

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



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

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

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

MID-MAY, 1931

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Vol. 2

No. 1

Application pending entry as second-class matter at the Phila., Pa., Post Office.

What is an Evangelical?

PHILIP SCHAFF'S great work, "The Creeds of Christendom," consists of three large volumes—of which the first deals with the *History of Creeds*, the second with the *Greek and Latin Creeds*, the third with the *Evangelical Creeds*. An examination of the second and third volumes shows that the former deals with the creeds of the Greek and Roman Catholic churches and the latter with the creeds of the Protestant churches, other than those of the Unitarian type, that appeared before the publication of the volumes in 1877. This means that the designation, "Evangelical," as employed by Dr. SCHAFF was for the most part synonymous with the designation, "Protestant."

If now we keep in mind the fact that Dr. SCHAFF employed the word in its generally accepted sense, we will not be greatly at a loss to understand how it has come about that the word as used today seems to have no definite meaning. As long as the vast majority of the members of the Protestant churches held to what was common in that system of thought and mode of life that found expression in the creeds of the Protestant churches—Lutheran, Reformed and Arminian—no great confusion resulted from identifying the Evangelicals with the members of these churches. It has come about, however, that an increasing number of the members, and particularly of the Ministers of these churches, do not hold to that system of thought and life. The word, however, still continues to be used to designate the members of these churches. Hence the varied and confused senses in which the word "evangelical" is

employed today. Hence the fact that men with all kinds of beliefs, or lack of beliefs, are designated "Evangelicals." If everybody that is called an Evangelical today is really an Evangelical, then it means nothing to call a man an Evangelical. A word applied indiscriminately to everybody ends by designating nobody. We would not imply that the word "Evangelical" has become a word without meaning but it does seem to us that if it is to be saved from that fate—and it seems to us too good a word to be allowed to die—there must be an insistence on the part of many that the word be used in its proper historical meaning.

When we call ourselves "Evangelicals" in the proper historical meaning of the word we mean, first of all, that we are not Roman Catholics. The primary protest of LUTHER and CALVIN was against the

sacerdotalism of Rome, i.e., its interposition of the church with its priesthood, as a means of grace, between the soul and God. As a result, their primary affirmation was on the immediacy of the soul's relation to God. An Evangelical is, therefore, first of all, one who holds that God saves men by acting immediately on their souls not through the medium of the church and its ordinances established by Him for that purpose. We are not to suppose, however, that a man is an Evangelical merely because he insists on the immediacy of the soul's relation to God. If that were the case Unitarians would have a perfectly good right to call themselves "Evangelicals." It is imperative to point out, therefore, that a man is not an Evangelical in the historical meaning of the word unless he also affirms that the soul is dependent on God and on God alone for salvation, that nothing that we are and nothing that we do enters into the ground of our salvation—that it is all of God, nothing of ourselves. The opposition of the Evangelicals to the sacerdotalism of Rome was not in the interest of making man his own saviour. Not at all. Rather it was in the interest of directing men's attention to JESUS CHRIST Himself as the one and only Saviour from the guilt and power of sin. The Evangelical is even more strongly opposed to any and all representations that makes man his own saviour than he is to the sacerdotalism of Rome. An Evangelical is ever one in whose soul there echoes a hearty "amen" when he reads PAUL'S words: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God;

IN THIS ISSUE:

Is the Pulpit Forgetting God?.....	5
Wm. Childs Robinson	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	7
J. Gresham Machen	
Birth Control in the Light of the Bible... ..	9
J. H. Gauss	
Books of Religious Significance.....	10
Questions and Answers.....	11
"Freedom and Restraint".....	12-13
Neal L. Anderson Cornelius Van Til	
Letters to the Editor.....	15
Ministerial Changes.....	17
News of the Church.....	19

not of works lest any man should boast." He alone is a true Evangelical, therefore, who makes the double confession (1) that salvation is of God and not of man and (2) that God in saving men acts directly upon their souls not through human instrumentalities that He has established for that purpose.

It cannot be said too clearly or too frequently that fundamentally there are but two doctrines of salvation. According to the one, man saves himself; according to the other God saves him. The Romanist as well as the Evangelical holds the second of these doctrines. Both give the same answer to the question, Does man save himself or does God save him? Their difference does not appear until we consider the question, Does God save men by acting directly on their souls or through the medium of the church and its ordinances? In stressing the Evangelical's opposition to the positing of any intermediaries between the soul and God, let us not forget his even profounder opposition to that doctrine of salvation that makes man his own saviour. There is nothing against which the true Evangelical sets himself more firmly than the doctrine that man saves himself. He regards that as the most fatal of all heresies. This is why he realizes that he has less in common with most Modernists than he has with Roman Catholics. We need not forget that the Roman Catholic agrees with the Evangelical as over against Unitarians, Modernists and all such like in maintaining that salvation is from God and that this salvation was wrought by the GOD-MAN through His sacrificial death. The limits of our space forbid us to deal with the presuppositions and implications of the evangelical doctrine of salvation; but obviously they include such doctrines as the sinner's inability to save himself, the deity and atoning death of CHRIST, justification by faith alone, and the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

Special significance attaches to the question, What is an Evangelical?, by reason of the fact that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America claims to represent the common interests of the evangelical churches that constitute its membership. It is true that only those churches that have evangelical creeds, or their equivalents, are eligible to member-

ship, but it seems to us only too clear that those who dominate the policy of this organization are "evangelical" only in the sense that they are members of evangelical churches. No doubt they share the evangelical's conviction relative to the immediacy of our relations with God, but their public utterances do not indicate that they share his sense of dependence on God and God alone for their salvation. It seems to us, therefore, that this organization misrepresents rather than represents the true "Evangelicals" of these churches. As a result we would like to see the Presbyterian churches sever their connection with it.

The Rights and Duties of Commissioners

THE Commission which each commissioner must produce from his (or her) presbytery before he can be enrolled as a member of a General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church distinctly specifies his rights and duties, to wit: "To consult, vote, and determine, on all things that may come before that body, according to the principles and constitution of this Church and the Word of God." This means that it is not only a privilege but a solemn responsibility to be a commissioner to a General Assembly. It is obvious that only an informed commissioner can properly discharge his responsibility. This means not only that he should read the "Blue Book" with care, but that whatever question may come before the Assembly (whether dealt with in the "Blue Book" or not) he should at least insist on sufficient information and discussion to enable him to "vote and determine" all things according to the principles set forth in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church and the Word of God.

We mention this matter because the disposition to discourage open discussion has been one of the outstanding characteristics of some recent Assemblies. We are confident that many Ministers and elders have gone to former Assemblies supposing they had some important function to perform, only to find that they were expected to sign on the dotted line, as it were, the recommendations of the "platform." Conclusions arrived at in small committees, or in small conferences of so-called

leaders, have been presented and adopted practically without discussion, with the result that the rank and file of the commissioners—those who most truly represent the Church—have played the part of mere rubber stamps, approving the recommendations presented without any real knowledge of their merits or demerits. A method frequently adopted to get a proposal adopted is first to move that a certain fixed period be set aside for its consideration. Then the chairman of the committee that makes the proposal is allowed to present the matter with no time limit fixed. It is not unknown for the chairman to use half, or more than half, of the allotted time, after which some one moves that discussion from the floor be limited to five or ten minute speeches—as though it were possible to say anything adequate on an involved subject in so short a time. We have seen matters of grave significance adopted with practically no discussion and with most of the commissioners obviously ignorant of their significance. Instances are not even lacking where commissioners who exercised their unquestioned right to discuss matters before the Assembly have been treated as those who were wasting the time of the Assembly or even as disturbers of the peace and unity of the Church.

We hope that the commissioners to the 143rd General Assembly will insist on their rights and perform their duties as indicated in their Commissions. What is the use of having a General Assembly unless this is done? This may require some of the secretaries, executives, "distinguished guests and fraternal delegates," and others, to shorten their speeches, but we are sure it would further the well-being of the Church. These speeches will soon be forgotten but the decisions reached by the commissioners to the next Assembly may profoundly affect the future of the Presbyterian Church for years to come.

The Moderator

EVERY commissioner to the 143rd General Assembly is a potential Moderator of that body. We do not mean to imply that every commissioner is equally competent to occupy that chair or equally deserving of that honor; but we are confident that the commissioners will

include a large number of men capable and worthy of occupying that position.

Dr. LEWIS S. MUDGE, the present Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, has been mentioned for the position. This has been done not only by individuals but by three presbyteries. All will admit Dr. MUDGE's ability as a presiding officer not only by reason of his unsurpassed knowledge of Presbyterian law and procedure but by reason of his gracious personality. Whether the majority of the commissioners will favor his candidacy will largely hinge, it seems to us, on the question whether they look with approval on the tendencies that have been most in evidence in the Presbyterian Church in recent years. Dr. MUDGE has, perhaps, been more influential than any other man in furthering those tendencies. He epitomizes them in himself to a degree that is probably not true of any other. We do not have the happiness to favor those tendencies and so do not favor him as the Moderator of the next General Assembly. It is our hope, therefore, that some one who looks with less complacency on things as they are in the Presbyterian Church will not only be nominated but elected as the Moderator of the next General Assembly.

Wholly apart from the things for which Dr. MUDGE stands, there is another consideration which ought, it seems to us, to militate against his candidacy for the Moderatorship, viz., the fact that he is Stated Clerk of the General Assembly. Dr. MUDGE already occupies what is probably the most influential position in the Presbyterian Church, as far as determining its policies is concerned, and it does not seem to us that there are any sufficient reasons for adding to those powers by also making him Moderator. No doubt there are precedents for the action contemplated; but the fact that unwise actions may have been taken by former Assemblies hardly warrants the coming Assembly in doing what is proposed. Moreover it should not be forgotten that the work and responsibilities connected with the office of the Stated Clerk were relatively small in former years as compared with the situation today. If Dr. MUDGE as Moderator should assume the tasks that have been attempted by recent Moderators, it would seem as though he would necessarily have to neglect his duties as Stated

Clerk. If after Dr. MUDGE retires from the office of Stated Clerk the Presbyterian Church wishes to honor him by electing him as Moderator, well and good. But it does not seem to us that he, or any other man, should be elected to fill both positions at the same time.

In our judgment the Moderator of the next Assembly should be taken from the pastorate and preferably he should be a pastor who is not a member of any of the Boards or Agencies of the Church. Recent Moderators have been able men but almost without exception they have reflected what may be called the "official" attitude of the Church rather than that of its rank and file. Quite apart from the question whether the next Moderator is a "conservative" or a "liberal" or a "middle-of-the-roader" we think it would prove wholesome to elect a Moderator whose viewpoint is that of the working pastor.

The Approaching Assembly: Its Problems

THE most important matters to be brought before the approaching Assembly, as far as they have been indicated, are: (1) The report of the Department of Church Cooperation and Union relative to the organic union of the Presbyterian and Reformed churches; (2) The report of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America together with the recommendation of the General Council that, as previously, \$18,500 be included in the budget for the support of this organization; (3) The suggestion of the Stated Clerk that he be authorized to transmit to the Presbyteries a revised Book of Discipline for their study and criticism; (4) The report of the Special Committee on Vacancy and Supply with its recommendation that Chapters XIV, XV, and XXI of the Form of Government be somewhat drastically revised; (5) The proposal of the General Council for reducing the size of the General Assembly; and (6) The report of the Special Commission on Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage. Of the matters enumerated, the second, fifth and sixth are apt to commend most popular attention.

It does not look as though the question of organic union with other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches will receive much

attention in the next Assembly. The Department of Church Cooperation and Union reports in effect that it has been unable to obey the instructions of the last Assembly to report "a complete plan for organic union" with any such churches (obviously because other churches have been slow to cooperate) and merely asks that it be "authorized and required" to join with the Committees of other churches in "holding at some convenient place a conference sufficiently prolonged to draft a Basis of Organic Union complete in all its details" to be submitted to the supreme judicatories of the churches concerned in 1932.

The report of the Federal Council of Churches, and matters related thereto, promises to be of special interest by reason of the fact that the Presbytery of Denver is sending up an Overture to the Assembly asking that the Presbyterian Church sever its connection with this organization. It is not unlikely, therefore, that this will be a subject that will sharply divide the Assembly. We hope the Overture will be adopted. The claim of the Federal Council that it "stands for the great common interest of the evangelical churches" (Blue Book, p. 74) has, in our judgment, no real basis in fact. The evidence adduced in the report, viz., the religious messages it sends over the radio from week to week proves, it seems to us, the exact opposite of what it is adduced to prove. Most of these messages are delivered by HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK and S. PARKES CADMAN, and practically all of them by men in sympathy with their viewpoints. If these men are "evangelicals" we confess we don't know what it means to be an evangelical. Moreover, it seems to us that most of the pronouncements which the Federal Council of Churches puts forth from time to time misrepresent rather than represent the Presbyterian Church.

The proposal to reduce the size of the General Assembly seems sure of being a subject of debate. Most will agree, we suppose, that the Assembly is too large to be what it is supposed to be—a deliberative body. But whether the proposal made is the best method of reducing the Assembly to a proper size is another matter and concerning which there is bound to be much difference of opinion. More-

(Concluded on page 16)

Is the Pulpit Forgetting God?

By the Rev. Wm. Childs Robinson, A. M., Th. D.
Professor of Church History in Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia

[We consider ourselves exceedingly fortunate to be able to publish this arresting and powerful analysis of present-day tendencies. It is the substance of an address delivered by Dr. Robinson before the Faculty and Students of Westminster Seminary on April 14. The first part only is included here. The second part will be published in our next issue.]

THIS question was first focused by a representative gathering of Southern Presbyterian ministers and officers (March 20, 1931). The agenda sheet proposed that the speakers assume the Gospel in its orthodox form and devote themselves to a discussion of the real questions facing the Church today, i. e., prohibition, capitalism, race, world peace, and church union. While such a platform may be very proper for a week evening discussion, it is my observation and conviction that this statement is symptomatic of the thinking of a large section of the American pulpit. Let us assume the gospel—in some places in its orthodox, in others in its Ritschlian form—and let us be busy making over the world.

The same question was focused a week later by the Southern Interseminary Conference at Emory University (March 26-27, 1931). The chief subjects discussed at this conference were capitalism and race relations. The January *Interseminarian* underscores the practical content of conversion—personal adjustments, political operation, commercial and industrial conduct, race relations, international relations. It declares: "Nothing less than a united church will be equal to the tremendous task we face" (p. 3).

God Ignored

The major planks, then, in the platforms of these two gatherings were identical. And the only plank in either platform which brought God in was the plank on Church Unity. And here God is only brought in to be asked out as unessential. Church unity is to be brought about by crashing the creeds. The first article in the creed is God. The Church is to be so concerned with human contacts and relationships that, when our doctrines of God intervene, we are to banish those doctrines. God doesn't matter!

And so these two programs were ar-

ranged (probably unwittingly) to play into the hands of contemporary humanism. For humanists demand either the reformation of the existing church along humanist lines or the abolition of any specific institution; and either the retention of the word God as merely a symbol of man's highest social aspirations, or the abandonment of the term.

W. A. BROWN, *Pathways to Certainty*, p. 16, cf. citations there given.

A Rabbi at the Religious Education Association

Tomorrow (April 15) the Religious Education Association, meeting in the Central Congregational Church in Atlanta, is to discuss the theme, "religious issues in our economic crisis." The program says: "The essential thing needed is a frank and persistent search for and analysis of the facts regarding the workings of our present economic philosophy to see in how far these facts make or break us as human beings." The conspicuous place in the program given to Jewish rabbis certainly relegates the Deity of our Lord to the position of a doctrine non-essential to a "religious" association. In fact, religion itself does not seem to be necessary for membership in the "Religious Education Association." Representatives of universities, social and business institutions, unite with "Jewish, Catholic, Protestant Churches" in the "Twenty-Eighth Annual Convention of the Religious Education Association." The president of the Association, Dr. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, favors admitting humanists (men who do not believe in God) to Christian communion (Introduction to HORTON'S *Theism and the Modern Mood*). We may be sure he will offer no objection to their fraternizing with Presbyterians in the meeting tomorrow. I am ready to attend a meeting of economists, regardless of their theology; but I cannot endorse a religious association which in its absorption with

economics and in its inclusiveness forgets God.

Why Not Include Communists?

If we are to include the Jews and Humanists in our "religious" associations, by what logic can we object to the Bolsheviks? On every hand it is being said that they have a fervid "religious" enthusiasm for the worker's cause. They are devoted to the betterment of humanity—at least the proletariat section of humanity. Indeed, we do find the *Interseminarian* (p. 5) recognizing that Communism, while atheistic, has "high and worthy ideals." While Religion recognizes the injustice of the economic order and yet tolerates the *status quo*, Communism is uncompromising in its efforts to establish the ideal society. Religion recognizes the family; Communism opposes the family as selfish; and Communism encourages women to develop the capacities and qualities which they have. DOUGLAS VERNON'S write-up of *Communism versus Theism* in the January *Interseminarian* seems to evaluate the social view of Communism more highly than the corresponding stand of Religion, and passes by the fact that Communism is atheistic as though that were a matter of small moment.

Some years ago one of our leading United States officials declared that American religion was emphasizing the second table of the law to the neglect of the first table. Since that time, in order to make the world safe for democracy, we mustered a great army. And now we hear Humanism's cry, "Heaven as well as earth must be made safe for democracy!" When Professor W. H. HORTON tells us that most of the time men trust in these little intimate, friendly, humanistic gods, you might think he was describing popular Chinese polytheism or Japanese Shintoism, instead of the faith of the American intelligentsia (*The Christian Century*, March 18, 1931).

Dr. Fosdick's "Non-theological Religion"

But more subtle and more dangerous is the repeated declaration of Dr. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK that he is not preaching a theological religion, he is preaching a psychological religion. And the great American radio public is sipping this psychological religion every Sunday afternoon. As you all know, there are "fifty-seven varieties" of psychology. Probably there is only one thing in which these conflicting psychologies agree—every one of them is a study of man. It may be a study of man's soul or it may be a study of his behavior. It may be the stream of his consciousness, the stream of his muscular actions, the release of his libido, or only the study of "the lyric note" in the midst of business. In any event it is a study of man. And therefore a psychological religion must be a humanistic religion, it must be anthropomorphic and anthropocentric.

Too often the exposition of Scripture drifts down into a frantic effort to decode the text into the latest phrases of psychology and philosophy; and a clutching after human or social values by forced exegesis, eisegesis, and "sanctified imagination." That God's self-revelation is the chief purpose of the text seems to be alien to the thought of the expositor. The center of gravity in public prayer is on earth, in sharp differentiation from the Lord's Prayer, of which the center of gravity is clearly in heaven. The re-reading of B. M. PALMER'S *Theology of Prayer* would be a tremendous help in reviving true worship.

Whose Kingdom?

Thus we see that there are two great notes in American religious thought, "the social gospel" and "a psychological religion"—the group and the individual. Synthetize the two and bring you in the Kingdom! That is approximately what a great deal of glib talk about "the Kingdom," "the Kingdom," "the Kingdom" comes to. Just one question obtrudes itself: whose Kingdom? Surely such a Kingdom is the Kingdom of man; it is not the Kingdom of God. Has the American pulpit forgotten God?

A religion that forgets God will not long bless man. Professor HOCKING discerns "that human life is of supreme

worth *per se* is the illusion of humanism. I would almost say that the supreme worth of human life is best represented by man worshipping" (OBERLIN Lecture on *The Inherent Value of Religion*). Your own Dr. MACHEN has pointed out that it takes Christianity to save men from the present mechanistic world view (*Forum*, March 1931). Caught in the vise of scientific environmentalism, men need as never before a vision of God in His Majesty. The only refuge from blind fatalism is to posit the sovereignty of man on the royal sovereignty of God. Focus your eyes with HU SHIH, the neo-Confucian modernist, on the Naturalistic Conception of Life and the Universe, and you become a causal automaton; you dismiss love as quaint biological lore, and can only describe your "beloved" in terms of angles and rhombs (HU SHIH in *Forum*, February 1931, p. 121. Cf. OTTO—*Things and Ideals*. W. LIPPMAN—*Preface to Morals*). Dr. W. P. PATERSON of Edinburgh recently remarked that the preaching of God in His objective reality produced the great religious experiences; while the mere preaching of religious experience has been impotent to reproduce worth-while Christian experience.

Pulpits That Speak Only for Man

Neither will the pulpit fulfill its call to serve greatly in the social maelstrom by forgetting God. When the pulpit commits itself to the support and upbuilding of labor organizations under the impression that "the entire Church stands committed to the principles of collective bargaining" (*Interseminarian*, p. 4, and speech of Mr. TAMBLYN at Emory University, Thursday, March 26, 1931), it makes itself *ex parte*. No more is it regarded as unprejudiced, unbiased. No longer can it bring the Divine Absolute to bear on the relativities of man.

EMIL BRUNNER, *The Theology of Crisis*, has ably summarized the situation: "It is supremely right for mankind to make its stand against tuberculosis, syphilis and alcohol, against imperialism and the spirit of acquisitiveness. These monsters must be met—and in that battle what man may hope to be a spectator? . . . But in order to see these practical questions and grasp them in a definite way, men must approach them with a standard of judgment, with an under-

standing of life already formed; that is, with a definite theology. How can men approach these questions with a definite theology if the pulpit forgets God? When you rob theology of its *theos*, you rob life of its meaning.

When even a Jewish rabbi recognizes that the first rôle of religion is to proclaim the burden of the LORD (Rabbi SILVER in *Religion in a Changing World*), it is particularly fatal for the Reformed pulpit to forget God. Some one has remarked: "Just as the Methodist places in the foreground the idea of the salvation of sinners; the Baptist, the mystery of regeneration; the Lutheran, justification by faith; the Moravian, the wounds of CHRIST; the Greek Catholic, the mysticism of the Holy Spirit; and the Romanist, the catholicity of the church; so the Calvinist is always placing in the forefront the thought of God" (M. W. PRESSLY, *Calvinism and Science*, quoted by MEETER, *The Fundamental Principles of Calvinism*, p. 27). As Calvinists our prophetic mission is to keep the God-concept at the heart of religion. We are called to preach God. It is as we fulfill our calling, as we help men to catch the vision of the King in His beauty, that we will be to them an effectual blessing, spiritually and socially.

The Calvinist's Vision of God

Just here, perhaps, some Presbyterians have a lesson to learn from the "unhypenated Calvinism" of Holland, with its emphasis on Common Grace. "The Calvinist is the man who has caught a vision of God in His majesty, one who sees the controlling and guiding hand of God everywhere." "It is God in the exercise of His sovereign rights in all spheres and in all relationships as it relates to His love and grace, His control of human destinies, the control of nature and its laws; it is God in this exercise of His sovereign rights which lies at the bottom of the Calvinist's thinking." "Everywhere the Calvinist is conscious of the fact that he is treading on his Heavenly Father's soil, in the realm of science and art, in politics, in business, in social life, no less than in the realm of particular grace. Everywhere in all departments of life he is treading on holy ground and his duty carries him everywhere" (MEETER, pp. 67, 72, 81). Every life is a plan of God, and every

man is called to observe the law of CHRIST in his vocation. Are men blinded by the pessimism of business depression? Preach, "The LORD reigneth, let the earth rejoice." Is man inhuman to man? Preach, "The LORD reigneth; let the people tremble, for the LORD our God is holy." God is King of every life and of all of life.

Professor T. F. CARL MULLER also recognizes the outward call of the Reformed Theology; but he is sure that "the outstanding interest (in the Reformed Faith) is centered in religion, not in morality; on the Beyond, not on the here; on God Himself, not on the world first, with God as a subsidiary help to our per-

sonal and social existence in it." (*The Reformed Theology as a Guardian of the Pure Gospel*, January 1931 *Evangelical Quarterly*.)

In centering on the God-concept the Reformed Faith is just upholding Bible Christianity. God is the theme of the Bible. Bible preaching is preaching God. The Scriptures "Principally teach what man is to believe concerning GOD." Would God that the pulpit were following the Book! God declines to be made secondary to man. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." The first and the greatest commandment is: "Thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all . . ." The first

article in the creed is: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth." This primary word in early Christian preaching was also the question to be first raised and to be nobly answered by that great line of Christian thinkers stretching from JUSTIN MARTYR to AUGUSTINE of Hippo. Concerning this significant fact perhaps mother Britain has a word for America. An Oxford manifesto affirms "that the doctrine of GOD is the primary doctrine, and the Church was right to lay stress upon it." (Introduction to *Oxford Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*.)

(Concluded in our next issue)

Notes on Biblical Exposition

By J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

V. THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST

"I marvel that you are so quickly turning from Him who called you in the grace of Christ, unto a different gospel, which is not another—only, there are some who are disturbing you and are wishing to subvert the gospel of Christ." (Gal. 1:6, 7, in a literal translation.)

Another Gospel Which Is Not Another

IN the last number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, we pointed out the strange absence, in the Epistle to the GALATIANS, of the usual thanksgiving for the Christian state of the readers. There was nothing to be thankful for in the news which PAUL had received from the Galatian churches, and PAUL had not the slightest intention of expressing a thankfulness which was not justified by the facts.

The news which had come from the churches was bad and only bad, and the Apostle plunges at once into his treatment of it. "I marvel," he says, "that ye are so quickly turning away, from Him who called you in the grace of CHRIST, to another gospel, which is not another—only, there are certain men who are troubling you and are wishing to subvert the gospel of CHRIST."

The Person whom PAUL means when he speaks of Him from whom the GALATIANS are turning away is of course GOD the FATHER. GOD had called them by that

majestic call at the beginning of their Christian life which had been made possible only by the gracious gift which CHRIST had made for them on the cross; yet now they are turning away from such a call and despising such grace. No wonder that the Apostle marvels at a perversity so great!

The thing to which they are turning away so quickly is designated as "another gospel, which is not another." But in the Greek two different words are used here for "another." The word which is used in the former place is *heteros*; the word which is used in the latter place is *allos*. The former word, *heteros*, often, though not always, has in it the notion of difference in kind between one thing and another. Thus it is said in the Gospel according to LUKE, in connection with the transfiguration, that "the fashion of His countenance became other." Here the word *heteros* is used for "other," and the plain implication is that the fashion of His countenance was *different* from what it had been before.

The other word, *allos*, on the other hand, designates merely numerical distinctness of one thing from another. If I give a man an apple, and he asks me whether I have "another," the word that he will naturally use is not *heteros* but *allos*.

In view of this distinction, the scoff-

ing observation that "orthodoxy is my doxy, and heterodoxy is the other man's doxy," is seen to illustrate rather clearly the principle that a little learning is a dangerous thing. As a matter of fact, *orthos* means "straight" and "orthodoxy" means "straight doxy;" whereas *heterodoxy* means a doxy that is *different* from straight doxy—in other words, it means "crooked doxy!"

We trust that the readers will pardon this slight digression and will now return with us to the matter in hand. PAUL says that the GALATIANS are turning unto a different gospel, but that that different gospel is not really a second gospel to be put alongside of the gospel already preached, as though it could be a companion with it in a series. "No," says PAUL, "it is not really a gospel at all; there is only one gospel, and that is the gospel already preached to you. This other teaching, though it purports to be a gospel, is not really a gospel at all. It is not really another gospel, but only a perversion of the one true gospel."

Christ's Gospel Or the Gospel About Christ?

The one true gospel is "the gospel of CHRIST." What does PAUL mean when he designates it so? In what sense is it to be called a gospel "of CHRIST?"

That question is closely connected with another question, the question what *we* mean today when we speak of the gospel of CHRIST. Upon this latter question there depends the whole vast question as to the truth or falsehood of the Christian religion.

The English phrase, "the gospel of CHRIST," with the corresponding phrase in Greek, may mean at least two things. In the first place it may mean "the gospel which CHRIST preached," and in the second place it may mean "the gospel which sets CHRIST forth," "the gospel about CHRIST." In the English language, each of these two uses of the word "of" is perfectly well established, and so is each of these two uses of the genitive case in Greek.

Thus when we speak in English of "the gospel of PAUL," we are using the word "of" plainly in the former of the two senses; we mean not at all a gospel about PAUL or a gospel which proclaims PAUL, but a gospel which PAUL proclaimed. On the other hand, when we speak, for example, of "the gospel of the cross," we are using the word "of" just as plainly in the latter sense; we mean not a gospel which the cross proclaims, but a gospel which proclaims the cross.

But how is it when we speak of "the gospel of CHRIST?" Do we mean "the gospel which CHRIST proclaimed" or "the gospel which proclaims CHRIST;" do we mean "CHRIST's gospel" or "the gospel about CHRIST?"

According to the Modernist tendency now so largely dominant in the Church, we mean, or at least ought to mean, the former and not the latter. We ought, it is said, to think of the gospel as being the gospel which CHRIST preached, not the gospel which sets CHRIST forth; a message of which CHRIST was the great exponent, not a doctrine of His person or of His work. We ought, in other words, it is said, to return from this gospel *about* CHRIST and have recourse to CHRIST's own gospel; we ought to abandon the theological subtleties of atonement, redemption and the like, and have recourse to the simple message that was proclaimed by JESUS of NAZARETH on the shores of the sea of Galilee nineteen hundred years ago.

That formulation of the great issue in the Church is by no means altogether new.

It has been known for a hundred years or so, if not even far longer than that. It raises rather clearly the very greatest of all questions, and it ought to be dealt with in the most careful possible way.

Ought we to yield to the demand of modern "Liberal" preachers that we should abandon the gospel about CHRIST and have recourse, in distinction from that, to the gospel which CHRIST preached?

Which Gospel Exalts Christ More?

Before we answer that question, we ought at any rate to clear up one strange misconception—the strange misconception, namely, that represents "CHRIST's gospel," in this modern sense, as bringing us nearer to CHRIST or as giving CHRIST a greater place in our lives than "the gospel about CHRIST" which is being abandoned. As a matter of fact, "CHRIST's gospel," so understood, puts CHRIST in a very small place in our lives and makes him very remote from us. If the gospel to which we hold is merely the gospel which CHRIST preached nineteen hundred years ago, then our relation to CHRIST is not different in kind from our relation to many other great teachers. We can speak in that sense of "a gospel of PAUL" or "a gospel of SPURGEON" or "a gospel of D. L. MOODY." But it would be blasphemous to hold to a gospel *about* PAUL or a gospel *about* SPURGEON or a gospel *about* D. L. MOODY. That would put mere human teachers in a position that belongs only to CHRIST. Others may proclaim a gospel, but CHRIST alone is the substance or content of the gospel.

How remote, too, CHRIST is made from us by this modern rejection of the gospel about CHRIST in the supposed interests of a gospel which CHRIST preached! It is amazing that men can be so blind as not to see that the blessed "doctrine" of the eighth chapter of Romans, far from putting a barrier between us and JESUS, really is the only thing that can unite us to JESUS. He died nineteen hundred years ago. How may we hold fellowship with him today? It is this much despised "theology" which alone can tell us how—this theology that sets forth the meaning of His death and the fact of His glorious resurrection.

The Gospel That Christ Preached

In holding to this gospel about CHRIST, are we rejecting the gospel which He

preached when He was on earth? Far from it. For the gospel which He preached was also a gospel about Him; He put His own person and work into the centre of the gospel that He proclaimed.

He could not, indeed, proclaim that gospel fully when he was on earth. He had come into this world to redeem men by His death and resurrection, and the recounting of that great event was to constitute the gospel by which He was to be presented as the Saviour of men. The meaning of the great event could not be set forth in all its fulness until the event had taken place. Much, therefore, was left to the teaching of the Holy Spirit through the Apostles. A gospel that neglects the Epistles of PAUL and holds only to the teaching of our LORD on earth is not really loyal to CHRIST; nay, it is profoundly disloyal to Him, and it impoverishes woefully and sinfully our knowledge of His teaching and His person and His work.

Nevertheless, our LORD did proclaim the gospel about Himself even when He was on earth. He did put His own person into His gospel.

That fact has often been denied in modern times. The denial of it lies at the root of the reconstruction called "the Liberal JESUS" in its typical forms. The real JESUS, according to that reconstruction, did not present a doctrine of His own person; neither did He have the slightest notion of a redeeming significance of His approaching death; but He proclaimed with wonderful simplicity the fatherhood of GOD and the brotherhood of man, and we are His true disciples when we cease disputing about His place in the scale of being and hearken to His simple message.

The Jesus of the Gospels

To reconstruct JESUS in this way, it is of course necessary to reject much that the Gospels contain. The gospel of JOHN has to be eliminated at the start, since throughout that Gospel JESUS is represented as making His own person and the nature of His redeeming work the express subject of His teaching. If the Gospel of JOHN is true, then JESUS most emphatically did put His own person into His gospel, and the "Liberal" reconstruction is wrong.

But even after the Fourth Gospel has

been eliminated, much still remains to be done. In the Synoptic Gospels also, JESUS is represented as putting His own person into His gospel; and hence by a mere appeal from JOHN to the Synoptic Gospels the simple teacher of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is not yet found. He can be found, therefore, if at all, not by taking as they stand the utterances attributed to JESUS even in the Synoptic Gospels, but by regarding some of those utterances as authentic and by rejecting the rest.

The Jesus of the Supposed "Sources"

How can the choice be made? Conceivably it might be made by the discovery of earlier sources underlying our Synoptic Gospels. Possibly, it might be said, the unauthentic elements in the teaching attributed to JESUS have been introduced by the authors of our Gospels, whereas if we could only reconstruct the sources that they used we should find that JESUS was really such a one as we modern men desire.

As a matter of fact, however, this method of reconstruction has been found to fail. The two chief sources supposed, rightly or wrongly, to underlie our Gospels of MATTHEW and LUKE are (1) MARK and (2) a source commonly called Q, which is supposed to contain chiefly sayings, as distinguished from deeds, of JESUS. And in both of these supposed sources the undesired element appears in the teaching which JESUS is represented as carrying on; in both of these sources JESUS is represented as holding a lofty view of His own person. The well-known utterance of JESUS in Matt. 11:27, beginning, "All things have been delivered unto me of My Father," appears in practically the same form in Luke 10:22, and so must be thought to have stood in the supposed source, Q. Yet this utterance presents the same lofty view of our Lord's person as that which is presented in the Gospel according to JOHN.

Even more impressive than such individual utterances is the entire tenor of the two supposed sources. Neither MARK nor the supposed Q really presents a JESUS who was a mere preacher of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; both of them present a JESUS who offered Himself not merely as teacher but as Saviour. As JAMES DENNEY (in a

book sadly mistaken and unduly concessive in some ways)¹ correctly insisted, JESUS is represented, even in the earliest sources which have been reconstructed, rightly or wrongly, by modern criticism, as offering Himself not merely as an example for faith but as the object of faith. He did, in other words, even according to the earliest sources or supposed sources, put His own person into His gospel; His gospel, even according to the earliest sources, was a gospel *about* Him.

Thus if we are to discover a gospel of JESUS which was not also a gospel *about* JESUS, we must certainly go back of the earliest written sources of information which, rightly or wrongly, have been discovered by modern criticism; we must suppose that, in a period of oral tradition prior to those earliest written sources, the information about JESUS became contaminated and thus the JESUS who really lived in Palestine, a pure and simple teacher of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, came falsely to be presented as one who attributed to Himself superhuman functions as the Redeemer of mankind.

"The Liberal Jesus"

But how are we to separate what is true from what is false in an oral tradition now preserved for us only in written sources already vitiated by a false view of JESUS' person? Surely the process of separation must be very difficult. And when it has been completed, what sort of JESUS remains? Is the JESUS who remains even then exactly the sort of JESUS that the "Liberal" historians desire?

At one point even the Liberal historians (or most of them) admitted that He is not. Even their reconstructed JESUS, they had to admit, thought that He was the Messiah; and His Messianic consciousness introduced a totally discordant element into their picture of Him. Their simple preacher of the fatherhood of God did after all claim a stupendous dignity for Himself. What becomes then of their fundamental thesis? Even their reconstructed JESUS was not exactly the kind of person whom they desired to find.

They did, indeed, try to minimize the importance of JESUS' claims; they represented the claim of Messiahship by

JESUS as a mere means to an end, a mere means that He adopted almost against His will. But such palliative treatment evidently did not go to the root of the matter. It remained true that the claim of Messiahship was totally out of character if JESUS was the kind of teacher that the Liberal historians represented Him as being. Yet that claim was rooted too deep in the sources for it to be removed save by a few extremists.

Thus it is not surprising to find in our day evidences that the whole imposing reconstruction of "the Liberal JESUS" is destined soon to fall to the ground. If JESUS was not the divine Redeemer whom the Gospels represent Him as being—and of course according to the current naturalism He could not have been that—then it is increasingly being admitted that we can never determine just exactly what He was.

Sixty or seventy years ago, when "the Liberal JESUS" was first constructed on the basis of the Gospel of MARK (or a supposed earlier form of MARK) and of the supposed source later called Q, there was vast enthusiasm. Scientific history, it was supposed, had had a beneficent result. At first, indeed, it was admitted, it had given many persons pain; it had removed from the pages of history many things about JESUS that the Church had held dear. But in removing things that were false or uncertain, it had, men were told, established with all the greater firmness the things that remained. For the first time, it was thought, "the life of CHRIST" was put upon a firm scientific basis; the assured results of modern criticism of the gospels could at last, it was supposed, be summed up, and on the basis of these assured results the real JESUS could be presented to the Church.

That real JESUS lacked, indeed, many things that had hitherto been found in the JESUS of Christian faith. Gone were His stupendous "metaphysical" attributes—His preëxistence, His omnipotence, His omniscience, His Trinitarian oneness with God. Gone were His miracles, His redeeming death, His resurrection from the tomb, His final judgment of the world. But to balance these losses, it was thought, how much had been gained! The true humanity of JESUS at last had been rediscovered. JESUS at last had been brought near to us: He was no longer a pale

¹ Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, 1909.

metaphysical abstraction, but had become a living person of flesh and blood; He had become a true example and teacher and guide, a true leader into a larger and more glorious life. Let the Church forget its dry theology, it was urged; let it take JESUS as its leader and go forth to more glorious conquests than it had ever seen before!

Such, in essentials, was the program of the Liberal historians. That program had a great vogue in the modern Church. The reconstruction of the Liberal JESUS appeared in all essentials in H. J. HOLTZMANN'S book on the Synoptic Gospels in 1863; it was repeated in many learned and many popular treatises; it was raised to the highest pitch of popular enthusiasm by HARNACK'S *What Is Christianity?* in 1900.

The Fall of "The Liberal Jesus"

But today the vogue of "the Liberal JESUS" has entered upon a sad decline. Scholars who, like the older Liberal historians, reject the supernatural in the Gospels are no longer at all clear about the "assured results" of modern criticism on the positive side. All our sources of information, it is seen with increasing clearness, are imbued with a supernaturalistic view of JESUS' person; all of them represent him as offering Himself to men not as a mere prophet or teacher, but as a Saviour. How, then, can the historian ever hope to discover the real JESUS beneath these gaudy colors of the supernatural that have so hopelessly defaced His portrait? In the attempt to answer that question, modern scholars are falling more and more into despair. Gone is the almost lyrical enthusiasm with which HOLTZMANN in 1863 set forth the purely human JESUS whom he supposed to have been rediscovered by modern historical research. More and more the sobering conviction is gaining ground that the naturalistic criticism of the Gospels, rejecting the miracles, has been able only to destroy and not to build. It has shown, in the opinion of the naturalistic historians, that the JESUS of the Gospels was not the real JESUS—but what sort of person the real JESUS was—that question, it is increasingly admitted, must forever remain unanswered. We can show what sort of person the primitive Church held Him to be, but what sort of person He

really was—this remains hidden from our eyes.

The Real Jesus

Against such skepticism must be placed at least one solid fact. It is the stupendous picture of JESUS which the Gospels contain. That picture presents unmistakable marks of truth. It is totally un-

like all that we know of the fancies of the early Christian Church; it is irreducibly original; it is amazingly vivid and concrete.

Yet about one thing modern skepticism is unquestionably correct. The Gospel picture of JESUS is suffused with the supernatural throughout. It is not the

(Concluded on page 17)

Birth Control in the Light of the Bible

By the Rev. J. H. Gauss, D.D.

Dean, Brookes Bible Institute, St. Louis, Mo.

THE reports of a committee appointed by the Federation of Churches on Birth-Control have been made public.

Undoubtedly thousands of right-thinking people are sadly perplexed, and some justly indignant at the Majority report approving the use of "contraceptives" in marital relations; also undoubtedly other thousands will be encouraged to resort to the use of such means to indulge sexual lust without marriage, or, if married, without incurring the care of children.

The Majority report refers to the Church and the Bible as "silent upon the subject," and intimates that such silence gives consent, or at least does not forbid.

Its reference to the Bible is quite misleading, though doubtless unintentionally so. The Bible is not as silent as the report implies:

Read Gen. 1:26, "multiply," and again after the Flood, Gen. 9:1, "multiply;" I Chron. 4:27, JUDAH'S superiority to SIMEON, SIMEON'S tribal family did not "multiply;" Ps. 127:3-5, many children a matter for congratulation as an expression of God's favor; Prov. 31:28, the "virtuous woman's" "household" consists of "husband" and "children;" I Sam. 2:21, the birth of prayer-answered SAMUEL; is followed by "three sons and two daughters." Zach. 8:5 promises the streets of Jerusalem shall one day be full of boys and girls at play. I Tim. 3:4 sets forth the fitness of one for the office of bishop, as having "one wife" and being the father of "children;" I Tim. 5:10, states as a condition that an aged widow receive aid from the Church, that she has "brought up children," and verse 14, directs that "younger women marry, bear

children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to reproach;" I Cor. 7:14, declares God's special interest in a Christian's children; Eph. 6:4, commands fathers to bring them up for God, Mark 10:14, records the Savior of our race welcoming children to His blessing and a large place in the Kingdom of God.—Most truly did the heathen women say to the Christian missionary, "Yours is a God that cares for little children."

God instituted marriage—and that for birth of children—and that according to the physical laws He had created in man; true, not as a means for gratifying selfish passion resulting in births too frequent for health of mother or child; yet not avoiding such births by use of "contraceptives" to prevent them.

Birth-denial is not birth-control, but sinful, selfish refusal to fulfill God's purpose in marriage.

True Birth-control, or Abstinence is God-fearing, marital self-control, as we are taught in I Cor. 7:5.

Not a child, but "children" are necessary in God's ideal family on earth. Such ideal families are vital to our race, to every nation, to our nation, to the Church of JESUS CHRIST. Let us not live lower than beasts, but as men, being spirits, created in the "image" of God, with bodies made in the "likeness" of God.

"Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." I Cor. 6:20.

"Your whole spirit, and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. Faithful is He that calleth you, who also will do it." I Thess. 5:23, 24.

Books of Religious Significance

THE MEANING OF THE CROSS by Henry Sloane Coffin. Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 164. \$1.50.

THE significance of this book lies in the fact that it represents an attempt on the part of an outstanding Presbyterian liberal "to put the meaning of the cross in terms intelligible and moving to the men of today."

In his attempt to evaluate the cross, Dr. Coffin pays little or no attention to the meaning that the writers of the New Testament ascribed to the death of Christ. What he seeks to do is to indicate the meaning that Christ Himself attached to his own death. In order to do this, he tells us that it is "obviously necessary to distinguish in the (gospel) narratives between material which can be traced back with some assurance to Jesus himself and the material which is due to the reflection of His followers subsequent to His death and resurrection" (p. 48). On the basis of such Gospel statements as he considers worthy of a measure of credence, Dr. Coffin holds that Christ went to His death deliberately, not however as one who offers himself as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God (Shorter Catechism Q. 25) but rather as one who had "become convinced that His death, even more than a continuation of His work of teaching and healing and friendship, would set up His Father's reign over His children and bring them abundant life" (p. 63). According to Dr. Coffin, Jesus went to His death "battling with doubts and tormented with moral perplexities" (p. 80) and with no clear understanding as to why the innocent should suffer with and for the guilty, but sustained by the faith that such was His Father's will and that His Father is good (p. 81). Dr. Coffin says "there is a sense in which we speak of Christ as our substitute" but only in the sense that it is He who has blazed the trail along which we must travel by our own efforts but with much less effort than was required on the part of Christ. (pp. 101-102). The present-day revolt from "various theories of the Atonement," we are told, "has been due to their un-Christian views of God" (p. 110). Dr. Coffin regrets that "certain widely used hymns still perpetuate the theory that God pardons sinners because Christ purchased that pardon by His obedience and suffering" (p. 118). "There is no cleansing blood which can wipe out the record that has been," we are flatly told (p. 119). The cross is spoken of as "the wisdom of God" but "not as a wisdom confined to the Christian Gospel" (p. 103). The cross of Christ is not needed as a means of procuring forgiveness because God graciously forgives all who turn to Him in penitence (pp. 118-121).

Dr. Coffin admits that the cross does not hold the central place in the preaching of those who accept the current liberal theology (pp. 3-4). Why should it if the cross of Christ has no meaning beyond that which he ascribes to it? Liberalism in the Presbyterian Church has no abler or more attractive exponent than Henry Sloane Coffin. His attempt to state the meaning of the cross has but served to make yet more clear, it seems to us, that liberals are the preachers of "another Gospel which is not another." The Christ of this book is not the Christ of evangelical Christians; and even if it were the cross whose meaning it seeks to set forth is not the cross that Paul had in mind when he wrote: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

S. G. C.

RELIGION IN A CHANGING WORLD by Abba Hillel Silver, D.D., Litt.D. Richard R. Smith, Inc. 1931. Pp. 204. \$2.00.

THE author of this book is a Jewish Rabbi of the liberal school. It has been written as an exposition and defense of liberal religion as over against materialism and atheism. It is safe to say that it is the best book of its kind that has appeared in many a day both as regards its content and its literary charm. Few, if any, will be able to read it without both profit and delight—unless it be those who hold to a materialistic conception of the universe. At the same time it is important not to overlook the fact that Dr. Silver writes from the viewpoint of those who hold that the citadels of orthodoxy—Hebrew as well as Christian—have crumbled under the battering rams of modern science. This viewpoint is assumed rather than argued but it dominates the book throughout. With all its excellence, therefore, the book must prove highly disappointing to all those who hold to the viewpoint set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. We rejoice at what Dr. Silver says in behalf of the theistic world-view as well as what he says in criticism of the materialistic and atheistic propaganda of today, but we are very far from supposing that he defends all that is essential. It is well that men believe in God but what does that profit the sinner—and all men are such—unless they also believe in the historic yet ever-living Christ? Moreover it seems to us that it is only from the standpoint of orthodoxy that we can effectually maintain even those values in which Dr. Silver and his fellow-liberals are interested. In other words we believe that the real conflict today is not between liberalism and atheistic materialism but between natural-

ism (whether in a materialistic or a pantheistic sense doesn't make much difference) and a supernaturalism in which both the facts and the doctrines set forth in the Bible find a natural and a logical place. "The great battle of the twentieth century," to cite Francis L. Patton at the height of his intellectual powers, "is in its final issue a struggle between a Dogmatic Christianity on the one hand and an out-and-out naturalistic philosophy on the other." Orthodoxy is not bankrupt; rather it offers the one hope for saving mankind from what Dr. Silver calls "the Apollyon of materialism, agnosticism and atheism."

S. G. C.

THE HISTORY OF FUNDAMENTALISM. By Stewart G. Cole. Richard R. Smith, Inc. Pp. 360. \$2.50.

THIS is a history of Fundamentalism written by a modernist. Moreover it is a history not merely in the sense of a narrative of events but in the sense of an explanation of their causes. What Dr. Cole purports to do is to explain the rise and development of Fundamentalism despite the fact that the things for which it stands are antiquated. He practically takes for granted that no man who is abreast of modern scholarship can be a fundamentalist and so is precluded from adopting the simple (but true) explanation that the rise and spread of Fundamentalism is rooted in the perception on the part of intelligent Christians that genuine Christianity is threatened with extinction at the hands of Modernism and therefore of the need of maintaining its truthfulness and saving power in the face of those who attack it—whether within or without the church. Fundamentalists do not admit for one moment that the beliefs for which they stand are incapable of scholarly defense; rather they maintain that it is the things for which Modernism stands that are incapable of such defense. Be this as it may, it is obvious that Dr. Cole's history of Fundamentalism cannot possibly commend itself to any except those who look upon Fundamentalism as a more or less quixotic attempt on the part of ignorant men to maintain an antiquated life and world view. Doubtless individual fundamentalists have set forth and defended the essentials of Christian belief with various degrees of knowledge and effectiveness but to characterize them as a group as obscurantists motivated by personal ambition to exercise rule in church affairs (as Dr. Cole does in effect) is in our judgment little short of sheer misrepresentation.

This volume contains a great deal of in-

formation concerning Fundamentalism not readily obtainable elsewhere. This information, however, is bound up with so much misinformation that relatively few will be in a position to know what to believe and what to disbelieve. How little dependence can be placed in Dr. Cole's history of Fundamentalism in the Presbyterian Church, for instance, is indicated by the fact that he speaks of the doctrinal deliverances of the Assemblies of 1910, 1916 and 1923 as an attempt to state the essence of the Westminster Confession and heads the chapter that deals with the controversy that centered about these doctrinal deliverances as "Neo-Calvinism in the Presbyterian Church." Such misunderstanding is abysmal. Apparently he confuses the five points of the doctrinal deliverances with the so-called five points of Calvinism. As a matter of fact, of course, the five points of the doctrinal deliverances were not an attempt to

state the essence of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and, what is more, do not even touch on the distinctive doctrines of Calvinism. A man might accept each and every one of them without being a Calvinist. In fact the five points of the deliverances are held in common by all the great historic branches of the Christian Church—Catholic, Lutheran, Arminian and Reformed. To speak of them as expressive of the views of the strict Calvinists is about the last word in misunderstanding. In view of this basic misunderstanding, it is not surprising that nearly every page of his account of the situation in the Presbyterian Church will have to be revised before it can be accepted as anything like a reliable account thereof.

Strictly speaking this book is not so much a history of Fundamentalism as an attack on Fundamentalism clothed in historical form.

S. G. C.

Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

Why Do "Liberals" Advocate Organic Union?

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

Will you explain why the liberal party in all branches of the Christian Church are so much in favor of organic union of the Churches? Why are they placing so much emphasis on the outward, visible organization of the Church?

J. A. C.

WE can hardly qualify as a spokesman for the liberals. All we can do is to indicate why it is that while liberals as a class are more or less indiscriminate advocates of church union proposals conservatives as a class are disposed to be critical of such proposals. It seems to us that this difference of attitude is rooted in different conceptions of what Christianity is, more especially in different estimates of the value of Christian doctrines. Liberals as a rule tell us that Christianity is life not doctrines (and so regard doctrines as having at the most a secondary importance) whereas conservatives tell us that Christianity is a life based on a message concerning Christ—and so include doctrines among the things of primary importance. The result is that liberals are not disposed to allow doctrinal differences to stand in the way of church union while conservatives favor only such church union proposals as involve the maintenance of the doctrines they consider essential to Christianity. Of course there are liberals and liberals just as there are con-

servatives and conservatives, but, broadly speaking, it seems to us that the consideration advanced explains the fact that it is the liberals rather than the conservatives who are pushing the present-day proposals for church union. Conservatives are not blind to the importance of the outward, visible organization of the church but they hold that such organization obtained at the cost of purity of doctrinal witness is obtained at too great a cost. Dr. A. C. Headlam wrote wisely, it seems to us, when at the beginning of his Bampton Lectures on "The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion" (pp. 2-3) he said:

"There is wide agreement as to the evils of disunion. There is a great and increasing desire for union. . . . From time to time reunion is discussed as if it were an economic or business proposition. The waste of division and overlapping is dwelt upon, the loss of efficiency or the weakening of power. All such questions in relation to Christianity are secondary. For the fundamental point to remember about it is that it claims to be a revelation of the truth, and to teach the truth. However much worldly motives or human frailty have prevailed among the causes of Christian disunion, yet ultimately the causes of division have been differences as to what is true. . . . The evils of disunion are great; but a far greater evil would be to compromise with truth. It would be better that we should remain divided than leave problems unsolved. If we are to come together it must be by wider knowledge and deeper thought, not by evading the issue."

Is the Bible to Be Taken "Literally"?

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

I greatly appreciate the kindness and the fairness of your reply to my inquiry in the December issue on the Old Testament canon. I know I did fail to particularize any of the "claims" of "extreme fundamentalists" which seem to be hindering rather than helping the young college seniors of whom I spoke.

One of these is the claim that the early chapters of Genesis must be taken with absolute literalness—that one cannot be a true Christian and accept the theory of evolution. Recently, as one might expect in any such youthful group, the question of the literal or allegorical acceptance of "the story of Jonah and the whale" came up, also of a literal Adam and Eve and a literal "tree of knowledge" in the garden of Eden. Personally I emphasize to the young senior who is nearest to me, my own belief that a true Christian's status depends upon his relations to Jesus Christ—that I think one may be truly His, and regard these puzzling parts of the Old Testament either as literal history or as inspired allegory. The question of the miraculous seems to trouble them especially and I do not hesitate to say that I find it easy and intellectually necessary to accept the miraculous in Christ while being in doubt as to many of the Old Testament miracles.

While I should very much like to have you say something about these points, I realize that I may have already had more than my fair share of space in your column of questions.

A. B.

IN our December issue we dealt in a broad way with our questioner's allegation that the "extreme claims of Fundamentalists" are an obstacle to Christian faith on the part of intelligent people inasmuch as nothing had been said to indicate the "extreme claims" our questioner had in mind.

In replying to this further question, we would say in the first place that we think she does right in emphasizing the fact that the question whether a person has the status of a Christian depends upon his or her relations to Jesus Christ. We are not to suppose that Christ saves only those who have an intellectual grasp of all the presuppositions and implications of Christian faith. Christ is able to save and does save all those who receive and rest upon Him alone for salvation even though their knowledge be very faulty and imperfect (see our October, 1930, issue, pp. 1-3). In the second place, we would say that we are not aware that "Fundamentalists" claim that all parts of the Bible must be taken with "absolute literalness." What they claim, as we understand their

claims, is that the statements of the Bible must be taken in the sense in which they were meant by their writers. That is to say "Fundamentalists" believe in what is known as "grammatico-historical exegesis." Whether any particular passage is to be taken as "literal history or as inspired allegory" hinges on the question of the sense in which it was employed by its author. What the "Fundamentalists" object to is not the treating of allegories as allegories but the treating of historical statements as though they were allegories.

The question of the relation between Christianity and evolution or Christianity and miracles is too large to be dealt with in this connection. As stated above our status as Christians hinges on our personal relations with Jesus Christ, not on the perfection of our knowledge or our logical capacity. It seems to us that if one accepts the miraculous in Christ there is no good reason why he should not accept all the

miracles recorded in Scripture. Whether one can be intellectually consistent and be both a Christian and an evolutionist is, in some cases, largely a matter of definition. According to our understanding of the matter the Christian need not maintain that there is no truth in the evolutionary theory. It seems to us, however, that he must needs maintain that it does not express the whole truth. If evolution expresses the whole truth it is obvious that the supernatural in the form of the miraculous has never been a factor in human life. A non-miraculous Christianity, however, is just no Christianity at all. Intellectually speaking, we do not believe that a man can be a true Christian and accept a thorough-going theory of evolution and that because there is no place for miracles in a thorough-going theory of evolution. How can one be a Christian and hold a theory that allows no place for the Christ whom the Christian receives and rests upon for salvation?

on such subjects as the home, the state, and the Church." And this concerning a man, who, by pen and in the pulpit, has been a strong tower for the defence of the integrity and authority of the Word of God, for over a third of a century, even in the "Bible belt of the South."

Again, the reviewer gives no proof of his charges concerning the author of "Freedom and Restraint," and his affirmations are spun out of his own imagination, and find no justification in the text of the volume, or in the well known theological position of its author.

To reply to such a "review" in detail is manifestly impossible, as it is concerned, not with answering Dr. Campbell's position, so clearly and brilliantly stated, but in replying to views that the reviewer supposes he holds.

There are only four citations in the lengthy article from "Freedom and Restraint," and three of these by page numbers only. The only direct quotation from the book consists of eight words, which are torn bodily out of the context:—"According to Doctor Campbell *believers in verbal inspiration*" (italics mine) "cannot observe the need of *'discrimination in drawing lessons from the inspired record'*"—p. 50." What Dr. Campbell wrote was this, "The need of discrimination in drawing lessons from the inspired record *might be illustrated from many passages*. Take for instance the Song of Deborah and Barak—."

There is direct misrepresentation of the position of the author in the pages cited only by their number:—

(1) "We are once more told," writes the reviewer "that the authority of the Bible is that of the expert, and not that of a judge. p. 17."

It is not strange that the reviewer immediately adds "this way of putting the matter is misleading," for neither on page 17, nor on any other page does Dr. Campbell say one word about the Bible "being the authority of the expert." Indeed he says nothing whatever about "the expert."

(2) Because Dr. Campbell, p. 14, quotes the famous aphorism of Coleridge, that "the Bible finds me," the reviewer proceeds to accuse him of holding Coleridge's view of inspiration, which view he proceeds to demolish. Yet the author of "Freedom and Restraint" was not discussing Coleridge's view of inspiration, but merely refers to him as having compressed into a line, what the Scriptures have to say of themselves as "a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

(3) The review continues, "The whole issue of inspiration is beclouded by the author in his second chapter on 'The Letter and the Spirit.'" Paul's words from 2 Cor. 3:6, 'for the letter killeth, and the spirit giveth life' are wrought upon till they are made to tell against those who believe in the verbal inspiration of Scripture."

"Freedom and Restraint"

[The Editors of Christianity Today are glad to publish this letter from the pen of the Rev. Neal L. Anderson, D.D. Dr. Anderson takes vigorous exception to a book review appearing in our columns. The Editors considered it only right, since his conclusions were disputed, to allow the reviewer, the Rev. Cornelius Van Til, Ph.D., to reply to Dr. Anderson. It is the aim of Christianity Today to be just and fair to all.]

Dr. Anderson Protests

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Under the heading "Books of Religious Significance," your issue of March 1931 contains a lengthy article signed "C. Van Til," concerning "Freedom and Restraint" from the pen of the Rev. Robert F. Campbell, D.D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Asheville, N. C.

Three circumstances make this volume indeed a book of genuine religious significance:—

It contains the lectures delivered by the author, in the second oldest Presbyterian Theological Seminary in America, and on the Sprunt Foundation, whose lecturers have all been foremost representatives of the Reformed Faith on both sides of the sea.

Second, the lectures on "Freedom and Restraint" in a fascinating and vigorous style deal with subjects of vital importance in the religious world today.

Third, the volume has special significance because its author, an ex-Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, is himself an outstanding champion of The Reformed Faith in America, and has been for more than a quarter of a century a defender of the "faith once for all delivered to the saints," in a great metropolitan centre, the Mecca of tens of thousands from all over the world, who seek there, health, rest, and refreshment of spirit. Recent events have made the author also a spokesman to the nation for the authority of God in the home, the church, and the state.

The reviewer has the following interesting things to say about Dr. Campbell: He is one "who halts between two opinions;" "misconceives God;" "holds the dualistic view of inspiration;" "makes concessions fatal to a belief in the self-testimony of Scripture;" "beclouds the whole issue of inspiration;" "spreads confusion," and "beats the air in his argument;" "hob-nobs with the enemy" of conservative theology; and reveals a "compromising attitude," which the reviewer reverently hopes is "not symptomatic of affairs in the South." In a word, Dr. Campbell is relegated to the camp of the enemy, who overthrows the faith of many.

This is all startling information to the Ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and to a host of Dr. Campbell's admirers throughout the country. It is convincing proof that the days of miracles are not over. "Saul among the prophets" is not so surprising as Robert F. Campbell in the camp of the Modernists! If it be true indeed, or only partially true, one can understand the minor chord that runs through the review, "I alone am left."

Since you have given such widespread publicity to the above statements, permit me to call the attention of your readers to certain matters dealt with in the article:—

It is not a review of "Freedom and Restraint," but of one, or at most two chapters, of a volume consisting of eight chapters. The other chapters are cursorily dismissed with the statement that "—we do not expect that the author will be very much concerned thereafter about what the Bible says

It is interesting to note that chapter 2 does not deal directly with the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scripture, but with the matter of the interpretation of the inspired records; and particularly that the author of the chapter, beyond a paraphrase of 2 Cor. 3:6 in the opening paragraph, makes no further reference to it, but does treat in detail twenty-eight other passages of Scripture, most of them from the very words of Jesus.

(4) Lastly the reviewer notes that "the author's first major deflection is on the matter of reducing the authority of the Scripture by virtually qualifying the 'natural man' as the judge of its truth."

It is difficult for one, with "Freedom and Restraint" open before him, to reply dispassionately to such a statement, for there is not a word in the book that justifies it. On the contrary, in passages of exceptional clarity and force, Dr. Campbell says directly the opposite:—

"Those who exalt experience as the criterion of truth in religion seem to forget that there are diseases of experience, inherent in man's fallen nature, corrupting both reason and conscience." p. 12. "The material of Christian experience is the Word of God, or more particularly Jesus Christ, as He is presented in the Scriptures to the soul renewed by the Spirit." p. 14. "It is evident again that the validity of the authority does not depend on its recognition as such." p. 15. Quoting Jeremiah's statement that God will write his "law in the inwards parts, and in the hearts" of His people, Doctor Campbell says "The ideal of Christian freedom is not realized therefore at Mt. Sinai, but only when we come to Mt. Zion—'for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.'" pp. 19, 20.

That the reviewer did not understand the brilliant dialectics, which unmask the subtle fallacies of Liberalism, is unfortunate. That he should misrepresent the argument is unfair.

If to believe that "The Word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only infallible rule of faith and practice," while at the same time frankly admitting the difficulties in the interpretation of many Scripture passages, dealing with scientific phenomena, historic data, and Chronology, is to be disloyal to The Reformed Faith, Doctor Campbell is found in the goodly company of Drs. Charles Hodge, Francis L. Patton, James Denny, Clarence E. Macartney, and the authors of the great symbols of the Faith.

The present writer knows no volume where the reader will be more richly repaid for careful study of its pages, than "Freedom and Restraint." It is not a treatise on Theology, but does much to strengthen the faith of its readers in the authority of The Word of God, through a practical treatment of some of the most interesting themes

of present day discussion, such as "The Freedom and Authority of the Scriptures;" "The Spirit and the Letter;" "Individualism and the Institution;" "Freedom and the Law of the State;" "Sunday Laws and Liberty;" "The Ideal and the Practical;" "The Law of Liberty and Restraint;" "Whose Man?"

Any one of these chapters is well worth the price of the book to the reverent, scholarly student of the Word of God, who devoutly believes that we may know the Truth, and that the Truth will make us free.

NEAL L. ANDERSON.

Winston-Salem, N. C.

Dr. Van Til Replies

My dear Dr. ANDERSON:

Dr. Samuel G. Craig has suggested that I reply to the letter sent him containing reflections on my review of Dr. Robert F. Campbell's book, "Freedom and Restraint," in the March issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I gladly do so in the hope of coming to a better understanding on the matter.

If I understand your point at all it is not that I have been mistaken on details or misrepresented Dr. Campbell on matters of detail, but that I have missed the mark altogether. Now after rereading the first two chapters of Dr. Campbell's book I must still hold to the view expressed in CHRISTIANITY TODAY. What I said there was not that Dr. Campbell was a Modernist, or "in the camp of the Modernists," as you say I said. Surely if one "hobnobs with the enemy," he is not that enemy himself. My whole point was that Dr. Campbell's book is a poor defense of the orthodox or Presbyterian system of doctrine against the attack of Modernism.

I may perhaps follow your letter in the course of its argument and seek to make some explanation on the points you mention.

1. I have made no distinction between "the author, and the volume from his pen." I dealt only with the volume. I do not know Dr. Campbell and am glad to believe all the good said about him. I could not be prejudiced if I wanted to be.

2. I appreciate the good there is in the volume in form and content, but the good seemed to me to be made of none effect by the compromising attitude I find in the volume and it was this that I sought to bring out.

3. Whether the "information" about Dr. Campbell's book is startling or not is of secondary importance. "Is it true or not," that is the question. Besides, it is quite a common thing today to find people with orthodox convictions "hobnob with the enemy." We are accustomed to that in the North.

4. I hold it to be the privilege of any reviewer to call special attention to one or two chapters of a book without reviewing

the other chapters in detail. Nor do I dismiss the other chapters with the single quotation you give on page two. Besides, a review is in the nature of the case more of a statement of opinion than a detailed argument. And finally, the reference to the other six chapters concerned the question of method; only an extensive discussion could bring out the point in detail, and the review was too long as it was.

5. Proof does not depend upon lengthy quotations cited by page number. Proof depends first of all upon a correct representation of an author's main line of argument. The two chapters I criticized are not so long but that any one could easily check up on my argument. Besides, I have given, as you say, four citations.

Coming now to the more definite items, I would remark:

1. The quotation from page 50, is not "torn bodily out of its context." On page 49, Dr. Campbell tells about a Minister troubled in his conscience because he thought his ministerial vows bound him to teach that Scriptures are inerrant not only on religious but as well on secular matters. The "brother Minister" relieves him by revealing to him that what he had really sworn to was no more than an acceptance of the inerrancy of Scripture with respect to matters of "religious faith or moral conduct." Thus the exact point in dispute was the inerrancy of Scripture on all matters of which it speaks. Now Dr. Campbell approves the "brother Minister" of page 48 by his argument on page 50. His argument is that the evident need of "discrimination in drawing lessons" proves the truth of the position of the "brother Minister" who does not feel that he needs to hold to the Scripture's inerrancy when it speaks of secular matters. The implication is plain that if one *does* feel that he needs to hold to Scripture's inerrancy on all matters of which it speaks one *cannot* make discrimination in drawing lessons. I cannot see, applying the ordinary canons of logic, where I have in the least misrepresented Dr. Campbell on this point.

In the same paragraph you seem to find a direct contradiction of what I wrote, in the quotation you give. But I did not deny that Dr. Campbell holds to the necessity of drawing discriminating lessons. I said that he claimed that I, believing in the inerrancy of Scripture on all matters of which it speaks, could not do the same. I did not deny that he could do a certain thing, but I denied his implication that I could not *also* do this same thing. If you say you can play ball I do not object but if you use that as a proof that I cannot play ball I must naturally rebel.

2. You maintain that I have misrepresented Dr. Campbell by my statement about the authority of the judge and the authority of the expert. You say that "neither on page 17, nor on any other page does Dr. Campbell say one word about the Bible "being the authority of the expert."

Here, too, I have not been convinced by your reasoning. On page 16 Dr. Campbell illustrates two meanings of "authority," by contrasting the authority of a judge as judge, and this same judge as the author of a standard treatise on Court Procedure. Of the latter he says, page 16, "It is not an authority that commands obedience by external compulsion, but an authority that commends itself by internal appeal." Any one failing to "follow the prescription of this authority" does so at his own peril. Is the author not plainly contrasting the authority of the judge and the authority of an "expert" who advises but does not compel? The word "expert" is not used but the thing is clearly signified and that is all one need be concerned about to be fair to an author.

Then further in the last paragraph on page 16, the author says with respect to the illustration used, "Though the parallel is not perfect, it may serve to illustrate in some measure the authority of Scripture. Scripture is first of all Jehovah's appeal to reason." Then on page 17, the author, with patent allusion to his statement on page 16 about the lawyer who might fail to follow the prescription of this authority, says to those who should respect the similar authority of Scripture, "It is true that serious consequences follow rejection or neglect of authority in this case as inevitably as in the case of a law of nature—"

In view of the course of the argument on these two pages and also on page 18, I feel fully warranted to use the phrase "authority of an expert," with respect to the author's view of Scriptural authority. Moreover on page 17, after the quotation from Dr. Denney, which quotation Dr. Campbell used in order to prove further his own conception of the Bible as illustrated by the judge who wrote the "standard treatise" the author says definitely, "The authority of the Bible is of this kind." For that reason I referred to page 17.

In addition to this the reasoning on pp. 12-13 fully corroborates the "expert" idea of Scripture. The author says, p. 12, "that there are diseases of experience inherent in man's fallen nature, corrupting both reason and conscience, and that there is also such a thing as an immature or undernourished experience. The Bible is medicine for the diseased experience and food for the experience that is immature or undernourished." Again on page 13, "We see therefore that experience begins as an infant and must be fed; that conscience must be exercised and nourished if it is to be quick and active to discern good and evil." In all this I find not a word about the *forensic side* of the matter. There where the author gives his profoundest reasons for differing from those who "make personal insight and experience the only criterion of truth" he has nothing to say about man's *guilt* before God. He speaks of experience being diseased and of *that only*. It is no wonder then that the

judge has to give way to the *expert*, when the question of Bible authority is broached. The author is quite consistent on this point. Thus you will realize that I must still hold the whole matter quite "misleading," if we remember that the author's views are supposed to be in consonance with those of the Westminster standards in which the forensic element is primary and controlling. You will also understand why I hold that the author "misconceives the matter."

2. As to the quotation from Coleridge I may remark: (a) I did not "proceed to accuse him [Dr. Campbell] of holding Coleridge's view of inspiration." I do not *mention* inspiration nor discuss the *matter* without mentioning it by name in this connection. The first chapter of Dr. Campbell's book deals with "authority." (b) What I said was that Coleridge was quite wrong. Coleridge thought of experience as it is today, regardless of what sin has done to experience, when he made his famous aphorism. This experience he takes as his standard and finds that the Scriptures correspond with it, and *therefore* accepts the Scriptures. Thus experience is made the judge of Scripture instead of Scripture the judge of experience. (c) What I said further was that Dr. Campbell quoted Coleridge with approval. Did he not? "On the contrary, when we say that the Bible is an infallible authority, we base its infallibility on its harmony with right reason. Between the teachings of Scripture and the reason and conscience of man there is a correspondence as between pure air and the lungs. As Coleridge expressed it, 'The Bible finds me.'"

I would ask Dr. Campbell here what he means when he speaks of "right reason." Is it regenerated reason or non-regenerated reason to which he refers? Of course the Scriptures and regenerated reason agree as fresh air and lungs but the Scriptures and the non-regenerated reason agree as fire and water. Surely the author "spreads confusion" when he passes from the one to the other type of experience without making the least distinction between the two. I must still hold that the author "wavers on this pivotal point and sends forth an uncertain sound."

4. As to the second chapter of Dr. Campbell's book, the subject directly under discussion is that of interpretation, but what Dr. Campbell says about interpretation definitely involves a certain view of inspiration. And it is Dr. Campbell's view of inspiration that I hold to be dangerous because unreformed. Why may I not say so?

A very disappointing feature about the second chapter is that the issues of verbal inspiration, of the old and new dispensations, of literalism and symbolism are discussed without distinction. For that reason the poor man who still believes in the inerrancy of Scripture in all matters of which it speaks, is made to bear the burden of a

mechanical instead of an organic view of revelation and inspiration, and the burden of a crass and absurd literalism of interpretation. Thus the author has been altogether unfair to the believer in plenary inspiration and has "spread confusion," and "beclouded" the whole issue between the orthodox and the Modernist. The argument is quixotic indeed.

5. Lastly you mention my main criticism that the author virtually qualifies the "natural man" as the judge of Scripture. I trust I have already made it clear above that this is exactly what the author does. And the strange part is that I have quoted in proof of my charge parts of those portions which you quote in disproof of my charge.

(a) That there are "diseases of experience" does not in itself prove that man is guilty and cannot be a judge. In fact, Dr. Campbell contends that though diseased, man nevertheless possesses "right reason" by which he can judge the Scripture. Dr. Campbell nowhere clearly distinguishes between regenerate and non-regenerate experience. Surely when Jehovah says to his covenant people, "Come let us reason together," that proves nothing about those that are not covenant people. Or when Paul writes to the Christian Church at Corinth, "I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say," Dr. Campbell is not justified in generalizing this statement so that it includes all men, non-regenerate as well as regenerate, (p. 16.) Were not the covenant people supposed to understand things others did not understand? Does not Paul agree with John that Christians if they be Christians indeed, have an unction of the Holy one by which they understand and respond to truths which are obnoxious to the unbeliever? The author has been,—such is my definite conviction—"hobnobbing with the enemy" on this point. The other quotations you give have no connection with the subject and may be omitted.

Your appeal to authorities, too, may pass unnoticed. It is not a matter of "frankly admitting difficulties in the interpretation of many Scripture passages. . . ." Every reformed person will gladly do that. The question is about the inerrancy of Scripture on *all* matters of which it speaks, *secular* as well as religious. The limitation of Scripture's inerrancy to religious truth in distinction from secular matters, as introduced by Dr. Campbell finds no support from reformed theologians. (Cf. H. Bavinck, *Dogmatiek*, Vol. I; A. Kuyper—*Dictaten Dogmatiek*, Vol. IV; B. B. Warfield—*Revelation and Inspiration*.)

You will now realize that instead of regarding Dr. Campbell's book as a piece of "brilliant dialectics which unmask the subtle fallacies of Liberalism," I must continue to regard it as a book concessive to Liberalism, and one that does more harm to the cause of the Reformed Faith than an outspoken liberal book could do.

Sincerely yours,

C. VAN TIL.

Letters to the Editor

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

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: In the April number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, appears a scurrilous letter by an Auburn Affirmationist in which he castigates you for your splendid contending for the faith once delivered. I too would rather be an unregenerate Hottentot in Africa, than a Presbyterian Minister who had vowed before High Heaven to be loyal to the Word of God, as expressed in the Westminster Confession, and then sign such an infidel protest as the Affirmation. I am not a Minister but a layman whose Scottish Ancestors laid down their lives in defense of those five points, that the Affirmationists hold of so little importance, to wit: First, essential doctrine that the Holy Spirit did so inspire the writers as to keep the Holy Scriptures from errors; second, essential doctrine that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary; third, essential doctrine that Christ offered up Himself as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice; fourth, essential doctrine that our Lord Jesus Christ, arose from the dead on the third day; fifth, essential doctrine that our Lord Jesus Christ, showed his power and love by working mighty miracles. The Affirmation says, We are opposed to any attempt to elevate these five doctrinal statements or any of them to the position of tests for ordination or for good standing in our Church. I do not believe a born again man could deny these doctrinal statements or any one of them. Why, oh why, do not Ministers, who have taken vows to be true to the Scriptures according to the Presbyterian Confession, instead of breaking their vows and destroying the Church from the inside—why are they not honest enough to leave the Presbyterian Church and go into the Unitarian or some other liberal church that holds their views? They are fulfilling 2nd Peter 2:1-2. "But there were false prophets also among the people even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of."

LAYMAN.

[Editor's note: The following letters are typical of the many encouraging and commendatory communications that have come from those sending in their renewal subscriptions. The Editors wish to assure the thousands of friends and supporters of CHRISTIANITY TODAY of how deeply their hearts have been touched by so many ex-

pressions of confidence and brotherly affection. Please continue to pray for CHRISTIANITY TODAY that God in His providence may sustain it and keep pure its witness to the truth.]

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have been receiving CHRISTIANITY TODAY during the past year owing to the thoughtful kindness of my friend . . . who is one of your subscribers for himself and for others. The paper is so well edited and printed that I have found it indispensable. Enclosed is my dollar for the year ahead.

I do not like the labels "Fundamentalist," "Liberal," "Modernist," as they can mean different qualities when defined from different standpoints; but I prefer "Supernaturalist," "Rationalist," "Materialist." I believe, with you, in the importance of the doctrine of the supernatural origin of the Christian Faith, and consequently have no quarrel with your brand of theology. Keep right on with the magazine as written and printed during the past twelve months.

Very truly yours,

ELI BENEDICT.

New York, N. Y.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am enclosing my renewal. Your paper always inspires me. I thank God that it is my privilege to receive and read the records of your unflinching witness to the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the Gospel of the grace of God. I cannot recall a single utterance with which I am not in hearty accord. In this day of aggressive apostasy, it is a joy to know that those who hold the faith of Christ have the encouragement and consolation of such a magazine at yours. It has pleased God to withhold wealth from me; otherwise it would be my delight to give large support to CHRISTIANITY TODAY and to Westminster Seminary. I pray that the Lord may open many hearts and purses, and that He may constantly assure you of His pleasure in your work.

Affectionately yours,

REV. H. H. KURTZ.

Glen Moore, Pa.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am pastor of the United Presbyterian Church of Torrington and have been receiving your splendid paper for a year now. It is the best religious paper I have ever read, and I am greatly concerned that

my session should read the sound worthwhile articles and editorials in CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

I thank God for your paper, and for the men of principle who are making it possible.

My prayer is that this year may be a most prosperous one for you.

Sincerely yours,

REV. JAS. A. GORDON.

Torrington, Wyo.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: After reading CHRISTIANITY TODAY for one year, I would sum up my opinion of it in one word—Good.

The Editorials, Expositions of Scripture, Book Reviews, Question Column, information of happenings and general state of the Church, etc., and the absence of "wildfire," have a very steadying and building up effect.

There are many young, and older, people, who by reason of circumstances have not had the grounding in the Bible, which they have longed for, and which is so vital in these days of "itching ears." I believe a course of two or three years study by such young, or older, people would surprise and delight, and be of immense value to such students. It would enable them to give a reason for the faith, we trust, that would be in them. It would also apprise them of the present day dangers, and prevent some, or many, climbing over the stile into By-Path Meadow.

Will you bear with a suggestion? I would like to send a free copy to a few young people who have not had or do not now expect a course of Bible study, and I would make an express condition that each recipient will get at least two—or more—others to join him or her in earnest and honest study of the matter appearing in CHRISTIANITY TODAY, from month to month. I would suggest also that a request be made that at least one of each Today Class report to the Editor as to the interest taken and progress made, and with a further suggestion to the students that the best way to build up a Treasury of Knowledge—ready for use at all times—is to give it away—spread it amongst friends—tell it out—scatter it as seed sown, and at last there will be the rejoicing and the sheaves.

How to get the names? Ask some workers far away from the big cities to send in a picked name or two, and if there are more names sent in than dollars, let it be known, and if the thing is of the Lord, the dollars will increase to keep pace with the names.

Yours sincerely,

F. R. J.

Toronto.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am enclosing my check for \$6.00, one dollar for my subscription for the coming year, and the remainder to be used in the way it is most needed, in the publication of your splendid paper.

I wonder if you know what CHRISTIANITY TODAY means to some of us, who have been longing for just such a publication. But of course, you do. How I do rejoice in the calm, undisturbed, unequivocal stand you are taking. When I've been reading other things, some so weak and indifferent, and timid, it heartens me to pick up CHRISTIANITY TODAY, and feel I can settle back, and "eat" good wholesome bread, no fancy dishes, seasoned and decorated, but real food, just what a hungry one needs to live.

You must understand that this (CHRISTIANITY TODAY) is my Presbyterian Church; (I have no church home here) in order to see what it means to me, and it is more to me than many a church is to those who attend its services. Its articles and sermons show that the authors are wideawake to conditions at the present time, do not doubt as to the reasons therefore, plainly and convincingly proclaim the only remedy, and unafraid and unhesitatingly face the conflict. I feel so plainly that God is looking with loving approval on this "venture of faith." And faith dares anything "in the name of the Lord," certain that God never foresakes His own, nor His work.

How I would love to do more for this work, and I believe it will be possible before long.

Yes, God has richly blessed this work so far, and will bless and honor it, so long as all remain true to His word. And may God richly bless you all.

Most sincerely,

MRS. C. T. FRIEDRICH.

Anoka, Neb.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I inclose my check to renew my subscription to CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I have read every issue of it with delight and thorough commendation. It certainly stands strongly for Apostolic religion and as such deserves the unqualified support of every Christian who deplores the present great lapse from the faith of the Fathers.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES A. INGRAHAM.

Cambridge, N. Y.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Will you please renew my subscription to CHRISTIANITY TODAY, for the coming year. I enclose \$2.00—one for my subscription and one for the general expense of the paper. I want to tell you how much I value your paper and rejoice that there is one paper that is not afraid to stand for the truth as it is in Jesus. Down with this five-square union about which so many are union-crazy! Wishing and praying for your continued success and for the prosperity of Westminster Seminary.

I am your faithfully,

F. M. WOODS.

Martinsburg, W. Va.

The Approaching Assembly

(Continued from page 3)

over, it is quite certain that questions other than its merits or demerits will enter into the question of its adoption or rejection. At present the number of commissioners from each Presbytery is based on the number of Ministers it contains; according to the method proposed the number of commissioners will be based on the number of communicant members. This, of course, is a radical departure from the present method of representation. Moreover, it is obvious that the proposed method would strengthen the powers of the larger presbyteries and correspondingly weaken those of the smaller presbyteries. Inasmuch as the city rather than the country presbyteries seem to be the strongholds of liberalism, the immediate effect would probably be to further the liberal tendencies in the Church. This proposal has much to commend it. This is not to say, however, that we favor it.

The report of the Special Commission on Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage is sure to receive a great deal of attention—at least in the public press. This report, in our judgment, contains little to commend and much to condemn. About the best that can be said for this report is that some of its recommendations are not as bad as others. The least defensible thing about the report, of course, is what it says about Birth Control. We will be greatly surprised and grieved if the General Assembly does not vigorously repudiate at least this portion of its report. "Economic conditions and a worthy standard of living," reads this part of their report, "clearly make it wrong to bring children into the world without adequate provision for their nurture and proper consideration for the health of the mother. . . . Two methods are possible in securing birth control. The first is continence. The second is the use of contraceptives. When this method is adopted in seeking the worthy objectives stated above, it should only be in fidelity to the highest ideals of the Christian home." Dr. CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY, a former Moderator of the General Assembly, has so well expressed our own reaction to the recommendation that this part of its report be adopted "as expressing the attitude of our Church" upon this subject that we avail ourselves

of his words. We cite from the statement that appeared in the *Pittsburgh Press*:

"Thousands of Presbyterians have read with shame and indignation the published report of the General Assembly's committee on marriage, divorce and remarriage. This recognition of, and practical advocacy of birth control is undoubtedly repugnant to a great number of our Ministers and to thousands of our members.

"In effect, those within the church who advocate birth control advocate that which is not merely ecclesiastically and doctrinally wrong, but that which is wrong with an elemental and fundamental wrongness, because it violates the laws of natural morality.

"Men have a right to recommend pagan and anti-Christian practices if they desire. But this should not be done under the guise of Christian teaching and faith. What is pagan should be set forth as such.

"The Protestant Church, by these colossal follies, is digging its grave and renouncing the moral leadership which it has held since the sixteenth century.

"There is no law requiring people to have a large family, or any family at all. But when Protestant Ministers begin to recommend the ill-favored doctrines of birth control, things have come to a sorry pass.

"If birth control had been practiced in the Epworth Rectory, there would have been no JOHN WESLEY, with his world-shaking evangel, for he was the fifteenth of nineteen children, and his mother, SUSANNA WESLEY, the twenty-fifth child of the celebrated Dr. ANNESLEY.

"It is sad to see the Protestant Church, and especially the Presbyterian Church—even through a committee whose report has not been adopted, and will not be adopted—trying to persuade the public that what is elementally and inherently sinful is no sin. This report has little chance of passing in the General Assembly. However we may have lapsed we certainly have not yet sunk to that low state.

"Presbyterians will not fail to note that of the ministerial members of this commission, two, the chairman and the secretary, or editor, signed the iniquitous Auburn Affirmation of 1924, in which it was declared, after reference to the inspiration of the Bible, the Incarnation, the Atone-

ment and the Resurrection, that the General Assembly's declaration of 1923 did not state the only theories allowed by the Scriptures and our standards as explanations of these facts and doctrines, 'and that all who hold to these facts and doctrines, whatever theories they may employ to explain them, are worthy of all confidence and fellowship.' Where loose doctrine prevails, dangerous ethical teaching is sure to follow. . . . The prominence which some of our Ministers are giving to these ill-favored teachings, such as birth control, is an evidence of a fading interest in redemptive Christianity. . . ."

Notes on Biblical Exposition

(Concluded from page 9)

picture of a mere prophet and teacher simply overlaid with a few supernatural elements. Rather does the supernatural, both in the presentation of fact and in the presentation of JESUS' claims, enter into the very warp and woof. If the supernatural be rejected, then there is really nothing that certainly remains. No wonder that an increasing skepticism has taken the place of enthusiasm for "the Liberal JESUS!" Increasingly it has become evident that unless JESUS was essentially what He is represented in the Gospels as being, His true person and character can never be rediscovered by any historical research.

Such skepticism will always be condemned by a sound common sense. The picture of JESUS in the Gospels is too self-evidently true ever to be removed thus radically from the pages of history. If, then, we cannot reject the supernatural element and retain the rest, what remains for us to do? One thing and one thing only remains—that we should accept the whole, that we should accept the miracles and accept JESUS' stupendous claims.

When we take that step, everything in early Christian history falls into its proper place. The beginnings of the Christian Church, which before seemed to be a mass of contradictions, a jumble of kaleidoscopic changes, become the inevitable result of one stupendous fact; and the historian wonders at the blindness with which he formerly groped for the solution of a problem to which the key lay so ready to hand. There is really no other solution. A great building was

never founded upon a pin point. At the foundation of the Christian Church there stands the supernatural CHRIST.

The One True Gospel

If that be so, the whole distinction between the gospel of CHRIST and the gospel about CHRIST falls to the ground. The gospel of CHRIST, the gospel which He proclaimed, is seen also to be a gospel about Him. He came into this world to make that gospel possible by His redeeming death and glorious resurrection. While He was on earth He proclaimed that gospel afore, and He left the fuller presentation of it to the apostles whom he chose. But always He is both the author and the substance of His gospel; the gospel that He proclaimed was also the gospel in which He was proclaimed.

Hence it makes comparatively little difference whether in any particular case PAUL means by "the gospel of CHRIST" the gospel that CHRIST proclaimed or the gospel that proclaims Him. Usually when he speaks of the gospel he is thinking certainly of the latter rather than of the former; he is thinking of the gospel as that which sets forth CHRIST's redeeming work rather than as that which CHRIST proclaimed when He was on earth.

What does he mean in our verse in Gal. 1:7, when he speaks of the "gospel of CHRIST?" Does he mean the gospel which CHRIST proclaimed or the gospel which proclaims CHRIST? If he means the former, he is no doubt thinking not so much of CHRIST's proclamation of the gospel when He was on earth, as of His proclamation of it to him, PAUL, after He had risen from the dead, when He appeared to him on the road to Damascus.

Possibly he might mean that. More probably, perhaps, he might mean the gospel about CHRIST, the gospel which sets CHRIST forth.

But in this particular place we are inclined to think that he means neither. Rather is he designating the gospel here simply as the gospel that *belongs to* CHRIST. It is CHRIST's property; yet these Judaizers are seeking to lay violent hands upon it. They are seeking to deal as they will with what is not really theirs but CHRIST's.

Would God that every modern preacher might avoid the Judaizers' sin! The gospel is not ours to change as we will; in proclaiming it we are but stewards. God grant that we may be faithful stewards; God grant that we may truly proclaim the gospel which is not ours but the gospel of the LORD JESUS CHRIST!

Two Corrections

THROUGH an unfortunate oversight two mistakes appeared in the April issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. The able article on "Church Union and Doctrinal Purity" was written, not by the Rev. Wm. Carter, D.D., but by the Rev. James Carter, D.D., Professor Emeritus at Lincoln University, Penna. The Rev. Wm. Carter, D.D., of Brooklyn, N. Y., wrote disclaiming authorship of the article, saying, "I thank you for the compliment in ascribing the article" . . . and "the article is a very fine one, and I fully agree with the author . . ."

The meditation on "Noble Loneliness—Micaiah," by Pastor R. Sallens, was translated by the Rev. Paul Woolley, Th.M., from the French periodical *Le Chretien Evangelique*, and credit should have been given that distinguished journal.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY is sorry for these unintentional mistakes and expresses its sincere regret to the parties concerned.

Ministerial Changes

Presbyterian Church U. S. A.

Calls

James G. Robinson, Ph.D., Oliphant, Pa. to First Church, Lewisburg, Pa.;
L. S. Hall, to Littleton, Colo.

Calls Accepted

J. D. McGregor, Watertown, N. Y. to Cato and Meridian, N. Y.;
William T. McKinney, West Chester, O. to Main Street Church, Petersburg, Ind.;
R. H. Rolofson, Royal Oak, Mich. to First Church, Astabula, O.;
William J. G. Carruthers, Chestnut Level, Pa. to Faith Church, Baltimore, Md.;
Frank R. LeFever, Ashland, N. J. to Light Street Church, Baltimore, Md.;
Laurence R. Waddell, Assistant First Church, Baltimore, Md. to Chestnut Grove and Ashland Church, Baldwin, Md.;

James Steenson, to Winnebago, Minn.;
E. E. DeLong, Roxana, Ill. to Wood River, Ill.;
Jesse E. Agams, Ossian, Ind. to Litchfield, Ill.;
Samuel Harris to Burns, Ore.;
Rex. Stowers Clements, Associate Pastor Fifth Avenue Church, New York, N. Y.;
Francis M. Dowlin, Ocean City, Md. to East Whiteland Church, Frazer, Pa.;
W. M. Bigham, Sturgis, Ky. to Paris, Tenn.;
G. W. Jones, Savannah, Tenn. to Huntland, Tenn.;
H. J. Hasch to Danville, Ill.;
George E. Muran, Sandy Lake-Fairfield-New Lebanon, Pa. group to Knox Church, Detroit, Mich.;
Frank M. Weston, D.D., First Church, Geneva, N. Y. to become Executive Secretary of Rochester Presbytery;

Changed Addresses

Arthur T. Davies, 6851 Halliday Ave., Oakland, Cal.;

A. T. Clark, Caledonia, N. Y.;
J. L. Millings, Danvers, Ill.;
Gordon R. Conning, 1545 Berkeley Rd., Emporia,
Kans.;
Andrew S. Taylor, Wanakena, N. Y.;
G. E. Albright, Wiersdale, Fla.;
Hugh Smith, Amoret, Mo.;
W. J. McBean, 4187 Winona Court, Denver,
Colo.;
H. J. Hasch, 2330 N. Halsted, Chicago, Ill.;
John Armstrong, White Pigeon, Mich.;
M. E. Morse, El Dorado, Ill.;
Daniel H. Rohrabau, 940 Grandview Ave.,
Westfield, N. J.;
William R. Bennett, D.D., Williamstown, Mass.;
Harry C. White, 1117 Woodruff Ave., Hillside,
N. J.;
James D. McCaughy, D.D., Crane, Mo.

Installations

Kenneth B. Carson, Garden Memorial Church,
Washington, D. C.;
Ralph W. Orr, Libby, Mont., April 26;
Charles A. Hunter, Worthington, O., April 21;
H. J. Noding, Lansing, Ia., April 22;
Harold J. Ockenga, Point Breeze, Pittsburgh,
Pa., May 8;
Lewis Westphal, Brentwood, Pa., April 19;
Claude Saunders, Ripley, O., May 27;
William E. Bonham, Farmersburg, Ind., May 6;
E. D. Byrd, Cythiana, Ind., March 31;
Roland C. Propst, Avoca, Ia., May 5;
Rudolph G. Riemann, Andrew Church, Minne-
apolis, Minn., April 30;
Victor B. Nelson, Aldrich Ave. Church, Minne-
apolis, Minn., April 17;
H. McAllister Griffiths, Hollond Memorial
Church, Phila., Pa., April 21;
Weaver K. Eubank, Ninth Church, Phila., Pa.;
Joseph A. Howard, Grace Church, Montgomery,
Pa., March 12;
Lewis S. Hall, Littleton, Colo., March 31;
Richard M. Mussen, Honeoye Falls, N. Y., June 8;
Arthur T. Clark, Caledonia, N. Y., May 6;
George C. Van Artsdalen, Victor, N. Y., April 19;
Richard H. Selway, Red Lake Falls, Minn.,
May 13;
George J. Dewitt, First Memorial Church, Dover,
N. J., May 7;
R. W. Radliff, Aurora, Mo., April 15.

Resignations

R. S. Illingworth, Gahanna, O.;
John A. Eby, D.D., Wilshire Church, Los An-
geles, Cal.;
Fred E. Dent, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.;
Joel E. Hayden, D.D., Fairmount Church, Cleve-
land, O., April 1;
Austin B. Dickerson, Calvary Church, Highland
Park, Pa.;
Stanley V. Bergen, Union Tabernacle Church,
Phila., Pa.;
William A. Hallock, Grace Church, Rochester,
N. Y. to take effect June 30, 1931;
James W. Marty, Ph.D., First Church, Hackett-
town, N. J.;
John N. McGinley, D.D., Baxter Springs, Kans.;
John N. Hanes, Arapahoe, Colo.;
W. G. Hall, Kingman, Kans.;
A. R. Griggs, Howard, Kans.

Deaths

William J. Seelye, Washington, D. C., March 27;
Charles H. Booville, Riverside, Cal., April 16;
David E. Platter, E. Cleveland, O.;
Joseph K. Freed, Beatvestown, N. J., April 5;
Antonio J. Redriguez, Ignacio, Colo.

Presbyterian Church U. S.

Calls

C. L. Nisbet, Norton, Va. to First Church, St.
Alban's, West Va.;
Wallace Alston to Rock Spring Church, Atlanta,
Ga. (declines);
John MacEachern, Columbia, S. C. to Whitmire,
S. C.;
W. S. Smythe to Troy, Ky.

Calls Accepted

B. C. Bell, D.D., to Westminster Church, Shreve-
port, La.;
J. E. Wayland to Kanawha-Salines and Putney,
W. Va.;
R. E. Eberly, Sharps, Va. to First Church, Wil-
hamson, W. Va.;
Thomas E. Gallaher, Comanche, Tex. to Com-
merce, Tex.;
C. E. Sullivan, Columbia, S. C. to Willington,
S. C.;
A. F. Doty, N. Charlotte, N. C. to Lownesville,
Rocky River, Mt. Carmel and Calhoun
Falls, S. C.;
F. W. A. Bosch, Tabernacle Church, Springfield,
Mo.;

C. H. Williamson, First Church, Lexington, Mo.;
F. N. Wilson, to Harrisburg, N. C.;
F. E. Estes, Walthalla, S. C. to Orangeburg,
S. C.;
D. J. Currie, De Funiack Springs, Fla. to Edisto
Island, S. C.;
E. C. Grunshaw, D.D., Sulphur Springs, Tex. to
Mt. Valley and Perry, Ga.;
J. D. McPhail, Demopolis, Ala. to Henry Me-
morial Church, Dublin, Ga.;
G. C. Bidwell, Barstow, Tex. to Crosbyton, Tex.;
G. W. Gregg, Crosbyton, Tex. to Balmorhea,
Tex.;
W. R. Hall, D.D., Manhattan Church, El Paso,
Tex. to Corsicana, Tex.;
J. B. McCall, D.D., Eastminster Church, El Paso,
Tex. to Sanderson, Tex.;
S. J. McMurry, D.D., Bartell, Tex. to Van Horn,
Tex.;
W. C. Smith to Chinquapin, N. C.;
David Shepperson, Corsicana, Tex. to Eldorado,
Ark.;
J. A. Christian, D.D., Tupelo, Miss. to First
Church, Baton Rouge, La.;
E. F. Lothery to Second Church, Baton Rouge,
La.;
Harry A. McBeth, Knoxville, Tenn. to Mildren,
Wesley and Campbell Memorial Churches,
Sharps, Va.;
F. H. Chapman, Blakely, Ga. to Mt. Vernon,
Ga.;
B. A. McIlhany to Hartsville, S. C.;
Henry Rankin, Walterboro, S. C. to Summerton,
S. C.

Changed Addresses

D. R. Greenhoe, Glade Spring, Va.;
John Campbell, Look-out Mountain, Tenn.

Ordinations

Kelsey Regen, Covington, Ky.;
H. W. Alexander, Carlisle, Ky.;
J. Walton Stewart, Atlanta, Ga.;
G. Sexton Buchanan, Halston, Tenn. Presbytery,
May 3;
Malcolm P. Calhoun, as Assistant-Pastor Bream
Memorial Church, Charleston, W. Va.;
Harry Petersen, Jr., Cedartown, Ga.;
Cecll Thompson, Marietta, Ga.

Installations

W. T. Palmer, D.D., Manning, S. C.;
W. M. Crofton, Rose Hill Church, Columbus,
Ga.;
W. T. Pearman, Dawson, Ga.;
J. C. Bridges, Pelzer, S. C.;
W. O. Nelson, Jackson and Norwood, La.

Resignations

H. L. Saunders, Lee's Summit, Mo.;
T. H. Spence, Rocky River, N. C.;
G. F. Patterson, Graham and Pochontas, Va.;
L. F. Kinney, Rural Retreat, Va.;
S. O. Hall, Moorefield, W. Va.

Deaths

John S. Wood, Forest City, N. C.;
Byron Clark, D.D., Salsbury, N. C.;
J. D. Deans, Mooresville, N. C.;
Cary F. Moore, Lexington, Ky.

Presbyterian Church in Canada

Calls

William Moore, Windsor, Ont. to Brussels, Ont.;
George Extence, Hull, Que. to Cote des Neiges
Church, Montreal, Que.;
Daniel MacVicar, Thorburn, N.S. to New Lon-
don and Clifton, P. E. I.;
John Riddell, Millbrook, Ont. to First Church,
St. Mary's, Ont.;
John Logan Veneta, Knox College, Toronto to
St. Giles Church, Ottawa, Ont.;
Agnew H. Johnston, M.A., Knox College, Tor-
onto to Walkerton, Ont. (declines).

Calls Accepted

Walter McCleary, Cochrane, Ont. to Westmount,
Edmonton, Alta.;
Norman F. Sharkey, Presbyterian College,
Montreal, Que. to Sonya, Cresswell, and
Wick, Ont.;
Hilton R. Campbell, Ph.D., Brigden, Ont. to
Knox Church, Windsor, Ont.;
James Alan Munro, Knox College, Toronto, Ont.
to Rosetown, Sask.

Inductions

Andrew Walker, Lloydminster, Alta., May 12;
A. Leslie Howard, Ph.D., Knox Church, George-
town, Ont., Feb. 24;
G. F. Cox, St. Paul's Church, Victoria, B.C., Feb.
25;

Robert G. McKay, M.A., St. Paul's Church,
Prince Albert, Sask., Feb. 26;
Prescott W. Murray, Barney's River, etc., N. S.,
Feb.;
W. D. Grant Hollingworth, First Church, Prince
Rupert, B. C., March;
Stuart A. Woods, Beamsville, Ont., March 19;
A. Raeburn Gibson, B.D., Knox Church, Mitchell,
Ont., March 27;
Samuel H. Hill, Kinburn, Torbolton, and Paken-
ham, Ont., March 27;
Walter Moffatt, Fingal, Ont.;
John Keir Geddie Fraser, D.D., Alberton, P.
E. I.

Resignations

G. C. Little, Hanover and Ayton, Ont.;
J. Beecher Snider, Fenelon Falls, Ont.;
Alex. Shepherd, Burgoyne and Dunblane, Ont.;
W. A. MacMillan, Southampton, Ont.

Deaths

Robert McDerment, M.A., Bournaville and New-
tonville, Ont., April 15;
T. B. McCorkindale, D.D., Port Dover, Ont.,
Feb. 3;
S. B. Rohold, F.R.G.S., Haifa, Palestine, Feb. 14;
W. W. Craw, Ph.D., St. Andrew's, Petrolia, Ont.,
March 8;
John A. James, Ailsa Craig, Ont., March.

United Presbyterian Church

Calls

J. A. Mahaey to Alexis, Ill.;
W. T. Mabon to Second Church, Springfield, O.

Calls Accepted

F. N. Crawford, Bovina Centre, N. Y. to Middle-
town, O.;
R. F. French to Clifton, O.

Inductions

Hugh Smith, Amoret, Mo., April 15;
E. G. Williams, D. D., Stated Supply, West-
minster, Ia.;
E. J. Roberts, Stated Supply, Caledonia and
Arlington, Wis.

Resignations

A. C. Douglas, Sterling, Kans., April 14;
W. R. Laurence, New Concord, O.;
D. H. Decheder, Federated Church, Elmira, Ill.,
April 15;
S. M. McConnell, West Side Church, Monmouth,
Ill.

Deaths

Robert H. Hume, D. D., Springfield, O., April 14.

Reformed Church in America

Calls

Nelson Van Raalte, Holland, Mich. to Wynant-
skill, N. Y.;
J. R. Euwoema, Alton, Ia. to Hope Church, Los
Angeles, Cal.;
A. Linnemann, Scotland, S. D. to Willow Lake,
S. D.

Calls Accepted

Cornelius Dykhuizen to Schoharie, N. Y.;
G. DeMotts, Lynden, Wash. to Hope Church,
Sheboygan, Wis.

Installations

Gerret John Wullschlegler, New Paltz, N. Y.,
March 18.

Deaths

Charles W. Kinney, Schuylerville, N. Y., April
11.

Reformed Church in U. S.

Calls

C. A. Lang, Culver, Ind. to Austintown, O.;
Carl Koephe to St. John's Church, La Crosse,
Wis.

Calls Accepted

William H. Landis, Hundman, Pa. to Derry, Pa.;
H. Shinn, Indianapolis, Ind. to Grace Church,
Toledo, O.

News of the Church

The Presbyterian League of Faith

IN the midst of renewed discussion of the "Auburn Affirmation" engendered by the proposals to unite the larger Presbyterian and Reformed bodies in the United States, announcement has been made of the establishment of a Presbyterian League of Faith. Declaring its intention to maintain the system of doctrine of the Westminster Confession, it exists "in opposition to all plans of Church union which would either break down that system or relegate it to a secondary place." Experienced observers regard the formation of the league as perhaps the most significant event of the last few years in the Presbyterian Church, since it serves notice that Conservatives are prepared to contend to the last ditch against the influence of Auburn Affirmation Modernism and Indifferentism and for the historic gospel. It is expected that the formation of the League will have a profound effect upon the campaign in favor of organic union as heretofore conducted. The League issued its constitution early in May, signed by one hundred and fifty Ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., who are the initial sponsors of the organization. Among them are included some of the best-known names in the Church.

In order that the Church at large may be informed concerning the league and its sponsors, CHRISTIANITY TODAY herewith reprints the constitution and the list of original signers.

This constitution has been sent to each ordained Minister in the Northern Church, with a postcard enclosed for his signature, if he so desires. The League is aimed to be an effective instrument for drawing all real conservatives in the church together for the maintenance of the faith. The constitution follows:

Constitution of the Presbyterian League of Faith

Article I. Title

The name of the Association shall be "The Presbyterian League of Faith."

Article II. Objects

The objects of this Association shall be:

1. To maintain loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God in opposition to denials of its full truthfulness.

2. To maintain the Reformed or Calvinistic system of doctrine as it is set forth in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. as it appears in 1931 in opposition to all plans of church union

which would either break down that system or relegate it to a secondary place.

3. To oppose changes in the historic formula of creed subscription required of candidates for the ministry and the eldership.

4. To oppose the attack made by the document commonly called the "Auburn Affirmation" upon the doctrinal pronouncement of the General Assembly of 1923, and to insist, in opposition to that affirmation, that the full truth of the Scriptures, the Virgin Birth of Christ, the Substitutionary Atonement, the bodily Resurrection and Miracles of our Lord are essential doctrines of the Word of God and our Standards.

5. To warn men everywhere that salvation is to be obtained not by human merit or human effort to please God, but only through the redeeming work of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as He is offered to us in the Gospel.

6. To encourage the vigorous defense and joyous propagation of the Gospel in its fullness as it is set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith on the basis of Holy Scripture.

Article III. Membership

Ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. if they are in full accord with the objects of the Association, shall be eligible to membership.

New members shall be proposed by a Committee on Membership, after careful consideration and after a statement to the effect that they are in accord with the objects of the League as set forth in Article II. Candidates thus proposed shall be received into membership if they receive a four-fifths vote of the members present at any meeting of the League.

Article IV. Officers

The Officers of the League shall be a President, three Vice-Presidents and a Secretary-Treasurer, all of whom shall be elected to serve for one year. These officers shall constitute the Executive Committee.

Article V. Meetings

The League shall meet at least once a year. Meetings may be called by the Executive Committee, which shall notify the members at least two weeks in advance of the time of meetings.

Article VI. Amendments

This Constitution may be amended by a four-fifths vote of those who are present at any meeting of the League provided that the proposed amendment shall have been presented in writing to the members of the

League at least one month prior to the time of such meeting.

Initial Members of the League

Crofton C. Adams, Maple Plain, Minn.; George D. Adamson, First Church, Bicknell, Ind.; William J. Agnew, Deerfield, Ill.; Roy L. Aldrich, Central Church, Detroit, Mich.; Alexander Alison, Jr., First Church, Bridgeport, Conn.; Valentine S. Alison, First Church, Springfield, Mass.; Oswald T. Allis, Westminster Sem., Philadelphia; George Wells Arms, Bedford Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Wilson Aull, Union Sq. Church, Somerville, Mass.; John S. Axtell, Penney Farms, Fla.; Alfred S. Badger, Waukesha, Wis.; G. Sydney Barber, First Church, Sunnyside, Wash.; Donald G. Barnhouse, Tenth Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; Sylvester W. Beach, Princeton, N. J.; N. S. Becker, Suffern, N. Y.; L. Carmon Bell, Huron, S. D.; John Bendelow, Hot Springs, Ark.; H. W. Bieber, Church of Covenant, Cynwyd, Pa.; H. Gough Birchby, Pasadena, Calif.; K. A. Bishara, Syrian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Alvin Blackwell, Mid. Smithfield, East Stroudsburg, Pa.; Conrad Bluhm, Bald Eagle Church, Mill Hall, Pa.; Walter P. Boardman, Wright Mem. Church, Barnegat, N. J.; Raymond I. Brahmans, First Church, Laguna Beach, Calif.; B. J. Brethouwer, Thayer, Neb.; Marcus A. Brownson, Southern Pines, N. C.; Roy T. Brumbaugh, First Church, Tacoma, Wash.; Walter Duncan Buchanan, Broadway Church, New York City; David DeForest Burrell, First Church, Williamsport, Pa.; D. M. Butt, Huron, S. D.; J. S. Butt, W. Kishacoquils Ch., Belleville, Pa.; William M. Carle, Twenty-nine Palms, Calif.; William Carter, Throop Ave. Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; David S. Clark, Bethel Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; Robert L. Clarke, Jr., First Church, Indiana, Pa.; William G. Clark-Duff, Duryea Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Philip H. Clifford, First Church, Boston, Mass.; Seth C. Craig, Union Church, Newburgh, N. Y.; Samuel G. Craig, Princeton, N. J.; Louis B. Crane, Westminster Church, Elizabeth, N. J.; Walter A. Creason, Charlestown, Ind.; R. W. Crichton, First Church, Nunn, Colo.; I. L. Crooks, Muddy Creek Church, Khedive, Pa.; Edgar Crossland, Woodstock Church, New York City; Oscar L. Daley, Islip, Long Island, N. Y.; Frederic A. Dean, Second Church, East Liverpool, O.; Joseph S. De Rogatis, West New Brighton, N. Y.; Otto Dietrich, First German Church, Orange, N. J.; J. M. L. Eckard, Barton, Md.; Walter E. Edmonds, First Church, Glendale, Calif.; Frank R. Elder, Church of Covenant, Cincinnati, O.; George M. Elsbree, Chelsea Church, Atlantic City, N. J.; Paul D. Elsesser, French Church, New York City; Edwin S. Evans, Arlington, Kansas; Robert

W. Evans, Greely, Colo.; Robert E. Flickinger, Rockwell City, Iowa; Robert G. Freytag, Valley German Church, Orange, N. J.; Albert Dale Gantz, Williamsbridge Church, New York City; John R. Gass, Albuquerque, New Mex.; Charles F. Geiger, First Church, Raymond, S. D.; B. M. Gemmill, Neshaminy Church, Hartsville, Pa.; Arthur H. Giles, Mora, Minn.; Lawrence B. Gilmore, Independent Church, Morristown, N. J.; Immanuel Gittel, Los Angeles, Calif.; Francis L. Goff, Rock Hill Church, St. Louis, Mo.; Henry P. Gray, Mechanicsville, Iowa; H. McAllister Griffiths, Hollond Mem. Ch., Philadelphia, Pa.; Norman B. Harrison, Oliver Church, Minneapolis, Minn.; John S. Howk, Evansville, Ind.; Frank A. Hunger, Spring St. Church, New York City; W. Russell Hunter, Donnellson, Iowa; Robert Scott Inglis, Third Church, Newark, N. J.; Milo F. Jamison, Los Angeles, Calif.; Frederick W. Johnson, Newark, N. J.; Edward H. Jones, Gettysburg, Pa.; J. Russell Jones, Scottsville, Kansas; E. A. Junkin, Okmulgee, Okla.; N. B. Kelley, Denver, Colo.; D. S. Kennedy, Wayne, Penna.; Marchant A. King, Newburgh, N. Y.; George Korteling, Cent. Park Church, Cedar Rapids, Ia.; James E. S. Lahman, Amistad, New Mex.; Harold S. Laird, Collingswood, N. J.; Orville R. Lamper, Hanna City, Ill.; A. L. Lathem, Third Church, Chester, Pa.; George H. Lee, Portland, Oregon; George A. Leukel, Kennett Square, Pa.; Robert R. Littell, Tioga Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; L. Craig Long, Benedict Mem. Ch., New Haven, Conn.; Frank Lukens, First Church, Burlington, N. J.; Clarence E. Macartney, First Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.; J. Gresham Machen, Westminster Sem., Philadelphia, Pa.; Allan A. MacRae, Westminster Sem., Philadelphia, Pa.; Thos. W. Malcolm, Mt. Olivet Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Clarence A. Marshall, Community Church, Yoder, Wyo.; Albert A. Martin, Hopewell Ch., Thompson Ridge, N. Y.; Mark A. Matthews, First Church, Seattle, Wash.; F. Paul McConkey, Immanuel Church, Detroit, Mich.; J. C. McConnell, Miller Mem. Church, Upper Darby, Pa.; D. H. McCullagh, Turlock, Calif.; Will V. McGee, Cottage Grove, Ore.; J. K. McGhillivray, Waterloo Church, Polk, Pa.; Arthur A. McKay, Rumson, N. J.; Frederick N. McMillin, Walnut Hills Church, Cincinnati, O.; Walter F. McMillin, Knox Church, Minneapolis, Minn.; Harmon H. McQuilkin, First Church, Orange, N. J.; John C. Monsma, Oostburg, Wis.; Arien J. Muyskens, East Orange, N. J.; John F. Nicholas, Graniteville, Vermont; Wm. P. Nicholson, Glendale, Calif.; Dwight L. Parsons, Little Silver, N. J.; W. B. Paterson, First Church, Winchester, O.; E. Edwin Paulson, First Church, Foley, Minn.; Russell Paynter, Memorial Church, St. Louis, Mo.; T. Roland Phillips, Arlington Church, Baltimore, Md.; George P. Pierson, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mebane Ramsay, Calvary Ch., W. New Brighton, N. Y.; E. G. Randal, First Church, Vashon, Wash.; B. Allen Reed, Nat. Bible

Institute, New York City; John T. Reeve, South Church, Syracuse, N. Y.; Edwin H. Rian, Westfield, N. J.; Andrew Richards, Harlem Church, New York City; Charles L. Richards, Poynette, Wis.; Parke Richards, Lawrenceville, N. J.; C. F. Robinson, Monroe, N. Y.; J. Millen Robinson, New York City; Walter Rothwell, Churdan, Iowa; George J. Russell, Second Church, New York City; Charles Schall, Wayne, Pa.; Joseph A. Schofield, Jr., Gouverneur, N. Y.; Clarence Beecher Scoville, Amagansett, L. I., N. Y.; George E. Sehlbrede, South Amboy, N. J.; Frank E. Simmons, Spencer Mem. Ch., Brooklyn, N. Y.; John E. Slater, Nat. Bible Institute, New York City; Joseph G. Snyder, Olivet Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Frank H. Stevenson, Princeton, N. J.; Maurice P. Stoute, Second Church, Portsmouth, O.; Paul J. Strohauser, Hamilton Square, N. J.; F. Larson Suetterlein, Whippany, N. J.; John H. Thompson, Goodwill Church, Montgomery, N. Y.; David B. Tomkins, Second Church, Princeton, N. J.; J. Montgomery Travis, Denver, Colorado; Thomas Tyack, Hightstown, N. J.; Henry M. Tyndall, Peoples Tabernacle, New York; H. G. Vorsheim, Central Church, Portsmouth, O.; Hugh Walker, First Church, Ridgebury, N. Y.; Warren R. Ward, Westminster Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; S. M. Ware, Seattle, Wash.; Walter Vail Watson, Seneca Church, Stanley, N. Y.; Thomas N. Weaver, Germonds Church, Spring Valley, N. Y.; H. Clare Welker, Brighton, Colorado; A. Forest Wells, Northminster Church, Baltimore, Md.; A. L. Whitfield, Gallum Church, Pinckneyville, Ill.; D. Forest Williams, Oak Hill, Ohio; Charles J. Woodbridge, First Church, Flushing, N. Y.; Henry M. Woods, Ventnor, N. J.; W. Clarence Wright, Birmingham, Mich.; John C. Young, Seattle, Wash.

The Rev. Walter Duncan Buchanan, D.D., Minister of the Broadway Presbyterian Church, New York, is President of the League. The Vice-Presidents are, The Rev. David De Forest Burrell, D.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Williamsport, Pa.; The Rev. O. T. Allis, D.D., Professor of Old Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, and The Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D., Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. The Secretary-Treasurer is the Rev. Albert Dale Gantz, Minister of the Williamsbridge Presbyterian Church, of New York.

A Parable in Action

THE parable of the talents has been adopted as a working principle in the Cuyaba church, Brazil, and with good results. Every six months each member is given a certain sum of money from the church treasury to be used as each one decides for himself. The earnings as well as the principal are then brought in at the end of a six weeks' period. The number of those who gain nothing with the money entrusted to them is very small.

Both Overtures Pass

LATEST advices from the office of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., show that Presbyteries have voted upon the overtures as follows: Overture A (On the Permanent Judicial Commission) Yes, 156, No, 63, No Action, 14; Overture B (On the rescinding of Constitutional Rule No. 1, respecting Local Evangelists) Yes, 166, No, 67, No Action, 5. Since an affirmative vote of one hundred and forty-seven Presbyteries is necessary for adoption, it will be seen that both of these overtures have been adopted, and will become a part of the law of the church when the returns are made known to the forthcoming General Assembly.

Overture from Denver

THE Presbytery of Denver, at its April meeting, adopted an overture asking the 143rd General Assembly to sever the connection between the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and the "Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America." It is certain that when the overture is before the Assembly it will lead to vigorous debate. Thousands of Presbyterians are opposed to the Church's continued association with the Modernist-controlled "Federal Council." The Presbytery of Denver also advised its churches to divert the .2% of their benevolence funds from the Federal Council to the Boards of the Church.

Lane Seminary Abandonment Blocked by Court

LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, which has been located in Cincinnati, Ohio, for more than 100 years, will continue to function as a seminary, if an opinion handed down in Common Pleas Court by Judge Charles S. Bell on April 21, is not upset by appeal.

Judge Bell held that as the result of testimony adduced before him in a hearing, several months ago, the seminary had not failed in its original purpose, and that it had not become extinct, despite contentions to the contrary. He also ruled that the court had no jurisdiction to authorize the seminary trustees to abandon it and endow scholarships in the Chicago Theological Seminary.

The institution dates back to 1829, when the Legislature of the State of Ohio created the theological institution "for the education of pious young men for the gospel ministry." In December of that year Elnathan Kemper, James Kemper, Sr., Peter H. Kemper and David R. Kemper and their wives deeded the property to the seminary.

This deed provided that, if the purpose of the seminary failed, or if it became extinct,

the property was to revert to the American Board Society, the American Tract Company, the American Colonization Society and the American Education Society. In the event that any of these societies also were extinct, the property then was to revert to any charitable religious institution selected by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

For many years the seminary flourished, and men who carried the gospel to the four corners of the world were its graduates. Of late years the enrollment has fallen off and bad times have overtaken the school.

About a year ago the trustees filed a petition asking for instructions as to what they were to do. They favored abandonment of the school and the establishment of scholarships in the Chicago institution which was formally known as "McCormick Seminary." It was claimed on behalf of the American Colonization Society, that the seminary had failed in its purpose and that therefore the property should be turned over to the other societies mentioned in the deed.

Discussing the matters that were brought to its attention during the hearing, Judge Bell wrote: "Since the establishment of this institution in 1829, there has been a great increase in the number of theological institutions available to students preparing for the Presbyterian ministry, and there has been a proportionate decrease in the past twenty-five or thirty years in the number of enlistments of young men for such training. A number of such institutions in the country have become more efficient for the purposes for which Lane Seminary was created, and this has been due largely to the fact that certain other colleges have received large incomes and generous gifts, which have been denied Lane Seminary.

"By reason of curtailed revenue, this institution has reached a financial status where there is in the neighborhood of about \$20,000 per annum for its upkeep; and because thereof the institution has generally deteriorated until the buildings are out of repair, the professors are underpaid, and the student body has decreased greatly. At the time of the hearing, there were less than 20 in the student body at the seminary. The future prospects of the institution presents a dismal picture; the institution probably will have fewer students and less money than at the present time.

"Disposing first of the disputed fact in the case, the court has concluded that Lane Seminary has not failed or become extinct."

Taking up the second matter before him, Judge Bell said: "The trustees propose to sell the property; create a legal entity to be known as the Lane Seminary Foundation; with the funds establish proper endowments, scholarships and fellowships in the Chicago Theological Seminary.

"After a careful consideration, the court

has concluded that it has no authority or jurisdiction to authorize these trustees to change the name or abandon the theological institution in Hamilton County," the opinion concluded.

Following the receipt of the judgment of court, it was announced that Lane Seminary would re-open in the fall as usual.

The Report on "Birth Control"

BOTH the Church and the World have been stirred by the portion of the report of the Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage which deals with "Birth Control." The Commission was appointed by the 1929 Assembly. Its report to the 1930 Assembly was handled somewhat roughly by that body, but the Committee was permitted another year of life. The report to the 1931 Assembly has to do with Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage, Birth Control and proper sex-education both of Ministers and people. Section II, which deals with Birth Control, has been widely commented upon. It is as follows:

"Earnest Christian people are asking for the Church's guidance on the subject of Birth Control. This subject demands attention today as never before. Economic conditions and a worthy standard of living clearly make it wrong to bring children into the world without adequate provision for their nurture and proper consideration for the health of the mother.

"The Christian conception of sex clothes the relationship between husband and wife with spiritual significance, sanctifying marriage as a divine institution. Moral control is the basic essential to a worthy experience of the marriage relation.

"In expressing its judgment on this subject, the Church in no sense modifies its condemnation of sex relations outside of marriage.

"Two methods are possible in securing birth control. The first is continence. The second is the use of contraceptives. When this method is adopted in seeking the worthy objectives stated above, it should only be in fidelity to the highest spiritual ideals of the Christian home."

The second general recommendation of the Commission is as follows: "The Commission recommends that the General Assembly adopt the report concerning birth control contained within this Commission's report above as expressing the attitude of our Church upon this intimate and all important subject."

The Presbytery of Philadelphia, at its April meeting overwhelmingly adopted a strong memorial to the forthcoming Assembly concerning this report. The memorial was moved by the Rev. George B. Bell, D.D., of the Patterson Memorial Pres-

byterian Church, Philadelphia, as follows: "The Presbytery of Philadelphia convened in its regular monthly meeting May 4, 1931, desires to express to the General Assembly meeting in Pittsburgh, May 28 to June 3, its profound disapproval of that portion of the report to be submitted to the Assembly by its Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage in which the Commission endorses birth control by contraceptive methods.

"It is the opinion of this Presbytery that the adoption of this declaration would bring deserved criticism and odium upon our beloved church."

It will be remembered that a year ago, when the Commission desired to alter the Confession so that marriages with Romanists should be allowed by the standards, a protest was adopted by the Presbytery of Philadelphia against making any change. This protest originated with Dr. Bell, who later carried his point on the floor of the Assembly. The Presbytery of Philadelphia has instructed its Commissioners to vote against approval of the section of the report dealing with Birth Control.

The "War Questionnaire"

THE number of 12,076, or 62 per cent of a total of 19,327 who responded to a questionnaire sent to 53,000 ministers, have expressed the opinion that the churches of America should go on record as refusing to sanction or support any future war. 10,427 or 54 per cent have stated that their present purpose is not to sanction any future war or participate as an armed combatant.

The Questionnaire was sent out by S. Parkes Cadman, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Daniel A. Poling, W. Russell Bowie, John Nevin Sayre, Ralph W. Sockman, Reinhold Niebuhr, Kirby Page, Sherwood Eddy and William Pierson Merrill.

The summaries published are those of replies from 19,372 clergymen. While most of them made either affirmative or negative answers some were in doubt and a small number failed to answer one or more of the eight questions of the document.

A summary of the replies to the questions follows:

Do you favor the immediate entrance of the United States into the League of Nations? Yes, 12,709. No, 3,060.

Do you favor military training in our public high schools and civilian colleges or universities? Yes, 2,574. No, 16,018.

Do you favor substantial reductions in armaments even if the United States is compelled to take the initiative and make a proportionately greater reduction than other nations are willing to do? Yes, 15,449. No, 2,702.

Do you believe that the policy of armed intervention in other lands by our government to protect the lives and property of American citizens should be abandoned and protective efforts confined to pacific means? Yes, 12,017. No, 3,899.

Do you believe that the churches of America should now go on record as refusing to sanction or support any future war? Yes, 12,076. No, 4,723.

Are you personally prepared to state that it is your present purpose not to sanction any future war or participate as an armed combatant? Yes, 10,427. No, 5,801.

Could you conscientiously serve as an army chaplain on active duty in wartime? Yes, 8,700. No, 6,628.

Do you regard the distinction between "defensive" and "aggressive" war as sufficiently valid to justify your sanctioning or participating in a future war of defense? Yes, 8,316. No, 7,130.

The questionnaire was sent out to many ministers of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, Methodist Episcopal, Protestant Episcopal, Congregational, Baptist, Disciples of Christ, United Brethren, Evangelical, Unitarian and Universalist bodies.

Among those who said they would not sanction "any future war or participate as an armed combatant" were Harry Emerson Fosdick, Ralph W. Sockman, W. Russell Bowie and Reinhold Niebuhr of New York; William L. Stidger, Boston; Bernard Iddings Bell, Annandale; Bishop Paul Jones, Yellow Springs, and A. Ray Petty, Kansas City.

Among those who held that the churches should not go on record as refusing to sanction or support any future war were Bishop Stires, of Long Island, S. Parkes Cadman, I. M. Haldeman, New York.

In denominational comparisons, the Episcopal clergy stood at one extreme, with 49 per cent against absolute condemnation of war, and with 70 per cent willing to serve as chaplains. Ministers of the Evangelical Synod, at the opposite pole, showed 69 per cent condemning any war, and 49 per cent stating that they would be unwilling to serve as chaplains.

Essay Contest on Christian History

CO-INCIDENT with the publication of *The Story of The Church*, by John Clover Monsma, Rae D. Henkle, publisher, of 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, has announced a contest for the best essay on the five most significant events in the history of Christianity. The Judges are: Dr. Daniel A. Poling, President of the United Society of Christian Endeavor; Dr. Walter Russell Bowie, Rector of Grace Church, New York

City; Rev. John Clover Monsma, author of *The Story of The Church*. The subject for discussion is "the five most significant events in Christian history, excepting only the life and ministry of Jesus." The discussion must be limited to one thousand words. The judges will select the seven best papers on the basis of literary quality and the arguments adduced, and will award to the authors the following prizes: First prize, \$50.00; Second prize, \$30.00; Third prize, \$20.00; Fourth prize, \$10.00; Fifth, Sixth and Seventh prizes, \$5.00 each.

The contest closes June 30th, 1931, and announcement of the awards will be made not later than September 1st, 1931. No manuscripts will be returned.

Heresy Charges Preferred Against Dr. Diehl

ACTION on a proposed heresy trial for Dr. Charles E. Diehl, president of Southwestern College, Memphis, has been postponed by the Presbytery of Nashville, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. At the same time attacks on his orthodoxy were made in letters to the synods of four states.

The Nashville Presbytery voted to wait until its meeting on September 29, before deciding whether to try Doctor Diehl. Eugene T. Hollins, Nashville, a member of the Presbytery, asked that Dr. Diehl be tried, preferring charges that he did not believe in the full inspiration of the Scriptures.

It is charged that Dr. Diehl does not "believe in the full inspiration of the Scriptures as contained in the Holy Bible, which is against the peace, unity, and purity of the church and the honor and majesty of the Lord Jesus Christ as the King and Head thereof."

A similar accusation was made recently by eleven Memphis pastors, but the board of directors of the school conducted a hearing and declared Dr. Diehl to be "sound in the faith."

The board also voted approval of his administration, with 11 pastors having charged him with "reckless extravagance."

Between now and the fall meeting a special committee will study the question and prepare a recommendation as to the advisability of a trial. The committee will be composed of three Ministers and two elders.

While the Presbytery was considering the matter, the Rev. J. P. Robertson, in Memphis, and Dr. W. S. Lacy, director of the church's educational activities in Mississippi, disclosed that they had renewed an attack on Dr. Diehl which had already resulted in an expression of his views.

Mr. Robertson who, with ten other Memphis pastors charged Dr. Diehl with heresy, has more recently criticized Dr. Diehl's be-

liefs and administration in circular letters to members of the Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama and Louisiana synods, which support the school. Memphis pastors said the synods, through their power to elect the college's directors, could oust Dr. Diehl if the proposed Presbytery trial did not develop or resulted in acquittal.

Dr. Diehl has denied the charges and has asserted his faith in the essential tenets of the church.

Days of Prayer and Fasting in the Southern Church

THE Rev. Thomas W. Currie, D.D., moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., has sent the following letter to the several Presbyteries of the Church: "From several sources suggestions have come that our Church should have a Day of Prayer and Fasting for God's blessing upon us. The suggestions are that we ask for guidance into an evangelistic spirit that will enable us to discharge our full duty to our generation, both at home and abroad. A second suggestion which keeps coming is that we may seriously undertake the financing of our work. Because these calls keep coming, I dare to suggest that each Presbytery at its spring meeting initiate processes as its own wisdom may suggest for calling the churches within its bounds to a Day of Prayer and Fasting for God's guidance. This can be done very happily in connection with the call that is being issued by our Home Mission Committee in Atlanta for a period of prayer in connection with the spring meetings of Presbyteries."

The Presbyterian Church in Canada

IN Dalhousie, N. B., the congregation has entered upon the possession of a new church after a long and trying experience. The congregation, however, has held together splendidly and their courage and faith have been rewarded. Sunny Corner, N. B., is another place that has rejoiced in completion of a new building. A fine new church has been added to the number in the city of Hamilton. This is known as the Westdale Church, in a new suburb of the city. It provides accommodation for 450 with provision for expansion. It has a beautiful pipe organ, the gift of a gentleman deeply interested in the work. It also has a fine bell.

A congregation that has developed rapidly is Central Presbyterian Church, Brantford, one of the industrial cities in central Ontario. The congregation was organized in February, 1925, with a handful of members from each of the three minority groups. The membership is now 841. Two years after organization the Congregational Church was

purchased and this has been entirely remodelled and is one of the most beautiful edifices belong to the Church. Accommodation for the Sunday School has proved so inadequate that advantage has been taken of facilities provided by the Y. W. C. A. across the street. One satisfactory feature is that the congregation is entirely free of debt and has regularly met its Budget allocation.

In Grace Church, Calgary, there is a strong congregation under the capable leadership of Rev. James McNeill, who came to the Church from New Zealand. A thank offering taken by this congregation toward the close of the year when \$5,000 was asked exceeded that amount by \$250.

One of the smaller congregations in Toronto, which recently welcomed Rev. J. A. Berlis as their minister, responded splendidly to his appeal to reduce the floating debt. A circular letter was the means adopted in soliciting contributions. These were handed to Mr. Berlis personally and he received the sum of \$1,400. High Park congregation, Toronto, was the recipient of two contributions, the gift of two ladies, \$1,000 and \$4,000 respectively, for the completion of the tower.

In the foreign field the Church recently completed in the Gwalior Mission an industrial school. This means a splendid addition to the missionary equipment and will be of great service in training youths for industrial pursuits.

A grave disappointment was recently experienced by the veteran missionaries, Dr. and Mrs. Goforth. They were on their way to their field in Manchuria, when at Winnipeg eye-trouble experienced by Dr. Goforth compelled their return. In Toronto he submitted to an operation and there is every prospect of restoration of sight.

Insanity as a Ground for Divorce Rejected in England

INCURABLE insanity as a ground for divorce was rejected by the British House of Commons by 148 votes to 114 when it considered a bill which Holford Knight, Labor member, sought to introduce.

Last year the House, by an overwhelming majority, gave permission to introduce a similar bill.

"If it gets on the statute book," said the Rev. Mr. Gordon Lang, a nonconformist minister who belongs to the Parliamentary Labor Party, it will be a first and very long step toward companionate marriages."

There were only two speeches on the bill. Introducing it, Mr. Knight said it was proposed to add to the grounds of divorce "the ground that the defendant has been incurably insane as certified for five years continu-

ously before the presentation of the petition."

The Rev. Mr. Lang said that few competent doctors would care to certify any person as permanently insane after five years of continuous insanity.

"There can be no value in the pledge to take for better or worse if five years of incurable illness is to be the basis for breaking it down," he continued.

"I suggest that this is a bill for which there has been no real public demand from the general body of quiet people who live happily with each other, who if adversity comes thank God for power to comfort and help each other, and who will never give up hope for the restoration of sanity and of peace and happiness to their homes.

"Those people, who are the salt of the earth, do not want this bill. It is desired by a few eclectics and people like that.

"I have had hundreds of letters since the last motion, but I regret to say that the overwhelming majority of them could be put in two files under the headings 'lust' and 'finance'—the one consisting of people whose only thought is sexual satisfaction, and the other people who object to pay contributions to their wives or mothers and think they would be relieved of that if this bill was passed."

Sunday "Movie" Bill Passes British House

WHILE kneeling thousands outside prayed for defeat of the bill legalizing Sunday movies and other amusements in Great Britain, the House of Commons late in April passed the measure, 258 to 210, on its second reading.

A barrage of prayer was raised by ardent Sabbatharians while debate on the movie bill was in progress. A huge prayer meeting was organized by the Lord's Day Observance Society in a nearby hall to synchronize with the debate and as division time approached most of those attending repaired to Parliament Square and formed groups for prayer.

Some of these groups gathered about the statue of Oliver Cromwell, great puritan leader of the Seventeenth Century, which stands on the parliamentary precincts. There ardent prayers were offered for the intervention of God and the defeat of the Bill which is aimed to remove the nationwide ban on Sunday amusements.

The parties were mixed up in extraordinary manner in the lobbies when the vote was taken on the measure. Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald and the Conservative leader, Stanley Baldwin, for once found themselves in the same lobby, voting for the bill. Most other Conservative leaders and all the Ministers voted for it. David Lloyd George was

absent but nearly all Welsh members opposed it, as did most of the Scottish members save for those from the Clyde districts, notoriously radical in their social views.

The bill does not legalize motion pictures throughout England, but rather provides for a system of "local option" by which any county may decide to have Sunday performances by a vote of its council. The act will not apply to Ireland or Scotland.

The Thirty-nine Articles Defended

THE "Church Association" of the Church of England has issued a strong manifesto regarding the proposal to abolish subscription to the "Thirty-nine Articles" as reported in the last issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. The statement is as follows:

"The Council of the Church Association desires to make public the following statement, in view of the suggestion made to the National Assembly of the Church of England, that subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles should no longer be required of candidates for ordination:-

"1. The Articles are the most important standard of doctrine in the Church of England. In 1865 when the terms of clerical subscription were modified the Articles retained their primary position in the Declaration of Assent; and while the obligation upon newly appointed incumbents to 'read themselves in' by reading the whole morning and evening services as well as the Articles, was relaxed, the obligation to read the Articles was retained. So binding is this requirement of the law that a clergyman though duly presented, admitted, instituted and inducted, who did not 'read himself in' by public recitation of the Articles, would find his appointment null and void in law.

"2. A fundamental principle in the Constitution is the maintenance of 'the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law.' Now the Articles of 1562-3 were brought to their present form and agreed upon and imposed by the authority of Church and State in the year 1571, as their title informs us, for the avoiding of diversities of opinion and the establishing of consent touching true religion. Therefore any tampering with the Articles involves a grave Constitutional issue affecting not only all members of the Church of England, but every citizen.

"3. The contention that the Articles are 'out of date' and too much concerned with the controversies of the sixteenth century is untenable. The principal concern of the Articles is with the main doctrines of Christianity, the essentials of the Gospel, which are unchangeable divine truths. The controversies with which the Articles deal are at bottom the same that confront the Church to-day, seeing that the errors they correct spring from the permanent tendencies of the

human mind to corrupt the Word of God by adding to it or subtracting from it. The real reason for the attack upon the Articles is not that they are antiquated, but that they precisely meet and refute present-day Anglo-Romanism on the one hand, and so-called 'Modernism' on the other.

"The Church Association calls upon all those to whom the revealed truths of Holy Scripture and the maintenance of our National Protestantism are dear to rally to the defence of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, which all of our clergy from the highest to the lowest have of their own free will solemnly declared to be agreeable to the Word of God."

The Church of England Approaches the "Free Churches"

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has addressed a letter to the Rev. Charles Brown, D.D., as Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of Great Britain, inviting the Council to appoint representatives to meet representatives of the Church of England in conference on the questions of Cooperation and Reunion. The Archbishop expresses his eagerness for the resumption of the conversations begun after the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and believes that misunderstandings may thus be removed. He repeats Resolution 44 of the recent Lambeth Conference, which clearly looked forward to the probable renewal of the former conferences. The letter of the Archbishop will be brought before the annual meetings of the constituent members of the Federal Council, and the various Churches will be asked to appoint representatives, if they desire to take part in further conversations.

Prussian Evangelicals Accept Disestablishment

THE Synod of Prussian Evangelical Churches has accepted a concordat which in effect gives independence to the former State church, whose titular head until 1918 was the German Emperor, and puts it on the same basis as the Roman Catholic Church in Prussia. By virtue of a similar concordat two years ago the Roman Church receives 2,800,000 marks (about \$672,000), annually.

The vote was one hundred and sixty-six in favor of the pact and forty-seven against. The concordat, which was submitted by the Prussian State, must be ratified by the Prussian diet.

There was considerable argument over the political clause whereby Prussia reserves the right to veto appointments of high ecclesiastical dignitaries for reasons of state.

This action disestablishes the former national church, but compensates it by state financial aid.

The Archbishop Goes to Palestine

READERS of CHRISTIANITY TODAY will note with interest that the informal objections of the Vatican to the proposed visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Palestine did not prevent the visit. The Archbishop arrived in Jerusalem in April, and spent Friday and Saturday, April 17th and 18th visiting both Christian and Moslem holy places, including the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem, where he was received by Greek Orthodox and Armenian ecclesiastical leaders; the Garden of Gethsemane, the subterranean Crusaders' Chapel in the old city near the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Ophthalmic Hospital, and the new Scottish War Memorial Hospital.

On Saturday afternoon the Archbishop and his party visited the Mosque of Omar, where the mufti and sheiks received them.

Due to delicate political and religious conditions, the representatives of the Eastern Churches have confined themselves to informal receptions to Dr. Lang. Rome must not be insulted too openly!

Westminster Commencement

COMMENCEMENT activities at Westminster Seminary began on Sunday afternoon, May 10, 1931, with the preaching of the Baccalaureate sermon to the students. The Service was held in the Seminary chapel. The preacher was the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., Professor of New Testament, who, in the intimate fellowship of the gathering brought home to the students their solemn responsibility as Ministers of Christ and His Gospel.

On Tuesday, May 12, at 3:30 P. M., an impressive Memorial Service for the late Professor Robert Dick Wilson was held in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia. Dr. Machen presided. The first hymn:

Give me the wings of faith to rise
Within the veil, and see
The saints above, how great their joys,
How bright their glories be.

was followed by the Invocation, offered by John Murray, Th.M., Instructor of Systematic Theology in the Seminary. The Scripture was read by Professor N. B. Stonehouse, Th.D. Addresses in memory of Dr. Wilson were delivered by the Rev. H. H. McQuilkin, D.D., who told of Dr. Wilson "At Western;" The Rev. Prof. O. T. Allis, D.D., "At Princeton and Westminster;" Philip E. Howard, Esq., President of the Sunday School Times Co., on "Dr. Wilson and the Layman;" the Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D., on "Dr. Wilson and the Minister."

Following the singing of "For all the saints, who from their labors rest," prayer was offered by the Rev. Cornelius Van Til, Ph.D., and the Benediction was pronounced by the Rev. Prof. Paul Woolley, Th.M.

The Commencement Exercises

At 8 P. M. of the same day, Commencement Exercises were held in Witherspoon Hall, with the Rev. C. E. Macartney, D.D., presiding. Following the Processional Hymn, "Crown Him with Many Crowns," and the singing of the long Metre Doxology, the presence of God was invoked by the Rev. Chas. Schall, D.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Wayne, Pa. All then sang:

I love Thy kingdom, Lord,
The house of Thine abode,
The Church our Blest Redeemer saved,
With His own precious blood.

The Scripture was read by the Rev. Wm. P. Fulton, D.D., Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. Prayer was offered by the Rev. Henry M. Woods, D.D., of Ventnor, N. J., a Minister and Foreign Missionary of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

The commencement address was then delivered by the Rev. Stewart P. MacLennan, D.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood, California. He delivered an eloquent discourse upon "The Philosophy of Paul's Calling," which will be reported more fully in the next issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Following the address, certificates of graduation were awarded to four students completing graduate work, and thirteen seniors who had met the exacting requirements of the regular course.

Announcement of awarding of the student prizes was then made. The William Brenton Greene, Jr., Prize in Systematic Theology was awarded to Mr. Alexander Kay Davison. The Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield Prize in Old Testament was awarded to Mr. Gerard Hallock Snell. The William Brenton Greene, Jr., Prize in Apologetics was awarded to Mr. Carl Curtis McIntire.

The address to the graduating class was delivered by Dr. Machen. Following the hymn:

Ye Christian heralds, go proclaim
Salvation through Emmanuel's Name;
To distant climes the tidings bear,
And plant the Rose of Sharon there. . . .

the benediction was pronounced by the Rev. David DeForest Burrell, D.D. Westminster Seminary thus closed its second successful year, growing, encouraged and trusting in the continuing mercy of God. It will be a source of gratification to all supporters of the Seminary to know that its graduates are rapidly being called for by churches that desire men of a high caliber and with the thoroughness of the Seminary. Two graduates of Westminster's faculty are now serving in the First Congregational Church of