

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.

FEBRUARY, 1936
Vol. 6 No. 9

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

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

Editorial Notes and Comments

THE DISRUPTION OF WESTMINSTER SEMINARY

AT A special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Westminster Theological Seminary, held on January 7th, thirteen of its twenty-eight trustees presented their resignations. Their names, given in alphabetical order, are: the REV. DR. MAITLAND ALEXANDER, a former moderator of the General Assembly and long President of the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary; the REV. DR. ALEXANDER ALISON, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Bridgeport, Conn.; the REV. T. STACEY CAPERS, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Hollidaysburg, Pa.; the REV. DR. SAMUEL G. CRAIG, editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY; the REV. DR. FRANK R. ELDER, pastor of the Covenant-First Presbyterian Church of Cincinnati; the REV. DR. CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh; the REV. JOHN H. MCCOMB, pastor of the Broadway Presbyterian Church of New York City; the REV. T. ROLAND PHILIPS, pastor of the Arlington Presbyterian Church of Baltimore; the REV. DR. JOHN T. REEVE, pastor of the South Presbyterian Church of Syracuse, N. Y.; MR. T. EDWARD ROSS, senior partner of Lybrand Ross Bros. & Montgomery of Philadelphia; the REV. DR. CHARLES SCHALL, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Wayne, Pa.; the REV. JOSEPH A. SCHOFIELD, JR., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Gouverneur, N. Y.; and MR. JAMES F. SHRADER, prominent lawyer and President of the Presbyterian Social Union of Philadelphia.

It should be added that at the last regular meeting of the Board, held on October 22nd, last, the REV. DR. F. PAUL MCCONKEY, pastor of Immanuel Presbyterian Church of Detroit, presented his resignation and that at least one other member of the Board has already affirmed that he will add his name to the list of resigners. Hence a majority of the Board, as it existed at the beginning of the school year, have or are about to resign. Whether others will also resign remains to be seen.

At this same special meeting, the REV. OSWALD THOMPSON ALLIS, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament, also

presented his resignation as a member of the Faculty to become effective at the close of the present school year. According to the Constitution of the Seminary, professors are under obligation to give six months' notice of their intention to resign.

Occasion and Alleged Cause of the Disruption

The immediate occasion of the above resignations (apart from that of Dr. MCCONKEY and possibly Mr. ROSS) was a special communication which the majority of the Faculty, without previous warning, presented to the Board of Trustees at its regular meeting on October 22nd, last. That communication alleged that "a serious division has been introduced into the affairs of the Seminary by the present editorial policy of CHRISTIANITY TODAY and by the present attitude of Dr. CRAIG." The communication concluded thus: "We respectfully ask the Board of Trustees to inform us and inform the world what its position is in the issue raised by Dr. CRAIG's present attitude and editorial policy. If it favors Dr. CRAIG's present attitude, then we are compelled, to our very great sorrow, to say that we cannot conscientiously continue our connection with the institution. If it is opposed to that attitude, we respectfully urge that such opposition be made known by immediate and definite action. . . ." It should be added, perhaps, that while no one but the editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY was mentioned by name in the communication yet that in the remarks that accompanied its presentation it was stated that its criticisms applied equally to such other members of the Board as shared his attitude.

Action Re the Faculty's Ultimatum

Immediately after the presentation of the Faculty's communication the following motion was offered by an evidently Faculty-instructed member of the Board:

"In reply to the Faculty's special communication the Board declares that it is in sympathy with the aggressive stand of the Faculty in the present ecclesiastical crisis as agreeing with the purpose for which the Seminary was founded and deprecates the serious division which has been introduced into the affairs of the Seminary by the present policy and attitude of CHRISTIANITY TODAY."

In the discussion that followed it soon became obvious that the majority of those present were opposed to the

attitude and demand of the majority of the Faculty. Inasmuch, however, as the majority of the Faculty asserted with all possible emphasis that it was their unalterable purpose to resign if the Board answered their request in the negative, and inasmuch as most even of those opposed to the Faculty's request were of the opinion that the Seminary would be compelled to disband if the majority of the Faculty carried out their threat, the opinion found favor that the best thing to do under the circumstances was to turn the institution over to those in full sympathy with the majority of the Faculty. There were not lacking those, however, who stoutly maintained that even if it involved the disbanding of the Seminary—all were not sure that it would—it would be better to let the majority of the Faculty resign (and thus take upon themselves full responsibility for wrecking the Seminary) rather than, in obedience to a threat, surrender the institution to the control of a group who, in their judgment, would either prove unequal to the task of carrying it on or would carry it on in a way that would work harm to the cause which it was founded to further, *i.e.*, they maintained, to put it briefly, that it would be better to disband the Seminary rather than accede to the Faculty's demand. The discussion culminated in the following motion being offered by one opposed to the Faculty's attitude, not as a substitute motion but as a method of voting on the motion under discussion:

Resolved: That in view of the grave importance of the motion now under discussion, and the absence from this stated meeting of eleven members of the Board, the question be put to a vote by ballot mailed to all members of the Board. . . .

Should the vote show that a majority of the Board support the resolution of the Faculty, it is the sense of this meeting that those who have voted against the resolution should then withdraw from the Board. Likewise, that should the vote show that a majority of the Board oppose the resolution, that those constituting such majority withdraw from the Board, and leave the way clear for the continued witness of a Seminary which we believe was raised up of God as a witness to the everlasting Gospel, and which has been so signally blessed by Him."

This certainly rather unusual motion—its proposer admitted that it was in harmony with the saying, "Heads I win, tails you lose"—was adopted by a vote of 11 to 3, three of those present not voting.

The result of the vote by ballot was 14 against and 10 for the Faculty's resolution. Four declined to vote either for or against. In this connection it may not be out of place to say that while Mr. T. EDWARD ROSS gave ill health as the reason for his resignation yet that he was one of the 14 who voted against the Faculty's resolution; also that Dr. McCONKEY resigned for essentially the same reason as the twelve of his former colleagues mentioned above.

The purpose of the special meeting of the Board on

January 7th, specified in the call, included action on the resignation of Dr. ALLIS from the Faculty of the Seminary, also on all resignations of members of the Board "tendered up to and including" the date of the meeting. The writer voted "No" on both of the motions cited above. Moreover, as he regarded the action of the Board as an unwarranted surrender of its rights and responsibilities he did not tender his resignation until after a sufficient number of the resignations of his former colleagues had been accepted to make it clear that he would henceforth belong to a hopeless minority in the Board. In this he was not alone. In extenuation of that avoidance of duty and abandonment of responsibility that these resignations seem to involve, it may be said that most who took this step did so in the belief that only by such action could the Seminary be "saved." The result of their action, in our opinion, was not so much to "save" the Seminary they loved as to consent to its destruction in the interest of originating a Seminary of a markedly different type.

An Expression of Satisfaction

It is needless to say that it is no small satisfaction to the editor of this paper, especially in view of the fact that he was singled out for attack by the Faculty, to have so many of the Board of Trustees express themselves as opposed to the Faculty's attitude and demand—a satisfaction that is greatly heightened by the quality and standing of those who resigned from the Board rather than support the policies advocated by the majority of the Faculty. It is also a matter of large satisfaction to him that Dr. ALLIS, whom he has long regarded as easily the most judicious and level-headed of the Faculty, is in substantial accord with his position.

Real Cause of the Disruption

While the immediate occasion of the resignations just considered was the Faculty communication, referred to above, that communication made no direct reference to the *real* cause of the serious division in the affairs of said Seminary that led to its disruption. Beyond question it was the formation of the Independent Board, without consultation with and even without the knowledge of any considerable part of either the Faculty or Trustees of the Seminary, that introduced such division into the affairs of the institution. Or rather it was a growing tendency on the part of certain of the Faculty and Trustees, after the Independent Board had been organized, to insist that the interests of the Seminary (and even the interests of Conservatism in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.) be identified in the first instance with those of the Independent Board and later with those of its offspring, the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union—a tendency that culminated in the Faculty's communication which is, in effect, a demand that the Seminary identify its interests with these two organizations, not indeed officially but none the less really. *It is difficult not to believe that the

* As matters now stand 3 of the 6 voting members of the Faculty and 7 of the 21 members of the Board of Trustees are officially connected with the Independent Board. It is safe to add that most of the members, both of the Faculty and Trustees, are members of the P. C. C. U. 3 of the 4 ministerial members of the Executive Committee of the P. C. C. U. are officially connected with Westminster Seminary.

Faculty was lacking in candor and sincerity when it alleges that this "serious division was introduced into the affairs of the Seminary by the present policy and attitude of CHRISTIANITY TODAY." The most that can be truthfully said is that CHRISTIANITY TODAY has given expression, in some degree, to the views of those who were opposed to tying up the future of the institution with the Independent Board and the P.C.C.U. Wholly apart from anything that has appeared in this paper—yes, even if its editor had shown himself in full sympathy with the position expressed in the Faculty's communication—this division in the affairs of the Seminary, the circumstances being the same, would have appeared and have disrupted the institution. An open break might have been delayed somewhat but about the only difference in the end would have been one less resignation. We affirm without fear of successful or even intelligent contradiction that the real cause of the division in the affairs of Westminster Seminary that led to the resignation of Dr. ALLIS and so many of the outstanding members of its Board of Trustees was the insistence by a part of its Faculty and Trustees that positive support of the Independent Board and the Covenant Union be made a test of loyalty not only to the Seminary but of uncompromising opposition to Modernism and indifference in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

More Than Aggressiveness Needed

When, therefore, the Faculty's communication asked the Board to express its "sympathy with the aggressive stand of the Faculty in the present ecclesiastical crisis" what it really asked was that the Board express its sympathy with the policies of the Independent Board and the P.C.C.U. As far as we know there was not a single member of the Board that did not (and that does not) favor a militant and aggressive opposition to Modernism in the councils of the Church. To say that they favor such an aggressive attitude is not to say, however, that they favor every method that may be proposed for combatting these evils, no matter how ill-advised they may be. They believe not only in aggressiveness but in a wise expenditure of effort. We are confident, moreover, that we speak not only for ourselves but for most Presbyterians who are opposed to Modernism and indifference when we express the conviction that the formation of the Independent Board and the P.C.C.U. have grievously harmed the cause of Conservatism in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. It is an intelligent interest in the purity and welfare of the Church, not fear of the Church machine or indifference, that led these sound Presbyterians to deprecate the existence and activities of these organizations under the leadership of Dr. MACHEN. Dr. MACHEN is a very gifted man but as a tactician we venture the opinion that he is about the world's worst. If we may use a football illustration, we would say that every expert would place him on the All-America but that not a single one would place him in the quarterback position. Our divergence from Dr. MACHEN concerns not the question of the right attitude toward Modernism in the Presbyterian

Church but the question of the manner in which that attitude can find most effective expression.

Board's Statement and Comments

Following the resignations, mentioned above, the Board of Trustees of the Seminary gave a formal statement to the press "for immediate release" in which it asserted: "twelve Trustees of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, have resigned from membership on the Board of that institution in order that the policy of the Faculty, the original policy upon which the institution was founded, may be continued. . . . The Seminary will go forward in accordance with the policy favored by the Faculty, which it holds to be simply the policy which the institution has followed from the beginning and on the basis of which it has made its appeal for funds. . . . With regard to the future, the Board desires to emphasize the fact that in its judgment the present changes in its membership will not bring any innovations of policy but will simply insure the continuation of exactly the same policy as that which has been followed from the beginning and on the basis of which the appeal of the institution for support has been made."

A few comments relative to the statements from which we have just cited seem called for. In the first place, the informed will not overlook their resemblance to the statements that were issued by the Board of Trustees of Princeton Seminary shortly after the reorganization of that institution by the General Assembly in 1929. In the second place, the statement of the Board can hardly be defended against the charge of being deliberately misleading in view of the fact that it asserts that "twelve" of the Trustees who presented their resignations at the meeting on January 7th did so "in order that the policy of the Faculty, the original policy upon which the institution was founded, may be continued." The Board knew perfectly well that the writer, not to mention others, did not resign for the reason given. In the third place, the writer at least—and he thinks he is as well qualified as any to express an opinion on the matter—does not think that the policy favored by the Faculty "is simply the policy which the institution has followed from the beginning and on the basis of which it has made its appeals for funds." We submit that the mere fact of the identification of Westminster Seminary with the Independent Board and the schismatic or separatist movement usually spoken of as the P.C.C.U.—not officially indeed but none the less actually—makes clear that a more or less radical change of policy has already been approved. Westminster Seminary was founded "to carry on and perpetuate the policies and traditions of Princeton Theological Seminary as that institution existed prior to its reorganization by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A." (see latest Catalogue of the Seminary, p. 17). Now that it has cast in its lot with a schismatic movement in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., we do not believe that Westminster Seminary can fairly claim to be carrying on those policies and traditions. If no change of policy was involved we do not think that among those who resigned would have been, not

to mention others, DR. MAITLAND ALEXANDER who was long the President of the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary prior to its reorganization in 1929, or DR. OSWALD T. ALLIS who not only taught at Princeton for some twenty years but who for years was editor of its official organ, the *Princeton Theological Review*. It is equally improbable that the list would have included the name of DR. CHARLES SCHALL to whom more than to any other individual is due the credit for the actual founding of Westminster Seminary. When every one else apparently despaired of crystallizing the sentiment in favor of a new Seminary he took the step that led to its establishment. Neither do we believe that the policy favored by the Faculty is "simply" that "on the basis of which the appeal of the institution for support has been made." We do not believe, for instance, that if DR. WALTER D. BUCHANAN were living today he would make Westminster Seminary a beneficiary under his will. It need not be overlooked, moreover, that among those Trustees who have resigned are a number of those who, directly or indirectly, have been among the largest contributors to the institution.

Westminster Seminary's Future

The future of Westminster Seminary, as we see it, hinges on the measure of success that attends the efforts of those with whom it is now aligned to split the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Should the outcome be a sizable split—which we very much doubt—the institution that carries that name will no doubt function as the official Seminary of the new Church that will be formed. Otherwise we anticipate its early demise. Be that as it may, it seems to us that its usefulness is practically at an end as far as the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is concerned.

It is hardly likely that many who want to enter the ministry of said Church will be seekers of its diploma.

The writer did his best to prevent the organization of the Independent Board on the ground that the attempt to operate that particular type of organization would not only jeopardize the future of Westminster Seminary but imperil the cause of Conservatism in the Presbyterian Church in its opposition to Modernism and indifferentism. Today, it is indeed a melancholy satisfaction to him that the event has shown that his fears were fully justified.

Concluding Statement

The chief speaker in behalf of the Faculty's request or rather demand when it was first brought to the attention of the Board of Trustees of Westminster Seminary affirmed that if the Board refused their demand he would not only resign in the most public way possible but fight against the Seminary as vigorously as for over six years he had fought for it. The editor of this paper has no intention of acting after that manner. While he has spent and been spent in behalf of Westminster Seminary—the immediate occasion of his establishing *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* and one of the main reasons why he has, in large part, maintained it for nearly six years was that there might be at least one paper that had a sympathetic understanding of the things for which Westminster Seminary stood (see initial issue, p. 1)—yet he has no intention of spending any part of his energy in fighting the institution that will call itself Westminster Seminary. He believes that the Faculty and others have acted wrongly as well as unwisely in this matter. At the same time he believes that God can cause the sin and folly as well as the wrath of man to praise Him and he hopes that it is His purpose to do this, in all these respects, in the present instance.

Mission Study Books for 1935-36

I. Home Missions

By Rev. Joseph A. Schofield, Jr.



EVERY year the Missionary Education Movement and the Council of Women for Home Missions publish a series of books, popularly called "Mission Study Books" and distribute them, largely through denominational literature headquarters, to individuals, to various "study groups" and to churches as aids in missionary education. Different books are prepared for adults, young people and seniors, intermediates, juniors and primary groups; some on home missions and some on foreign. Generally there is one principal book prepared for each group in each line of study, i. e., one for home mission study and one for foreign. Usually a leader's guide is prepared in pamphlet form to go with each book studied and certain other reference books and supplemental material are issued. The Editor of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* has asked me to deal with the mission books for the current year written for adults and young people and seniors. In this article, I plan to deal with the books prepared for the study of home missions. In a second article, I hope to consider the foreign mission books.

The principal book for adult groups on Home Missions this year is "Toward a Christian America: The Contribution of Home Missions" by Hermann N. Morse, Administrative Secretary of the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Dr. Morse has given us a very good book on a very important subject and the entire church will thank him for it. He has written upon a difficult subject in the sense that it is not at all easy to make home missions interesting. Statistics are so apt to be very dry. The work of the church before our very eyes is so apt to lack the glamor and the appeal of the unusual and the bizarre. It is not strange, therefore, that this book does not grip the reader as does Basil Mathews' "The Jew and the World Ferment," one of the books suggested for general reading this year; but nevertheless it is well done; giving a splendid outline of the history of home missions in this country; of the work being done today and of the outlook for the future.

Dr. Morse bases his book very largely on another book which

he himself edited a year earlier, "Home Missions Today and Tomorrow; A Review and Forecast," which was the report of the results of the Five-Year Program of Survey and Adjustment conducted under the joint auspices of the Home Missions Council, the Council of Women for Home Missions, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the Community Church Workers. He himself was chairman of the joint committee which undertook this work, which was extended, before its completion, from five years to six. He therefore has been able to draw upon a great wealth of material, which he has used to great advantage.

He begins his book by stating the purpose of Home Missions as "the Christian ideal for America . . . is that all places and all people may be reached with the Christian gospel and with a Christian ministry to every form of human need." (Page 2.) He then outlines the history of home missions in this country and says, "Such a history would be in large measure the history of the church in America and in no inconsiderable degree the story of the nation as well." (Page 3.) He explains how missions have followed the frontier, "but as the nation developed it was not always so obvious where the frontier was, or what it was." (Page 36.) He explains how various secondary types of work should supplement and further the primary purpose of missions, which he takes great care to point out is evangelism. He reminds us that the aided pastor is the most characteristic worker in the whole field of missions in the home land and that the organized church is the most characteristic agency. He explains how today there is a movement "away from . . . denominational expansion and toward the conception of (home missions) as an unselfish contribution to religious development and social reconstruction." (Page 50.) The cost of the enterprise is very great, being about \$27,500,000 a year and the proportion of workers allotted to administration seems a little high; although possibly not out of line with the numbers of workers engaged in direct church and Sunday School work. He gives us the astounding bit of information that only about one half of the adult population of this country is enrolled in any church, and that two-thirds of the Protestant churches of America need financial aid from denominational bodies. He remarks that the social service program of the home mission enterprise can be given up when state and private philanthropies are ready to take it over, leaving the church to return to its primary concern.

On the whole, this is a very fine book. Nevertheless there are a few questions that arise from time to time as the reader goes through it. Our author presents a high and noble aim for home missions: "However much one emphasizes its concern with social or educational or economic or moral issues, its primary concern is religious and spiritual." (Page 16.) "The program of work includes definite religious instruction and evangelistic activity." (Page 72.) One cannot help wondering if this high ideal is always lived up to. He states positively that evangelism is the primary aim (page 93) and that the chief purpose is to present Christ to those who would otherwise be lost (page 129). We rejoice that this book takes this point of view and see in it a healthy sign of a return to Christ-centered missions in our land. But we wonder if our author may not be a little too optimistic. We wonder if all the missionaries under all the Boards of all the Churches of this vast land share his view at this point. We surely hope so, but are not wholly convinced. He states that there is a "definite evangelistic purpose in all mission schools" (page 145) and mission hospitals (page 157); that neighborhood houses under mission auspices are "much more definitely and avowedly religious" than social settlements (page 163). We delight to hear these things and hope they are true, but wonder if in some respects this book is not better than the actual conditions with which it

deals. We are sorry that our author thinks that the issues that divide denominations are "minor" affairs (page 174) and we may not agree with him that mission aid should always be refused to so-called competitive churches (page 177). But after all, most of these questions do not invalidate the book itself, though they may cause us to pause before saying that the entire home mission enterprise is above criticism.

"How Fares the Church in America? A Home Missions Course for Adult Groups" by Kenneth D. Miller is a small pamphlet to be used as a leader's guide in connection with classes studying "Toward a Christian America." It outlines a course of study based upon the larger book and adapted especially to those who do not believe in missions. It contains good questionnaires, good discussion questions, good check lists, good opinion tests and much good supplemental material. It should prove a real help if used in connection with the text.

We turn now to the study book for young people and seniors, "Christian Youth in Action," by Frank W. Herriott, an Instructor in Union Theological Seminary. If the book for adults could be highly commended; this book for youth can be just as highly condemned. If the book for adults we think of as good; this book for youth we think of as bad. Our author tells us (page 1, page 34, page 35) that his book is unique in that it is a book not of needs and projects which might be carried out but rather a book of examples of actions that have been carried out. Without doubt his book is unique in this respect, but it falls in a very large and increasing class of poor books, poorly conceived, poorly written, with a very cloudy, not to say utterly mistaken, idea of the meaning of Christianity. In style, the book is choppy and not inspiring; with too many quotations and unrelated incidents; with one illustration strung after another. In content it is liberal, socialistic, pacifistic, unchristian. To say the very least it seems most unwise to use such a book, as its author and its sponsors intended it to be used, as a study book in groups of young people. More than that it seems most unwise that our Presbyterian Church should employ the book in its youth groups and in its summer conferences.

Our author avoids the direct expression of his own opinion by quoting others almost entirely throughout this book. Yet the tone of the book is perfectly clear and the very evident approval with which he quotes one statement after another clearly indicates the author's position. He tells us that youth complains that religious bodies go through meaningless routine (page 3), or hold trivial discussions. But does youth complain of this? Maybe it is rather their older leaders that urge them to make such criticisms. Why should youth think that what the church does is meaningless and trivial? He tells us that young people are determined to remake the world (page 4), and does not even smile at such big talk! He tells us that youth objects to the financial foundation of our churches and the profit motive in business (page 28) and suggests socialism as the remedy for all our ills. He advises youth to make recommendations to the church (page 29) and gives approval to one project that taught etiquette to girls whose families were on relief rather than religion (page 55). Indeed the large majority of the projects cited in the book with great approval were in no way even remotely connected with religion! He treats "accepting Christ" lightly (page 71); likewise "heaven and hell" (page 75); also "preaching" (pages 85 and 86); and the "comfort" of the church (page 88). He quotes with approval the statement of one group of young people to the effect that, "There is little clarity of insight on the meaning of the Christian life for today" (page 94) as if nobody knew anything today but youth! He speaks of the "spiritual experience" of

Jesus as if it were the same as that of men (page 95)! He advocates an "economic seminar" instead of the study of religion (page 106)! He quotes with approval a new pledge for a Christian youth society that is socialistic, that misunderstands the Bible, that sets the Old Testament against the New, that misquotes Christ and the Lord's Prayer (page 110). He assumes certain ideas are "principles of Jesus" (page 111) instead of getting them out of the New Testament and quotes with approval a finding of a Youth Conference on personal religious living that advocates a change in ideals, attitudes and motives with no word of salvation, conversion, the new birth or God's part in redemption (page 111). He offers a view of sin that is unscriptural and untrue (page 111) in sad contrast to the glorious definition in our Westminster Shorter Catechism and in close harmony with humanism in its ethical subjectivism. He sets Jesus up as an example to follow (page 112) rather than as a Lord to worship and obey; suggesting that mankind can imitate him without being reborn! He looks down on creeds (page 112), quoting youth all the while, but certainly expressing through them his ideas; as indeed they themselves may be expressing ideas handed to them by others rather than worked out by themselves. And in his rejection of creeds, he throws away all objective truth, making faith a thing that man works out for himself rather than something God gives to man. He takes pacifism for granted (page 78ff) and states and defends it (pages 116-117). He approves a general redistribution of wealth (page 121), substituting socialism for the Gospel. He conceives of the Church as a purely human institution, a co-operative institution rather than a Divine, based on efficiency rather than truth (page 126). On page 141 he starts to discuss missions—the entire book only runs to 169—but displays a very inadequate idea of the purpose and scope of home missions.

The book is not without its good points, although they are few and far between. It abounds in illustrations; it does present many different types of missionary and social service; it does try to glorify the church; it does attack the liquor problem; it does advocate patience and thoughtfulness in the co-operation of youth with age in the church. But on the whole, the book is pretty poor!

"What Will You Do About It? A Guide to Action" by Sue Weddell and Frank W. Herriott is the leader's guide to accompany "Christian Youth In Action" the book just discussed. It contains many good questions and suggests many stimulating discussions but it leans strongly toward socialism, pacifism and modernism as does the larger book. Still, it might prove stimulating as a basis of a discussion group under a wise and really Christian leader. Dr. Dosker of Louisville used to say that you could always detect a modernist by the way he prayed. This pamphlet outlines six study sessions with a worship period in each, each closing with a prayer. Of the six prayers suggested, only one is made in the name of Jesus Christ. This displays the tone of the book.

Two other books are listed in the list for adults. "Home Missions Today and Tomorrow: A Review and Forecast," edited by Hermann N. Morse, was published in 1934. It is a vast source book, full of statistical tables and valuable information, but since it was published last year and is the basis of the study book for this year, it will not be discussed in this article. Neither will "The Challenge of Change," by John Milton Moore, published in 1931, and offered as a reference book for this year's study.

But we shall briefly discuss one of the books offered for general reading. "The Jew and the World Ferment," by Basil Mathews is a most excellent book which we would advise every Christian to read. Mr. Mathews has written a number of books, some of which we may not have entirely approved, as, for example, his

"Roads to the City of God," the Foreign Mission Study book for 1929-30. But the present book on the Jew, his place in the world and the problems he faces is a splendid contribution to a very perplexing yet a very important question.

Mr. Mathews begins by showing how the old ghetto is being broken up. He then proceeds to face "The Jewish Riddle," which, reduced to its simplest terms, is simply, "What, after all, is a Jew?" There are nine Jews in New York City to one in Palestine, there being over two million of them in the confines of greater New York, comprising 28% of the total population of America's greatest city. Of these, only one-fourth have any active loyalty to the Synagogue. Hence the importance of the question for America becomes apparent; not only because of the large number of Jews in our midst, but also because of the fact that great multitudes of them are giving up, not only their own faith, but all religion.

The author then goes on to discuss the Heritage of Israel, telling us that "That vision of a united nation whose sole rule should be the will of God, and the hallmark of whose citizenship should be spiritual and moral, was the greatest creative idea yet given to man." (Page 42.) He shows how the Jew has given the world, or more exactly how God has given the world through the Jew, the idea of the oneness and holiness of the Almighty. He discusses the Jewish use of the Bible; the Talmud; the synagogue, the rabbi, the home, the phylactery. He also plainly shows how the Christian Church claims to be the fruition of the Old Testament.

A very full and excellent account of the anti-Semitic movement throughout history down to the present time is given, with emphasis upon the truth stated by Dean Inge when he said, "The Jew has stood at the graveside of all his persecutors." 10,000 Jews leave Germany every year. An excellent discussion of the Zionist movement is given, with a carefully drawn distinction made between the religious Jew and the political Jew. It is the latter, often frankly atheistic or clearly agnostic, who is found almost exclusively in the Zionist movement and who makes up the bulk of the growing population of Palestine. The difficulty of compromise between Jewish religion on the one hand and modern life and culture and business on the other is pointed out with the further fact that religion is no longer the center of Jewish life.

An excellent chapter on the true meaning of life according to the various views within Judaism and then according to Christianity is presented. Our author shows how liberal Judaism and liberal Christianity are related, admitting that liberal Christianity essentially is not real Christianity and further suggesting that many liberal Christians are nearer Jewry than true Christianity. He closes his excellent discussion by pointing out the duty of Christians toward Jews as being two-fold: first, to treat the Jew as any neighbor should be treated and second, to present Jesus Christ to him with tact, with love and with gentle yet firm conviction.

Some might have wished that Mr. Mathews would have stressed the Cross a little more in this book, together with a little stronger emphasis on sin and on faith. Nevertheless, he does not deny any Christian doctrine nor willingly pass over or neglect any. His definition of salvation may be somewhat limited but it is not wrong. He shows that Christianity is the only way to God, even though we might wish he would say this in language a bit more clear. Nevertheless, we are convinced that this book is a truly Christian book and at the same time a book that could not unnecessarily offend a Jew who might read it. We hope, therefore, that it may find wide reading both among Christians and among Jews.

Water Baptism, Sprinkling or Immersion? What Saith the Scriptures?

By Rev. Warren R. Ward

Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia

[The following interesting and to us somewhat unique article dealing with the Biblical method of baptism was written without thought of publication in this paper. Prepared by its pastor-author in order to help his own people understand the Presbyterian interpretation with regard to this important subject, it was submitted to us at the urgent request of some of those who had read it. While we appreciate the privilege of publishing it and accept its conclusion, that does not necessarily mean that we concur at all points.—Editor.]



SHORT time ago a young lady asked me this question: "Why do the Presbyterians sprinkle when the Bible teaches that baptism is immersion?" My reply was: "The Presbyterian Church baptizes by sprinkling because they believe that this baptism is in harmony with the teachings of the Scriptures. If I believed that the Bible taught that immersion was the only mode of baptism I would be immersed immediately."

The question and the point of view of this young lady are very common. Many people are thoroughly convinced that the Bible teaches one form of baptism—that of immersion. Some have gone so far as to suggest that there must be one of two reasons why we do not accept the immersionist's point of view, either we have not studied the Scriptures on the subject or we deliberately refuse to accept their plain teachings. The writer feels that his answer to many inquirers may help to assure those who hold that sprinkling is baptism; and it is for this reason rather than in any spirit of controversy that this article has been written.

Startling as it may sound to some, the purpose of this paper is to prove that immersion, far from being the *only* mode of baptism taught in the Scriptures, has little if any ground for support in the Bible. After very careful study of the Scriptures with open mind, I believe that sprinkling is the proper mode of baptism rather than immersion.

Let it be distinctly understood that the Presbyterian Church accepts *any* mode of water baptism as fulfilling the demands of the Scriptures. We do not believe that the phrase "One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism" refers to water baptism at all—certainly not to one *mode* of water baptism; such baptism is that of the Holy Ghost.

It should be stated that the Presbyterian Church does not *require* its members to have their children baptized in infancy. We believe that it should be done, because we understand the Scriptures to teach that it is not only the duty but the privilege of Christian parents to present their children to God and place upon them the sign and seal that they are saved by the grace of God in Christ until they come to the age of understanding; but desire or willingness to have this done is in no sense a condition of membership in the Presbyterian Church U.S.A.

Again, we do believe that the Scriptures teach that all true believers should be baptized with water. In His great commission to His Church, Christ says: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations *baptizing* them . . ." (Matthew 28: 19). When the people had been convicted of sin and they asked Peter what to do, he said: "Repent and be *baptized* every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ . . ." (Acts 2: 38). There can be no doubt that baptism with water had an important place in the plan of Christ for His Church.

On the other hand, we do not believe that water baptism has any efficacy of its own, but that it is simply "a sign and seal of the washing away of our sins and our engrafting into Christ" by the inner operation of the Holy Ghost. Baptism with water has no regenerating or saving power in itself. The amount of water, the mode of application and the administration of it are non-essentials. The words of Jesus to Peter are applicable here: "He that

is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit" (John 13: 10). Peter did not need to be immersed or washed all over to have part with Jesus; a little water on the feet was sufficient.

Moreover, while baptism with water is emphasized in the Scriptures, it is not made an essential thing. Why was Paul so unconcerned about it if it is as important as some would have us believe? "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in my own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other" (I Corinthians 1: 14-16). If the Apostle had believed as some do today, I feel sure that he would not have let a single believer go until he was sure that he was immersed. And did you ever realize that there is no evidence that all of the disciples were baptized? Surely they did not give it the important place in the Church that some have given it.

In all discussions of baptism the definition of terms is most important. We must not lose sight of the fact that immersion means "to dip until the thing or person is submerged." Whether the person is being baptized with water, oil, blood, fire and so on, the water or other thing must be there and the candidate dipped into it until he or she is submerged. The application must be made by putting the person *into* that with which the person is baptized rather than by pouring the substance on the person or sprinkling him with it. This fact will have an important bearing upon our interpretation of the Word.

Now let us approach this subject with open minds and with a prayer that we may really understand what the Bible teaches. If God has spoken on this subject we want to know just what He has said. I am sure that all real Christians are anxious to know His will and to do it.

May I call your attention, first of all, to a basic fact which is often overlooked, and that is that the *baptism of John the Baptist is not Christian baptism*. Many people seem to feel that if they can prove that John the Baptist immersed and that Jesus was immersed, nothing more should be asked to prove that all Christians should be immersed or be classed as disobedient. Nothing could be clearer than the teaching of the Scriptures along this line; they teach exactly the opposite. Whether or not John's baptism was by immersion, it was not Christian baptism and it has no place in the program of Christ for this age. John's baptism belongs under the law—before the New Testament age. Note what is said in Acts 19: 3-6, "And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." What was wrong with these Ephesian Christians? They were still living under the law; they knew only the baptism of the law, the baptism of repentance (Luke 3: 3). Christian baptism, as Paul soon showed them, is the baptism with the Holy Ghost. John the Baptist also made this plain, and it is strange that so many Christians of this age do

not see it. Note Luke 3: 16. "John answered, saying unto them all, I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." And John 1: 33. "And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." John the Baptist's baptism was one of repentance; Christian baptism is the sign of the work of the Holy Ghost; they are not the same baptism at all.

Recall the connection of Paul's baptism with the descent of the Holy Ghost. "And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized" (Acts 9: 17-18). He was baptized after he had received the Holy Ghost, not simply after he had repented. See also I Corinthians 12: 13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." The baptism which baptizes into the body of Christ is that of the Holy Spirit.

Now, if it be true that Christian baptism is the sign of the coming of the Holy Ghost upon the individual, and it seems to me that the teaching of the Scriptures is very clear on this point, then the mode which would most clearly indicate this experience would be that of sprinkling. The whole teaching of the Scriptures is that the Holy Ghost *fell* on people or He came upon them.

The second fact on which we should keep in mind in studying this subject is the *meaning of Jesus' baptism*. I believe that some who have held to sprinkling as the Scriptural mode of baptism have betrayed their whole case by a wrong definition of Jesus' baptism. The fact that Jesus came to John the Baptist to be baptized does not mean, necessarily, that He attached the same meaning to baptism, as applied to Himself, as John and his followers attached to the baptism of men. In fact, the plain teaching of the Scriptures is exactly the contrary. Read Matthew 3: 13-15: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him." John recognized the incongruity of Jesus, the sinless One, coming to him for the baptism of repentance. And please note that Jesus *did not argue the point* with him. Jesus *did not* say that while He was not a sinner He was the "representative of the sinful race" and was being baptized as such. What He *did* say was something entirely different. He said: "Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Study your Bible and see what the phrase "fulfill all righteousness" means elsewhere. Unquestionably, it goes back to the demands of the law; He must fulfill the demands of the law. Jesus must be anointed to His Messianic office according to the law.

John the Baptist was a representative of the old dispensation. He was the *forerunner* of the new dispensation under Christ. What he did, he found in the old law. The Pharisees recognized this fact. "Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" See also Matthew 21: 26: "For all hold John as a prophet." They realized the fact that he was doing something that belonged to the Old Testament age: he was fulfilling the law and prophecy. Sprinkling with water, oil or blood was a common procedure under the old law. Sometimes it meant repentance and separation from sin; at other times it meant a setting apart or dedication to service.

As applied to the common people, John's baptism meant separation from sin, under the old law. When Christ came to John, he realized that the baptism of repentance was not for Him. But Jesus gave it a different meaning for Himself; He must "fulfill

all righteousness." To Him it meant that He must be separated to His office according to the law. Note how Aaron and the Levites were set apart. Exodus 29: 1, 19, 20, 21: "And this is the thing that thou shalt do unto them to hallow them, to minister unto me in the priest's office: Take one young bullock, and two rams without blemish. And thou shalt take the other ram; and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the ram. Then shalt thou kill the ram, and take of his blood, and put it upon the tip of the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the great toe of their right foot, and *sprinkle* the blood upon the altar round about. And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and *sprinkle* it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him: and he shall be hallowed, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him." Leviticus 8: 10-12, 30: "And Moses took the anointing oil, and anointed the tabernacle and all that was therein, and sanctified them. And he *sprinkled* thereof upon the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and all his vessels, both the laver and his foot, to sanctify them. And he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him, to sanctify him. And Moses took of the anointing oil, and of the blood which was upon the altar, and *sprinkled* it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon his sons' garments with him; and sanctified Aaron, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him." Numbers 8: 5-7: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: *Sprinkle* water of purifying upon them, and let them shave all their flesh, and let them wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean." Note how, in every case, the sign of separation to God or to office was by sprinkling, not by immersion. If John the Baptist was fulfilling the law in consecrating Jesus to His office as the official prophet of the Lord, he could do it in only one way, that of sprinkling.

Moreover, as a representative of the old law, John the Baptist would have used sprinkling as the mode of separating the people from their sins. See what the law saith. Numbers 19: 9, 13, 17-21: "And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up without the camp in a clean place, and it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel for a water of separation: it is a purification for sin. Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel: because the water of separation was not *sprinkled* upon him, he shall be unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him. And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel: And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and *sprinkle* it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave: And the clean person shall *sprinkle* upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day: and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even. But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord: the water of separation hath not been *sprinkled* upon him; he is unclean. And it shall be a perpetual statute unto them, that he that *sprinkleth* the water of separation shall wash his clothes; and he that toucheth the water of separation shall be unclean until even." It is difficult to see how anybody can admit that John the Baptist anticipated the Christian era and came to prepare the way for Christ, and then say that he used any other method than that of sprinkling, which was practiced universally under the old law. Whether he was separating people from their sins, or dedicating Jesus to His office as God's representative to His people, he must have done it by sprinkling.

Again, have you ever realized the almost impossible situation which baptism by immersion would have demanded of John? He must have stood waist deep in water for days and possibly weeks.

Another important consideration is the prophecies concerning sprinkling. Isaiah 52: 13-15 reads: "Behold my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men. So shall he *sprinkle* many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him." Again in Ezekiel 36: 25-27: "Then will I *sprinkle clean water* upon you and ye shall be clean, from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you and cause you to walk in my statutes and ye shall keep my judgments and do them."

Who is the "servant" in Isaiah 52 who is to be exalted and extolled? Whose "visage was so marred"? Whoever that is will sprinkle the nations. Of course, He will not do it in person, but through His disciples. When will He sprinkle people if not during this age? And look again. Note that the same Person Who is to give you a clean heart and a new spirit will *sprinkle clean water* upon you. Who is that? Is it not the plain and necessary inference that when He does regenerate the heart and renew the spirit he will sprinkle with water to indicate that the heart has been changed and you have been separated to God?

Now let us look at some New Testament references to Old Testament customs. In Hebrews the ninth chapter, the inspired writer is comparing conditions under the old and the new covenants; he calls attention to the similarities and the differences. In verses 13 and 14 he refers to the fact that "the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer *sprinkling* the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ . . . purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." We all know that the blood of a bull or goat could not sanctify a sinner; that was God's way of typifying the great sacrifice of His own Lamb for the sins of men. The bringing of the earthly lamb was a testimony on the part of the bearer that he accepted God's promise under the new covenant. Now if God accepted the sign of sprinkling under the old covenant, why should He demand something other than sprinkling under the new covenant? Surely if He did expect us to make a change, He would have made it plain so that nobody need misunderstand. This He has not done. Sprinkling was not changed to immersion under the new covenant by any direct command of God. If He had made the change, this was the place to state it very definitely. The same situation is indicated later in this same chapter, in verses 18-21. Again I say, if sprinkling was God's sign under the old covenant, what right have we to change it unless He told us to do so?

But, they tell us, "Jesus was immersed and we are supposed to follow Jesus in baptism." Who can prove either of these statements? There is no statement in the Bible which says definitely that Jesus was immersed; and where is there any statement to the effect that we should follow Jesus in baptism? Even though we admit that Jesus was baptized in a particular way this is not proof that we should follow Him in that mode of baptism. Are we to follow Jesus in His *manner* of keeping the Lord's Supper?

The fullest reference to the baptism of Jesus is Matthew 3:13-16: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him." And Mark 1:9-10: "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And

straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him." Search these verses for any statement to the effect that Jesus was immersed in the water of the river. Matthew 3: 16 does indicate that Jesus went up straightway out of the water; but this was not a part of His baptism—this was *after* His baptism. Moreover, John is supposed to be immersing Jesus. I never heard of a candidate "*going down under the water*" or "*coming out from under the water*"; the immersing minister *puts* the candidate under the water and *lifts* him out from under the water. In other words, when Jesus went down into the water and when He "went up straightway out of the water," these acts were not a part of the baptism; they preceded and followed the baptism. How John baptized Him after He had gone down into the water with him, the Scriptures do not say; neither can any man say at this time. Probably it was done by sprinkling, as in Old Testament times, though it may have been by immersion.

But, some one replies: "You have forgotten the little preposition in the Greek, *en*; you forget that the Revised Version says that John baptized Jesus *in* the Jordan." Sufficient to say that any Greek lexicon will tell you that this preposition does not always mean "in," but sometimes it means "with," as in the King James Version and in the margin of the Revised Version. To support their point it must *always* mean "in." But it does not always mean "in." Note Luke 22: 49: "Shall we smite with the sword?" Here the word "en" is translated "with." Revelation 12: 5: "who was to rule the nations with a rod of iron." Again, we must translate "en" as "with." The context would indicate that it should be translated "with" rather than "in" here also. As John compares his baptism with that of Jesus he says in Matthew 3:11: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I . . . He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." The Revised Version again uses the word "in" for "with," it is true. But I would have you recall that when Jesus sent the Holy Ghost, He *came upon* them; they were not dipped down into the Holy Ghost until they were covered. They were filled with the Holy Ghost; but the mode of being filled was that of pouring upon them until they were filled. Acts 11: 15-16: "And as I began to speak, *the Holy Ghost fell* on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but *ye shall be baptized* with the Holy Ghost." If the immersionists poured water upon the candidate until he was covered and filled with water, they might be symbolizing the baptism with the Holy Ghost, which is what Christian baptism really does.

Our viewpoint is that Jesus did go down into the Jordan river to be baptized of John. As they stood together in the river John sprinkled Him with water as he had the others, but with a different meaning. Then Jesus went up out of the water in which He had stood during the baptism. On the basis of the actual statements of the Scripture can anyone deny that such an interpretation entirely satisfies the record?

Again, somebody rises to say that the word "baptizo" means to dip down into or to immerse or to submerge. But this man is asking us to leave the Scripture and turn to classical Greek. There I admit that this word does usually mean to immerse. But not so the Scriptures. Many times where the word is used in the Scripture it *cannot* mean to immerse. For instance, I Corinthians 10: 1-2 tells us: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Turning back to a description of this experience in Exodus 14: 29 we read: "But the children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left." That does not sound much like immersion in the sea, does it? Yet the Bible says that they were *baptized* in the sea. It is quite likely that the strong wind which made the path through the sea did sprinkle them; but they were not dipped in the water. Any water that they felt came from the mist *falling upon* them.

We read in the Bible that the disciples were baptized with the Holy Ghost. What was the mode of such a baptism? Joel tells us that in the last days the Holy Spirit was to be *poured out*. (Joel 2: 28.) And this is called baptism? Then baptism is by sprinkling or pouring rather than by immersion. In Matthew 3: 11 we read that the disciples were to be baptized with fire and Acts 2: 3 tells us this was done. Were they dipped or submerged in fire?

But our immersionist friends tell us that there is an illustration of baptism in the Scriptures which proves conclusively that baptism means immersion. They refer to the baptism of the eunuch by Philip. Many of them are willing to stand or fall on this passage. Well, if this is the foundation upon which they are to stand, it seems to me that their house is built upon sand.

Let us examine that passage and read exactly what the Word says. Acts 8: 38-39. They say that the eunuch "went down into the water" and he "came up out of the water" and that proves that he was baptized by immersion. But to prove their point they must read the passage thus: "And he commanded the chariot to stand still. And they went down both *under* the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come *out from under* the water the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." Now note that whatever happened to the eunuch happened to Philip; I have been much interested to observe how the Holy Spirit seems to go out of the way to prove this point. Note that "*they*" went down "*both*" into the water (or, *under* the water as the immersionists must read it) *both Philip and the eunuch*. Now they are *both under* the water. "And he baptized him." That is, he baptized him while they were *both under* the water. How did he baptize him? We do not know. "And when *they* were come out from under the water, the spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." How does it sound to read it the way immersionists must read it to prove their point? The illustration proves nothing whatever about the mode of baptism. It seems to me that the common sense interpretation of the incident is that these two men went down *into* the water. While they both stood in the water Philip baptized him. How did he baptize him? The Book does not say. After the baptism they both walked out of the water to the edge of the pool. The going down into the water and the coming up out of the water was not a part of the baptism. Why did the eunuch want to be baptized? Is it not probable that Philip had referred to Isaiah 52: 15: "So shall he sprinkle many nations?" If so he would expect to be sprinkled.

There is one more passage which the immersionist quotes constantly; I refer to Romans 6: 4 and the companion passage in Colossians 2: 12. But here again I feel that our immersionist friends fall into the error of misinterpreting a passage of the Scripture. This passage has no bearing on the *mode* of baptism. Start at the first verse of the chapter and see what the Apostle is saying. He tells us that we should not continue in sin, because we are "dead to sin." When do we admit or declare that we are dead to sin? The third verse says that when we were baptized into Christ, we were baptized into His death. The fourth verse goes farther and declares that we are not only dead but buried with Christ. How were we buried with Christ? By baptism. What mode of baptism? It does not say. It is not the *form* of baptism but the *fact* and its significance that is emphasized. Whatever the form of baptism, it means that we are dead and buried with Christ.

If we attempt to push the form of baptism here and make it signify Christ's death and burial, we get into trouble. When Christ died His body was sprinkled with blood. When He was buried, His body was not put in the ground and covered with earth; it was put into a tomb and was never covered with anything. Let us not try to read into this passage what the Holy Spirit did not put into it.

After examination of the most important points in favor of the immersionist position, we see that a careful analysis of each argument reveals definite weakness. Some years ago I read a book which was supposed to be a strong argument for the im-

mersionist point of view. At the very beginning the writer made a statement somewhat like this: "Since the world began no person was ever sprinkled with water by command of God." Of course, this statement is not true, if we understand the teaching and statements of the Scripture. It might be more proper to say that since the world began no person was ever immersed in water by the direct command of God.

One of the most important elements in this discussion is the question as to whether the Apostles actually did baptize by immersion. There is no statement in the Bible which indicates that they did. On the other hand, I think there is one verse which clearly states facts which would seem to prove that they did not. Acts 2: 41 says: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." While it does not definitely say that these three thousand people were baptized in one day, the language certainly implies that this was done.

A few moments with pencil and paper will convince any one that the twelve disciples could not have baptized three thousand people by immersion in one day of twenty-four hours. Even though you admit that the one hundred and twenty members of the apostolic band took part in the baptism, you have an impossible situation. On the other hand, if you take the position that these disciples were following the teachings and customs of the Old Testament concerning cleansing by sprinkling, it is very simple. The people could have stood before the disciples, who could have dipped a spray of hyssop in water and have baptized them all by sprinkling in a very short time. Why try to make the Bible tell an impossible story?

The baptisms in homes and in the jail must not be lost sight of, in any discussion of baptism. Paul was baptized in the home by Ananias (Acts 9: 17-18). There is absolutely no indication that he was taken out of the house, to any river or pool. The baptism of the Philippian jailer stands as a protest against the immersionist's position. The record says: "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord and to all that were in the house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway" (Acts 16: 32-33). Surely no one can say that this jailer took his prisoners out of the jail and that he and his household were baptized in some river thereabouts.

Attention should be called to the statements in I John 5: 7-8. "For there are three that bear record in earth, the Spirit, and the water and the blood; and these three agree in one." I would call your attention to the fact that the "Spirit" was poured out or sprinkled upon the people (Acts 2: 3; Acts 10: 44-45). Please note that the "blood" is sprinkled for sanctification. "Elect according to the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (I Peter 1: 2). "And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel" (Hebrews 12: 24). If the three "*agree*" in one, why should we change from *sprinkling* of the Spirit and of the blood to *immersion* in the water? If sprinkling is God's method for the Spirit and the blood, who can say that it is His plan to change the mode to immersion with respect to the water? This seems most unnatural.

I think that enough has been written to prove that baptism by immersion is not the *only* possible interpretation of the Scriptures. In fact, it appears that baptism by sprinkling was more likely the mode used. God's sign of cleansing, sanctification and dedication, was always that of sprinkling with water, oil or blood. That sign has never been changed by the command of God; and we should not change it. While I admit that, because of the very nature of the meaning of baptism, any form is in harmony with the general teachings of the Word of God, if we must make a choice, we should choose sprinkling.

A Meditation

Every One Which Seeth the Son

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

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

OF ALL things among men the chief thing is to believe on Christ.

In every note of the musical scale it is proclaimed to us in Scripture that God hath given "his 'only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life." And there is added to this with equal emphasis that, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him" (S. John iii, 16, 36).

When asked what the great work is which in obedience to God we have to do, Jesus answered: "The work of God which ye have to do is, that ye believe on me." (S. John vi, 29).

It is faith in Christ that shall one day bring about the division of mankind in eternity, and it is this same faith that already here on earth leads to this result.

Not a general religiousness, not personal pious inclination, and not, again, a general faith in God, but, solely and very positively, the faith in Jesus—according to its presence or its absence—denotes eternal destiny, and answers the question whether one already here belongs to the flock of the Good Shepherd or whether he stands outside of it.

Upon this faith is based the entire Gospel.

It is this faith in Christ towards which the whole Revelation of God—read it in the epistle to the Hebrews (xi)—was directed.

The *sola fide*, by faith alone, is still in another sense than that in which Luther proclaimed it, the ground thesis for all higher human life.

There are among men at large all sorts of other marks and badges and rules and relationships which indicate other movements in our life, or which

impart other tendencies to it. And all these can be worthy causes, and have significance of their own.

Only, all these other movements in life can interest but limited circles, for a limited period of time, in limited measures. Sympathy, inclination, predilection, affection—all blossoms with a silvery blossom, but all together never dominate the whole human existence, do not transpose the ground of existence, have no results that make final decisions and eternally abide.

And, for this reason, faith on the Son of God stands so highly exalted above all else that flourishes among men and unites and inspires.

All these other interests are only in part, they all lack the deep fullness of life, they are all as grass that flourishes in order, presently, when the wind passes over it, to wither.

What alone remains as foundation of the inner life, and decides as to what the tone of life must be, and guarantees this life in endless unfolding, is the faith in the only-begotten Son of the Father, or as was said in the prison at Philippi: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

Saved; this is in itself the all-embracing, the all-permeating, the complete and perfect happiness; the happiness that endures until and throughout the eternal morning.

What this faith is, how it operates, wherein it consists, needs no consideration here. It is a mystery which the Church of Christ has repeatedly endeavored to express in terms of speech, but she has never been able to express the fullness thereof in words, and to exclude all misunderstanding.

When the Church defined the faith too zealously it led to cold and barren

intellectualism without spiritual glow. When she entered more deeply into the mystery of the hidden life of the heart, she crowned too frequently a feverish mysticism which presently evaporated in excitement.

Only this is, and always was, the heart of the matter, that a lost world, a human heart in its self-inflicted insolvency cried out for deliverance; and that age upon age, all human genius, all human heroism, all human compassion had ineffectually endeavored to bring this deliverance about, until at length God wrought it for us.

He imparted it to us not in the form of a gift but in a most holy Person. And this person was not one taken from among us, but One Who came down to us from heaven. He came down not as an angel who as God's servant and our helper stands outside of both the Divine and human natures, but as One Who was sent down from heaven and Who came to us as the only begotten Son of the Father, Who having entered into our nature brought God Himself to our view. "Philip, he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, show us the Father?" (S. John xiv, 9).

And therefore the faith in Christ can not be otherwise than the highest, the *one* and the only thing that counts.

Where God in Christ gives Himself to the world and enters so deeply into our human life, that this Son assumes our nature, that the Word becomes Flesh, on the ground of which angels proclaim the *Immanuel*, God with us—there the absolute, the infallible, the in itself perfect revelation of Divine compassion has come to us.

There it can not go higher, it can not go farther. There the boundary has been reached of what is eternally complete in itself.

And, therefore, nothing transcends the faith in Christ. There is nothing that can be placed by the side of it. There is nothing that you can compare with it. It far excels all human invention. Nothing can be substituted for it, it can be surpassed by nothing.

*Copyright by Translator.

The faith in the Son of God brings, deliverance, or there is no deliverance.

No deliverance for the lost world, and no deliverance for your self-lost heart.

For the rise of this star of faith in the life of your soul, Jesus Himself demands an *activity* on the part of your soul.

Not, as is self-evident, that any activity whatever on the part of your soul would be able to create the faith in Christ, produce it, imprint and implant it. The seed of faith is a Divine kind of seed. The faith in Jesus itself is a *gift*, even as the Christ Himself is a gift. Faith is a product of Divine compassion wrought by the Holy Ghost.

But all faith in Christ is peculiar and necessary in this particular, that it must be taken up into our consciousness, and that to this end it enters into our consciousness with irresistible power. It makes entrance for itself as a sensation, as a driving power, as an inspiring principle, as a power that rules and transfigures our whole life.

And, therefore, this faith must obtain for our consciousness a content, a form, a figure. Truly it brings emotions with it, unspeakable emotions of extraordinary power. But, above and beyond all this, it has an intellectual content, which wills that it be understood, a content which fills itself with what we know from the Sacred Revelation of the Person of the Son of God, of His life on earth, of His works, of His words, of His sitting at the right hand of God, and of His continued activity from heaven, after His Ascension.

And herein consists what is learned by rote. There is memory-work in it, memory of names, facts, conversations; memory of words and deeds, mortal sufferings and glorious Resurrection.

But the memory does not nurse the faith. Conceptions are not one in essence with your faith. In your faith, learning does not ignite the glow.

And, therefore, says Jesus, that your faith, in order to become ever clearer, stronger and more inspiring, needs this *one thing*, viz., that you *see the Son of God*.

"Every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him, he hath everlasting life" (S. John vi, 40).

This seeing of the Son of God, this alone supplies such enchantment to the soul as keeps the glow of faith alive and causes it to burn brightly.

All the content of your memory, therefore, must be reduced to the unity of the Image of the Son of God. It must all be united and epitomized in order to bring this Image in its sacred purity before the eye of your soul. And when this Image perfects itself in you, every inner impulse and sensation, every holy emotion in you must merge in this Image, in order that you too may enjoy it. And this living Image of the Son of God must impress you, must interest you, must not loosen its hold on you, must keep you engaged, must transport you in holy ecstasy.

Not as a knowing after the flesh. No, it must be a spiritual vision, but always in such a way that the name of Jesus passes over into the Person of Christ, and that from this Person of the Christ the inner Divine Being takes hold of you and draws you with magnetic power.

No Jesus-glorification which fathers the vain wish that He were still on earth, so we could hasten to Him. That would be to descend from the high to the low. The spiritual vision, the seeing of the Son of God with the eye of the soul, stands incomparably higher than the experience vouchsafed to the disciples, who saw and handled the Person of Jesus on earth.

The *Apostle* knows the Savior in a far richer way than the *disciple* has ever known Him. The Ascension has not impoverished but enriched us. And the seeing of the only-begotten Son of the Father, which cultivates the faith, feeds it, and continually refreshes it, is such a conscious fellowship of the soul with the Lord of glory, that, in and through Him, you make approach to the Eternal Being Himself, and seeing the Son spiritually with the soul, you as child of God, know and feel yourself one with the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

Listen to the petition in the high priestly prayer:

Holy Father, I pray thee, that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me (S. John xvii, 21).

The Solitary Way

There is a mystery in human hearts,
And though we be encircled by a host
Of those who love us well, and are beloved,
To every one of us, from time to time,
There comes a sense of utter loneliness;
Our dearest friend is "stranger" to our joy,
And cannot realise our bitterness.
"There is not one who really understands,
Not one to enter into all I feel;"
Such is the cry of each of us in turn.
We wander in a "solitary way,"
No matter what or where our lot may be;
Each heart, mysterious even to itself,
Must live its inner life in solitude.

And would you know the reason why this is?
It is because the Lord desires our love.
In every heart He wishes to be first;
He therefore keeps the secret-key Himself,
To open all its chambers, and to bless,
With perfect sympathy and holy peace
Each solitary soul which comes to Him.
So when we feel this loneliness, it is
The voice of Jesus saying "Come to me;"
And every time we are "not understood,"
It is a call to us to come again,
For Christ alone can satisfy the longing soul,
And those who walk with Him from day to
day
Can never have a "Solitary Way."

And when beneath some heavy cross you
faint,
And say "I cannot bear this load alone,"
You say the truth, Christ made it purposely
So heavy that you must return to Him,
The bitter grief that "no one understands"
Conveys a secret message from the King,
Entreating you to come to Him again;
The Man of Sorrows understands it well.
In all points tempted He can feel with you;
You cannot come too often or too near;
The Son of God is infinite in grace,
His presence satisfies the longing soul,
And those who walk with Him from day to
day,
Can never have a "solitary way."

—Reprinted from *The Indian Christian*.

Missions

By Mrs. George P. Pierson



Studying Chinese

"Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity.

Till I come give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine."—(1 Timothy 4:12, 13.)

* * *

A NOTE of venerable age is beginning to attach to Missions. The "Spirit of Missions," the one official Missionary publication of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., celebrates this year its 100th Anniversary.

Next Sunday, January 19th, the "Young Men's Missionary Society" of the Moravian Church at Bethlehem, Pa., will celebrate its 96th Anniversary. Modern Y. P. S.'s and C. E.'s please take notice.

Finally the "Woman's Union Missionary Society of America," organized in 1860, observes this year its Diamond Jubilee.

We spoke last month of Mary Slesson of Calabar. A striking tribute to her power to present the Gospel to a primitive people occurs in *World Dominion* for January on page 62 in an article by Mrs. H. S. Cooper who herself has been doing this in Africa since 1909 in the Sudan Interior Mission.

* * *

From Jimmie Rohrbaugh of Ethiopia comes his latest letter under date of November 23, written in his tent at Dessie, the place so often mentioned in the daily press as the field headquarters of the Emperor Haille Selassie. It is "the town through which all soldiers pass on their way to the northern front.

It lies 9,000 feet above sea-level. Aircraft guns, and soldiers—in uniform and without—abound, besides numbers of wounded and refugees, some of them half starved and crazed with hunger" whom Jimmie proposes to help feed. But most people, he says, "are hail and hearty and eager for the fray, in fact in a holiday mood, no one doubting that Mussolini will be badly beaten in the near future. An amazing number of children are here, all apparently yearning to talk to a foreigner."

It seems Jimmie is here as a reporter, but he has most of his time free for Missionary work among the soldiers which he expects to pursue by "going out on his mule with a Bible and a pocket full of tracts. Whether or not they will listen is a question, but they should have the opportunity to hear the way of salvation. Please pray that the Word sown may really take root in the hearts of those who are going out to die for the defense of their country."

Mrs. Rohrbaugh, brave soul, who put nothing in the way of her husband's going, writes that his meetings in Addis Ababa have been taken over by another Missionary and the attendance continues good. "It is surprising," she says, "that there should be so many people left to attend meetings when so many have gone to the different 'fronts.'"

* * *

The *Missionary Review of the World* for January has a highly interesting and informing article on Ethiopia with a good map by a Missionary doctor, Stuart Bergsma. It seems there are ten Protestant Missions with 138 Missionaries at work in 30 stations in Ethiopia.

* * *

A cable just received from another of the Westminster Seminary Missionaries, Rev. L. D. Hitchcock and his wife, announces their safe arrival in their far distant field, Iquitos, Peru. They sailed from New York November 2nd and arrived in Para, Brazil, November 19th. They were to leave by river-steamer for Iquitos on Thanksgiving Day, November 28th. If they did, they evidently made the 2,200 miles up the Amazon River in about six weeks.

Their address in Iquitos is:

Care of Erwin H. Lauriault, Apartado 156, Iquitos, Peru, S. A.

They had had a good voyage to Para, for the most part out of sight of land, just escaping a hurricane off Florida, enjoying the Caribbean Sea as smooth as glass, enlivened by flying fish and porpoises, and enjoying not less the refreshing daily dip into the salt-water swimming tank on deck. They found the Para streets lined with vivid green mango trees which contrasted pleasantly with the red, blue, and pink pastel-colored houses. The streets were paved and small trolley cars gave good service. The mixed Negro, Portuguese, and Indian population seemed poor. The language is Portuguese. The thermometer in November registered 85°, but the nights were cool.

They ask our prayers for physical and spiritual health and help in studying the Spanish language, in Iquitos.

* * *

The "Korea Digest" of the reports of the Korea Missionary stations for 1935 gives 20 millions for the population of Korea, with an extra one million for Koreans who have emigrated to Manchuria.

It lists the number of Korean Christians, Protestants and Catholics included, as one-half a million.

The population of Japan as given by the last report of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions is sixty-six millions. This is of Japan proper. The total number of Christians, Protestant and Catholic included, is about one-quarter of a million.

* * *

The Rev. James S. Orr, of the China Inland Mission, reports the following from Kiangtu (Yangchow) Kiang su Province, the inimitable Chinese and Missionary touches of which will surely be appreciated.

He told his Chinese congregation about a new kind of "Meal-Offering," that had been made in a church in Canada to offset the diminishing Missionary contributions. It consisted of every member making a thank-offering of one cent at every meal. The idea caught on in the little Chinese congregation. Soon eleven persons were giving the "Meal-Offering" which meant an additional monthly contribution of

§3. Another C. I. M. church promptly adopted the plan.

At Lien-shin, further north, he held a conference, where the people "drew out one's heart in a great longing to help, so eager were they, so responsive, so needy and poor. A little bit of love shown to them went a long way."—"Over 100 people slept on our premises. We had just nine bedsteads and a few coverlets. The soldiers who had occupied our premises had burnt most of the beds and appropriated all the bed-quilts. However, by using the chapel seats, and packing close in, everybody was accommodated."

"Little old Mrs. Ch'in, the Bible-woman, has been gathering a number of people each Sunday in a temple to worship the true God. We had exhorted her to find some other place of meeting. She had, through years of scrimping, accumulated enough money to buy her coffin. This money she gave to the Lord to build a house for His worship. This set the ball a-rolling. A piece of land was given and other believers gave out of their poverty; some gave their labor, and the thing was done! Did Solomon and his people have greater joy over their beautiful Temples than Mrs. Ch'in and her friends over the house of mud-walls and straw roof?"

New Joy and Hope for the Blind

THE Home of Onesiphorus, Taian, Shantung, China, has welcomed a number of blind children. With the training that the Home provides, these young people are able to lead useful and happy lives. For instance, one boy has learned to play the cornet. And so proficient is he in reading the raised type especially designed for the blind, that he has become the teacher of the others. These blind pupils are able to go about unassisted, in the compound and the surrounding fields. Their sense of touch and hearing is very keen; they do not require the aid of a walking stick.

One of the girls is able to detect by touch what is wrong when her garments do not fit properly and is able to remake them, if necessary, doing the work as skillfully as a girl with good eyesight could do it.

To read the Word of God for themselves by means of embossed type and to hear Bible stories related by teachers and fellow students is a continual delight to these blind boys and girls. To them the Home of Onesiphorus is the happiest place they have ever known.

Question Box

Dr. Fosdick and Orthodoxy

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

WHAT warrant, if any, is there for the assertion that Harry Emerson Fosdick has forsaken Modernism and returned to orthodoxy? I am told that this is the case but saw no evidence of it in a recent radio address to which I listened. While it contained little that I could not approve, there was no advocacy of distinctively Biblical beliefs. . . . J. H. W.

Early in November, last, Dr. Fosdick preached a sermon, entitled "Beyond Modernism," in which he severely criticised Modernism and maintained that "now the church must go beyond it" if it is adequately to accomplish its mission. He condemned Modernism as it has found expression during the last fifty years as having been: (1) "Excessively preoccupied with intellectualism"; (2) "dangerously sentimental"; (3) "predominantly man-centered" and (4) as having "too commonly lost its ethical standing-ground and its power of moral attack." But while he had much to say of the inadequacy if not the bankruptcy of Modernism the sermon contained nothing to indicate a return to that evangelicalism in which he was reared. Rather the contrary. He still speaks of the "absurdities of the old supernaturalistic theology" and of the "incredible things" children in Christian homes were asked to believe when he was a child in a context that makes clear that he has in mind the things commonly believed in Protestant circles as they had found expression in the creeds of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. The most that can be said is that Dr. Fosdick is conscious of the inadequacy of Modernism. There is not the slightest warrant for supposing that he has returned to orthodoxy. He is in no sense a repentant modernist. He sees the "shallowness and transiency" of current Modernism but instead of summoning his hearers back to the faith once for all delivered he urges them to seek a Modernism that lacks the shallowness and transiency of what still passes under that name. He has lost none of his hostility to "Fundamentalism." Near the close of his sermon he said: "We have already largely won the battle we started out to win; we have adjusted the Christian faith to the best intelligence of our day and have won the strongest minds and the best abilities of the churches to our side. Fundamentalism is still with us but mostly in the back-waters. The future of the churches, if we will have it so, is in the hands of Modernism. Therefore let all Modernists lift a new battle cry: We must go beyond Modernism!" Would that Dr. Fosdick not only saw the insufficiency of the Modernism he has been preach-

ing but the sufficiency of the Gospel of the once crucified but now living Christ who abides the same through all the world's changes.

The State of the Church

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

I HAVE several questions which I should like to have answered. To what extent is our Church controlled by Modernists? How many of our ministers are Modernists and how many Conservatives? What percentage of the Board of Foreign Missions is Modernist? Is the Board of National Missions all right? Is the situation in the other Protestant denominations better or worse than in our own—in either case why don't we hear more about the struggle in other churches? MISS K. P.

In any attempt to answer such questions much depends on the meaning we attach to the words, "Modernists" and "Conservatives." As some employ these words most Presbyterians are Modernists. As others employ them most are Conservatives. Any and all discussions of such question will be both "confused and confusing" unless the parties to the discussion are more or less agreed in the answers they give to the questions, What is a Modernist? and What is a Conservative? From the point of view of our Church a Conservative, it seems to us, is rightly defined as one who believes the Bible to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and who sincerely receives the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures. From the same viewpoint those who, like the Auburn Affirmationists, affirm the fallibility of the Bible and who deny or regard as non-essential certain of the doctrines essential to the integrity of that system may be called Modernists, even though it be true that from the standpoint of more thoroughgoing Modernists whose views find expression in a paper like the *Christian Century* the Affirmationists are themselves at least near Conservatives. In considering such questions, it should also be remembered that a sharp "either or" is hardly in place here. There are conservatives and near-conservatives, Modernists and near-Modernists—not to mention quarter, half and three-quarter ones. Moreover, many are confused in their thinking, speaking at times like Conservatives and at other times like Modernists.

Even if we attach a more or less fixed

meaning to the words, Conservative and Modernist, it is not possible, as our correspondent requests, to answer the above questions "plainly in figures." Such figures are not available, apart from the fact that some twelve years ago approximately 1,300 out of 10,000 ministers signed the Auburn Affirmation. The most we can do is to indicate in a general way how, in our opinion, these questions should be answered.

In our opinion our Church at the present time is largely under the control of Modernists or at least those friendly to Modernists. That is not necessarily to say that most of its ministers and elders are Modernists. Many of them are indifferentists—some on principle, but more because they are uninformed. It is true, for instance, that the last General Assembly elected a Modernist as its moderator, but at the same time it is doubtless true that most of those who voted for him did not know he was a Modernist. In our opinion there are relatively few out-and-out Modernists in our Church but they are aggressive and thanks to the ignorance and indifference of the rank and file of the Church they are able to exert an influence far beyond their numbers. If we mistake not, there are relatively more Modernists, or at least those who are sympathetic to Modernism, among the ministers than among the elders (not to mention the members) of our Church. Even among the ministers, however, we are disposed to think there are more Conservatives than Modernists but the latter because they pull together have much more influence with the ignorant and indifferent than the former in their present divided state. With some Conservatives pulling one way and others equally Conservative pulling another way, it is not surprising that they are ecclesiastically ineffective and that the impression is widespread that they are a negligible body in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. If the Church could only be confronted with a clear-cut issue between Modernism and Conservatism, we are disposed to think it would approve the latter.

Bad as the situation is in our Church, we think it better than in most of the other large Protestant denominations, apart from the Lutheran. The fact that we hear more about the struggle in our Church than in the other Churches is due partly to the fact that we know more about our own Church and partly to the fact that some of these other Churches are so permeated with Modernism that there is little outspoken opposition of importance. The situation in the Board of Foreign Missions is, we judge, about the same as in the Church at large. It seems clear to us that this Board has been altogether too friendly toward Modernism and indifferentism, but just what percentage of its members are Modernists

at heart we have no means of knowing. We wish we were able to say that all is well with the Board of National Missions. As a matter of fact, however, we think that it is more dominated by Modernism than is the Foreign Board. Its General Secretary is a signer of the Auburn Affirmation and its President the Moderator of the last General Assembly. In fact, apart from the Board of Pensions, it would seem as though the Board of Foreign Missions is the soundest Board we have, despite the fact that it is the one that has been most criticised.

Support of the Independent Board

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

WON'T you be so good as to tell your readers why it is that so many Presbyterians, reputed to be sound and zealous for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, withhold their support from the Independent Board?

M. E. C.

As a partial answer to this question we can, perhaps, not do better than refer our questioner to the considerations which impelled the Rev. Joseph A. Schofield to resign from the Independent Board. His statement, submitted to said Board in connection with his resignation, may be found practically in full in the August issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, p. 67. We summarize his five reasons: (1) It has proven impracticable; (2) it makes no provision for the support of sound missionaries already on the field; (3) it involves an abandonment of any effort to reform the official Board or to preserve its assets for the purpose for which they were given; (4) it has proven divisive between sound Presbyterians and so weakening to the conservative cause—a fact that has been strikingly illustrated by its disruption of Westminster Seminary; (5) it has confused rather than clarified the main issue before the Church, viz., that between Modernism and historic Christianity and so played into the hands of the Modernists and indifferentists. To these may be added the fact that a good many think that the Board is unconstitutional or if not technically unconstitutional as opposed to the spirit of the Constitution. Further, many resent the disposition on the part of its champions to question the zeal or orthodoxy of any and all who withhold their support. Other considerations weigh with some, but those mentioned are sufficient to indicate why so many of those most opposed to Modernism and indifferentism in our Church refuse to have anything to do with the Independent Board.

The Physical Resurrection

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

WE ARE taught by the Bible and by our Church that Jesus Christ rose from the dead in the same body in which He suffered. His resurrection was a physical thing. Does the Bible not teach that our resurrection will be a physical thing in the same sense? How can a Christian minister preach a true Easter Sermon, for example, if he denies or does not affirm the physical resurrection of Jesus? How can there be a truly Christian funeral service where the belief in the physical resurrection is not held?
J. S.

It is hardly open to denial that both the Bible and the Standards of the Presbyterian Church teach that Jesus rose from the dead "with the same body in which He suffered" (John 20: 25, 27; Confession of Faith, Chap. VIII, sec. IV); also that according to the same Standards the dead shall one day arise with the same bodies that were theirs on earth (1 Cor. XV:42-44; Confession of Faith, Chap. XXXII, sec. II; The Larger Catechism, Q. 87). Obviously, therefore, one who does not believe in the physical resurrection both of Jesus and the dead is not qualified to preach either a true Easter Sermon or to conduct a truly Christian funeral service. There are those who seek to distinguish between what they call the Easter *Message*, i.e., the story of the empty tomb and the appearances of the risen Jesus, and the Easter *Faith*, i.e., the conviction that Jesus still lives, that death has been vanquished and that there is eternal life. One can reject the Easter *Message*, these allege, and still hold fast to the Easter *Faith*. If the Easter *Faith* was *merely* a belief in the immortality of the soul, there might be some warrant for this distinction. The Easter *Faith*, however, includes belief in the immortality of the whole man, i.e., according to both the Scriptures and a sound psychology, the body as well as the soul. The resurrection of the body, therefore, is an essential element in the Christian doctrine of immortality. Hence the impossibility of preaching a truly Christian conception of immortality where there is no belief in a physical resurrection. Anything like an adequate discussion of these questions would necessitate pointing out the bearing of Christ's physical resurrection on the Christian doctrine of incarnation and redemption, including Christ's present-day activities as Lord and Saviour. For instance, if Christ's death had not been followed by the resurrection, the incarnation would have been undone. Moreover if Christ had not been raised for our justification we could not be confident that He was delivered for our offenses.

Letters to the Editor

[The letters printed here express the convictions of the writers, and publication in these columns does not necessarily imply either approval or disapproval on the part of the Editor. If correspondents do not wish their names printed, they will please so request, but all are asked kindly to sign their names as an evidence of good faith. We do not print letters that come to us anonymously.]

Students Reply to Dr. Ward

December 17, 1935.

DEAR DR. WARD:

AS STUDENTS at Westminster Seminary we read with considerable regret your letter which appeared in the December issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Having appreciated your interest and support in the past, we are grieved that you feel compelled to change your attitude in respect to the Seminary. For obvious reasons we are not in a position to discuss the question of the identification of the interests of the Independent Board with those of the Seminary, but we would like to express our disagreement with certain statements which you made with reference to the reactions of those students who are not in accord with the views of the majority of the faculty.

The accusation is distinctly made in your letter that it is no longer possible for students, not in sympathy with the Independent Board, to continue their studies at Westminster without feeling that they are out of place and the objects of criticism. This was clearly implied in the following statement: "Students at the Seminary who cannot see their way clear to support the New Board are made to feel very uncomfortable there." Then again, referring to those who might be interested in attending the Seminary, you state: "They have no heart to enroll in a Seminary where they are to be subjected to criticism and almost ostracism because they cannot agree with certain leading members of your faculty with regard to the method of dealing with the problems in the Church." Doubtless such statements were not made without some sort of evidence. Nevertheless, we are compelled to protest against them, and to state that they convey an entirely erroneous impression. As a student body we naturally represent different attitudes with respect to the present church situation, but we unite in stating that students are welcomed at Westminster regardless of their attitude toward the Independent Board. We do not believe that fair-minded students will feel that they are subjected to "criticism and almost ostracism" because they do not support the Independent Board.

We regret that you have received an impression of the Seminary which we, as its student body, regard as completely mistaken. It is extremely unfortunate that students who have considered attending Westminster Seminary may have been misled by the impression given in your letter. We trust that this statement of our sincere con-

viction in the matter may correct the misunderstanding which it indicated.

We are writing to express the opinion of the student body as indicated by a unanimous vote at a special meeting on December 17th. This letter will also be sent to CHRISTIANITY TODAY in order that it may be presented to those who read your statement in the December issue of that publication. We trust that you will understand why we have felt it imperative to protest against the impression given by your letter.

Sincerely yours,
JEAN FAUROT, *Secretary.*

[The above letter is printed with the approval of Dr. Ward. It arrived too late to be used in our last issue due to the fact that the material for that issue had been sent to the printer earlier than usual in view of the approaching holidays. Had it been printed in that issue, it would have called for more or less extended comment on our part. In view of what happened at the meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary on January 7th such comment is hardly called for. When men are not welcome on either the Faculty or Board of Trustees of the institution who cannot see their way clear to support the Independent Board, it is hardly possible that students who share their viewpoint can feel altogether at home in its environment. —EDITOR'S NOTE.]

The De Waard Case

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

THE Presbytery of Milwaukee has dissolved the pastoral relation existing between me and the Cedar Grove Church. A few of the more salient facts will be sufficient to give a correct understanding of the conditions which brought about this dissolution of pastoral relationship. In June of this year the Presbytery received a petition signed by 25 members of the Church. The 25 petitioners desired the dissolution of pastoral relationship on the grounds that I preached against the modernism in the denomination. Three hundred seventy-two, out of a membership of 464, gave the Presbytery a paper in which they expressed their confidence in me and their hearty approval of my work among them. It has been my privilege to work in this church for ten years and it has always been with profit and enjoyment. Our auditorium, which seats about 425 to 450, is filled every Sunday morning and we need all the chairs in our Sunday School room. The church has during

the past three years (1932-1934) given \$6502 to the Boards. During these years, when the church was giving this money, I did from time to time preach against the modernism in our denomination. I also brought to the attention of the Presbytery some serious departures from the Reformed Faith as found in the Sunday School literature used in our church. My opposition to modernism induced 25 members of the church to sign a petition requesting that the pastoral relation be dissolved. There was no charge that I neglected my duty as pastor, or that I offended people by my conduct, nor yet was an effort made to show that I did not speak the truth. The reason for requesting the dissolution of pastoral relationship was only that I "created suspicion and antagonism towards the Presbyterian denomination of which we are part" by my preaching against modernism.

The Commission, reporting to Presbytery September 24, recommended that this petition be not allowed but on the following conditions: (1) "That Brother De Waard be directed to desist from adversely criticizing the Boards and their personnel publicly from the pulpit and privately among his people." (2) "That the session be directed to publish to the congregation that the benevolent contributions to the church, within the assigned quota, be distributed among our Boards, unless otherwise designated." I, of course, could not promise to fulfill the first condition. To obey such a direction of the Presbytery would make my ministry dishonest and is in serious conflict with my ordination vows. The second condition, though it did not so directly concern me, I was compelled also to resist, since, according to the Constitution of our church, the session is the judicatory of original jurisdiction in the matter of benevolences. When I refused to obey the first condition and said that I would have to resist the second, Presbytery dissolved the pastoral relation by a vote of 15 to 18.

I complained of this action of the Presbytery to the Synod of Wisconsin. The Commission of the Synod unanimously dismissed the complaint. There is "a crying need"; and "how shall it be met?" is an important question indeed. I am not a member of the Independent Board and this church has not contributed to it. I am trained in the Old Princeton, by Dr. Machen, Dr. Hodge, Dr. Vos and others and I love the Reformed Faith, but there apparently is no room for me in the Presbyterian Church. I will complain to the Assembly and while I am very confident that the Assembly will sustain my complaint, yet what Presbytery and the Synod have done indicates quite clearly the sad conditions in our beloved church. But the saddest thing of it all is, my dear Dr. Craig, that strong and gifted defenders of the faith once for all delivered to the saints cannot stand together in this "crying need."

JOHN J. DE WAARD.

Cedar Grove, Wis.

[We share Mr. De Waard's sadness over the existing division among the conservatives of the Presbyterian Church—a division which, it seems to us, has been unwisely widened and deepened by the formation of the Independent Board and the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union. Did this division not exist, we do not think that Mr. Waard or any one else would be in danger of being denied a place in the Presbyterian Church because of his opposition to Modernism within as well as without the denomination. While we are disposed to think that the session of Mr. De Waard's church should have acceded to the directions of Presbytery to the extent of distributing benevolent contributions *unless otherwise designated* among the official Boards (rather than contrariwise) yet as the judicatory of original jurisdiction in the matter of benevolences it is to be commended for insisting on its constitutional right to give the people an opportunity to contribute to such other Christian objects as may meet their approval. We with all good Presbyterians honor Mr. De Waard for refusing to desist from telling the truth, as he sees it, concerning the Boards and their personnel. Things have certainly come to a pretty pass if men may be deprived of their churches because they are true to their ordination vow to be "faithful and zealous in maintaining the truths of the Gospel and the purity and peace of the Church; whatever persecution or opposition may arise on that account." It hardly seems conceivable that the coming Assembly will dismiss his complaint.—EDITOR'S NOTE.]

A Layman Speaks Out

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

THE recent regrettable, unnecessary and foolish division of conservatives at Westminster, prompts the following practical propositions:

First: "Interlocking directorates" in evangelical organizations are to be *avoided* as unnecessary and provocative of trouble; unnecessary for co-operation, because such organizations are bound together by a firmer and better bond—their common devotion and allegiance to our one Lord and Saviour. Again, each organization should stand on its own merits, and then attacks on one need not involve or imperil another. Where such interlocking directorates exist, the situation should be voluntarily and promptly mended.

Second: Withdrawal of evangelical Christians from the existing denominational churches does *not* appear desirable at present, wherever the local preacher himself is sound in the faith. Christ—obviously referring to membership of the visible church—said "let both (wheat and tares) grow together until the harvest" (Matt. 13:30). If the minister is untrue to God's Word, and non-evangelicals evidently control that individual church, then the evangelicals can

withdraw to another church of their denomination where the minister is sound. If that cannot be done, then the evangelicals may consider withdrawal and starting of a new local church of their denomination. Or, if the evangelicals from different denominations are united by the apostasy of all the clergy in that locality, then the evangelicals from the different churches may unite under the aegis of a denomination mutually acceptable, *but* the ecclesiastical machinery of which cannot force on the evangelical group a non-evangelical minister. The more autonomous the congregation, the more possible to maintain its intended evangelical character. While, of course, the characteristic doctrines of the different denominations do not all equally reflect the full, complete and perfect teachings of Scripture in detail, yet those are in the evangelical fellowship who receive the plain Bible teachings as to the absolute *deity* of the historic Jesus Christ; as to man's absolute *need of forgiveness by and reconciliation to God*; and that *only by taking that risen, ascended and living Christ as his personal representative before God* as his Redeemer from the guilt, power and consequences of his personal sins, and as the rightful sovereign and *Lord of his daily life*—can any man be reckoned "holy" and have a right to eternal life.

Withdrawal of evangelicals to form a new group separate from and independent of all existing denominations is a "*last resort*" only; for, judging from recent occurrences, there is small assurance that in a few years differences would not again arise—not necessarily over spiritual truths, but over men and methods—resulting in further undesirable subdivisions and weakening of the evangelical body. Unfortunately, evangelicals have not yet shown ability to "pull together" through thick and thin; in this they can learn wisdom from "the enemies of the cross of Christ."

Third: It is obvious that evangelicals have as much right as unbelievers to give money for the furtherance *only* of that for which they themselves stand. Hence, those who feel uncertain or dissatisfied with the old benevolence agencies are entitled to direct their gifts—and to have a medium therefor—to those persons or objects only in which they have confidence. To talk of "designating" gifts through unacceptable channels is mere nonsense; obviously, such "designated" gifts simply release an equivalent amount to support persons or activities which the donors do not wish to support. So, the evangelical must either seek out and give to individual objects or persons meeting his approval, or must have a satisfactory agency for that end. This is the function of the "Independent Board"—though, incidentally, we consider it was very unwise to designate it as a "Presbyterian" (or any other denomination) Board. Obviously—however organized—evangelical believers are entitled to some such agency through which to express their legitimate preferences—their in-

herent right. One may belong to a denomination without approving and supporting its every act; he, for example, may be a "Presbyterian" contributing to his own individual church, yet retain his personal liberty to so direct his benevolences as he sees fit; he does not surrender his personal property when he joins a denominational church, nor sell his soul, so to speak, to its human officialdom.

Syracuse, N. Y.

E. VAN DEUSEN.

[What Mr. Van Deusen says about the designation of gifts seems to us perfectly true with respect to all gifts given to radically unfaithful boards; also to new or additional gifts given to partially unfaithful boards provided they are not used to support new sound missionaries who would not otherwise be sent. We can not see, however, how the transferring of gifts from undesignated to designated funds can result in releasing any additional funds for the support of unsound missionaries. Unless Dr. Barnhouse, among others, is much mistaken in thinking that all but a small minority of our missionaries are sound, it seems clear that a general withdrawal of gifts from the old Board of Foreign Missions at the present time would mean, for the most part at least, withdrawal of support from sound missionaries.—EDITOR'S NOTE.]

Stay Within the Church

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I wish to congratulate you on your stand re *The Independent Board*. To unbiased onlookers the whole attack seems much overdrawn and far-fetched.

Some time ago, there was a note in CHRISTIANITY TODAY to the effect "Would that there was a real issue around which Conservatives all could rally." That struck a deep response in my heart.

It seems to me many of our Conservative brethren lack a kind of faith. They want to rule and have their own way immediately or will not play ball at all. Can they not get a perspective as the High Churchmen did in England in the early nineteenth century: "Stay within the church and eventually control it"?

Then again it seems to me, this group in leaving the church act precariously like false shepherds; the sheep (laymen) are to be left to the Modernist wolves, while the shepherds (Conservatives) run away from the fight to seek a peaceful calm behind new denominational fences where they think themselves safe. Why not stay *in* the church? Let Westminster Seminary train up the greatest array of ministers the Presbyterian Church in U. S. A. ever saw—and by sheer might of scholarship and preaching ability win the attention, admiration, devotion and thanks of the church. This is to me the statesman-like way to handle the situation and not to skulk away from the scene of battle. SEATTLE, WASH. F. G. S.

News of the Church

New York Presbytery Refuses to Obey General Assembly's Mandate

THE Presbytery of New York followed the example of Philadelphia North when, at its meeting on January 13th, it decided not to obey the command of the General Assembly that it "discipline" Mr. James E. Bennett because of his failure to resign from the Independent Board. By vote of the Presbytery the following communication was ordered to be sent to the 1936 Assembly:

"Fathers and Brethren:

"In response to a communication sent to you in April, 1935, referring to James E. Bennett, a member of the Fort Washington Church and formerly a Ruling Elder in the bounds of this Presbytery, Presbytery received a reply dated June 4, 1935, which read as follows:

"That the assembly acknowledge the expression of loyal intent of the Presbytery of New York and that the responsibility in this matter be left where it has been placed, with the Presbytery of New York and the session of the Fort Washington Presbyterian Church."

"This communication was sent to the Fort Washington Church, of which Mr. Bennett is a member. A reply has been received from the session of said church saying that the mandate of the assembly in reference to members of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. serving upon the mission board known as the Independent Board of Foreign Missions and forbidding the same, had been sent to Mr. Bennett and received by him, but no acknowledgment or reply had been received from him. While deploring the fact that that communication has been ignored by him, they are convinced that Presbytery, because of its wider jurisdiction, is in a better position than the local church to deal with the situation.

"In light of the actions of the Assemblies of 1934 and 1935, the session has referred the matter to Presbytery and asks that in the interest of that church and of the churches of Presbytery it take such action as it deems wise.

"We have given this matter our prayerful consideration and would respectfully make this reply to the Assembly's communication.

"We recognize that Mr. Bennett's failure to respond to the communication sent him by the church, and by still continuing, to the best of our information, to serve as a member of the Independent Board of Foreign Missions, constitutes ground for disciplinary action.

"We have been disturbed beyond measure by the doubts and questions that have been raised as to the work of our boards and agencies and particularly as to that of the

Board of Foreign Missions. We have every confidence in their fidelity and their loyalty to the Church and Standards. We regret the setting up of the Independent Board of Missions, which to us seems wholly unwarranted, and we regret still more the unjustified aspersions which have been and still are cast upon the secretaries and members of our board.

"We deplore the action of James E. Bennett in not severing his connection with this board at the command of the general assembly and his disregard of its mandate.

"In view of the action of the Fort Washington Church we do not think we should insist upon its proceeding to a course that might result in causing difficulty within its congregation and interfering with the fine work which the church is carrying on. There is no question of the loyalty of this church and its hearty fidelity to the work of our board.

"We further are of the opinion that it would be inexpedient for this Presbytery to undertake disciplinary measures with Mr. Bennett for the following reasons:

"It is a well-known fact, both in the Fort Washington Congregation and in this Presbytery, that while Mr. Bennett allows his name to remain on the roll of the Fort Washington Church, he is not, at present, active in its affairs or attendant upon its services, or a member of its session. His religious activities of late have centered in churches belonging to another denomination. No disciplinary measures which the Presbytery might take would change the situation.

"Knowing the mind of our churches, we believe that to institute judicial processes in this Presbytery would give to the critics of our foreign board and of the church that publicity which they seek. It might mar the peace and break the unity which prevail not only in the Presbytery but throughout the congregations. Among our people there is widespread feeling against judicial processes.

"In this confused day in the world's life the church of Christ, in order to give her positive testimony to the Gospel, must endeavor to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace—a peace sorely jeopardized by controversy, which weakens the power of the church to minister to the moral and spiritual needs of men."

Independent Board News

THE Permanent Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania handed down its decision on January 15 in the cases of the Philadelphia ministerial members of the Independent Board. They were ordered suspended from the ministry. The effectiveness of the suspension is deferred until the General Assembly has passed on the case.

The decision which was unanimous found each of the defendants guilty of the six charges and 19 specifications preferred against them.

The commission comprises ten members headed by Halleck C. Sherrard, Pittsburgh attorney.

The sentence stated the suspension would last until "such time as they resign from the Independent Board and show genuine evidence of repentance."

The members of the Board thus affected are: Revs. Merrill T. MacPherson, pastor of the Central North Broad Street Church; H. McAllister Griffiths, editor of the *Presbyterian Guardian*; Charles J. Woodbridge, general secretary of the Independent Board; Edwin H. Rian, field secretary of Westminster Seminary, and Paul Woolley, a seminary professor.

The recessed trial of Rev. Harold S. Laird was renewed January 15 in the Dover Presbyterian Church before the Judicial Commission of the Presbytery of New Castle.

The session of the Hollond Memorial Church, Philadelphia, convicted Miss Mary W. Stewart and Mr. Murray F. Thompson. They face probable expulsion from the church unless they disassociate themselves from the Board within ninety days. A dissenting opinion to the verdict was filed by one member of the "jury."

Westminster Seminary News

ON JANUARY 13, the following Directors resigned from the Board: Rev. Dr. Maitland Alexander; Rev. Dr. Alexander Alison; Rev. T. Stacy Capers; Rev. Dr. Samuel G. Craig; Rev. Dr. Frank R. Elder; Rev. Dr. Clarence E. Macartney; Rev. John H. McComb; Rev. T. Roland Philips; Rev. Dr. John T. Reeve; Mr. T. Edward Ross; Rev. Dr. Charles Schall; Rev. Joseph A. Schofield, Jr.; Mr. James F. Shrader.

The following new members were elected: Rev. John P. Clelland; Rev. J. J. De Waard; Rev. Gerard H. Snell; Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge; Mr. Calvin K. Cummings; Mr. Murray Forst Thompson. Three of these are recent graduates of the Seminary. Mr. Woodbridge is General Secretary of the Independent Board; Mr. Thompson is Treasurer of that Board. All are members of the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union.

Resolution Regarding Rev. John B. Thwing

Approved at the Pro Re Nata Meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, December 17, 1935

WHEREAS, the Reverend John B. Thwing, when asking for the dissolution of the pastoral relation existing between himself and the Beacon Presbyterian Church at a Pro Re Nata Meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia on Tuesday, November 26,

1935, declared to the Presbytery, in effect, that he desired to have the pastoral relationship between himself and the Beacon Presbyterian Church dissolved in order that he might accept a call to a church not affiliated with this Presbytery, the said church from which he wished to accept the call was not connected with any ecclesiastical body in correspondence with the Presbyterian Church U.S.A., and

WHEREAS, the Reverend John B. Thwing has allowed his name to be posted as pastor of the so-called "Knox Presbyterian Church (unaffiliated)" on a building situated at 2216 East Cumberland Street, Philadelphia, Pa., that is to say, about two blocks from the Beacon Presbyterian Church, his former church, thus violating the territorial rights of the Beacon Presbyterian Church and other neighboring Presbyterian Churches within the Presbytery of Philadelphia (see rules of Presbytery, chapter 4), and

WHEREAS, the conduct of the Reverend John B. Thwing, at the aforementioned meeting of Philadelphia Presbytery, clearly indicated that his purpose was to cripple seriously the work of the Beacon Presbyterian Church, by moving for an adjournment, immediately after the pastoral relation existing between himself and the said Beacon Presbyterian Church had been dissolved, and before arrangements could be made to declare his former pulpit vacant, and to appoint an ad interim moderator of the Session (which motion was voted down by the Presbytery), and

WHEREAS, newspaper articles have appeared in the local press which, in announcing the formation of this new church, has cast aspersions upon the churches of this Presbytery and have reflected upon the doctrines taught therein and declared that the so-called "Knox Presbyterian Church (unaffiliated)," would offer a "haven" to dissatisfied Presbyterians (which newspaper articles have never been repudiated by the Reverend John B. Thwing), and

WHEREAS, the said Reverend John B. Thwing allowed himself to be installed as Pastor of the so-called "Knox Presbyterian Church (unaffiliated)," on Wednesday evening, December 11, 1935, without having first sought his dismissal from this Presbytery, and

WHEREAS, the membership of this newly formed church is composed almost, if not altogether of persons who immediately prior to the organization of the so-called "Knox Presbyterian Church (unaffiliated)," were members of the said Beacon Presbyterian Church, of which the said Reverend John B. Thwing had been the pastor up to November 26, 1935, thus making him a party to if not the leader of, a schism, and

WHEREAS, the above mentioned acts and attitudes constitute a renunciation of the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the name of the said Reverend John B. Thwing be erased from the roll of the Presbytery of Philadelphia in accordance with the provisions of the Book of Discipline, Chapter VII, Section 2 (b), page 400, 1934 edition.

Complaint against the action has been filed.

The All-Bible School

A CONFERENCE on the Summer Bible School will be held in the Third Presbyterian Church of Chester, Pa., on January 30th and 31st. The plan for the All-Bible Summer School includes a triple course of study: 1. Memory Work; 2. Bible History; 3. Bible Geography. The complete course takes twelve years preceded by one kindergarten year and followed by two post-graduate years. The course uses no hand-craft; it is systematic, definite, clear-cut, orthodox. It lifts up Christ and focuses the Scriptures on Him. It has been carried out in actual practice by hundreds of churches of different denominations.

The members of the Third Presbyterian Church and their friends will take pleasure in entertaining the delegates in their homes and at the Church for the two nights and the five meals, beginning with dinner Thursday evening. Conference opens at 1.30 on Thursday. Rev. A. L. Lathem, D.D., is the pastor.

Founder's Week at Moody Bible Institute

THE Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, on February 2, 1936, launches a two-year celebration designated the D. L. Moody Centenary (1937) and the Moody Bible Institute Jubilee (1936). The fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Institute by D. L. Moody begins with the opening day of the Founder's Week, Sunday, February 2. The program of former years has filled four or five days, that of this year will extend over eight—through Sunday, the ninth.

The range of program and vital interests touched are indicated by the following designations: Sunday, "Moody Day"; Monday, Evangelism; Tuesday, Alumni; Wednesday, Bible Institute Day; Thursday, Christian Education; Friday, Missionary; Saturday, Laymen and Youth Day.

Each day will present speakers of authority and understanding, some of them of world reputation. Provision has been made for the larger comfort of visitors and the Chicago public in the placing of the day and evening services. All day programs may be heard in the Institute Auditorium, at North LaSalle St. and Chicago Ave., and the evening services will convene in the Moody Memorial Church, one mile farther

north, Clark St., at North Ave., where 4,500 sittings are available.

Among the speakers already announced are: Rev. Herbert Lockyer, England; Dr. Howard A. Kelly, Baltimore; Mrs. Ralph C. Norton, Belgium; Dr. W. B. Riley, Minneapolis; "Mel" Trotter, Grand Rapids; Dr. Walter L. Wilson, Kansas City; Dr. R. C. McQuilkin, Columbia, S. C.; Evangelist Harry Vom Bruch, and the President of the Institute, Dr. Will H. Houghton. These are but few of the many speakers to be heard.

Convention of Evangelical Students

THE eleventh annual convention of League of Evangelical Students will meet in Chicago, February 20th through 23rd. Students everywhere are invited.

The speakers will be: J. Gresham Machen, DD., Litt.D., Westminster Theological Seminary; James Oliver Buswell, D.D., Wheaton College; Henry Schultz, Th.D., Calvin Theological Seminary; Martin C. Lehman, Ph.D., Goshen College; Thomas E. Wellmers, M.A., Hope College; R. B. Kuiper, M.A., B.D., Westminster Theological Seminary; Wallace L. Emerson, Ph.D., Wheaton College; Will H. Houghton, D.D., Moody Bible Institute; F. D. Whitesell, Th.D., Northern Baptist Theological Seminary; P. B. Fitzwater, D.D., Moody Bible Institute; Albert B. Dodd, D.D., Missionary to China; Melvin A. Stuckey, Th.M., Ashland Theological Seminary.

Meetings will be held in the auditoriums of the Moody Bible Institute, 830 N. La Salle St., Chicago, Ill.

Lodging will be provided free to all delegates whether League members or not. Send all registrations and reservations for rooms to Miss Ida McMillen, 830 N. La Salle St., Chicago, Ill., at least ten days before the Convention. Please state whether you plan to attend the Banquet on Saturday evening—price fifty cents.

The Smyth Lecture Series

THE Smyth Lectures at Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia, were delivered this year by Dr. Cornelius Van Til. Dr. Van Til, who is professor of Apologetics at Westminster Theological Seminary, chose "God and Human Knowledge" as the theme for his lectures, and the fact that he discussed this subject with especial reference to Barthianism and to other thought movements of the present day made the series one of unusual interest for ministers. The seminary considers itself fortunate in having been able to arrange for the annual visits of Dr. Henry W. McLaughlin and Rev. Jos. H. Cudlipp to coincide with the delivery of the Smyth lectures so that visiting ministers also had opportunity to take special work under their leadership. The short term courses which these men are to offer will

open on Tuesday, January 21, and continue through Saturday, February 1. Dr. McLaughlin will offer three courses in the "Problems of the Rural Church," while Mr. Cudlipp is to teach courses in "Worship Materials and Methods," "Leadership of Recreational Activities," and in "Evangelism."

The Sprunt Lecture Series

THE Sprunt Series of Lectures at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, will be delivered this year by Rev. John M. Wells, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Sumter, South Carolina. The special lectures series will be delivered by Dr. Robert E. Speer and Dr. Charles R. Erdman.

The Sprunt Lectures will deal with a series of outstanding personalities in the early years of Southern Church life, the part these men played, and their messages for America today. The subjects of the Special Lectures have not yet been announced.

A Church of Christian Jews

The First Presbyterian Hebrew Christian Church Organized in Chicago

THROUGH the fifteen years of its existence Peniel Community Center, Chicago, has been instrumental in winning to Christ about two hundred and fifty Jews. Most of these have been received into the membership of various neighboring churches. But they have missed in these churches the warm Christian fellowship of their own group in Peniel. To meet this need the First Hebrew Christian Presbyterian Church was organized. The problem that the director of Peniel Community Center, Rev. David Bronstein, faced was not theoretical but practical. Seeing what was befalling those who had been sent out from Peniel into neighboring churches, he was constrained to meet the situation by the establishment of a church in which the need for understanding and close fellowship could be more fully met.

On the afternoon of November 10, 1935, the new church was organized with thirty-four charter members, three elders and four deacons—all Jews. It was a most impressive service. The appropriate sermon by Dr. Ward of the Oak Park Church, the baptism of five Jews, and the ordination of the new church officers will long be remembered by the sympathetic congregation that filled to the full the auditorium of the Bethany Church in which the service was held.

The new church which will meet for worship in the hall of the Peniel Community Center begins its career under favorable auspices. It is located in a community of 70,000 Jews, many of whom are already sympathetic with the purpose of the varied ministries being rendered. There have been many striking conversions in Peniel from the radical elements in the neighborhood

and a witness can thus be maintained of the power of the Gospel to win the Jews. The opportunity for creating a warm, close spiritual fellowship has been made possible. It is the beginning of a great adventure in the extension of the cause of Christ among His own people. Many eyes are being focussed upon this unique enterprise. Very many warm friends of the church will unite in prayer that the pastor, officers and members may see the realization of their most radiant hopes.

The Board of Foreign Missions

THE following figures show a statement of receipts applicable to the Board's regular budget, from April 1 to November 30, 1935 (eight months of fiscal year), compared with the same period last year:

	1935	1934
Churches	\$405,917.66	\$409,273.09
Sabbath-schools . . .	27,386.62	25,020.36
Youth Budget	3,531.47	2,508.17
Individuals, etc. . . .	34,002.04	31,990.62
Women's and Young People's Organizations	303,786.96	311,483.37
Total	\$774,624.75	\$780,275.61

Their Works Do Follow Them

William E. Blackstone

By David L. Cooper, Ph.D.,
President of Biblical Research Society

ON NOVEMBER 7th the Lord called His faithful servant, William E. Blackstone, (author of "Jesus Is Coming") into the presence of his Lord whom he passionately loved and whom he served faithfully throughout his entire life. He was ripe for his heavenly home, being in his 94th year.

Brother Blackstone accepted the Lord Jesus Christ as his Saviour in his early years and lived a consistent, faithful life in the service of his Lord. He was the very embodiment of humility, meekness, faithfulness, kindness, and loyalty to his ideals and to his Lord. Of him it can truly be said that he supplied in his faith the seven Christian graces of which the Apostle Peter spoke in the first chapter of his Second Epistle.

He seemed to have lost sight of all selfish interest and personal ambition and was totally absorbed in living for others and in serving his Lord, winning souls for the Master's cause. Few men have had such a passion for the lost as he exemplified throughout his entire life.

When people desired to speak of him and to praise him for his great work, his usual reply was: "I am but a little errand boy for Jesus." He was so very much imbued with the thought of his insignificance and unworthiness that it never occurred to him that he had done anything except to render a very meager service for his Lord.

Though only a layman, he was a close student of the entire Word of God. His research in the Scriptures was so thorough that he was well acquainted with the teachings of both the Old and New Testaments. His mastery of the English Bible was such that even in the late years of his life he could turn with readiness to any portion of it. He so hid the Word of God in his heart that Bible phraseology frequently determined his choice of words and expressions.

Very few men have to their credit such vast achievements as William E. Blackstone. His passion for the lost was so consuming that it led him into the missions to speak publicly and also to deal privately with the lost. He eventually gave up his business career to devote his entire time and energy to that of saving souls. He toured the world, on one occasion at least, in the interest of world missions. One evening in the Pacific Coast Garden Mission in Chicago Brother Blackstone, in the vigor of health, exclaimed with great earnestness: "Oh that God would trust me with a million dollars! I would use every penny of it for the evangelization of the world." God was looking for such a man whom He could trust. The Lord heard that cry and placed in his hands a trust fund, not of one million dollars, but of five millions, which he was to use over a period of 20 years. During this time he managed and invested the remaining funds so that under his wise stewardship it gained a sixth million. For these 20 years he faithfully served the Lord at his own charges in administering this large fund for the glory of God and for the salvation of souls.

In his great enthusiasm for lost souls he never lost sight of the Scriptural instruction found in Romans 1:16, which declares that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all who believe, but "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Hence he paid especial attention to the propagation of the Gospel among the Hebrew people. One of his first enterprises for the Jews was the establishing of the Chicago Hebrew Mission, of which he was president for years. Even to the end of his life he took great interest in this noble mission and assisted in every way possible. He also was very much interested in Jewish work abroad, especially among the 3,500,000 Jews in Poland, to which he gave largely. He also had a very deep and abiding interest in the work of the Jewish Department of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. When he was able to do so, he attended the "Jewish Meetings" conducted there on Sunday afternoons twice each month. He showed his interest in this work in a most practical manner by supporting it to the limit of his ability.

One of the greatest pieces of work which he accomplished was that of writing the book, "Jesus Is Coming," which has been published in 48 languages. Over a million copies of this book have been scattered throughout the world. No man in modern times has done more for the propagation of

the teaching relative to our Lord's return than **Brother Blackstone** did by this book. Throughout the country there are thousands who testify that the light of the truth concerning prophetic matters was first brought to them by the instrumentality of this book.

He brought out also nearly a million copies of lessons concerning the Scriptures with illustrations and scattered them throughout all China. At this time doubtless our departed brother has learned a bit of the result of his vast missionary efforts in the great Chinese Empire.

At the Columbian Exposition in Chicago 1893 he procured the signatures of the rulers of about thirty-six nations calling for the arbitration of international disputes in peace conferences rather than on the field of battle. Thus it was **William E. Blackstone** who conceived the idea of peace by arbitration, which has crystallized into the League of Nations in its efforts to avoid war and to establish justice among the nations.

His life stands out in bold relief in this generation as one of the noblest and grandest of Christian laymen. May his example be an inspiration to all of us and may we follow in his footsteps as he followed the Lord.—*Prophecy*.

Frederick N. Charrington

ON JANUARY 2, there died in his 86th year in a nursing home in the City of London, a man, the inheritor of a \$6,000,000 brewery fortune, who devoted most of his life to temperance and the needs of the poor.

In his 20th year, in a notorious section of London where he was rowdying with a group of friends, an incident occurred to **Frederick N. Charrington** which changed his life. A saloon door opened and a man reeled out with a woman clinging to him. Disheveled and emaciated she plead "For God's sake, give me a copper. I am hungry and the children starving." The man struck her down.

Above the door of the saloon, a gilt sign swung in the bitter air. On it the young brewery heir read, "Drink Charrington's Beer."

For sixty years after, **Charrington** devoted himself to a fight on drink, drugs and the white slave traffic. In 1870 he founded the Lower Hamlets Mission and later the Assembly Hall at Mile End, the largest mission hall in the world, holding 4,000 persons. He fed the hungry, clothed the naked, and sheltered the homeless.

On May 18, 1915, during debate on a liquor bill in the House of Commons, he rushed into the House, advanced to the Speaker's table, where rested the mace. Holding it high above his head, he harangued the startled M. P.'s on the evils of drink.

Attendants and four members of the Commons bore him to the floor, and wrested the mace from him. All England was aghast

at a private citizen walking into the House of Commons and suspending a session of Parliament by seizing the mace. This had been done only once before in history. That was by Oliver Cromwell.

Fiftieth Anniversary Bross Competition

FOR the best book or manuscript, heretofore unpublished, on the connection, relation, and mutual bearing of the Humanities, the Social Sciences, the Physical Sciences, the Biological Sciences, or any branch of knowledge, with and upon the Christian religion, the Trustees of Lake Forest College will award a cash prize of \$15,000. The award will be made under the Bross Foundation, after decision by a committee of judges, on or after January 1, 1940. This Foundation was planned by **William Bross** in the years following the death of his infant son, **Nattie**, in 1856; stipulated in his agreement with the Trustees of Lake Forest College (corporate title: Lake Forest University), in 1879; and consummated at the time of his death, in 1890. **William Bross**, in his trust agreement, set forth the purpose of the competition as follows: "The offer must be open to scientific men, the Christian philosophers, and historians of all nations. . . . My object is to call out the best efforts of the highest talent and the ripest scholarship of the world, to illustrate from science or from any department of knowledge and to demonstrate the divine origin and the authority of the Christian Scriptures; and, further, to show how both science and revelation coincide and prove the existence, the providence, or any or all of the attributes of the only living and true God, 'infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.'"

Conditions of the Competition

Manuscripts (or proof sheets) must be mailed to reach Lake Forest College on or before September 1, 1939. They must be accompanied by a sealed envelope containing the name of the writer, his address, the title of his manuscript. It is requested that no manuscripts be submitted before June 1, 1939.

A committee of judges, three in number, will make the award. Their names will not be announced until the close of the competition.

Books Now in Preparation

Authors, or prospective authors, who contemplate publishing a book in the near future, may if they so desire submit proof sheets of such a book, under these conditions: (1) Proof sheets must be anonymous; (2) Books must remain unpublished until the Bross Award is announced; (3) The author of the book, should he receive the \$15,000 award, must arrange to have trans-

ferred to the trustees of Lake Forest College (Corporate title: Lake Forest University) the copyright of his book. Such an instance occurred in 1915, when the Bross Decennial Award went to a book previously prepared for publication by the **Rev. T. J. Thorburn** of Hastings, Sussex, England. Authors of such works may well hold them in abeyance for the opportunity of competing for the considerable award and the prestige of winning a place in the internationally-famous Bross Library of Lake Forest College.

Rules of the Competition

These rules govern the competition for the Bross Foundation \$15,000 Award: 1—Three typewritten or printed copies of each manuscript must be submitted. 2—Manuscripts or books by foreign authors must be submitted in English translation. 3—Manuscripts must be of a *minimum* length of 50,000 words. No maximum is established. 4—Authors may submit more than one book. 5—Material previously published may be used *only* if it be a small portion of the whole projected work, which shall have been developed into a broader or lengthier treatise for the purpose of this competition; or, it may be a pamphlet containing the germ of the larger work, expanded for the purpose of this competition. 6—Final decision of the eligibility of a contestant's work rests with the judges, as does the final decision for the award. 7—Trustees of Lake Forest College (Corporate title: Lake Forest University) assume no responsibility for loss of manuscripts in transit, nor will any manuscripts be returned, unless accompanied by sufficient postage for their return.

Any desired additional information may be obtained readily by addressing: **Herbert McComb Moore**, President, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois, U. S. A.

Prize Offered for Best Treatise

THE American Tract Society has received and accepted a gift of \$1,000, to be awarded as a Prize for the best treatise of 50,000 to 60,000 words, on one or more essential, evangelical doctrines of the Christian faith.

The Publishing Committee of the Society has suggested that we write to a few outstanding, evangelical leaders of the Christian Church, of the various denominations, asking that they suggest the names of five or more men whose strong personal faith and literary ability are such that they could write an acceptable book, to be published by the Society, emphasizing one or more essentials of our faith.

WM. N. MATTHEWS,
General Secretary.

EDWIN NOAH HARDY,
Executive Secretary.

New York, N. Y.

A Native Bible School in Manchuria

MANCHURIA is one of the most strategic and fruitful Mission Fields today. The new situation in that country has produced a background that makes for revival conditions. A widespread presentation of the Gospel Message in the power of the Holy Spirit has been bringing multitudes to Christ.

One of the factors in this movement has been the establishment in 1930 of the Newchwang Bible School by a group of Chinese spiritual leaders in Manchuria. This Bible School supplies a need which had been increasingly felt—the equipment of Evangelists, Bible-Women and voluntary workers for the wider proclamation of the Gospel.

The School has adopted the Evangelical Credal basis of the League of Christian Churches in China, and it is organised on independent and interdenominational lines like the Moody Bible Institute or the Glasgow Bible Training Institute. It seeks to serve the interests of all Evangelical Churches and Missions working in Manchuria and North China.

The School is governed by a Board of Control composed of spiritual leaders of the Church in Manchuria and China. This Board, which includes Dr. Chia Yu Ming of Nanking, meets occasionally for the consideration of matters of policy, and a wider circle of Chinese representatives from Hong Kong, Amoy, Shanghai, Tsingtao, Nanking, Peking and Manchuria constitute a Board of Finance sharing the responsibility of arousing interest in the work of the School and securing support for it.

An Executive Board of seven members directs the administrative work of the School. The only European member of the Executive is the Rev. James McCammon, M.A., of the Irish Presbyterian Mission, Newchwang, who is Honorary Treasurer.

The School started work in temporary premises in 1930, and in 1932 through the goodness of God commodious premises were built. The Bible School building has a large auditorium, class-rooms, library, office, dining-room and kitchen on the ground floor. The second floor has dormitory accommodations for 100 men students, and the third floor provides sleeping quarters for 150 delegates during Convention times. In an adjoining compound are teachers' residences and the Women Students' Hostel, which is large enough to house 80 students.

Three courses are offered by the School:—

(1) The *Regular Course* covers a period of three years, with two terms of four months each year. This gives a comprehensive and practical training that fits the students to be Evangelists or Bible-women. Three afternoons a week each Student takes

part in some assigned work such as Gospel Hall and Open-air preaching, or visitation. The first half of the third year must be spent in practical evangelistic work. Some of the students are assigned work in connection with various churches and others are organised into Evangelistic Bands which, on the invitation of various Missions and Churches go all over the country and carry on extensive evangelistic and revival campaigns. In 1933 two Bands toured two large Missions districts for several months. A Missionary (Irish Presbyterian) thus writes of their work:—

"These zealous young evangelists, twice daily, addressed attentive crowded audiences in Churches, Gospel Halls and Government schools. Our leaders marvelled at the power with which they told forth the message of the Cross. From every place visited letters reached us reporting how God was working. The heathen were having the Gospel preached unto them with saving power, church members were being revived and refreshed in soul and our Evangelists themselves received a new urge to preach and pray."

Another Missionary (Church of Scotland) writes:—

"There is a real seeking these days and we feel that the Newchwang Band was a great help during their time with us."

(2) The *Special Elective Course* is open to theological graduates and others who wish to come for a shorter or longer period of study and spiritual refreshment.

(3) The two months *Short Term Course* in the Autumn is open to any church member who wishes to come for a period of Biblical teaching. This course has been productive of great blessing and spiritual enrichment.

Each summer a week's Convention for the deepening of spiritual life is held at the School. The 1934 Convention was attended by about 250 delegates from all parts of Manchuria, and was characterized by remarkable spiritual blessing.

The students manifest a deep spirit of consecration and devotion. They not only meet for prayer at various times in the day but special days of prayer at the beginning and end of each term, attended by both Faculty and students effect far-reaching results in the life and work of the School. This is the secret of the keen evangelistic spirit among the students who exhibit a real passion for souls. Many of them spend their holidays in voluntary evangelistic work. This year they started to contribute an evangelistic article three times a week to a local newspaper issued by the Merchants Guild.

The Newchwang Bible School has been honoured of God in sending forth the first

Chinese Missionaries to Mongolia. In 1933 one of the students of the School—Mr. Li—resigned his work as an evangelist under the Canadian Presbyterian Mission to go forth in faith as a missionary to Mongolia. Mr. Li has endured much hardness for the sake of the Gospel, travelling thousands of miles, and has already been used to lead several Mongols to Christ. This spring another graduate joined him in this work and a third is planning to go when he completes his course. Recent news tells that Mr. Li has started the first Christian Church in Mongolia.

The growth of the School has been phenomenal. In 1930 it opened with 23 students; now there are 110—80 men and 30 women. The catholic scope of the School is evident from the fact that the students have come from several different Missions:—Irish, Scottish, Canadian and American Presbyterian, American Baptist, Methodist Episcopal, Danish Lutheran, Norwegian Lutheran, Brethren and China Inland Mission. Eight Provinces of China have also been represented on the Student body.

The Faculty is composed of six consecrated and capable Chinese teachers, one of whom gives devoted service in an honorary capacity. The life of the School owes much to the wise and mature spiritual direction of the members of the teaching staff.

Dr. Jonathan Goforth, the veteran missionary of the Canadian Presbyterian Mission, writing some time ago to the Rev. Paul Rader of Chicago from Newchwang, thus refers to the Bible School:—

"In our Master's world-wide service, when you see where my letter is from, you will recall the days of blessing here a couple of years ago. Those were never to be forgotten days: Once again the Lord has visited us with His Salvation. The ninety Bible School students along with many others who attended our eight days of meetings have been quickened along the line of service and responsibility for the salvation of the lost to a degree equal to anything I have ever known. It does seem to us that a work is being carried on in connection with this Bible School not excelled by anything throughout the world."

Though the School has no capital funds or Mission grants, its needs have been met in a wonderful way. The annual running expenses amount to about \$8,000 M. (almost £600) more than half of which has been raised by Chinese Christians.

Present economic conditions in Manchuria make it increasingly difficult for the Chinese to adequately support this enterprise. The work of the School is commended to the prayerful interest and practical sympathy of the Christian public of all denominations, that its present usefulness may not be hampered, and that certain proposed extensions may be rendered possible.

News in Nutshells

A New Commonwealth

ON NOVEMBER 15, the proclamation which certified the freedom of the Philippine Islands was signed by the President of the United States. Missionary work there will be helped by the provisions for the continuance of the English language and the maintenance of religious liberty. Four-fifths of the population is Roman Catholic and the leaders of that church are seeking to bring back the papal authority that existed under the old Spanish regime. The Eucharistic Congress is to meet in Manila in 1936.

The total population is about eleven million, of which some five million read and speak English. There are eight languages and eighty-seven dialects. There are 7,083 islands in the Philippine group, of which only two and a half thousand are named. In many of these islands the name of Jesus has never been heard.

It is encouraging however to read the recent figures compiled by the American Bible Society. More than 2,000,000 Bibles are in use there.

"Millions of Filipinos probably have never handled any other book, and there are doubtless remote sections of the Philippines where the inhabitants believe there is only one book in the world, the Bible.

"The annual distribution of the Bible has reached a point above the combined circulation of all newspapers here. The sale of 1,000 copies of any current work in the Philippines would be unusual, whereas the demand for the Bible maintains itself above 125,000 annually."

It costs twelve dollars per day to operate the gospel ship, which is taking the gospel to many hitherto unreached territories.

Christianity Supreme

THE *Christian* (London) reports the meeting next summer in London of a World Congress of Faiths. The general theme is to be "World Fellowship Through Religion," and in an official statement the hope is expressed that the Congress will "provide definite evidence that the day of religious antagonism is passing" and that the Congress will be "a definite step towards the laying of a foundation upon which the various religions of the world will unite in promoting a true fellowship of the nations to help humanity in its most essential and fundamental purpose, that of spiritual, and therefore individual, regeneration."

The *Christian* says that the idea that Christian thinkers can come to terms with representatives of Eastern and other systems, so that they can speak with one mind upon the most vital issues, "is completely at variance with the New Testament, both in letter and spirit." The claims of the

Crucified and Risen Christ, are absolute and exclusive.

The Waldensian Church in the Italian Crisis

IN THESE days of tension between Italy and the League of Nations, many readers of *The British Weekly* will be thinking of the Waldensian Church of Italy, that most ancient Protestant Church in the world. They will be remembering how the Waldensians kept the lamp of the pure Gospel alight in their mountain valleys during generations of trial and persecution, and how in these days they have extended their mission work throughout almost the whole of Italy.

This great mission work has been maintained in largest measure through the devotion and generosity of the Waldensians themselves; but they have been helped in past years by liberal gifts from other Protestant Churches. Unhappily the situation in America is such that instead of the considerable sums that were received thence at one time, almost nothing now comes from that source; whilst contributions from other European countries have also diminished.

In these circumstances the Waldensians have been making heroic efforts to overcome their difficulties. During the past twelve months they have wiped out a large debt on their Boys' Boarding School at Pomaretto; and, partly under the stimulus of increasing Roman Catholic propaganda, they are intensifying their already great evangelistic activities.

The situation is, however, one of exceptional gravity for them. A recent letter from one of the pastors contains the following sentences:—

"For reasons which I leave you to understand the Waldensian Church is more in need of sympathy now than ever; God only knows what developments there may be for us in the near future; we know that, whatever happens, there is ahead of us a time of great trial and difficulty. . . . The Tavola is taking steps never taken in the past; help has not yet come in such a measure as to avoid severe cuts in some of our activities; almost every institution is faced with the danger of being closed down. We still trust that God will help. The situation in which we, Waldenses, find ourselves, is difficult, and it is only through prayer that one finds confidence and hope."

It will be obvious that the present political crisis must intensify these difficulties. A number of the Waldensian young men have already been drafted off to Africa with the Italian troops. It seems probable that the League's Sanctions may make it difficult or impossible for Protestants outside of Italy to continue to send financial help to the Waldensian Church, although no embargo is meanwhile being placed upon the despatch

of gifts to Italy for religious and humanitarian purposes. And if, after the present troubles are ended, there should be any change in the régime in Italy, it is not improbable that the clerical party might be in power. Whatever we may think of Signor Mussolini, there is no doubt that he has extended his powerful protection hitherto to the Italian Protestants; and it is certain that were the clerical party in power, it would fare ill with our brethren.

May I make a twofold suggestion?

(1) The present occasion calls for much more earnest, persistent prayer on behalf of the Protestant people of Italy than most of us have been accustomed to hitherto. Let ministers so guide the prayers of their people in public worship, that both in public and in private our brethren in Italy will be continually remembered before God.

(2) This is the time for those who remember the words of Christ "Love your enemies," "Overcome evil with good," to give more generously than ever to help the work of the Waldensian Church. If at a later stage difficulties should arise with regard to the transfer of money to Italy, the gifts could be accumulated in this country, so that really substantial help could be made available at a time when the need will be tremendous.—*British Weekly*.

National Church for Canada Discussed

DR. RICHARD ROBERTS, moderator of the United Church of Canada and Bishop R. J. Renison, in radio addresses commemorating the 10th Anniversary of the union of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches advocated a national church for Canada. The matter is being widely discussed.

Danger Ahead

THE *Presbyterian Banner* states that the pastors of Cleveland were invited to a luncheon at Hotel Statler on December 4 to hear a number of men who had attended the meeting of the "National Committee of the Modern Missions Movement" at Rochester last May. At that time a new name was adopted, i.e., "A Movement for World Christianity." The purpose is to apply the findings of the "Layman's Inquiry" in the work of the denominational boards, if possible. An informal organization was effected to arrange for a later meeting in Cleveland.

German Calendar Heathen

THE German government has issued a calendar for 1936 which avoids all reference to Easter or Christmas. It refers to "Holy Night" as Baldur's Light-Birth; Good Friday as a memorial of 4,500 Saxon's slain by Charlemagne. Easter is called the Feast of Ostara or Sunrise, and Ascension Day marks "Thor's return for his hammer."

The German Protestant Church

EACH day the crisis in German Protestantism becomes more acute. On December 2, Hans Kerrl issued a decree forbidding Confessional Church governing bodies to make appointments, collect funds or convene official meetings of the church. His interpretation extends to making it an act of high treason for a minister to read in his pulpit the pronouncements of the Confessional Synods. On December 5, Kerrl decreed that proceedings be opened against Bishop Otto Zaenker of Breslau because he had examined theological candidates in bold defiance of the regulations. On December 20, he expelled from his pulpit one of the most distinguished and most widely known Confessional pastors, Rev. Gerhard Jacobi, chairman of the Berlin-Brandenburg Confessional Synod and Brotherhood Council.

On January 12, many pastors read to their congregations a manifesto of defiance to Nazi church authorities. After pointing out that press reports have given a false impression of growing peace with the Evangelical Church, the manifesto said:

"The Confessional Church has its mission from the Word of God. It was obliged to assume the responsibility of leadership of the Evangelical Church to prevent the falsification of doctrines and the destruction of order within the church.

"It considers itself called to testify to the fact that grace is in Christ alone and to claim the will of the Lord in the church. The State has established church committees of the Reich federal, state and provinces and commissioned leadership in them. The Confessional Church considers the establishment of these committees a fatal mistake because—and so long as—the committees claim church leadership.

"Therefore, the Council Brethren reject church leadership by these committees established by the State and proposes itself to continue to exercise that leadership.

"It reminds the Councils of Brethren in the provinces and districts and communities of the obligation they assumed before God and their congregations. It instructs them to exercise that office of leadership to the full degree."

The manifesto concluded with greetings to the pastors and their congregations and a New Year's message taken from St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Chapter vi, Verses 9 and 10:

"As unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold, we live: as chastened and not killed;

"As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things."

The Need of France

OUT of 40,000,000 inhabitants of France, only 8,000,000 are Roman Catholics and 1,500,000 Protestants. The majority of the population are wholly indifferent or atheistic.

Results of One Hundred Years of Missions

THE *Evangelical Messenger* gives the following alignment of the membership of Christian churches:

"The estimated population of the world is approximately 2,000,000,000. The number of Christians (nominal included) is about 600,000,000, of which 200,000,000 are Protestant adherents; the remainder belong to the Greek and Roman Catholic faiths.

"China with 425,000,000 inhabitants, has 3,000,000 Christians. Eighty-eight per cent of China's entire population lives in the rural sections, yet forty per cent of all its missionary forces reside in twenty cities.

"Japan, with 60,000,000, has 300,000 Christians. Eighty per cent of Japan's population are farmers who are still unevangelized.

"India, with 350,000,000 people, has 5,000,000 Christians. Of 710,000 villages in India, only 39,727 have Christians living in them.

"Africa, with a population of 155,000,000 has 3,000,000 Christians.

"This means that in these four major areas of missionary activity having a total population of one billion, the Gospel message has gained approximately eleven million Christians, Protestant, and Catholic, or one per cent."

Revival in Denmark

THE Evangelical Lutheran Church is the national church of Denmark and includes 98 per cent of the people. It is at present experiencing a strong revival with greatly increased church gatherings and a deepened interest in Bible study.

Christian Layman's Hour in Mexico

PROFESSOR G. BAEZ CAMARGO of Mexico City, in an exchange, says:

"The age-long conflict between the Catholic Church and the Mexican government has resulted in a drastic restriction of the number and activities of priests, culminating, in some states of the republic, in the closing of all churches. In one of the states the churches are kept open under the care of the laymen, but no priest is allowed to attend. These regulations and laws apply to evangelical churches and ministers as well.

"This situation is placing a new and uncommon responsibility upon the lay membership of our churches, and is leading to a great and unprecedented awakening among them. By necessity, the laymen are coming to the front line and assuming with earnestness and fervor some of the activities formerly reserved exclusively to the ministry.

"The training of laymen for their urgent leadership is thus becoming one of the paramount duties and functions of the Church. Laymen's conventions and institutions are gradually emerging with increasing emphasis and force and rallying a fresh body of lay workers for the great drive against secularism and atheism.

"The energetic campaign against religion, recently launched and conducted with great strength by some powerful organizations in this country, is gradually destroying the hold of the Catholic Church upon the people, and shaking the superficial beliefs of many to whom religion was and still is a matter of mere doctrine and ritual practice. But at the same time, it is arousing an enormous interest in the study of religion. If the evangelical Churches succeed in grasping the conscience of panic-stricken Catholic religionists and of formerly uninterested inquirers, with the clear and forceful presentation of the Gospel, Mexico will have been saved of Christ.

"This task and duty, this opportunity and responsibility, rests wholly upon the shoulders of the laymen. Their hour has certainly come."

"The Liberal Retreat in China"

FRANK RAWLINSON, in the *Christian Century*, notes that the depression has affected missions representing a liberal viewpoint in that land, more than it has those which represent the conservative viewpoint. "In addition it has been noted that the proportion of new missionaries with old minds is growing. It is evident that conservative missionaries in China are gaining in proportionate strength, most noticeably in connection with American missions. . . . The available facts show that the depression has decimated the liberal ranks and left their conservative colleagues stronger."

IN THIS ISSUE:

EDITORIAL	
The Disruption of Westminster Seminary	193
Mission Study Books—I. Home Missions	196
JOSEPH A. SCHOFIELD, JR.	
Water Baptism—Sprinkling or Immersion	199
WARREN R. WARD	
A Meditation	203
ABRAHAM KUYPER	
Missions	205
MRS. GEORGE P. PIERSON	
Question Box	206
Letters to the Editor	208
News of the Church	210