Council devoted itself almost exclusively to an effort to minimize the significance of the evidence advanced by DR. BARNHOUSE. It sought to convey the impression that DR. BARNHOUSE'S charges have only an apparent basis in fact and that despite said charges



the Board of Foreign Missions has neither knowingly sent out missionaries untrue to the faith of our Church or retained in its service those disloyal to said faith. Its pronouncement, in fact, is quite in harmony with the previous attitude of the Board to the effect that all is well in the Foreign Board and that its critics are either misinformed or worse. It is highly significant, therefore, that the Board as a whole a few days later practically repudiated the action of its Executive Committee and issued a statement that leaves little to be desired. If the future actions of the Board are in harmony with its statement there would seem to be no good reason why the Board should not have the whole-hearted support of all loyal Presbyterians. It is true that more than satisfactory statements are needed in this connection. Action of a more or less drastic nature is called for. It will no doubt be charged that this statement was issued only for effect and that in the end nothing will be done. We prefer to proceed on the assumption that the statement was issued in good faith until the contrary is proved by the event. It is our hope and prayer that this

action by the Board means the beginning of a better day for the Foreign mission work of our Church. We are sure that Dr. BARNHOUSE himself expressed the thoughts of many when commenting on the Board's statement he said: "Those who are devoted to the missionary cause will pray that these new signs of vigor, this new tendency of the Board to control its Executive Council, will not be found to have been a stream of lava which burns out and stops, but rather a gushing stream sent from God in answer to the prayers of multitudes of faithful people to cleanse and refresh the work of our Church throughout the world. If this present action be indeed the beginning of such a cleansing and refreshing work, the danger of schism within our Church will have been averted, as the very ground of present opposition to the past policies of the Board will then have been eliminated" (*The Presbyterian*, Nov. 28, p. 5). We will await with interest the report which the Board promises the Church relative to the conditions cited by Dr. BARNHOUSE.

## John Calvin, the World Reconstructionist

By the Late Rev. James Mitchell Foster, D.D.

(Revised and Edited by his Daughter)

[Reverend James Mitchell Foster, D.D., was pastor of the Second Reformed Presbyterian Church of Boston, Massachusetts, for 37 years exactly, from his ordination, a Sabbath afternoon, November 11, 1891, to the day of his death, a Sabbath afternoon, November 11, 1928. He was killed almost instantly by an automobile soon after he had left his church, so that it was said of him at his funeral service, "He stepped from the pulpit into Heaven."]

**I**N THESE days of Dictators with standing armies, greater navies, and air forces of increasing size, is it not timely to turn our thoughts to John Calvin, whose work in Geneva produced an efficient, orderly and prosperous civil polity ruled "not by might nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts"? The old aphorism of the historians that the history of the world cannot be understood apart from the government of the world is a tribute to Calvinism. History is God's plan of governing the world in which He moves towards a perfect order as the goal of the human race.

John Calvin had a little city. Geneva had only 20,000 people. But he gave an object lesson for all the world. It was not the size but the *kind* of temple he built that counted—like a little leaven that leaveneth the whole. He ceased from his labors and fell asleep May 27, 1564, as Beza remarks, just as the sun was setting. But the sun will never set on Calvinism. The Huguenots kept Calvinism alive in France until it produced the Republic. William the Silent and the reformers established Calvinism in the Netherlands as the Dutch Republic. Knox established Calvinism in Scotland, Cromwell and William Prince of Orange made England by Calvinism. The Pilgrims and the Puritans of England, the Presbyterians of Ireland, the Covenanters of Scotland brought Calvinism to America.

Candid judges, like Mark Pathson, have written: "In the sixteenth century Calvinism saved Europe"; like Ban-

croft, "He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin knows little of the history of American liberty"; like John Morley, "To omit Calvin from the forces of Western evolution is to read history with one eye shut." "Calvin shaped the mould in which the bronze of Puritanism was cast." In a lecture by James Anthony Froude before the students of St. Andrew's University on Calvinism, Dr. Froude accentuated the fact that Calvinism has produced some of the world's greatest men. "It is enough to mention the names of William the Silent, of your own Knox and Andrew Melville, and the Regent Murray, of Coligny, of our English Cromwell, of Milton, of John Bunyan. These men were possessed of all the qualities which give nobility and grandeur to human nature—men whose life was as upright as their intellect was commanding and their public aims untainted with selfishness: unalterably just where duty required them to be stern, but with the tenderness of a woman in their hearts; frank, true, cheerful, humorous, as unlike sour fanatics as it is possible to imagine anyone, and able in some way to sound the keynote to which every brave and faithful heart in Europe instinctively vibrated."

John Calvin was a man of poverty—like Jesus of Nazareth. He left only \$200 at his death but he had hewed Plymouth Rock from the Alps of divine truth. And Calvinism will yet give civil and religious liberty to all nations and kindreds and tongues and peoples, because



Calvinism is God's order for the sons of men upon earth. And when Calvinism has become triumphant in all nations, Abraham's vision will be realized.

On October 31, 1517, when Calvin was eight years old, Luther nailed his 95 theses to the door of Wittenberg Castle Church. The sound of that hammer was heard through all Europe. Luther and Zwingli and Melancthon were iconoclasts rather than builders. A master-builder was needed for the constructive work of the Great Reformation. And God raised up John Calvin, French by birth, born and bred a Roman Catholic in God's Providence, taken away from his native country because France would not have his reformation views, after trying in vain to find a hiding place, going about Savoy, to Bavaria, to Italy, and at last to Geneva, where, after being banished and recalled, he established a true Christian church and a true Christian state, according to the pattern shown him in the mount of God's word.

#### **The Providential Preparation of Geneva for Calvin**

Geneva is situated at the end of Lake Lemman, between the Jura and Alps Mountains. Cæsar carried his conquests here and left Roman laws. After the breaking up of the Roman Empire, King Goudebald led his Burgundian Christian soldiers into this basin of the Rhone and brought freedom to Geneva in the 5th century. In 534 A. D. the Merovingian Kings of France seized and held Geneva until 888 A. D. when the second Burgundian Kingdom began there.

As early as 381 A. D. Geneva had a bishop. In 1091 A. D. we find one Aymon, Count of Geneva, at the helm. There was a conflict between the counts and bishops for supremacy. Peter of Savoy attempted to subjugate Geneva and failed in 1267. Twenty years later Amadeus of Savoy renewed the assault on Geneva and again it came to naught. In 1418, the Counts having become Dukes of Savoy, the Duke appealed to Pope Martin V to confer upon him the secular authority of Geneva. The syndics, counselors, and deputies of the municipal organization protested but the Pope acceded. In 1504, Charles III, Duke of Savoy, entered the struggle for the subjugation of Geneva, which had become characterized by its passion for independence and playing of one rival ruler against another. The struggle lasted for twenty years. The fairs at Geneva were destroyed and the prevalent distress of the 15th century became worse in the 16th. Finding that he could accomplish nothing by wily plots with the citizens themselves, he procured through the Pope Leo X the appointment of a scion of his own house (Savoy) as bishop, upon condition that the bishop should give the control of the city, so far as civil affairs were concerned, into the hands of the Duke. This resulted in a rebellion on the part of the citizens, which ultimately became a revolution, led by Berthelier, Pecotat and Bonivard, who in turn were subjected to the rage of the Duke's authority but liberated the city from Savoy control and put the power, civil and military, in the hands of the people. The heads of Berthelier, the father of Genevese liberty, of Blanchet and Navis, nailed to the bridge of Arve, did more than their words and

courageous deeds to arouse the people to action in the cause of their emancipation.

There were two parties among the people—the ducal or safeguard party, nicknamed the Marmelukes, and the popular or republican party, called Confederates or Eidgenossen—afterwards corrupted into Huguenots. The citizens' party was triumphant. This was a victory for civil liberty. Once the Genevese were rid of Charles III they were able to organize their independent republic. Better times came at last, thanks to the commercial relations re-established between Geneva and the Swiss and Italians.

About this time a young French theologian, Guillaume Farel, a zealous reformer and an eloquent preacher, who had fled from France because of the persecution of Francis I, came to Geneva. He preached the doctrine of Martin Luther and showed up the idolatry, superstition and vice of those in power. His tireless zeal and flaming enthusiasm made the Genevese a pillar of fire. By order of the council, a public discussion was held at which Farel challenged anyone to discuss with him the subjects of debate between the church of Rome and the Reformers. The result of the discussion was a sudden and almost volcanic religious revolution.

The people, demoralized by their civil disturbances, impulsive and impetuous, impatient of restraint, carried away in part by the sense of freedom already gained in political affairs, rushed to the churches, destroyed the relics, overthrew the altars, and then by an act of council abolished the Roman Catholic religion and declared Protestantism established in its place. But the forces which had been set free by Farel and the liberty which had been proclaimed by edict, needed to be organized, controlled and directed and Farel felt his helplessness. A statesman and a religious reformer was needed in Geneva to organize their independent Protestant republic and God had both at hand in the person of John Calvin.

#### **The Providential Preparation of John Calvin for Geneva**

It was at this stage that Calvin appeared on the scene. He had made a visit to Italy with a view of aiding the reformers in France from abroad. Visiting Ferrara, Florence and Naples, he seemed to have been disappointed in his hopes. He purposed returning to Basle to pursue his studies in seclusion. On the way he passed through Geneva, July, 1536, intending to tarry only for a night. But some one recognized him and informed Farel. The preacher visited Calvin at the inn and asked him to remain and help him. Calvin shrank from such an undertaking. Farel plead the interests of the true religion and that of the people. Calvin protested that he must be at his books. Then Farel became indignant and charged him with refusing to come up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty and declared that he would be obnoxious to the judgments of God if he refused this call to duty. "I denounce you in the name of Almighty God and declare that if you pretend the love of study in such a case, you are seeking your own things and not the things of Christ unless you become our fellow laborer in this cause," were the impetuous words of Farel.



Calvin was struck with terror by Farel's formidable obstetation and felt as if the hand of Almighty God had been stretched out from heaven and laid upon him and he was powerless to resist. And so the place, the hour and the man are brought together by the foreknowledge and predestination of God through the instrumentality of human agency. Calvin had been prepared for the place.

John Calvin was born in Noyon, Picardy, 67 miles north-east of Paris, July 10, 1509. He was a French Roman Catholic. His grandfather was a cooper and his father was secretary to the bishop and provost of the country. His mother was a beautiful and cultured woman, the mother of six children—John being the second of four sons. She died while John was young and he was placed in a noble family where he shared with the sons the lessons of an able tutor, DeMommor. When he was twelve years old his father procured for him the revenue of the Chapel de la Gesire, and when he was eighteen the revenue of another ecclesiastical benefice, although he was never ordained a priest according to the rites of the Roman Church. These benefices afforded an ample income to meet the expense of education.

\* "In regard to these early benefices two things are noticeable as indicating the clear integrity and crystalline firmness of character. One is, that being educated thus with abundance of worldly resources at his command, placed in entire dependence at 13 years of age, he did not become soft and effeminate; that his energies did not evaporate in indolence and self-indulgence; that his moral fibre did not become flaccid; that his mental power maintained from first to last its fine, hard grain and temper. And the other notable thing is that when the definite course of his life was settled in his own mind, he resigned his benefices, though the resignation left him poor, and poor he remained to the end of his life."

He went to the University of Paris and won the favor of the learned Spaniard Cordevuis, the instructor of Ignatius Loyola. He was so out of harmony with the frivolities of the students and so devoted to his studies that he was nicknamed the "Accusative Case." He often took only one meal a day and studied more than half the night. High thinking and meagre living wasted his physical frame and made his nerves so sensitive and intolerant that he was reputed censorious. Ten years were devoted to languages and logic and philosophy,† "a severe and unsparing discipline, which made him the prince of reasoners and the perfect master of Latin elegance and terseness that he was. Never was man clearer in the apprehension of his own thought or more precise in its expression. One of his chapters is like a web of chain-mail. He saw through things from their roots to the ramifications without effort, a very incarnation of logic."

His father intended him for the priesthood, but his studies of the Latin turned his attention to law. His father about this time had a quarrel with the church authorities at Noyon and readily agreed that his son go to Orleans University. John Calvin devoted himself to this new line

of study with his same ardor and success and he showed every promise of standing at the head of the legal profession. In 1530, when twenty-one years of age, he wrote a letter upon the royal divorce of Henry VIII from Catherine, giving his opinion in favor of it on the ground that the marriage was illegal as being within the degrees prohibited by the Scriptures. The fact that such a young man was consulted along with other Continental scholars on such matters indicates the altitude he had already reached. When twenty-four the University conferred upon him the title of LL.D. without the ordinary fee, as a compliment to his legal acquirements.

Two events seem to have changed the course of his whole life, although he had had many misgivings and deep spiritual convictions of sin. In the year 1527 Nicholas Doullon, aged 36, a priest, prothonotary, and holding several benefices, was accused of uttering blasphemy against the Virgin Mary and of denying that the Host was the very Christ. In the absence of the King four days sufficed the clergy for his condemnation. He was led, stripped of his official robes, with a rope about his neck and a taper in his hand, to apologize to the Virgin before an immense concourse in front of the Cathedral of Notre Dame. He remained firm in his faith and was burnt alive at the Gieve. The execution made a sensation and many disciples were made for the reformed faith. The scene affected Calvin deeply. He said: "The kingdom of Christ is strengthened and established more by the blood of martyrs than by force of arms." This was the first providence. Up to this time he had been more concerned about classical scholarship than about religion.

The second was the death of his father—an event which determined him to give up the law as a profession. He went to the University of Bourges, where he met a relative, Olivetan, a scholar of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, who was engaged in translating the Bible into French. Calvin joined him in this and was led to the study of Hebrew. He became a thorough reformer. In his "Introduction to his Commentary on the Psalms" he holds up the mirror and lets us have a glimpse into his soul at this time.

He was asked to expound the Scriptures to those who were seeking light. Modest and retiring he repaired to Paris, where he hoped to hide himself and study the Bible alone. But his attainments and personal character made him the natural guide and counselor of the inquirers in their thought and study. They crowded upon him in his retirement, so that, as he said, "My solitary place became like a public school." What he calls his "sudden conversion" took place here.

Calvin's friend, Nicolas Cop, was made rector of the University of Paris. Calvin urged him to improve the opportunity of declaring the reformed faith boldly in his inaugural address in Latin on All Saints Day. The oration was, in effect, a defense of the reformed opinions, especially of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and showed the tremendous influence of Calvin. It praised the Christian philosophy which taught the will of God.

The address observed an admirable proportion. It was

\* Rev. S. E. Herrick, D.D.—lecture on John Calvin.

† Dr. Herrick.



academical and yet evangelical. The monks were amazed. The Sorbonne was filled with anger and alarm. The rector essayed to defend his address. He convoked the four faculties, November 19, 1533, pointed out its scripturalness and complained that he had been denounced in the Parlement at the instance of the monks. Great confusion followed. The faculties of letters and medicine were for Cop's proposition, while the law and divinity faculties were against it. Cop would not cast the deciding vote.

Cop was summoned to Parlement. He essayed to go in his academic robes but, on the way, advised that a band of soldiers had been stationed to arrest him, he fled the city. Then Calvin was sought. He let himself down by sheets tied together from his window and escaped. Dressed as a peasant, he traveled to Angouleme. Here he enjoyed the hospitality of the rector of the Cathedral who had imbibed reformation principles and here he had the use of the rector's great library. This was just what Calvin wished for and for a whole year he studied here. He prepared the first draft of his "Christian Institutes" here. It was in the form of a catechism.

Then came the Year of the Placards—1534. It was a decisive year for Calvin. From this time forward his influence became supreme and all who had accepted the reformed doctrines in France turned to him for counsel and instruction. Francis I, who was at this time persecuting violently the Reformers of France, but who was desirous while crushing the new doctrines to keep on good terms with the reforming princes of Germany, gave out that his endeavors were directed against certain fanatics and subverters of social order, like the Anabaptists. And Calvin simply undertook to repel the mean aspersion. He had not thought of writing anything new or strange, anything original even. He simply undertook to tell what the true Christian faith is now, what it was in the beginning, what it always has been—gathering up the truths which Christians of all ages had held—Augustine, Remigius, Anselm, Luther. He bound them together in the adamant chain of his logic, showed their consistency and co-relation and then dedicated it to His Majesty, Francis I. "This, Your Majesty, is what the reformers believe, whom you are persecuting and we leave it now to your Majesty and to all the world to say whether we are Anabaptists and communists and rioters or whether we are members of the true Church, catholic of all time, and if you seek to drive us from this, the true faith, ply your fagots."

He went from here to Saint Onge, where he had a final interview with Queen Margaret of Navarre. Thence he went to Noyon, where he settled his father's estate, and with a brother and sister went to Basle. Here he published the first edition of the "Christian Institutes," 1535, in Latin. It seems he also made a French translation which appeared about the same time. It was revised and a new edition published in 1539. In 1559, with great pains, Calvin made a final revision of the work which is without parallel in the history of Christian doctrine, which is necessarily the basis of study in all the reformed theological semi-

naries, which to the end will regulate the thoughtful study of God's Holy Word.

The book at first appeared anonymously, the author having, as he himself says, nothing in view beyond furnishing a statement of the faith of the persecuted Protestants. In this work, written at the age of 26, we find a complete outline of the Calvinistic theological system. Nor is there any reason to believe that he ever changed his views on any essential point from what they were at the period of its first publication. It exercised a prodigious influence upon the opinions and practices both of contemporaries and of posterity.

#### Calvin's Great Work in Geneva

John Calvin was in his 28th year when he settled in Geneva and in this city the rest of his life, with the exception of a brief interval, was spent. His services at first were rendered gratuitously. He preached in the Church of St. Pierre and after about a year he was elected preacher by the magistrates with the consent of the people. The post to which he was called was not an easy one. Though the people of Geneva had cast off the obedience of Rome, it was largely a political revolt against the Dukes of Savoy, and they were still (says Beza) "but very imperfectly enlightened in divine knowledge." He was a prodigious worker. Besides preaching every day and sometimes two or three times, he published more commentaries than any of the reformers. His correspondence was immense. He often spent the whole night keeping it up. Add to this his duties as a member of the city executive council and the care of the municipal commonwealth and one wonders how the man was able to live even fifty-five years.

So far as it was possible for him to get a controlling hand upon the affairs of the church and state in Geneva, he meant to govern both by principles laid down in the Bible as he, Calvin, understood those principles. But Geneva was not yet ready for his system. Calvin and Farel were banished by order of the Council in 1538.

He went to Berne, then to Zurich and thence to Basle. He became pastor in Strassbourg, purposing to remain there. Here he married a widow, Idellette de Bure, with whom he lived happily for 9 years. But Geneva fared badly, anarchy prevailed. Cardinal Sadolet wrote a letter to the German Senate, calculated to mislead. That stirred Calvin and he answered the Cardinal so effectively that he retired in confusion. This warmed the hearts of the Genevese towards him and in September, 1541, after a banishment of three and one-half years, he returned in triumph to Geneva. Now his work began in earnest.

Concerning Calvin's plan of operation in Geneva, the French philosopher, M. Guizot, remarks:

"He desired (1) to establish and promote Christian faith in accordance with his own views; (2) to secure to the religious society which had been founded in virtue of that faith on the one hand religious independence of state control, and on the other authority and power in matters of religion over its members and faithful adherents; (3) to reform public and private morality both in civil and religious society in the name of the allied powers of the



church and state and by their mutual help. Such was the three-fold design which Calvin hoped to accomplish. No doubt, he had not set it very distinctly before him, nor had he fully realized all that it involved and all its difficulties, but he commenced the struggle with a stout heart and a resolute mind."

D'Aubigny remarks: "The people of Geneva and their great doctor have each left their stamp on the Reformation, which issued from their walls: Calvin's was truth, the people's liberty." Another more potent and supreme principle that Calvin diffused is the sovereignty of God. He enjoined the people to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's but, he has added, "God must always retain the sovereign empire and all that may belong to man remains subordinate. Obedience towards princes accords with God's service; but if princes usurp any portion of the authority of God, we must obey them only so far as may be done without offending God."

In establishing the state in Geneva Calvin recognized Almighty God as the Source of all authority, to know whom is man's supreme end; the Lord Jesus Christ as the divinely appointed ruler of nations; and the Bible whose writers were "sure and authentic amanuenses of the Holy Spirit," as the fountain of all law.

He maintained that civil government should restrain vice and encourage virtue, making doing wrong as difficult as possible and doing right as easy as possible. To obviate the evils, he drew up in union with Farel a statement of Christian doctrine consisting of 21 articles. This the citizens were summoned to profess and swear to as the confession of their faith. But the severity, both of ritual and of living, enjoined by Calvin and his endeavour to affect the complete freedom of the Church from State control was deeply resented.

Dancing and card playing were put under the ban and made penal offenses; all holidays were abolished except Sabbath. "These things are not wrong in themselves," said Calvin, "but they have been so abused that it is the wisest way to abrogate them altogether." There was to be no more feasting and revellings at weddings. All the lighter follies and amusements of society were to be abolished and all the darker vices of licentiousness and debauchery and drunkenness and profanity were summarily dealt with. Penalties were severe. Parental authority was defended with exceeding vigor. A girl was beheaded for striking her mother, a boy who threatened the same unfilial act was condemned to die. A young child was ordered whipped who sang some silly words to a Psalm tune; and a man hearing an ass bray and said, "What a fine Psalm he chants, to be sure," was banished. Parents were held responsible for the training of their children and all were compelled to cease work on the Sabbath Day.

He recodified the Genevan laws and constitution. His system of church polity assumed that every member of the State was also under discipline of the Church; and he asserted that the right of exercising this discipline was vested exclusively in the body of preachers and elders.

His views on Church discipline naturally brought him

into conflict with the civil authority and with the people. But his courage, his perseverance, and his earnestness at length prevailed and before he died his system of Church polity was firmly established, not only at Geneva, but in other parts of Switzerland, and was adopted substantially by the Reformers in France and in Scotland.

Calvin was consulted on every affair that came before the Council—on questions of law, police, economy, trade, and manufactures. To him the city owed her trade in cloths and velvets, from which so much wealth accrued to her citizens; sanitary regulations were introduced by him which made Geneva the admiration of all visitors; and Calvin was the founder of Geneva's University. He believed that a free city and a free government could not exist except by educating the people in morals and religion, and so he instituted a system of free public schools.

But the University was in a sense his crowning work there, for it added religious education to the evangelical preaching and the thorough discipline already established and so completed the reformer's ideal of a Christian commonwealth. The men whom he trained at Geneva carried his principles, civil and religious, into almost every country of Europe.

For Calvin the Decalogue was both a civil code and a spiritual rule of life. The state was its keeper in the former sense; the church in the latter sense—each separate in its sphere of action. The state forbade idolatry, the church promoted the pure worship of God. The state forbade profanity and blasphemy, the church taught reverence for God's holy name. The state forbade public Sabbath desecration, the church kept the day holy unto the Lord. The state required obedience to just and legal authority, the church required preserving the honor and performing the duty belonging to every one in their several places and relations as superiors, inferiors and equals. The state executed the criminal, the church taught that hating a brother without cause was murder. The state punished adultery and fornication, the church called for purity in thought, word and deed.

Professor George P. Fisher, in his analysis of John Calvin's System in "The Reformation," assigns three reasons for the triumph of Calvinism in Geneva.

1. It separated church and state.
2. Its church government was republican.
3. Its Scripturalness throughout in doctrine, order and administration.

Professor Fisher also makes clear two objections to the Geneva system.

1. The church discipline was too severe.
2. The penalties of the state were too drastic and out of proportion to the offenses.

But are we sure that lawless human nature can be held in check without such stringent laws as Calvin had? Are we sure that we shall not be compelled to adopt Calvin's way yet to stamp out the lawless spirit of crime prevalent in our country? Remember he was dealing with a people demoralized by civil disturbances, an impetuous and impulsive people, impatient of restraint. The city had gone



wild and needed a strong, severe and powerful hand to bring order out of confusion.

One act of extreme severity—the burning of Michael Servetus—sullied the cause he had so greatly at heart. After the decision of the Council, Calvin did all in his power to have the decision changed, but the Council, backed by the Swiss authorities and some of the more famous reformers like Melancthon, would not yield and Calvin cannot be held guiltless of this untowardly extreme severity.

Calvin took nothing but his Latin Bible with him into the pulpit. He used no notes. He was of medium height, pale, sharp-featured, physically weak. He was a sensitive man, but so modest that he did not make it known. In his "Introduction to his Commentary on the Psalms," he compares himself with David, who was pierced by the calumnies of his enemies, but more deeply wounded by the reproaches of his professed friends. And, he remarks, that in describing David's heartaches in his annotations he is depicting his own. Though he lived for 30 years at the foot of the Jura Mountains and in the shadow of the Alps and beside the beautiful Lake Lemman he never referred to these in his writings. The truth of the unseen kingdom was his all absorbing theme. "We look not on the things that are seen, but on the things that are not seen." And so he did not carry his heart on his sleeve and bring his own feelings into the arena. He was simply the voice of God crying in the wilderness. His marvelous modesty made him hide

himself that the truth of the kingdom might be clearly seen. "I preach not myself, but Christ the Lord."

"His system has had and still has great value in the history of Christian thought. It appealed to and evoked a high order of intelligence and its insistence on personal individual salvation has borne worthy fruit. So, also, its insistence on the chief end of man, 'to know and to do the will of God' has made for strenuous morality. Its effects have been most clearly seen in Scotland, in Puritan England, and in the New England States, but its influence was and is felt among peoples that have little desire or claim to be called Calvinist."\*

In a word, Calvin's system is the affirmation of God's sovereign government of the world and of the universe. Calvin had no dependence on standing armies or body guards or the rule of might—his dependence was wholly upon the sovereign Word of God. As a little leaven leaveneth the whole, one such Christian city would seal the redemption of the world. John Calvin produced that city in Geneva.

Is such a city possible in this day and age in our land? However small, a sincere group of Calvinists can keep alive Calvinism and save Presbyterianism from disasters and pitfalls which are besetting our church and our nation and the world.

\* Encyclopædia Britannica.

[Note: This paper was read before the Presbyterian Ministers Association of Greater Boston (Massachusetts), October 16, 1922, by Rev. James M. Foster, D.D.]

## Controversy and Compromise

By Rev. S. J. Henman

Presidential Address Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Fellowship of Evangelical Churches, 1935

**M**Y SUBJECT centres round two words which are closely akin. Controversy and Compromise. These words have fallen upon evil days in later years, and I think they need rescuing and reclaiming for the Service of God.

### I. Controversy

The literal meaning of the word is "a turning against." It may be quite a simple dispute. A statement is advanced and you turn it back because you do not accept it. That is controversy. In advancing it reasons are given for so doing, and in turning it back other reasons are given, and so it goes on and becomes an argument or discussion. In the argument many things are often introduced which are not relevant to the point at issue and it is obscured, and a purely wordy warfare ensues. Or heat may be introduced, and the matter which should be quietly and seriously considered with a view to an agreement is often a cause of strife and division. Therefore, some people raise the cry, "No Controversy!" But we need to distinguish between the essential and the incidental: right methods and wrong, and not condemn a thing because some people use it wrongly.

The necessity for controversy arises from the fact that there is evil in the world as well as good: error as well as truth, and these two are not only contrary to one another, but contradictory of each other. Good and evil can never be reconciled, and no one can be on both sides at the same time. Everyone must, and does, inevitably choose his side either actively or passively.

The word controversy occurs thirteen times in the Old Testa-

ment. There is the controversy of Zion (Isaiah xxxiv. 8). Jehovah has a controversy with the Nations (Jeremiah xxv. 31), and with His people (Hosea iv. 1, and xii. 2, Micah vi. 2), and He will plead with them. These passages show us what true controversy is. It is the opposing of evil and refusing to acknowledge its right, and giving reasons for so doing. God is engaged in a holy controversy with evil in all its forms, and we who profess to be His servants are to let it be known that we are on His side. This was the challenge to Israel in Moses' day in the matter of the golden calf, and in Elijah's day regarding Baal. Christian controversy has to do with matters that are vital to the Kingdom of God. There are truths about which we differ, and which can well be left to each man's individual judgment in the sight of God, because the difference is of the surface rather than of the foundations. They are important—all truth is—but not fundamental, and we are able to discuss them together while yet remaining on equal terms of fellowship. But there are some truths which cannot be so treated. As for instance, the full inspiration and complete authority of the Scriptures: the proper and essential Godhead of our Lord: His atoning and substitutionary work at Calvary: His triumphant resurrection and ascension: the new birth: Salvation by grace through faith and not of works: the condemnation of the unbeliever and Christ rejector. These truths are vital, and there are others, and with all those who deny or distort them God has a controversy, and so have we, His servants, if we are faithful. Where truth is concerned we cannot be neutral or non-committal and loyal at the same time.



### Manner of Controversy

But controversy is to be conducted in harmony with the mind of Christ. He is our pattern in this as in all else. It is important to see that a great part of the New Testament is controversial; that is to say, it was written to expose some error and to put in its place the positive truth. Dr. Stalker in his "Imago Christi," p. 285, says, "In the records of our Lord's life we have pages upon pages of controversy. It may have been far from the work in which He delighted most to be engaged; but He had to undertake it all through His life, and especially towards its close. The most eminent of His servants in every age have had to do the same." These words are true, and I may add that there are very few pages of the New Testament where no trace of controversy can be found. The question is a simple one. In addition to giving to the best of our ability our positive and constructive witness to the great truths for which we stand, are we never to raise our voices in protest against those who by word and act are so diligently undermining these truths by specious arguments? Dr. Stalker also says, p. 283, "At the present time controversy has an evil name," and, p. 287, "Excessive aversion to controversy may be an indication that a Church has no keen sense of possessing truth which is of any great worth, and that it has lost appreciation for the infinite difference in value between truth and error." This is also true, and to be remembered.

I am very far from wishing to turn this Fellowship into a controversial machine. That was not in the intention and purpose of its founders for a moment. But I am equally far from wishing to see it remain entirely silent on the great matters that agitate the Church from time to time. We want a fellowship in affirmation, that is our principal purpose; but there will be occasions when we shall need to have a fellowship in protest. Fellowship in the truth may mean, and must mean sometimes, fellowship against error.

In saying these things I do not forget that in matters of controversy we need very earnestly to seek the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the special guidance of the Holy Spirit. Many rush in where angels fear to tread, and that has brought the whole subject into a measure of disrepute. Some of us, it may be, have had to dissociate ourselves from those with whom fundamentally we are in the heartiest agreement, because we do not feel that their methods are of God. To rightly conduct controversy it is necessary first of all to have very clear convictions of truth, and then to examine the matter in dispute, as far as possible, from all sides. We need also to search our own hearts to see that there is no selfish interest, or desire for self-prominence or advantage of any kind. In addition there should be an earnest seeking of the grace of humility, as well as of the mind of Christ in meekness and gentleness. We must likewise give credit for any good that can be found in our opponent, and be careful not to impugn motives which only God can rightly determine. In short, controversy, like marriage, is not to be entered into lightly, but prayerfully, in the fear of God and under His guidance, submitting ourselves entirely to His will, remembering that the controversy is really His, in the first place. At the same time we must not shrink from pointing out in the plainest and most definite way how the statements and actions which we are controverting, contravene the truth as it is revealed in the Word of God. It is the honor of God that is at stake, and we must try so to act and speak as that He shall be glorified. The closing weeks of our Lord's life were largely spent in controversy, and so were the closing years of the Apostle Paul. Reading these records, we see how steadfastly our Lord held to the Scriptures, and with what wisdom and grace He answered His critics and exposed their errors. At times His words were scathing: "O generation of vipers"; at another time He gently expostulated: "Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures." And sometimes He carried the war into the enemy's camp by asking questions which they dared not answer, and by making statements which they could not contradict. We cannot help being controversial at times if we are going to keep the Faith, for if we are silent when Truth is denied or distorted, and there is

opportunity to protest, our silence may well be taken as consent. Moreover, to make our position clear is necessary for our own peace of mind's sake and the spiritual health of our soul. I have kept the Faith, said the Apostle—that is, he had kept it by proclaiming it plainly and fearlessly and by defending it against those who would deny it.

### "No Controversy"

The cry "No Controversy" in New Testament times would have meant that when the Rulers denied our Lord's Messiahship, He would have said nothing; when Peter dissembled at Antioch, Paul would not have withstood him to the face; when some said that the resurrection was already passed, he would not have answered them, and when others were preaching gnosticism or Judaism as an addition to the Gospel, he would have refrained from exposing their errors. But then a good deal of the New Testament would never have been written! As Dr. Stalker says, "Controversy is by no means a pleasant task," and I can personally testify to the mental pain one suffers when feeling impelled to engage in it, and especially when those we have to oppose are fellow-believers whom we hold in real affection and esteem. But I can also say that out of such painful experiences have come some of the most precious manifestations of God's grace and care.

## II. Compromise

I now pass on to speak of the kindred topic of compromise, and first of all to see what we mean by the term. In its derivation it is an agreement, and the dictionary defines it as placing one's life, honour or reputation in a position of jeopardy by agreement. We are here concerned with believers in Christ, because in matters of Biblical truth they are the ones chiefly involved, and it is to them I am addressing these words. In experience it is the fact, I believe, that the nearer one seeks to abide by the truth of God as revealed in His Word, the more careful we have to be to see that we are not betrayed into a position which, to some extent at least, nullifies our positive testimony. The Apostle John lays down an inspired rule which is most important, but is not always easy to apply. In his Second Epistle, verses 9 to 11 (R.V.), he says, "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God: he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son. If anyone cometh unto you and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works." What is meant by the teaching of Christ? We understand it to be the great fundamental facts as taught by the Saviour and recorded in the Scriptures. "If any man bring not this." It is not chiefly what a man says, but what he does not say; and this is very significant, for it is just here that so many lead others astray. Yet in dealing with cases like this we have to be careful to inquire the reason for the omission. Is it deliberate and because the speaker does not believe these things, or is it that he is taking them for granted for the moment, and does not feel the need of specially affirming them on that particular occasion? The answer to these questions will determine our attitude and action. Our Lord's example needs to be carefully studied and copied.

### Three Ways of Compromise

Compromises may be entered into in three ways. (1) By silence when truth demands that we should speak. Not that silence always involves compromise, for there is a dignified silence that is more eloquent than words, and a look may convey as much as a word. (2) By a hasty consent or co-operation without giving time for prayerful thought and for seeking the mind of the Lord. (3) By association, which is the most frequent form that compromise takes. Men holding the fundamental facts of our Faith will associate on terms of equality with others who, while professing to be believers, deny or belittle these facts. This is compromise of the most insidious and dangerous type. It may be regarded as very narrow and bigoted to refuse to associate with such, but the honour of God and the clarity and truth of our own witness must stand first, and we dare not. "He that giveth him greeting partaketh of his evil deeds." Was it not for just such a compromise



that Jehoshaphat was rebuked by the prophet Jehu, in 2 Chronicles xix. 2? There is not only individual responsibility, but collective responsibility, and association on equal terms with those from whom I am compelled to differ fundamentally compromises my position and weakens my moral character. Otherwise truth becomes a matter of opinion rather than of conviction. We are stewards of the mysteries of God, and we shall have to give an account.

In maintaining a position of no compromise it is important that we should not only have definite and clear convictions concerning the truth, but also firmness and steadfastness of purpose, together with a spirit of meekness and fairness and, above all, self-control. These things are not naturally found in us, but the indwelling Spirit will give them as we surrender ourselves to His ruling and guidance.

Further consideration of the subject will remind us that there are a good many matters of Scripture interpretation about which those who are of one mind as to fundamentals have always differed, largely because of the different angle at which they approach them, and it is here that another principle comes in to check and guide

the former. It may be called Christian accommodation, and it was in relation to this that the great Apostle said that he sought to be all things to all men, and that we were to receive one another as Christ also received us. Difference of view on these things should not divide believers to the point of separation from one another. We can agree to differ on many things without compromise or any breach of fellowship being made. The bonds of love and peace which unite the people of God are sufficiently strong and elastic to stand the strain of such differences without any danger of breaking. The essential thing is to maintain an attitude of frankness on the one hand and considerateness on the other. It is hardly necessary perhaps to add that in the application of these principles to individual cases, we should earnestly seek the special guidance of God.

Here I leave the subject. I have tried to speak of things which have been in my own mind for many years and of principles which have guided my own conduct in many difficult and sometimes very painful experiences, "and herein do I exercise myself to have a conscience void of offence towards God and toward men."

## Report of Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse Concerning his Visit to Presbyterian Foreign Mission Stations in Asia

[The major part of Dr. Barnhouse's Report was printed in our last issue. See editorial in this issue page 173.]

The following, however, are incidents which may throw light on some of the problems in our Church through what I believe to be a small percentage of our missionaries:

CASE A. Accompanied by my secretary, I went to preach to a certain national group. A missionary whom I shall call Mr. One translated for me. My message was addressed to non-Christians who knew very little about Christianity, was very simple and centered on the fact of sin and our lost condition, and the necessity of faith in the death of Jesus Christ as the atonement for sin. After the meeting, Mr. One said, "Here is one Liberal who has been tolerant, since I translated you most accurately, though I did not agree with what you said." When he left us, my secretary and I went on our way, making notes of the conversation within ten minutes and writing the diary within a few hours. I quote from my diary. Mr. One "then went on to say that he did not believe in justification through faith in the work of Christ as a substitute." Several Conservatives told me that this man is a known Liberal in his attitude toward the central truths of the Christian faith.

Some time later, I quoted this instance to one of our missionaries, Mr. Two. He affirmed that Mr. One had once said, "If I did not believe that a good Buddhist had as much chance of going to heaven as a good Christian, I should never have wanted to become a missionary." This, Mr. Two said, was in line with the general impression of Mr. One's theological position. Further, Mr. Two told me that one of the officials of the Board from New York City, Mr. Three, discussed this matter with him, Mr. Two. When the phrase was quoted, Mr. Three made an entry of it in his notebook, and said: "Isn't it terrible that one of our missionaries should ever say such a thing." We personally are willing to believe that this Board official later lost his notebook, for within a few months of that time, Mr. Three stated publicly that he had found no evidence of Modernism on the foreign field.

CASE B refers to a theological seminary supported jointly by

our Board and that of some other Boards. At a tea attended by about forty missionaries of our Church, it came out that the budget of this theological seminary is not under the control of the Mission, but that the money is sent directly from New York. One of our missions protested to the New York Board against such support, but the protest was disallowed. I asked why the protest had been made, and was answered that it was because the school was "outstandingly modernistic" and there were very few Presbyterian students in the school; only two in the theological seminary. Although our year book shows that the salaries of ten Americans working in the institutions are paid from New York, in addition to the amounts given directly to the support of the institution, Mr. Four said that one of the co-operating denominations had issued a statement in native language concerning recognition by the educational department of the government, in which it was definitely stated, "not in the least have we to do with the proclamation of the Gospel." Mr. Five said that the persons in this institution ought not to be judged without being present. His exact words were: "At Blank it is vital Christianity. These men should be here to answer for themselves." I asked, "Do they believe in the deity of Christ and in His bodily resurrection?" Mr. Five replied, "It is scarcely fair to impose doctrinal standards on them. They should be judged by whether their Christianity is vital in life." After this tea, I wrote this statement down and read it to five or six people who had been present and asked them if they recognized it as a direct quotation. They all agreed that this was precisely what Mr. Five had said.

Later, a missionary told me he had announced a plan at his station meeting for a series of evangelistic meetings in the local church. Mr. Five came to him and told him he hoped there would be no such thing done, as there had never been such meetings in their station, and he thought there should be no evangelistic meetings. Both Mr. and Mrs. Five were opposed to the definite preaching of the Gospel. Mr. Five had once said that a missionary



who built a mile of good road in that country which needs roads so badly, did more for the land than all of the street chapels. On another occasion, Mrs. Five said, "Are we to continue to have revival meetings in that church of yours?" The missionary answered that as long as he was connected with the station, there should be revival meetings. At another time she said, "How long are we going to have talk about conversion and the Blood of Jesus?" This Mr. Five was one of the principal advocates for government recognition for the schools, which meant the elimination of the Bible from the curriculum. I asked Mr. Six if there were any Bibles in the institution where Mr. Five taught. He told me that Mr. Five had abolished compulsory Bible classes and compulsory chapel even before the institution had been put in the hands of a board of directors, while since government recognition had been given, the directors abandoned even the voluntary Bible classes on the roster.

Mr. Five, because of his first conversation in which he had said the men of the Union Institution should be allowed to speak for themselves, arranged to take me to the school. When I reached the city in which it was located, he came for us, and while we were traveling to the school, I told him that I had heard that he had said the day of direct evangelism was over. He attempted to avoid the question, but finally said he thought the day of direct preaching of the Gospel was over and that the emphasis should be upon the social needs of the country. We reached the grounds of this Union Institution. The secretary of the mission had informed me that \$5,500 a year goes to this institution through specific gifts from individuals to this work, and that \$20,000 a year is contributed by the New York Board. Mr. Five took me to the offices of the faculty of the school of religion. The first man we met with a national, Mr. Seven. After the amenities of the meeting were over, I told him I had heard that his school had several faculty members who were practically Unitarian and that the churches did not like the students who graduated from the school because of their theological position. I asked him if that were true. In his answer, stenographically reported by my secretary, Mr. Seven said, "We stand here for freedom. You can contrast this place with the Blank Theological Seminary. I am told the teachers over there have to subscribe to a creedal statement and that they have to subscribe to it each year. Here we do not do that. The individual belief of a man is honored. When we invite a man to teach here, of course we investigate and make sure he is in good standing in an evangelical Church." Mr. Seven said that though he himself personally did not take the Unitarian position, he would be glad to have Unitarians in his church as associate members. He said, "I think a Unitarian is a Christian, but he cannot be admitted into full evangelical fellowship." I asked Mr. Seven what his definition of a Christian was, and he answered, "A Christian is one who is not against Jesus."

Mr. Five then took us to call on Mr. Eight, the dean of the school of religion. This gentleman told us that there were eleven regular students and eleven special students. There is also a faculty of eleven, but all of them do some teaching in the university.

I told Mr. Eight I had heard that the doctrinal position of the school was a Unitarian one. He immediately explained that he was not a Unitarian. I now quote from the stenographic report of the conversation:

Q. Do you believe that Jesus eternally pre-existed as God?

A. I do not know.

Q. Do you believe that Jesus had a human father?

A. I do not know. I am an agnostic on that point.

Q. Do you believe He pre-existed eternally?

A. Something did exist, certainly. The existence of something is very important.

Q. Do you believe that this existed in Christ more than in any other being?

A. I do not know.

Q. What about the Bible statements?

A. Some claim one view, others claim another. Each claim to have a revelation from God. How can anyone know about spiritual things?

I answered that this knowledge was supernatural and explained my position by the difference between those who were not born again and those who were born again, and thus received supernatural knowledge of spiritual things. He replied, "You draw a line between two classes, those who are saved and those who are lost?" I answered, "Yes." He replied, "I do not know how you can draw that from the teachings of Jesus."

Q. But what does God say?

A. The Word of God is written in the hearts and minds of men and women and is found in the writings of men throughout the ages as well as in the Bible. The Bible means nothing without the life of Christ. I believe that every word that comes from the mouths of Christians is a word of God. There are new complexities of life and new needs for an expanding revelation.

It is to be remembered that the school of which this man is the dean is the religious department of a union institution that receives \$20,000 a year from the Presbyterian Board. It also should be noted that all of the missionaries attached to this school have a full vote in deliberations concerning all activities of the mission, while the missionaries who are not attached to the school have no vote in any of the activities of the institution.

CASE C. At one of our great mission institutions, I asked the group of missionaries if they would make an open statement of their faith. Several of them spoke enthusiastically, some lukewarmly, others kept silent. The next day, Mr. Nine came to see me. He told me that he had sat through the meeting and had not given any answer concerning his faith because he had reservations and did not wish to start a discussion, but had come to me to talk about them.

He was brought up in another denomination. Though he had read of the Apostles' Creed, he had never actually heard it until in college he visited the church of another denomination where it was recited. He told me that he did not accept the main truths of Christianity. When he was baptized he had said that he accepted Jesus as Lord and Saviour, but he did not in any wise realize the theological meaning of these terms. He had friends in college who were Presbyterians and who did not believe in the central truths of Christianity as held by the historic Presbyterian faith.

He had majored in one subject in college and then later had decided to become a minister. Someone suggested that instead of going back to a classical course and spending more years in preparation, that he should enter some institutional mission work as a compromise between the two ideas. This friend put him in touch with the Presbyterian Board. He was taken into a Presbyterian church by letter from the denomination in which he had been brought up though he did not believe in the central Christian truths. He applied to the Presbyterian Board to be a missionary, specifying the institution with which he is at present working. He made out the blanks which the Board sent him, and when he came to the questions of doctrine, wrote very frankly that he did



not believe in the deity of Christ, that he did not believe in the bodily resurrection, that he did not believe in the atonement made by Christ. He said his conscience made no trouble for him because he knew that the Presbyterian friends who had led him thus far held the same position he did and he had supposed that many Presbyterians had the same ideas.

Shortly afterwards, he received a letter from the Presbyterian Board, saying that they had noted his answers and that probably it was a case of phraseology, in view of the fact that he had not been theologically trained. Had he had this training, his answers would probably have been different. They were enclosing the report of the Jerusalem Conference on missionary purpose, and asked him to read it. Mr. Nine began the reading of this document, but before he had time to write to the Board again, another letter was received from them, announcing his appointment by the Presbyterian Foreign Board.\*

Even then he did not think that it was an anomalous situation for him to be on the field with his name listed as a Christian missionary, because he was sure that there were more Presbyterians in America who believed as he did and were contributing to missions than there were missionaries on the field believing as he did. Therefore, he felt he was being supported by their money and was their representative and was not the representative or using the money of the Christians who believed in these doctrines.

I do not think that I have ever met a young man more frank and more honest. A few questions showed that he had never had true Christianity presented to him. He was as ignorant of Biblical Christianity as some of the heathen in the villages around us. We spent an hour together in Bible study. The next morning he came for another hour. There is no doubt of his honesty. The manner of his coming and the frankness of his speech demonstrate it. Concerning the finality of Christ as the only way of salvation, he said and I wrote it down word for word as he spoke and read it back to him, "According to the God I know and which I was brought up to believe in in the Christian Church, these Hindus and Mohammedans are not lost." When I presented to him the truth of the holiness of God and the justice of God as well as the love of God, it could be seen that he was visibly moved. Evidently he had never come face to face with the holiness of God in any thought before. I have put good literature into his hands and told older missionaries in his station the full extent of the conversation, with the hope and prayer that the Lord would bring him to the knowledge of the truth. But what a commentary on the indifference in New York when the papers were passing.

Five months later, a letter was received from older missionaries who knew about the case from which I quote. "You will be glad to know that we feel our young friend has been making real and definite progress the past few months in finding his way through uncertainties and difficulties. . . . This was very evident in a talk he gave recently. A few of us who understood a little about what he had been going through had quite a thrill as we listened to him."

CASE D. I heard of one of our missionaries, Mr. Ten, who had been greatly criticized because of a sermon he had preached in

which he denied some of the central truths of Christianity. I had been told that this situation had been reported to the Board, and that there had been correspondence between the Board and this man concerning his faith, that he had been asked for a statement of his beliefs and had submitted one which was not satisfactory to the Board, and that they had written him asking him to make a still stronger statement. When I came to his station, I had hoped to speak with him about it. Before I had the opportunity, the matter came up in discussion with other missionaries, who spoke of the affair quite freely as though it were well known. Finally, one of the older missionaries told me about the coming of this man to the field. He had been kept from worldly thought from his childhood, and outside influences did not reach him even in college or theological seminary. The missionary said to me, "Most missionaries have these problems and settle them before they come to the field. Ten hasn't settled them yet," and yet he is a man in early middle age.

In the early part of his missionary work, he was put on rural evangelism, and as the people were in the fields most of the day, and his work was mostly early and late, he had a great deal of opportunity to read. He began reading the wrong books and developed in the wrong direction. Mr. Ten came to call on me, and at the moment of his entrance I happened to have been discussing the recent archaeological finds in the Lachish with another missionary. So I began with this man, who was somewhat combative in his ideas of Christianity, to attempt to break down prejudice, and spoke of these finds and their importance in accrediting the Scriptures and destroying so many of the higher critical theories. This man immediately began to lay traps in order to show me that one couldn't believe the Bible, that certain things taught in the Mosaic law as being facts were in reality superstitions which could be found in the folk-lore of the country in which we were. I pointed out that there was one thing which was more important than any other, and asked him as to what position he would take as to the deity of Christ. He said that he could answer my question yes or no, depending upon what he put into the words. He then went on to explain that he was of the opinion that Christ denied the Old Testament by His attitude in the Sermon on the Mount, and that therefore the Old Testament could not be inspired. He further said in the course of the conversation that he could not accept any orthodox ideas in doctrinal truth. I asked if there could be two ways of interpreting the work of Christ on the cross. He thought there would be many more than two, and would not admit for a moment the absoluteness of the truth of Christ's person and work. This man seemed very disturbed that anyone should question his call to his present work. He said that there were so many Liberals in the Church at home in America, that they were contributing so much to the funds of the Board that he was as sure that the proportion of Liberals was a low one and that he could consider himself supported by the Liberal group. He seemed to be very bitter and felt that he was going to be hounded out of the Church just because he did not believe in certain doctrines and he did not think this was just. I did not attempt to take up with him the argument for the basis of the faith which he had sworn to believe when he was ordained.

There are other cases which exist where there is almost unanimous testimony as to definite disagreement with the doctrines of the Scriptures as expressed in our Presbyterian Standards. In some cases I received the statements of missionaries only on definite promise that they should not be quoted, and I respect that confidence. The cases that have been cited here have been brought forth with one particular object in view. They are cases of existing unbelief in Presbyterian supported work of which our Board is reported to have full knowledge.

\* In the discussion that followed the reading of this report, I received the assurance from the senior Secretary that he would write me a formal letter requesting the names of the individuals mentioned therein and upon this assurance, disclosed the name of this young missionary. His papers were immediately brought to the meeting. It was discovered that his memory in his conversation with me was only partially exact, as he had written in answer to the question, "Do you accept the confession of faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America?" a brief and categorical affirmative, but in the next question concerning the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, denied this affirmative in an answer which I was permitted to read and which the senior Secretary declared was "entirely unsatisfactory." The implication as I understood it was that he himself had never seen these papers.



# A Meditation

## The Courses of the Age Are His

By Abraham Kuyper, D.D., LL.D.

Translated by Rev. John Hendrik De Vries, D.D.\*

WITH the completion of the year another limit is set upon your life and upon the number of your days.

A new year is brought into the allotted span of your life. . . . Involuntarily you ask what this year will bring you and yours. Whether this year will outlive you, or whether you will outlive it. And this of itself prompts you, at the threshold of this year, to look up to your Father in heaven, to ask little but to trust much, to lay the hand upon the mouth, and, quietly as the weaned child, to await what God will bring upon you, and upon your dear ones.

"The courses of the age are his," declares the prophet (Hab. iii, 6, Dutch Ver.). God counts and reckons with centuries, as the dial of your clock, with hours and minutes. You are the little one in need of help, who counts with tenths of a second; your God bathes Himself in eternity with millions of time-periods at once. There is no comparison conceivable between your reckoning of time and the time-reckoning of God. With God it is the ever welling, the always bubbling up, the perennially bountiful overflowing fountain of the eternal; with you it is the dripping of the moments, audible to you in the tick of the seconds. How unbearably long sometimes, when you must wait, five single minutes seem.

Never must this more than gigantic difference between you and your God be lost from sight; a difference that stretches so far that it is absolutely impossible for us to make plain to our understanding the relation between our time and the eternity of our God, though we know that this relation must be there, and is. Surely, if you die happily in Christ, you, too, shall one day enter upon this eternity, in order to enjoy therein great things eternally; but yet, even this shall never be to you the eternity of your God. Though presently you live eternally, you have had a

beginning, but your God never. "Before the mountains were brought forth, yea, from eternity to eternity, thou art God" (Ps. 90). And this never applies to man.

But however inconceivably great this difference is between you who live by hours, and your God to Whom the courses of the age belong, such is the grace of your Lord, that He breaks the period of your life-time, from the cradle to the grave, into parts of years, and into parts of days, and into parts of hours and minutes, and thereby imparts to your otherwise so short life, a breadth, a lengthening of duration and a richness of scope, which makes you bathe yourself in the little pond of the brief years of your life as in an ocean.

Time and its division into years and days has not been invented by you; it has been ordained for you by your God. "And the evening and the morning were the first day" is the creation word, whereby this entire order and division of time was appointed in your behalf, before man had yet appeared on this earth. Sun and moon and the rotation of the earth and the pulsation of the blood in your veins, have been disposed with the view of dissolving your life into minutes and seconds. And it is through this wondrous means, wonderful in its simple design, that the grace and the loving kindness of your God has created, in behalf of you and because of you, a wealth of life in the past, now in the present, and before long in the future, whereby your life which by itself is so short, becomes almost immeasurably long and great, both in retrospect and prospect.

Even that one year that now again lies behind you seemed so long to you that only a few of its more significant days are clearly remembered, and the new year that begins makes an impression as though it could never end.

Yea, and what is more, not only has

your God Whose ways are everlasting, richly divided your life and thereby mightily enlarged it in your idea, but He entered and continually enters into this your minutely divided life with His faithfulness and Fatherly care.

From week to week, and from day to day, His compassion and His love are over you, new every morning and glistening with new brightness every evening. From hour to hour He goes before you on the way. And all along to the very subdivisions of your hours into minutes and seconds, the pulsation of your blood in your heart is His work. He takes notice of every sigh that from your heart goes up toward Him.

He is the Father of the everlasting ages, Who from sheer grace, for the sake of enrichment, divides the life of His child even to its minutest parts, and enters into every one of these parts and subdivisions with His grace to protect you.

But if God Himself thus divides your life, and enters into every part of it with His grace, it is incumbent upon you, on the other hand, from this temporarily divided life to reach out after the courses of the age, and lift up yourself to the eternal.

In Revelation (x, 6) we read, that the angel, who stood by the sea, lifted up his hand to heaven, and "swore by him, who liveth for ever and ever, *that there should be time no longer.*"

Time is a form of existence that is given us by grace, but it is unreal; eternity alone is real. In eternity alone our destiny lies, and from the viewpoint of eternity alone can your existence, your future, your destiny be understood.

Whatever year of your life you may consider, it is never understood by itself. Before God, your whole life, with all its years, is one plan, one design, one whole. This plan, this design did not begin just with your birth but traces its lines backwards to the life of your parents and grandparents. And, likewise, in looking forward, this plan does not end with your death but extends across death and the grave into the everlasting ages of eternity. Even though you live here seventy or eighty years, this part of your life which you live on earth

\*Copyright by Translator.



shrinks almost into nothing, when you put it alongside of the thousands and tens of thousands of years that await you in eternity. Your whole life on earth is nothing but the starting of the line to the first station in order after that to begin the real journey through your field of eternal life.

And not to understand this plainly and clearly, is the great cause of the discouragement that overtakes so many people, time and again, as they journey through this short earthly life.

A year of your life can never be understood by itself. Every year of your life must be viewed in connection with your whole life here, and with your whole life in the hereafter, because it stands so, and not otherwise, before God, and is so, and not otherwise, to be explained.

He Who fashions, forms and prepares you for eternity is the Lord. In His fashioning of your heart, in the forming of your person, in His preparation of your spirit within you for eternity, the courses of the age are His. Not what would provide you pleasure and love for the moment is the standard here; but what, in the course of the ages, you are to become, governs His plan of your life and existence.

On this long way, He leads you now through darkness and depth, then again through sunshine on the mountains of His holiness, but His plan, His design regarding you always goes through. And not what would smile on you this year, but what must happen to you in order to carry out His eternal plan concerning you, determines and decides what this year shall bring you. And why it must be so and not otherwise you can not understand now, but will hereafter.

He who forgets this, has no peace; but he who with his whole soul enters into this doing of his God, rests, whatever comes, in his Father's faithfulness.

If, now, caught within the narrow bounds of time, you continue to reckon by the day, by the week, and your heart becomes bitter every time that that day things go wrong or bring nothing but disappointment, then you become the prey of irresolution and gloom. Then it becomes one unbroken recital of complaint, a steady wail and lament; and the habit of seeing all things black overmasters you. Then there is no courage

of faith, no inspiration to work out your destiny, no uplifting joy in God. Thence it comes that thousands upon thousands become either coldly indifferent, or continue the weary struggle with dejection and disheartenment till the end of their days. And he who so lives, what is he other than a playball before the wind of the day, and how far he sinks below his dignity as man! For does not the Prophet say (Eccles. iii, 11) that "God hath set eternity in the heart?" And "eternity in the heart," what else can it mean, than that God created in us the capacity to lift ourselves up from this whirling of the flakes of time around us, to the fixedness of the eternal?

With this "eternity in the heart," let every child of God, therefore, bravely face the newly-opening year. He knows that he worships a God Whose are the everlasting ages, and that therefore God designs and also directs his life only in keeping with what eternity shall one day demand. He prays that it may be peace and joy, for after happiness his heart thirsts. But if this year he must go through a period when God puts him in the smelting furnace, or makes finer

cuttings on the diamond of his soul, then, though tears make his eyes glisten, he will nobly bear up in exaltation of faith; for then it is certain that he is in need of this, that it can not be otherwise, and that, if it did go otherwise, his life would be a failure forever.

To have to undergo a painful operation is hard, and yet the sick one willingly submits, and in the end pays large sums of money to the operator, because he knows, that this drastic treatment alone could save him.

And just like this, God's child stands before his Father in heaven. Not he, but God alone, must know what is indispensable and necessary for him this year, and what, in view of his *permanent* fashioning, this year must bring him. And should it be the case that this year such a Divine operation proves to be necessary, he will not murmur and complain, but willingly submit himself to God, yea, though the waves of sorrow should go over him, he will nevertheless rejoice in his God, knowing that what He doeth, *must* be done, both for the sake of His honor and for his own highest good.

## Missions

By Mrs. George P. Pierson

"Ezra came to Jerusalem, according to the good hand of his God upon him.

For Ezra had prepared his heart to *seek* the law of the LORD and to *do* it and to *teach* in Israel statutes and judgments."—(Ezra 7: 9, 10.)

**W**HAT a motto for a Missionary! And Mary Slessor of Malabar, perhaps the greatest woman Missionary in the world, literally did this in the jungles of Nigeria. Her splendid biographer, W. P. Livingstone, says in his preface: "Mary Slessor's belief was that argument and theory had no effect in arousing interest in Missionary enterprise; that the only means of setting the heart on fire was the magnetism of personal touch and example." She herself described her Missionary life, a solitary one in the African bush, as "a perpetual exhilaration of delight."

News has just reached us that one of our Missionaries in Africa, James Rohrbaugh, has gone to the front, and is working in the ranks of the Red Cross in Ethiopia. Prayer is specially asked for him.

\* \* \*

The following stirring letter from Henry Coray has just come in. We append it almost in full, with no apologies for allowing him to take up the rest of our space.

Please note his change of street in Peiping.

16 Tung 'Tsung Pu Hutung,  
Peiping, China,  
October 16, 1935.

Dear Friend:

By the time this letter reaches you we shall have been in China about a year. First, we do wish to express our



thanksgiving to God for His continued grace, mercy and peace; for blessing us at every point in our new life; for bringing us to this great land of opportunity and need. One-third of the human family is here. Everywhere one lifts up his eyes he beholds fields white unto harvest. The introduction into evangelistic work this summer has made us long for the time when we can give full-time to the preaching of the Gospel.

Our impression of the mission field after nearly a year in a mission city, what is it? Well, we wish we could paint a rosy picture. Peiping, with its cultural, educational and political influences is an important spring that might have been healed by the salt of Christian truth for the purifying of the streams of society that flow out from here. From it could have sounded out the Word of the Lord through all North China. Had the root of the missionary tree been holy so also would have been its branches and fruit. As we see the situation it is most heartbreaking. The leadership of the colleges is distinctly rationalistic. The missions have stressed educational and vocational enterprises at the expense of evangelism. The worldly living of foreigners has turned the Chinese mind against the Christian religion, for many have the mistaken idea that all westerners are Christians. One of the healthy signs, however, is that intelligent Chinese Christians are beginning to tire of what Spurgeon once called "atheism dressed up in fig-leaves," and are casting off the leadership of liberals. James Graham, a magnificent evangelist who knows the Chinese like a book, writes that everywhere he finds people becoming dissatisfied with the husks of Modernism and hungering for the Bread of Life. A very wholesome movement started by one Dr. Sung is calling men back to the great redemptive doctrines of the Bible. In this city Mr. Wang Ming Tao, a real Bible teacher, has gathered together a large group of native believers. Last winter a company of 300 laymen, independent of foreign leadership organized preaching bands to send out

a vital, evangelical witness. It shows that the Word of God is not bound.

I wish you could have been with us on our tour this summer. It was really a great thrill to swing into action with Dr. Dodd and Mac (Heber MacIlwaine). Dr. Dodd is a splendid evangelist. He is much beloved of the Chinese who, by the way, are keen students of human nature and have an amazing knowledge of what is in man. We will not soon forget the picture of him standing out in the pouring rain preaching to eager listeners. We had an interesting experience at a mountain village called An Cha Chwang. We had just arrived and were resting at an inn when the father of a sick child sent word asking us to come and help his boy. After praying about it, Dr. Dodd, our Chinese evangelist and I went to see him. We found the child lying on the kang, or bed, desperately ill. It looked to us like symptoms of the deadly typhus. The tiny face was pinched and faded and the little form was wasted to the size of a mere skeleton. We explained to the parents the way of salvation and Dr. Dodd prayed that the mercy of God might be manifested. We noticed that even as he prayed the weeping changed to whimpering and when he finished praying there was perfect silence. We left tracts and Gospels and exhorted the father and mother to trust the Lord. A few days after we returned home a letter came from the father saying that the child was fully restored. So in that lonely mountain village, miles from hospitals or churches, God has borne witness to His power and mercy. The interesting thing about it is the father's testimony. He wrote, "I am trusting in Jesus. Even if the child had not got well, I would still trust Him." What a testimony! "Where the word of a King is, there is power." As Mac said, if that were the only result of the trip it was worth while.

Betty and I had fully intended to go interior this fall to continue our studies as well as observe missionary methods. However, a combination of circumstances has blocked the way for the time being. Most missionaries concen-

trate on the language for the first two years, so it will be just as well for us to get a thorough grounding before diving into the work. We shall be delighted to meet the reinforcements soon. Our home for the next 7 or 8 months is a large semi-foreign house. It has a big fireplace in the spacious living-room which we shall enjoy this winter. In the spring we shall cast about for a field to open and probably in the fall we shall pitch our tents and begin a permanent work. The problems confronting us are many. Where to go, the land problem, the matter of comity with other missions, our limited knowledge of Chinese customs and ways and a host of unforeseen complications are ahead. With all this we were never more confident that no mistake has been made, either in the matter of the formation of the Independent Board or of our coming to China under it. There is one passage that comes to us again and again as we wait for the guidance of the Holy Spirit on this whole thing. This is it: "These things saith He that is holy, He that is true, He that hath the key of David, He that openeth and no man shutteth; and shutteth and no man openeth." To Him has been committed the entire future of the work. In His own time we believe that He will instruct us and teach us in the way that we should go, that He will guide us with His eye, that He will, as he promised Zerubbabel, "make the mountains plains."

We want to say that we appreciate your praying for us. Not a few times we have felt the divine undergirding in answer to your requests. Now we ask you to remember definitely three things: (1) that the Spirit of God may prepare the soil in the hearts of the Chinese to whom we shall go with the seed of the Word; (2) that at the right time the right door may be opened and all others closed; (3) that consecrated and able native helpers may be raised up to labor with us. We join you daily in praying for the critical situation at home.

Faithfully yours,

BETTY AND HENRY CORAY.



## Book Reviews

DAILY MANNA. Edited by Rev. M. Monsma. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. Seventy-five cents.

THIS is a Calendar for 1936 with "a Scriptural Meditation for every day of the year by men subscribing to the Presbyterian and the Reformed Faith." Each contributor has, as a rule, supplied seven meditations. This means that approximately fifty-two writers have had a share in its production. The majority of these contributors are ministers of the Dutch Reformed and Christian Reformed Churches but many are ministers of the Northern, Southern or United Presbyterian Churches. These include such well-known names as Dr. C. E. Macartney, Dr. D. G. Barnhouse, Dr. Lorraine Boettner, Dr. W. C. Robinson, Dr. William Crowe, and Dr. A. G. MacLennan. The object of the publishers is to supply a Calendar with a distinctively Reformed message. Such examination of it as we have been able to make leads us to think that with the Rev. Martin Monsma as editor they have admirably succeeded in this effort. Those who daily feed their souls on the manna provided in this calendar throughout the coming year will doubtless grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Its form is that of a pad of 366 sheets so arranged that one sheet may be torn off each day of the year. It should be ordered without delay. We regret that we did not receive our copy in time to mention it in our December issue.

THE ORIGIN OF MANKIND VIEWED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF REVELATION AND RESEARCH. By Sir Ambrose Fleming, F.R.S. Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., London. pp. 160. 3s 6d. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids. \$1.40.

THIS small but well-written and well-printed book, by a well-known British scientist, has been written with a twofold purpose: (1) to show that the evolutionary theory of the origin of mankind from animal ancestors by Darwinian natural selection, or any other automatic process, is a philosophy and not a scientific generalization from ascertained facts; and (2) to reconcile the theory of the origin of mankind by special creation with the known facts of ethnology.

Had its author confined himself to the first of these purposes we would have little but commendation for his book. He presents strong reasons for denying the validity of the evolutionary origin of the human race and for maintaining that it owes its origin to a special creative act of God. "It is entirely misleading and unspeakably pernicious," he writes after considering the pres-

ent state of knowledge on the subject, "to put forward in popular magazines or other publications . . . pictures of gorillas or chimpanzees labelled 'Man's cousin' or 'Man's nearest relative' or to publish perfectly imaginary and grotesque pictures of a supposed 'Java man' with the brutish face as an ancestor of the modern man. . . . Those who do such things are guilty of ignorance or deliberate misrepresentation. Neither is it justifiable for preachers in the pulpit to tell their congregations that there is general agreement among scientific men as to the evolutionary origin of Man from an animal ancestor. All that science can say at present in the light of definitely ascertained and limited human knowledge is that it does not know, and has no certain proof how, where and when, Man originated. If any true knowledge of it is to come to us it must be from some source other than present modern anthropology" (p. 75).

Such "true knowledge" concerning man's origin our author finds in the Bible, particularly in what it tells us about Jesus Christ. After referring to the person and work of Christ he writes: "The actuality of the above-mentioned exceptional events is all-important relative to the question of human origin. Because if they did take place as stated in the New Testament books, and if these statements are true to fact and not human inventions, then they unquestionably certify to the occurrence, even within the limits of historic time of happenings and acts of creation which lie quite outside of the range of that uniform causation studied in scientific research or even ordinary life. Hence the evidence for the Gospel miracles and for the existence as described of a Unique Personality appearing suddenly with absolutely abnormal powers over natural energies, is of stupendous importance in relation to the question of creation generally" (p. 90). It is refreshing to find a scientist of Fleming's standing arguing from the facts of Christianity for not only the possibility but the probability that Man's origin is due to a special creative act of God. As God has acted creatively within the historic period, he argues, there is no good reason why the Biblical teaching as to the origin of mankind may not be accepted as true.

We wish we could go on and say that our author has been equally successful in reconciling the teachings of the Bible with the known facts of ethnology. We cannot follow him, however, when in order to reconcile the teachings of the Bible and the results of archaeological research he maintains not only that Adam was not the first man but that he was the ancestor only of the Caucasians and so that Mongolians and Negroids owe their existence to separate Divine Creations. He holds that Adam was created approximately 5500 B. C. but that

we have no knowledge as to when the Negroid and Mongolian races first appeared on earth. He defends the historicity of the Deluge but regards it as a more or less local phenomenon that wiped out of existence the family of Noah excepted, the corrupt descendants of Adam. Apparently he holds that the Negroids and Mongolians were created before the Adamites but not necessarily that they were the first creatures that could be called "men." It seems strange that a man seemingly so able as Sir Ambrose Fleming should make use of such a hypothesis in his efforts to reconcile science and revelation. Our author to the contrary, it is altogether certain that the Bible teaches the unity of the human race. What is more it is a basic presupposition of the Biblical plan of salvation. To cite Dr. Warfield: "The whole doctrinal structure of the Bible account of redemption is founded on its assumption that the race of man is one organic whole, and may be dealt with as such. It is because all are one in Adam that in the matter of sin there is no difference, but all have fallen short of the glory of God (Rom. iii, 22f.), and as well that in the new man there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Sythian, bondmen, freemen; but Christ is all and in all (Col. iii. 11). The unity of the old man in Adam is the postulate of the new man in Christ" (Studies in Theology, p. 258). It seems to us that in the latter part of his book Sir Ambrose Fleming deals neither with "clear and inspired statements of the Bible" nor with "well-ascertained facts as regards primitive man."

THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION. By Samuel M. Zwemer. Cokesbury Press. pp. 256. \$2.00.

THIS volume is receiving deservedly high praise. Based on the Smyth Lectures which Dr. Zwemer delivered at Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Ga., in March, 1935, it makes available for the general reader the present state of knowledge concerning the origin of religion derived from the ethnologists particularly Professor Wilhelm Schmidt of the University of Vienna. While this volume contains a mass of information hitherto available only to those having access to many books (foreign as well as domestic) it is by no means a mere compilation.

Following the historical method of investigation with the aid of the leading ethnologists Dr. Zwemer finds that primitive revelation supplies the key to the origin of the idea of God, of creation, of prayer and sacrifice, of the family, of conscience and moral ideals, and of immortality. Incidentally, he supplies us with one of the strongest arguments against evolution as an all-embracing explanation. He shows that the researches of the ethnologists confirm the belief that monotheism was the



original religion and that the history of religion has been one of decline and degeneration rather than one of evolution and unbroken descent. The bearing of this on certain theories of the origin of the Bible is pointed out. In connection with calling attention to the almost universal tradition of a High-god, or Sky-god, or Supreme Spirit among primitive tribes and the ancient ethnic religions, he remarks: "In view of all this it is preposterous to find the liberal school of Bible interpreters denying that Moses was a monotheist and making Yahweh a local thunder-god of the Sinai peninsula, or tracing the religion of Israel from animism and totemism to the early prophets who (according to these critics) were the first monotheists" (p. 92). Later in connection with the evidence that the History

of Religion offers of the universal belief of mankind in a future state of existence, he asks: "Is it not astonishing that some liberal theologians and the Graf-Welhausen school of Bible critics do not find the idea of immortality in the Old Testament?" (p. 212.) The two basic factors (the one subjective and the other objective) which must be taken into account to explain the origin of religion, according to Dr. Zwemer, are (1) man's creation in the image of God and (2) God's revelation of himself to man. Calvin, as is pointed out (p. 98) is confirmed by anthropology and the history of religion.

Dr. Zwemer has dealt in a large and illuminating way with a problem of basic importance.

## News of the Church

### The Executive Council of the Board of Foreign Missions Comments on Dr. Barnhouse's Mission Report

THE Executive Council of the Board of Foreign Missions have been requested to make some comment on Dr. Barnhouse's report, published in *The Presbyterian* of October 31, on his visit to the Presbyterian Missions in Asia. We are glad to do so, reserving any further statement, if it should seem necessary, to some later time. It has not been possible to submit this comment in detail to all the members of the Board, but the Executive Council are cognizant of the facts involved so clearly that we are assured of the support of the Board in the material here given.

It is gratifying to note Dr. Barnhouse's warm and positive declaration of approval of the foreign missionary work of our Church in Asia and of the missionaries as a whole, his assertion of faith in the deep and true devotion of the vast majority of the missionary body and his emphatic statement: "I can say without question that I believe the greatest piece of work in the world is being done on the foreign field and that our Presbyterian missionaries on the whole are doing a creditable part of that work." We earnestly hope that this warm and approving testimony may receive the major attention which it deserves when considering the report of Dr. Barnhouse's long visit to the field.

With regard to the specific cases of criticism which Dr. Barnhouse presents, it is to be regretted, both for the sake of those involved and for his own sake, that Dr. Barnhouse, who undoubtedly wishes to be fair and just, has not allowed time for each individual concerned first to have opportunity to correct Dr. Barnhouse's account

of his interview; and, second, to be given the opportunity to present his case at the same time and to the same audience with Dr. Barnhouse.

It is to be noted that of the various cases of criticism only three are regular missionaries of the Board. One is a special teacher supported by an agricultural institution and two are Chinese Christians, neither of them supported by or related to the Board, while of the other two individuals named as Board officers, the statements made are in grave error. All of these individuals except one are included in cases A, B, C, D in the report.

CASE A. The person involved would be entitled to report on the accuracy and meaning of the remarks attributed to him. We have good reason to know that that person would protest earnestly against the quotations. One of the remarks, if made at all, was made at least thirteen years ago, and came to Dr. Barnhouse by hearsay and with accompaniments which are entirely erroneous. A letter from the missionary (Case A), written since the visit of Dr. Barnhouse and in no connection with his visit, includes this paragraph: "I believe in the full gospel of Jesus Christ and for it I came to this country. My belief in it has been quickened and I have been saying over and over again in my Bible classes (sometimes thirteen a week) that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the *only Gospel*." This does not comport with the expressions passed on to Dr. Barnhouse.

CASE B. No heretical statement is alleged to have been made in this case to Dr. Barnhouse himself by the missionary and his wife concerned. Most of the unsatisfactory quotations which are given are again hearsay and must be checked by the persons involved. And the account given to Dr. Barnhouse as reported by him with regard to government educational regulations and

required Bible teaching is not accurate. Government recognition of the Mission schools and compliance with it in order to save the schools did not mean the elimination of the Bible from the curriculum except as a required course. There are Christian schools both at home and abroad where religious teaching and chapel service are not compulsory, but which are nevertheless thoroughly Christian and evangelistic. The two Chinese teachers referred to were not related to the Board. The Board is related to the university in question, but not to its theological school. The two men are not fully of our theological view, but they are devoted, earnest, evangelical Christian men, believing deeply in the deity of Jesus Christ and His Saviourhood, and it is better to hold fast to them than to thrust them away. Mr. Uemura, the most powerful mainstay of the evangelical faith in Japan in his day, was in earlier years distrusted by some of the missionaries. But others held to him, and he became a Gibraltar of the full New Testament faith. As to higher educational institutions in general, it may be said that there is the same struggle on the foreign field that there is at home to make and keep such institutions thoroughly Christian and that on the whole the foreign field has succeeded better thus far than the Church at home.

CASE C. This is the case of a special teacher who is now in America. He has seen and strongly dissents from Dr. Barnhouse's account of their interview. Furthermore, he did not disavow his belief in the deity and resurrection of Christ before he was accepted for this school. And his acceptance did not precede his approval of the message of the Jerusalem Missionary Council, but came some months afterwards. He is a layman without theological training, but is now taking a special course of reading and study in the Christology of the New Testament, which it is hoped will do for him what the Board and Dr. Barnhouse earnestly desire, in clarifying and maturing his Christian convictions. He is the earnest and honest man that Dr. Barnhouse represents him to be. In his application papers he explicitly declared his acceptance of the Westminster Confession and his agreement with the Presbyterian Church.

CASE D. The officers of the Board have known of this situation for some time, have publicly referred to it without mentioning any names, have been dealing with it carefully and sympathetically, and are not unhelpful of the outcome. If it is found that this friend has moved from the positions avowed in his licensure and ordination and is out of accord with the system of doctrine and essential faith of our Church, the proper constitutional course will be followed.

The two Board officers mentioned in Dr. Barnhouse's criticisms both demur strongly to the representations made. One of them was not an officer of the Board at the time stated, and has no remembrance of any re-



mark or notebook entry such as were reported to Dr. Barnhouse or of the statement claimed to have been made to him. The other was troubled at the remark of a certain missionary, that only ninety-eight per cent of the members of his Mission were "true to the faith." But he did not criticize the man at all for not saying one hundred per cent, but earnestly took up with him the question of the unfaithful remnant and asked what should be done. The good shepherd of our Lord's parable surely rejoiced in the ninety and nine safe in the fold, but he did not allow this joy to lessen his anxiety over the one per cent of the flock that was astray. It was the missionary himself who personally and in correspondence begged that his remark be not further considered and left the fidelity and integrity of his whole Mission unquestioned.

Dr. Barnhouse criticizes the Board because its "officials have made statements to the effect that they knew of no Modernism on the foreign field. This statement was made several years ago before the General Assembly by one of the officials, more recently by another in public utterances in defense of the Board's policy." We do not know of any such statements. The Board and its officers have been careful not to use terms that have no clear and accepted meaning. Certainly "Modernism" and "Modernist" have no such meaning. As they are used by critics of the missionary force, they are peculiarly vague and indefinite. One good man, for example, has declared those Christians to be Modernists who do not affirm the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Board has constantly said that the foreign missionary body, as Dr. Barnhouse urges, represents the best level of the life of the Church at home, that it has been the projection of the home Church in its best expression to the foreign field. The Board's official and repeated utterance has been: "The Board has considered every definite complaint regarding missionaries and has not found a single instance of unfaithfulness. If there is one missionary of the Board who is not true to the central doctrinal convictions of our Church, the Board does not know of him. If anyone has evidence of the unfaithfulness of a missionary and will report it to the Board, the Board will deal with it at once in a constitutional way. While the Board is not an ecclesiastical body and cannot trench upon the jurisdiction of presbyteries over anyone's ecclesiastical standing in the Presbyterian Church, the Board is the judge of the qualifications of missionaries, and it deems sound views of the Gospel a vital qualification."

It is surely unnecessary to say to Dr. Barnhouse or to other friends of the Board that such specific utterances as he condemns meet with the equal disapproval of the Board as he gives them. The Board is in no sense and at no time indifferent to such

errors. Its major duty is not done, however, in mere condemnation, as may be the case with passing observers, but in serious effort to discover the accuracy of the reports of these utterances and then in a sympathetic and fraternal effort to bring about the correction of any errors that may be actually involved. A somewhat long experience has led to the conviction that fatal and incorrigible conditions in the mission field seldom occur, and that a loving spirit in dealing with errors when they do emerge is the surest path to their correction. This has been the method of the Board in the past; it does not believe that Dr. Barnhouse would have the method changed now. And the Board will make careful inquiry regarding these specific instances as it has done in all other cases when sufficient data have been forthcoming, and will take such action as is proper under Presbyterian practice.

The Board has held the view, which Dr. Barnhouse recognized as sound, that it could not withdraw confidence from devoted missionaries on the basis of impersonal and unsupported charges or hearsay evidence or on grounds in conflict with the Constitution and authority of the Church, but it has considered and will consider every charge against any missionary that he has gone beyond the bounds of our Presbyterian law and liberty.

Perhaps the two essential issues are these: (1) Has the Board knowingly sent out missionaries who are not true to the faith of the Church, and the answer is "No." All ordained missionaries must be approved by their presbyteries after meeting the constitutional tests and assuring the Board of their qualifications, both spiritually, intellectually and physically. Unordained men and women without theological training required or ordained missionaries are still required to answer the same constitutional questions as to our system of faith and the Holy Scriptures and to satisfy the Board as to their missionary character, purpose and spirit. (2) Does the Board know of any of its missionaries who are not loyal to the faith of the Church within the bounds of its constitutional freedom? It does not. It will follow up all intimations if there are such in accordance with the Constitution of the Church and the obligation of its trust and of the Spirit of Christ. Dr. Barnhouse heartily recognized in the conference with the Board's officers that it was not in accordance with the law of the Presbyterian Church to indict men on hearsay evidence or to condemn them without full opportunity afforded them for reply and without proper judicial procedure, not in the press and on the platform, but in the constitutionally specified courts of the Church.

It is a pleasure to return in closing to the positive section of Dr. Barnhouse's report and to note again his clear and glowing tribute to the foreign missionary work

of our Church and to our foreign missionary body as a whole. We can echo Dr. Barnhouse's closing words: "The Church at large owes it to the faithful host at work on the foreign field to support the men and the work which has been so well begun and to expect from the Board as a right that a small minority on the field or their supporters in this land should not be permitted to detract from the worth of the cause as a whole." This is true, whatever the character and position of this small minority may be.

The Executive Council of the  
Board of Foreign Missions.

November 6, 1935.

### An Action of Board of Foreign Missions on Dr. Barnhouse's Report, November 18, 1935

IN VIEW of the fact that the Rev. Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse has visited unofficially many of the foreign mission fields of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and has presented to the Executive Council of the Board of Foreign Missions a carefully prepared report of his study and observations in the various mission fields visited by him; and in view of the encouragement which his report has given to the Church, because of the high type of Christian zeal and manifest loyalty to the Word of God and the principles of mission endeavor as set forth in our Standards, which his report ascribes to the missionary force on the field; be it therefore

Resolved, That the Board of Foreign Missions expresses to Dr. Barnhouse its appreciation of his efforts and consideration; and that the Board of Foreign Missions again assures the Church which it represents, that it is, and ever has been, the constant aim of the Board of Foreign Missions to prosecute its work in fidelity and loyalty to the purpose of missionary endeavor as set forth in the Word of God and the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.; and further, that we assure the Church that the special cases cited in the report of Dr. Barnhouse which seemed to him to be at variance with the Word of God and our Standards, are receiving and will receive our immediate and serious attention with the view of either justifying or rectifying the conditions cited; and that the results obtained from the inquiry will be reported to the Church.

### General Council Votes Quotas and Percentages

A BENEVOLENCE budget of \$8,000,000, for the year beginning April 1, 1936, was adopted, as follows:



	Amount	P. C.
National Missions .....	\$2,380,000	42.50
Foreign Missions .....	1,848,000	33.00
Christian Education ....	1,036,000	18.50
Pensions (Relief Dept.)..	280,000	5.00
American Bible Society.	44,800	.80
Federal Council of Churches .....	11,200	.20
	\$5,600,000	100.00
Women's National Missions .....	\$1,200,000	
Women's Foreign Missions .....	1,200,000	
	2,400,000	
	\$8,000,000	

### Generous Gift to Grove City College

AT A recent meeting of the Finance Committee of Grove City College held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. John G. Pew, President of the Sunshipbuilding Company, Chester, Pa., announced that substantial gifts had been made the College by the children of the late Joseph Newton Pew who was President of the Board of Trustees of the College from 1895 until his death in 1912. The donors are: Miss Ethel Pew, Mrs. Alarik Myrin, Mr. J. Howard Pew, and Mr. J. N. Pew, Jr.

The Trustees of the College in accepting the gift authorized the construction of a new dormitory for women which is to be located on the new upper campus of the College. By unanimous action, they named the dormitory the "Mary Anderson Pew" dormitory for the late Mrs. J. N. Pew, the mother of the donors who died at her home in Philadelphia in August of this year.

The Pew family have been closely affiliated with Grove City College for more than 40 years. The late Mr. Joseph Newton Pew became interested in the College in 1894. Since that time the family have been the most generous supporters of the College. Mr. Joseph Newton Pew was President of the Board of Trustees from 1895 until his death in 1912. Since 1912, his son, Mr. J. Howard Pew and his nephew, Mr. John G. Pew have been Trustees of the College. For a number of years, Mr. J. Howard Pew has been President of the Board of Trustees and for many years, Mr. John G. Pew has been Chairman of the Finance Committee of the College.

The new building will be located on the upper campus opposite the new men's dormitory and will completely outline the quadrangle formed by buildings erected since 1930 at a cost of almost a million dollars (\$1,000,000.00). The building itself will accommodate more than 100 students. It will relieve the present congestion in the college dormitories and cottages and will provide room for a number of additional students.

### Early Date of Manuscript Supported

THE Mail" (Birmingham, England) in commenting upon the recent discovery in the Ryland's Museum says:

"In his judgment on the date of the fragment, Mr. Roberts [C. H. Roberts, fellow of St. John's College, Oxford] is supported by high authority. On the whole, he says in the monograph, we may accept with some confidence the first half of the second century as the period in which it was most probably written—a judgment I should be much more loath to pronounce were it not supported by Sir Frederic Kenyon, Dr. W. Schubart and Dr. H. I. Bell, who have seen photographs of the text and whose experience and authority in these matters are unrivaled."

"It may well have some bearing on the wider problem as to the date of the Gospel according to St. John. Not only is it the earliest text of the Gospel; it is also most probably the earliest substantial evidence for the existence of the Gospel. It is clear from Justin Martyr that the Gospel was known in Rome soon after the middle of the century, and it is possible that Papias, whose writings are placed between 135 and 165, alludes to it, though he does not mention it by name; on the basis of the present discovery, we may assume that it was circulating in middle Egypt in the first half of the second century. This would imply a slightly earlier date for composition, especially if with some critics we hold that the Gospel was first intended for a select circle at Ephesus; from Ephesus to middle Egypt is a far cry, and in the case of the Unknown Gospel the editors ('The New Gospel Fragments,' p. 17) allow for a time lag of about thirty years between the date of composition and that of the MS. But all we can safely say is that this fragment tends to support those critics who favor an early date (late first to early second century) for the composition of the Gospel, rather than those who would still regard it a work of the middle decades of the second century."

The papyrus slip is three and one-half by three and one-third inches in size, and contains John 18: 31-33 on one side and John 18: 37, 38, portions of the description of Jesus' trial on the other. These vary but slightly from the present version, the variation being so slight that there is no material difference in meaning.

Unbelieving Bible critics have attempted to date the Gospel of John about the middle of the second century in order to deny that John wrote it. This new discovery if genuine, establishes the fact that the Gospel of John was in existence and widely disseminated a very few years after the death of its writer.

### Irish Letter

By S. W. Murray

CASTLECANFIELD Presbyterian Church has made out a call in favor of Mr. A. Malcolm Parke, B.A., a licentiate of Clogher Presbytery. The Rev. Gordon Young, B.A., of Wellington Street Church, Ballymena, has received a call to St. Enoch's Church, Belfast. Both Mr. Parke and Mr. Young studied theology at Princeton Seminary and Assembly's College, Belfast.

The Irish National Christian Endeavour Convention was held in Newtownards, September 21-24. Approximately 300 delegates attended from all parts of Ireland. Speakers included the Rev. Professor Francis Davidson, B.D., of the Original Secession Divinity Hall, Glasgow.

Queens University Bible Union, Belfast, recently held a successful week-end conference at Moyallon (County Down). The leader was Mr. H. W. Verner, of London. The presidents of the Bible Union for the year 1935-36 are Miss Irene Lamberton (Women's Branch), and Mr. Reginald A. E. Magee (Men's Branch).

Throughout the Inter-Varsity Fellowship (with which is affiliated the Queen's University Bible Union) there has been a greatly increased interest in the missionary responsibility of the church. A pamphlet published recently by the Fellowship is entitled "Evangelize to a Finish," and this gives a challenge to the Christian student similar to that given in the days of the inauguration of the Student Volunteers about 50 years ago.

From the north of Ireland there recently sailed three missionary candidates in connection with the China Inland Mission. These were Mr. H. M. Brown (Belfast), Mr. Duncan McRoberts (Bangor) and Mr. Edward Smyth (Belfast).

On October 24, the Rev. Gordon Young, B.A., was installed as minister of St. Enoch's Church, Belfast. Mr. Young has had a very successful ministry in Wellington Street Church, Ballymena, where he succeeded the late Rev. McCheyne Gilmour. St. Enoch's is the largest Presbyterian Church in Ireland and former ministers included Dr. Hugh Hanna and Dr. Charles Davey. Mr. Young is a graduate of Queen's University, Belfast, and studied theology at Princeton Seminary and Assembly's College, Belfast. BELFAST.

### The Presbyterian Church in Canada

By T. G. M. Ryan

THE Synod of the Maritime Provinces met in Halifax on October 1st and elected Rev. A. Craise of Sackville, New Brunswick, as its moderator. St. John Presbytery has accepted Mr. Craise's resignation from Sackville and Dorchester, and he has retired from



the active ministry after forty years of service. The moderator of St. John Presbytery is **Dr. George E. Ross** of St. Andrew's in Fredericton, the provincial capital. The only induction in the presbytery since the General Assembly was that of **Dr. Samuel Davies** of Smith's Falls, Ont., at Greenock Church, St. Andrew's-by-the-Sea, N. B., on July 5th.

**Rev. A. L. Budge** of Hagersville, Ont., veteran historian of the General Assembly, has been elected moderator of the Synod of Hamilton and London. **Mr. Budge** is clerk of Hamilton Presbytery, and **Rev. W. I. McLean** of Chalmers, Hamilton, is assistant clerk. St. Andrew's Church, Hamilton, whose minister is **Rev. C. L. Cowan**, has five students in preparation for the ministry, four of whom served on mission fields last summer. One of these students, **Mr. Joseph Lattimore**, asks questions of **Mr. Cowan** regarding the Church, what it offers to the young today, and the way of salvation, at the young people's service each Sunday evening. Four hundred or more attended the young people's rally at St. Enoch's Church, Hamilton, in October. **Rev. Peter A. Dunn** gave an address on "The Man in the Gallery." St. John's Church, Hamilton, is vacant as a result of the call of **Rev. A. D. Sutherland** to Westminster Church, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. **Mr. Sutherland** is an evangelical preacher who has done excellent work in Avonmore and Hamilton in the nine years since his graduation from The Presbyterian College, Montreal. **Rev. C. E. Dougan** of Clinton, Ont., clerk of Huron Presbytery, has been appointed to succeed **Rev. A. D. Sutherland** as Synod's Convener of Church Life, Work, and Evangelism. **Rev. T. D. McCullough** of Kincardine, Ont., has resigned his charge, and will devote his full time to his work as Chairman of the General Assembly's Committee on the Budget and Stewardship. **Rev. W. J. West** of Atwood, Ont., **Rev. A. W. K. Herdman** of Arthur, Ont., **Rev. Allister Murray** of Caledonia, P. E. I., **Dr. Bunyan McLeod** of Perth, Ont., and **Rev. Thos. Dodds** of Corunna, Ont., have resigned their charges and retired from the ministry. **Rev. A. Roskamp** (Westminster, Philadelphia, '30) has accepted a call from Hopewell, N. S., to Weyburn, Sask.

LENORE, MANITOBA

## News Letter from Australia

By Rev. H. T. Rush

**REV. GEO. TULLOCH** of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church while in Edinburgh last year, got into touch with **Dr. D. E. Hart Davies**, M.A., of St. Thomas' Episcopal Church in that city and suggested a trip to Australia. **Dr. Hart Davies** is the Superintendent Lecturer of the Bible Testimony Fellowship, London. The Bible Union of Victoria with similar organizations in New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia and West Australia, arranged a series of

meetings in the various capitals which have recently been brought to a conclusion. The writer can speak for the Melbourne meetings which were large, often crowded, and on at least one occasion many were turned away. Similar reports have been received from the other capitals of the States.

**Dr. Hart Davies** is the winner of a prize from the Victoria Institute of London for an essay on "Biblical History in the Light of Archaeological Research and Discovery since 1900 A. D." Archaeological lectures with lantern slides were a means of showing the wonderful corroborations of the Bible during the last few decades. He also delivered some fine doctrinal messages.

It was inevitable that some criticism should be aroused; it is almost surprising that there should be so little. The lecturer had a platform presence and style of speaking with touches of humor that tended to disarm antagonism; while at the same time he got home his facts and his testimony to the Bible and the faith. The "cobwebs spun out of the insides of the critics were shattered by the bricks of the archaeologists." His testimony was fearless and effective and has given a great impetus to the evangelical cause.

A feature of the Melbourne meetings was what might be called the cosmopolitan character of the audiences. Leading clergymen of the churches presided at the gatherings. It appears that similar evidences of interest obtained in other cities.

A great forward movement is being talked of for our Union, one part of which will be other visits from overseas distinguished lecturers.

At the annual meeting of the Bible Union in Collins Street Church, **Dr. Hart Davies** was the speaker. **Rev. R. Kelly** retired at his own request and **Dr. J. J. Kitchen** was elected President. Several names were added to the Council. The report showed satisfactory progress during the year.

MELBOURNE

## China Letter

By Rev. Albert B. Dodd

**T**HOSE interested in the proclamation of the true Gospel in China cannot afford to ignore the menace to the future of theological teaching connected with the very large Wendell bequest to the Nanking Theological Seminary. Some years ago the North Kiangsu Mission of the Southern Presbyterian Church withdrew from that institution because of the strong "modernistic" tendency which even then had made itself felt and which has by no means been checked since that time. The following action of the Board of Managers of that Seminary, taken May 23, 1935, is significant: "We are willing to explore the possibilities, in case other theological seminaries should desire to unite with the Nanking Theological Seminary under a common board of managers, of con-

ducting the work of the Seminary in more than one center."

That this proposition received consideration at a Conference on Leadership Training for the Church in China held at Kuling, July 18th to 27th, seems evident from a report of that meeting given by **Bishop Herbert Welch** in the China Christian Advocate of August, 1935, wherein he states, "As a result of their deliberations, three things seem to me to stand out most prominently. First, it was agreed that some reorganization was demanded. Externally, a larger degree of co-operation if not of actual union was felt to be wise. Internally, curricula should be restudied. . . . The duty and function of the Church in these changing times, the rising educational level, the broadening conception of the Gospel message, must be taken into account in training the workers of the future."

When it is explained that this Kuling conference was under the leadership of **Dr. Luther A. Weigle**, Dean of the very "liberal" Yale Divinity School, who had just finished a visitation of the various theological schools in China, the danger to the cause of evangelical truth involved in such an inclusive union becomes still more apparent.

In competition for students with such a combination, those very few theological seminaries which are standing boldly and unequivocally for the true Gospel are deserving and sorely in need of your special sympathy, support and prayers.

We are glad to report that the North China Theological Seminary, with its 151 students from 18 provinces and a score or more of denominations, still holds its own as the largest theological seminary in all China.

The North China Theological Seminary was very happy to welcome back from furlough **Rev. Martin A. Hopkins**, D.D. Two colleagues, Hampden Sydney and Southwestern, recently honored themselves as well as him by conferring upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. **Dr. Hopkins** has just issued in Chinese a Biblical Theology based on that of **Dr. Geerhardus Vos** of Princeton Seminary.

The writer of this China Letter and his wife take pleasure in announcing that on December 30, 1935, they expect to reach the United States for their fourth furlough. Letters addressed to them at Victoria, B. C., as incoming passengers on the Canadian Pacific Steamship *Empress of Russia*, and arriving at Victoria before that date should be received. After several days spent in the far west, they expect to join their son **Stephen** for a few weeks at Wheaton, Ill., before the writer starts out on his spring deputation work. During this period, they may be reached by mail at Wheaton, Ill., care of **Mr. Stephen I. Dodd**, Wheaton College, or at Philadelphia, care of **CHRISTIANITY TODAY** or the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

TENGHSIEN, SHANTUNG PROVINCE



## News in Nutshells

### A Social Gospel

THE Twelfth Quadrennial Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement will meet in Indianapolis, during the Christmas holidays. Twenty-five hundred students from Canada and the United States are expected and the speakers will include among others: Kagawa, the Archbishop of York, Basil Mathews, John R. Mott and Robert E. Speer. It is informing to note "the spirit in which the delegates are asked to approach the gathering and the objectives held before them":

1. To probe with ruthless realism the inner character of the world's suffering and confusion.

2. To confess the presence in ourselves of the same factors which have made the world what it is.

3. To appraise the new crusading forces which are increasingly conscripting men's allegiance.

4. To discern, through a more vivid perception of God's eternal purpose disclosed in Christ, His intention for our generation.

5. To grasp the significance of the world fellowship of the Christian Church in the fulfillment of this intention.

6. To discover how each one may find his place in the world mission of Jesus Christ."

Professor Charles T. Holman, a Baptist minister and professor in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, in a recent article in the *Christian Century* entitled "I Don't Want to Christianize the World" repudiates utterly the central meaning and purpose of missions. He maintains that missionaries should confine their efforts to maintaining helpful relations with other religions, and should not proclaim Christianity as the only true and supreme religion. He is to be one of the speakers at the Conference.

### "Bring Ye All the Tithes into the Storehouse"

THE Belmont Covenant Plan is attracting wide attention in the South. It was approved recently by the Southern Baptist Convention. The Plan originated with the Belmont Presbyterian Church, Roanoke, Virginia. Its purpose is to provide financial support in a Scriptural way.

### To Be Communist or Not to Be

AT THE Fall meeting of the Methodist Federation for Social Service, it was suggested to the regional conference that they prepare a memorial to the coming General Conference, asking it to make a statement explicitly repudiating the capitalistic system of government on the ground

that its breakdown coincides with its moral defects and that the General Conference order the statement to be printed in the next edition of the Discipline.

For a long time Methodist leadership has encouraged the "united front" even to the point of aligning its Federation for Social Service to the American League against War and Fascism. However there are now some indications that it is beginning to realize that as *The Communist* (official organ of the Communist Party) states, "The united front is at the present time the main road along which the masses will be prepared for the struggle for Soviet power under the leadership of the Communist Party." Dr. Oxnham, President of Depaw University, called by the *Christian Advocate* "a true Methodist liberal" quotes the above statement in an article in the *Advocate* ending with: "The United front is a dangerous gift horse."

### Second Conference of Methodist Laymen

THE statement adopted at the second Conference of Methodist Laymen in Chicago, November 9, is as follows:

"The timeliness and need of the Methodist Laymen's Movement, initiated at the meeting held in Chicago on July 29, has continually since then been emphasized by many letters and words of approval received from every part of the United States.

"Ours is not a movement to 'muzzle the pulpit,' but it is a movement to preserve the original and vital message of Christianity.

"We believe in the right of free speech for the pulpit, and be it said to their credit that the majority of the clergy have exercised this right in a way that is beyond criticism. However, the right of free speech does not give an entrenched minority the privilege of binding an entire church organization on political, social, and economic issues, without full understanding and agreement. The right of free speech is no justification for an unauthorized minority to commit, or appear to commit, the church to a social or economic program covering questions where there are wide and honest differences of opinion among equally conscientious members. The church should not take a position on any social or economic question without a scriptural basis therefor and a real knowledge of such question, obtained through research, careful study, and experience. . . .

"We recognize that Christianity teaches social duties and responsibilities, but any plan for the improvement of the social order and the betterment of mankind must have a spiritual source and not merely be an anti-capitalized-by-product of a materialistic 'ism.' . . ."

### "Owe No Man Anything"

AT THE General Meeting of the Society of Friends at Richmond, Indiana, it was reported that not one of their members has been on the relief rolls during the depression.

### Modernism Unsatisfying

HAVE the results of that enormous Modernistic enterprise, the Riverside Church, New York City, not come up to the expectations of its minister and its chief financial sponsor? In recent utterances Dr. Fosdick although he has not become an evangelical by any means yet plainly states his belief in the failure of the modernism he has been preaching for many years. Also recently Mr. John D. Rockefeller has notified the Baptists that he no longer believes in denominationalism but will give his gifts through non-denominational channels.

### Homiletics and Hobbies in New York

THE newspapers report that Rev. Raymond E. Finehout, of the Lutheran Church of the Messiah, Flushing, has developed a new technique in preaching. He delivers what he calls a "scenario sermon," in which he attempts "through an economy of words and, when necessary, by a deliberate disregard of syntax rules, to catch the swifter tempo of modern living." A twenty minute sermon on "The Pearl of Great Price" flashed a score of situations in which the truth of the text might be applied, as for example: "Union Square . . . soap box orators . . . preachers, peddlers, communists . . . hungry faces, cruel faces, transfixed faces . . . earnest question, bold answer, hard laughter . . . Mussolini? . . . cheers for Ethiopia . . . England? . . . knowing smiles . . . the Supreme Court comes up . . . grumblings, praise, headshakings . . . class against class . . . the world undecided and blundering . . . wanting the precious things . . . peace, brotherhood, liberty, a larger life and happiness for all . . . but all stubbornly unwilling to pay the price for them."

Leisure time activities have been resumed at the First Presbyterian Church. The craft class, the dramatic group, the glee club, and the art classes have all entered upon their fall work. Dr. Moldenhawer has also begun a new series of lectures on Shakespeare and his plays. The topic of the opening lecture was "Shakespeare and English History." This is the sixth season of Dr. Moldenhawer's lectures on English literature.

### A Deadly Success

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TIMES points out that one evidence of the deadly success of Repeal is the fact that in place of the 177,000 saloons closed by Prohibition, Repeal



has opened 437,000 liquor selling places, which, by the testimony of non-prohibitionists, are "incredibly worse than the old saloon." In some of these, high school girls are serving as barmaids. And concerning bootlegging, the greatest crime charged against Prohibition, "The Federal authorities state unequivocally that more illicit liquor is being manufactured and distributed in the present year of grace than ever before in the history of the American people."

### Mexico's Religious Crisis

A WRITER in the *Alliance Weekly* has the following to say of Socialism as it is now at work in Mexico:

"In an interesting and illuminating survey of Mexico's religious crisis, Kenneth G. Grubb, in *The Life of Faith* (London), states that most evangelical missionaries who still work in that country are practically unable to do any immediately spiritual work. Although the evangelical ministers and their full-time lay workers outnumber the Roman Catholic priests who are licensed to perform mass, extension work is obviously impossible, since the Government owns all churches and religious buildings, and in some states, no service—not even a prayer meeting—can take place outside a registered church building, and these buildings are only conceded to the faithful to use at the pleasure of the Government. The provision of the Constitution, aimed at the Roman Catholic Church, because of its seeking after political power, necessarily applies to all religions, including evangelical churches founded through American and British missions.

"The new system of education in Mexico is closely allied to its religious life. By a recent amendment to the Constitution, 'Socialist teaching' is imperative in all schools, including mission schools. Mr. Grubb examined some of the Government textbooks prepared for primary schools, and found them to be definitely against religion. The 'Socialist' teaching of Mexico is irreligious, planned to remove all religious ideas from the minds of the people; and it often means an entirely anti-religious education. In one of the most populous states, all school-teachers have to the following document:

"I declare emphatically that by all the means in my power I will fight the Catholic religion and any other religions. I declare emphatically that I will not take part in private or public in any ceremony of the Catholic Church or any other religion."

"The following is a Socialist Lord's Prayer which Mr. Grubb found being taught in a school:

"Our Socialism which art on the earth,  
Respected be thy name,  
Thine influence come,  
Thy will be done as in the cities so in the fields.  
Give us this day our daily bread,

And do not pardon us if we pardon our enemies,

And lead us not into the hand of clergy,  
But deliver us from evil. Amen."

### Household Worship in Germany

ONE of the most touching features in the life of the German Confessional Church is the holding of public worship in the rooms of private houses, when a community has been deprived of its church. A correspondent, describing such a case in the Rhenish area, mentions that as soon as the people were driven out of the church they had lately built, several householders at once offered rooms in their own homes for Sunday services, and each in turn made himself responsible for accommodating the members. "There was no trace there of depression on account of the continuous persecutions; on the contrary, the people felt very clearly that it was the Divine will that they should return to the early Christian institution of the church in the house. New possibilities are herewith opened for the future of congregations in large towns. An 'altar' was done away with, but in its place more than twenty home altars have lighted their candles. If love to the Evangelical Church has kindled them, neither malice nor force will succeed in breaking up these communities in days of even sterner trial."

### German Missions

ACCORDING to Dr. Julius Richter, of Berlin, Germany, "the German Protestant missions are in dire straits again. Foreign exchange is so scarce in our country (Germany) that the utmost amount which can be provided for these missions under the direct restrictions is little less than one hundred marks for every German missionary per month or about two million marks for all missionaries together. Not a penny is

allowed either for the construction or repairing of churches, mission houses, schools, native pastorates and similar things, nor for the salaries of the native pastors, teachers, catechists, evangelists, Bible women and the rest. So this whole burden of maintaining the native Church and of propagating the Gospel has to be thrown on the weak shoulders of the native Church, and that at a time when they are not prepared for so great a task. They will imperatively need some years to accommodate themselves to this new duty. It is falling on them all the more heavily because they are in a state of rapid and radical impoverishment."

### What Will Be the Message?

THE Federal Council of Churches is taking upon itself an evangelistic campaign which it calls the National Preaching Mission. The preaching mission will be held in the Autumn of 1936, beginning early in September and continuing three months to the middle of December. Some 25 strategic centers will be visited; four days will be spent in each center. The ministers and churches for a radius of 100 to 200 miles will be invited into each city. The personnel of the preaching mission will consist of a number of eminent divines from foreign countries, as well as from our own country. They will all be "great present-day leaders in religious thought and life in the churches of Europe and America." Dr. E. Stanley Jones of India will be included in the personnel, and is expected to speak in each of the 25 cities, as is also each of the speakers from Great Britain and other parts of Europe.

### One Hundredth Anniversary of Bible for Blind

THIS year, the 400th anniversary of the printing of the English Bible, is the 100th anniversary of the printing of the Scriptures for the Blind. The first reference to the blind in the records of the American Bible Society is a minute in June, 1833, recording "there were at least 5,385 blind persons in the United States" (120,000 are now reported), and declaring "it is the duty of the Society to provide an edition of the entire New Testament for their use, so soon as a system of printing is settled."

From the beginning the policy has been to supply these expensive volumes at moderate prices to the blind and to schools and libraries serving them. For the last decade the Society has made a uniform special price to or for the blind of 25c a volume in any system, though the books cost from \$2 to \$8 each. It is a missionary service. The whole costly Bible is not ordinarily given to individuals, save to blind ministers, teachers, and Bible or theological students.

No blind person, whose desire for the Scriptures was known, has failed to receive some volumes.

### IN THIS ISSUE:

EDITORIALS	
Our Lord's Central and Abiding Purpose . . . . .	169
The Mandate of the 1934 Assembly . . . . .	170
Decisions Handed Down by Judicial Commission . . . . .	171
The Board of Foreign Missions and the Barnhouse Report . . . . .	172
John Calvin, the World Reconstructionist . . . . .	173
THE LATE REV. JAMES MITCHELL FOSTER	
Controversy and Compromise . . . . .	178
S. I. HENMAN	
Report of Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse Concerning his visit to Presbyterian Foreign Mission Stations in Asia . . . . .	180
A Meditation . . . . .	183
ABRAHAM KUYPER	
Missions . . . . .	184
MRS. GEORGE P. PIERSON	
Book Reviews . . . . .	186
News of the Church . . . . .	187