

THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

HEADQUARTERS

Wheaton, Illinois

OFFICERS

DIRK MELLEMA, *President*, Grand Rapids, Michigan
Calvin Theological Seminary

ROBERT K. RUDOLPH, *Vice-President*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Reformed Episcopal Theological Seminary

WILBURN S. McLAIN, *Secretary*, Siloam Springs, Arkansas
John Brown Schools

W. HARLEE BORDEAUX, *Treasurer*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Westminster Theological Seminary

WILLIAM J. JONES, M.A., B.Th., *General Secretary*

ADVISORY BOARD

MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D., Xenia Theological Seminary

LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D., Hamma Divinity School

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., Westminster Theological Seminary

CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D., Calvin Theological Seminary

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D., Temple University

"By the word of truth, by the power of God."—2 Corinthians 6:7.

The League of Evangelical Students is a continent-wide organization of students, founded in 1925 by a student group. Its aim is to exalt our Lord Jesus Christ—by setting forth the gospel of His grace as presented in the inerrant Word of God, by promoting the intellectual defense of the evangelical faith, by proclaiming the joy of Christian living through the indwelling power of the Spirit, by presenting the claims of the gospel ministry at home and abroad. By these means it desires to present a well-rounded witness, spiritual and intellectual, to the truths of historic, evangelical Christianity. It is an organization of, and for, students. It is set for the proclamation and defense of the gospel.

A student group in any higher educational institution may become affiliated with the League. Its membership may range in size from three to the total number of students in the institution. The procedure is exceedingly simple, and is explained in the following extract from the Constitution:

"Any student association, society, or club of any theological seminary, school for the training of Christian workers, college, or other institution of higher learning may apply for membership in the League upon the ratification and adoption of this constitution by a three-fourths vote of its members. Otherwise, a local chapter of the League may be formed, consisting of not less than three members, such a chapter to have the same standing—in proportion to the number of its members—as an entire student body or association that constitutes a branch of the League."

"Application for membership shall be sent to the Secretary or General Secretary of the League." (Article III, Sections 3 and 5.)

The Evangelical Student is published in October, January, and April of each academic year. Every member of the League is entitled to a copy of each issue. The subscription price to non-members and to institutions, in all countries in the Universal Postal Union, is \$1.00 a year.

Printed in the United States of America.

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

WILLIAM J. JONES, *Editor*

VOL. V

Wheaton, Illinois, April, 1930

No. 3

EDITORIAL

FROM one of our exchanges¹ comes the word that, "During his visit to India, Dr. Mott paid an unhurried visit to Mahatma Gandhi. *Young India*, the weekly paper edited by Mr. Gandhi himself, has published a record of the conversation between them."

Believing that recent conditions and events in Indian student life, missions, and national affairs are traceable, in large part, to false conceptions of Christianity, we are quoting portions of the reported conversation, and commenting thereon. All of the quotations are taken directly from the magazine just cited, the italics being ours.

"They talked about several things, the general political situation in the country, Dominion Status v. Independence, . . . , and the like. At last the doctor asked Gandhi the question: "What do you consider to be the most valuable contribution that India can make to the progress of the world?" "Non-violence", replied Gandhi, "which the country is exhibiting at the present day on a scale unprecedented in history. . . ."

"What, then, is the contribution of Christianity to the national life of India? I mean the *influence of Christ as apart from Christianity*, for, I am afraid, there is a wide gulf separating the two at present", asked the doctor."

"Aye, there lies the rub", replied Gandhi. "It is not possible to consider the teaching of a religious teacher apart from the lives of his followers. Unfortunately, Christianity in India has been inextricably mixed up for the last one hundred and fifty years with the British rule. It appears to us as *synonymous with materialistic civilization and imperialistic exploitation by the stronger white races of the weaker races of the world.* . . ."

"Dr. Mott: "Do you, then, disbelieve in all conversion?""

"Gandhi: "I disbelieve in the conversion of one person by another. My effort should *never be to undermine another's faith but to make him a better follower of his own faith.* This implies belief in the truth of all religions, and, therefore, respect for them. . . ."

"Dr. Mott: "Is it not our duty to help our fellow beings to the maximum of truth that we may possess, to share with them our deepest spiritual experiences?""

"Gandhi: "I am sorry I must again differ from you, for the simple reason that the deepest spiritual truths are always unutterable. That light to which you refer transcends speech. It can be felt *only through the*

¹The *Student World*, October, 1929.

inner experience. . .””

“Dr. Mott: “But even God sometimes speaks through His prophets.””

“Gandhi: “Yes, but the prophets *speak not through the tongue but through their lives*. I have, however, known that in this matter I am up against a solid wall of Christian opinion.””

“Dr. Mott: “*Even among Christians there is a school of thought—and it is growing—which holds that the authoritarian method should not be employed but that each individual should be left to discover the deepest truths of life for himself. . .* In other words, they feel that propaganda in the accepted sense of the term is not the most effective method.””

““I am glad to hear you say this”, remarked Gandhi. “That is what Hinduism certainly inculcates.””

It needs very little discrimination to notice that in the italicized words there are certain sentiments which are peculiarly familiar! We are reminded of the stock arguments of liberalizing missionaries, of the chicaneries of certain theological views advanced by a popular missionary writer, whose discussion groups in India brought forth questions from university students. These questions bore too familiar a smack to be entirely indigenous.² As one conservative scholar has well said concerning this type of thinking: “And so sometimes we read more or less formal expositions of belief that have come from the native churches of the East. What an interesting thing the formation of such expositions is, to be sure! A fresh, new expression of the Christian religion independent of all the conventions of the West! Unfortunately such expectations are often sadly disappointed when one reads the new formulations for himself; the vaunted freshness and originality is often not to be seen, and what we actually have is a most unoriginal repetition of the vague naturalism of the contemporary Western world. The Eastern mind has turned out to be as like as two peas to the mind of the South Side of Chicago; all the stock phrases of modern agnosticism seem to be thoroughly acceptable to the Oriental students to whom they have been taught.”³

Gandhi is a pacifist. We feel, somehow, that there is a generic relation between the pacifist in theology and the pacifist in international relationships, whether he be in this country or elsewhere!

It seems to us that it is Western *a-theology*, not theology that has made tremendous impacts on the East, that students, both Occidental and Oriental have been inoculated with the toxin of a virulent and noxious philosophy and metaphysic. Gandhi reflects all the pet party terms of American liberals, he reflects their anti-intellectual, non-doctrinal, mystical views; the syncretistic, Ritschlian, and inclusive views of the Christian religion; and hence the utter disbelief in an authoritative revelation. Certainly the Indian leader would be “glad to hear” a Western leader speak of an increasing number of Christians who maintain views whose implications are extremely deleterious to genuine Christianity.

²E. Stanley Jones. *The Christ of the Indian Road*, pp. 123-130.

³J. Gresham Machen, *What Is Faith?* p. 30, f.

As a matter of further interest to those concerned about the contents of that being taught to students today, we beg leave to quote from another student report.⁴

"Until the last two decades the average Christian leader felt that he had a pretty well worked out blueprint of what it meant to be a Christian, and how one became a Christian. What we today call the social expressions of Christianity were fairly simple and were found in practical service opportunities in the community, in our evangelistic endeavors, and especially in the missionary enterprise of the church."

"We find ourselves today in a situation where many of the blueprints seem to have been destroyed. We are in the midst of questioning of a fundamental nature. Is the religious view of life tenable in the light of the facts of our world? Are we to regard Jesus as a way, or as The Way, of life? Is our main business not that of developing an appreciation of other religions, rather than sharpening our convictions with regard to the unique contribution of the religion of Jesus to the life of the world?"

The article closes with the statement that the leaders feel that "questionings and perplexities" of today indicate opportunities for religious leadership which are "vastly more significant . . . than that which obtained when the catalogued certainties of religion were of a doctrinal and more superficial nature."

What begging of the question is this last statement "mere superficial nature."! And what a sublimely naïve disregard of history is this whole commentary on the early church. We confess that it is a most difficult feat for us to picture the apostolic church calling councils to instruct emperors on peace programs, or to suggest overtures or gestures for better understanding and coöperation between religions! Indeed it was against such eclectic and agglutinative tendencies as that of gnosticism that some of the most polemic and apologetic of the New Testament epistles were written.

But what folly is this which causes a contemporary student movement to arrogate to itself all the prerogatives of deity? The very structure of Christianity is revelatory—God speaking to man, not man hopelessly groping after some far-off Being. Why the retention of the name Christian, for such ideas? Why not call the system to which these ideas belong, sociology or anthropology? These sciences would be very modern, to say the least. But to dare to raise the question of Jesus as a way, is to immediately brand the one suggesting it, as some one else than a believer. That must be a perverted, and faulty view of Christ which could still conceive of Him as *a* means of salvation, among others. To those who accept the full content of Scripture, the entire meaning of Christian revelation, He is the first-born, the Head of the Church, the One who is before all things.

Among other truths ignored or slighted by such a world-view as that implied by our coeval is the principle of individuality. Such a philosophy

⁴From the Report of the Commission on the Place and Function of the S. C. A.

assumes that sin is merely social and not personal or individual, and that unless a human being look outward upon his fellow-man, upon his neighbor, and upon the whole world he has a twisted and contorted view of life. Of what avail to improve mankind, and allow it to remain in its sin! For our part we shall remain "blueprints", or as Paul says imprints or impressions, being modeled "after the image of him that created him"—we content ourselves with the Divine artist, whose Son the model, is in the most absolute sense, "the way, and the truth, and the life:".

Something of value comes from another of our exchanges, which writes of faculty-student projects, saying that faculties are concerned about college religious life and endeavoring to find "ways to foster authentic religious experience."

Here are the four ends which such projects should keep in mind, and some of the comments of our contemporary:

First, "To explore the meaning of the Christian gospel and its interpretations in terms of contemporary needs and opportunities."

"That there is a widespread hunger for such an attempt at exploration and interpretation is unmistakably clear. This desire comes from varying experiences in the life of today; . . . from reactions in certain parts of the country to a childhood training in religion which now seems inconsistent with college training. . . ."

Second, "To consider the possibilities of making all the activities of college life contributory to religion:

". . . A college can no longer be called a Christian college simply because constitutional provision is made for daily compulsory chapel. Courses in the Bible may be taught by never so saintly a professor—if across the hall the psychologist or philosopher is undercutting by a materialistic view of life the very foundation on which vital Christian experience may rest. . . ."

Third, "To lift the morale of Christian workers among students and to call forth more adequate resources in life and wealth to strengthen student Christian work."

"Herbert Gray said as he sailed for England after five months' work with the Student Association Movement that amidst encouragements in many places he felt a 'chilling blast had devastated the religious spirit in many colleges' and he found no one who said that student Christian work is easy now. . . ."

Fourth, "To remind American students of the universal character of the Christian faith and its implications in a world of human need."

"This truth of God in Christ and its challenge is not lessened because we are now eagerly hospitable to the values in other religions. At their best they are but 'broken lights'; the world needs the fulness of God as Jesus revealed and reveals Him. How desperate that need is few of us in prosperous America are aware."

With the findings and discoveries of the student religious situation mentioned in these cullings, who of us would disagree? They are the

more remarkable because stated by a liberal movement. But the solution to the problems suggested and the causes implied, are quite other matters. Does it not quicken our interest in the spiritual welfare of hundreds of students to know that they are aware of the need for a definite, vital message? Despite what is to us a radical departure from Christianity, there is something in the American student world which calls for our most serious consideration and thought. We cannot be done with mere comment on such a problem. We must declare boldly the word of truth, humbly offering that which transformed our lives, made us new creatures in Christ, and gave us that priceless treasure, salvation from sin through the new and living Way, the only Way!

We are still able to recognize the good things written by those who differ from us! In a magazine number previously quoted, is an article entitled, "The Pantheon Principle". The writer makes some telling strictures on that type of thinking which always stresses points of agreement in religion. We give only snatches of the article which are pertinent.

"The spirit of the Roman Pantheon is the spirit which characterizes many of the Christian leaders of the West in their world outlook. The essence of this spirit is the assumption that creative activity is favored by an impartial respect for all the gods, that reverence for personality means 'your idea is as good as mine', and that catholicity involves the inclusion of all possible points of view. . . ."

"There is no such thing as a God for all the creeds. . . . To assume that the creeds are all pointing to the same God is to accept the spirit of the Roman Pantheon; it results in emptying faith of all intellectual content and in reducing the idea of God to undifferentiated vaporous sentiment."

The writer continues, speaking of the Universal Religious Peace Conference at which a Moslem member spoke of the cosmopolitanism of Islam, and of the President of the American Federal Council of Churches being indifferent to the views of some Christian people when he welcomed the conference in the name of the United States. He continues by insisting that one might just as well aim for political unity as religious unity. And speaking of Christians helping Jews he says, "But the people who will help most at these conferences (between Jews and Christians) are not the muddled headed persons who wish to coöperate on the assumption that after all Jews and Christians believe nearly the same thing. . . . Instead of aiding at this point, world religious conferences tend to blur distinctions and to minimize the value of honest intellectual disagreement."

With a pointed injunction the author concludes, "Let us as Christians give content to our faith rather than waste our slender resources in minimizing whatever distinctive content it may already have."

THE CHRIST OF THE COLLEGE*

W. H. JELLEMA

IN the measure that He should be, if indeed He be the Christ, Christ is not for the college student his Prophet, Priest, and King. Nay, of the college student generically it would seem to be true that he has other prophets, that he needs no priest, that he is his own king.

Why is it that the college student finds it difficult to accept Christ? Why is it that the Christ of the college halls is at best a hazy and impotent figure?

Various are the reasons that at once spring to mind, and that are often suggested.

It is said that the college student today is a materialist, or that at any rate he worships only success. I doubt not that this plays a rôle, but I do not think that it is gross materialism which stands in the way; youth and a measure of cloistral seclusion still combine in our day to produce at least some degree of the idealism that is traditionally associated with the college.

It is sometimes alleged that the modern student is completely unable to believe anything. My own impression is rather that if anything he is too credulous.

"The student is doubtful of this or that doctrine in a specific system of theology, and hence is doubtful of and critical toward the Christ." Thus reads another attempt at explanation. Here again I can judge only on the basis of my own experience with and analysis of student thinking. It would seem to be true that the student often does defend his attitude toward Christianity by a reference to doubts of particular theological beliefs. Yet despite the student's own testimony I do not think that his inability to straighten out his belief concerning miracles or evolution or some other specific problem is the fundamental reason why Christ is not his Prophet. Furthermore, were such his real difficulty a type of apologetics, familiar also to him, would long since have removed it.

Still others contend that a complacent religious indifference among college students prevents their acceptance of Christ; religion supposedly means nothing whatever to them; the absence of religion in their lives causes them no concern. Of the truth of this contention I am very doubtful. College students feel they are losing something of value when they feel themselves losing their religion. And, early religious training apart,

"Just when we are safest, there's a sunset touch,
A fancy from a flower-bell, someone's death,
A chorus-ending from Euripides—
And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears
As old and new at once as nature's self,
To rap and knock and enter in our soul. . . ."

*An address delivered by Professor W. H. Jellema, Ph.D., of the Department of Philosophy of Calvin College, at a public meeting of the Calvin College Chapter of the League of Evangelical Students held Friday, March the seventh.

That is as true for the college student as it is for all men. College walls can not strain out our human nature.

* * * * *

But if none of these alleged reasons is sufficient, why then, once more, is it that the college student so generally fails to acknowledge Christ as his Prophet, Priest, and King?

The deep root of our difficulty, if I may venture a dogmatic opinion, lies here: We are not certain that Christ is *real*. We are not sure of His reality. We find Him admirable. We acknowledge his aesthetic appeal. He has for us a sentimental attraction, it may be. We may even wish that we could accept Him. But we find that we can not be *certain* of Him.

And, assuming that we can not be certain of Christ, we are right in not accepting Him! If Christ be indeed such that as our certainty, our knowledge increases, His certainty must diminish, I do not blame the student for not accepting Him. As students we rightly demand not opinion, not conjecture, not mere beauty, but knowledge; to admit less were false to our vocation.

It may help us to understand the student's situation if we consider briefly what certainty can mean to the student.

Men are certain in different ways. There is first of all a certainty derived from sensation. I am certain of my body, of stones and trees, of the whole physical world, because I have sensations. It is this kind of certainty regarding reality which forms the basis of the everyday life of each of us. Without any further analysis and criticism, it is sufficient to point out that however certain one may be by way of sensation, one can not be certain of Christ in this way. One may sing, "I wish I had been with Him then"; one may suppose that were Jesus here now one would believe; but to accept Him as the Christ requires more than sensation; mere sensation will never give one certainty that Christ is real; His reality, if He be real, is not in the field of perception.

There is another channel of certainty,—authority. History, the weight of an institution, the consensus of opinion, the force of tradition, the pressure of society,—these all make for certainty. Upon authority in one form or another we are all dependent for some of our knowledge. But though authority may once have been the very source of his religious certainty, the college student, whether for better or for worse, soon learns to challenge it on general grounds, and at any rate is certain he can not accept Christ on that basis. That the church has accepted Christ is real, that many men still accept Him, that his parents do, is for the student not a sufficient ground of certainty. As a matter of fact, so he will contend, authorities may be quoted on both sides; and hence there is always a prior question: What certain criterion have I for choice between the disputing authorities?

There is a third means for arriving at certainty. It is depersonalized reason. It is what the student usually means by science. All his training as student, it seems to him, has been in the direction of validating reason. Atoms, the War of 1812, the inner constitution of the stars, Mendel's

laws, and in general all the facts and conclusions of science,—why is the student certain concerning these? It is not because of the evidence of his senses. To some degree, perhaps, authority has its say. But science gives certainty because it satisfies reason; even authority is always subject to rational check. Where reason vouches for reality, there and there alone can one be certain. Unfortunately for one who thus seeks Him, however, Christ is not to be found on the road of abstract reason; you will never demonstrate His reality in this way; there is no room in what we usually call science for a God-man and His paradoxical mediatorship.

Thus far we have three kinds of certainty: sensational, authoritative, and rational. As students, however, we question authority. We may not challenge sensation; but even so, Christ is not perceptible. Our one reliable ground is reason, but by the road of what we understand by reason Christ is not to be found. And thus the Christ of the college student is an uncertainty.

Unable to maintain that Christ is real, the student may assign to Christ a mystical or else a pragmatic "certainty". Indeed either of these two seems to be the recourse of much modern Protestantism.

"We can not be certain of Christ, it is true, but we have our unaccountable mystical experiences," so he may hold. But we can not take mystical experiences back with us into life; we can not objectify them, verify them, mediate them; they are out of touch with all else that we as students hold real. And if we thus divorce religion and mediated knowledge, while Christ may appear to us in mystical experience, He can not come to us with the absolute conviction that withstands the shock of actual living and knowing.

"We can not be certain of Christ, it is true, but we can live *as though* we were certain; Christ may not be real but He may nevertheless be humanly valid; He stimulates to noble action and the action to which He leads is a degree of proof of His reality." This is, I think, a fair statement of positions that for the sake of simplicity may be grouped together as pragmatism. But in order to validate our action and moral faith what we want is just the certainty and reality which is for the pragmatist admittedly absent and impossible.

Depersonalized and abstract reason, then, give us certainty, but no Christ; mysticism or pragmatism may give us a Christ, but no certainty.

* * * * *

If this brief statement of the student's difficulty be essentially correct, must we rest content with the student's conclusion? Is the dilemma real?

There are, it would seem, two assumptions basic to the dilemma.

First, the student assumes that rational certainty in the sciences is what he thinks it is.

Explanation or verification or certification in science may mean either of two. By it we may mean a reference of a finite A to a finite B; of B to C; of C to D; and so on indefinitely or else to a final rest in some major assumption. It is, I suppose, in some such fashion that the college student would proceed, for example, in scientifically explaining the World War.

We are certain of our facts when we refer them to other facts, and usually in the end to a general law. But explanation in science involves as well an opposite procedure. We explain, verify, objectify, become certain of, an ultimate law or fundamental principle not by referring it to something else but by referring all else in its universe to it.

And these two moments in explanation are never separate. But of the latter moment the college student is only vaguely conscious, if at all; and when he speaks of scientific certainty he thinks only of the former. Limit certainty to the former, however (and you do not have to be a student of the natural sciences only in order so to limit), limit certainty to the former and you can not be certain of Christ; whatever faith you have will have to retreat at every advance in knowledge. Nay, if Christ be the ultimate reality, then we are certain of Christ not because we are first certain of something else to which we can refer Him; but because we can be certain of all else only by reference to Him. He is the Light in which we see the light. He is the truth transcendent and therefore immanent in all truth. It may be the mystic means to tell us something of this sort.

The first assumption, then, is unwarranted. Rational certainty involves more than the student thinks it does or else it is not rational certainty.

There is a second assumption,—actually but another version of the first. We assume that truth is a matter of “mere intellect”. We separate prophecy from priesthood and kingship.

But if rational certainty be obtainable only in the degree that we accept the challenge of mediating the ultimate with the finite, then apart from direction, character, self-denial, and apart from appreciation, evaluation, aspiration, rational certainty is itself uncertain. If we as students are to be certain that Christ is the Prophet, we must know what a serious search after truth means; we must know what in our own lives it means to be priest and king. If there is no profound love for one's fellows, no sincere will to character, no real aspiration, if we do not know what sin is, if we do not know what it means to fall wretchedly short, if we come not as earnest seekers, if we do not know truth as a value,—then we can not be certain of our own certainty. Something of this is the message of the pragmatist.

The student will be increasingly certain of Christ only as he increasingly reveals Christ and finds Him revealed in and giving meaning to finite life. Not in the degree that you succeed in separating Christ and your life as student will you be certain of Him, but only in the degree that you root all your knowledge in Him.

True faith by inner necessity goes forth to conquer!

Not only may the student be certain that Christ is Prophet, Priest, and King, but his very studies may and should increase his certainty,—if he but be a student in the real sense! And the student whose study fails to ground itself in Christ, fails in his study.

DOING THE WILL OF GOD

LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER

AS it is true that God made the uttermost sacrifice in the death of His Son, it is equally true that His uttermost desire is that the knowledge of that sacrifice shall be proclaimed to all for whom it was made. In other words, the supreme purpose of God is to be realized in the missionary cause. This great fact is revealed in the Scripture and confirmed in every human experience; for the individual who is fully adjusted to the cause of Missions is invariably refreshed with the dew of Heaven, and the church which gives world-wide evangelization the first place in interest, prayer, and gifts, is without fail enlarged with all of the riches of divine grace. Missionary activity is not, then, a mere optional thing with the Christian; it is the one all-important objective and without it he is abnormal in God's sight and deprived of the Father's blessing. Interest in world-wide evangelization is distinctly foreign to the natural heart. It is supernatural. God alone loves the lost and it is only as His love is shed abroad in our hearts by the Spirit which is given unto us, that we will ever experience a genuine desire for the salvation of men. Love is the first and all-important fruit of the Spirit, which the Spirit creates in the heart that is adjusted to Him. Adjustment, then, is the key to all blessing in experience and service and this is something which presents a practical issue. That issue may be stated in the searching question: "*Am I willing to do God's will?*" When God's will is accepted as the final and abiding authority, His power is set free to enrich the life and to accomplish those good works which He has "before ordained that we should walk in them." This adjustment to God's will is not only the key to the riches of divine realities in this life, but is an important feature in the life to come.

When we have entered heaven by His grace, and have gained the larger vision and understanding of that sphere, we shall look back over our pilgrim pathway on the earth and have either joy, or regret, as we contemplate the life we have lived. There is a life of no regrets. It consists in having done the will of God. The divine plan and purpose will be recognized through all eternity as that which was God's very best for us.

To be yielded to Him is to allow Him to design and execute the position and effectiveness of our life. He alone can do this. Of all the numberless paths in which we might walk, He alone knows what is best. He alone has power to place our feet in that path and to keep them there, and He alone has love for us that will never cease to prompt Him to do for us all that is in His wisdom, power, and love to do. Truly the life is thrice blessed that learns to yield to the will of God.

Nothing could be more misdirected than a self-directed life. In our creation God has purposely omitted any faculty, or power, of self-direction. "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." (Jer. 10:23). It is the divine

plan that the element of guidance shall be supplied in us by God Himself. One of the results of the Adamic fall is the independence of the human will toward God; however, man is most spiritual and most conformed to the design of his Maker when he is most yielded to the divine will. What greater evidence of the fall do we need than that we must struggle to be yielded to Him? How much we feel we have gained when we can say, "Thy will, not mine be done"! It is because our daily life will be helpless and a failure apart from the leading of the Spirit, and because the Spirit has come to do this very work, that we can not be rightly adjusted to Him, or be spiritual, until we are yielded to the mind and will of God.

A yieldedness to the will of God is not demonstrated by some one particular issue; it is rather a matter of having taken the will of God as the rule of one's life. To be in the will of God is simply to be willing to do His will without reference to any particular thing He may choose. It is electing God's will to be final, even before we know what He may wish us to do. It is, therefore, not a question of being willing to do some one thing; it is a question of being willing to do *anything*, when, where, and how, it may seem best to His heart of love. It is taking the normal and natural position of childlike trust which has already consented to the wish of the Father even before anything of the outworking of His wish is revealed. This distinction can not be over-emphasized. It is quite natural to be saying: "If He wishes me to do something, let Him tell me and I will then determine what I will do." To a person in such an attitude of heart He reveals nothing. There must be a covenant relationship of trust in which His will is assented to *once for all* and without reservation. Why should it not be so? Might not our reluctance sometimes be stated in the words, "I know thee, hard taskmaster"? Is *He* a hard taskmaster? Is there any hope whatsoever that we of ourselves might be wise enough to choose what is best if we keep the directing of our lives in our own hands? Will the Father, whose love is infinite, impose upon His child? Or will He ever be careless?

We make no promise that we will not sin or violate the will of God when we yield to Him. We do not promise to change our own desires. The exact human attitude has been expressed in the words: "I am willing to be made willing to do His will." Let it be stated again that this question, so simple in itself, instantly becomes complicated when related to any concrete issue of obedience. It is the question only of the will of God in the abstract in which we have the assurance that in every detail He will work in us that which is well-pleasing in His sight. He will work in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure.

We may experience long waiting to ascertain what His will may be; but when it is clearly revealed, there can be no room for debate in the heart that would not quench the Spirit.

The highest motive for yielding to the will of God is not the mere desire for victory in life, or for power, or blessing. It is that we may live the sacrificial life which is the Christ life. Sacrificial does not mean painful; it is simply doing Another's will. Some pain may be in the path;

but the prevailing note is *joy*, and the blessing of the heart is *peace*.

All of this bears most vitally on the missionary enterprise. Those who are right with God, and who, therefore, experience His mind and love, will be given the heart-interest in this all-important service and will be placed where He would have them serve for Him.

"If our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God" (I John 3:20, 21). But no heart can be uncondemning which consciously withholds its all from Christ. So, also, we abide in His love only when we keep His commandments (John 15:10). And His supreme command, which is in agreement with His supreme purpose, is that His own, whom He has sent into the world even as the Father hath sent Him into the world, shall go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.

While all Christians are appointed to missionary activity, the locality and precise form of that service is to be worked out in each case by the immediate and personal leading of the Spirit of God. Some Christians will be called to the foreign field and some to serve at home. Christ alone will determine in each and every case, but His guidance and decision cannot be realized until a complete surrender to His will has been made. In any case, the same missionary zeal, missionary vision, and missionary training is required. If it is on a foreign field the need of thorough preparation is obvious. If the individual is called to service at home, there is likewise the same need for thorough preparation, since the church at home must have intelligent leadership and be given intelligent missionary development if she fulfils her part in sustaining the work abroad. Is not the present deplorable shrinking and retrenching on the part of many missionary societies chargeable to pastors who are indifferent in heart and disgracefully ignorant concerning the one great project which more than all else is committed to them and which is the supreme objective of God in this age? How remiss, too, a ministerial training is which places the study of missionary work and preparation for that service among the least important of its studies.

The personal responsibility is very simple indeed. Let the individual Christian first surrender everything to God and then depend upon His leading, and God will guide in the path which is according to His own infinite love, wisdom, and grace.

THE MISSIONARY CHALLENGE OF THE LEAGUE*

WILLIAM H. HOCKMAN

I FEEL led, first of all, to say a few words about the League, before we pass on to the more particular aspect of its missionary interests. I suppose I am as green as anybody, as far as actual touch with the League up to the present, although I have known about it and kept informed by conversation with various ones and by reading its literature. And my mind has been deeply moved, because anyone looking about the horizon of things can not but feel that there is something in the League idea which has come to the rescue of the present situation, so far as the Christian students and student activities are concerned.

I do not feel that the League needs any particular apology, and yet there is a sense in which the apology is an argument. The only apology the League needs to offer is to call attention to the present situation which prevails on every hand. Situations, you know, develop so subtly, conditions change so quietly and so unobtrusively that sometimes we need something or other to wake us up; and all at once we discover, if we take our bearings, that things are not what they used to be. It is something like the experience of drifting in a boat that has noiselessly slipped from its moorings and floated with the current down toward dangerous rocks and rapids.

My mind runs back some years ago, when some other organizations were started, just as this League is starting now; and the conditions which they met and the manner in which the new ideas took root and expanded may be of some help to us at the present time. I think of early gatherings of the S. V. B., and the Y. M. C. A., and the Y. W. C. A.; of the young men and young women in those conventions, regional and local gatherings, and one recalls that the outstanding thing about those meetings was the deep conviction that was written on the faces and showed itself in the voices and actions of all the delegates. You didn't need to ask anybody why they were there; they had come because of burning convictions on certain important matters, and they came for business, which was attended to with seriousness throughout all the sessions. Delegates were all there at the opening session, and remained till the closing hour, when they were loth to depart. In my student days it was my privilege to attend a number of Y. M. C. A. gatherings, when the whole conference from the very first hour until the close was just like one prolonged, most intense, prayer meeting.

All the Christian student organizations of the past generation had their birth in just such an atmosphere. What was it that attracted these people from their various campuses? It was either because they were already familiar with the contents of this holy Book, and its divine truths had gripped their souls, or else they were conscious of a deep spiritual

**This address was reported stenographically, but altered and corrected by the author. The message was given at the Missionary Meeting of the First Central Region League Conference, meeting at Wheaton College.*

hunger which they had reason to believe could be satisfied at one of these conferences. All other campus interests and activities were overshadowed by this characteristic Christian longing for the deepening of spiritual life and the salvation of souls.

But alas, with the passing of years, things have drifted; there has been a drift, and there has been a rift. If you would like to know how far those particular student organizations, and others like them, and the sentiment on the average campus have drifted, you should read carefully the reports of the sessions of the Milwaukee Conference, meeting some five years ago. You wouldn't believe it possible that young men and young women from our higher institutions of culture could get together and express themselves, under the leadership of certain outstanding liberalists, as they did on that occasion. If you would like to know more of that you can find it in the book I mentioned this morning, *The Red Fog*. Another book throwing a flood of light on the drift of our Christian institutions is Ernest Gordon's *Leaven of the Sadducees*. And if you want further evidence as to the drifting of our so-called Christian organizations, read first-hand reports from those who attended the Detroit Quadrennial gathering of the Student Volunteer Movement. On the platform were to be found none of the spiritual leaders of former years, but instead a group of men known to be of the liberal persuasion. Liberalism, of course, means uncertainty as to the Fundamentals of the Faith, uncertainty as to the Christian message, and mistiness as to the Christian program. One of the prominent speakers has drifted so far from the Christian verities that on an important occasion when appealed to by a large group of earnest spiritual seekers he advised them to send to India for a noted non-Christian Hindu philosopher! Another person prominent on the program was compelled to vacate an important secretarial position because of the violent protests against his liberal theology and pink sociology.

Now we are face to face with the most serious crisis in our generation, and it is high time to find some rallying point and effect some kind of organization by which can be linked up the young men and women of our campuses who stand for the truths of the old Book and who acknowledge the Lordship of Jesus Christ. The present situation in colleges and seminaries, and in the Christian Church at large, most certainly warrants the launching of such an organization as the League, as a means of strengthening the fellowship and directing the activities of conservative students. There is a tremendous need for an organization that will link up the scattered groups and individuals, numbering into the thousands, for the kind of service that is being neglected and for upholding the ideals that are lost or forgotten. Many of the older organizations have lost their first vision and convictions, and with the loss of convictions has come a total change in character and goal. That the old challenge has nearly died out may be noted from the sad falling off in response to the Student Volunteer Movement, which ten years ago registered some two thousand new names, but last year found the number dwindled down to some two hundred applicants.

The only real question is, *Are there young men and women who will rise up today, with sufficient vision and conviction, to pay the price for carrying on just this kind of program which the League offers?* If only a small group of consecrated students take this matter seriously, who can measure the results?

Mark you, it is not a case of opening a new cafeteria in a community already more than provided with eating houses; but it is like providing relief for a famine-stricken land. With all our religious institutions and organizations, we are in the midst of a terrible spiritual famine, with the knowledge of God obscured, and with many false prophets leading the blind into the ditch. To meet the desperate need the League offers a helping hand of relief.

Turning our thought into another direction, may we ask how big is the conception of the League, how wide are its sympathies? Is it to be occupied only with local campus problems, or is it to grasp the vision of world need and missionary service—and there is nothing that expresses breadth of vision more than the missionary aspect of an organization or group;—if the League has a vision, and has place in its sympathies for the whole world-wide plan and program of our Lord Jesus Christ, then it has something that will carry it on and carry it through. The League needs the missionary element, needs the world-wide vision; and too, the missionary movement needs the League, for there are young men and women on all our campuses with the old time conviction and fire, but they are not linked up in any organized fellowship.

The world situation is a call to all who love our Lord Jesus Christ. With the whole world like a seething pot, with ominous clouds and fearful thunderings on every hand, with wide open missionary doors swinging shut, and with the last commission of our ascended Lord ringing in our ears, what are we going to do? With the terrible conditions that prevail in Europe and China, and the threatenings that portend a coming storm in India and Africa, some might ask, "Is the day of Missions past?" As an answer let us say, that, in the midst of the almost unbelievable chaos and sufferings, the hearts of the multitudes are crying out as never before for the life-giving Word, and never were missionaries more gladly welcomed by the populace than at this present hour.

Can such a comparatively small and humble group, as at present constitutes the League, do anything worth while to meet these appalling needs—on our own campuses, and over in Russia, China, and Africa? That all depends upon whether we get the vision or not, and whether the Spirit of the Lord has His unhindered way with us. Here is one of the greatest challenges ever put before any group of students! Are there willing and yielded hearts who will pay the price of praying this thing through?

IS THERE A CONFLICT BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION?*

L. FRANKLIN GRUBER**

YOU will notice that my subject is expressed in the form of a question, "Is there a conflict between science and Religion?" Perhaps the reason why it is put in that form is because that is the question which is in the minds of people when they discuss the subject of the first chapter of Genesis. If that were the only way in which the question could be worded and if I were asked to give a categorical answer to it, my answer would be in one word: it would be "No."

Volumes have been written on the subject, and many a magazine article, upon the mistaken notion that there is a conflict between *science* and *religion*, and now I am telling you that there isn't any conflict between them. Let us then see what religion is and let us see what science is, and then you will see the reason for my statement. Science has to do with the facts and laws of nature, while religion, in its primary sense, has to do with the relation and attitude of the heart to God. If some great architect had a loving wife, she would love him because of his person, not because of the building he has erected. Her love for her husband would be one thing and her admiration for his building would be quite another thing. The one would be a personal relationship between herself and her husband, the other would be a study of his work. The one would be a matter of the heart, and the other would be a matter of the head. As the two would belong to altogether different categories, there could be no real direct comparison between them. There could be no conflict between a friendship and a cathedral. No more could we speak of such a conflict than we could speak of a conflict between a song and a sunset. They don't belong to the same classification at all.

Now just as there could be no conflict between a personal friendship and a building, so there can be no conflict between the spiritual relationship of a person to God and a study of God's works, or between religion and science. The one is a personal relationship between spirit and spirit, between the soul and God; the other is an intellectual investigation of physical nature, or God's works. Surely, between science and religion, as thus understood, there could, therefore, be no conflict.

I shall now put the question in this form, "Is there a conflict between nature and Scripture?" Again, in anticipation of the explanation which I hope to make later on, I say there is none. There never has been; there never will be—upon one supposition and that supposition is that nature is from God and that Scripture is from God. If both nature and Scripture are from God, we can readily see that there could be no conflict between them.

*Copyright, 1930, by L. Franklin Gruber.

**Part of an address, as stenographically reported; and adapted by the author. This address was delivered at the First Central Region Conference of the League, held recently at Wheaton College.

I am just now partly rewriting one of my earlier publications, a publication which appeared first about eleven years ago. And I am sure there are some conflicts between my present position and the position which I held eleven years ago. There is a conflict between these two positions because I have changed somewhat in the course of eleven years. Now God has two volumes of truth; the one is Scripture, the other is nature, which is much older than Scripture. But God does not change. I may change. You may change. We all grow. God does not grow or change. He knew just as much a million years ago as He did last night or as He will tomorrow. There is no change in the knowledge of God, because it is that of an infinite Being. Therefore, there can be no conflict between the volume of nature and the second and later volume, the volume of Scripture, assuming that God is the author of both.

I shall merely *assume*, for the present, that He is the author of both volumes. I shall not now enter into a further development of this point. I shall come back to it presently. But I shall ask you for the moment to *accept* these two premises, namely, that nature is from God and that Scripture is from God. Then, surely, there never could be a conflict between them.

I shall now pass to another phrasing of the question for this particular subject, "Is there a conflict between science and theology?" You will notice that I have asked a different question each time. Now, if I put the question in this third form, my answer is, "Yes, there is, there always was, and there always will be, a conflict between *science* and *theology*."

My reason for this statement is not far to seek. First of all, let us get a clear understanding as to the meaning of these two terms. What is science? It may very aptly be defined as the accumulated interpretation of nature. Then, what is theology? Well, it is exactly with reference to Scripture what science is in reference to nature. It is the sum-total of the interpretation of God's revealed Word. I am sure you will agree that we do not yet *fully* understand this sacred Book of ours. There are some things in it that we have not yet learned. Don't let anybody make you believe that the last word of the interpretation of God's Word has been spoken. As long as God's Spirit is with the Church, and as long as the Church is sincere in her search after truth, so long ought she to be led more and more into the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. Therefore, we do not yet have full knowledge, we do not yet inerrantly know all that is in God's Word.

What about nature? What about science? Some of us still remember the day when men of science used to say, "Surely there is a limit to our researches. The greatest discoveries have been made in the past and we are largely only interpreting what already has been laid bare." They thought that somehow the world had come to the climax of its researches and that science and discovery would not in the future make the progress that they had made in the past. Then came the discoveries of the X-rays and radium, and a multitude of others too numerous for me to recite;

and today we are standing on the eve of what I believe will be the greatest epoch of discovery in the history of science.

After all, how much do we really know? We know about as much of nature as a boy who wants to see a football game, or perchance a baseball game, and doesn't have the quarter to get into the bleachers. But he somehow finds a knot-hole into which he can put two of his little fingers, after which a rude policeman pushes him away twenty feet. How much of the game would he see if he were twenty feet away from a knot-hole just big enough for his two little fingers? Well, about that much we know of the great whole of God's creation and what it contains. Hence, for anybody to say that science has spoken her last word as to the facts of the universe, is simply to betray that he knows nothing about it. Therefore, for science to say that our interpretation of nature in this twentieth century is final, is to claim what it is very well known is not true.

Now, my friends, you see that there is necessarily a conflict between science and theology, because our theology is not a complete and perfect interpretation of Scripture, just as science is not a complete and perfect interpretation of nature. Not until science and theology both become complete and inerrant, will the conflict between them cease. And that will not take place on this side of the pearly gates.

What should be our attitude in the meantime? Don't think that this question is going to be settled tonight, next year, or in ten years from now. Don't think it will be settled in our time. It is not going to be settled until the last chapter of the universe will be closed, when we shall see eye to eye and know as we are known. Meanwhile we should not be disturbed by the conflict, but patiently await more light.

But you will remember that I have *assumed* two premises as the basis for my argument. I have assumed that nature is from God and that Scripture is from God. Some objector might now say, "You are merely making assumptions." Someone might tell you that we have no more proof that nature is from God than that Scripture is from God. You might even be told that humanity is the product of an upward thrust and merely creates its own Deity or is its own created Divinity. Thus, there are some people who are still arguing that to say that nature is from God is begging the question. But to say that nature is *not* from God is to say that nature can be a self-existent entity.

It is as impossible for the universe to be a self-existent entity as it is for two plus three to be a million. I see a chandelier hanging there, and I ask the question, "What supports the chandelier?" Your answer naturally would be, "The beam." "What supports the beam?" "The wall." "What supports the walls?" "The earth." "What supports the earth?" "The sun". "What supports the sun?" "Why, some other sun or center of gravity." "What supports that other sun or center of gravity?" "Some other center of gravity". . . . You understand enough about mathematics to know that you cannot add enough integers together to constitute an infinite. Hence, there must be a *last* link somewhere in that chain of supports. No matter what the nature of that link is, it must be supported

by something that lies beyond it, something that is not material like the other links. And that which supports the last link and therefore the links of the whole chain, must be a non-physical entity or a spiritual personality, or what we call God, Who must necessarily be greater than the universe which He created and upholds.

Now, what is true of God with reference to the universe, is true of Him with reference to the Bible. It, too, must be from God. For example, as to that first chapter of Genesis, I am convinced that we have not yet caught up with the full meaning of it. The more I read it, the more light breaks upon me from new and unexpected angles. For example, it contains certain statements which, until our times, were wholly irreconcilable with human knowledge. Thus it states that the sun was made on the fourth day. The fact is that the man who wrote it, if he had tried to write it from the standpoint of all the knowledge of his time, would have put the sun into the first day; and he would have jeopardized his literary and scientific reputation, such as it was, by putting it anywhere but in that day. And yet, in the light of twentieth century science, it is exactly the fourth day where it belongs and nowhere else. Where could the writer get the information from, if he was not divinely inspired? To say that it was a poetic guess is to give the writer credit for the greatest scientific generalization from the standpoint of known facts that has ever been made in the annals of human knowledge.

May I give you a few side-lights as to what I believe is the gist of that creation story? The records says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Then it starts all over again, "And the earth was waste and void;" and it continues to speak about the *earth* and its creatures, only incidentally, as it were, referring to the sun, moon and stars, in putting them into functioning relationship with the earth. Those six creative days, therefore, do not belong to any other world than ours. Then a little later the story gives a more detailed account of the creation of man. It is a misunderstanding of these facts that has caused so much confusion as to this passage.

There are thus really three accounts of creation. The first is the account of what might be called the *cosmic* creation, inclusive of our earth. In one sweeping statement it gives the entire cosmic creative history, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." That verse would thus be true for every other world by the mere substitution of the name of that world for the earth. Thus if it were written for the planet Mars, it would read, "In the beginning God created the heavens and Mars." And so for any other world. The second story is plainly that of the *terrestrial* creation, inclusive of man. Therefore, it gives the creative story of the earth, not that of the planet Mars, or of any other body in space. It is meant to be the account of creation of *our* world for our world's *inhabitants*. Nor would this story of the six creative days fit any other world in its details, for there would no doubt be differences between the creative stories of all worlds. The third story is that of what might be called the

human creation or the story, in greater detail, of the creation of man, together with the account of the origin of sin.

Each of these three accounts of creation ends with and includes a brief statement of the one succeeding, and each succeeding one gives in greater detail the account of the one with which the former ended. Thus the story of the cosmic creation includes the earth, because the earth is a part of it. The second, or the story of the creation of our earth, includes man, because he is a part of it. The third, or the story of the creation of man in greater detail, adds the story of the origin of sin. If this whole account of the threefold creation is read in the light of this interpretation, these three parts become beautifully harmonious and consistent.

As I read the first chapter of Genesis, I thus find that it is not in conflict with science in so far as science interprets nature aright. As we know more of our universe and of the world upon which we live, so shall we understand the first chapter of Genesis better and better. My contention, therefore, is that the story of creation, instead of being in conflict with nature, is wholly in accord with the facts of nature, but that we have not yet fully interpreted the facts of nature nor completely and inerrantly interpreted the story in Genesis.

Surely, in the light of what I have already said, there should not be much difficulty even on the part of the somewhat skeptical that Scripture is from God. And I might now take up other points in a somewhat similar manner and arrive at the same conclusion, so that with the force of the cumulative nature of the argument, virtually all doubt should disappear from the minds of most men. Hence, both nature and Scripture being from God, that there could be no conflict between them should need no further proof.

If I studied the building of some great architect, I could learn a great deal about the builder from the structure which he has erected. But if I should want to know more of the builder than I could learn from his building, I should have to read his biography. Now nature is like that building and the Bible is like the biography. What you cannot learn from the building concerning its infinite Architect, that you must learn from His inspired biography. I have, therefore, no trouble in reconciling nature and Scripture. The conflict is therefore not between science and religion, nor between nature and Scripture; but it is between our interpretations of these two sources of truth.

The works of God can never be in conflict with what is in truth the Word of God, whatever conflict there may be between our interpretations of truths in those two realms. Nor need we ever be afraid of the issue, whithersoever truth may lead us. Our motto may safely be as to both truth and the great Author of truth, "Where Thou leadest, I will follow." It is true that many a fainting heart may tremble and some may fall by the wayside, but the danger is not in the truth but in those who fear for its safety. The trembling for the truth on the part of some men is often only a transfer of motion from their own trembling selves to the truth

which is eternally fixed and unchangeable. As a voyager on the ocean at night sees the stars of heaven shuttling to and fro with every rolling billow, so some men see truth trembling upon its immovable throne. But as the voyager is simply transferring his own swaying motion to the stars, so the apparent trembling of the truth is but a transfer of motion from men's own trembling hearts. God's truth itself is as fixed and permanent as are the apparently fixed stars of heaven.

THE WORD MADE FLESH*

P. B. FITZWATER

"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us" (John 1:14).

THE Word in that time had a definite connotation. No explanation is offered; no inquiry was made, because the meaning was clearly understood. This Greek term was used to designate the historic person, Jesus of Nazareth.

First, Who Was This Word?

Three things are asserted of Him.

I. John declares that He was the one who was "in the beginning". This means that He was existent before time. He was the Eternal One.

II. He was "with God". This means that the Eternal One had a personal existence. His being was separate and apart from God and was associated with God. As a personal Being, He had fellowship with God.

III. The One who was with God "was God." In these masterful sentences, Jesus is declared to be the Eternal God.

Second, What Took Place, "made flesh"?

By being made flesh is meant that this Eternal One became man. There was taken up into the divine personality the human nature. This is what is commonly expressed by the word "incarnation". This means that the eternal personality embodied Himself and tabernacled among men. The divine and human natures interpenetrated each other, becoming one. In this union there was not the intermingling of two natures merely, but the one personality united to a human nature. In this coming together, there was no violation of the integrity of either. He was very God of very God. It was not the divine nature filling the human as an empty vessel is filled with its substance. This union which was effected, became inseparable. What the Son of God became, He still is.

Third, When Did This Union Take Place?

I. It was Purposed in Eternity. The incarnation was included in the divine decree. The plan of the universe included it. God's plan was one, therefore the incarnation was not His afterthought provoked by man's fall. God's plan was not only one, but complete. It embraced no contingencies. It was not subject to modification by the introduction of another one. Christ's relationship to the universe is vital and organic. It is the pivot upon which all creation swings. It is not only the ground of redemption, but the medium through which the whole universe is carried forward to its goal.

II. The Divine Purpose Fulfilled in Time (Luke 1:35).

This fulfillment of the divine purpose took place when Christ was born in Bethlehem. It is to be observed that this was not the beginning of His personality, but its entrance upon the condition of humanity.

1. The humanity was created by the Holy Ghost "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee." We thus see that the humanity of our Lord orig-

*An abstract, by the author, of a Chapel address given at the recent Regional Conference at Wheaton College.

inated in the humanity of the virgin mother by the creative power of the Holy Spirit.

2. The Eternal Son united Himself with the created humanity "the power of the highest shall overshadow thee". While God the Spirit was creating the human nature, God the Son was overshadowing and uniting Himself to the humanity thus originated.

Fourth, The Purpose of the Incarnation.

I. It Revealed the Father (John 1:18). "No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." In order that God might reveal Himself to man, He appeared in human nature. In the virgin birth of Jesus Christ we have fulfilled the anthropomorphism of Scripture.

II. To Bridge the Chasm Between God and Man. This chasm was the result of sin. As soon as Adam had sinned, he hid himself. The history of the race proves the existence of such a chasm. Paul refers to the nations of the world as feeling after God (Acts 17:27). Job exclaimed, "Oh, that I knew where I might find him:" (Job 23:3). This shows the out-reaching of the human heart after a Being suited to its needs. The incarnation of God in Christ is in harmony with the universal instincts of man. It has been declared that no form of religion is known in which there is no incarnation. Its necessity lies imbedded in human consciousness. All human philosophy and religion are but the expression of man's vain effort to bridge this chasm between man and God. Human philosophy has tried by various mediators or emanations to bridge this chasm. Idolatry is man's vain attempt to make God real to the senses.

III. To Lay Hold Upon Man and Save Him (Heb. 2:14, 16).

The divine method of salvation is not by example or incentive, but by a definite apprehension of the lost individual. When thus the divine Saviour incorporated Himself with the race, there was established an organic union which makes the life of the individual dependent upon the life of the Son of God.

IV. To Rescue the Whole Creation (Rom. 8: 19-22).

The deliverance of creation from its bondage is dependent upon a redemption of the sons of God. The whole creation is groaning under its burdens. These burdens shall be removed when the fulness of redemption shall come to realization. From this we see that the incarnation in its implication has:

1. A cosmic relation (Col. 1:16). All things were created by Him in heaven and earth, visible and invisible, whether they were thrones or dominions. Not only were things created by Him, but by Him all things consist (Col. 1:17). The atoms of the material world are held together by the divine immanence. They not only hold together in Christ, but all things shall be united in Him (Ephes. 1:10). In the dispensation of the fulness of time, all things in heaven and earth, visible and invisible, shall be gathered together in one, even in Christ.

2. A soteriological relation. The things created are preserved by the energy of the immanent God. By virtue of the vital connection

between Christ and the world which He created, new life is imparted to the universe. We thus see that salvation is possible through the cosmic relationship of God. The only possible way of salvation is as the lost are apprehended by Christ.

3. Eschatological relation. The plan of God comprehends a goal. In order that the goal might be attained, there must be a proper dynamic or force. The immanent God through the incarnation, assures the accomplishment of this end. The end thus made possible will surpass any picture made by the most devoted evolutionist. God is moving forward to an end. His purpose cannot fail, because He is linked with it. The truths of God's Word are thus seen to be in harmony with right philosophy and all true science. God is the God of nature, as well as the God of revelation.

NEWS AND NOTES

In an editorial we have endeavored to show that in movements which are *not* conservative, there exists the recognition of a definite and immediate need for improving the religious life of our schools. How faculties can be concerned after many of them have done their utmost to root out all that would lead to a valid and proper Christian philosophy—we cannot tell, but they are concerned!

The General Secretary of the League completed the trip mentioned in the last EVANGELICAL STUDENT. In schools visited, the Secretary found precisely the same conditions as are mentioned in the article to which we have just alluded.

The General Secretary and His Trip

After visiting the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada in their Holiday Retreat, and presenting the work of the League there, and in several Toronto schools, the Secretary began his first trip in the States.

In twenty-nine days, twenty-seven different schools were visited. Of that number the following have Chapters or Branches: Cleveland Bible Institute, Oberlin College, Muskingum College, Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Calvin College, Calvin Theological Seminary, and Western Theological Seminary.

The non-League schools visited were: Baldwin-Wallace College, Nast Theological Seminary, Ashland College, College of Wooster, Heidelberg College, Geneva College, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Western Theological Seminary, Denison University, Ohio State University, Otterbein College, Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College, Bonebrake Theological Seminary, Central Theological Seminary, Taylor University, Marion College, Goshen College, Hope College, and Kalamazoo College.

It is significant to notice the distribution of the schools visited

	League Schools	Non- League Schools	Totals
Bible Schools	1	0	1
Theological Seminaries	3	8	11
Colleges and Universities	4	13	17
	—	—	—
Totals	8	21	29

From this summary one notes the large percentage of *colleges* and *universities* which were visited. The League is truly an interscholastic organization, and it endeavors to reach students in undergraduate institutions, as well as those in post-graduate Christian schools.

There is but little space for a discussion of the observations of the Secretary. We can hope to bring only a few details of the visits. Twenty various meetings were addressed by the Secretary, as a representative of the League, and four all-day college personal conferences were held. Here is a work which itself would be worth the efforts of the League—the private and close discussion with individuals, and the attempt to meet problems in the light of the truths of Scripture.

What impressed the Secretary further, was the very evident spiritual bankruptcy of certain national student organizations in their local campus activities, and their utter failure to present a wholesome and true evangelical message. By this, it is not meant that all of the students met, were not standing for the faith, nor that where an evangelical testimony was not found, that there were no students on that campus who had convictions concerning the truth. What is meant, is that in thirteen instances, no voice of corporate protest was found—no stand against the destructive influences of liberalism.

Here were men eager to know of an honest attempt to place squarely before student America, the issues of modern Christendom; and *there* were men longing to know of the specific claims of the gospel ministry, and the high privileges thereof. There were others who rejoiced to know of the glories of the Christian life. Some were simply curious to hear of such an organization as the League. Whatever the case, there was deep spiritual hunger, unsatisfied longing and craving for spiritual truth and reality, in the lives of both men and women students. With what joy the Word was ministered; and with what delight the uncompromising nature and character of the gospel set forth in the language of Scripture!

The Prologue of the League Constitution was composed several years ago. If it were to close this account, it would be a fitting comment on the need for the League. Here is a portion of that opening section of the Constitution:

"Inasmuch as mutually exclusive conceptions of the nature of the Christian religion exist in the world today and particularly in theological seminaries and other institutions of higher learning; and since it is the duty of those who share and cherish the evangelical faith to witness to it and to strive for its defense and propagation; and in view of the value for this end of common counsel, united effort and Christian fellowship: . . . do hereby form a League . . ."

Already one school has formed a Chapter as a result of this trip, and word of the Lord's blessing in other places has been received. Please God the work will continue, and the Secretary be permitted to take other similar tours!

First Central Region Conference

In a brief but happy visit with the Moody Chapter, at one of its meetings the General Secretary proposed a Regional Conference. The result was that the two Chicago chapters, Northern Baptist and Moody, worked with Headquarters in making such a gathering possible. Wheaton College cordially opened its doors and assisted in a number of ways, so that a three-day Conference was held on March 28th, 29th, and 30th.

Because of the lingering traces of a recent blizzard, the quiet beauty of the Wheaton campus was hidden from the view of the delegates, as they filtered through Blanchard Hall. Out-of-town visitors were few, but though the attendance at the meetings was low, the spiritual tone and character of the sessions were high. The League President, Mr. Dirk Mellema, of Calvin Theological Seminary, presided at all of the sessions. Marion

College sent a good delegation, and Northern Baptist and Moody were both represented. Fraternal delegates came from Aurora College, Michigan State College, and Wheaton College.

President James Oliver Buswell, of Wheaton College, gave the opening address and welcome. His speech was a vigorous defense of the *esprit de corps* and the attitude of the League and indeed, of all aggressive evangelicals. It is with regret that we find it impossible to print the whole address. Among some of the choice points, Dr. Buswell said, concerning the League: "We oppose certain tendencies and teachings in the world today because we feel that we have a better way. These things must be opposed because they act as hindrances to the cause of Christ, and they are put forward as a substitute for the pure, unadulterated gospel . . . We cannot preach the gospel without telling what it *isn't*, as well as what it *is*. There are certain sharp distinctions which need to be emphasized in our world today." The speaker concluded with a ringing appeal: "And so we stand before the world today, a group of students in various institutions. We do not desire to stir up strife and noise and confusion; we desire only that the truth may be known, that the truth may shine out clearly, positively . . . I believe God has called us to a separated life, separated from compromise with false doctrine; from indifferent, false teaching; separated from worldliness and sin and corruption, so that our life may shine, so that our fellowship may be the real, deep, and true kind, as we look for our Lord Jesus Christ, and hope for His appearing. Amen."

The first breathing spell of the Conference was spent in a fellowship supper hour, at the College Dining Hall.

What was lost in numbers was more than gained in the testimonies of the Praise service Saturday evening. Joy in the Lord, and gratitude for the League were both voiced in notes of praise from saved students. Here are what some of them remarked. A theological student, but four years from Russia, said: "I am certainly thankful and glad that I am connected with the League of Evangelical Students. I hope that God will give me courage to be strong in the faith." His fellow-delegate spoke, "I want to express my thanks for the League as it goes forth to stand in the colleges. I admire this effort for the reason that a student is faced with men who attempt to undermine his faith, and I must say that it is not in vain nor established in vain." "I am glad to belong to an organization that stands for the fundamentals of the faith and, as was said this afternoon, calls us to separate ourselves"—thus spoke a young lady member of the League. And a Wheaton student, from Canada, concluded by saying, "I think there is a need for this League and I am praying that more students will come in contact with the League."

A professor from a nearby college spoke briefly, "I will say this—our contact thus far has been pleasant and hopeful . . . Certainly anyone who is acquainted with present-day trends of thought will see the importance of such an organization as this, functioning among the colleges and universities of the country."

The evening meeting was addressed by Dr. H. Framer Smith, one of

the most faithful friends of the League. He spoke on, "The Sufficiency of Christian Belief". We hope to print his address in a later issue of the EVANGELICAL STUDENT. Dr. Smith is Faculty Advisor of the Moody Chapter.

A very gracious time of fellowship and prayer was that in the Sunday morning and the Monday morning devotions, both of which were led by President Mellema. He gave short, telling messages; one an exposition of Psalm 40:1-3, and the other a word of encouragement from II Chronicles 20.

Sunday morning worship was with the Wheaton College Interdenominational Church. The speaker was Dr. Walter Wilson, of Kansas City, Mo.

Those who heard Dr. Hockman in the Sunday afternoon Missionary Meeting, were gladdened by his stirring and appealing challenge. His message appears in this number.

Lord's Day evening, the delegates worshipped with the College Church of Christ, when L. Franklin Gruber D.D., LL.D. gave the address. This, his first appearance on a League platform, was heartily welcomed; and readers of the EVANGELICAL STUDENT will be delighted with his article, which appears elsewhere in this issue.

Dr. P. B. Fitzwater was the speaker at the Wheaton College Chapel period, Monday morning. The nature and design of the incarnation were strongly developed in his address, which we are printing in abstract form, in this number.

A most profitable hour of business and discussion was held following Chapel. Reports which the chapters gave, are published in "NEWS AND NOTES". Among other topics mentioned, were the questions of further Regional Conferences, and the Summer Camp project. An informal recommendation of the delegates, indicated that the League groups in other sections be urged to sponsor similar meetings; and that they endeavor to have some sort of sectional camp this summer. It was pointed out that there would be great value in such camps, not only in fellowship for Leaguers, but also for vital contacts with students in other schools. Opportunities for discussion of fall and winter programs would be also afforded, so as to render such a venture altogether worthwhile.

Monday afternoon, the Rev. E. M. Wadsworth, Director of the Great Commission Prayer League, led the devotional hour of the closing session. He gave a happy and joyous exposition of the truth of the believer's union with Christ.

Dr. A. C. Gaebelein concluded the Conference with a glowing exposition of the "Five-Fold Glory of Christ". This well-rounded address we hope to publish in the October number of this magazine. It was a proper conclusion to the Conference and a worthy tribute to the Lord whose the League is, and Whom it serves.

Thanks are due the Wheaton students who made the music of the Conference such a success. And the gratitude of the League goes out to the College and Church communities which so gladly ministered to the needs of the delegates both through entertainment and accommodating

of the Conference; and to the numerous other friends who so kindly helped in arrangements.

Among the Chapters*

The following news notes are culled from recent reports and letters to Headquarters. Personal contact with the groups at Cleveland, Muskingum, Northern Baptist, and Western, has revealed very earnest and faithful striving for the faith. The items given here are but illustrations of some of the work done by League members everywhere.

CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

"We at Calvin are a group whole-heartedly interested in the League and giving our entire moral support to the League. Last year we carried on a campaign and secured some \$1200.00.

"Outside of that, this year we have held only brief meetings . . . but our interest continues. We shall never leave the work because we feel that there are other students who ought to be helped along in the sense that they should feel that they are not alone."

CENTRAL COLLEGE

"We are planning deputation work to small churches near Pella, presenting the League work, in connection with a lecture on Japan to raise money for Ferris Seminary . . . The local group has a two thousand dollar debt on a Prayer Room in memory of Jennie Kuyper at Ferris Seminary, which is to be raised this year, if possible."

MARION COLLEGE

"The League is connected with the Student Conference. We have services, held every Sunday at various points around Marion; the jail, the Children's Home, the County Infirmary, the Old Ladies' Home . . . Then in connection with that we have our own church organization; a missionary organization, and that has special prayer meetings and services every Thursday night, in addition to our prayer meetings."

MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE

"We have two meetings a month in the League. Our first meeting is a business meeting . . . Only matters of business come out and they 'snap through' them in ten or fifteen minutes. The rest of the time we have an address—always trying to have the address of a philosophical nature, something that would be interesting, something that would concern the philosophy of the Christian religion."

"Our meeting the third week of the month we call devotional . . . We insist that our speaker make his address purely devotional."

REFORMED EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

"The Reformed Episcopal group faces the problem that most thoroughly orthodox seminary groups are up against. It is the problem of a

*This part of the magazine is for the interchange of ideas in chapter organization, program, and activities. League groups should see that the Secretaries send in word of their unit. Reports for the League BULLETIN or STUDENT should be sent directly to Headquarters.

special activity which will advance the cause of Christ in a special way, under the particular auspices of the League."

"The activities decided upon were in addition to a special emphasis upon personal work: Instituting a morning chapel group for prayer one morning a week, in addition to the regular seminary weekly service . . . Then once a month a meeting was held at the Presbyterian Old Ladies' Home here in Philadelphia. A service of song and cheer, with our seminary quartette helping us out several times, and with other special features and a sermon by one of our men, was held every third Thursday evening."

"Three business meetings have been held . . . At the middle meeting a magazine article was read and discussed, with the idea that just as the college man fails to keep in close enough touch with the Church and her teachings of the fundamental truths, so the seminary man loses, all too often, sight of what his congregation is reading and the influences working in the psychology of those whom he is trying to lead to Christ."

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

"Three of the men have steady work preaching; one has complete charge of a mission Sabbath School; and all the rest are teaching in Sabbath School, or connected with Y. M. C. A. work."

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

"Every Friday a prayer group has been held in the Christian association building on the campus. This little gathering starting with five or six, has grown until eighteen or twenty are regularly present."

"As to the program of the group, we have been holding meetings about once a month to discuss papers presented by members upon the general topic of Christian evidences. The start was made through a presentation of the proofs for the existence of God, and then was followed with the consequent thought that such a God would reveal Himself; and then by four papers presenting external and internal proofs for the Old and New Testaments. Of the fall conference (Regional) you are already informed. A committee has just been formed to set the day in May, and the place, and choose a speaker at a dinner to be held by the group to close the year. The other chapters will be invited to attend. Last year Dr. Machen was the speaker and twenty-two were present. I am sure that this year the meeting will be even more of a success."

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON*

"Our group meets each Tuesday noon between 12:10 and 12:40 and the first Monday evening of each month. Our noon meetings are a rotating leadership type, for the purpose of promoting freedom of action and thinking, while testifying or witnessing for Christ. The latter part of the noon meetings is devoted to prayer and communication with him. The Monday evening meetings are devoted to discussion and instruction on how to approach our campus companions in an effort to win them for Christ."

*The University of Washington Chapter, and the Gospel Team group of Ashland College, are the two newest units to apply for membership in the League. This is a matter of much rejoicing.

WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

“Our chapter seems very close to the League because of mutual understanding . . . We have no special functions of the League because all interests are merged into one . . . But we have our Tuesday night gathering, and class prayer meetings regularly. Other prayer groups are personal . . .”

“The boys are very active in the city doing deputation work, preaching, in mission work, and so forth. Perhaps three-fourths of the men are engaged in some special work on Sundays or during the week.”

HERE AND THERE

IN THE LEAGUE AT LARGE

Many heard the message concerning the League, given by the General Secretary over radio station WMBI, April the fifteenth. Pray that students may respond to the appeal for new League centres, and that a host of Christians may become earnest supporters of the movement.

We are deeply grateful to God for all His mercies. Another token of His loving kindness came but recently.

A devoted friend of the work was led to provide the means for the Secretary to make a much-needed visit to the East. It is his purpose to visit as many of the groups as possible, and to make visits to many new and old contacts.

The occasion of the trip is a student gathering at the home of Dr. and Mrs. Henry M. Woods, of Ventnor, Atlantic City.

Mr. Kenneth Hooker, Traveling Secretary of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada is an expected guest, as well as a number of League members from Eastern schools. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson is to be one of the leaders and speakers.

We trust that our readers will pray that rich blessing might come from this fellowship, and that the League bonds will be strengthened not only by this means, but also by means of the Secretary's visits among students, on various campuses on the Atlantic Coast.

IN OTHER CIRCLES

The French Student Christian Movement contains this interesting note in its annual report by the General Secretary: “What can the great Christians teach us, from St. Augustine to St. Thomas, from Calvin to Pascal, from Rivière to the Catholic novelists of today? These are the questions that are being asked, and they witness to such a profound need for positive and decisive certainties, that certain students are even demanding that we give up the too often profitless study-circle discussions, and devote ourselves to organizing courses in dogmatics.”

The Eleventh Annual Conference of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions was held from April fourth to tenth. It convened at High Leigh, Hoddesdon, Herts, England, with some of the speakers being: Rt. Rev. Bishop Taylor-Smith, A. Rendle Short, and others. Our readers are asked to remember this gathering in prayer, that its influence may be extended for blessing. Let our readers pray for this English student witness, which now numbers groups in twenty-two different universities in Great Britain and Ireland. The Honorable Secretary is Mr. Douglas Johnson, 49, Highbury Park, London, N.

WHO ARE THE WRITERS IN THIS ISSUE?

W. H. JELLEMA, Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy, in Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan. Professor Jellema has done brilliant work in that position, and in this issue contributes a very cogent discussion of student problems.

LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER, M. D., is President of Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Texas. He is a noted Bible teacher and author. Among some of his most widely-read works are: *Grace, Major Bible Themes, Salvation, and He That Is Spiritual*. Besides his work as a preacher and teacher, Dr. Chafer is busy with various inter-denominational enterprises.

WILLIAM H. HOCKMAN, D. D., was in college days Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. and leader of the local Volunteer Band. He has spent twenty-five years in China, engaged principally in educational work among the Chinese youth. In that period he was a member of the National Christian Council during the first years of its existence, and also a member of various Committees dealing with the problems of student life. He is now Director of the Missionary Course of the Moody Bible Institute.

L. FRANKLIN GRUBER, D. D., LL. D., of the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary is new to most of us. But his influence both as a preacher and a scholar are far-reaching. President Gruber has written several notable volumes, such as, *Whence Came the Universe?, The Einstein Theory, The Relation Between Tyndale's and Luther's Version of the Bible*. Apart from his work in the Seminary, as Professor of Systematic Theology, Dr. Gruber is engaged very frequently as a lecturer on such subjects as that on which he spoke to the recent League Regional Conference.

P. B. FITZWATER, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Moody Bible Institute, is one of the founders of the League. (The League is fortunate to renew acquaintance with a teacher of the ability of Dr. Fitzwater.) He is also an author, having written *The Church and Modern Problems, and God's Code of Morals*.

The League of Evangelical Students has friends who send help from the ends of the earth. It could do with more helpers!

Within the past few weeks contributions have come from New Zealand and Australia and even India! If Christians **there** are concerned for the League testimony, what should **YOU** do?

And here, in this country, is a dear saint of God, a woman seventy-eight years of age. She has sent her bit.

There are several immediate calls for funds in our work. If led, will you not give as the Lord directs? Address the

**GENERAL SECRETARY, BOX 455,
WHEATON, ILLINOIS, U. S. A.**