

8433
MAY 1933-R
R D 2
QUARRYVILLE PA

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-JUNE, 1932
Vol. 3 No. 2

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE
Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at
the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.

Christianity and External Authority

A GENERATION or two ago those calling themselves Christians were practically unanimous in holding that Christianity derived both its content and its sanction from external authority. Protestants and Roman Catholics differed as to the proximate seat of this authority—whether in the Bible or the Church—but they were wholly at one in their recognition of its existence. It is a historical error of the first magnitude to suppose that the Protestant doctrine of private judgment as advocated by our fathers carried with it a rejection of the idea of external authority in the sphere of religion.

Seventy-five years ago the rejection of external authority in religion was for the most part confined to those who were professedly antagonistic to Christianity. Today, however, such denial is an outstanding characteristic of multitudes of professing Christians, including many would-be leaders. We do not have to look outside the circle of the Presbyterian ministry to find those to whom the very idea of an external authority is anathema, notwithstanding the fact that without exception they have solemnly vowed that they believe that "the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice." How in view of this palpable contradiction they are able to retain a sense of intellectual honesty and moral integrity we do not profess to be able to explain.

Various causes have contributed to the bringing about of the existing situation. One of the most potent of these has been

the spread of modern evolutionary ideas. Where such ideas are dominant, all things are regarded as in a state of flux. There is nothing fixed or stable. Relativity belongs to the very essence of reality. If Evolutionism expresses the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, it needs no labored argument to prove that there is no such thing as an infallible authority in any sphere of life. In that case the existence of such an

authority is impossible in the very nature of things.

A closely related but deeper cause is that naturalism of thought and sentiment so characteristic of present-day thought, according to which the whole history of the world and man including religion and morality has come to pass without the operation of any supernatural factor. It is clear that in as far as we are naturalistic in thought and sentiment, we are precluded from the recognition of an external authority that speaks in terms of finality; for if there is such an authority it has a supernatural sanction. No doubt there may be a recognition of such external authority as the State, for instance, exercises where there is no recognition of the supernatural; but the existence of an external authority in any sphere of life that speaks in terms of finality is inextricably bound up with the reality of the supernatural as a factor in human life.

Other causes that have been potent are indicated when we speak of Rationalism and Mysticism. We mention these together because they are at one in finding the seat of authority within man himself. What is more, there is much to warrant the statement that the difference between Rationalists and Mystics is largely temperamental. "Warm up a rationalist and you have a mystic; cool down a mystic and you have a rationalist." Be this as it may, as belief in either Rationalism or Mysticism spreads belief in an external authority wanes.

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial Notes and Comments

The Denver Assembly.....	2
Putting First Things First.....	3
Dr. Machen's Denver Sermon.....	4
What is an Evangelical?.....	4
The Popularity of Jesus.....	5
R. B. Kuiper	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	8
J. G. Machen	
The 144th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.....	10
H. McA. Griffiths	
The Fourth Montreat Assembly.....	18
J. B. Morton	
The United Presbyterian Assembly....	20
A. G. MacLennan	
The 58th Canadian General Assembly.....	21

In view of the currents of thought that flow up and down the modern world—some of which have been mentioned—it is not at all surprising that many should be telling us that the very idea of the existence of an external authority in religion and morals is outgrown. Despite the number and standing of these men, however, and despite the confidence with which they speak, we refuse to allow ourselves to be stampeded by their statements. In our judgment they speak without knowledge. We not only believe in the existence of an external authority in religion and morals, we believe that its recognition is indispensable to the very existence of Christianity as taught in the Bible and in all the great historic creeds of the Church. It seems to us therefore that the whole mass of that evidence that may be cited to prove the truth of Christianity may also be cited to prove the existence of an external authority in religion and morals. It is not too much to say, we believe, that Christianity stands or falls with the existence or non-existence of an external authority that tells us what we should believe concerning God and the duty He requires of us. The fact that the new Protestantism, so called, in distinction from both Roman Catholicism and the older Protestantism, denies the existence of such an authority is merely one indication of the extent to which it has ceased to be Christian.

That the existence of such an external authority is a prerequisite to Christianity is closely related to the fact that Christianity is a revealed religion. It is, of course, true that revelation lies at the basis of all religion worthy of the name. This follows from the fact that God is a person, and as such can be known only as He makes Himself known, only as He reveals Himself. But while there is a broad sense in which all religions may be spoken of as revealed religions, since apart from such general revelation of God as is to be found in His works of creation and providence there would be no such thing as religion in any proper sense of the word; yet, strictly speaking, there is but one revealed religion, because Christianity alone is based on that special, supernatural revelation—in word and deed—recorded in the Bible. As a result,

Christianity has what is lacking in all religions where there is no recognition of special, supernatural revelation, viz., the element of external authority. External authority, in other words, is a correlate of special, supernatural revelation. Where such revelation exists (or is supposed to exist), and only there, is there any recognition of an external authority that speaks in tones of finality. Because Christianity as no other religion is based on and derives its content from special, supernatural revelation, it is dependent as no other religion upon the concept of external authority both for its existence and its maintenance. Whatever may be true of other religions, Christianity stands or falls with the validity of its external authority.

No one has written with fuller knowledge or with clearer insight on the relation between Christianity and external authority than has the late BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD. Fortunately the most important of his writings are being made available through the volumes now being issued by the Oxford University Press. The latest of these volumes, fresh from the press, entitled "Studies in Theology," contains two chapters that deal with this subject under the titles, "The Latest Phase of Historical Rationalism" and "Mysticism and Christianity." It is hoped that this volume will receive the attention its merits warrant. "There is nothing more important," he writes, "in the age in which we live than to bear constantly in mind that all the Christianity of Chris-

tianity rests precisely on 'external authority.' Religion, of course, we can have without 'external authority,' for man is a religious animal and will function religiously, always and everywhere. But Christianity, no. Christianity rests on 'external authority,' and that for the very good reason that it is not the product of man's religious sentiment but is a gift from God. To ask us to set aside 'external authority' and throw ourselves back on what we find within us alone—call it by whatever name you choose, 'religious experience,' 'the Christian consciousness,' 'the inner light,' 'the immanent divine'—is to ask us to discard Christianity and to revert to natural religion" (p. 659). It is especially pertinent to note as Dr. WARFIELD proceeds to point out that it is particularly those elements in Christianity that enables it to meet the needs of sinners that must be omitted if we reject the notion of external authority. "Above all other elements of Christianity, CHRIST and what CHRIST stands for, with the cross at the center, comes to us solely by 'external authority.' No 'external authority,' no CHRIST and no cross of CHRIST. For CHRIST is history, and CHRIST's cross is history, and mysticism which lives solely on what is within can have nothing to do with history; mysticism which seeks solely eternal verities can have nothing to do with time and that which has occurred in time" (p. 662).

Those who reject "external authority" have broken in principle with Christianity.

Editorial Notes and Comments

The Denver Assembly

THE General Assembly of 1932 has met and adjourned—and all things continue very much as they were. It could hardly have been otherwise in view of the fact that the same group that has been dominant in the Assembly since the election of Dr. CHARLES R. ERDMAN in 1925 was again in control.

There was nothing surprising about the election of Dr. KERR as Moderator. It was only what was anticipated as soon as it appeared that he was to have the support of the main section of the "organization." It

would seem, however, that all was not harmonious among the powers that be—as is indicated by the nomination of Dr. VANCE—but there was little doubt as to what would be the outcome. How fully Dr. KERR enjoys the confidence of those who have controlled the policies of the Church in recent years is evidenced, (1) by his membership in the General Council, (2) by the fact that he was nominated by a member of the Commission of Fifteen whose iniquitous report in 1926-1927 was all in favor of those who would make the Presbyterian Church an "inclusive" church, and (3) by the fact that his nomination was seconded by a signer of

that heretical document known as the Auburn Affirmation. We would not be understood as implying that Dr. KERR is not himself personally loyal to the faith as set forth in our Standards. All the information we possess indicates that he is. It is evident, however, that there will be disappointment among those most responsible for elevating him to his high position should he fail to use his influence to further the tendencies that have controlled the policies of the Church in recent years.

We think it regrettable that there was no candidate in the field who ran on an out-and-out conservative platform—a platform that would stress the fact that our troubles as a church are doctrinal more than ecclesiastical and that what is needed most of all is the placing in positions of power men who will bear clear-cut witness to the Bible as the Word of God and to the gospel of the grace of God as set forth in the Bible against all who oppose whether within or without the Church. We hardly think that such a man would have been elected, but we think it safe to say that he would have been second in the final vote. We think that as at present organized the Presbyterian Church places altogether too much power in the hands of a few men; but we have relatively small interest in a reorganization unless it be made in the interest of purifying the doctrinal witness of the Church. After all it makes little difference whether this or that man is Moderator, whether this or that man is a member of the General Council (and on down the list) apart from its bearing on the corporate testimony of the Church to the gospel of the grace of God in its purity and integrity. It has again been demonstrated, it seems to us, that the one way of breaking the power of what is popularly known as "the machine," that offers any possibility of success, is the one that stresses the fact that doctrinal differences are at the root of our troubles as a Church.

While out-voted at all points at the Denver Assembly, the "Fundamentalists," so-called, have reason to be encouraged as they face the future. Bad as was the Denver Assembly from their point of view, it was not as bad as was the Pittsburgh Assembly. They had what was lacking at Pittsburgh, viz., able and courageous voices to state and plead their cause. The *Rocky Mountain News* in summing up the Assembly paid them this tribute: "Although they were in the minority on virtually every issue which came to the Assembly floor, it was the Fundamentalist forces which infused color and spirit into the proceedings. They fought vigorously for abolition of the General Council, which they branded as autocracy, and for the severance of all relations with the Federal Council of Churches. But the beautifully co-ordinated church machine was too powerful for this wing and it was defeated in every skirmish." Not only were the "fundamentalists" very much alive at

Denver but they had a large measure of success in their attempt to secure the severance of relations with the Federal Council. In order to keep the Assembly from voting to sever relation with the Federal Council, the friends of the latter were compelled to admit that it needed reformation from within and to plead that no action be taken pending the coming meeting of the Council in the expectation that desired changes would then be made. Apparently no one had the hardihood to defend that Federal Council as it now is. We will await with interest the outcome of the approaching meeting of the Federal Council. Unless there is genuine reformation from within, severance of all relations with the Federal Council by the next Assembly is by no means unlikely.

A comprehensive report of the Proceedings of the 144th General Assembly, that is both descriptive and critical, will be found on the pages that follow. It is written by our Managing Editor who attended the Assembly as a commissioner from the Presbytery of Philadelphia and who as such did so much to keep the blue flag of historic Presbyterianism flying in connection with its meetings.

Putting First Things First

MUCH present-day preaching has been aptly characterized as "suburban preaching." It deals with what lies on the periphery of the things of CHRIST rather than with what lies at their center. "Suburban," however, is about the last adjective that could be properly employed to describe the sermon preached by Dr. WILLIAM CROWE of St. Louis at the opening of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church. Dr. CROWE, who later was elected moderator, preached at the request of Elder R. A. DUNN, the retiring moderator. With Acts 21:8 as his text and "Evangelism" as his theme, Dr. Crowe dealt with what is and ever must remain the central task of the Church of JESUS CHRIST if it is to fulfill its God-given mission in the world. "Any church," he rightly said, "in any Synod or Presbytery, anywhere, that suffers the loss of the spirit of Evangelism (defined as the 'mighty urge of the Church of JESUS CHRIST to tell the story of incarnate Deity to all the world') either in its local parish or beyond its parish borders is surely facing a day when its candle-stick will be removed."

It is the neglect of this primary task through absorption in things of secondary importance that, according to Dr. Crowe, explains as nothing else the present-day weakness of the Church. Lack of church attendance, diminished income, and such like, are merely symptomatic of the real trouble. The seat of the trouble lies in "confused thinking on the part of preachers and people." We cite a few typical passages:

"When the pulpit loses its positive note and

the pew its positive faith—the faith that makes all things possible—foreboding must prevail. . . . 'Away with the supernatural' is a slogan that gains in popularity. The doctrine of sin is taboo, of regeneration, an apostolic fancy. . . . Therefore the whole head is sick, the whole heart faint. . . . The Church of JESUS CHRIST has allowed itself to become allied to a party of theorists, dominated by an idea of shallow social reformation, all the while forgetting that the great Head of the Church came into the world solely for the purpose of giving power to men to become the sons of God. . . . The only adequate solution is to be found in a return to the program of our LORD, which is Evangelism. The Church needs to retrace its steps and get back to the doing of one thing. May God help it to do that one thing well. . . . National prohibition is an achievement for the American people. But it is no business of the Church of JESUS CHRIST in its organized capacity to promote the addition of any amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is not the business of the Church of JESUS CHRIST in its organized capacity to promote the election of any candidate for the presidency of the United States. Nor is it the business of the Church of JESUS CHRIST in its organized capacity to assume responsibility for defeating any candidate for the presidency of the United States. If the Church keeps up its program of meddling in the business of other people, the time may come when it will advise me to use some particular kind of roofing on my warehouse. Instead of spiritualizing business and politics, the Church is bent upon secularizing the Gospel of CHRIST."

Dr. CROWE shows himself a true son of the Southern Presbyterian Church in his insistence on the principle of the strict spirituality of the Church with its corollary, the non-participation of the Church in its organized capacity in the political and secular. We are not certain that our views fully coincide with his at this point but unquestionably they do for the most part. What is more, his representation is in harmony with Chapter 31, sec. 4 of our Confession of Faith, which reads as follows: "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs, which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition, etc.," true as it may be that in our own Church it has been "more honored in the breach than the observance." As individual Christians we are of course under obligation to do everything in our power to solve the complex social, economic and political problems that confront us and that call loudly for solution; but when the Church in its organized capacity has dealt with these and similar matters it has almost invariably done so at the cost of being unfaithful to the main purpose for which CHRIST established it.

Perhaps few things are doing more today to weaken the power of the Church than these misguided efforts.

Dr. Machen's Denver Sermon

FOR the information of my readers we are reproducing the exact text of news-summary of Dr. Machen's sermon in the First Avenue Presbyterian Church of Denver, during the recent assembly. This is the only form in which the sermon was released to the press.

"SUMMARY EXTRACT FROM SERMON By J. GRESHAM MACHEN, Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. Preached in the First Avenue Presbyterian Church, Denver, Sunday Morning, May 29, 1932.

"According to the Bible, a minister is not, as is often supposed today, a mere promotion agent of a society of general welfare, and he is not a specialist in the investigation of the human phenomenon of religion, but he is a 'steward of the mysteries of God.' His duty is to make known the facts about God which God has revealed in His Word.

"Not only an individual minister but also a church is a steward of the mysteries of God. But the important thing about a steward is that he should be faithful. Is the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. a faithful steward of the mysteries of God?

"That question must be answered in the negative. The Presbyterian Church is *not* a faithful but an unfaithful steward today.

"Suspicion of that fact is naturally aroused by the secrecy and the discouragement of fair and open discussion which prevails in the councils of the Church. A treasurer who is afraid to let his books be seen is under suspicion. So also is a Church that checks investigation of its doctrinal witness. A secret trial of an evangelical minister has recently been conducted in the Synod of Pennsylvania. Such secrecy offends against the most elementary principles of liberty and fair play, and places the Presbyterian Church on a distinctly lower ethical plane than that which prevails in the world at large. A similar temper prevails in the administrative procedure of the Church. The really serious questions are covered up by a mass of verbiage, and the deep-seated unfaithfulness of the Church is being concealed.

"But gradually the truth is coming to light. It is becoming increasingly plain that the Presbyterian Church is dominated by a tendency which is hostile or indifferent to the deep things of the Christian religion.

"That tendency is represented by the Modernist document commonly called the 'Auburn Affirmation' which declares that the virgin birth, the bodily resurrection, the miracles of CHRIST, the substitutionary

atonement are non-essential for the ministry, and which attacks vigorously the doctrine of the full truthfulness of the Bible.

"This Modernist document was signed by thirteen hundred ministers in the Church, and the position which it represents is dominant in the Church's affairs.

"For example; the gentleman who seconded the nomination of the present Moderator of the Assembly is a signer of this Modernist Affirmation; and the same gentleman is a member of the present governing Board of Princeton Seminary, an institution which formerly, before its enforced reorganization in 1929, was the leading opponent of the Modernism that the Affirmation represents. Four out of eight ministerial members of the 'Permanent Judicial Commission' (practically the supreme court of the Church) are signers of the same Modernist document. So is the editor of the only official journal, *The Presbyterian Magazine*. So is the General Secretary of the Board of National Missions and so are six out of sixteen ministerial members of that Board. So is the 'Candidates Secretary' of the Board of Foreign Missions, who has the delicate and important duty of interviewing candidates for the foreign mission field and of encouraging them or discouraging them in their purpose. So also are many others high in the councils of the Church. There can be no doubt whatever about the fact that the entire corporate business of the Church is dominated by a tendency quite contrary to that for which the Church has historically stood.

"What shall be done under such circumstances by Bible-believing Christians in the Church? In the first place, they should face the facts and lay the facts before God in prayer. They should cease repeating in parrot-like fashion the untruth that 'the Presbyterian Church is essentially sound.' In the second place, they should insist on faithful stewardship. If the present Boards and agencies cannot be radically reformed, new Boards and agencies should be organized to propagate faithfully the gospel of the LORD JESUS CHRIST. The present condition of the Presbyterian Church is an offence against God. But the Spirit of God is all-powerful, and the darkest hour sometimes just precedes the dawn."

What is an Evangelical?

THIS always timely question has been given special timeliness by the action of the last Assembly relative to the Federal Council of the Churches of CHRIST in America. The Committee on Bills and Overtures in reporting on the various overtures that had been sent to the Assembly urging the severance of financial and functional relations with the Federal Council recommended no action "in view of informa-

tion set forth in the Blue Book, pages 130-143" (*Assembly Daily News* of May 31, p. 3). This recommendation, therefore, carried with it approval of the claim that the influence exerted by the Federal Council is "fundamentally evangelistic" in character (see last issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, p. 3). Apparently it was on the supposition that the Federal Council is "standing on the rock of evangelical faith" that the Assembly approved "by an overwhelming vote" to continue financial and other relations with this organization. In our judgment, the Assembly acted in ignorance of the real nature of the influence exerted by this organization. Did we not so judge we would be compelled to think that the great majority of those who constituted the last Assembly were themselves non-evangelicals. As a matter of fact we expressed ourselves with restraint when in our last issue we stated that "its influence is pronouncedly anti-evangelical and in many respects definitely 'anti-Christian.'"

It is true, no doubt, that the word "Evangelical," like the word, "Christian" is employed so loosely in current usage that it may mean little or nothing to call a man an Evangelical (Compare WARFIELD, *Biblical Doctrines*, 395). But if we take it in its historical meaning, and as it is employed by careful writers, it not only has a very definite meaning but it directs attention to what is basic and indispensable to Christianity as it is set forth in the official creeds of the churches that constitute the membership of the Federal Council of the Churches of CHRIST in America. An Evangelical, according to any right understanding of the word, is one who holds: (1) that all the power exerted in saving a sinner is from God; (2) that in saving men God deals with them individually and immediately.

In affirming that God deals with the individual immediately the Evangelical separates himself from the Sacerdotalists like the Roman Catholics who teach that God saves men through the instrumentalities He has established for that purpose, i. e. the Church and its ordinances. Now in this respect, it is of course true that the influences that radiated from the Federal Council are Evangelical in character. No one alleges that the Federal Council is dominated by Sacerdotalists. It is equally important, however—even more important—to remember that an Evangelical is one who affirms that salvation is wholly of God. Much as the Evangelical is opposed to the sacerdotalism of Rome that puts the Church and its ordinances between the individual soul and God, he is even more opposed to those who like the Unitarians hold to a naturalistic conception of salvation according to which man is really his own saviour. Now it seems to us that it cannot be successfully denied that the dominant influence in the Federal Council is hostile to this basic

(Concluded on Page 9)

The Popularity of Jesus

An address delivered at the Third Commencement of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

By the Rev. R. B. Kuiper, D.D.
President of Calvin College

IN the heart of every minister of the gospel dwells a desire for popularity. It is wont to be especially strong in the case of the youthful preacher. Without either condemning or condoning this desire I purpose to consider the question, what are the faithful minister's chances of becoming popular.

A brief study of the popularity of Jesus may be expected to yield the answer.

That Jesus was exceedingly unpopular with the religious leaders of His day is a matter of common knowledge. Only occasionally did one of them do homage to Him. By and large, both the priestly party, the Sadducees, and the prophetic party, consisting of Scribes and Pharisees, evinced violent opposition to Him. Far though these stood apart one from the other generally, in their hatred of Jesus they were at one. Jesus and the machinery in control of the Jewish church were openly and flagrantly at odds with each other.

The Sadducees may be styled the Liberals of that day. On several scores they denied the supernatural. According to the early church fathers they rejected the greater part of the Old Testament as the inspired Word of God. They denied, so the New Testament tells us, both the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. No wonder that we find them in frequent dispute with orthodox Jesus.

The Scribes and Pharisees, on the other hand, constituted the orthodox party in the church. But their orthodoxy was dead. They exclaimed, "Lord! Lord!" but did not the will of God. Under the show of offering long prayers in public, they devoured widows' houses. They resembled whited sepulchres—fair without, within full of dead men's bones.

Jesus in His passion for truth tore the cover from their lives, ripped the mask from their faces, and poured out upon them His undiluted woes.

By the way, the Pharisees were not altogether as orthodox as they pretended to be. Just as soon as orthodoxy dies it ceases being orthodoxy. Their legalism led them to suppose that law observance was meritorious and thus they denied that hall-mark of true-blue orthodoxy, the doctrine of salvation by grace.

Perhaps it is well to observe that His conflict with the leaders of the church, violent though it was, did not lead Jesus to cast overboard the institution of the church. It was His custom to attend the synagogue on Sabbath days. When He had cleansed a certain leper He sent him to the priest for examination according to the law. And in the same breath in which He warned the people not to do after the works of the Scribes He admonished them to heed their teaching. Jesus was not an ecclesiastical anarchist.

So far we have hardly touched upon our theme. To assert that Jesus was unpopular with the religious leaders of His day is to say next to nothing on our subject. The reason for this is obvious. Popularity may be defined as having favor with the people; the populus, if you please; the plebs, if you prefer. But they were not the people.

With the common people Jesus was for a long time exceedingly popular. Immense throngs were wont to follow Him. We read of four or five thousands. They came to Him from every quarter, even from Idumea, Decapolis, and the parts about Tyre. His enemies complained that the world was running after Him. When He had miraculously fed a multitude with a few loaves and a couple of fish they were ready to

crown Him king. On the last Sunday of His earthly stay His popularity reached its pinnacle. Seated on the colt of an ass He rode toward the royal city over the clothes of His admirers and branches of palms. The enthusiastic crowd was eager to lead Him triumphantly through the gate into the city of David and to place Him high on the throne of His illustrious sire. The earth must well nigh have been rent by the shout, "Hosanna! Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David! Hosanna in the highest!"

What accounts for Jesus' amazing popularity? Without an attempt at completeness several factors may be named.

His preaching had much to do with it. The people fairly hung on His lips when from them flowed the matchless parables, those wonderfully simple, yet unfathomably deep, tales of workaday life. They were captivated by His gracious manner, His simple delivery, devoid of every trace of artificiality. The note of authority that characterized His preaching satisfied them, dead-tired as they were of the negativistic preaching of the Scribes and their evasion by appeal to human authority of the fundamental questions of religion demanding clear-cut answers.

His readiness to help those in distress must have made him exceedingly popular. He traveled through the length and the breadth of the Jewish land doing nothing but good. He healed the sick, cast out demons, cleansed lepers, even made the dead to live. Such a man commanded adoration, almost worship. The people gave it Him.

How it must have pleased the common folk when the great Rabbi of Nazareth

on many occasions took sides with the despised, the scum of society, over against a self-appointed aristocracy. The fact that His retinue consisted largely of Galileans, with the smell of fish on their hands, and publicans, some of which may well have had the smell of liquor on their breath, must have drawn many to Him. The parable of Dives and Lazarus, no doubt, gained Him the plaudits of the poor.

Who can doubt that Jesus' sympathetic attitude toward sinners, not of the self-righteous type, but such as through weakness had sunk deep into the mire, won for Him the love of many? Anybody at all conscious of his own proneness to sin could hardly help loving Him who told the tale, so full of human interest as well as divine grace, of the prodigal son; who delivered from the hatred of her persecutors the woman caught in adultery; who spread out His hands compassionately to sinners laden with legalistic burdens too heavy to bear, and issued the sweet invitation, "Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For My yoke is easy and My burden is light."

Most important of all, it may not be forgotten that the Jews of Jesus' day were yearning to shake off the yoke of heathen Rome, were longing unspeakably for a king to arise among them who would smash this hated yoke, restore to Jewry independence, and place Jerusalem at the head of the nations. No doubt the people hoped that the wonder-working Rabbi of Nazareth might prove to be that deliverer. Their national hopes they staked on Him. That made Him a popular idol.

Came the time when Jesus' popularity began to wane. It happened in the synagogue at Capernaum. Just the previous day he had miraculously fed thousands and they had sought to make Him king by force. Now He told them sharply, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have not

life in yourselves." Said they, "This is a hard saying. Who can hear it?" And many went back and walked no more with Him.

Came the time when Jesus' popularity collapsed. It happened in the last week of His ministry. On Sunday the multitude escorted Him as king into the city of David. On Friday the same multitude shrieked, "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!" Why the sudden and complete reversal? The answer is significant. Instead of king, Jesus had become a prisoner. Instead of royal purple, He wore the purple of mockery. Instead of a sparkling diadem, a crown of thorns pressed upon His temples. Instead of a sceptre of gold, there was given Him a reed. Instead of making the streets of the holy city run red with the blood of Romans, He permitted His own blood to be shed. Instead of a throne, He chose the cross. Then the people were through with Him. Now He was despised and rejected of men as no one else ever was.

The crucified Jesus is little more popular today than He was nineteen hundred years ago.

To be sure, superficially viewed this would not seem to be the case. Seldom, if ever, in the course of the centuries that have elapsed since His earthly sojourn has the Man of Nazareth been as popular as He is today. Modernists are vying with Fundamentalists in singing His praises. Missionaries tell us that there are heathen who have no respect for our occidental Christianity and yet are deeply in love with the person of Jesus. Mahatma Gandhi would be His disciple. Liberal Jewish Rabbis courageously break with tradition and express high admiration for the carpenter's Son. Bolshevik Russia, to be sure, has repudiated Him, but it is hardly an exaggeration to assert that the rest of the world adores Him.

But, I ask, who is this popular Jesus? And the answer comes, It is not Christ crucified. He is about as unpopular as ever. Some reject Him more boldly than do others. But, whether rudely or suavely, many, very many, who profess

great admiration for Jesus reject the Crucified One.

Says a recent biographer of Joseph Pulitzer: "As a symbol the Christian cross compares poorly with the crescent of Mohammed. There is no cross or blood in the teachings of Confucius or Buddha. A real Reformation would restore the living Christ, banish the cruel cross, and take for its guidance the shining star." There is Satan as a roaring lion.

More frequently his servants come in the guise of angels of light.

There are several theories of the atonement, known by high-sounding names, but there is only one adequate interpretation. It is the Scriptural view of the atonement. The Example Theory, the Moral Influence Theory, the Governmental Theory, the Mystical Theory, the Vicarious Repentance Theory—all these deny that the unswerving justice of God required that sin should be atoned for by death and that this atonement was effected by the substitutionary death of the Son of God on Calvary's tree. By that very denial the Christ crucified is denied.

Many modern teachers of religion place a disproportionate emphasis on Christ's prophetic office, and not a few of these completely ignore or even flatly deny His priestly work. The older liberals, as Renan and Strauss, adore His teaching as such. Several later liberals, Julicher, Harnack and Bousset, for instance, and their numerous satellites go a step farther and derive the virtue of His teaching from His person. It must be remembered, however, that the latter, as little as the former, ascribe Deity to Him. In consequence it may be seriously questioned whether their admiration of Jesus differs essentially from that of Mohammedans. It is certain that for His bloody sacrifice for sin they have no more use than do the followers of the false prophet.

There are those who would substitute for the old-time gospel a so-called social gospel. I would not be misunderstood. Far be it from me to deny that the gospel of Jesus Christ has social impli-

cations, to assert that the preacher has no business to apply it to social conditions. But when men substitute the salvation of society by Jesus' precept and example for the salvation of the individuals constituting society by His atoning death, then it is time that we demur. For then the Christ crucified is being rejected.

More subtle is the denial of Christ crucified implied in the present day fad of paralleling Christ's cross with the cross of mortal man. When a soldier dies for his country, when a mother lays down her life for her child, many do not hesitate to put them in a class with the vicariously dying Jesus. It grieves me exceedingly to have to remark that some of our most popular hymns have not escaped this baneful error. To illustrate:

"On a hill far away stood an old rugged cross,
The emblem of suffering and shame;
And I love that old cross where the dearest
and best
For a world of lost sinners was slain."

Good so far, splendid even! But then comes the refrain, which is saddening indeed:

"So I'll cherish the old rugged cross
Till my trophies at last I lay down;
I will cling to the old rugged cross,
And exchange it some day for a crown."

What? Exchange what cross for a crown? Your own or Christ's? What confusion of thought! What sinful confusion! Christ's cross is unique. It represents the divine curse, the wrath of God due to sinful mankind but poured out on God's own Son as substitute. Whoever detracts in the least from the uniqueness of that cross, in principle denies the Crucified One.

Exceedingly subtle is that denial of the Christ crucified which is implied in the tendency on the part of supposedly orthodox preachers to stress Christ's resurrection at the expense of His death. They tell us to center our attention more on the living Jesus, less on the dying. A false antithesis! A dangerously false antithesis! The two are inseparable, and one may never be made to give way for the other.

Yes, Jesus is popular as once He was

in Palestine. But the dying Jesus, the crucified Jesus, is almost as unpopular as He was then and there.

What accounts for the unpopularity of the crucified Christ? A few suggestions are in order.

The cross makes man appear awfully guilty. It tells him something like this: "Jesus is hanging there in thy stead. Thou, O sinner, art worthy of death, the accursed death of crucifixion. Thou hast deserved it that God should forsake thee and plunge thee into everlasting and outer darkness. Thou hast merited hell." How humiliating!

The cross makes man appear woefully weak. It says to him: "Thou canst not save thyself. That thou mightest be saved God had to move heaven and earth. The very Son of God had to come down from heaven. He had to grapple unto death with Satan in order to release thee from his hold. To deliver thee from death, the penalty of sin, He had Himself to enter upon death's dark domain and to emerge triumphantly. He alone the Almighty Son of God, can save thee." How humiliating!

The natural man will have nothing of this. He turns from the cross and gloats:

"It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishment the scroll;
I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul."

Lady Macbeth has become responsible for a couple of murders. Her conscience troubles her. She dreams of her misdeeds. She talks and walks in her dreams. One night while thus engaged she rubs her hands as if she were washing them. Then she says, "Yet here's a spot." A little later she calls, "Out, damned spot! Out, I say!" Finally she shrieks, "Here's the smell of blood still: all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand—oh—oh—oh!" Declares the gospel of the crucified Christ: "Thou, Oh sinner, hast a spot of blood in thy hand, and all the perfumes of all the good works thou mayest do, of all the noble traits that may grace thy character, of all the self-denial thou mayest practice, will not sweeten that hand. The only thing in all the universe

of God that will do it is the blood of the crucified Son of God."

What are the faithful minister's chances for popularity? we ask again. And now we are prepared to give an answer. Let the minister imitate the greatest Preacher of all time so far as possible. Let him preach simply, beautifully, authoritatively. Such is his duty. Let him ever stand ready to aid those in distress. It is his privilege. Let him be sympathetic toward the under-dog. It is noble. Let him tenderly lift up fallen sinners. It is his honor. Then he will gain a measure of popularity, mayhap a large measure. But let him not neglect to preach the gospel of the crucified Christ. Then he will soon know what the Master meant when He said, "The disciple is not greater than his Lord; if they hated Me they will also hate you." For there is no more unpopular message than this. It is a gospel not at all after the natural man. It goes against his grain as nothing else does. The faithful minister is bound to share in the unpopularity of his message.

My wish for these seminary graduates is that they may become unpopular by preaching the unpopular gospel of Christ crucified.

Will they have no friends at all? Yes, possibly many; likely few; certainly some; and these some, warm. They will be penitent publicans, prodigal sons who have learned to abhor themselves, sinful women to whom much has been forgiven, Marys of Magdala out of whom seven demons have been cast, malefactors who pray as they die, and virtuous folk who realize that by nature they are not a whit better than these others,—all such as can sing from the heart:

"Upon that cross of Jesus
Mine eye at times can see
The very dying form of One
Who suffered there for me;
And from my smitten heart with tears
Two wonders I confess:
The wonders of his glorious love
And my own worthlessness."

Better than that, they will enjoy the blessed friendship of Him who declared, "Ye are My friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." For this is His command: to preach the gospel of His cross.

Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

XVIII. THE POWER OF EXAMPLE

"But when I saw that they were not walking straight according to the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all: 'If thou being a Jew livest as the Gentiles do and not as do the Jews, how is it that thou art compelling the Gentiles to Judaize?'" (Gal. 2:14, in a literal translation).

How Much Was Addressed to Peter?

IN the last article, we discussed the beginning of the incident at Antioch. At first, Peter held table-companionship with the Gentile Christians; but then, fearing the disapprobation of certain men who had come from James, he was withdrawing from such companionship. By such conduct he was concealing his true principles; and he was not acting in accordance with "the truth of the gospel". Paul spoke out boldly in opposition. Putting all consideration of consequences aside, he withstood Peter to his face in the presence of the whole Church.

Today we begin to study what he said to Peter. But where does the speech to Peter end? Some have supposed that it ends with verse 14, so that all that Paul reports of what he said to Peter is the one sentence: "If thou being a Jew livest as the Gentiles do and not as do the Jews, how is it that thou art compelling the Gentiles to Judaize?" In that case, the rest of the second chapter of the Epistle is simply a comment by Paul to the Galatians setting forth the reasons for his attitude at Antioch.

But surely such a view of the passage is unnatural. The brief sentence which we have just quoted from verse 14 is very abrupt if it is all that Paul gives us of the speech which he made to Peter: the reader inevitably expects that more of that speech will be reported; and since the words that follow are very natural on Paul's lips in his address to

Peter, it is altogether probable that they are a part of that address. There is no clear break in the discourse until we come to the beginning of Chapter III, where, with the words "O foolish Galatians", Paul seems to mark the point where he turns from the report of what he said to Peter at Antioch to that which he is now saying directly to the Galatian Christians.

No doubt the report of Paul's Antioch speech is not intended to be anything like a verbatim report; it is the substance of what he said that the Apostle is here calling to mind. No doubt also he is thinking, before he gets through the report, more of the present effect of his words upon the Galatian Christians than of their effect upon Peter long ago at Antioch. What he had said to Peter at that time was essentially the same thing as that which he now desires to say to the Galatians. Hence Gal. 2:11-21 forms a transition between the first main division of the Epistle, in which Paul meets the attack upon his independent apostolic authority, and the second main division, in which he defends the content of his gospel. The very heart of Paul's gospel is set forth in the passage with which we begin to deal this month.

What Is Meant by "Live"?

"If thou", says the Apostle in his report of what he said to Peter at Antioch, "livest as the Gentiles do and not as do the Jews, how is it that thou art compelling the Gentiles to Judaize?" What does Paul mean by the word "livest" in this sentence? Some think that the word is used in its high, special sense, to designate that life in communion with God, that life that is life indeed, which the Christian has in Christ. Paul would then be saying to Peter: "If thou hast thy new life, thine eternal life, in the

same way as the way in which the Gentiles have it—that is, not by earning it through the works of the law but by receiving it through the free grace of God—how is it that thou art compelling the Gentiles to try to get that true life in an entirely different way from the way in which thou hast got it thyself?" This interpretation may possibly be correct.

Another interpretation, however, is also possible—the interpretation which takes the word "livest" in a more ordinary sense. According to this interpretation, Paul would simply be saying: "If thou being a Jew livest as the Gentiles do—that is, if thou hast taken it as the fixed habit of thy manner of life to relinquish the keeping of the ceremonial law—how is it that thou art compelling the Gentiles to keep that ceremonial law?" At first sight, an objection might seem to arise against this view from the present tense of the verb "livest". Was Peter living at that time as the Gentiles do; was it not just because he was *not* living as the Gentiles do, but rather was living as the Jews do, that he was being blamed by Paul? But the objection is not serious. Paul may mean by the present tense of the verb merely that the fixed principle of Peter's manner of life was to live as the Gentiles do, even though there might be temporary aberrations from that principle as was the case when those men came from James. Peter had lived in a Gentile manner before; and the presumption was that he would live in a Gentile manner again. Why then, Paul would be saying, does he conceal that fixed principle of his life by pretending in the presence of those men from Jerusalem to be a strict Jew?

How Peter Influenced the Gentiles

The question between these two ways of understanding the word "livest" is

difficult to decide. In either case, it is fairly clear what Paul means when he says that by withdrawing from his former table-companionship Peter was "compelling" the Gentiles to Judaize. The compulsion referred to was not physical compulsion; and it was not even the compulsion of any definite command or advice. Rather it was the compulsion which Peter was exerting by his example. He had accustomed those Gentile Christians to table-companionship with him. Then he withdrew from them because they did not keep the ceremonial law. Would they not draw the inference that if they were Christians they were Christians only of a second rank? If they wanted to continue the companionship which they had enjoyed with the chief of the original apostles of their Lord, they must apparently do as the Judaizers had told them to do—be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. We can understand how powerful such considerations must have been; they would lend much weight to what the Judaizers had always said.

But if the Gentiles yielded to such considerations, that would mean that they were putting trust in their own works as being necessary to the obtaining of merit with God. And that would mean, according to Paul, that they had fallen from grace and that Christ would profit them nothing.

A Peril to Men's Souls

We shall never understand the situation unless we see that for a Gentile Christian to keep the ceremonial law was a very different thing, according to Paul, from a Jewish Christian's keeping of it. If, indeed, a Jewish Christian's keeping of it meant that the Jewish Christian regarded it as necessary to salvation—necessary in supplement to faith in Christ—then a Jewish Christian's keeping of it would be just as bad, according to Paul, as a Gentile Christian's. But the point is that a Jewish Christian's keeping of it did not necessarily mean that, whereas a Gentile Christian's necessarily did.

A Jewish Christian might keep the ceremonial law on the ground that the gospel was still being offered to the

Jewish people as such, and that therefore the time had not yet come when the corporate identity of the people should be broken up. But if a Gentile Christian kept the ceremonial law, then, since that ran counter to all national custom and to all ordinary considerations of policy, it could scarcely mean anything else than that it was regarded as being necessary to salvation—as being necessary in order that a man should belong to the people of God. It could scarcely be regarded otherwise—or, to put the thing more cautiously, it *would* as a matter of fact, under the circumstances that then prevailed, scarcely be regarded otherwise—than as a meritorious work which a man needed to perform in order to win the favor of God. But if it was so regarded, then, according to Paul, it was contrary to the very heart of the gospel of Christ. A man who tries to earn his salvation, or to do anything

towards earning it, has, according to Paul, done despite to the free grace of God.

It was into such a deadly error that Peter's conduct was leading the Gentile Christians at Antioch. If Peter had never begun to hold table-companionship with those Gentile Christians, it is not at all certain that Paul would ever have blamed him. Paul did not demand—for the present at least—that the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem should give up their Jewish manner of life. But when Peter had once accustomed the Gentile Christians to hold table-companionship with him, then his withdrawal from such table-companionship would tend to lead them to seek a continuance of their table-companionship with him by keeping the ceremonial law. And that would mean, for them, the adoption of a principle of justification by works and not by faith alone.

Editorial Notes and Comments (Concluded)

doctrine of Evangelicalism. Doubtless a voice here and there, under the auspices of the Federal Council, has sounded this Evangelical note; but as a whole the voices that have proclaimed its messages have been voices that have been silent on the basic contention of Evangelicalism, viz., that man is utterly unable to save himself, that if he is to be saved at all he must be saved through faith in the GOD-MAN who bore our sins in His own body on the tree. How many of its spokesmen believe in the real deity of CHRIST? How many of them teach that salvation is wholly of God, a supernatural gift made available only through the expiatory death of the Son of God? How many of them teach that CHRIST is to be worshipped equally with the Father and the Holy Spirit? If we had to choose (as fortunately we do not) between the modernism of Fosdick and those like minded and the sacerdotalism of Rome, we would choose the latter as Rome with the whole of organized Christianity teaches that ultimately salvation is wholly of God. The most fatal of all heresies is the heresy that man can save himself. Either CHRIST must save him or he is forever lost.

There are three thought and life tendencies struggling for the mastery within Christendom—Sacerdotalism, Evangelicalism, and Naturalism (Modernism). These three tendencies are not merely one-sided or partial expressions of the same fundamental

truths. They are flatly opposed as regards their basic principles. Sacerdotalism and Evangelicalism have much in common as over against Naturalism—they both proclaim the supernaturalism of salvation. But their agreement at a number of points should not blind us to the fact that in other vital respects they are flatly opposed. Evangelicalism and Modernism have much in common as over against Sacerdotalism—they both proclaim the immediacy of the souls relation to God. But this should not blind us to the fact that in their doctrines of salvation they stand as the precise contradictions of each other. Neither of these tendencies, therefore, can join forces with another of them as against the third. Each must continue to occupy a position of antagonism against the other two, since the triumph of one of them would mean the extinction of the other two. As Evangelicals we express our determined opposition to Sacerdotalism when we deny that any man or institution stands between our souls and God; but our equally determined opposition to Modernism because we affirm that it is God and God alone who saves. Those who maintain that the Federal Council is "fundamentally evangelistic" apparently think that a man is an Evangelical merely because he is not a Roman Catholic. It would be difficult to imagine a more preposterous supposition.

No one who really knows what an Evangelical is—provided he has no sympathy with Modernism—can approve of the Federal Council as it is now functioning.

The 144th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

A DESCRIPTION AND AN INTERPRETATION

EVERY assembly of "The largest Presbyterian Church in the World" possesses certain fixed characteristics. It is always preceded by "pre-Assembly conferences"—a conference on evangelism, and gatherings under the auspices of the Boards of National Missions, Foreign Missions, Pensions and Christian Education. This year, in Denver, there were also held meetings in the interest of the Presbyterian College Union, the General Council of the Assembly, Theological Seminaries and Colleges, and a popular meeting under the auspices of the "Spiritual Emphasis Committee" of the General Council. As usual, the platforms of these conferences were made to serve the purpose of introducing the early arrivals among the commissioners to those great ones in the life of the Church who should guide their deliberations during the Assembly. The consummate wisdom of those in charge in not having their moderator-designate speak at the conference on Evangelism, is to be generously and frankly commended. For the first time in years the organization candidate did not use the sacred topic of evangelism for what would be, in effect, a campaign utterance. The custom, while becoming venerable, had also accumulated a bad odor, and its demise will be mourned by only a few. The two years' crusade by CHRISTIANITY TODAY on this subject seems to have borne fruit. At the same time it must be confessed that the nominator and the seconder of this year's moderator were both on the conference program, which in the opinion of some, served the purpose better than if the candidate himself had spoken. It should also be noted that one of the unsuccessful candidates for Moderator was on the program, but that meant nothing, for no one conceded Dr. Joseph A. Vance the slightest chance of being elected, anyway.

The Conference on Evangelism

Notwithstanding its incidental uses, the Conference on Evangelism struck a high, sustained and powerful Gospel-note through the presence of one man. This was Dr. Geo. Truett, of the Southern Baptist Convention, the guest preacher. Seldom, if ever, have Pre-Assembly audiences listened to preaching like his. Transparently loyal to the one redemptive gospel as held by the Church Universal, his heart throbbing with a passionate love to God and man, Dr. Truett held his thousands of auditors in a spell

not of human oratory, but of Divine Truth. He lifted us up, and led us to sit in heavenly places with Christ Jesus our Lord. Out of a richness of experience in human relationships, he demonstrated in his great sermons anew the strange, mighty, victorious power of the Gospel of the Blood to change, regenerate and heal. Time and again he warned of the exclusiveness of the Gospel, of the Supernatural Person and works of the Lord Jesus Christ. The writer hardly sees how any true Christian could fail to be deeply moved, and yet during the climactic address, he sat near one great official who, with a look of bored and sophisticated tolerance on his face, filled that portion of the room with the buzz of a *sotto voce* conference of his own with his friends, much to the annoyance of everyone else. No, the messages of Dr. Truett were not concessive or palatable to modernism. And as compared with the other speakers of the conference—some of whom spoke well—Dr. Truett was as a mighty full organ is to the tinkling of a piccolo.

The Assembly itself opened on Thursday morning, May 26th, in the Central Presbyterian Church, the host Church. The main floor of the church was reserved for commissioners, and the rest of the edifice was crowded to the doors. The service was conducted by Dr. Mudge and was possessed of a degree of dignity. The only blemishes were, the unveiling of the sacramental elements much too early in the service (during the singing of "My Country 'Tis of Thee"), and a repetition of the all-too-frequent exhibition of laxity as to what constitutes a true prayer of eucharistic consecration. Dr. Mudge's sermon was, on the whole, able and vigorous. His theme was "The Church and the Nation." His text was Joshua 23:11.

Dr. Mudge's Sermon

Dr. Mudge referred to the fact that the United States of America was in the midst of the bi-centennial celebration of the birth of George Washington, and held that Washington occupied much the same relationship to our nation that Joshua held in Israel, as a great churchman, statesman and soldier. Then he turned over the pages of national and ecclesiastical history to indicate how as citizens we may become better churchmen, and how as churchmen, we may become better citizens.

He declared that the church had founded

the nation; that the church, far more than any other organization, has fostered the nation in the advancement of its highest and best interests, through ideals, through such institutions as the American home and the American school, and through individuals; and that the church must future the nation. He held that we must give our nation to Christ for our nation's sake; also that we must give our nation to Christ for the world's sake, because of our present lawlessness, because of our abiding complacency, and because of our attempted isolation; furthermore, that we must give our nation to Christ for Christ's sake.

After the moderatorial sermon, the Assembly was constituted with prayer. Then followed the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in which Dr. Mudge was assisted by several other ministers. The elements were distributed by a large number of ruling elders, drawn from the local churches and from the ranks of the commissioners. This portion of the service was impressive in the extreme.

The Election of the Moderator

Thursday afternoon came the first session held in the Municipal Auditorium,—the session which, usually each year, witnesses the end of several fond ambitions. For at this sederunt the new moderator is elected.

An unusually large number of names had been mentioned in preliminary discussions,—and the "candidacy" of this one or that one—weighed in groups large and small—in trains, hotel rooms, street corners and church basements. This year, more than ever, the atmosphere of the moderatorship seemed to resemble more a political convention than that of a court of Jesus Christ. It very nearly happened that the name of one who had made no "bid" for the office was presented to the Assembly—and had his name been presented in the opinion of the writer he would have secured a very great number of votes. Hundreds of commissioners did not like to vote for those who had apparently made "candidates" of themselves, and had they had the opportunity to vote for someone else, they would have seized it gladly.

Five candidates were nominated. First, Dr. Hugh I. Evans of Dayton, Ohio, nominated Dr. Joseph A. Vance, of Detroit. He made a capable, run-of-the-mill nominating address, featured principally by the fact that Dr. Vance, who is a well-known mod-

ernist, was presented to the commissioners in glowing terms as one "loyal to the standards." The uninitiated might well have thought him to be the conservative candidate. Later, the nomination was seconded by Dr. J. Walter Malone, Jr., of Champagne, Ill.

Dr. David DeForest Burrell, of Williamsport, Pa., who had been sent to the Assembly by his Presbytery with the express hope that he might be made moderator, was nominated by Dr. C. E. Granger, of Williamsport, in a capable and sonorous speech. Dr. Burrell was recommended as one who had no connection with the Boards of the Church, and as a conservative. But "while a conservative he was not reactionary, while democratic, he was not a bolshevik." Dr. Burrell's nomination was seconded by Dr. Oscar P. Bell, of Los Angeles.

Dr. Charles W. Kerr, of Tulsa, Oklahoma, was nominated by Dr. Harry C. Rogers of Kansas City, who, himself prominently mentioned, had withdrawn to smooth the way for Dr. Kerr. His speech followed the usual lines, ending with the statement that Dr. Kerr was sound in his theology—even the horse of his early prairie ministry had been named John Calvin! This nomination was seconded by Dr. Asa J. Ferry, of Chicago, an Auburn Affirmationist, who is a member of the board of the reorganized Princeton.

The brilliant speech of the afternoon was made by Dr. Joseph W. Holley, of Albany, Georgia. He is a well-known colored preacher and educator whose wit and tongue are both nimble. Yet with all his humor he presented ably the cause of one who had worked among negroes—a work which had never, he said, been recognized in the election of a moderator. He nominated Dr. Wm. Hallock Johnson, long known as a white educator of the colored race. Dr. Johnson's nomination was seconded by the Rev. Hugh W. Rendall, of Mendham, N. J.

The last nomination was that of Dr. Dirk Lay, of Sacaton, Arizona, outstanding home missionary. His name was submitted by Dr. F. W. Backemeyer, of Gary, Indiana. His unusual record was described in glowing language. This nomination was seconded by Dr. Harry B. Boyd, of Philadelphia.

The first ballot resulted as follows:

Total vote cast—914.

Majority necessary for choice—458.

Vance—198.

Burrell—126.

Kerr—277.

Johnson—118.

Lay—193.

Two ballots were cast for a "Mr. Thompson."

No election.

The second ballot resulted as follows:

Total vote cast—911.

Majority necessary for choice—456.

Vance—164.

Burrell—73.

Kerr—454.

Johnson—48.

Lay—172.

No election.

Dr. Burrell then announced his withdrawal from the candidacy in favor of Dr. Kerr. The Moderator ruled that it was his privilege to withdraw, but that no candidate could undertake to throw his votes to any other candidate; he could merely express his good will toward any candidate.

Dr. Johnson announced his withdrawal with good will to all the other candidates.

The third ballot was in progress when Dr. Vance got the Moderator's attention and stated that he wished to withdraw. The Moderator ruled that a withdrawal was not possible in the midst of a ballot already in progress.

The results of the voting by individual Electing Sections were announced, and as the recording proceeded it was evident that Dr. Kerr was well in the lead, and had a majority of votes. Before the totals could be announced, Dr. Lay moved and Dr. Vance seconded that the election of Dr. Charles W. Kerr as Moderator be made unanimous. The Assembly so voted.

The totals of the third ballot were as follows:

Total number of votes cast—905.

Majority necessary to choice—453.

Vance—113.

Kerr—649.

Lay—143.

Retiring Moderator Mudge appointed Dr. Harry C. Rogers and Dr. Asa J. Ferry as a committee to conduct the newly elected Moderator to the platform. It was then 5:30 o'clock.

On Thursday evening a popular meeting was held under the auspices of the Cooperative Council on Young People's Work.

Chairman of Standing Committees

On Friday morning the Assembly was informed of appointments by the Moderator. Dr. Leon D. Young, of Dallas, Texas, who had also withdrawn from the moderatorial race, reputedly in favor of Dr. Kerr, was rewarded with the vice-moderatorship (usually given to a ruling elder). Chairmanship of the *Bills and Overtures* Committee was given to Nominator Harry C. Rogers; *National Missions* to Dr. Hugh I. Evans; *Foreign Missions* to Seconder Asa J. Ferry; *Christian Education* to the "Tall Pine of the Sierras"—Dr. Mark A. Matthews, of Seattle, pastor of the largest Presbyterian Church, and the Church's most outstanding individualist; *Pensions* (as last year), Candidate David DeF. Burrell; *Polity*, Candidate Vance; *Theological Seminaries*, Candidate W. H. Johnson; *Finance*, Ruling Elder J. A. Huff; *Mileage*, Ruling Elder G. H. Zacherle of Philadelphia; *Leave of Absence*,

Dr. Frank M. Cross of Ensley, Ala.; *Synodical Records*, Dr. L. C. Walter, Oklahoma City; *Nominations to General Council*, Dr. C. W. Kerr himself; *Resolutions of Thanks*, Dr. J. V. Moldenhawer, of New York. (A committee to *nominate members of the Permanent Judicial Commission* was also named, but since there were no vacancies this year it had nothing to do. Candidate Lay was chairman of this phantom committee.)

It will not be necessary to weary readers of this report with a chronological account of all details that passed through the Assembly. As was remarked by the writer in reporting last year's Assembly, the Assembly spends the first part of its sessions marking time while everything is sent to committee as grist to a mill, and the last part of its time giving hurried and rushed assent to almost all the recommendations of the various committees. The Assembly is obviously not a deliberative body, though many of us wish that it were.

Each of the four boards is given two hours to present its cause to the Assembly through its standing committee. Saturday morning is reserved for Pensions; Monday morning, for Christian Education; Tuesday morning, for National Missions; Wednesday, for Foreign Missions. Other departments, such as the office of the General Assembly, the Department of Church Cooperation and Union, etc., have stated places on the docket. The Committee on Bills and Overtures always has the right of way whenever it brings in its partial reports.

The Untouchable Budget

What may well, in the perspective of time, prove to have been one of the most significant incidents happening at the Assembly, took place on Friday afternoon. The Budget of the General Assembly, as recommended by the Budget and Finance Committee of the General Council, was presented for approval by J. Willison Smith of Philadelphia, well-known banker. The figures as offered showed an item of \$14,500 for the Federal Council of Churches. As soon as a motion was made to adopt the report, an amendment was offered by the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, of Philadelphia. (Since that person is the writer of this interpretation and report, readers will please allow for natural modesty in references to himself!) He moved in amendment that the appropriation for the Federal Council be neither approved nor disapproved until after the Assembly had voted on the weighty question as to whether it wished to continue related to the Federal Council. The motion was seconded, and briefly advocated by the mover. And here appeared the significant thing to which allusion has already been made: Mr. Smith, in replying to Mr. Griffiths, declared in effect that it was now too late for the Assembly to make any changes in the

budget. It had already been put into operation, because of the time of beginning the fiscal year. Thus the Assembly was told that it could not, in practice, modify its own budget. The commissioners hardly seemed to take in the significance of this fact, although one of them rose to inquire whether this did not simply make the Assembly into a rubber stamp? His conclusion was the only one possible, upon reflection, for if the Assembly cannot alter its own budget in any way it wishes, then its "adoption" of the budget by a formal vote is only an empty farce. The argument that this must be so because the fiscal year begins on April 1st seems entirely without merit to the writer. No sovereign, executive body with the slightest amount of self respect should allow policy to be determined by its bookkeepers' convenience. If the Assembly must adopt any budget presented, and for the reason stated, it is the old business fallacy of allowing the books to determine the policy, rather than insisting that the books reflect the policy. It is far more important that the Assembly should be master of its own budget than that the fiscal year should begin on any given date, no matter how convenient that date may be. Budgets exist for the sake of Churches, not Churches for the sake of budgets, even if some of those who frame budgets have the opposite notion. If this matter is not rectified, we have passed another milestone on the road to bureaucracy, topheaviness and its inevitable ruin.

Amid the discussion of the Amendment to hold the Federal Council appropriation in abeyance, one bright commissioner made a passionate speech against the motion on the ground that it "assumed that this Assembly was going to take definite action on the question, and that no one had any right so to assume." If the gentleman who worked himself up to such a fever of indignation had looked at the "White Book" of the Assembly, he would have known that three Presbyteries had overtured the Assembly to leave the Council, and that the Assembly had to take definite action of some form on these overtures—as it later did.

On the call for the vote, the Moderator ruled the amendment lost, but a division was called for. The vote was approximately two to one—about six hundred against the amendment and three hundred for. The budget was then "adopted" with only a few dissenting votes. This was done with the understanding that the decision in no way prejudiced the later consideration of the relation of the Assembly to the "Federal Council."

The "Barnhouse Cases"

The permanent Judicial Commission on Friday afternoon, May 27, reported to the General Assembly the following decisions. The General Assembly voted that the preliminary judgment of the Permanent Ju-

dicial Commission become the final judgment of the General Assembly.

"Judicial Case No. 2.

In Re: Complaint of

Merrill T. MacPherson, et al

Against

The Synod of Pennsylvania

"This is a complaint filed by Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson and others against the action of the Synod of Pennsylvania in accepting the alleged reference from the Presbytery of Philadelphia of the case of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America against Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse.

"Judicial Case No. 3.

In Re: Complaint of

Merrill T. MacPherson, et al

Against

The Synod of Pennsylvania

"This is a complaint against certain actions of the Synod of Pennsylvania taken through its Judicial Commission wherein the Synod did not sustain the complaint of Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson and others against actions of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson and others complained that the Synod was in error in sustaining the Presbytery of Philadelphia in sustaining the ruling and decision of the Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia to the effect that the Presbytery "should consider the De Facto phase of the case and not the De Jure when voting" upon the question of the reference of the case of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America against the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse to the Synod of Pennsylvania; that the Synod was in error in sustaining the Presbytery in referring the case to the Synod for ultimate trial and decision and in discharging its Judicial Commission.

"Judicial Case No. 4.

In Re: Complaint of

Roland K. Armes, et al

Against

The Synod of Pennsylvania

"This complaint is against the action of the Synod taken through its Judicial Commission in not sustaining the complaint of Roland K. Armes and others against the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia respecting the decision of the Presbytery of Philadelphia denying the request of Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse to be tried in open Presbytery.

"These cases are all complaints of certain members of the Presbytery of Philadelphia against the Synod of Pennsylvania for accepting the alleged reference of the case of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America against the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse and for not sustaining the complaints against certain actions of the Presbytery of Philadelphia taken in connection with the said case.

"The Presbytery of Philadelphia acting under the direction of the Synod of Pennsyl-

vania had appointed a Judicial Committee to prepare charges and specifications against the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse, and had elected a Judicial Commission to try the case. At a meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia September 29, 1930 said Presbytery took action denying to Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse a trial in open Presbytery, and directing that he be tried by a Judicial Commission. At a subsequent meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, December 8, 1930, said Presbytery took action referring the case of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America against Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse to the Synod of Pennsylvania for ultimate trial and decision.

"The complaints are made on the basis of Section 84, Chapter 9 of the Book of Discipline which provides that:

"A complaint is a written representation by one or more persons, subject and submitting to the jurisdiction of an inferior Judicatory to the next superior Judicatory against an articular delinquency, action, or decision of such inferior Judicatory in a non-Judicial or administrative case."

"It is the opinion of your permanent Judicial Commission that all the actions complained of are inseparable from and a part of the Judicial case of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America against the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse, and as such the actions complained of are judicial in character. The removal of an action judicial in character from an inferior to a superior judicatory can only be taken by appeal made by either of the original parties from the final judgment of the lower judicatory.

"Since the papers before us are complaints against actions judicial in character, they are not in order.

"It is, therefore, the judgment of the permanent Judicial Commission that these three complaints be not entertained, and the cases are hereby dismissed.

"Mr. Lewis M. Stevens, being of the Synod of Pennsylvania, did not participate in the hearing and determination of this case."

It will be noticed that these complaints were not dismissed on their merits by the commission, but upon the technical ground that nothing in any way relating to a judicial case may be the subject of complaint. While this decision seems to settle the matter, the writer desires to put himself on record as saying that he considers the judgment erroneous since it seems to assume that no one but the defendant in a judicial case has any right to ask that administrative illegalities be rectified, a principle which, on its face, is absurd. This is the end of the "Barnhouse Case."

Fraternal Greetings

On Saturday morning, the Assembly received fraternal greetings from the following churches: The Waldensian Church of

Italy, the United Presbyterian Church, the First Christian Church of Denver, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church in Canada and the United Church of Canada. Some of these were conveyed by letter, others by accredited delegates.

"Spiritual Emphasis"

The General Council, in reporting on a reference from the last Assembly, on "Spiritual Emphasis," reported, in part, as follows: "... The cultivation of our Church constituency by means of the circulation of religious messages dealing with the great elemental truths of our faith is needed as never before in the history of our Church. The ignorance of the rank and file of our present Church membership concerning the basic facts of the Gospel is alarming. They are reading on all hands literature that negatives the redemptive message, and reading little which builds them up in Christian hope and holiness.

"We therefore prayerfully recommend:

"1. That the General Assembly reaffirm the deliverance of 1931 already quoted, instructing the General Council to carry forward a Spiritual Emphasis program which by its own constitution it is under obligation to do.

"2. That the General Council cooperate with the Department of Evangelism, looking to an intensive cultivation in all our churches of a program of spiritual emphasis and Gospel evangelism.

"3. That the General Council study ways and means of directing the thought of the Church to positive, evangelical literature and in seeking to unite the ministry in a program of Scriptural preaching which will exalt Christ as adequate to meet the needs of personal, social and national life.

"4. That we rejoice in the spiritual challenge flung out in the pre-Assembly services and emphasize the importance of carrying forward all the promotional work of the Church in the spirit of sincere and prevailing prayer."

The following resolution was also offered by the General Council and adopted by the Assembly:

"The present unparalleled situation in our own land, and throughout the world, economic, moral and religious, demands that all Christians should face fearlessly and with faith in God the issues of the hour. As in the days of old, God has been speaking to us, through the tragic events of war, the abuse of unprecedented prosperity, and now through the suffering and disillusionment of these days of depression; yet we have not returned unto God. Crime, lawlessness and atheism have become organized and challenge the very existence of the Christian Church. Financial and economic laws are moral laws and are rooted in the law of God, and not until God is acknowledged will the things that are wrong be set right.

"We, therefore, recommend that this Assembly follow the example set by the heroic fathers of the Church in the Assembly of 1858, as well as in earlier and later Assemblies, and call the entire membership of the Church to penitence and intelligent and unceasing prayer. If we return unto God, he will return unto us.

"We further recommend that the Assembly instruct the Moderator, together with the Stated Clerk, to confer with other Christian communions, inviting them to join with us in an appeal to all Christian believers that they dedicate themselves to persistent, prevailing prayer to Almighty God on behalf of the Church and the Nation and the World, and to designate a definite period for penitence and prayer."

While the present writer believes that these actions fall far short of what is really needed to get at the root of our troubles—repentance for unbelief and the Church's false toleration of heresy—yet he rejoices that this and other features of the Assembly give clear indication that the smug self-satisfaction of years past has been mightily disturbed; that in the Providence of God, men are yearning for the old message, with its sure certainty, its unchanging Christ. This writer confidently hopes and believes that we are on the threshold of a great time of penitence and revival,—one of the blessed results of which will be to give to the Church a needed purification and an undivided witness. But the Church *must* be purified.

The report of the Department of Church Cooperation and Union, of which the peripatetic Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., is chairman, was presented on Saturday morning, and its recommendations made the order of the day for Monday afternoon.

The Overtures

The final vote on the overtures was as follows,—and on Saturday morning, Overtures A and E were declared the law of the Church:

Total number of presbyteries—291.
Necessary to adopt—146.

Overture A	
Affirmative	147
Negative	121
No action	11

Overture B	
Affirmative	37
Negative	234
No action	5

Overture C	
Affirmative	145
Negative	122
No action	11

Overture D	
Affirmative	126
Negative	135
No action	14

Overture E

Affirmative	146
Negative	91
No action	22

Overture "A" deals with ordination to the ministry, and Overture "E" permits women who need not be ruling elders to membership on the General Council. The last minute drive to carry the companion overture of "A"—"C", failed by one vote. The Church has now one method of examining for ordination and another for licensure. Inasmuch as a mistake was discovered in the text of Overture "A" a new overture was sent down later to correct it. As adopted, the overture reads "If the examination in theology be unsatisfactory to three-fourths of the presbyters present, they may demand a further examination in writing . . ." The words "three-fourths" should be "one-fourth" and will be rectified, without doubt, this year.

Pensions

The Standing Committee on Pensions reported in part, as follows: (The report was adopted by the Assembly)

"Your committee begs leave to report that no Standing Committee of the Assembly can ever have had a happier experience than it has enjoyed in surveying the work of the Board of Pensions. To you we would express our appreciation of the frankness of the Board's executives, of their sympathetic understanding of the needs of those dependent upon the Church for support, and of their careful and amazingly successful financial methods in the second year of this deepest of depressions. With all our heart we congratulate the Church upon the report which this Board is able to make to you; and we commend to your gratitude not only the executives of the Board, but the members of the Board itself, men and women who have made constant and willing sacrifice of time and labor throughout the year.

"We urge upon you, one and all, that you emphasize before your Presbyteries and Churches certain vital points:

"The fact that the Relief Department still exists, and needs for gifts for its support will exist for many years to come; and the further fact that the continuance of grants from this Department on the present scale, depends upon the reception of the full quota allowed to the Board out of the general benevolence budget. Thousands of Churches still labor under the unfortunate illusion that the establishment of the Pension Fund automatically ended the need for gifts for the Relief Department and are making no contributions thereto. Go back and tell your Churches to open their purses and hearts for the relief of the many ministers and widows to whom the Relief fund offers the only means of aid.

"As in former years it must be repeated that the complete success of the Service Pension Plan depends largely upon payment by the Churches and Ministers each month in advance, since the interest upon these advance payments—as in all proper Pensions systems—is an absolute factor in enabling the Board to pay your Pensions.

"The number of subscribers delinquent in their payments to the Layman's Pension Fund is affected by the depression. We heartily agree with the Board's kindly insistence upon ultimate payment in full of these obligations. This is of the essence of the Plan; without these payments a part of the Board's work, for which this money is specified, can not be completed. Sixteen percent of the Layman's Fund is as yet uncollected.

"We rejoice with the Board, that certain advance steps have been initiated. One of these in particular, the establishment of the Accumulations Department, will be greatly appreciated by ministers who desire to make safe investment of their small funds or to let their pensions accumulate until some later date.

"Realizing the uncertainty of financial investments in this day, and conscious of the weight of the burden that lies upon the mind and conscience of a Board to which are en-

trusted well over thirty millions of dollars, we commend the Board to your prayers, in the hope that the coming year will find your affairs, in its hands, fully as prosperous as during the year just ended.

Sunday

On Sunday, various commissioners and others connected with the Assembly occupied various pulpits. Dr. C. W. Kerr, of course, preached in the Central Presbyterian Church. The writer had the pleasure of preaching in the morning to a most attentive congregation in the Pilgrim Congregational Church, and to a capacity congregation in the First Christian Reformed Church in the evening. Never did he have a more enjoyable evening than in the fellowship of the Holland people of the Church which is so noted for its fidelity to the principles of the Reformation, and never did he hear better singing. The Church has no choir,—for the whole congregation is the choir. It was a privilege to worship with this great congregation and to know its ministers, Drs. Bergsma and Van Dellen, a stirring evening which will never be forgotten. It was an exhibition and a vindication of the practical value of Calvinism in life as well as in thought.

Dr. Machen's Sermon

The chief event of Sunday, however, was the appearance of Dr. Machen in the pulpit of the First Avenue Presbyterian Church of Denver, whose pastor is Dr. Thomas Murray. Dr. Machen preached two powerful sermons. He was quoted in Monday morning's *Rocky Mountain News* under the following headlines: "Presbyterian Heads Flayed by Churchman . . . Dr. J. Gresham Machen Fiercely Assails Attitude of Modernists . . . Directs Suspicion . . . Asserts Unfaithfulness Is Being Concealed in Reign of Secrecy . . . Bitter Attack on the Presbyterian Church . . ." One of the paragraphs of the news item read: "Scarcely any branch of the church's administrative bodies escaped the withering fire of his criticism. In harsh language he assailed the actions of men high in the Councils of the Church." The whole effect of the manner in which this story was handled was to make it appear that Dr. Machen's message was other in spirit and content than it was. It was not bitter—unless the truth is bitter. It certainly was not harsh,—but it was unpleasant to many because it brought out into public view the very dangerous condition of the Church,—which many people want to ignore, ostrich-like. His words were a needful and salutary purgative. In order that the readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY may know the exact form in which quotations of Dr. Machen's sermon were handed to the press, the text is reproduced on Page 4. It is an undeniable fact that, on Monday morning as newsboys at the door of the Auditorium shouted out "Dr. Machen makes bitter attack on Presbyterian Church," a number of tempers went up to the boiling point.

Monday was, by common agreement, the crucial day of the Assembly. The afternoon was to witness the debate and vote on two questions—that of the Federal Council of Churches, and that relating to the report of the Joint Committee on organic union.

Christian Education

But before these two issues were reached, the Assembly spent most of the morning listening to and debating the report of the standing committee on Christian Education. Some of the recommendations of the Committee, all of which were adopted, were as follows:

"1. That the General Assembly approves the Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Christian Education.

"2. That the General Assembly approves the Minutes of the Board of Christian Education, of the General Board of Education, of the College Board, and of the Board of Education for the year 1931-1932.

"3. That the General Assembly approves the report of the Treasurer of the Board of Christian Education for the year 1931-1932 as certified by the auditors, and the report of the Treasurer of the Publication Department for the year 1931-1932, as certified by the auditors.

"The Board of Christian Education began the year 1931-1932 with a deficit of \$87,675.33. The year 1931-1932 closes with expenditures in excess of receipts from regular sources of \$229,798.70, making a total deficit of \$317,474.03. The Publication Department finds itself able, by increased efficiency, to operate with \$100,000 less working capital than heretofore. Therefore, this \$100,000 is available for the general work of the Board and the Board has applied it to reduce this deficit. After the application of this \$100,000, the deficit of the Board as of March 31, 1932, is \$217,474.03.

"The receipts of the Board from all sources except designated contributions and income from trust funds in the year 1929-1930, which was the year upon which its budget for 1931-1932 was directly based, were \$1,019,666. The expenditures of the Board on account of its budget during the year 1931-1932 were \$1,022,088.28, which includes compulsory payments of \$19,882.72 in excess of the total budget for Student Aid because of an increase in candidates for the ministry and other whole-time Christian callings recommended for aid to the Board by the Presbyteries, and an increase of \$6,900 in interest on borrowed funds.

"The expenditures of the Board on account of its budget in 1931-1932 were \$25,171.10 less than in 1930-1931. The undesignated receipts from living givers applicable to the budget were \$110,707.48 less, and the receipts from other sources were \$38,330.17 less.

"The authorized expenditures of the Board of Christian Education for the year beginning April 1, 1932, have been reduced by \$203,000, or approximately 20 percent in comparison with those of last year.

"11. That in response to Overture No. 20 on 'The materials for Sunday-school instruction issued by the Board of Christian Education,' from the Presbytery of Monmouth, the General Assembly take the following action:

"Inasmuch as the Board of Christian Education is giving every evidence of its fixed purpose to follow the definite instruction of the General Assembly of 1931 in the revision of the 'Age Group Program Material,' namely:

"To take the Bible for the general textbook on which these materials in all age groups shall be based, and to maintain throughout these materials an unmistakable emphasis on salvation by faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour."

"We commend the Board and once more urge it to exercise all diligence in the arduous, difficult, and essentially important task thus committed to its care.

"Further, we commend the Age Group Program materials to our churches and request them to cooperate with the Board in developing the teaching material of our Church to the end that our children may be built up in Biblical knowledge and Christian living."

"20. That in response to Overture No. 44 on 'the unsatisfactory character of the vast majority of the films now being produced by the film industries,' from the Presbytery of Sioux City the General Assembly take the following action:

"That the General Assembly regrets that we have been driven to the conclusion that there is no concerted action on the part of the producers of moving pictures to produce decent entertainment for the public. We are convinced that many of the pictures produced here for foreign exhibition are of such a type as to damage seriously the good name of our country. We have had an abundance of promises of better things to come, but we have also had abundant and continuous disappointments. We have seen, in the press, the moral codes adopted by producers and have then seen upon the screen a procession of inanities, ineptilities, immoralities, and obscenities. The advertising in the press has been even more objectionable than some of the pictures. The pressure of the law, of public opinion, and of decreased box office receipts seems to be the only alternative.

"The conviction is growing that all promises and all activities of men of influence working within the producing organizations for clean pictures are ineffective. We urge upon Congress the advisability and practicability of a federal commission that shall deal with this evil at its source and with all the accompanying evils that now baffle the efforts of individuals and groups of citizens in securing clean pictures.

"We urge that local organizations be set up for the purpose of securing information concerning motion pictures of value for the purpose of making local previews and of giving local publicity that will inform the public of approved pictures, and we recommend that a list of approved films be published in our Church papers and in Moral Welfare."

"21. Resolved, that we rejoice in the ideals of peace which have characterized our national history. We support with no wavering loyalty the army and navy as organizations to be used only in self defense.

"We abhor war. We believe that aggressive warfare is contrary to the will of God. As a Church, we seek peace and will pursue it. We are opposed to compulsory military training in educational institutions in times of peace. We would lift the oppressive burden which war places upon our people in days of war and days of peace. We believe that this can be done only by dealing effectively, by means of Christian education, with the causes of war.

"We, therefore, pledge our undivided support to all efforts and agencies which make for peace and international good will. We work and pray for the success of all undertakings which seek through conferences, peace pacts, treaties, and courts of justice to outlaw war and to establish among men international understanding based upon mutual respect and Christian good will.

"In a day when forces are at work undermining the constituted and historic authority of our nation, we register our unequivocal support and undivided loyalty to the Constitution of the United States.

"25. That in response to Overture No. 38 on 'The use of the Sabbath for broadcasting secular matters' from the Presbytery of George, the General Assembly take the following action:

"That the Department of Moral Welfare respectfully request Federal and other public officials to confine their broadcasting messages in the interest of the public welfare to the six secular days of the week, except where some great extremity or emergency occurs, and when the message or appeal would accord with the spirit and proper observance of the Sabbath Day and would not interfere with the regular hours of Divine worship.

"That the General Assembly disapprove of all commercial advertising over the radio on the Sabbath day and that we support the Lord's Day Alliance in appealing to the Federal Radio Commission to take proper action in this connection."

"26. Whereas commercial, motion picture and sporting organizations are making vigorous efforts to repeal Sunday laws in order that they may commercialize Sunday, be it

"Resolved: That the General Assembly heartily commend the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States and its auxiliary and affiliated bodies in their determination successfully to oppose these movements for a wide open commercial Sunday, and assure the Alliance of its heartiest support and call upon the churches to make as generous a contribution as possible to the Alliance and its auxiliary societies from their budgets, or where it can be arranged, that speakers of the Alliance and its auxiliary societies be invited by pastors and official Boards of the churches to present this cause to the people and offerings be taken for the cause.

"27. Whereas, the Sunday newspapers, even when printed on Saturday, compel in their distribution many men to work on the Sabbath in violation of the Fourth Commandment; and

"Whereas, the Sunday newspaper is a potent enemy of the Sabbath in that it tempts men to forsake the house of worship;

"Resolved: That the General Assembly calls upon all its people not to patronize the Sunday newspaper."

The "Federal Council"

On Monday afternoon the Bills and Overtures Committee reported concerning the Federal Council as follows:

Overture 4 from the Presbytery of Chester.

Overture 14 from the Presbytery of Hudson.

Overture 23 from the Presbytery of Newburyport,

and other papers pertaining to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Your committee recommends that in view of information set forth in the Blue Book, pages 130-143, and having heard representatives of these Presbyteries, that no action be taken."

Immediately the author of this report presented a substitute, as follows:

"The 114th General Assembly, in answer to the overtures from the Presbyteries of Chester, Hudson and Newburyport, expresses sorrow and regret that the Federal Council of Churches has pursued policies which do not represent the position of the Presbyterian Church, and to which the church cannot in good conscience consent. Therefore, the General Assembly, out of a deep sense of duty, with malice toward no man, hereby severs relations with the Federal Council of Churches altogether, and instructs the General Council to omit any appropriation for the Federal Council when framing the next budget."

The amendment was ably spoken for by the Dr. Edwin J. Reinke, of West Grove, Pa. Dr. Reinke appealed for severance from the Council on the ground that it did not properly represent the Presbyterian Church, and that the expenditure was needless and wasteful.

Dr. Asa J. Ferry spoke in favor of the Federal Council, and, while admitting that it was not perfect, said that to repudiate it would be a turning back.

Mr. Griffiths spoke to the motion. He declared that while we were faced with a choice it was not a choice between going forward or backward, as intimated by Dr. Ferry, but a choice as to whether the Presbyterian Church would keep its historic path of witness, or whether it would go with the Federal Council down the long path to the left—the path of religious liberalism that ends at last in agnosticism. No one objected to a great common voice to speak out concerning the great truths of the Gospel. How glorious it would be if the churches spoke as one concerning the Inerrancy of the Word of God, the atonement as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and to reconcile us to God, concerning the last estate of man and the necessity of redemption through the blood of Christ. But this

was not what the Council did. Its doctrinal witness was not pure. Not long ago, a sermon had been preached over the radio, under the auspices of the Council by its most famous preacher, on "The peril of worshipping Jesus." Think of it! The Peril of Worshipping Jesus! Would any present defend that? Then he went on to say that the Federal Council took positions that we could never endorse concerning politics and radical activities,—as explained in Colonel Sanctuary's book "Tainted Contacts." The Council's moral witness was also marred, as a direct result of its doctrinal lapses. He held in his hands a manual issued by an agency of the Council entitled, "Young Peoples Relationships," portions of which, given as "The View of the Church" were unfit for reading publicly to the Assembly.

Mr. Griffiths condemned the consistent policy of the Council in allowing statements to be issued through its committees, and then evading responsibility on the ground that the Council itself had not so spoken. "The general public does not pay any attention to this fine, hair-splitting distinction," he said, "and the public is right. Year after year this organization allows this to go on, and if we remain in it our grandchildren will be here listening to these same excuses. If the Council is really a great common voice, why cannot it accept responsibility for pronouncements issued in its name, or else be silent?" The speaker concluded with the plea that the call of God to the Church was "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you . . ."

The Rev. Jas. L. Rohrbach of Ismay, Montana, also addressed the Assembly. He made a reasoned yet impassioned appeal that the Assembly withdraw from the Council. He attacked the Council on doctrinal grounds, showing the Modernistic nature of its activities. It was a forceful speech.

Another clear and cogent address against further participation in the Council was delivered by the Rev. Christian S. Jessen, of the Presbytery of Hudson.

Dr. Mark A. Matthews, of Seattle, presented an amendment to the effect that the resolution be referred to the General Council, to be brought up at the next Assembly if the Federal Council were not reorganized. Dr. Matthews did not defend the Council. What he did do, was to say that the General Council had promised that the Federal Council would be reorganized, so as (1) to be put on an evangelical basis, and (2) so as to avoid pronouncements by committees. He did not think we ought to withdraw from the Council now. We should wait and see if this reorganization took place. If it did, well and good, if it did not, the next Assembly would see that the Church left the Council. (This is a non-verbatim summary of Dr. Matthews' words as nearly as

the writer could follow them.) The whole purpose of Dr. Matthews' effort was not to "whitewash" the Council, but was to put the leaders of the Church in a position where they must either put the Council upon an evangelical basis or leave it next year. In that maneuver Dr. Matthews was undoubtedly successful, and when the Assembly at last voted on the Federal Council there is no possible question that the Assembly wanted to stay in *pending reorganization*.

Several others discussed the matter before the Assembly, including Elder C. Archer Dunlap of Portland, Me. Elder Dunlap representing Newburyport Presbytery, said that the Federal Council had put the Presbyterian Church in a false position, so that Presbyterians blushed with shame. He insisted that it was time for us to withdraw, and that, if the Federal Council thereafter reorganized on a basis such as the Presbyterian Church could support, we could then again affiliate, as the door would still be open for us to enter at that time. In the meantime, we must conserve our own reputation.

Dr. Robert E. Speer, though not a commissioner, was invited by the Moderator to speak. He gave an address in favor of retaining membership in the Council. Yet even in his defense, as in all the defenses of the Council, ran the note of apology and promise of amendment of its ways.

Dr. Speer urged the Assembly to abide in that fellowship which, he said, was an own child of the Presbyterian Church. He said that by continuing in the Federal Council we could help make changes from within, and could take our part in reconstruction; but that for us to withdraw was to encourage enemies that would seek to break down respect for law. In response to complaints of the radio sermons sponsored by the Federal Council, he said that the radio was a colossal opportunity that could be better used, and that by remaining in the Federal Council we could join in cultivating that agency along evangelistic lines.

At that time the parliamentary situation became somewhat confused, and, to clarify it, Dr. Matthews withdrew his amendment, with the understanding that the proponents of the Council would reorganize it or leave it. Upon the question being put, Mr. Griffiths' amendment was defeated by a vote of 2 to 1 or slightly better. The recommendation of the committee was then adopted.

Dr. Hugh T. Kerr, for the General Council, presented the Council's report concerning the Federal Council as contained in the Blue Book. He said that the report of the approaching reorganization of the Federal Council would be made to the next General Assembly by our own Presbyterian representatives, through the Department of Church Cooperation and Union, and that the demands of the General Assembly for safe-

guarding utterances of the General Council would be fully satisfied.

The following resolution, presented by Rev. Walter E. McClure of New Castle, Pa., was then adopted:

"We recommend that the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, in providing religious service over national broadcasting chains, be requested to provide services thoroughly evangelistic and positively Christian."

There has been some misunderstanding of the position of Dr. Mark A. Matthews concerning the Federal Council, and the writer is glad to state that he believes Dr. Matthews wants a change as much as do many others. It was simply a question of how that result could best be attained. The danger, of course, is that some kind of "re-organization" may be accomplished which while making some changes, will not actually put the Council on a strictly evangelical basis. If this happens, the writer predicts that Dr. Matthews will not be fooled thereby, but that he will lead the Presbyterian Church out of the Council at the Fort Worth Assembly next year. Wait and see.

Church Union

Monday afternoon also witnessed the only action taken by the Assembly concerning Church Union with the United Presbyterian Church, and while the action was merely to postpone sending down to the Presbyteries the Basis of Union for a year, yet it was highly significant. Readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY are aware that there is, among the rank and file of the Church, an increasing opposition to the Basis of Union hitherto suggested. That opposition, it should be made quite clear, is not to *United Presbyterians*—the writer believes them to be, as a whole, probably more loyal to the Reformed Faith than is our own Church as a whole—but the objection is mainly to (1) the United Presbyterian "Confessional Statement" and (2) the form of questions to be asked of ministers at ordination. In both of these, it is clear to the writer, there are departures from the Reformed Faith, as expressed in the Westminster Standards, and, truly, any attempt to hide this, or to deny it, is childish. The second question of the Formula of Subscription is especially subtle and dangerous, because, while it *sounds* very much like the old question, it is in fact plainly susceptible of a modernist interpretation. As things are *now*, modernists are in the Church, but the law is against them. If the Basis of Union is adopted, their position in the Church is likely to be judicially unassailable. And that will mean the end of the Presbyterian Church as a truly confessional Church. But most people do not know of these dangers. These changes are being made at this time, in the opinion of the writer, not because of Church Union, for we could undoubtedly have Church Union

without them, but because there is a desire to legalize modernism in the Church. It could not be done if proposed directly—there is still too much loyalty in the Church for that—but it *can* be done, and *is being* done under the cloak of Church Union with a body only one-tenth the size of our own. (This is not to say that the members of the Joint Committee are all aware of the use to which their work will be put in the United Church.) "Church Union" is a popular war-cry, and it is easy to stampede Assemblies and to howl down those opposed to this Basis of Union as if they were opposed to all union. But the conviction seems to be growing that the United Presbyterian Church is going to awake and refuse to be made a tool of for the pulling of modernist chestnuts out of the fire. And when both churches are finally informed as to the real nature of the Basis of Union, and the special danger in this regard due to the great power of modernists in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., things are going to begin to happen.

When the order of the day came for the Union report, its recommendations were before the Assembly as follows:

The Joint Committee on Organic Union would respectfully offer the following recommendations:

1. It is the unanimous opinion of the Joint Committee on Organic Union that action by the General Assemblies of the negotiating Churches on the "Plan of Union" with the purpose of transmitting said "Plan of Union" to their constituent Presbyteries for action thereupon, should be postponed at least until the General Assemblies of 1933. This unanimous opinion is based upon the conviction that further time should be given to the constituencies of the negotiating churches for the consideration of the many important issues involved.

2. The Joint Committee suggests its continuance that it may receive the instructions of the 1932 General Assemblies of the negotiating churches, and pending the presentation of a report by it to the 1933 General Assemblies, comments from all interested parties who may desire to express their views.

3. The Joint Committee recommends that the "Plan of Union" as herewith submitted, with such further revision as may be deemed wise in the light of the instructions of the 1932 General Assemblies of the negotiating churches and of comments received from interested parties not later than September 1, 1932, be printed and distributed to the ministers of the negotiating churches, to the clerks of the sessions of all the particular churches of the negotiating churches, and to such other persons as may be willing to purchase copies of the "Plan of Union" at a nominal cost.

WILLIAM J. REID, Chairman

LEWIS SEYMOUR MUDGE, Secretary

Upon this report being presented by Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, chairman of the Department of Church Cooperation and Union, and after the appointment of a Special Commission of fifteen, required by the Constitution of the Church, the following amendment was offered by the writer:

"The 144th General Assembly instructs its Department of Church Cooperation and Union, its Special Commission of 15, and the representatives of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. on the Joint Committee for Organic Union, to offer the following as a basis of union with the United Presbyterian Church:

"The Union shall be effected on the doctrinal basis of the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. as received in 1932, and of its other doctrinal and ecclesiastical standards; and the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged as The Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice."

After this resolution had been seconded, Mr. Griffiths spoke to it, pleading that this basis for union—that of the "standards pure and simple" was the historic method of Union in the Presbyterian Church. Those proposing this new basis declared that the "Confessional Statement" was "substantially the same" as the Westminster Confession. If that were so, why did they want both? What objection could they have to eliminating the "Confessional Statement" if they really believed it did not differ from the Confession? There were those who believed it *did* differ from the Confession. Remove it and you have satisfied them, while surrendering no principle. This and this alone would secure the peace of the Church. Any attempt to push through Union on the present basis might result in union,—but it would also result in disruption in the Presbyterian Church. Adopt the amendment, and everyone will be for the Union. Try to force the present basis through, and the result will be—schism.

While it was made plain by the writer that his objection to the Union was not to the United Presbyterians but to the Basis proposed by the Joint Committee, nevertheless various members of the Assembly who spoke against the amendment serenely ignored this, and appealed merely to sentiment for union, which misled the Assembly. The only argument really advanced was that since we are uniting with the United Presbyterians, we must not merely "absorb" them—but must "go half way"—by including the Confessional Statement, and revising the other standards so that they are different from those of either of the negotiating Churches. The great Reformation principle that a creed ought to be an ordered statement of Divine Truth, received because and only because it is revealed of God, seems to have disappeared in the shuffle. Instead we have the new, en-

lightened (?) principle that we insert articles in Confessions out of a fine sense of courtesy. To such a pass has the Presbyterian Church come. And so far as "absorption" is concerned everyone in the Church not still feeding on mental infant's food knows well that it *will* be an absorption—that in three or four years the ten per cent of United Presbyterians will become so mingled with the ninety per cent that they will not be a separate stream or even a trickle in the Church. And it will *then* be perfectly apparent to the United Presbyterians that they *have* been absorbed—and the "powers that be" will not likely be so deferential of their feelings as now.

After discussion, the forces of Church Union voted down the resolution, after an amendment to refer it to the Department of Church Cooperation and Union had been defeated. Dr. J. A. Vance, in discussing the amendment to refer, shouted from the Press Table, "Let's vote this amendment down so we can all vote 'No' on the Griffiths resolution!" This sage counsel seemed good to the Assembly, and the majority noisily voted down both amendments, although there was still, significantly, a considerable, but not vociferous minority.

The overture from the Presbytery of Philadelphia, asking that the rights of minorities be respected in any Church Union was referred to the Department of Church Cooperation and Union.

National Missions

Tuesday morning the Assembly heard the report of the standing committee on National Missions. The report, with recommendations, was adopted, and is, in part, as follows:

For the past two years the Board has felt compelled to keep its rate of expenditure somewhat above its reasonable expectation of income because of the despicable need which has existed throughout the mission field. The serious droughts of 1930 and 1931, the wide-spread unemployment, and the general business depression have had a serious effect upon the entire National Missions area. Those missionaries employed by the Board who receive a part of their support from the fields which they serve, have found themselves with seriously diminished income, which has made them to a greater degree dependent upon the Board. All National Missions enterprises have had a smaller local income. There have been many cases of real privation. The Board has acted on the belief that the Church desired the Board to stand behind its working forces even at the risk of debt.

During the last fiscal year the total income of the Board for its current work showed a decrease of \$520,000 below that of the previous year. Most of this decrease developed during the last three months of the year. As a result, in spite of drastic economies, the deficit for the year was nearly half a million dollars and the total debt of the Board on this date is \$536,000. In view of this fact and of the possibility of a further decline in income, the Board has already taken steps to reduce its expenditures for the current year to \$3,450,000, a decrease of \$468,000 below last year's basis. This General Assembly is asked to approve a simplification of the Board's organization, which will permit further savings in headquarters costs. Of necessity, other reductions will be made to achieve a balanced budget at the earliest possible time. These economies necessarily work great hardship upon all of the Board's work. In effecting them, however, the Board is receiving the heartiest cooperation of all of its staff and working force whose single aim is to achieve financial stability while preserving the missionary program of the Board.

In reporting this situation to the General Assembly, the Standing Committee, while deeply

regretting the necessity for such drastic reductions in missionary expenditures, would express its hearty approval of the policy adopted by the Board. The Committee would urge

First, that the Church put forth every effort to increase the Board's income that the budget may be balanced and the work stabilized and further retrenchment be made unnecessary;

Second, that the effort of the Board to reduce its administrative and promotional costs to the lowest point consistent with efficiency be commended;

Third, that churches and individuals able to do so make *plus* gifts to the Board for the purpose of maintaining particular enterprises, the continuance of which is imperilled by this situation;

Fourth, that after every proper effort has been made to increase the Board's income, the Board take the necessary steps to adjust its expenditures to the available resources, as soon as that can be done without irreparable damage to the missionary program;

Fifth, that this General Assembly assure the Board and all of its missionaries of the interest and prayers of the Church through this trying period and of the determination of the Church to carry forward this great work of winning America for Christ. . . .

IV. CHURCH EXTENSION AND MISSIONS

Second, that the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly and the Board of National Missions send a joint communication to the Stated Clerks of all the Presbyteries and the chairmen of Presbyterian committees on National Missions requesting action during the present year on this matter, and requesting them to review carefully all their appropriations to aided churches, looking toward negotiations with other denominations for the purpose of eliminating unnecessary competition resulting from over-churching.

Third, that each Presbytery be requested to utilize the services of the Board or the Home Mission Council in arranging comity conferences, in order to put the principles of comity into practicable operation.

2. With reference to the program of Aid-receiving churches, the Committee recommends that the Board be instructed, in connection with its grants, to insist as a condition upon which financial aid shall be continued, that such churches shall adopt and put into practical operation the education and missionary program of our church, with specific goals to be attained as a minimum requirement for aid from mission funds. In the application of this principle the services of the Board of Christian Education should be utilized in the preparation of a suitable parish program in conjunction with the staff of the Board of National Missions. . . .

X. MODIFICATION OF FORM OF ORGANIZATION

In the interest both of efficiency and of economy your Committee favors a simplification of the organization of the Board of National Missions to further the coordination of the work and program of the Board, and to make possible a substantial saving in administrative and promotional expenses. In order to effect such a simplification, while preserving each essential feature of the present missionary program, the Committee recommends that the General Assembly approve a modification of the form of organization of the Board in the following particulars:

First, that for the present divisional and departmental organization of the Board there be substituted a division of the organization into two sections, under the General Secretary, as follows:

1. A department of missionary operation under the immediate oversight of the Administrative Secretary, to include all the work hitherto carried under the Divisions of Church Extension and Missions, Missions for Colored People, Schools and Hospitals, Evangelism, and the Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains.

2. A department of missionary support under the immediate oversight of the Treasurer, to include the Treasurer's office and the work hitherto carried on under the division of General Promotion and the Department of Building and Property; the Treasurer's office to be conducted under the direction of the Finance Committee of the Board.

3. Each of these Departments shall be provided with such operating staff as in the judgment of the Board is needed for the conduct of its work.

Second, that the Board be authorized to make such other changes in its form of organization as are necessary to carry into effect the above provisions.

Social and Industrial Relations

Tuesday the extreme advocates of the "Social Gospel," led by Dr. John McDowell, of New York, secretary of a special committee on social and industrial relations, made their fight to have the Assembly adopt the committee's report. The report, which was adopted with some amendments, contained the following section entitled "Ideals and Objectives":

In view of these obligations, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. does now declare and stand for the following ideals and objectives:

1. Practical application of acknowledged Christian principles to the accumulation and use of wealth; subordination of profit to the creative and cooperative spirit; observance of such social plans and control as are involved in the economic process which operates for the common good.

2. The right of all to an opportunity for self-maintenance; a wider and fairer distribution of wealth; a living wage as an irreducible minimum together with a just participation by the worker in the profits of the industry in which he or she is engaged.

3. The safeguarding of working people from harmful conditions of labor, dangerous machinery and occupational disease, and for the education of the workers in avoiding hazards in connection with their employment.

4. The assumption by industry of the burdens entailed by industrial accidents, disease, unemployment and death, and for the training of injured workers for continued production and self-support.

5. Reduction of hours of labor as the productivity of industry increases; release from employment at least one day in seven, with a shorter working week as a realizable objective.

6. The right of employees and employers alike to organize for collective bargaining and social action; the obligation of both to cooperate for the commonweal.

7. Such regulation of the conditions of occupation of women as shall secure an adequate living wage and at the same time safeguard their physical and moral health and that of the community and of future generations.

8. Abolition of child labor; adequate provision for the education, spiritual nurture, and healthful recreation of every child.

9. Protection of the family by the insistence on a single standard of continency; educational preparation for marriage, home-making and parenthood.

10. Economic and social justice for the farm-family; the fostering and preservation of the distinctive values of rural life.

11. Protection of the individual and society from the wasteful and detrimental traffic in intoxicants and habit-forming drugs; advocacy of the public policy of the prohibition of both, and the unremitting maintenance of the education of the individual citizen in the support of his position.

12. Application of the Christian principle of redemption to the treatment of offenders; reform of penal and correctional institutions and an equitable readjustment of judicial procedure.

13. Justice, opportunity, and equal rights for all; mutual goodwill and racial, economic, and religious cooperation.

14. Repudiation of war, drastic reduction of armaments, participation in international agencies for the peaceable settlement of debatable questions; the erection of a cooperative world-order.

15. Recognition and maintenance of the rights of free speech, free assembly, and a free press as guaranteed by the Constitution; the encouragement of unfettered interchange of mind with mind, as essential to the continuing discovery of truth and the dissemination of knowledge.

16. The inviolability of agreements, both in letter and in spirit, since good faith is the foundation of social and industrial stability and progress.

The Assembly resolved to create a new standing committee, to be known as the "Committee on Social and Moral Welfare." The next Assembly will be the first at which this committee will function.

A dissent from, and protest against the action of the Assembly, in the matter of

the Federal Council of Churches, was filed by the writer and others with the Stated Clerk. After having been read to the Assembly, it was voted that it be recorded in the minutes with no answer by the Assembly.

Wednesday morning was, as usual, a hurried time. The last sederunt is always an occasion of the gathering up of all the loose-end business of the Assembly.

Foreign Missions

The Standing Committee on Foreign Missions made its report through its chairman, The Rev. Asa J. Ferry, D.D. It was, in part, as follows:

We make the following recommendations to the General Assembly:

1. That the Assembly approves the Minutes and the 95th Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions and record its profound gratitude to Almighty God for His Manifest blessing upon the work of the year.

2. That the Assembly expresses its grateful thanks to all the members and officers of the Board, to its able and devoted Secretaries and to the consecrated Missionaries on every Field of Service, for their fidelity and their devotion to the Cause of Christ.

10. That the Assembly learns with profound gratitude of the continued progress of the Foreign Missionary work of our Church in all the Missions under the direction of the Board; and that in spite of unsettled conditions in the Orient, and revolutionary movements in certain Latin American countries, the work has gone forward with little interruption, and no loss of life or serious loss of property; and rejoices in the remarkable record of accomplishments recorded in the Report of the Board.

11. That the Assembly records its deep joy in the growth of the National Churches, in many Mission Lands, and the fine spirit of co-operation which they have displayed in their relations with the Missions of our Church; and that we extend to them our fraternal greetings, and pray for the continued blessing of God upon both the Churches and their Leaders.

12. That the Assembly reaffirm its conviction that religious liberty is an inalienable right of all men everywhere; and expresses the hope that our fellow Christians of all lands where this right is withheld, may be given wisdom, patience, and perseverance until it is secured to all.

13. That the Assembly notes with special appreciation the steady increase in giving on the part of the Churches on the Mission Fields, which has now reached the fine proportion of one to two in relation to the gifts of the home Churches; so that for every two dollars given to Foreign Missions by the Churches at home, one dollar is given on the Mission Field. . . .

21. That the Assembly learns with deep gratitude of the remarkable Conference of the Board and its Missionaries, Representatives of the Home Churches and Missionary Societies, and of the churches of China, Japan, Chosen, India, The Philippine Islands, and Latin America, in Lakeville, Conn., on June 20-30, 1931; that it approve the embodiment in the Manual of the Board of the findings of the Conference, as revised by the Missions and the Board, and submitted to the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions of this Assembly; and that it notes with special joy that throughout the findings, which deal with many phases of the Missionary enterprise, the Evangelistic note is dominant, and the spiritual purposes of the Board are consistently kept in the foreground.

Next Assembly at Fort Worth

An invitation that the next General Assembly meet in Fort Worth, Texas, was extended by the First Presbyterian Church of Fort Worth, through Rev. Jasper Manton of Dallas, and was seconded by Rev. M. E. Chappell of Fort Worth, as stated clerk for the Presbytery of Fort Worth. It was explained that the church extending the invitation was a federated church, in which the happiest of working relationships had

for a number of years been in existence between the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. and the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., each of which bodies had about 700 communicant members therein, making a total membership of about 1,400. It was added that the mayor of the city was a member. Dr. James K. Thompson, pastor, is a member of Fort Worth U. S. A. Presbytery.

On motion of Dr. Mark A. Matthews, the invitation from Fort Worth was accepted.

Exception to having the General Assembly meet in Texas was made by Rev. Irwin W. Underhill, Jr., who filed a protest which was entered in the official minutes as follows:

"Rev. Irwin W. Underhill, Jr., of the Presbytery of Corisco, Cameroun, French West Africa, wishes to go on record as protesting against the motion that the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. meet at Fort Worth, Texas, in 1933.

"Inasmuch as the General Conference of the Methodist Church North, the Federal Council of Churches in America, and the National Convention of the Y. M. C. A., have gone on record as refusing to hold their assemblies and conferences in cities where the Colored commissioners will be segregated and Jim Crowed, he feels that the General Assembly should concur in this advanced and Christian step.

"He feels that to go to a town or city where the Colored commissioners will be forced to be Jim Crowed and humiliated is not only to insult the Colored commissioners and the people that they represent, but that it is an insult to Jesus Christ and to God Almighty, for did the Master not say: 'Inasmuch as ye do this to the least of these my brethren, ye do it unto me?'

"IRWIN W. UNDERHILL, JR."

The Assembly adjourned several hours in advance of the docketed time, thanks to its smoothness of operation. No one could attend the Assembly, no matter what his views about the state of the Church, without admiring the efficiency with which Dr. Mudge as Stated Clerk handled the business

of the Assembly, with the especially able assistance of Dr. W. P. Finney and Mr. Henry Barraclough, assistant clerks.

Thus "another Assembly" has come and gone. Yet, in the light of history it may not have been only "another assembly." First, the leaders have given solemn pledges to reorganize the Federal Council, put it on an evangelical basis, or else get out. That is certainly of major importance. Second, the die has evidently been cast that Church Union will be pushed through on the present doctrinal basis, which means that conservatives will now begin to organize in earnest. Third, after a period of recession, conservatives are beginning to realize their strength and find their friends. And it is significant, noted by many, that the men now becoming active on the conservative side are *young* men, while those who lead the organization are mostly elderly men. The moral of this hardly needs pointing out. Fourth, there is a distinct evangelical reaction in the Church, recognized and allowed for by all. People are becoming sick and tired of the husks of modernism. They want the bread of the Gospel. The writer believes that had the Assembly had any strictly doctrinal question before it, which it recognized as doctrinal, the vote would have been two to one for the Gospel. The strategy of the powers that be is to present every dispute that has doctrinal roots in a non-doctrinal light. It should be obvious that the proper strategy of conservatives henceforth should be to keep the doctrinal issue to the front and to hammer away at it unceasingly. Any other counsel will continue to play into the hands and suit the plans of those who wish the Church to be, at best, doctrinally neutral or indifferent, and those who want it to be a modernistic church. Modernism thrives on that state of stagnation of witness and evangelical effort sometimes mistakenly called "peace in the Church." There will never be true peace in the Church until our deep doctrinal differences are eliminated, until evangelicals and modernists go their separate ways, until the Lord Jesus Christ, the Christ of the New Testament, of history and of experience, is again enthroned in the heart of an undivided and believing Church.

The Fourth Montreat Assembly

By the Rev. J. Blair Morton, D.D.

THIS Assembly was: The shortest on record. It moved smoothly, swiftly, silently, and efficiently to its adjournment. On paper before it convened the impression in several quarters was, it was not a great Assembly. As seen by those on the outside, as it worked from day to day, it was great in its alertness, in its patient attendance on

the sessions, in its self control; for only about one-sixth of its Commissioners rose to speak. It was leaderless, but at the same time it acted in unity—not a minority report, not a printed protest, not a sustained complaint, no two parties lined up against each, and almost perfectly organized. Like the word or not, this Assembly was pro-

foundedly Fundamental. And it hewed to the lines of Southern Presbyterian Traditions, while there were no oratorical flights back into the glories of the past.

MONTREAT AGAIN: For the fifth time, and three times consecutively, the Assembly will convene at Montreat for its 1933 meeting. To go is to know, what a fine place Montreat is for such a meeting. No temptations to be carried sight-seeing away from Committee meetings. For Dr. R. C. Anderson is too good a business man to offer distractions, however accessible they are in the near surrounding scenery of this "sky-land," to such a body of men. He wants the Assembly every year, and wants the Assembly to want to come to Montreat every year. Could the Presbyterian and Reformed Bodies of America come together, under the blue flag of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, could a more suitable gathering place for the Clans than Montreat be imagined.

THE MODERATOR: The Rev. William Crowe, D.D., pastor of the Westminster Church of St. Louis, Mo., was chosen from a field of four, any one of whom would have proved himself to be a splendid Moderator. In this writer's opinion, there is never scarcity of personnels of Moderatorial capacity in any Southern Presbyterian Assembly. For why should it be thought a gigantic task to moderate Christian gentlemen? This opinion is in no way to be interpreted as discounting Dr. Crowe as an Assembly-Moderator. Just to see and hear him moderate was a keen pleasure, for those not seeking the floor on superfluous matters; and after the second day there were none such in this Assembly. Moreover, the Moderator's facetious humor and spontaneously sparkling repartee carried the Assembly serenely over several mountains of parliamentary procedure. And this Moderator has been well-termed, "Clear-headed, courteous and gracious."

PRESENT DEPRESSION: It came not as a certified Commissioner from any Presbytery. But the impression of the oppressive presence of the nation-wide depression was somewhat marked during the initial sessions. It may be fairly said, that this Assembly just escaped being denominated as Most Economically-minded. It is meant that the said escape was made in this article. To sustain such a position as the truth in re this Assembly, attention is called to the extreme financial pressure that was for a while at least brought to bear upon their actions. For instance, at one stage in the proceedings, a "I call for the question" was tagged as costing so many dollars and cents. If the writer's memory serves him rightly, the exact bill for the time consumed was \$11.85. The hurried hurry of these moments was rather heavily tintured with frenzied finance. No figures will be brought forward. The purpose is not to stigmatize but to glorify. For the smothering atmos-

phere of pessimism, said to be at least slightly present, was soon clarified by the effects of the sermons, the devotional talks, the resolutions passed, and the many prayers. So this writer will surname this body of Commissioners as the Most Fundamental Assembly. It was fundamentally Southern Presbyterian, but was neither reactionary, nor non-progressive. It steadily faced the facts, which are depressing beyond a doubt, and sanely planned greater conquests for its Lord and Master, who is God and man, in two distinct natures, and One Person forever.

THE PRESS: The Press as always was an asset and a liability. Its news-item in re the anonymous circulation of a financial statement draughted in a way to insinuate, that the office of the Stated Clerk was costing the Assembly too much, or even that there might be graft there, brought forth some protests. But in a way, the Press was an asset in this incident for it revealed that there was underhand work being done, and the Assembly was afforded an opportunity to repudiate all responsibility, and put itself on record as being disgusted with all such doings.

Now, the Press is and has to be undenominational and seems almost to think that it has to be unreligious. Trained not to express its own opinion in regard to anything, or anybody; how could it perfectly reflect the conclusions of any opinionated conference, and the Presbyterians are at times somewhat obstinate, and their terms of expression are hard even for graduates from their Seminaries to always understand. Anyway this Assembly was rather widely broadcasted by the Press.

And again there was the "Wet Press" comments on the Moderator's sermon, preached as the opening incident of the Assembly. These comments should be designated as the "Wet Editors" comments. Moreover, these comments gave added publicity and interest to Dr. Crowe's sermon, which was a clear statement of the historical position of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

IMPORTANT ACTIONS: 1. The Rotary System of electing Church Officers, became by the action of a large majority of the Presbyteries, a part of the Book of Church Order. There was relief that this years and years drawn out matter had come to an end, of course the end reached as in case of everything consummated by discussion, was questioned in many quarters. There is much evidence that the said amendment will not be taken advantage of very largely throughout the Church.

2. There was an Ad Interim and a Standing Committee's report on Union. "A definite, complete, and detailed plan for Federal Union of our Church with any, or all Presbyterian or Reformed bodies," was

recommended and adopted. By expert interpretation of the Standing Committee's report, the door was partially opened to organic Union with the said bodies. In another report progress was announced in re union with the Associate Reformed Church. From comments caught here and there and yonder, The Montreat Association need not rush their preparations to entertain either a United Federal Assembly, or a completed Organic Union Assembly. Yet in hopes, and to satisfy hearts longing for Union, an Ad Interim Committee, representing all the Synods, with the Moderator as Chairman, was appointed to receive and list, and report to the next Assembly proposals for Union from the said bodies.

3. The perennial discussion in re the Federal Council as per usual for twelve or more years, rapidly devoured some two or more hours of the Assembly time. The Committee handling this matter recommended that there be no discussion of this matter, adding, which was later stricken out, a clause to effect that they feared the effect upon the coming Evangelistic Campaign. Many thought that but for the wording that the Assembly would have voted to remain out of the Federal Council without any debate. To the mind of this writer that is a rather hazardous way of thinking. Among the speeches there seemed to be those that were studied and primed for this occasion. Another remark was rather too cruel to be believable. It stated that the debate did not change a single Commissioner's mind. Another aspect of these discussions is the drastic statements that are made pro and con this matter of the Federal Council, by men whose integrity cannot be questioned, and yet the statements are as opposite as black and white. One wonders when the Southern Presbyterian Church is going to find out the exact truth in re the Federal Council. The different Assemblies do not hesitate to refer difficult questions to Ad Interim Committees, why not this one? Many expressed themselves as disgusted with the matters put forward in this debate, yet no one proposed any definite way of ending the annual fireworks. If "Tainted Contacts" is a lie, why not find out the truth; if it is even more or less the truth, why not cut loose from such a contact. Moreover, the meaning of the word "Federal," as was stated on the floor of this Assembly, almost constitutionally requires a vote of the Presbyteries in order that such a union, (note, Federal means, "A compact or act of union between separate sovereign states" Standard Dictionary), may be established. Each member may easily be termed a representative.

Well, after the usual agitation, the Assembly voted to remain outside the said Council by an almost three-fourths majority. Last year it was nearly a two-thirds majority.

COMMITTEES: Seldom if ever have Standing Committees been provided with better Chairmen. The Moderator showed a deal of spiritual shrewdness in naming the Chairmen of Standing and Special Committees. All matters were splendidly treated, and there were many and complicated questions coming before the Committees. Finances were treated as finances, but also as finances of the Heavenly Kingdom. As much as five percent of all indebtedness must be paid during the coming year. This order is less drastic than last year, for last year twenty percent was required.

HEAVENLY PLACES: And to this caption might easily be added, "In Christ Jesus." To understand just what is meant by this caption one needs only to experience the feelings that surged through this Assembly at times. Take for instance, when Dr. Egbert W. Smith for twenty or more years Executive Secretary of the Assembly's Committee forced the Assembly to accept his resignation because he had reached the age of three score years and ten. What memories of past victories gained throughout the world for Christ, through Dr. Smith's instrumentality? During this Assembly he had vividly brought the needs of Africa to its attention, as well as the victories of faith, there gained over heathenism. Then the question of a successor was forced upon the Assembly, and there were nominated two fine men of Dr. Smith's own training. And with a prayer for guidance Dr. C. Darby Fulton was chosen, and Mr. Edward D. Grant, the other nominee, presented him with tender words to the Assembly. In that sweet moment did not David and Jonathan, of a more spiritual dispensation, stand upon that platform?

No, these Commissioners were not only representatives of their Presbyteries, but were also of the household of God. Just listen: When Dr. Ben R. Lacy, President of Union Seminary, Richmond, Va., had, in his striking address on Evangelism, pointed that gathering to possible victories through a blood bought Gospel under the leadership of the crucified Son of God, did not all hearts burn with new love to Christ and one another? This was touchingly brought to a heavenly climax by the closing prayer, offered by Dr. Ernest Thompson, who had presided during this address.

Permit it to be said lastly, that that Assembly was unconsciously very near to heaven. For sitting at the Press table was Dr. David Sweets, who on Friday went to be with his Saviour. This writer will never forget that scene and his conversations with that devoted Christian and Editor.

Editor's Note.—It is also of interest to record the following action of the Assembly: The sending down as an overture to the Presbyteries the report of the "Ad Interim Committee on Title to Church Property," which is designed to safeguard the right of

individual congregations to their own properties. The report is as follows:

"Your Ad Interim Committee on Title to Church Property begs leave to submit the following report:

"The Committee presented a report to the General Assembly of 1931, and that portion dealing with safeguarding against Excessive Debts of Synods and Presbyteries was adopted, but the portion dealing with Title to Church Property was recommitted to the Committee, and with it Overture No. 91 from Muhlenburg Presbytery.

"Your Committee met in Memphis, Tenn., on February 11, 1932, restudied the whole matter, giving special consideration to the thoughtful overture from Muhlenburg Presbytery.

"The Committee feels that the suggested amendment submitted to the last Assembly is not out of harmony with the principles of representative government set forth in said overture, but is in strictest accord with the principles of justice and equity embodied in the Constitution and usage of our church. Our church limits in a constitutional manner the rights of Congregations, Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assembly. The uniform usage of our church and the Book of Church Order justly give in principle the power of control, management, and disposal of their respective properties to the congregation, the Presbytery and the Synod. The amendment submitted by your Committee proposes to incorporate in a definite form in our Book of Church Order what is already the usage of our Church, and your Committee believes that if this amendment is adopted it will avoid future misunder-

standings and controversies in our church and preserve its peace and harmony.

"Therefore, your Committee again recommends that the General Assembly approve and recommend to the several presbyteries for their adoption the following amendment to Chapter 13 of the Book of Church Order as paragraph 60a, namely:

"Each Church, Presbytery and Synod owns and has the power of control, management and disposal of its respective property, whether the title thereto be held by trustees, individuals or corporate, or otherwise; and, except as provided in Section 158 of the Book of Church Order, it is not within the power of any one or more of such bodies, or of the General Assembly, to impair or divest such title so held by any other of such bodies without its consent given by the affirmative vote of three-fourths of those present at a meeting of such body constitutionally called for that purpose. The right of a Church, a Presbytery and a Synod in and to its property is a civil right and cannot be involuntarily impaired or affected by an ecclesiastical action of any other Church court."

"Respectfully submitted,

J. B. HUTTON,
JNO. M. WELLS,
W. G. GILLIS,
ALLAN D. SANFORD,
JOHN J. DAVIS,
E. T. MILLER, *Chairman.*"

The Assembly was greatly impressed in this committee's report by the fact that it had been prepared by the elder-members, men of strong legal mind.

The United Presbyterian General Assembly

By the Rev. A. Gordon MacLennan, D.D.
Minister, Shadyside United Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

THE Seventy-fourth General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church met in the First United Presbyterian Church of Beaver, Pennsylvania, on May 25th, at 7:30 in the evening.

A sense of sadness pervaded the Assembly because of the death of the Moderator, J. Knox Montgomery, D.D., LL.D. For the fifteenth time in the history of the church the Moderator's alternate was called upon to preach the opening sermon. Rev. James A. MacDonald, D.D., preached a most forceful and timely sermon from the text Isaiah 65:16. His theme was "The God of the Amen."

Dr. C. S. Cleland, pastor of the Second Church, Philadelphia for thirty-eight years, was unanimously elected Moderator. Dr. Cleland has fifty-three relatives in the Foreign Mission field. It was a most happy choice, and Dr. Cleland presided over all the sessions in a most gracious and fair manner.

The report of the committee on statistics was most encouraging in view of general conditions during the year. While contributions show a decrease, yet contributions to the Budget (missionary work) decreased only 10% while payments on congregational expenses decreased 20%. The reception of

members on profession of faith shows an increase over last year of 375, and the total net increase in membership was 1,511.

It was clearly understood that the outstanding issue of the Assembly would be the report of the committee on Presbyterian Unity. Dr. W. J. Reid, the chairman of the committee, presented his report on Thursday afternoon, and asked that the matter be held in abeyance for one year that further details might be completed. Commenting on the report Dr. Reid explained why other members of the original group withdrew from negotiations, declaring that it was not now possible to reach greater union. His principal argument in favor of the report and the recommendation of the committee was "Courtesy" to the Presbyterians. They were in the negotiations at our invitation and as our guests. We should not drop the matter and offend them. Also he felt that "the important thing is what can we contribute to the Kingdom of God?" He feels that the United Presbyterian Church is on the down grade, and while we have something to offer at the present time, in five years we will have nothing that the Presbyterians or any other Church will want. He stated that a representative of one of our boards had said, in a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, "we are sunk if this union does not go through." He was quite pessimistic regarding the future of the United Presbyterian Church even though the denomination had led the Protestant Churches of America in per capita giving for missions last year. He felt that our missionary work, "which now means so little," would be worth while if put under the care of a man like Robert E. Speer.

On Saturday morning the report was again taken up when the Bills and Overtures committee reported to the Assembly. Other matters in the report were settled and when the question of union was reached the Bills and Overtures committee recommended that action relative to Union with the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. should be postponed until other churches were ready to enter the union. At this point the Unionists attempted an adroit political move when Dr. E. R. Davidson moved that the recommendation of the committee on Unity be substituted for that of the Bills and Overtures Committee. Such a motion would entirely close all discussion. The substitute was voted down by a large majority. At once a Pittsburgh minister moved the same as an amendment. Further discussion was postponed until Monday morning, at which time Dr. W. L. C. Sampson, chairman of the Bills and Overtures Committee, spoke strongly in favor of their recommendation and pointed out the doctrinal dangers of the Basis of Union, and cited many instances of Presbyterian action in admitting men to the ministry who refused to accept the fundamental doctrines of the church. He was followed by Mrs. S. D. Sands represent-

ing the Women's Association, the most efficient organization of the church. She spoke strongly against the idea of Union with the Presbyterian Church.

Again discussion was postponed until four o'clock in the afternoon. The discussion was then opened by Dr. Charles R. Watson, the president of the Union College at Cairo, Egypt, who spoke most persuasively in favor of this union. To Dr. Watson must go the credit for saving the Committee on Unity from defeat. He was followed by Dr. George Rait, a representative of the Board of Home Missions, who also supported the Union Committee. A speech was also made by a native of India in favor of Union, although many thought it rather out of keeping that one who knew so little of conditions in this country, and the real issues involved should presume to speak as he did.

After considerable discussion, in which none of the vital issues involved were touched upon, except by Dr. E. S. McKittrick who spoke against the Union, the amendment was carried and the Unity Committee's recommendation adopted.

Later on in the Assembly the following

resolution introduced by Dr. F. F. Cummings was carried by a large majority; "Resolved that we instruct the Committee on Presbyterian Unity to add to the Formula of Subscription for all ministers admitted to the United Church:—3. Do you believe in the Triune God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as set forth in the Confessional Statement in Articles 11, 12, and 13?"

One of the noticeable things about this Assembly in connection with the Union question was the tremendous increase in opposition to the proposed union since the Assembly at Youngstown last year. Many feel that by the time of next Assembly the Union will be a dead issue.

Next year will be a special year in The United Presbyterian Church with the celebration of the Seventy-fifth anniversary of the organization of the Church in 1858. The General Assembly, The Women's General Missionary Convention, and the Young Peoples' National Convention will be held simultaneously from June 28 to July 2. This year will also be the fiftieth of the organization of the Women's General Missionary Society.

Fifty-eighth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada

THE 58th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada met on the evening of Wednesday, Just 1st, in New St. James Church, London, Ontario, with 216 commissioners on the roll (ministers and elders), and with altogether about eight hundred crowded into the church to hear the wonderful message of the retiring moderator, "Brown of Red Deer." The Rev. W. G. Brown, broken in health, preached as only he could, an inspiring sermon on John 17:19: "And for their sakes I sanctify myself." There were four nominations for moderator, Rev. Dr. Robert Johnston of Ottawa by Dr. Allan S. Reid, Rev. Dr. James MacKay of London by Dr. S. Banks Nelson, Rev. S. Banks Nelson, by Rev. K. Hunter Palmer, Rev. D. James Wilson, by Rev. J. B. Skene. Dr. Johnston, famed throughout Canada as a preacher and a fighter for Presbyterian doctrine and polity, was elected on the third ballot.

Among the matters dealt with at the Thursday sederunts was the annual question of whether or not fraternal greetings be received from the United Church of Canada. The local committee had felt quite justified in inviting that church, along with others, to send an official representative. But those in the Assembly who desired to bring about

peace this year were disappointed, on account of the following communication from the United Church of Canada, addressed to the Moderator and Secretary of "The Presbyterian Church":—

Right Rev. W. G. Brown, M.A., D.D.,
Moderator,

Rev. J. W. MacNamara, M.A., D.D.,
Secretary,

The General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church,

St. James Presbyterian Church,
London, Ontario.

Gentlemen:—

Under the authority of the General Council of The United Church of Canada, we again notify the General Assembly of the non-concurring congregations of The Presbyterian Church in Canada, as has been done each year since the consummation of Church Union in 1925, that The Presbyterian Church in Canada, by action in accordance with its Constitution, and as provided in The United Church in Canada Act (14-15 George V. Cap. 100), continues its identity in The United Church of Canada. We renew our protest against your use of the name "The Presbyterian Church in Canada,"

and against your claim to the continuity of "The Presbyterian Church in Canada" in your Church.

We repeat our confident belief that harmony will be best attained and the highest interest of both your Church and ours will be best conserved by a frank and earnest endeavour to remove the causes which have been productive of friction between our Churches. We therefore renew the suggestion that each Church appoint a small Committee to consider the matters between us and endeavour to arrive at a solution which will be in the interests of all concerned. If your General Assembly will favourably consider this proposal, we shall be pleased to appoint a Committee for this purpose.

Yours faithfully,

T. ALBERT MOORE,
Secretary, The General Council.

As a result, a Montreal lawyer who was an elder commissioner, Mr. Donald MacKenzie Rowat, presented the following resolution:—

"We pray for the day when fraternal relations may be taken up with the United Church of Canada, but we feel that that day has not come until the United Church recognizes the indubitable fact that we, *de facto*, if not in the subtlety of the law are the Presbyterian Church in Canada." This was adopted, and Dr. James Endicott, ex-moderator of the United Church, hearing that there was so much controversy, withdrew his delegation. At a later sederunt the whole question was referred to the Legal Committee of the Board of Administration (without power to take the matter to the supreme courts of Dominion or Empire).

Dean Tucker brought greetings from the Church of England in Canada and Rev. Guido R. Miegge, representative of the Waldensian Church of Italy, addressed the Assembly briefly on the great history and needs of the Italian Presbyterians.

Then the Rev. A. S. Grant, M.D., Secretary, gave part of the report of the General Board of Missions, and "spoke feelingly of the great loss sustained in the deaths of Dr. D. R. Drummond, the chairman, Dr. M. White, Synodical Missionary of Alberta, and Rev. D. MacVicar, a member of the Board" from Nova Scotia. Certain of its recommendations were approved upon the motion of Rev. Rupert G. Stewart of Toronto, while others were postponed, by motion of Mr. James Rodger of Montreal, until the report of the Board of Administration should be received. Dr. Reid made a plea that the colleges be made attractive so that young men be not lost to the Canadian Church. At a later sederunt, Principal F. Scott MacKenzie, D.D., in presenting the report of the senate of The Presbyterian College Montreal, said that Canadian students al-

ways have and always will go in small numbers to better equipped colleges in other lands as long as Canadian theological colleges are understaffed. Dr. MacKenzie, in protesting against students in Canadian universities being left without summer mission fields, stated that Canadian students who had gone abroad for their studies had received fields when they applied.

After the report of the Board of Missions came the reports of the Women's Missionary Society, Eastern and Western divisions, presented by Dr. Hugh Munroe of New Glasgow, N. S., and Mrs. D. Strachan of Toronto, respectively. Neither had any deficit to report.

Then arrived Home Mission night when Dr. A. S. Grant, formerly medical missionary in the Yukon during the Gold Rush, of '98 and now secretary of the Mission Board, spoke first. Dr. A. J. MacGillivray, of Guelph, presiding. Dr. Grant was followed by Rev. E. A. Wright of Grande Prairie, Alberta, who addressed the Assembly upon the work in the Peace River country and its great possibilities, paying tribute to Miss Hazel MacDonald who spoke after Mr. Wright, and to Miss Margaret Strang, B.A., M.D., the latest recruit in that pioneer district in Northern Alberta and British Columbia. It was mentioned that Dr. Strang, educated in the University of Western Ontario, London, the Assembly city this year, had asked for the most difficult outpost on the Canadian frontier, and there she does the work of a medical doctor, preacher of the Word, Sunday School teacher, dentist, and leader in church-building. Rev. H. R. Horne, Synodical Missionary in the Synod of Saskatchewan, gave a review of the work in that province and described conditions in the burnt-out districts in the Southern and Western section of the Province. He outlined the measures adopted in connection with the relief work and paid tribute to the splendid work carried on by the Women's Missionary Society in administering the relief. He also spoke of the fine spirit of optimism and courage displayed by the people, and of the great increase in church membership in certain mission fields where under the leadership of consecrated elders some churches have been built also notwithstanding the dire straits of the people. The name of the great superintendent of Missions, the late Dr. James Robertson, was mentioned several times during the evening, as well as later in the Assembly, when the celebration of the 50th anniversary of his appointment was referred to the Board of Missions, with the suggestion that Old Kildonan Presbyterian Church in Manitoba, in whose churchyard his body is buried, be the starting-point. On Home Mission night, too, the Rev. Alexander Forbes, D.D., the pioneer missionary in the Peace River district, now in Ontario, was asked to stand up. As commissioner to General Assembly, there was also present another pioneer, Dr.

Hugh R. Grant of Fort William, the original "Sky Pilot" of Ralph Connor's novels.

On Friday, behind closed doors the Assembly considered a special commissioner's report, presented by Dr. Frank Baird of Pictou, N. S., advising that unsatisfactory conditions did exist in Knox College, Toronto. The report was an echo of charges made in 1931 by a group of divinity students which involved, it was understood, at least one Knox College professor. An investigating commission was therefore established, which received the report of a previous investigation by the college senate and collected evidence from over two hundred interested parties and witnesses. Not having much power, the Knox College Commission made no recommendations other than that the Assembly look into such a serious matter. For more than an hour the Church Court considered the report in camera, but consideration of it was adjourned when the time for the Financial Report, a fixed order, arrived.

One feature of this report was the threatened resignation of Mr. E. W. McNeill, church treasurer, when it was suggested that his report be referred to the Board of Administration before being adopted by the General Assembly. Mr. J. G. Pelton, and Mr. James Rodger, both of Montreal and members of the Board of Administration, denied any reflection on the Treasurer.

The report of Mr. McNeill for the year ending Jan. 31, 1932, showed total expenditures for the Budget of \$523,318, and revenue of \$478,627. Reference was also made to the "One Step Forward Movement" offerings of \$75,000 so far received, as a result of the inspirational addresses of Rev. W. G. Brown in his moderatorial tour. "The Church is perfectly solvent," said the treasurer.

Divided opinions on the introduction of a liturgy in devotional services were expressed. "Written prayers," said Rev. C. N. Miller MacKay of Levis, Que., "were not anti-Calvinistic." Opposition to liturgies was expressed by Dr. W. D. Reid, Montreal, who did not like "cheap imitations of Anglicanism." He doubted if the New Testament contained a written prayer.

Foreign Mission Night brought the Friday sederunts to a close. After Dr. James Wilson had outlined the extent of the church's work in Formosa, Manchuria, and Japan, in Jhansi, India, and in the Vindhya and Satpura Mountain Bhil Presbytery, India, and in British Guiana, Mrs. D. Strachan spoke for the W. M. S., making special mention of six appointed this year, including one lady doctor to India (formerly in an American Presbyterian Hospital in Jhansi), and a high school principal who has graduated from university with a B.A. and an M.A., appointed to Formosa, who speaks the Japanese language. Miss Stringer of Jhansi, India, and Rev. Hugh MacMillan of Tamsui, Formosa, both on their first fur-

loughs, then spoke of their respective fields of labour. Miss Margaret O'Hara, M.D., LL.D., formerly of India, was also on the platform. But the great address of the evening and of the whole Assembly was that of the ex-moderator, Rev. W. G. Brown, B.D., of Saskatoon, when he told in such a novel and interesting way of his visit to Formosa, Japan and Manchuria. Those present were made to see the North Formosa Mission in a new light when Mr. Brown told of the 1500 Christians gathered from all over the island to take part in the 60th anniversary, and of the honouring with their presence on that occasion of high Japanese officials, and of the gratitude which was conveyed to the mother church through him.

On Saturday morning the Assembly resumed consideration of the report of the Commission on the Knox College situation.

Mr. W. J. West moved, seconded by Dr. H. Munroe: "That a Committee consisting of the Moderator, and the three ex-Moderators, Dr. Baird, Dr. MacGillivray and Dr. W. G. Brown be a Committee to name a Special Committee of twelve, one-third of whom shall be alumni of Knox College, who shall review the evidence with the said Commission, and with those interested, with a view to bringing before the Assembly an amicable solution of the matter, and report to this Assembly at the morning Sederunt, on Tuesday the 7th day of June, 1932."

Judge John MacKay moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. H. R. Horne, "That the report be referred back to the Committee to report a solution of the difficulty to the Assembly."

Dr. T. Wardlaw Taylor moved in amendment to the amendment, seconded by Dr. S. Banks Nelson, "That the following be added to Mr. West's motion, 'Such interested parties to be accorded their constitutional right to be present throughout all proceedings leading up to the time of the Committee's proceedings to the consideration of its findings.'"

Dr. A. S. Reid moved, seconded by Mr. Miller, that Mr. W. J. West, Mr. H. R. Horne, Judge MacKay, Dr. H. Munroe, Dr. T. W. Taylor and Dr. S. B. Nelson be permitted to withdraw, to consider the various motions and report back. The motion was carried.

Dr. H. Munroe reported for the Committee as follows:

"That the Moderator appoint eight members of this Assembly to be added to the Committee dealing with Knox College situation, the parties named in the complaints being present during their Sederunts. This enlarged Committee shall report their finding to this Assembly on Tuesday at 10.30 a.m."

Dr. Munroe moved, seconded by Dr. S. B.

Nelson, that the report be received and adopted.

The Moderator reported and the Assembly accepted the following as the Committee on the Knox College situation, in terms of the resolution passed at this Sederunt: Mr. Thomas Humphries, Dr. Wardlaw Taylor, Mr. A. M. Nairn, Mr. C. S. Miller, Mr. W. J. Moffatt, Mr. J. R. Graham, Dr. McCulloch Thomson, and Mr. Clarence Pitts.

On Tuesday, June 7th, the Knox College Committee reported that a grave state of affairs, not doctrinal but personal, existed in Knox College, and made the following recommendations:

"1. That Rev. Dr. Eakin be relieved of the Principalship of Knox College by the 31st of August and retain his Chair as Professor of Old Testament.

"2. That the services of Rev. Dr. E. Lloyd Morrow, as Professor in Knox College, terminate August 31st, 1932.

"3. That the General Assembly now in session appoint an Acting Principal for the ensuing year and for this office we recommend, as in 1925, the Moderator of the Assembly.

"4. That the General Assembly take steps forthwith, by the appointment of a Special Committee or otherwise as the Assembly in its wisdom may judge best, to ascertain and if considered advisable, to define and indicate the administrative and other duties, powers and functions of the Faculty, the Senate and the Board of Management, respectively; and with a view to preventing the recurrence of a condition similar to that at present existing, that legislation be secured amending the Act of Incorporation in so far as to provide for the appointment of the Board and Senate and anything further found necessary by the Committee.

"5. That the Board of Management be instructed to make all arrangements necessary for the carrying on of the College work during the sessions of 1932-33.

"6. That the documents in the case be held in retentia by the General Assembly."

Dr. Baird moved, seconded by Dr. T. Wardlaw Taylor, that the report be received and the recommendations considered serially. This was agreed to.

After discussion, Mr. J. B. Skene submitted the following question: "Whereas the Commission on the situation in Knox College has reported to this Assembly 'that a grave situation exists in said College, and recommended that the General Assembly take steps to bring such situation to an end,' I therefore ask through the Moderator what is the 'grave situation' complained of?"

Upon being requested by the Moderator, Dr. Baird, Convener of the Committee, replied as follows: "While recognizing the sincerity and competence of the question, I do not consider it wise or expedient to

answer it, and I respectfully ask to be excused from attempting to do so."

Dr. Nelson, supported by Mr. A. N. Millar, requested that the vote be taken by roll call. This was done.

Upon the vote being taken the recommendation was approved by a vote of 132 to 23.

Dr. Baird then moved, seconded by Dr. T. W. Taylor, that the second recommendation be adopted.

Dr. Nelson and Mr. J. B. Skene requested that the vote be taken by Roll Call. This was done. Upon the vote being taken the recommendation was adopted by a vote of 128 to 23.

Mr. D. M. Rowat then submitted a motion, seconded by Judge MacKay. "That the Assembly grant such indemnity as the Board of Administration may deem proper and that such payment be a charge against the College." This was agreed to.

Upon motion of Dr. F. Baird, seconded by Dr. T. W. Taylor, the third, fourth, fifth and sixth recommendations were adopted.

The report as amended was then adopted as a whole, upon motion of Dr. F. Baird, duly seconded.

Upon motion of Dr. Alexr. Esler, seconded by Mr. W. J. West, it was agreed to tender the thanks of the Assembly to the Commission appointed by last Assembly and the members added by this Assembly.

It was announced the same day that all Toronto officials have made a voluntary contribution of 10% of their salaries. A special committee urged that all officials of the Church should follow this example, including college principals and professors.

The overture of the Presbytery of Victoria (B. C.) asking for permission to induct ministers where all parties were willing that the salary be not \$1,800, and manse, in special cases, was defeated. "It would be a retrograde step," said E. W. McNeill, Church Treasurer, "Stick to the minimum salary of \$1800, and let presbyteries know that they cannot juggle it," as they have done illegally in the past.

On Wednesday, Mr. J. G. Pelton, in making the report of the Board of Administration, promised to move that the Budget estimates be increased by \$59,000 on two conditions. The first condition was fulfilled when the report of a committee with Dr. James MacKay of London, as convener, was adopted, to the effect that some one already in the employ of the Church be appointed to spread propaganda concerning the Budget and help raise it. After nominations had been sent in, this committee later proposed Rev. Allan S. Reid, D.D., of Montreal, Synodical Missionary for the Synod of Montreal and Ottawa, for the position. Dr. Reid was appointed for one year, at the end

of which time a permanent appointment can be made according to the law of the Church, when presbyteries have sent in their nominations.

Mr. Pelton's other condition was that the Board of Administration be given the same powers as last year to cut expenditures in case of an emergency. The chief opposition to this recommendation came from Dr. A. S. Grant on behalf of the Board of Missions, which already having passed its grants, cannot break its contracts; but other Boards of the Church were affected. Finally a motion by Mr. Clarence M. Pitts of Ottawa, a member of the Board of Administration, was carried, as a result of which, in case of a great emergency, the Board of Administration has the power to call together representatives of all the spending Boards, and consult them as to what action should be taken.

Mr. J. G. Pelton then moved, as he had promised with the consent of a sufficient number of members of the Board of Administration, that the estimates for 1933 Budget be changed so that the Board of Missions should be allocated \$346,000. instead of \$300,000., the Board of Sabbath Schools and Young People's Societies \$15,000., the Missionary and Deaconess Training Home \$6,000. instead of \$4,000., and \$12,000. and \$13,000. to Knox and Montreal Colleges respectively instead of \$9,000. each. The rest of the estimates were unchanged; Mr. Pelton's motion was duly seconded and passed.

Dr. D. T. L. McKerroll in presenting the report of the Commission on Reception of Ministers said that 202 ministers had been officially received into the Church since 1925, and about twice that number had been refused admission. Other applications were referred back to the committee (the same members as the commission which acted between Assemblies) to report back.

An Overture from the Presbytery of Montreal asking that the General Assembly take such steps necessary for the prosecution of the one-step forward movement until the complete objective of \$180,000. (an average of a dollar per member) has been reached was approved. It was stated that \$75,000. has already been raised. Dr. A. S. Grant's scheme to raise \$750,000. was also endorsed, as it would include the \$180,000. just mentioned, as well as \$70,000. in individual subscriptions already promised, and \$25,000. promised by the W. M. S. The whole of the \$750,000. is to be raised in two years, and is not to interfere with the ordinary Budget of the Church. Besides wiping out the deficit of \$189,000. or more, it will be used for further church-building.

On Thursday, at the nineteenth sederunt, a resolution asking that the legislative assemblies and the Dominion parliament be petitioned for a bill incorporating the board of trustees of the Presbyterian Church in

Canada was rejected by the general assembly of the church at its 19th and last meeting of the 1932 session. At present the assets of the church are held by an unincorporated body, but some of these individuals have died. Incorporation has been delayed on account of the trouble concerning the name, "Presbyterian Church in Canada." Illegal or not, that name was used in the reply from Government House, Ottawa, to the loyal addresses sent by Assembly to H. M. King George and His Excellency the Governor General. "We will go to the Privy Council to fight for our name and existence," said His Honor Judge John MacKay of Port Arthur, Ont., in introducing an amendment recommending that no application be made to any legislature for incorporation of trustees.

There was also received during the Assembly a telegram congratulating Dr. Johnston of Knox Church, Ottawa, on his election to the highest honor in the Presbyterian Church in Canada, from the Right Hon. W. L. MacKenzie King, P.C., Ph.D., LL.D., former Prime Minister, who is now Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa. He is a member of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church in the "Washington of the North," as that beautiful city overlooking the Ottawa River has been called.

A short address by the moderator, the Rev. Dr. Robert Johnston, was the last speech of the 1932 Assembly. He reviewed the difficulties which the Presbyterian Church in Canada had overcome in the past and foretold a decidedly successful future provided that all members work together with confidence.

The Assembly was dissolved to meet next year in St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, Peterborough, Ontario.

"Pillar of Salt" Near Sodom?

THE Biblical story of the destruction of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire and brimstone is believed by Father Alexis Mallon, Jesuit archaeologist of the Pontifical Biblical Institute at Rome, to be confirmed by archaeological discoveries on the site of the two towns.

Father Mallon, who, with Father Robert Koepfel, has spent three years excavating on the north shore of the Dead Sea in Palestine, said their investigation has shown that the two cities were contemporary and existed from before 2500 B.C. to not later than 2100 B.C. At the latter date, he said, both were destroyed by fire and never were reoccupied.

Traces of violent conflagrations were found in the ruins, he said, including layers of ashes. He added that on the plain below the hill on which the cities stood there was a curious rock formation, about five feet

high, which legend associates with Lot's wife, who, according to the Biblical story, was turned into a pillar of salt.

The excavators penetrated 26 feet and dug through three cities, each built on the ruins of another. Underneath these three, they said, is probably a fourth. The ruins of Sodom and Gomorrah were found in the top layer.

The houses were rectangular. The floors of the homes in the upper layer were of stone and those in the lower of brick. In the floor were holes in which grain was stored.

Many skeletons came to light, with the same characteristics as a skeleton today. Babies were buried in pottery urns. One incident of the discoveries was the finding of a child's head cut off apparently by a sharp instrument. Some ancient person had taken the head and made an urn around it.

Death of Dr. Swearingen

THE Rev. H. C. Swearingen, D.D., Moderator of the 1921 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and long prominent in its councils was suddenly called by death at Hastings, Nebraska, the day after the close of the 144th Assembly. The altitude, it is said, of the Rocky Mountains, was so great that when one with his particular heart condition descended to lower levels, it was too much. Dr. Swearingen died on the railroad train. He was for years pastor of the great House of Hope Presbyterian Church of St. Paul, Minnesota, and considered one of the master minds in administration in the Presbyterian Church.

Westminster Seminary Luncheon In Denver

ONE of the most enjoyable features of the Denver Assembly, to many, was the luncheon in the interest of the Seminary held on Friday, May 27, in the Auditorium Hotel, near the meeting place of the Assembly. About sixty persons met by invitation about the luncheon table. The meeting was presided over by Dr. Thomas Murray of Denver. Addresses were made by Dr. Murray, The Rev. E. H. Rian, indefatigable field secretary for the Seminary, Dr. J. Gresham Machen, and others. Dr. Machen gave an inspiring and informing address on the state of the Church, which was enthusiastically received by evangelical leaders from all over the country and the foreign field. This luncheon did much to advance the cause of the seminary, and it is expected that such a gathering will be held in Fort Worth next year. Mr. Rian, who arranged it, is proving a tower of strength to the evangelical cause.