

# 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., Inc.  
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-APRIL, 1934  
Vol. 4 No. 12

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

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

## Editorial Notes and Comments

### THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY SUSTAINS DR. MACHEN



IN stating his opposition to the "Plan of Union," in the January issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, DR. MACHEN expressed the opinion that its proposed "Formula of Subscription" "obscures what is really quite central in the present formula of creed subscription in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.—namely, that there is only one system of doctrine taught in the Bible and that system is the Reformed or 'Calvinistic' system of doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith and the Catechism of the Church."

In its issue of March 14th *The Christian Century* says editorially: "Professor MACHEN is, we think, right in so interpreting the new formula. His keen, incisive mind,

Skilled to divide  
A hair 'twixt south and southwest side,

did not overlook, as a less meticulous critic or a more careless theologian might have done, the significant difference between the system and a system of truths drawn from the Bible." *The Christian Century* then adds: "If he has called attention to a point which might otherwise have escaped attention, he deserves the gratitude of all schools of Presbyterian opinion. He has helped them to take this step, if they take it, with their eyes open to its meaning."

*The Christian Century* does not, of course, share Dr. Machen's opinion that the system of doctrine expressed in the Westminster Standards is the one and only system of doctrine contained in the Bible. It maintains, in fact, that there are other systems of doctrine that have as good a right to maintain that they have been derived from the Bible as the system set forth in the Confession of Faith and Catechism of the Presbyterian Church. Such an opinion is, it is almost needless to say, in flat opposition to the conviction that the Bible is the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. It is inconceivable that God Himself should be the author of mutually opposed systems of doctrine. That, of course, does not worry *The Christian Century* as its view of the Bible is thoroughly modernistic. Those, however, who believe not only that the Bible is the Word of God but that the one and only system of doctrine that it teaches is that set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms will appraise the matter quite differently. They will agree with *The Christian Century* that "for those who have hitherto held the Westminster doctrines as the system of truth taught in the Scriptures to hold them still but only as one of

the systems which men have devised out of materials drawn from that source is a step so long that it may fairly be called a stride." But they will hold that it is a stride—a long stride—not in the right but in the wrong direction.

We are grateful to *The Christian Century* for what it has done toward clarifying the doctrinal significance of the "Plan of Union."

### A FRIENDLY WARNING



THE editor of this paper is well disposed toward the United Presbyterians. A large part of his early education was received at Tarkio College where he had as his classmates such well-known United Presbyterians as H. H. MARLIN and WILLIAM MURCHIE. He owes a special indebtedness to Dr. J. A. THOMPSON, president-emeritus of Tarkio College, whom he acknowledges as one of the major influences in his life. His own father was reared in the United Presbyterian Church (N. Y.) so that he himself was doubtless saved from being a United Presbyterian only by reason of the fact that there was no United Presbyterian church in that part of the Middle West to which his father went as a young man.

In view of what has been related, it might be expected that the writer would be heartily in favor of the proposed merger of the United Presbyterian Church with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., with which he is connected. As a matter of fact, however, he is opposed to it, and that because, in his judgment, the consummation of this merger would not be for the best interests of either of these churches.

He does not think it would be for the best interest of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. because, as he pointed out in the last issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, he believes that the terms of union not only involve a serious lowering of the doctrinal standards of the Church, but that they would be creative of a situation in which it would be relatively easy further to amend them in the direction of Modernism. Doubtless some of his United Presbyterian friends will not admit that the terms of union involve any lowering of the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Even DR. GORDON MACLENNAN, whose view of what the consummation of this merger would mean for the United Presbyterians is very much in accord with the writer's, does not seem to agree with him at this point (see *The Presbyterian* for Feb. 8th and *The Christian Union Herald* for March 17th). He can only say that in his judgment Professor JOHN MURRAY and DR. MACHEN, among others, has made this clear—a judgment in which even *The Christian Century* concurs as may be learned from an adjoining editorial.

The writer is more particularly concerned to point out, how-

ever, that he does not think that this merger would be for the best interests of the United Presbyterian Church. Whatever may be true about the United Presbyterian Church, there can be no doubt that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is a doctrinally divided Church. DR. MACLENNAN, who was pastor of the Bethany Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia previous to his acceptance of the great Shadyside United Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, has proved this to the hilt in *The Christian Union Herald* of March 17th. Besides the more formal evidence DR. MACLENNAN cites replies received from "representative ministers and laymen of the Presbyterian Church" in answer to the question, "Is there, in your judgment, a serious division doctrinally in the Presbyterian Church?" including the following the pastor of "one of the largest churches in the denomination":

"Surely no one can doubt that there is a serious doctrinal division in the Presbyterian Church. There are three parties in the church—the Modernists, the Middle-of-the-Road Indifferentists, and the Evangelical Party. For ten years assemblies, synods, and presbyteries have resounded with this discussion. If anyone is in any doubt as to the division in the Presbyterian Church, surely the establishment of an independent Presbyterian Seminary, and now an independent Board of Foreign Missions is of a nature to remove such doubt."

What is more important to note is that during these ten years it is the Modernist-Indifferentist party, not the Evangelical party, to which the writer is confident the great majority of the United Presbyterians belong, that has controlled the machinery of the Church and dictated its actions. This would not be so serious a matter if the United Presbyterian Church was at all equal in size to the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. In that case the merger might prove a great blessing, from his point of view, as it might create a situation in which the Evangelical Party would again become, almost over-night, the dominant element in the new Church composed of the two churches in question. If such were the case, however, we may be sure that most of those Presbyterians who are urging this merger would be opposed to it. Whatever may be said about the United Presbyterians as regards quality, it must be admitted that as regards quantity they constitute a relatively small body of people. As a matter of fact, even if the United Presbyterians were 100 per cent. Evangelical their union with the Presbyterians would make no appreciable change in the general situation. Let it not be overlooked not only that the Modernist-Indifferentist Party constitutes at least two-thirds of the Presbyterian Church but that the United Presbyterian Church is less than one-tenth as large as the Presbyterian Church. It seems to the writer, therefore, that DR. MACLENNAN was well within the truth when he wrote:

"So far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned, the union will make little or no difference, merely the report at the close of the year following the union, if the union is consummated, that the Church has shown an increase of ten per cent. in both membership and ministers. The assimilation of this ten per cent. will have no noticeable effect upon such a large body as the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. The price of union will be paid entirely by the United Presbyterians. I do not mean with corruptible things as silver and gold, but in the sacrifice of things which silver and gold cannot buy."

Nothing is more certain than that the United Presbyterians, if they approve this merger—it is all but certain that the Presbyterians will approve it by a fairly large majority—will not only find that they have been absorbed by a Church that is divided by doctrinal controversy (a controversy in which willy-nilly they will have to take part) but that inasfar as they are thoroughly Evangelical they will have to take their stand with a more or less despised minority. Hence this friendly warning,

## THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS' REPLY TO CHESTER PRESBYTERY



UNDER date of March 12th the Board of Foreign Missions, through a committee consisting of Mr. CHEESMAN A. HERRICK, MRS. JOHN HARVEY LEE and Drs. WILLIAM HIRAM FOULKES, J. ROSS STEVENSON and WALTER L. WHALLON, transmitted a lengthy answer to the "Friendly Statement" which the Presbytery of Chester had adopted on January 23rd. The substance of this "Friendly Statement"—we are not sure that "friendly" was quite the right word with which to describe it—may be found in the February issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY together with certain comments thereon.

This reply was printed in full, without comment, by the *Presbyterian* in its issue of March 22nd—a fact that would seem to imply that in the judgment of that paper it is fitted to restore confidence to "the minds, the hearts and the purses" of the members of Chester Presbytery. At any rate what is more or less implied in the *Presbyterian's* treatment of this reply is openly expressed by the *Presbyterian Banner*. In its issue of April 5th it states, editorially, that it is "faultlessly courteous, frank and full, calm and clear, and without irritation or impatience, and completely convincing to all that are open-minded."

We don't like to admit that we are not "open-minded"—unless a certain wit was right when he defined an open mind as one that is open at both ends—but if we can claim that we are open-minded only on condition of admitting that this reply is of a nature to bring about a "restoration of confidence" on the part of sincere and intelligent Presbyterians in general in the Board of Foreign Missions as a channel through which to contribute to the work of foreign missions, we are afraid that open-mindedness is not one of our characteristics. Certainly it does not impress us as either frank or adequate. In fact, it seems to us that it is fitted to confirm distrust of the Board on the part of Bible-believing Presbyterians. We lack space to indicate all the points at which we are disposed to take exception to the lengthy reply that the Board has made to Chester Presbytery's communication. Some of the more obvious of these points may, however, be mentioned.

1. We take exception to the representation that "when the final court of our Church has determined issues brought before it, its judgment must be conclusive both for the agencies of the Assembly and the Church-at-large." We admit that the decisions of the Assembly are final for the agencies of the Assembly, including, of course, the Board of Foreign Missions, but we flatly deny that they are final for the Church-at-large. That may be good Roman Catholic teaching, but it is certainly bad Presbyterian teaching. According to Presbyterian teaching at least "all synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice." If the statement cited from the Board's report really represents the attitude of its members, it can hardly be denied that the Assembly has in effect put into un-Presbyterian hands the control of the Foreign Mission work of the Presbyterian Church.

2. We take exception to the representation that decrease of contributions offers no evidence of decreased confidence in the Board because there has been equal or even greater decrease of contributions to the other Boards of the Church. It was to be expected that there would be a great falling off of contributions to the Board of Pensions after the \$15,000,000 endowment fund had been raised, but as regards the other Boards of the Church we are of the opinion that what explains the decrease of contributions to the Board of Foreign Missions also explains the decrease of contributions to these other agencies, viz., decreased confidence. It is the Bible-believing Christians who give the vast bulk of the contributions to Christian benev-

olences and inasmuch as the Board of National Missions and the Board of Education are dominated to an equal extent, perhaps to a greater extent, by modernistic influences than is the Board of Foreign Missions there is nothing strange in the fact that they also have received decreased contributions.

3. We take exception to the representation relative to the Board's attitude toward the Report of the Laymen's Appraisal Commission and MRS. BUCK. We do not think that the Board's disavowal of the Report has been "explicit and definite." It means nothing to say that the Board "definitely disavows those parts of the volume 'Re-Thinking Missions,' which are not in harmony with New Testament teachings and not in agreement with the doctrinal position of the Presbyterian Church." We could in all heartiness and sincerity make a similar statement about the writings of CHARLES HODGE and BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD. What is said relative to MRS. BUCK seems to us positively misleading. It is fitted to convey the impression that when the Board accepted MRS. BUCK's resignation "with regret" it merely intended to express its regret that she had forsaken the evangelical position and was no longer qualified to be a Presbyterian missionary. As a matter of fact the Board not only took no initiative in removing MRS. BUCK from the roll of its missionaries (as the reply itself indicates), but it voted to acquiesce in her resignation unwillingly and when compelled to accept her resignation expressed "its sincere appreciation of the service she has rendered during the past sixteen years and its earnest prayer that her unusual abilities may continue to be richly used in behalf of the people in China." It seems clear that if the Board had had its way MRS. BUCK would still be a Presbyterian missionary.

4. We take exception to the representation that "the Board has never had among its secretaries in the Candidate Department, or elsewhere, any man who was not above 'suspicion in the matter of loyalty to the doctrinal standards of our Church and the too oft-declared motive and aim of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.'" The REV. L. S. B. HADLEY, a signer of the Auburn Affirmation, was until recently candidate secretary of the Board. It would be superfluous to say anything further in this connection.

Other matters might be mentioned. But doubtless we have enough to indicate why we think this reply is fitted to increase rather than decrease mistrust of the Board of Foreign Missions. Relative to the complaint that "the Board has been at a loss as to how to reassure some of its critics who seem unwilling to accept its words as honest and sincere" we are disposed to say that it can do this by so altering its policies and methods that it will be instrumental in furthering only truly Biblical and truly Presbyterian missions. As matters now stand, what it does speaks so loud that many do not hear or at least do not heed what it says.

## CHRISTIANITY THE FINAL RELIGION



It is a source of abiding satisfaction to Christians to know that their religion is the final religion, that as age succeeds age, Jesus abides the same strong Saviour on whom they can safely venture their all—whether for this life or the life to come. This conviction is the source of their confidence, the ground of their assurance, the basis of their hope that, be the world's changes what they may, they themselves shall abide, not as bits of driftage on the ocean of time, but as those who shall reach

a safe harbor.

That Christianity is the final religion is an essential element of the Christian consciousness. The whole content of one's religious consciousness varies according as he sees in Jesus the first among equals or the only and final Saviour. The former think of themselves as needing at most instruction and encouragement to enable them to save themselves. The latter, how-

ever, think of themselves as wholly destitute of power to save themselves, as those who, if they are to be saved at all, must be saved by a power other than themselves. For the latter Jesus is not merely a teacher and example; he is, above all, the one who frees from the guilt and power of sin. Unquestionably this was an element in the consciousness of the early Christians. Peter, Paul, and the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, spoke not only for themselves, but for the whole body of Christians when they made such affirmations as these: "In none other name is there salvation, for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, whereby we must be saved"; "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ"; "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and today, yea, and forever."

Christians have never been content to maintain that their religion is merely the best religion. They have never admitted the possibility that it may some day be superseded by a new and higher religion. They have resolutely maintained, through good report and bad report, that it is not only unsurpassed but unsurpassable, that the appearance of a superior type of religion is not only improbable but inconceivable. This has not been due to pride and unreasonableness; rather, it has been due to a true understanding of the nature of the religion they profess; more particularly, it has been due to their recognition of Jesus Christ as one whose status is that of God, and as such the object of religious faith. If Jesus Christ can be enclosed in human molds, if he can be made to fit into a naturalistic system, there is no inherent reason why he may not be surpassed. In fact, it seems inevitable, according to the current evolutionism, that if he has not already been, he certainly will be surpassed even as a teacher and an example. If, however, as all intelligent Christians hold, he be infinitely more than a man, if his rank in the scale of being entitles him to a place by the side of God, if he is not merely man, but the God-man, then it is inconceivable that he should ever be surpassed or that the time has come, or may come, when he will no longer be able to meet the deepest needs of men. It is because Jesus is what he is that Christians are persuaded that his teachings will never be surpassed, but that as Saviour from the guilt and pollution and power of sin, there is nothing that he has been to any past generation that he is not to this generation and that he will not be to generations yet unborn. Nothing short of such a conviction is needed for our stay and support as we face the unknown future. We can safely depend on Jesus as our eternal refuge only as we see in him one who is able to provide an eternal refuge for all men.

This claim to finality so enters in to the substance of Christianity that its truthfulness is involved. Deny the finality of Christianity and we can no longer believe in its truthfulness. The whole mass of that evidence, therefore, that goes to prove the truthfulness of Christianity may also be adduced to prove that is the final religion. It should be frankly confessed that this claim to finality is rooted and finds its warrant in the reality of the supernatural in human life. Christianity is the one final religion because it is the one supernatural religion. Obliterate the distinction between the natural and the supernatural as Modernism does, and we cannot maintain the finality of the Christian religion—at the most we can maintain its superiority. The Christian religion not only resolutely but rightly refuses to be so regarded. It esteems such an estimate of its significance not as an honor but as a dishonor. It feels in fact towards those who so regard it somewhat as one who claims to be king feels towards those who treat him as merely a leading citizen.

We live in a changing world; we ourselves are constantly changing; nevertheless "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, yea and forever." Through every change and chance of time he remains the same strong Son of God who is able to save sinners, in whom we can safely ground our confidence—whether for this life or the life to come.

# STOP, LOOK, LISTEN

## Why the Plan of Organic Union Should be Opposed

By J. Gresham Machen

The most important piece of business before the 1934 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is the question whether a Plan of Union providing for the Organic Union of that church with the United Presbyterian Church of North America should be sent down immediately to the presbyteries for approval or disapproval.

Bible-believing commissioners will, no doubt, be asking what they ought to do about it. We shall try here to tell them, just as briefly as we can, what we think and why. If what we have to say is common sense, and above all if it is in accordance with the Word of God, then it ought to be heeded quite regardless of the question who it is that says it.

### I. WHAT SHOULD BE DONE AT THE ASSEMBLY?

#### 1. Study the Plan of Organic Union for yourself.

Do not take anything for granted. You ought not to trust any committee whatever to do your thinking for you about such an extremely important question as this. Certainly you ought not to trust the particular committee that is recommending this Plan of Union; for the part of it representing our church has not among its members—at least not among its ministerial members—a single representative of that party in the Church which has its eyes really open to the great issue between Modernism and Christianity in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and which has shown itself determined to stand against Modernism in the actual situations as they arise.

#### 2. Insist that the question be fully and freely discussed on the floor of the Assembly.

Almost at the very beginning of the first business session of the Assembly the docket will be presented for approval. If the docket as so presented does not provide at the very least for one full forenoon of discussion on this all-important matter, you should move that it be amended to that effect; and then, when the appointed time comes, you should oppose with all your might any undue limitation of debate, and should favor all reasonable extension of time in order that commissioners on the floor, as distinguished from appointed speakers, may be freely heard.

It has come to be the custom to send down overtures to the presbyteries without prior discussion on the floor of the Assembly. That is a thoroughly bad custom. Now is the time to see that it is abandoned. Discussion of these tremendously important constitutional questions in the presbyteries is not enough. There should also be an opportunity, as can be provided only at the Assembly, for a man from California to exchange views with a man from Maine.

It has further become the custom to fill the docket of the Assembly with interminable reports, some of which are already, in substance, in print in the hands of the commissioners. That custom also should be abandoned. It is a waste of the time and money of the Church. It should not be allowed any longer to crowd out the proper business

of the Assembly, which is full deliberation on the great doctrinal and administrative questions.

#### 3. If full time is not allowed for debate on this question, oppose the sending down of the Plan of Union quite regardless of the merits of the Plan.

If the Assembly cannot find time this year for debate upon this momentous change in the Constitution of the Church, then the consideration of the Plan should be postponed to some year when time *can* be found.

#### 4. Vote in any case against the sending down of the Plan.

The Plan undermines the authority of the Bible; it undermines the great system of revealed truth contained in our Confession of Faith; it is opposed to Presbyterian liberty.

Our reasons for saying so are set forth in summary below. They have been set forth more fully in various issues of CHRISTIANITY TODAY (especially in the articles by Mr. John Murray in the January, 1932, and February, 1932, issues).

#### 5. If, despite your negative vote, the Plan is sent down to the Presbyteries, prepare and sign a formal protest setting forth briefly your reasons for opposing the action of the Assembly.

Such a protest will serve to indicate to the presbyteries that the Plan of Organic Union is opposed by Bible-believing commissioners and should not be adopted by the presbyteries without careful scrutiny.

#### 6. Prepare yourself, before you leave Cleveland, to contend in the presbyteries with all your might against this great attack upon the faith and witness of our Church.

In 1920-1921 a destructive Plan of Organic Union was defeated in the presbyteries after having been sent down by the Assembly. This present Plan can be defeated if those who truly love the Word of God will contend earnestly against it.

#### 7. Take preliminary steps looking to the continuance of a real Presbyterian Church in case this destructive Plan of Union is adopted by the presbyteries.

Our Presbyterian heritage is too precious a thing to be abandoned. If we seek to retain it, we shall have to

make sacrifices; but no sacrifice is too great if in making it we have the favor of God.

## II. WHY THE PLAN OF UNION IS BAD

### 1. We are not opposing any conceivable union with the United Presbyterian Church, but only this particular Union.

There is no real reason why an acceptable form of union should not be proposed. If the United Presbyterian Church is a real Presbyterian Church, it should be willing to stand clearly for the Bible and the great historic Westminster Confession of Faith without qualification.

### 2. The benefits to be obtained from the Union are at best not worth the price that must be paid.

The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has 1,968,788 communicant members; the United Presbyterian Church has within the United States 177,265 communicant members. In order to effect a union with a church less than one-tenth its size, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is being asked to abandon its historic formula of creed subscription, to load itself up with a miserable hasty creed as an "historical interpretative statement," and to make radical changes in its form of government. Such a union will show the usual results of forced unions—division in the existing communions, heartburnings, bitterness and, in general, a serious setback to real Christian unity. Is the end to be attained worth the payment of so great a price?

### 3. The Plan of Union makes no provision for permitting retention of property by congregations that are conscientiously unable to enter into the union church.

Until such provision is made, the Plan of Union is opposed to Christian ethics just as much, perhaps, as it is opposed to Christian doctrine. Whatever the civil law may say about the matter, it is, from the Christian point of view, a ruthless and wicked thing to seize for a new union church the property of congregations which have been supported by men and women who regard the union as hostile to that for which the money has been given.

### 4. According to the Plan of Union, the 1925 "Confessional Statement" of the United Presbyterian Church and the 1902 "Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith" (the latter merely approved by our General Assembly in 1902) become parts of the Constitution of the proposed union church.

These two "Statements" are "embodied in the Plan of Union as historical interpretative statements of the United Church, as aids to the faith and witness of the United Church."<sup>1</sup>

The Plan says, indeed, that "in all questions of doctrine, the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms shall be the final authority, subject

to the Holy Scriptures."<sup>2</sup> But there are two ways of destroying a Confession of Faith. One way is to abrogate it or add to it something that contradicts it. The other way is to "interpret" it to mean something quite different from that which it originally meant. This latter way is followed by the Plan of Union when it adopts that 1925 Confessional Statement and the 1902 Brief Statement as "historical interpretative statements of the United Church" and "as aids to the faith and witness of the United Church."

It is no wonder that Dr. John McNaugher, Chairman of the United Presbyterian part of the Joint Committee, says, in a press release, regarding the place of the 1925 Confessional Statement in the present form of the Plan of Union, as compared with its place in the form originally proposed, that the "clear recognition" of the 1925 Confessional Statement "as having interpretative character scarcely lessens its influential value as an exponent of Reformed theology," and that "with its exaltation of the Psalms it will remain permanently in the foreground as a teaching symbol." If a man thinks, with Dr. McNaugher and the rest of his Committee, that the 1925 Confessional Statement is really an "aid to the faith and witness of the United Church," he may favor the Plan of Union; but if he thinks, as we do, that the 1925 Confessional Statement is an attack upon the faith and witness of the Church and an offense to Christ's little ones, then he will oppose the Plan of Union with all his might.

### 5. The 1925 Confessional Statement, thus included in the Plan of Union, undermines the authority of the Bible.

The article in the Confessional Statement on "The Holy Scriptures" states that the Scriptures are "an infallible rule of faith and practice and the supreme source of authority in spiritual truth."<sup>3</sup>

The latter part of this statement practically nullifies the former part. It gives comfort to the great central error of the present day, which is that there is such a thing as "spiritual truth," distinguished from historical truth or scientific truth. A real believer in the Bible, in sharp distinction from this error, holds that the Bible is true throughout; and in particular he holds that the Bible is true when it speaks of events in the external world like the resurrection of the body of our Lord from the tomb on the third day.

The same article in the 1925 Confessional Statement says that the writers of the Bible, "though moved by the Holy Spirit, wrought in accordance with the laws of the human mind."

That sentence denies the supernaturalness of the Bible. What is in accordance with the laws of the human mind or with any others of the laws of nature is natural; what is not in accordance with the laws of the human mind or any of the others of the laws of nature is supernatural. We believe that the inspiration of the Bible is in the latter category. We believe that the Bible is a supernatural

<sup>2</sup> *Plan of Union*, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Plan of Union*, p. 28.

<sup>1</sup> See Pamphlet on "The Plan of Union" issued by the Joint Committee, January 1, 1934, p. 25. Copies of this pamphlet may be obtained at the price of twenty-five cents from the Secretary of the Joint Committee on Organic Union, 514 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Book. Hence we are opposed to the 1925 Confessional Statement.

The true doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible does not, indeed, involve a "dictation theory." It does not deny to the writers of the Bible the use of ordinary means of obtaining information and the pursuance of their own individual habits of style. But in addition to this use of ordinary means of obtaining information and in addition to the pursuance of their ordinary habits of style, the Biblical writers were supernaturally preserved from error. Such preservation from error, of course—being supernatural—was beyond the laws of the human mind. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the writers of the Bible were not merely inspired recorders of historical facts and of supernatural revelation already given, but were also, in countless instances, themselves organs of new revelation. To say, therefore, sweepingly, as this 1925 Confessional Statement does, that they "wrought in accordance with the laws of the human mind" is not only to deny the doctrine of plenary inspiration, but also to deny by implication the presence of supernatural revelation in the Bible. Was Paul working in accordance with the laws of the human mind when he said: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump?" Or was he telling the mysteries of God as God revealed them to him? We may thank God that the answer is plain; we may thank God that the Confessional Statement is wrong.

**6. The 1925 Confessional Statement and the 1902 Brief Statement are objectionable and faulty in other respects.**

Lack of space prevents our going into details. But certainly a Confessional Statement which undermines the authority of the Bible undermines the very foundations. Even if the superstructure were less faulty than it is, the attack upon the foundation is sufficient to condemn this Statement.

It should be observed that the (also very faulty) 1902 Brief Statement is now no part of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. It has not been approved by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., as the Plan of Union misleadingly states, but has merely been approved by the General Assembly of that Church. The Plan of Union, on the contrary, makes it, with the 1925 Confessional Statement, a part of the Constitution of the Church.

**7. The proposed new formula of creed-subscription attacks the faith of the Church at the most vital point.**

The present formula of creed-subscription of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. reads as follows:

"Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?"

The proposed new formula of creed-subscription reads as follows:

"Do you believe and acknowledge the system of doctrine professed by this Church as contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as taught in the Word of God, and do you engage to adhere to and maintain its truths?"

According to the present formula of creed-subscription the Bible teaches one system of revealed truth and that system is the system set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith; according to the proposed new formula of creed-subscription the Bible may teach any number of systems and the system contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith may be held to be only one of them.

Such at least will unquestionably be a very common and very plausible interpretation of the new formula.

So interpreted, the new formula degrades, of course, the Presbyterian or "Reformed" system of doctrine. But it does a great deal more than that. It also degrades the Bible. If the Bible contains various contradictory systems of doctrine, then the "infallibility" of the Bible spoken of in the first question of the formula of creed-subscription can mean very little; and certainly it is little short of blasphemous to call such a self-contradictory book the "Word of God."

In pronouncing this view of the new formula very plausible, we cannot be charged with "hair-splitting," because we have the support of clear-sighted Modernists. The Modernists like the new formula; we dislike it: but they agree with us perfectly as to what it may plausibly be held to mean.

To show that that is the case one needs only to turn to what we suppose is perhaps the ablest Modernist journal dealing with American ecclesiastical affairs. Here is what *The Christian Century* (March 14, 1934, p. 353) says about the new formula of creed-subscription:

"The old formula required acceptance of the confession of faith 'as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.' The new one demands only acceptance of it 'as taught in the Word of God.' . . . One is not, then, required to affirm that there can be no other system of doctrine whose component parts are not also drawn from the teachings of the Bible. The Bible is a large and varied body of literature. . . . John's idea of God was not David's, and Paul had concepts of the means of grace other than those of James. Let us say, as the candidate for Presbyterian ordination is to be required to say under the new formula, that the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith contains nothing which is not drawn from Holy Writ. Still, there may be other systems of doctrine which are equally taught in the Word of God."

We agree with *The Christian Century* in holding that

*Plan of Union*, p. 13.

if Presbyterians take this "step," which, as *The Christian Century* rightly says, "is a step so long that it may fairly be called a stride," they ought to take it "with their eyes open to its meaning."

**8. The proposed formula of subscription is almost ridiculously long, enters into detail in oppressive fashion, and is in part extremely infelicitous and obscure.**

The last named defects appear particularly in Question 2, with which we have been dealing above. A man has to read that question over a number of times before he can untangle the coil of "as's" sufficiently to get at the meaning. It seems almost unthinkable that a great Church should place at the centre of a solemn service a question couched in such atrocious English.

The rest of the formula of subscription enters into such a detail as a promise to attend the judicatories of the Church. To require of candidates for the ministry such detailed promises is a serious burden to really conscientious men, however lightly it may be taken by others.

**9. The proposed Form of Government practically destroys all rights of the local church.**

Chapter XVII of the proposed Form of Government permits a presbytery, at any time, for as long a time as it may desire, without any judicial process and without any hearing of the parties concerned, to take over the affairs of a local church by the appointment of a provisional session.<sup>5</sup> Thus according to this law a presbytery may use the name and resources of a local church in complete contradiction to the desires of that church. It is really to be wondered whether, if Presbyterian elders really had the slightest inkling of the presence of this abominable provision in the proposed Plan of Union, they would favor the plan for a moment.

**10. The Plan of Union makes support of the Church and of its agencies no longer a matter of free-will giving but a tax enforced by penalties.**

This revolutionary and destructive provision is found, not in any proper place, but tucked away in the Directory for Worship! It reads as follows (Chapter V, Article 5, of the proposed Directory for Worship):

"If any person of known pecuniary ability fails in giving of his substance, the session should point out his obligation as revealed in the Word of God and the blessing attending its faithful discharge. If he still withholds from the treasury of the Lord, the session may deal with him as an offender."<sup>6</sup>

That is what the Plan of Union says. Very different is what the Bible says:

"Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver" (II Cor. 9:7).

<sup>5</sup> *Plan of Union*, p. 66.

<sup>6</sup> *Plan of Union*, p. 165.

The conflict here between the Plan of Union and the Bible is a very old conflict. It is the conflict between man's wisdom and the Spirit of God, between the world's methods on the one hand and real obedience to Jesus Christ on the other.

Let it be observed that this section does not merely vitiate part of the support of the proposed union church. No, it vitiates all of it. Every gift to the Church and its benevolences is made, according to this section, under threat of ecclesiastical censure. That means that real free-will giving is altogether eliminated.

Can we really hope that an ecclesiastical organization supported by methods such as these will ever be owned as His by the One who said: "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth"?

**11. There are other defects in the proposed Form of Government, which lack of space forbids us to mention.**

The general effect of the changes as over against our present Form of Government is to strengthen the hold of the central ecclesiastical machinery and weaken the rights of the plain man in the Church. At any rate, this new Form of Government should not be voted for by anyone who has not studied it in all its details for himself.

**12. The proposed new method of amending the Constitution of the Church removes safeguards and makes it increasingly easy for the General Council or other central agencies to rush amendments through without real scrutiny.**

In other words, it increases the efficiency of what has been called the great "overture-factory." At present, that overture-factory rushes the proposed amendments through the General Assembly without debate. But then it meets one check. The check is found in the provision of the present Constitution that a proposed change in the Constitution must be voted on affirmatively by a majority of *all the presbyteries* (two-thirds of all the presbyteries in the case of amendments to the Confession of Faith). This check is removed by the new Plan of Union, which provides that a majority of the individual votes actually cast (two-thirds in the case of amendments to the Confession of Faith) shall be sufficient to effect changes in the Constitution, provided these votes represent not less than two-thirds of the presbyteries. That puts the power much more largely in the hands of the large city presbyteries. Moreover, the General Assembly is permitted to determine the time when the presbyteries shall act, so that the present right of the Presbyteries to allow real time for deliberation on these overtures, in accordance with local conditions, is impaired. The real effect of all this is perfectly plain. The little group of men running the machinery of the Church will be able to rush amendments through very much as it pleases. Real safeguards will have been very largely removed.

# The Example of One Family

By the Rev. Frank H. Stevenson, D.D.

President of the Board of Westminster Theological Seminary



THE following paragraphs are the substance of dispatches printed in Pennsylvania and New York newspapers on March 13, 1934:

Mrs. Janetta Alexander McCook, widow of Colonel John J. McCook, lawyer, died yesterday in Palm Beach, Florida, where she had been living at the winter home of her brother and sister-in-law, Dr. and Mrs. Mait-

land Alexander of Pittsburgh. She was eighty years old. Private services will be held tomorrow afternoon at Princeton, New Jersey, where burial will take place.

Mrs. McCook was the daughter of the late Henry Martyn Alexander and Susan Mary Brown Alexander. Her father was founder and senior partner of the law firm of Alexander & Green, and a leader of the New York bar. He was the son of Dr. Archibald Alexander who established the first theological seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton and for a time was its sole professor. Mrs. McCook's maternal grandfather, Dr. Matthew Brown, was president of Washington and Jefferson College and a celebrated pioneer educator and preacher in Pennsylvania.

Her husband, Colonel McCook, died in 1911. One of the brothers of the famous "Fighting McCooks," he shared their renown for valor on the battlefields of the Civil War. Veterans of the Army of the Republic wherever encamped during the years after the war usually delighted in singing the praises of the gallant McCooks after the manner of some old world saga of loyalty and heroism. Colonel McCook married Janetta Alexander in the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York where she long was interested in every activity, charitable and religious. Eventually he succeeded his father-in-law as a partner in Alexander & Green, entering the legal career that did not cease until his death. He was offered the posts of Attorney General and Secretary of the Interior in the cabinet of President McKinley but accepted neither appointment for reasons that created considerable comment but revealed his independence of judgment.

Mrs. McCook's three brothers were eminent in their professions. Mr. Charles Beatty Alexander was distinguished as a lawyer and in 1912 was put forward by *The Independent* as the best qualified man in the country to be ambassador to Great Britain. Dr. Samuel Alexander was widely known as a surgeon and teacher of medicine. The Rev. Dr. Maitland Alexander is now pastor emeritus of the First Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh which he made one of the foremost churches in America during a pastorate of nearly thirty years.

Mrs. McCook had the extraordinary experience of seeing her family become a dominating factor at Prince-

ton, both in the affairs of the University and the Theological Seminary. Her father, her husband and her oldest brother were trustees of the University; and her husband was a member, and her youngest brother became president of the Board of Directors of the Seminary. There are two Alexander Halls in Princeton; one, a perfect example of colonial architecture, stands on the grounds of the Seminary; the other is the newer Norman-Gothic convocation hall on the University campus.

Surviving Mrs. McCook besides her brother, Dr. Maitland Alexander, are four daughters: Mrs. Peter Augustus Jay, widow of the former ambassador; Mrs. John Junius Morgan of the family of New York and London bankers; Mrs. Eliot Cross and Mrs. Jackson Boyd. Another daughter, Janet, wife of the late Malcolm Whitman, the tennis champion, died in 1909.

This account from daily newspapers affords a glimpse of a remarkable family as reporters presented the story to the public. Omitted are the references which most Presbyterians would consider important. For the Alexanders more than any family contributed to the strength and vitality of the Presbyterian Church as men knew it in its days of power.

It does not merely happen that a Church attains power. God uses people as His instruments, and He used with great effectiveness a line of Alexanders from Archibald Alexander who taught students for the Gospel ministry in his own study a hundred years ago in Princeton, on down to Maitland Alexander whose evangelistic preaching in our generation reached across the entire Church. When the Lord wanted something done, an Alexander often enough was ready.

Going back to the time when Thomas Jefferson was President of the new nation in America, we find that Archibald Alexander was a lonely, persevering Christian missionary in eastern Virginia. At twenty-five years of age he was chosen president of Hampden-Sidney College. When he was thirty-five he was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. Not only did he establish the Church's theological seminary at Princeton and give it the uncompromising standards that were to endure seventy-eight years after his death, but in the midst of his thirty-nine years of teaching Pastoral and Polemic Theology and Church Government, he became minister of the Pine Street Church in Philadelphia. The value of his rich gifts of mind and heart in a day when the Presbyterian Church was comparatively small and compact, and the part he played in building the great Church of the future, are facts of history.

Joseph Addison Alexander was the most accomplished American scholar in oriental and Bible languages of his day and the first of that great succession of oriental and



Biblical scholars whose scholarly defense of the Old Testament made Princeton famous as a center of orthodox Old Testament scholarship for nearly a century. For twenty-seven years at Princeton he prepared Seminary students for their exacting calling and contributed immeasurably to the standing of the Presbyterian ministry in the field of classical learning. His books were standard equipment in ministers' libraries up to the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

James Waddell Alexander showed the family resourcefulness and industry by being in turn a professor in Princeton College, editing *The Presbyterian*, holding pastorates in various cities, accepting the chair of Church History in Princeton Seminary, and becoming minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York. His volumes of sermons had extensive circulation in the United States and in Great Britain. In 1854 he was granted an honorary degree by Harvard University, proving that a Calvinistic theologian could invade successfully the stronghold of Emerson and William Ellery Channing.

Henry Martyn Alexander with such a background was a pillar of the Presbyterian Church in the city of New York. A brilliant lawyer with a distinguished social position, he made his career count for Christ. Mrs. Alexander's Bible classes were a feature of uncommon interest to hundreds of her friends and the Alexander homes in the city and at Sea Bright, New Jersey, radiated with Christian knowledge and sympathy. Many young men and women, afterwards prominent socially, professionally and religiously, attributed to Mr. and Mrs. Henry M. Alexander the help and stimulant that led them to a wholesome Christian life. New York City, and every city, would be immensely benefited today by just a few households equally conspicuous and influential, and equally resolute in putting first things first.

Thus the heritage was handed down. For some it might provide a study in heredity. For Christians it is a demonstration of the sure promises of a covenant keeping God, even unto children's children.

Contemporary descendants of the family sustained the trust. Any one slightly acquainted with the character and personality of Mrs. Janetta Alexander McCook would have predicted unhesitatingly the effect of her influence upon as fine a man as Colonel John J. McCook. To approach an Alexander was to acquire something of the devotion to Christ and to God's Word that was the mark of the family. The writer has read of the controversy over Professor Charles A. Briggs, and of the skill with which Colonel McCook aided in the Church's case. The outcome never was in question; that was assured from the start. But there was the question of enlightening the Church on the whole problem of the Old Testament and this he undertook to accomplish. It is pleasant to recall Colonel McCook as late as 1908 taking seriously his obligation as a Director of Princeton Seminary by visiting a class in Old Testament History, asking for information from the professor, and then briefly speaking to the students in the clear language of a first rate mind. The able lawyer resembled a portrait

of a Roman patrician; classic features, imposing carriage, strength, dignity and all the rest of the picture. Probably he was not aware of the impression he made on thoroughly susceptible beginners in the Seminary when he spoke of God's unchangeable Word, but it was a lasting impression for some of us.

For many years Mr. Henry M. Alexander, Colonel McCook and Mr. Charles B. Alexander aided in holding Princeton University true to the orthodox belief of the Presbyterian Church. While they were on the Board of Trustees no university in the United States was as capable of furnishing enquiring students with the sound intellectual basis of the Christian faith. The teaching and preaching of presidents and professors reinforced evangelical pastors and missionaries throughout the world.

In accord with the dynamic advocacy of Dr. Maitland Alexander the Theological Seminary at Princeton also was saved from drifting with the sweeping ebb tide that was carrying away one Christian school after another in every nation of the earth. His direction of the defense of an institution his ancestors had launched and maintained continued through an incredible conflict and ceased only when the General Assembly's decision in 1929 made all endeavors useless. The defeat brought to a close a glorious epoch in Presbyterian history. But in a happier day, please God, a restored Church will rejoice in the fact that Princeton Seminary's witness was steadfast far beyond the time when the Church itself had abandoned a united testimony to the truth. The greatest of the Church's schools was the last to succumb; the defense was prolonged and valiant; and thanks in large measure again to Dr. Maitland Alexander, Westminster Theological Seminary now is bravely trying to carry on the honorable tradition unimpaired.

Generation after generation the Alexander family has stood for the Old Book and the Old Faith. What they gave was as unto God and not unto men and was without a thought of earthly preferment.

Many are the memorials in Princeton that bear the Alexander name—Alexander Street, two Alexander Halls, a window in the new University Chapel, a tablet in the Chapel of the Seminary. But more eloquent perhaps are the memorials in the quiet grounds of the old Princeton Cemetery.

Immediately to the left of the entrance gate are the plain stones of white marble that disclose the continuity of a dynasty clear back to the missionary in the wilderness of Virginia. Nearby are the graves of four generations of Hodges. Across the way is the resting place of Jonathan Edwards. Here is the Westminster Abbey of the Presbyterian Church. Grover Cleveland, himself a son of the manse, asked to be buried here. All around sleep "the dead but sceptered sovereigns who still rule our spirits from their urns." The ground is hallowed ground. If an appropriate inscription were to be cut on a shaft of granite and the monument were to be erected on the Alexander plot, these would be the fitting words: "He preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection." They would adequately tell of the hope that made the lives of a succession of

Presbyterian ministers, teachers, lawyers and doctors glow with the pomp of golden banners. They would testify to the purpose that prompted them to give themselves to the cause most worth living for in a troubled, bewildered world—making Christ known, and pointing to the gates of heaven which He opened to sinful men. They knew Him and the power of His resurrection and they were eager, able witnesses before the tribunal of the American people.

No Alexander would have us turn the past into an elegy, certainly not if by any means it could be turned into an inspiration. A family like the Alexanders is rare. But there are numerous homes in America where a beginning not unlike the Alexanders' is entirely possible. From godly fathers and praying mothers we must expect new generations of witnesses. If much of the Presbyterian Church is decadent; if trusted agencies are failing; if the light of life is smoldering where once it shined so bright; now is the time for leaders to appear. And God will provide them.

On the day this article is written the author has had the good fortune to find abundant evidence of an oncoming army of Christian young men. March 31st, at the California Club in Los Angeles, nineteen university undergraduates attended a luncheon at the invitation of two youthful ministers, Milo F. Jamison and Samuel H. Suther-

land. The gathering seemed to be constituted solely of boys. But these boys, working together, not only have organized and developed a students' church at the State University; they have established unique and popular Bible Clubs as well.

It was astonishing to discover the information of the situation in the Presbyterian Church possessed by the whole company. The nineteen students are aware of prevailing conditions and are resolved to enter the Presbyterian ministry if they can, whatever the price they must pay. They want to bear witness to the truth. In a score of colleges from the Atlantic to the Pacific similar groups have been found. They are the untouched reserves of the Church and they are waiting for the bugle call. Promising young men are now coming to Westminster Theological Seminary in such numbers that there is little room left for more. Their hearts are not cold and professional; they are aflame with enthusiasm. Everyone of them is capable of a great work.

Let none of us Bible-believing Presbyterians faint or grow weary. From the past we can choose our own examples of integrity, loyalty and determination and we can be grateful to God for a family like the Alexanders. But God's resources for the future are inexhaustible. Elijah's mantle will fall upon Elisha before the day is done.

# THOU SHALT SAY, NO!

## Shall We Unite?

By Clarence Edward Macartney

[The Editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY are glad to publish this arresting and informative article. In our opinion it presents a graphic picture of facts as they are in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and as they may become if the proposed union goes into effect. The editors gladly share Dr. Macartney's estimate of the evangelical convictions of the great bulk of United Presbyterians. They are sure however that the author in bearing witness to them is not in any sense approving the Confessional Statement adopted by the United Presbyterian Church in 1925, which statement is included in the proposed Basis of Union as an "historical interpretative statement." We agree with Dr. Macartney's estimate of the rank and file of the United Presbyterian Church, and we also agree with Dr. J. Gresham Machen in holding that the basis of union as now offered is essentially destructive of what evangelical Christians hold dear. Now, the United Presbyterians are in a church with an evangelical majority and a bad creed. Presbyterians, U. S. A., are in a church with an evangelical minority and a good creed. Under the proposed union all who might remain in the union church would be in a church with an evangelical minority and a bad creed.

We call attention in this connection to the article by J. Gresham Machen which appears with Dr. Macartney's article in the present number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. The two articles, taken in conjunction, show that the proposed union would be a calamity both for the United Presbyterian Church and for the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.]



STERN old Covenanter, about to finish life's pilgrimage, summoned his eldest son, and said to him: "John, I am not long for this world. It's time that you were married. I hope you will marry in the Church, but if you do marry out of the Church, don't go *lower* than a U. P.!"

The dying charge of the old Covenanter sums up our opinion of the doctrine and practice of the United Presbyterian Church. That church we hold to be superior to almost every branch of the Presbyterian family in sober and godly living and in firm adherence to the cardinal truths of the Christian faith.

Why, then, should those of us in the Presbyterian

Church who so highly esteem the United Presbyterian Church not favor the proposed union of the United Presbyterian Church of N. A. with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America? I will endeavor to put down briefly and sincerely our objections to this union, and why we hope and pray that it shall not be consummated.

In the first place, it is well for all United Presbyterian ministers, elders, and communicant members clearly to realize that should the majority of the Presbyteries in both denominations ratify the union,<sup>1</sup> then all churches, all min-

<sup>1</sup> Editor's Note: Two-thirds of the Presbyteries must vote for the Basis of Union in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., for adoption. In the United Presbyterian Church the total votes in all the Presbyteries are counted for and against.

isters, and all members *must* go into the union. But suppose a single congregation of the Presbyterian Church, or a single congregation of the United Presbyterian Church should express itself as unanimously opposed to the union? What then? In they go, in spite of their unanimous dissent. But suppose such a congregation should say they will have nothing to do with such a union? The members might constitute an independent congregation, but all their buildings, properties, and endowments go with the union. This is made clear by a letter to me from the Stated Clerk of our own General Assembly. In this letter Dr. Mudge says:

1. "The plan of union makes no provision for dissenting churches.

2. "Every particular church will be upon the roll of the church resulting in the organic union.

3. "The properties of all the particular churches will have the same relationship to the church resulting from the organic union as it had to the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. or to the United Presbyterian Church of N. A. prior to the consummation of the union.

4. "After the organic union is consummated any minister or communicant member who does not wish to continue in the church resulting from the union, may enter into other ecclesiastical relations by the orderly process of asking for, and securing, letters of dismissal. It should be clearly understood, however, that any departing minister or communicant member can take with him or her no ecclesiastical property whatever."

This shows how iron-clad the terms of union are. I feel that some churches in both denominations have the idea that they can stay out of the union even if it is consummated. But *in* you go, whether you like it or not; and *all* your church properties and endowments go along with you.

The chief consideration for a Church of Christ planning to enter such a union should be whether or not the Kingdom of God will be thereby advanced. Reference is frequently made to villages and hamlets where United Presbyterian and Presbyterian Churches are established, and both of them weak, struggling bodies. I know a little town where you can stand and throw a rock and hit a Reformed Presbyterian, a United Presbyterian, or just a plain Presbyterian Church. But this argument can be overdone. The main thing for the United Presbyterians to face is this: What effect will this union have on the witness of the United Presbyterian Church to Christ and His Kingdom?

I wonder if the rank and file of our United Presbyterian brethren have any conception of the true state which exists within the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.?

In 1910, aroused by the course of the Presbytery of New York in licensing and ordaining young men who refused to affirm their faith in certain cardinal doctrines of Christianity, the General Assembly made a declaration concerning some of the doctrines which were called in question. There were five doctrines mentioned in the declaration, and hence the popular name "The Five Points." The declaration was as follows:

1. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide

and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error.

2. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary.

3. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and to reconcile us to God.

4. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and of our standards concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, that on the third day He rose again from the dead with the same body with which He suffered, with which also He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of His Father, making intercession."

5. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God as the supreme standard of our faith that our Lord Jesus showed His power and love by working mighty miracles. This working was not contrary to nature, but superior to it."

In 1923, when a dispute arose in the Presbyterian Church over the preaching of the Rev. Dr. Harry E. Fosdick in the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church of New York, the General Assembly of 1923 directed the Presbytery of New York to take such action as would "require the preaching and teaching in the First Presbyterian Church of New York to conform with the system of doctrine taught in the Confession of Faith." In connection with this mandate to the Presbytery of New York, the General Assembly also reaffirmed the five doctrines mentioned by the General Assembly of 1910. In answer to this action of the General Assembly, twelve hundred ministers of the Presbyterian Church signed what was called the "Auburn Affirmation." Some of the statements of that Affirmation shocked and amazed thousands of Presbyterians when the Affirmation appeared. I believe they will shock and amaze United Presbyterians who may not be familiar with them. Here are some excerpts from the "Auburn Affirmation":

1. "There is no assertion in the Scriptures that their writers were kept from error. . . . We hold that the General Assembly of 1923 in asserting that 'the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error' spoke without warrant of the Scriptures or of the Confession of Faith.

2. "We all hold most earnestly to these great facts and doctrines (the Five Points). . . . Some of us regard the particular theories contained in the deliverance of the General Assembly as satisfactory explanation of these facts and doctrines. But we are united in believing that these are not the only theories allowed by the Scriptures and our standards as explanations of these facts and doctrines of our religion, and that all who hold to these facts and doctrines, whatever theories they may employ to explain them, are worthy of all confidence and fellowship."

It has been claimed that some of those who signed the "Auburn Affirmation" did so merely as a protest against

methods of ecclesiastical procedure, and that they did not mean to endorse loose doctrinal statements, or indifference to such statements. I know of several signers who confessed to me their great regret at having signed the Affirmation, with the subsequent implication as to their beliefs. But what inspired the Affirmation was the ringing declaration of the General Assembly that the great doctrines mentioned and commonly called the "Five Points" are now, ever have been, and ever must be, cardinal and essential doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, and of Catholic Christianity.

The Confession of Faith, Chapter 1, Section 8, says "The Old Testament and the New Testament being immediately inspired by God and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic." But according to the Auburn Affirmation the General Assembly of 1923 in asserting that the writers of the Holy Scripture were kept from error, spoke "without warrant of the Scriptures or of the Confession of Faith."

The Confession of Faith, Chapter 8, Section 4, says of our Lord's Resurrection, "On the third day he arose from the dead with the same body in which he suffered." This,

according to the Auburn Affirmationists, is only a "theory," and not an essential doctrine of our Standards. Again, the Confession of Faith, Chapter 8, Section 2, says, "The Son of God did take upon him man's nature, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance." This again, according to the Affirmationists, may be regarded as a mere "theory" as to the Incarnation.

The Confession of Faith, Chapter 8, Section 5, again says, "The Lord Jesus by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself hath fully satisfied the justice of his father." This again, according to the Auburn Affirmation, is but a "theory."

To the "Auburn Affirmationists" the statement of the Confession of Faith as to the Scriptures "Kept pure in all ages," does not mean "Kept free from error"!

Let all United Presbyterians remember that this Affirmation was signed by 1200 ministers, more than a tenth of those on the roll of the Presbyterian Church, and more than all the ministers now in the United Presbyterian Church.

(Concluded on Page 19)

## The Theology of Dr. Mackenzie

A Rejoinder by Dr. Van Til

[The Editors publish herewith the rejoinder of Dr. Van Til to Dr. D. Mackenzie's criticism of the review of his book, "Christianity—the Paradox of God." The Review appeared in our February number and the communication of Dr. Mackenzie in our March issue. The Editors believe it unwise to prolong the discussion indefinitely. Therefore they will permit Dr. Mackenzie to reply further in the next issue, if he so desires. As is customary in such discussions, Dr. Van Til as the first writer will be allowed to reply to whatever Dr. Mackenzie may write, if he so desires, also in the May issue. Then the correspondence will be closed.]



IN his reply to my criticism of his book, *Christianity—The Paradox of God* (CHRISTIANITY TODAY, February, 1934), Dr. Mackenzie falls back on certain theological distinctions which, he says, he took for granted, since his general theological position was well known. Thus, for example, he would make it appear as though I were criticizing him for such an innocent thing as using the term "chance" in everyday life with reference to the unexpected for us rather than for God, or for such a praiseworthy thing as pointing out that "chance" if really entertained as a serious concept, should be removed from a Christian's vocabulary.

I propose, therefore, first of all to go back to Dr. Mackenzie's well-known writings in order to see whether they warrant his present conclusion. My judgment is that they do not. On the contrary, it was to some considerable extent because of the nature of the background with which these well-known writings of Dr. Mackenzie furnished me, that I felt compelled to make the criticism contained in my review.

The writings referred to are chiefly five articles in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* entitled "Ethics and Morality" (Christian), "Free Will," "Libertarianism and Necessitarianism," "Synergism," and "Transcendentalism."

It will be noted that all the articles in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, to which I confine myself here, deal with subjects in which a definite position would, in the nature of the

case, have to be taken on the chief issue between Calvinism and Arminianism, as well as between the Christian and the non-Christian solutions of the problem of free will.

In these articles Dr. Mackenzie quotes from several philosophers but makes very little use of the literature of the great Reformed theologians. We are prevented from thinking of this neglect of Reformed theology as incidental, inasmuch as the content of the articles is opposed to Reformed theology in the whole of its spirit and approach as well as in its specific teaching.

### THE EXPERIENCE APPROACH

In the first place, the Reformed theologians have made the concept of God as absolute in all His attributes determinative for the whole of their theology. God has revealed Himself as absolute in all His attributes. This God-concept is fundamental and the man-concept must be adjusted to it.

That Dr. Mackenzie does not agree with this Reformed approach appears only too clearly. In his article, "Free Will," he says: "Can God's sovereignty be reconciled with such freedom of choice as we require? It cannot if God's absoluteness be asserted without qualification; then the moral life becomes unintelligible. Butler has warned us against speculating on how God ought to reveal Himself. We ought rather to find out how He has revealed Himself. So God's absoluteness must be approached from experience. The defect of Augustinianism and Calvinism is that they start from a knowledge of God's

absoluteness above experience, deduce logically from this his eternal decrees, and so explain individual experience. We must start from experience, however, and, doing so, the problem is to reconcile God's absoluteness in grace with man's freedom." (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VI, p. 126.)

We see from this quotation that Dr. Mackenzie, together with the Arminians, has taken for granted that if the absoluteness of God be maintained without qualification, the moral acts of man are meaningless. Thus he has conceded to the opponents of Christianity that the *apparently* contradictory is the *really* contradictory. He has reasoned as though that which man cannot fully understand must be really contradictory.

To do this one must start with human experience as something ultimate. That Dr. Mackenzie does not hesitate to do this, the quotation shows. He definitely sets his position which starts from "experience" over against the Reformed position which makes the concept of God the determining factor in its theology. So far from following Butler's advice not to ask how God ought to reveal Himself but simply to ask how God has revealed Himself, Dr. Mackenzie felt himself compelled, by virtue of his un-Biblical ideal of comprehensive knowledge, to say that God cannot remain absolute while man has freedom.

Now it is perfectly true that Dr. Mackenzie here and in other connections *also* says that he wishes to maintain the absoluteness of God. He *also* says, in the article referred to, that human experience must not be taken as ultimate. But it is in this *also* that the difficulty lies. Dr. Mackenzie's articles resemble in form the writings of idealist philosophers who write volume upon volume to prove that the pragmatist is wrong in saying that the Universe, inclusive of God and man, is wholly subject to time and change, and then at a critical juncture maintain that time is, after all, an aspect of existence as a whole. Thus, though they emphasize the fact that God is eternal, they, in effect, subject Him to time also.

If, as Dr. Mackenzie himself correctly says in his article on "Synergism," the "supreme regulative principle of Calvinism is the sovereignty of God" (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. XII, p. 162), one cannot *also* begin from "experience" in order to adjust the absoluteness of God to it.

#### THE FIVE POINTS OF CALVINISM

Our criticism on the starting point of Dr. Mackenzie's theology is further justified by the fact that he does actually reject Calvinism in some of its particular and distinctive doctrines. He does not especially discuss the "five points of Calvinism," yet where he does mention any of them he shows clearly that he does not believe them.

Speaking of the synergistic controversy as a whole, Dr. Mackenzie says: "The synergist fought against a view of God which made Him in the case of some men the obstacle to salvation, withholding His grace from some, and making remedial provision only for some; and in this the synergist was right" (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. XII, p. 164).

Here Dr. Mackenzie in the first place rejects unconditional election. He speaks of it only in its negative aspect, *i. e.*, with respect to those who are lost. On this point he expressly denies what the Westminster Confession expressly affirms in Chapter III, Section VII, when it says: "The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice." This section teaches: "That as God has sovereignly destinated certain persons, called the elect, through grace to salvation, so he has sovereignly decreed to withhold his grace from the rest; and that this withholding rests upon the unsearchable counsel of his own will, and is for the glory of his sovereign power." (*Commentary on the Confession of Faith*, p. 107, by A. A. Hodge; cf. also A. A. Hodge, *Popular Lectures on Theological Themes*, article, "Predestina-

tion," and B. B. Warfield, *Biblical Doctrines*, article, "Predestination.")

In the sentence we have quoted above, Dr. Mackenzie not only rejects unconditional election but limited atonement as well. He says the synergist was right in rejecting the doctrine which holds that God made "remedial provision only for some." Here Dr. Mackenzie rejects the Westminster Confession when it says: "Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only." (Chapter III, Section VI.) Of this section Dr. A. A. Hodge says: "All the purposes of God, being unchangeable, self-consistent and certainly efficacious, must perfectly correspond to the events which come to pass in time. He must have predestined to salvation those and those only who are, as a matter of fact, saved; and he must have intended that Christ should redeem those and those only who are redeemed. God's purpose in the gift of Christ cannot be in any respect in vain." (*Commentary on the Confession of Faith*, p. 107.)

We need not point to further details, though it can be shown that Dr. Mackenzie rejects efficacious grace as well as unconditional election and limited atonement. Enough has been brought forth to indicate that he will appeal in vain to writings of A. A. Hodge such as his *Commentary on the Confession of Faith*, *Popular Lectures on Theological Themes*, and *Outlines of Theology*, in order to prove that his own thinking is essentially Reformed. Dr. Mackenzie in his reply to me has merely referred to C. A. Salmond's book, *Princetoniana*, which is a collection of disconnected student class-notes, to the neglect of Hodge's well-known works.

#### CHANCE

The un-Reformed character of Dr. Mackenzie's theology appears still more definitely in his use of the concept "chance." He brings in the main philosophical concepts of Bergson, the great pragmatist, not for criticism or for acceptance with qualification, but as a help toward the solution of the baffling problem of freedom. For Bergson, fatalistic naturalism and the Reformed conception of the plan of God are equally obnoxious, inasmuch as both oppose the idea of something absolutely new coming into the world. Over against all "finalism," Bergson sets his notion of the dynamic nature of life, which to him means that the absolutely new can be produced by man. Now Dr. Mackenzie uses this concept of the dynamic nature of life as a starting point to which the absoluteness of God must be adjusted. To quote: "Bergson tries to show that it is the neglect of this dynamic nature of life that makes the whole difficulty of freedom; and for philosophy and theology the greatest task at present is to outline a theory of reality and of God that, starting from this fact, can give us some reasonable view of nature below us and God above us." (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VII, p. 906.) With this as a background and the actual words of Dr. Mackenzie's book I quoted in my review, it would not seem to be an unfair conclusion that one must be in doubt where Dr. Mackenzie's sympathies lie. He has himself definitely and in unequivocal terms rejected specifically Reformed doctrines and has, to say the least, expressed his full sympathy with Bergson's notion of the "dynamic nature of life" which involves the very reverse of the Reformed philosophy of history. Dr. Mackenzie cannot deny that Bergson's philosophy implies the notion of the changing God. Nor can he deny that he has expressed the utmost sympathy with the basic concepts of Bergson's philosophy. He cannot now dismiss the whole matter by saying that when he spoke of Christ changing the changeless God, he, of course, meant nothing more than what all orthodox theology means when it says that in the economy of redemption God revealed Himself more fully from time to time. Dr. Mackenzie's well-known writings seem at the most critical juncture to swing at least as far to the pragmatist as to the Reformed view of reality.

Still further, it seems that Dr. Mackenzie has clearly felt

that from the orthodox, or certainly from the Reformed side, objection would be made to his views on this very ground that it brings in the Bergsonian idea of something absolutely new not only for man but also for God. After stating *his own view* of the relation of man to God by saying that God's "unchangeable nature gives independence to our dependence" he says, referring to his own view: "The great objection to this view is that we get something 'de novo.'" (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VII, p. 907.) The exact point here is that something absolutely new *for God* as well as for man is spoken of. No one could possibly object to something new *for man*. The whole problem discussed is that of the relation of man's freedom to God's absoluteness. It will not do for Dr. Mackenzie now to brush all this aside and say that *of course* he meant the new, or "chance" *for us* and not for God.

We observe that so far from apologizing for the concept "chance" or from showing that he has not taken it in the ordinary, accepted sense of the opposite of the plan of God, he definitely accepts it as such and that as the only *escape* from the mystery of man's freedom in relation to the plan of God. To quote: "We need not be afraid of those who cry 'chance.' For there is so much unreason and absurdity, so much cruelty and evil in the world that we welcome even 'chance' if it opens a door to their abolition. That this could be possible without the dangerous gift of free power we cannot conceive. But so imperative is the need of betterment that even this dangerous method is welcome." (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VII, p. 907.) Dr. Mackenzie cannot say that he has put the word "chance" in quotation marks in order to indicate that he does not necessarily agree with its current meaning. If he did not accept it in its essentially non-theistic meaning, if he did not accept it as something genuinely new for God, there would be no point in introducing it as a solution for the difficulty of man's freedom in relation to God's absoluteness. Dr. Mackenzie cannot, after telling us that he is opposed to specifically Calvinistic doctrines, complain that I have unjustly called him an opponent of Reformed theology. So also Dr. Mackenzie cannot, after telling us that he has accepted chance as an escape from the problem of a changeless God and human responsibility, complain that I have unfairly fathered the doctrine of "chance" upon him.

Needless to say, Dr. Mackenzie's position cannot be harmonized with the Westminster Confession's statement that "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass . . ." (Chapter III, Section 1). It is needless also to say that Dr. Mackenzie's position cannot be said to be similar to that of A. A. Hodge who, in discussing the same problem that Dr. Mackenzie discusses, says: "The free actions of free agents constitute an eminently important and effective element in the system of things. If the plan of God did not determine events of this class, he could make nothing certain, and his government of the world would be made contingent and dependent, and all his purposes fallible and mutable." (*Commentary on the Confession of Faith*, p. 94.)

Finally, we note that after thus accepting the chance concept as an asylum to which he may resort in time of need, Dr. Mackenzie does make an obviously sincere effort to harmonize his teaching on this subject with the church's doctrine of the changeless God. He says, "Nor need we be concerned that thus the peace of the absolute is destroyed. The only Absolute for which Christian men care has, if certain tales be true, sacrificed His own peace and more to make it possible for men to obey their conscience and be fellow-workers with God." (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VII, p. 907.) Now Dr. Mackenzie cannot say that of course he meant no more than that God revealed Himself redemptively. The question he is discussing is not merely ethical, but also metaphysical, *i. e.*, one having to do with the nature of reality. Dr. Mackenzie is definitely seeking to outline a "theory of reality" in order to find a solution for the baffling problem of freedom. If there is to be a

point to the argument, if the fact that the "Absolute" has "sacrificed His own peace and more" is to help us to see how we may believe in God and also believe in chance, these words must be taken as teaching a change in the very Being of God.

It is this strain of thought in Dr. Mackenzie's well-known writings that unfortunately forbids one to think that of course he has taken for granted that the essence of God remains unchanged when he speaks of Christ's work as being, above all, that He has changed for man the unchangeable God.

It appears from what we have said about Dr. Mackenzie's theology that it seems to be built up of two mutually contradictory motifs. Dr. A. A. Hodge speaks of the two motifs that lead men to construct their theological systems, when he says: "Instead of our doctrine of foreordination being the same with the heathen doctrine of fate, it is its absolute opposite and only alternative. We are shut up to a choice between the two—either a fatalism which results from mechanical coercion, or a fatalism which results from a mindless and purposeless chance, or an all-controlling providence of a heavenly Father who in the exercise of his own personal freedom has made room for ours. All thinkers who understand themselves know that they run along one or other of these lines." (*Popular Lectures . . .* p. 160.) Dr. Hodge virtually identifies "fate" and "chance" and takes refuge in the all-embracing providence of God. Dr. Mackenzie virtually identifies "fate" and the absoluteness of God and takes refuge in chance. To be sure, he *also* takes refuge in God, and this shows that he seeks to do what Dr. Hodge says can never be done. Dr. Mackenzie tries to combine the absolute rationality of God and the absolute irrationality of chance. We are quite willing to believe, on the present testimony of Dr. Mackenzie, that this is not intentionally done but this does not remove the fact that in the articles discussed the confusion prevails.

#### AGNOSTICISM

In the preface to his book, *Christianity—The Paradox of God*, Dr. Mackenzie tells us that certain convictions "lie deep at the heart" of all he wishes to say. These convictions deal largely with the recognition of mystery in physical science, in psychology and in theology. Speaking of science, Dr. Mackenzie says: "Here we can say, with Kierkegaard, that paradox is not a concession but a category of thought. Mystery, in short, is not at the margin of knowledge, but at its centre, and must be recognized there" (p. 6). Again in connection with his discussion of the recognition of mystery in psychology he repeats Kierkegaard's words that paradox is not a concession but a category. With respect to theology he says he welcomes the recent emphasis on paradox because of its recognition that God is "infinitely greater than our best categories."

In all this we note that Dr. Mackenzie has, to say the least, no great desire to distinguish his position from that of recent scientific agnosticism. Now we may rejoice that science today is not, generally speaking, materialistic and mechanistic but it cannot be denied that it is thoroughly agnostic. The issue here is far deeper than the recognition of the fact that man cannot fully understand even the simplest of things. Christians have always held that we cannot fully comprehend God and they may most heartily believe that we cannot fully understand the circulation of the blood. But this is not what science means today when it says that mystery is not only at the margin but at the centre of human knowledge. Science today, generally speaking, assumes that the universe is ultimately mysterious. When science speaks of the recognition of mystery at the heart of human knowledge it does not mean that, of course, God knows all. It does not figure with God in its interpretation of facts at any point.

#### HERBERT SPENCER

When we read the book itself in order to see whether Dr. Mackenzie has helped to set Christian thought in opposition

to the recent form of scientific agnosticism we are again disappointed. Dr. Mackenzie says: "We do not find fault with Herbert Spencer for dwelling on the mystery and so casting his vote in favour of agnosticism. His error was not in being agnostic, but in not being agnostic enough—his very agnosticism became dogmatism. He should not have separated off the Unknowable into a special compartment, for the simple reason that it cannot be so separated. It haunts us, penetrates us, and interpenetrates like the air we breathe, and clarity may be another name for superficial simplification" (p. 26).

It should be observed here that the meaning of agnosticism in the case of Spencer is that he interprets the universe without reference to God. In this he quite resembles James Jeans. The only difference is that Jeans, together with many other recent scientists, recognizes more definitely an ultimate mystery at the heart of the universe than did Spencer. Now one may hold, perhaps, that the present form of scientific agnosticism is, from the Christian point of view, preferable to the scientific agnosticism of the last century but one cannot say that agnosticism, as understood by science today, is in itself commendable.

We are well aware of the fact that Dr. Mackenzie goes on in this connection to tell us that "Mystery and knowledge are not incompatible, they are complementary" (p. 27). He speaks of Paul's "doxological agnostic cry" when the latter spoke of the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God. We are well aware of the fact that Dr. Mackenzie also adds: "The 'Halt' of the skeptic must become the 'Hallelujah' of the saint" (p. 29). Our criticism is that Dr. Mackenzie has not actually in his argument pointed out clearly that modern agnosticism and the theology of Paul are two opposing systems of thought. He has not pointed out that modern agnosticism, whether in its nineteenth or in its twentieth century form, is basically wrong while Paul was right. His fundamental argument seems to be that if Herbert Spencer but became like Jeans he would only need to be supplemented by Paul in order to have the truth. It is in this way that he speaks of rolling Huxley and Wordsworth together and adding the psalmist in order to arrive at the truth.

#### PARADOX VERSUS POSSESSION

That this is a fair representation of Dr. Mackenzie's thought is definitely seen if we observe that he has set his conception of paradox in contrast to that of *possession*. Speaking of a form of theology which has been too "cocksure of God," Dr. Mackenzie says: "We thought we had domesticated and sociologized Him, ethicized and rationalized Him, until we found that while we His servants were so busy here and there, He had gone; and now our very uncertainty may be an indication that we are getting sure of Him again, sure of Him, not in possession but in paradox. For perhaps only in paradox can we have Him at all, and only in His unknowableness can He be known, and in our longing for His presence is He most truly present" (p. 32). In this connection we should recall that Dr. Mackenzie has set it down as a deep conviction underlying his whole book that *paradox is not a concession but a category*. There would be no point to this if Dr. Mackenzie meant no more than that man, because a creature, cannot comprehensively understand the Creator. Orthodox theology has constantly maintained that man is created in the image of God and that therefore his thought, his "categories," and therefore his "possession" of God are perfectly true and valid, though he cannot exhaust God. Dr. Mackenzie, on the contrary, has virtually set the category of paradox over against "our best categories." We are said to be sure of God *not* in possession *but* in paradox. It is true that Dr. Mackenzie's argument is directed against the false immanentism of modern theology. It is equally true, however, that his argument here would, if valid, destroy the foundation of Reformed theology.

#### KIERKEGAARD'S PARADOX

This point becomes clearer still if we recall that Dr. Mackenzie

definitely brings in Kierkegaard's conception of paradox. He uses Kierkegaard's phrase that "paradox is not a concession but a category." He sets paradox in definite contrast to "possession." Besides all this, he devotes a section to Kierkegaard and his influence. In this section he does not indicate any disagreement with him. On the contrary, he says: "Kierkegaard is as subtle in his insight into the paradoxical nature of man as Pascal, and as felicitous in his expression" (p. 210).

Now Dr. K. Schilder, in an exhaustive study, *Zur Begriffsgeschichte des „Paradoxon“*, seeks to prove that Kierkegaard introduced a use of the term paradox not current till his time. Dr. Schilder speaks of the change introduced into the use of the word paradox by Kierkegaard as radical because instead of using it to indicate the notion of something unexpected and strange or as something only apparently contradictory he has used it as indicating that human thought is really contradictory. According to Kierkegaard, says Dr. Schilder, the historical or relative precipitates in the form of systematic interpretation, while the eternal or absolute is paradoxical. (Chapter on "Radikalismus der Kierkegaardschen Wendung.") It cannot, therefore, be taken as a serious reply to my criticism when Dr. Mackenzie shows that Warfield has used the term paradox. Calvin also uses it and Scripture uses it in the Greek text. The point in debate is whether the Kierkegaardian use of it is consistent with the Calvinistic use of it. Dr. Mackenzie has expressed great sympathy with Kierkegaard. If Dr. Mackenzie wishes to use Warfield's name he should show that his own use of the word paradox is like Warfield's and that Warfield's use of the term and Kierkegaard's use of the term are similar. It cannot be denied that the only Reformed theologian who has expressed himself fully on this subject has found a radical difference between Kierkegaard's use of the term and the use of the term in Reformed theology. (See also K. Schilder, *Bij Dichters en Schriftgeleerden*, and *Tusschen "Ja" en "Neen,"* on H. Barth's attempt to claim Calvin as his authority.) Till Dr. Mackenzie really shows by an appeal to authorities that his usage of the term paradox accords with Reformed usage, we must argue the matter as best we can.

#### KANTIAN ANTINOMIES

The root of the whole matter, as far as the conception of paradox goes, lies, we believe, in this fact that Dr. Mackenzie has not clearly distinguished between the apparently contradictory and the really contradictory. Dr. Mackenzie, as we have pointed out, began his argument about the relation of human freedom to God's absoluteness, from experience. This forced him to introduce chance or the irrational as an element in the total situation. This would also naturally lead him to think that the apparent contradictions between God's absoluteness and human freedom are real contradictions. In fact, it was only because he thought of these apparent contradictions as real contradictions that he could introduce the concept of chance at all. If the concept of paradox should mean no more than the harmony of the apparently contradictory it would not help to bring together the discordant elements of his theology.

Now it is true that Dr. Mackenzie has entitled one of the chapters of his book, *Paradox as Apparent Self-contradiction*. Yet, under this innocent flag Dr. Mackenzie has brought in the Kantian concept of a separation between one field, the phenomenal, in which the law of contradiction holds good and another field, the noumenal, to which the law of contradiction does not apply.

Immediately following his statement that "perhaps the day may come also when the scientific view of natural selection and the New Testament doctrine of an election of grace may be seen to be both sides of God's activity, and not the horns of an inescapable dilemma," Dr. Mackenzie says: "The philosophy of Immanuel Kant gave the prestige of that great thinker's name to the *inevitableness of paradox or antinomy in all our thinking*" (p. 81). Then he adds a little further on: "I am

not here attempting to defend all the Kantian antinomies, nor the justification of Hegel's correction—but *antinomies are not antagonisms* either in the knowledge of nature or in the realm of theology" (p. 81). Here it seems plain that though Dr. Mackenzie does not defend *all* the antinomies of Kant, he does accept the Kantian concept of antinomy. Now Kant thought that as far as the understanding is concerned as good an argument can be produced for the proposition that the world has had no beginning in time as for the proposition that the world has had a beginning in time. This illustrates Kant's conception of antinomy. As far as the field of knowledge or science was concerned, Kant held that A and not-A, though contradictory to one another, could be proved by arguments in which no such contradiction is found. From this inescapable dilemma in the field of knowledge, Kant sought refuge in the "noumenal" realm in which we need not be concerned with the law of non-contradiction. It was, according to Kant, with this noumenal realm that religion deals. Accordingly, though the phenomenal is an aspect of Reality as a whole, religion need not be seriously concerned with the law of non-contradiction. In Reality as a whole these contradictions of the realm of knowledge may, after all, each state an aspect of the truth. Reality as a whole is analytic but also synthetic; it is fixed and yet the absolutely new somehow appears.

Over against this Kantian view, as it largely controls modern philosophy, Reformed theology has maintained that God is absolutely rational, so that nothing absolutely new can exist for Him. Accordingly when we face what seems to us to be antinomies, we do not seek refuge in the realm of the irrational where something absolutely new may emerge, with the result that both of our contradictory statements may yet be approximations to the truth. *Reformed theology has never allowed that there is any sphere in which the law of non-contradiction does not operate.* To do that would be to give up its conception

of God who "from all eternity did by the most wise and Holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain(s) whatsoever comes to pass." Thus we maintain that the world has had a beginning in time and we deny that it can, with an equal show of truth, be held that the world has not had a beginning in time. In short, Kantian thought denies while Reformed theology affirms that Christian theism is intellectually defensible.

Kantianism and Reformed thought may both say that "antinomies are not antagonisms." For Reformed thought this is true because, if taken in the Reformed sense, antinomies are only *apparent* contradictions which are resolved in God. On the other hand, if taken in the Kantian sense of real contradictions one of the "antinomies" is true while the other is false. For Kantianism this phrase is true because in the totality of things the intellectual or phenomenal realm in which the antinomies operate is, after all, only one aspect of Reality as a whole. *For Kantianism antinomies are not antagonisms because for it truth is relative; for Reformed thought antinomies are not antagonisms because for it truth is absolute.* Kant's position implies an ultimate Irrationalism while Reformed theology is based upon the conception of God as an absolute, self-conscious and therefore wholly rational being.

There can be no peace but only war between these two types of thought. One will look in vain for a clear distinction between these two lines of thought in the writings of Dr. Mackenzie. The main impression created is that he has sought to combine the Kantian-Kierkegaardian and the orthodox-Christian lines of thought, that he has fought to combine the ultimately rational and the ultimately irrational. That was my main criticism. I brought out something of the results of such an effort by pointing to things that lie on the surface. In the present article I have tried to show that the difficulty lies at the very roots of Dr. Mackenzie's theology.

## "Indigenizing the Christian Faith"

By the Rev. Prof. Wm. Childs Robinson, Th.D.

Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Ga.

*(Before publication, the following was submitted in tentative form to two Southern Presbyterian ministers of wide experience in Chinese missionary work. Dr. Henry M. Woods replied: "Your article is a clear, strong statement of the evangelical position, and your criticisms are well founded and entirely proper. Your article is an excellent one and I heartily endorse it." The other minister offered as a unit an evaluation of the book which is too long to include in this article. His letter, which may be had on request, treats of the worth and inadequacies of the book and embodies many of the criticisms hereinafter made.)*

### "Indigenizing" Christianity

The religious press is welcoming a volume presenting a concrete effort to "indigenize" the religion of Christ in China. The "liberal" *Christian Century* describes this work as a tangible illustration "of the changed sort of missions the laymen's commission was favoring" (Jan. 17, 1934, p. 90). The book is written to aid teachers

"to root Christian faith and ethics into the soil of native ideology and social experience" (Preface ii). The author disavows syncretism (p. ix), as did Professor Hocking of the Laymen's Committee in his remarks at the Jerusalem Congress. However, his "underlying philosophy" is to make a *synthesis* of Chinese aims, principles, methods and materials of moral education with modern aims, principles, methods and materials of Christian education (iv). He suggests that all the indigeneous material which he presents in the book "may be helpfully used as a basis and integral part of Christian education in China" (iv). The author's view of modern education may be seen by his remark that it is congruent with the philosophy of *inter alios* Dewey (viii, cf. emphasis on "functional," p. 62).

### Worth

In objecting to the religious teachings and implications of the volume the reviewer has no desire to impugn its scholarship, diligence, or literary excellence. It brings together and catalogues in accessible form much of the best that has been said on

moral and religious themes by the sages of China. Maxims, quotations and stories from the native sources are conveniently grouped for the use of teacher and writer. Much of the material so exhaustively collected and codified *may* be used in a proper manner by missionaries as a point of contact and of approach. However, from the standpoint of Presbyterian faith there is fundamental objection to the way in which this material is used in the volume at hand, and to some of the material itself.

### The Rule of Faith

The volume does not affirm the sufficiency of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the rule of faith and life. Instead it provides for "using Indigeneous Materials as well as those derived from the Bible and Christian Experience to foster a consciousness of God and personal relationships to Him," "to understand and appreciate the personality, life and teachings of Christ," "to foster a continuous development of Christ-like character" (including "recovery from sin") . . . "to foster assimilation of the best religious experience of the race as a guide to present experience."

### The Old Testament "Hitlerized"

While the Bible is spoken of in this outline and a section is provided in the outline for a discussion of the Old Testament under the proposed chapter on "the best religious experience of the race," this chapter is not

<sup>1</sup>Stuart, Warren H. *The Use of Material from China's Spiritual Inheritance in the Christian Education of Chinese Youth*, Oxford Press, 1922.



contained in the book. The appendices which "suggest how all this material may be helpfully used as a basis and integral part of Christian education in China" virtually "Hitlerize" the Old Testament. Appendix II is a questionnaire drawn up by the author to discover which elements from Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism, Mo Ti, ancestor-worship, etc., may be built into the education of Christian children "along with the New Testament, in the expectation of making them more natural, indigeneous, and useful Christians." In synthesizing these indigeneous elements with the *New Testament* the author has omitted from his conspectus of Chinese Christian education the one book on which Jesus Christ was Himself educated—the Old Testament. Appendix I offers as responsive reading in "Christian Worship" selections from Mencius, Mo Ti, Confucius, Buddha, Loa-tse interspersed with selection from the New Testament and a single verse from the Old, Isa. 6:8.

Part One condemns the attitude toward image-worship "derived from the iconoclastic prophets of Hebrew tradition," p. 59. Does the writer mean to deny the Divine authorship of the Second Commandment? Instead of the Old Testament doctrine of idolatry, and in the face of the Apostolic exhortation to flee from idolatry, this book provides for visiting Buddhist and Taoist worship as an integral part of Christian education. Such a visit is to inculcate a "mild-set of sympathetic appreciation," "tolerance," "the spirit of tolerance and even friendship," "sympathetic understanding" toward the "truly religious" experiences of this idolatrous worship, pp. 58-61.

Instead of finding the roots of Matthew and Hebrews in the Old Testament record of God's special revelation the author says that these books explain Christianity in terms of already existent racial consciousness, viii. Ignoring the Old Testament Passover, the volume says: "Jesus rooted His memorial in simple Jewish customs, so will His church 'do this in remembrance of Him' congruently to the social environment," p. 25.

### Strange Fire!

Building upon the basis of these indigeneous materials, p. iv, Christianity is "to enrich, irradiate, and vitalise them with its own dynamic, receiving enrichment in return," p. ix. Concretely this means that the Chinese Kitchen God may be retained as symbolic of Christian belief in God's presence in the family circle, p. 9. "A strong religious sentiment" is to be built up by nature material native to China, poems, etc., to which "We will add the Nature-psalms of our Christian heritage," pp. 76-81. Ancient ceremonial usages are to be incorporated into the ritual of Christian worship, or even taken over into "the Church sacraments and other ritual, such as initiation into the company of believers,"

pp. 25-26. The Yenching University Church at Peiping is commended for incorporating into its worship "Chinese poetry along with translated hymns," p. 25. From the Y. M. C. A. Manual of 1931 a series of Responsive Readings are offered as a "helpful integral part" of Christian Worship. The first of these under the caption, *Whom shall I send?* places our Lord Christ's sense of His vocation, Luke 4:18, immediately after and in the same selection 21 with readings from Mencius, Confucius and Fan Tsongyen. The next selection "sandwiches" readings from Mo Ti between ones from I Corinthians and I John. The third selection begins:

### "Faith

*Leader:* Just as one who has hands entering upon the Hill of Treasures, can without ado grasp wealth; so having faith, you may enter the law of Buddha, and simply take to yourself unlosable precious things (Hwa Yen King—Buddha).

*Response:* To enter the law of Buddha, faith is the essential. To cross the River of Life and Death, your vow is your boat and raft. (Heart Classic—Buddha.)

*Leader:* Heaven has created virtue in me, what can Hwan Hwuy do unto me? I have no complaint against Heaven; I blame no man. Learning below and pressing upward, it is heaven that knows me. (Confucius in Analects.)

*Response:* In quiet thought accomplish it; speak not but believe standing fast in your good conduct. (Book of Changes.)

*Leader:* Who through faith wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness were made strong, waxed mighty in war, turned to flight armies of aliens. (Hebrews 11:33, 24.)

In reference to the above, it should be said that Buddha was an atheist and that Confucianism is recognized as agnostic. Religious faith in the words of the one or in the system of the other cannot have the same meaning, as in the New Testament.

The book rejects the traditional Presbyterian doctrine of departed loved ones, p. 16. It is tolerant of Confucian reverence for ancestors, pp. 16, 14, 17, 90, 91; but prefers the Roman Catholic custom of prayers for the dead, p. 16. The "sacred" places of China are "Christened" "Galilee," "Mt. Sinai," and "Caesarea Philippi" that in nature scenes associated with pagan religions as well as in their "very temple precincts, where incense, beauty, and stillness conspire for religious impression" Christian student conferences may be held, pp. 64-67.

It is a long leap from the zeal for God's house and the purity of His worship which marked Jesus, John 2:17; 4:22, cf. Isaiah 11:2-3, and which was reflected in the Presbyterian fathers who sought a Divine warrant for every element introduced into their worship to this effort to indigenize Chris-

tianity in China. Both the Nestorians and the early Jesuits failed in similar endeavors—Latourette, *A History of Christian Missions in China*, p. 59, 134; Cf. *Confession of Faith*, xxi, 1, 4.

### A Finality That Is Not Final

The very title to this volume implies that Christ is superior to other religious leaders. The book, however, does not make it clear that Christ is *sui generis* as the following will indicate:

"As morning star and eastern glow prepare us for the world's sunrise, so the thoughts of ideal Man, imminent outshining Deity and redeeming Love, as found somewhat dimly in China's religions, prepare her people for an appreciation of Christ," p. 131.

The writer affirms that in the personality of Christ Christianity brings something new and unique, p. 121; cf. also p. ix and p. 64. When, however, one faces the distinction between eternity and time by which discriminating thinkers distinguish the eternal Personality of the God-man from temporal personalities the book is disappointing and misleading.

In reference to Confucius the author writes without quotation marks of the unadorned greatness of the Master himself, p. 58. Then he quotes without dissent, "over his simple natural grave blows the breath of eternity, p. 59." He advocates taking Christian students to a "heathen" temple at which they are worshipping Buddha as "Eternal One," "my Saviour," p. 61. On the other hand one does not note a statement which does justice to the *eternity* of the Trinitarian Personal of the Lord Jesus Christ. The writer speaks of "Him whose fullness of grace and truth revealed the Eternal Father," p. 129. Further, Professor T. C. Chao is quoted with approval in statements of the relationship of God and the logos which presents a unipersonal rather than a tripersonal God, p. 129; and "human-divine Jesus" rather than "the divine-human Christ of the West," p. 200, that is a temporal rather than an eternal person.

The finality of Christianity is defined by a quotation from Mr. K. J. Saunders: "Christianity again is final, because these truths (which Jesus teaches and embodies), as we discover more and more, are the very warp and woof of our universe, and it seems unlikely that they can be superseded, unless this world is replaced by an entirely different one! And even there Fatherhood and Love will surely be ultimate," p. 132. It will at once be seen that the finality here affirmed is one that may conceivably be superseded.

One turns from these unsatisfactory statements to the ringing affirmations of the great and absolutely unique acts of God which Julius Richter, the veteran missionary leader, read to the Jerusalem Congress, or to the incisive statement of *The Finality of The Christian Religion* made by Dr. C. W.

Hodge, Jr., in *Princeton Biblical and Theological Studies*, or to some of the excellent passages in Speer's *The Finality of Jesus Christ*, such as the following:

"But viewed in anywise the thought of Christ with which Christianity began, out of which it arose, and which it got from Christ Himself, was the thought of His absoluteness and finality. 'The absolute religious significance of Jesus,' as Dr. Denney, says, 'in all the relations of God and man, is the specific quality of the new faith.' Christ filled in it, that is, in the true religion, 'the absolute and unshared place.' In Him a person of absolute significance—an eternal person—a person to whom finality attaches had appeared. He was the key of all the ultimate problems. He was Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the Creator of all things and the final Judge." (*The Finality of Jesus Christ*, pp. 43-44.)

Above all, one turns to the Scriptures of the Old Testament to hear again their testimony to the sufficiency of the written Word and the glory of the Word Incarnate. Here is finality:

"The Word of the Lord abideth forever," I Peter 1:25; Is. 40:6. And the Word, as represented by Moses and the prophets in the Old Testament, the Word as represented by Paul, John and Acts in the New Testament, the Word as interpreted by the Westminster Catechism, does not favor a mind-set of sympathetic appreciation, tolerance and friendship toward idolatrous worship (Larger Catechism 108, 109).

## The Comfort of the Scriptures

A DEVOTIONAL MEDITATION

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." Acts 2:24.

THE Apostles preached the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. They proclaimed the Resurrection to convince men of the truth of the gospel. The GREAT FACT is presented as evidence for the truth of salvation. "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses."

No amount of proof is sufficient to make us believe. The evidence for the truths of the Gospel is overwhelming and still men do not believe. If we will not hear Moses and the Prophets we will not believe "though one rose from the dead."

But God is gracious and condescends to our human weakness. God has given to our unbelieving hearts all that they possibly can insist upon. The "record is true." There is ample witness to the record. It is made evident "that ye might believe."

What warning there is for us in the GREAT PROOFS for the truth of the Gospel! A glorious evidence is the Resurrection! What reason have we for not accepting the Gospel? We shall have no excuse to offer if we reject the Gospel.

Jesus of Nazareth is a divine figure in the gospels. He was "approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs." But the miracle of His Resurrection is the capstone of all. How can He be anything less than Lord and Christ?

He died upon the cross to save men from sin. But now can we answer the derision of those who witnessed His death—"He saved others; himself he cannot save"? By pointing to a Saviour who rose again from the dead, we lead men to One who has power to save. He is "declared to be the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection from the dead."

Our sinfulness caused His death. Will His blood be upon us? Will it cry out for vengeance against us? It is true that He died with words of mercy upon His lips yet we are assured of God's mercy and forgiveness only because He rose again and continues ever as our Mediator in heaven. By His resurrection He can now apply to us the effects of His death. There is redemption full and free. His rising from the dead to an unchangeable priesthood, declares it.

Because He lives forever "to make intercession for us," He is able to save to the uttermost "those that come unto God by Him." Let us come. We are assured of His mercy.

"He who slumbered in the grave  
Is exalted now to save."  
"He who bore all pain and loss  
Comfortless upon the cross,  
Lives in glory now on high,  
Pleads for us and hears our cry:  
Alleluia!"

## Sunday School Lessons for May

(International Uniform Series)

Lesson for May 6, 1934

JESUS ACCLAIMED AS KING

(Lesson Text—Matt. 21:1-46. Also study Matt. 20:29-34; Luke 19:29-46; John 12:12-19; Heb. 1:8-12; I Peter 3:15. Golden Text—Phil 2:9.)

TO the crowds it was a day of soon-expended joy. The Messiah had come! They were welcoming him to his city! Soon he would reign! It is not necessary to pour ridicule or blame upon these great throngs. Their own hoarse cry, "Crucify him! Crucify him!" has cursed them down the ages. In all probability they were sincere, or at least most of them were, as they spread their palm branches in the way. That is the terribly tragic thing about enthusiasm of this sort—for not going deep into the very roots of the soul it is soon changed. Enthusiasm that takes hold of all but the very soul is a dangerous thing.

For Jesus it was a day of triumph—and of tears. He alone of all there could see beyond the waving palm branches, could hear voices that did not cry "Hosanna." Already He was entering the shadow of the cross. And in that shadow the light streaming from His face becomes more and more visible.

It is not the crowds that should engage our thought of this lesson. It is that lonely glorious figure in white—the figure of One who of His own will went up to Jerusalem, then to Calvary, that by His death we might know abundant and eternal life. Who could not cry Hosanna! to the King of Life?

Lesson for May 13, 1934

CHRISTIANITY AND PATRIOTISM

(Lesson Text—Matt. 22:1 to 23:39. Also

study Romans 13:1-14; Phil. 3:17-21. Golden Text—Matt. 22:37-39.)

The enemies of Jesus did not yet dare denounce Him to the people. The people were still warm with the glow of Palm Sunday. So the ecclesiastical politicians (Scribes and Pharisees—bosses of the "Jewish Church") decided to try to embroil Jesus with the Roman authorities. (Had anyone exposed the perfidy of these men, doubtless he would have been branded as a "slanderer of the brethren," "disloyal," and put out of the organization. And in the confusion the guilt of the conspirators would be conveniently forgotten.)

But to trap Jesus was not so easy. He knew what was in their minds before they opened their mouths. And when He answered them, He used, not "plain English," and what they possibly called in those days, "Plain Aramaic." At any rate it was plain enough: "Why tempt ye me, hypocrites?"

Yet God can "make the wrath of man to praise Him." (That should give comfort to all of us.) He used this incident as the occasion of teaching a powerful lesson. "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Not that God did not truly own *all*. But the teaching, it seems clear, had to do with the responsibility one owes to the government that protects him, under whose laws he lives. A good Christian is a good citizen of an earthly country simply because he is *also* a citizen of a better country.

Lesson for May 20, 1934

THE FUTURE OF THE KINGDOM

(Lesson Text—Matt. 24:1 to 25:30. Also

study *Matt. 7:24, 27; Eph. 6:10-20; I Tim. 6:17-19; Rev. 21:1-7. Golden Text—Rev. 11:15.*)

These chapters are among the most soul-shaking in the Bible. They are filled with the portentousness of doom to come, with the climax of human sin, with the mighty sweep of an eternal purpose. Over all lies the shadow of the wing of God, thrown in protection over His own. If ever the teaching of Scripture is clear in its great outlines while mysterious in its near details, it is here. These words of our Lord are doubtless partly to be understood literally, and partly as symbolism. Yet if symbols they were the symbols which He chose to shake and warn the soul of man!

In these chapters we see no gradual improvement of human civilization, and character until at last the whole world "lapped in universal law" awaits the triumphant return of the King. A world that could achieve perfection that way first would hardly need Him afterward. No—here we see stupendous forces in conflict and collision. We see earthquake and fire, cataclysm and overturning, sleeping and watching, and at the last the return of the King to do what man could not do and what man in God's eternal purpose was never destined to do. The future of the Kingdom is safe—safe because the King Himself reigns even now from Heaven, and some day will set His throne on earth.

#### Lesson for May 27, 1934

##### THE LAST JUDGMENT

(*Lesson Text—Matt. 25:31-46. Also study Luke 10:25-27; James 1:27; 2:14-17; Psalm 86:1-7. Golden Text—II Cor. 5:10.*)

To one who reads the words of our Lord with attention and understanding there is etched an unforgettable and solemn picture on the fabric of the mind. Here is retribution made graphic, certain, passed far beyond the so often useless chatter of speculation and argument. Sin, which is always being judged, is coming for its final appearance before the bar of the One who is altogether Holy, whose Holiness is as great and boundless as His very Being.

Space is too limited here to deal with the many important questions that naturally throng the mind. How many judgments are there? When? How? All these are serious questions that will repay earnest thought. But one thing is clear: Whoever is judged will be judged on the basis of character and condemned because that character is ruined by sin. No one will be condemned excepting for his sin. Yet many sinners will not be condemned! Why? Because as they are called to stand before the throne, a figure in spotless white will interpose between them and the wrath of God, saying, "These are mine. I have purchased them

with my own blood. I bore their sin upon the cross. They are complete in me." And to such, judgment holds no terror.

#### Thou Shalt Say, No!—Concluded

In 1929 there were those in the Presbyterian Church who were convinced that the establishment of an independent Presbyterian Seminary was necessary to uphold the Standards of the Confession of Faith and to train young men for the Gospel ministry, the result was the Westminster Seminary at Philadelphia, greatly used of God in the four years of its brief history. Many of the students, four of the Faculty and several of the former directors of Princeton Theological Seminary took part in the establishment of the New Seminary.

In 1933 a body of earnest men within the Presbyterian Church established an independent Board of Foreign Missions. The reason for this was deep dissatisfaction with some of the policies and practices of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, President of Princeton Theological Seminary, and a chief proponent of this union, writing in "The Christian Union Herald" for April 24th, and answering an article published by Dr. A. Gordon MacLennan in a previous issue of that paper, cites the action of the General Assembly of 1933, which, by an overwhelming vote of the Assembly, expressed "entire confidence in the members of the Board, its secretaries, missionaries, policies and transactions." It was *that very vote* which gave occasion for the establishment of the new Board, and which caused grave misgivings in the minds of many ministers and churches who still support missionary work under our Foreign Board.

In 1931, one thousand and eighty-two ministers in the Presbyterian Church organized the Presbyterian League of Faith. The objects of the League are as follows:

1. "To maintain loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God.
2. "To maintain the Reformed, or Calvinistic, system of doctrine.
3. "To oppose changes in the historic formula of creed subscription required of candidates to the ministry and eldership.
4. "To oppose the attack made by the document commonly called 'The Auburn Affirmation.'
5. "To warn men everywhere that salvation is to be obtained not by human merit, or human effort to please God, but only through the redeeming work of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.
6. "To encourage the vigorous defense and joyous propagation of the Gospel in

its fullness as it is set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith on the basis of Holy Scripture."

Among the almost eleven hundred members of the League of Faith are well known names in the Presbyterian Church. Prominent professors, missionaries, ministers, and three former moderators of the General Assembly are on the list of members.

It would be preposterous to say that the many earnest men of the Presbyterian Church who have taken part in these movements of protest are laboring under a foolish hallucination, and attacking an enemy who does not exist. The organization of these different movements is conclusive proof that there is a most serious doctrinal division within the Presbyterian Church. If the United Presbyterians wish to unite with our church, they should act in full knowledge of the lamentable doctrinal condition which now obtains within the Presbyterian Church.

But, it will be asked, Would not the accession of the ministers and churches of the United Presbyterian Church strengthen the hands of evangelical men in the Presbyterian Church? In my opinion it would not. The total ministry of the United Presbyterian Church would not equal the number of men who signed the "Auburn Affirmation," and the other hundreds who did not have the courage of their convictions, or lack of convictions, but who secretly bow at the low altar of the "Auburn Affirmation." A small and questionable gain in the number of evangelical men in the Presbyterian Church would be cancelled by the catastrophe which would befall the men of the United Presbyterian Church.

The United Presbyterian Church is a Church united not only in name, but in loyal adherence to the great doctrines of Grace. Should you unite with the Presbyterian Church, you will find yourselves in an altogether different and new condition. You have made a grand and united testimony to our Lord and to His Kingdom. You have done this in your Seminaries, in your General Assemblies, and in your missionary Boards. The question before the United Presbyterian Church is this: Shall we silence our witness and quench the lamp of our Testimony? The moment the United Presbyterian Church united with the Presbyterian Church, its distinctive witness will be lost.

John Calvin once said that he would cross the seven seas for the sake of true Church Union. Earnest Christians everywhere will subscribe to that sentiment, and everywhere true believers will pray that the torn and rent robe of the Church of Christ shall again be a Seamless Robe.

# News of the Church

## Foreign Missions

DEVELOPMENTS of late March and the first half of April, concerning the Foreign Missionary situation in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were many. Taken together they evidence an amazing maintenance and even increase of interest. Far from having been "settled" by the last Assembly; it appeared that the issues having to do with the Official Board were more alive than ever. The air was full of predictions of what would come, both in the immediate and the more remote future. Principal events follow:

### Complaint from Philadelphia Minority

The minority which had unsuccessfully opposed the admission of the **Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.**, President of the Independent Board, as a member of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, on the 15th of March filed a "notice of complaint" with the stated clerk of Presbytery. It was signed by 44 persons. The actual complaint itself had not been filed up to the date of going to press, so far as was known. Inasmuch as the so-called "stay" is only effective if the *complaint itself* is signed by more than one-third of the members of Presbytery present when the vote was taken, it was doubtful whether such a stay had actually been procured. **Dr. Machen**, however, voluntarily refrained from voting in Presbytery on April 2nd, and after the notice of complaint had been read, asked for, and received, permission to withdraw. The Presbytery of Philadelphia took no action concerning the so-called "stay" which is designed to accomplish the liberal (?) effect of barring **Dr. Machen** from Presbytery on a technicality, since no complaint had actually been filed.

**Dr. Machen's** reception had been voted against on March 5th by every Auburn Affirmationist in the Presbytery of Philadelphia. When the notice of complaint was presented to Presbytery, however, it was found that the **Rev. Alexander MacColl, D.D.**, of the Second Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, had not signed. **Dr. MacColl** was a member of the original committee which issued the Auburn Affirmation. After the vote on March 15th, however, he had moved to make the reception of **Dr. Machen** unanimous. Another minister who had voted against reception did not sign the complaint. He was the **Rev. Charles Vaillumier, Ph.D.**, not a signer of the Affirmation.

The text of the notice of complaint, declared by legal experts to be almost humorously vague, is given below. Names are

given in the order of the actual notice. Names of Auburn Affirmationists are printed in boldface type (*not* as in the actual notice).

#### *Notice of Complaint to the Presbytery of Philadelphia:*

In the matter of the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, March 5, 1934, respecting the reception of the **Rev. J. Gresham Machen** as a member of that body, the undersigned hereby give notice of their intention to complain to the Synod of Pennsylvania as to the aforesaid action, and for the following reasons:

1. That the Presbytery of Philadelphia was guilty of irregularity in its proceedings.
2. That the Presbytery of Philadelphia refused a reasonable indulgence to a large number of the members of the Presbytery.
3. That the Presbytery violated the constitutional rights of a large number of the members of the Presbytery.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

1. **WEAVER K. EUBANK**
2. **ROBERT SIMPSON**
3. **W. T. BUCHANAN**
4. **JOSEPH B. C. MACKIE**
5. **Edward B. Shaw**
6. **H. Alford Boggs**
7. **RAYMOND H. ROSCHE**
8. **VINCENT D. BEERY**
9. **J. A. MacCallum**
10. **Wm. R. Rearick**
11. **W. WAIDE**
12. **EDWARD M. FREEMAN**
13. **J. R. WAITE**
14. **GEORGE B. PENCE**
15. **ABRAM M. LONG**
16. **WILLIAM MAIN SCHALL**
17. **JAMES H. DUNHAM**
18. **Wm. M. Curry**
19. **CLARENCE E. SMITH**
20. **Edward Yates Hill**
21. **J. MELVIN SMITH**
22. **HARRY A. LLOYD**
23. **J. WARREN KAUFMAN**
24. **JOHN MORRISON**
25. **GUY E. KLETT**
26. **WILLIAM R. CRAIG**
27. **BENJAMIN KREHL**
28. **George Emerson Barnes**
29. **Francis DeSimone**
30. **KARL FREDERICK WETTSTONE**
31. **WILLIAM J. BROWN**
32. **MONROE G. EVERETT**
33. **GEORGE A. AVERY**
34. **ELMER S. MURRAY**
35. **Robert B. Whyte**
36. **WILLIAM L. MUDGE, JR.**
37. **GEORGE T. MOULDER**
38. **Alvin B. Gurley**
39. **ANDREW SZILAGYI**
40. **O. G. McDOWELL**
41. **HARRY BURTON BOYD**
42. **JOHN A. THOMPSON**
43. **SAVERIO SCELERA**
44. **JAMES RENWICK JACKSON**

### Philadelphia Postpones Decision

At the same meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, on April 2nd, the Presbytery by a large majority voted to postpone discussion of the whole matter of Foreign Missions to April 16th when a special meeting was ordered to consider that subject only. The resolution, which was offered by the **Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths**, also provided that the official Board of Foreign Missions should be invited to send a committee to make whatever statement it might see fit, and to discuss the matter with the members of Presbytery in an amicable and open manner.

### Presbytery of Chester

The Presbytery of Chester, which on January 23rd adopted a "friendly statement" of grievances to the official Board, met in special session in the First Church of West Chester, Pa., on March 13th. The *pro re nata* meeting was called in order that the Board might answer the "Friendly Statement." (See CHRISTIANITY TODAY for February, 1934.) The Board was represented by a committee from its membership consisting of **Dr. Cheesman A. Herrick**, Ruling Elder, President of Girard College; **William Hiram Foulkes**, of Newark, N. J., once the apostle of the Inter-Church World and New Era movements; **Mrs. John Harvey Lee**; **J. Ross Stevenson**, President of Princeton Seminary, and **Walter L. Whallon**, of Newark, N. J. A prepared statement, dated March 12th, was read by the committee on behalf of the Board. Too long to quote, the following excerpts are illustrative as showing a Board reluctant to confess faults, and unable to change basic policies:

When the final court of our Church has determined issues brought before it its judgment must be conclusive both for the agencies of the Assembly and for the Church-at-large. The Board is very happy, nevertheless, to respond cordially and in detail to the Friendly Statement of the Presbytery. It is hoped that the Presbytery will find a number of its questions adequately and satisfactorily answered by the enclosed statement which the Board at its meeting on December 18th instructed its Committee on Policy and Methods to prepare, and which, after submission to all the members of the Board in advance, was amended and adopted by the Board at its meeting on January 15, 1934. . . .

In the case of **Mrs. Buck** and the Report of the Laymen's Appraisal Commission we would say that regarding the latter the Board has in three actions disavowed the theological basis of this Report—on November 11, 1932, March 20, 1933, and January 15, 1934. The actions of the Board on November 11, 1932, and March 20, 1933, while expressed with Christian courtesy, were explicit and definite. No Board spoke more promptly or more positively or with more faithful and judicious care regarding the issues raised by this volume than did the Presbyterian Board in these two actions which were unanimously adopted. The action of January 15th declared: "The Board definitely disavows those parts of

the volume 'Re-Thinking Missions' which are not in harmony with New Testament teachings and not in agreement with the doctrinal position of the Presbyterian Church."

Regarding Mrs. Buck's case, may we remind the Presbytery that this was fully presented before the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions at the last General Assembly and that the Committee approved the Board's action and included its endorsement of the Board's course in its recommendation for the approval by the Assembly of the minutes of the Board's proceedings. When it became clear that Mrs. Buck no longer held the evangelical position of the Presbyterian Church and that she could not consider a return to that position, the situation was met by the acceptance of her resignation in terms which seemed to the Board, as it seemed to the Church-at-large, in conformity with the Christian spirit. Surely any Christian group would "regret" such a necessity of separation.

As to emphasis on the supreme aim of the missionary enterprise as being the proclamation of the Gospel of the grace of God in Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the only Saviour of the world, the utterances of the Board for the nearly one hundred years of its history have been clear and unequivocal and never more clear and unequivocal than in recent years and today. . . .

Concerning the Candidate Department, and Auburn Affirmationist **L. S. B. Hadley**:

The second numbered paragraph of the Presbytery's statement refers to the Candidate Department. In regard to this matter we should bear in mind that under the Constitution of our Church the Boards which employ missionaries are strictly limited as to their functions and are estopped from usurping the constitutional rights of the Presbyteries. Within these limits, however, our Board has always sought in the most careful way to secure a body of Missionaries absolutely loyal to the faith of the Church and of her evangelical conviction and witness. . . . the Candidate Department of the Board has been conducted with efficiency and fidelity. . . . It is clear that the statement of the Presbytery refers to the former candidate secretary of the Board, Rev. L. S. B. Hadley, who is now pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Cortland, New York. We desire to speak with complete candor to the Presbytery in this matter. Mr. Hadley was for six years a missionary of our Church in North China. In his ordination vows he answered the constitutional questions in the affirmative and he has never qualified his position or receded from it. . . . In pursuance of its policy to have a young man as candidate secretary, thoroughly evangelical and evangelistic and not too far removed in age from the young men and women of the colleges and seminaries with whom he works, the Board called Mr. Hadley to its service in 1926. During the seven years he was connected with the Board he rendered most efficient and devoted service both as candidate secretary and as a speaker among the Churches. . . . No one could have been more careful than Mr. Hadley showed himself to be in seeking to secure candidates qualified in faith and character and in capacity. . . . As to Mr. Hadley's position he voluntarily made a statement a year ago, which, in justice to him and to the Board, it may be well to quote to remove any suspicion with regard to him. He wrote:

"There has never been any suggestion of compromise as to the Evangelical basis of judgment of our

missionary candidates. The responsibility for the Ministerial group rests with the Presbyteries. The Executive Council and the Candidate Committee of the Board have exercised the greatest care in seeking a vital evangelical faith and conviction on the part of every new missionary appointed, as you can testify.

"As for my own position I am sure you know that I am a conservative in theology. In my ordination vows before the Presbytery of Geneva in 1908 I affirmed my belief in the Scriptures as the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice; in Jesus Christ as the Eternal Son of God who became flesh and dwelt among us; that he was born of the Virgin Mary, died for our sins according to the Scriptures; rose from the dead on the third day; ascended to Heaven and ever liveth to make intercession for us.

"I have never departed from this position nor from my conviction that it is the only real motive for, and foundation of our great missionary work at home and abroad."

The Board has never had among its secretaries in the Candidate Department or elsewhere, any man who was not above "suspicion in the matter of his loyalty to the doctrinal standards of our Church and to the oft-declared motive and aim of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A."

Since the resignation of Mr. Hadley and Mrs. Corbett as Candidate Secretaries the Board has appointed no new candidate secretary. . . . When the time comes to appoint a new candidate secretary the Board will seek one who will represent the sound principles on which it has always acted and will continue to act in securing candidates fully representative of the faith and evangelical spirit of our Church.

The Board made no apologies for recent Modernist textbooks, withdrew none, but pledged "closer supervision":

With regard to mission study textbooks it should be said that the publication of such books interdenominationally has been carried on for more than thirty years through the Central Committee of Women's Boards on the United Study of Missions and the Missionary Education Movement. Scores of such books have been issued and they have been widely read and studied in our churches. There have been a few books which have not been acceptable either because of their omissions, or of their secular and non-evangelistic emphasis, or their inadequately missionary character, or of the presence or suggestion of views not representing the position of our Church. From time to time our Board has issued supplementary helps to be used with the books provided and it is and will continue to be its effort either to secure in advance satisfactory textbooks or to provide substitutes or supplements. It believes there is need of yet closer supervision and the Board will do its utmost to secure it in conjunction with the Board of Christian Education to which several years ago the General Assembly assigned the responsibility for promoting missionary study and providing the necessary aids for such study. . . .

Concerning educational institutions, the Board professed ignorance concerning textbooks used in some mission schools, although facts concerning such textbooks had been circulated widely in the pamphlet "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.," by **J. Gresham Machen**. This gave rise to the supposition that perhaps the Board had not even troubled to read Dr. Machen's brief!

In this paragraph of the Presbytery's statement it is said that "disturbing criticisms have been made concerning some of the textbooks in use and it has been alleged that non-Christian teachers are employed." The Board does not

know of these textbooks and would be glad if the Presbytery would specify the books to which reference is made and the institutions in which they are in use. . . .

After a summary of what the Board called the "true basis" of Christian missions, the statement concluded:

It is indispensable that our beloved Church should be permeated through and through with the spirit of confidence and trust, and in order that we may do the work of our common Lord with unity and joy we seek and pray for a Church united in faith and truth and love.

Following the presentation of the Board's answer, the members of its committee delivered short addresses. Then the meeting was thrown open for questions. If the members of the Committee had expected merely formal questioning, they received a surprise. For more than an hour questions came from every quarter, and discussion raged. Space does not permit the publication of these questions and answers, nevertheless it is safe to say that as time passed many of the Presbytery considered the answers unsatisfactory, sometimes even evasive. Typical questions and answers:

Regarding registered schools in China:

Q. "Is it true that in some of the schools the Bible is only elective? That our money is going for schools where the Bible is not required? Is that true?"

A. (By **Dr. Herrick**) "The present regulations of educational work in China and India have imposed certain regulations for the registration of schools. Certain benefits accrue—subventions, educational standing, and so on. Because of complicated religious conditions in India and China, and the multiplication of sects, there has been introduced a principle of freedom of choice as to religious instruction. A fixed curriculum is laid down, and such instruction is available in other schools. There is in every school to which Presbyterian money is given—and the proportion of Presbyterian money is small—but I can say unequivocally and unreservedly, there is given the opportunity and the privilege of Christian instruction."

After the reading of statements approving the "Laymen's Report," given out by **James M. Speers**, Vice-President of the Board, the following (by the Rev. **Wilbur M. Smith, D.D.**):

Q. "Why is he there?" [on the Board]

A. (By **Dr. Herrick**) "**James Speers** is not a theologian. He doesn't mean by what he says what you read into it. He ought to be judged as a layman. He didn't have the full significance of what he said. I don't know a finer Christian gentleman. He voted for this disavowal. Therefore he really didn't understand what he said. I can't answer for **James M. Speers**. I wish he could be here and answer for himself. He has given much time and money."

Q. (By **Dr. Smith**) "**Mr. Speers** is presumably an intelligent man and would know what he meant to say."

A. (By **Dr. Foulkes**) "I am a member of

the Presbytery in which he is an elder. His son is one of our most devoted and valued missionaries. Mr. Speers is a thorough evangelical Christian. When he says he is not troubled by the theology of the 'Laymen's Report' he means that the whole theological statement did not impress him as it impressed us. He is simply a man of another type."

Q. (Dr. A. L. Lathem) "Anyone of intelligence can tell from Mr. Speers' position that he is not an evangelical Christian."

\* \* \*

Q. (By the Rev. G. A. Leukel, D.D.) [Concerning unsound textbooks cited in Dr. Machen's pamphlet on the testimony of Dr. A. B. Dodd and Chancellor Arie Kok.] "Could we have the assurance by the committee that the facts given by Dr. Dodd and Chancellor Kok are not true?"

A. (By Dr. Herrick) "I could not give any such assurance. These statements have never come to my attention, so I don't know."

\* \* \*

Q. "If a Modernist candidate appears before the Candidate Department, and a Presbytery has already ordained the man, then will the Board send him as a missionary?"

A. (By Dr. Herrick) "I can conceive that one who had been ordained and had met the Board's requirements concerning zeal and Christian experience would be sent out even if he might be what you would call a modernist. That word isn't in our vocabulary."

A. (By Dr. J. R. Stevenson, quickly) "But such men would have to be examined regarding their passion for souls, and if a man did not have a passion for souls he would not want to go to the mission field."

### Presbytery's Action

The Presbytery, after discussion, postponed action until April 10th. On that date it met and by a decisive vote of about two to one adopted a statement which, while couched in respectful and almost affectionate terms, was a plain notice that confidence had not been established in the mind of the Presbytery. The action was as follows:

The Presbytery of Chester deeply appreciates the Board's cordial and detailed reply to the "Friendly Statement." We rejoice in the Board's earnest declarations of loyalty to the Presbyterian missionary aim. Yet we cannot escape the conviction that, in several particulars, the problems set forth in the "Friendly Statement" remain without a satisfying solution. May we indicate a few of the difficulties that remain?

1. It remains true that the honored Senior Secretary of the Board and the man honored

with the office of Vice-President hold contradictory views concerning "Re-Thinking Missions."

2. The Board maintains that a signer of the Auburn Affirmation can be fully loyal to the doctrinal deliverances of the General Assembly. We are by no means convinced that he can be. He may sincerely accept for himself the doctrinal deliverances of the 1923 Assembly; but he has declared, over his signature, that he is "opposed to any attempt to elevate these five doctrinal statements, or any of them, to the position of tests for ordination or for good standing in our church." If consistent, he should not scruple about accepting a candidate who does not accept the "particular theories" of the Assembly's doctrinal deliverances but who prefers "some other theory." In short, such a man can be personally sound but he cannot be loyal to the doctrinal deliverances of the supreme judicatory of our church.

3. The practical fact remains that the appointment of a Signer of the Auburn Affirmation to an official position of importance cannot but be most disquieting to a large section of the church.

4. The Board gives no assurance that it will not hereafter appoint a Signer of the Auburn Affirmation to the oversight of its Candidate Department.

5. Since the reception of the Board's answer, it is more difficult than ever to fix responsibility for the promotion of the distribution and use of Mission Study Books. The Board's reply places large responsibility upon the Missionary Education Department of the Board of Christian Education. On the contrary, a letter from the Director of Missionary Education, under date of February 20, 1934, places the responsibility squarely upon the Board Secretaries, who have "examined the manuscripts of these adult texts and pronounced them good." A later letter, from the same Director, under date of March 29, 1934, denies that any adult texts have been finally approved and leaves it uncertain whether responsibility rests upon the Mission Boards, upon the Board of Christian Education, upon the latter Board's Curriculum Committee, or upon its Administrative Committee. Meanwhile, the preliminary announcement for 1934-1935 is none too assuring. The selection of Dr. Albert W. Palmer and of Kagawa to write mission study books is most disturbing.

6. Many of us fail to understand the Board's elation over the registration of some of its school of higher education in China. We regret the sacrifice of the School's Christian Testimony to the commercial value of its diploma. We believe that the use of missionary gifts for the support of a secular education that is divorced from definite Christian instruction is unfair to the giver.

7. Serious problems involving textbooks and the employment of non-Christian teachers remain unsolved. Although the Board does not know of the existence of questionable textbooks, no answer is yet available to the detailed charges set forth in a widely-circulated pamphlet entitled "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the

U. S. A." A severe critic of textbooks is Dr. Albert B. Dodd, a missionary in the employ of our Board. We maintain that the Board's answer to these charges should be just as accessible as the pamphlet containing the charges.

If the Board will point the way to a satisfactory solution of these problems, it will do much to awaken a new confidence among our people—a new confidence that will release new financial resources and promote a new unity throughout our beloved church. Until these matters are disposed of in a satisfactory manner, the Presbytery seems powerless to remove the distressing situation which led to the sending of its "Friendly Statement."

### New York Presbytery Approves "Soundness" of Official Board

Perhaps the largest "boost" received by the Independent Board and those who have exposed the Modernism in the official Board's policies, was given on April 9th when the notoriously Modernist Presbytery of New York lined up with the official Board, declared its confidence in "the essential soundness of the modern missionary program" which it plainly identified with the program of that board. The text of the resolution follows, as introduced by Dr. J. V. Moldenhawer, Auburn Affirmationist Pastor of New York's First Church, formerly the fortress of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick:

"The Presbytery of New York recognizes the difficulties which the work of the Foreign Board has confronted for the past several years and records its thankful acknowledgment of the spirit by which this great enterprise has been moved as well as the excellence of its work and rightness of its aim.

"We believe that there can be no serious question as to the essential soundness of the modern missionary program with its great diversity of approach and the very large variety of its forms of human service.

"The purpose of foreign missions continues to be, like that of the church at home, the spread of the Gospel of Christ by word and by deed. Just as every kindness done to a fellow preacher is itself a declaration of our loyalty to Christ, so every worthy word that declares God's grace in Christ is itself the greatest deed that can be done for men.

"This intensive service of word and deed is the work of our foreign missionary enterprise everywhere.

"We specifically record our confidence in our Board of Foreign Missions. We approve of their truly Christian view of their duty. We praise them for the resourcefulness with which they have met and have dealt with these problems on the field. We commend the patience, the courtesy and the capacity of self-judgment with which they have met criticism both friendly and unfriendly. We pledge to them anew our hearty support and we pray for God's blessing upon their task."

# Independent Board Appoints First Missionaries

## Incorporation Announced

THE regular meeting of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions was held in the Drake Hotel, Philadelphia, on Tuesday, April 10th. After the meeting the following announcements were made:

(1) That the Board was now fully incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

(2) That the Rev. Carl MacIntire, minister of the large Collingswood Presbyterian Church, Collingswood, N. J., had been elected a member of the Board, to fill the unexpired term of the late beloved Dr. W. D. Buchanan of New York.

(3) That the Rev. and Mrs. Henry W. Coray have been appointed by the Board as its first missionaries. Other appointments are pending.

Mr. and Mrs. Coray are at present residents of West Pittston, Pa., where Mr. Coray is minister of the flourishing First Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Coray was born in 1905, at Pittston, Pa. He graduated from Wheaton College (Ill.) in 1927. He first professed his faith in Christ there in 1923. After a year at Princeton Seminary, 1928-1929, he came to newly-organized Westminster, graduating in 1931. He was considered an exceptionally able and keen student. Since 1931 he has been pastor of the West Pittston Church, where he has accomplished a fine work and is greatly beloved by his people.

Mrs. Coray was born in Philadelphia in 1906. Her maiden name was Elizabeth Behm. She attended Germantown High School and is a graduate of Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa. She is regarded as especially qualified by training and ability for the work before her.

The Corays will in all probability sail for northern China, to do pioneer work, within the next few months.

## The Philadelphia Meeting

On the evening of April 11th a great public meeting was held in the Central North Broad St. Church in Philadelphia, in the interests of the Independent Board. The meeting was a fitting climax to the day of deliberation and prayer. Standing room only was available for late-comers. Mr. and Mrs. Coray were introduced as the first missionaries of the Independent Board, and were accorded an ovation by the great throng. Many present expressed themselves afterward as having experienced some of the deepest and most inspiring moments of their lives during the meeting. Dr. Machen pre-



MR. CORAY



MRS. CORAY

sided and introduced the speakers. Short but enthusiastic and powerful addresses were delivered by the Rev. Charles F. Ball, of Bethany Collegiate Church ("the Wanamaker Church"), Philadelphia; the Rev. Harold S. Laird, of the First and Central Church, Wilmington, Del., and the Rev. J. A. Schofield, Jr., of the First Presbyterian Church of Gouverneur, N. Y. Messages in song were brought by the Rev. M. T. MacPherson, minister of the host church. Mr. Coray was especially impressive as in simple yet eloquent words he told why he was going out as a missionary, and why he was going out under the Independent Board.

After the singing of "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross," the main address was delivered by the Rev. C. J. Woodbridge, General Secretary of the Independent Board. It did not take him long to capture the heart of the audience, and soon its mind as well. He showed the necessity of the Independent Board, and called upon them all to stand for the Gospel and those who were contending for it. Rarely has the present reporter seen so quickly established a feeling of comradeship and understanding between speaker and audience.

The historic meeting was closed with prayer by Dr. Machen. Soon afterward it was evident that many who had come "al-

most persuaded" or even skeptical of the need of an Independent Board had become enthusiastic supporters.

Keynote of the meeting: Loyalty to the Bible and the God of the Bible comes first of all, and takes precedence over any other loyalty that may conflict with it. And that is good Presbyterian doctrine.

## Westminster Students to Tour

THROUGH the gift of a friend, five members of the Westminster Seminary Branch of the League of Evangelical Students hope to make a tour of the following colleges and universities during May. The purpose of the tour is, through pre-arranged meetings and personal conferences, to establish new chapters of the League, to strengthen existing chapters and "to present to students evidences of the truths of evangelical Christianity":

- May 8th—Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.
- May 9th—Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.; Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.; Bloomfield College and Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J.
- May 10th—Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.; Lehigh University, Bethlehem Pa.; Moravian College and Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.
- May 11th—Albright College, Myerstown, Pa.; Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa.; Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
- May 12th—Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pa.; Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.; Shippensburg State Teachers' College, Shippensburg, Pa.
- May 14th—University of Western Maryland, Westminster, Md.; Blue Ridge College, New Windsor, Md.; Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.
- May 15th—Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.; Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
- May 16th—Juniata College, Huntington, Pa.
- May 17th—University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.; Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa.
- May 18th—Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.; Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.; Slippery Rock State Teachers' College, Slippery Rock, Pa.; Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
- May 19th—Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.

May 21st—Bethany College, Bethany, Pa.; Fairmont Teachers' College, Fairmont, W. Va.; University of West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.

May 22nd—Davis & Elkins College, Elkins, W. Va.; Washington and Lee College, Lexington, Va.

May 23rd—Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Va.; Hampden-Sidney College, Hampden-Sidney, Va.; University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

May 24th—Sweet Brier College, Sweet Brier, Va.; University of Richmond, Richmond, Va.; William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.

May 25th—Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.; American University, Washington, D. C.; George Washington University, Washington, D. C.; Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

May 26th—University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.; Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Milton College, Baltimore, Md.

May 28th—University of Delaware, Newark, Del.; Washington College, Chestertown, Md.

In this connection the committee has asked that readers please:

(1) Send in the names of student contacts in these institutions. (2) Remember them before God in prayer throughout the trip. (3) Support the League with gifts, thus enabling it to keep a General Secretary in the field throughout the entire college year, so that he may be able to do thoroughly throughout the year what these students must hastily accomplish in one month. Communications may be addressed to Egbert W. Andrews, Secretary, Westminster Seminary Branch, 1528 Pine Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Presbyterian Church, he pointed out, was of the first kind, the Presbyterian U. S. A., of the second. But the plan of union, committed the Church to the *third* type—radically different from that in use in *either* Church. Why? Certainly it was no halfway compromise between the Presbyterians and the United Presbyterians, but a clear step toward Modernism.

After debate was closed, the vote was taken and the overture was adopted, 29 to 23, at 6.45 P. M. Had the large numbers present earlier in the day been present, the proportions, it is believed, would have been about the same.

## Organic Union

ORGANIC union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the united Presbyterian Church of North America came to the fore again in late March and April.

### Philadelphia Presbytery Overtures Against Plan of Union

The Presbytery of Philadelphia, meeting on April 2nd, adopted the "Griffiths Overture" asking the General Assembly not to send down the plan of union because of doctrinal deficiencies. Its text is as follows:

"The Presbytery of Philadelphia respectfully overtures the 146th General Assembly not to approve or send down to the Presbyteries the proposed plan of union with the United Presbyterian Church, since that plan

- (1) By appending the Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church and the Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith of 1902 to the basis of union as "historical interpretative statements"; and
- (2) By making certain changes in the present formula of subscription for ministers;

weakens the witness of the Church to the system of doctrine of the Confession of Faith and threatens the historical doctrinal continuity of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A."

In presenting his overture the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths made it perfectly plain that he was in favor of union with the United Presbyterian Church—if that union were upon a right basis. He expressed the hope that no one would make the mistake of supposing that he held an unbrotherly attitude toward the United Presbyterians. On the contrary, he had great respect and admiration for them. His objection was not to union but to this proposed basis of union. He showed from official press releases just what members of the joint committee on organic union thought of "Historical Interpretative Statements." Certainly adoption of the plan in this form would weaken the

witness of the Church to the Confession and its system of doctrine.

Dealing with the second point raised by the overture, namely, the change in the formula of subscription, the mover showed clearly that the new question was a concession to modernism. To prove this he quoted from two modernist publications, the *Christian Century* and the *Presbyterian Advance*. (See below.) He ended with a plea that the Church should think twice before going down the road of doctrinal declension and ruin, from which no church had ever returned.

The opponents of the overture in no case met the specific allegations made, but contented themselves with the time-worn formula, "Let us forget our little differences," and "That they all may be one." It had been requested by the first speaker for the overture that the words of our Lord quoted be not brought into the debate because no one was opposing true Christian unity or union, but only the wrong features of this particular basis, which features our Lord certainly would not have endorsed. One member of Presbytery, however, in opposing the overture made the astounding statement that he, after forty years in the Presbyterian ministry, had just learned for the first time that he had subscribed to the system of doctrine of the Confession as the *only* system taught in Scripture!

The Rev. Prof. Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D., Moderator of the Presbytery, left the chair and spoke for the overture, showing clearly the modernism of the "Confessional Statement" in making the Bible the supreme guide in "spiritual truth"—with no mention of factual truth. The Rev. Prof. N. B. Stonehouse, Th.D., also spoke in favor of the overture, showing the three great types of creed subscription: (1) The churches that require subscription to the whole doctrine of the Confession; (2) the churches that require subscription to the system of doctrine as the only Scriptural system; and (3) the Churches which require only a very loose subscription for ministers. The United

### The Christian Century

The bombshell of the spring was the publication in the *Christian Century*, Modernist arch-organ, in its issue of March 14th of an editorial entitled "A Presbyterian stride towards Union." Its significance lay in the fact that in it, Modernist opinion was brought to support conservative judgment that the plan of union was a concession to Modernism. Significant excerpts:

Those outside of the Presbyterian fold, as well as those inside, will at once ask, What degree of conformity to the historic standards of Calvinistic theology, as embodied in the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, is to be required by the proposed terms of subscription in the united church? Is there to be a tightening or a loosening of the bonds of Calvinistic orthodoxy? Not to instigate any charges of heresy, it is a matter of rather common knowledge that there has been a considerable change of climate in Presbyterian territory within the past century, and there now exist fairly wide diversities of doctrinal definition and emphasis within the ministry of the bodies concerned in this union project. Will that diversity be recognized in the new formularies, or are they so drawn as to embarrass or exclude some who have hitherto found it possible to come to terms with both their intellects and their consciences under the old terms?

The crucial point in the new formula of subscription is its second question to which candidates for the ministry must respond:

Do you believe and acknowledge the system of doctrine professed by this church as contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as taught in the Word of God, and do you engage to adhere to and maintain its truths?

At first glance, this seems strict enough to please the most conservative. But not so. Not only do many of the younger ministers protest that this formula, like the old one, binds the church to a system of doctrine which men "have devised"—as the assembly of 1824 frankly put it—instead of leaving it free to grow in knowledge of the truth, but a conservative element, led by Professor Machen, protests that it gives away the whole case by failing to specify that the system of doctrine expressed in the historic standards is the one and only system contained in the Bible. When the text is examined more critically, it appears that Professor Machen and those who join with him in his protest are right. The formula represents a



decided, though cautious, advance. The old formula required acceptance of the confession of faith "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." The new one demands only acceptance of it "as taught in the Word of God."

One is not, then, required to affirm that there can be no other system of doctrine whose component parts are not also drawn from the teachings of the Bible. The Bible is a large and varied body of literature. God hath spoken at sundry times and in divers manners; and the men who produced the sacred books heard and thought and wrote in equally varied manners. John's idea of God was not David's, and Paul had concepts of the means of grace other than those of James. Let us say, as the candidate for Presbyterian ordination is to be required to say under the new formula, that the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster confession of faith contains nothing which is not drawn from Holy Writ. Still, there may be other systems of doctrine which are equally taught in the Word of God.

As a matter of fact, there are. Presbyterian sages of a hundred years ago spoke of the Westminster confession as a formulation of "truths diffused through the sacred scriptures" into a system by "men of sound learning, full of the Holy Ghost and mighty in the scriptures." But other men, equally learned, Spirit-filled and mighty, have found other truths and devised other systems. . . .

Now if the basis of union which the joint committee of these two Presbyterian bodies have approved means that their common creed is something like that—a body of religious truth drawn from the Bible, the acceptance of which is not to be construed as aspersing any other body of truth which others may draw from the same source—it represents a signal and sensible triumph of the liberal spirit, and a triumph which is all the more liberal in its spirit because it leaves room in the church for men who hold the most conservative theology, provided they do not insist that their theology is the only one which a Christian man can hold. Professor Machen is, we think, right in so interpreting the new formula. His keen, incisive mind,

skilled to divide,

A hair 'twixt south and southwest side, did not overlook, as a less meticulous critic or a more careless theologian might have done, the significant difference between the system and a system of truths drawn from the Bible. If he has called attention to a point which might otherwise have escaped attention, he deserves the gratitude of all schools of Presbyterian opinion. He has helped them to take this step, if they take it, with their eyes open to its meaning.

It is true that Professor Machen finds something objectionable in this implied generous attitude toward other systems of doctrine than that embodied in the Westminster confession. Naturally, The Christian Century cannot follow him there. Neither, it may be predicted, will very many of his fellow-Presbyterians. . . .

Some of the more liberal thinkers in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. protest that the plan of union binds upon them afresh a Calvinistic theology the bonds of which had grown somewhat thin and loose. They are disappointed that subscription to the Westminster confession is required on any terms. When a new formula is being written, why not do it right?—make it, for example,

like the test questions for the ministry of the United Church of Canada, which make no mention of any creed whatever. The only answer to this question, from our point of view, is that, while this would be a tremendous stride in the right direction, it would undoubtedly be such a long step that too many members of the churches concerned would not take it and the proposed union would fail. Better a short step that can be taken than a long one that can only be talked about.

And this is not, after all, such a short step. For those who have hitherto held the Westminster doctrines as the system of truth taught in the scriptures to hold them still but only as one of the systems which men have devised out of materials drawn from that source is a step so long that it may fairly be called a stride.

### The Presbyterian Banner Agrees

The Presbyterian Banner, leading organ of Modernism in the Presbyterian Church, in an editorial in its issue of March 22nd, agreed with the *Christian Century*.

Excerpts:

The Westminster Standards now constitute our doctrinal basis, and they will continue to be the only doctrinal basis if the union is consummated. Readers do not need to be told that this paper has repeatedly advocated the adoption of a shorter creed, with more emphasis upon the vital and less upon the theological phases, of religion. It is of the same opinion still, but that is not the question up for decision at our spring presbyteries. The only question is the question of whether we believe that union with another branch of the Presbyterian family is desirable and will tend to advance the kingdom of God.

To be sure, there are some slight changes in "The Formula of Subscription." That formula, however, is not a part of the doctrinal basis. It is simply a form to be used in publicly accepting the doctrinal basis. The only important difference between the old formula and the new is this: The old formula requires the ordinand to affirm that the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Confession is the system (as if it were the only system taught in the Holy Scriptures). The proposed formula merely requires a declaration that the doctrine set forth in the Westminster symbols is taught in the Scriptures.

Of course, it would be a little more accurate to say that this doctrine was deduced from the Scriptures by our fathers, which is an undeniable historical fact. It is not an undeniable historical fact that the Bible teaches any theological "system of doctrine." . . .

A number of ministers have criticized that paragraph [No. 2] rather sharply, not because of its content, but because of its English. The editor, therefore, ventured to raise with some members of the Joint Committee the question whether its English could not be improved without the slightest change in its purpose.

The editor understands the paragraph to assert that "the system of doctrine professed by this church," and which is contained in the Westminster Standards, is taught in the Word of God; but not to assert that it is the only system taught in the Word of God. Correspondence brings the information that some of the United Presbyterian members of the committee did not want a statement affirming that any "system" is taught in the Word of God, and

accepted the present form of the paragraph because it did not positively assert that our system is taught in the Scriptures, though such a conclusion might be implied by the words. . . .

### Dr. E. C. Reeve Celebrates 25th Anniversary of Pastorate

ON March 11th the Rev. E. C. Reeve, D.D., completed twenty-five years of service as the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Clearfield, Pa. In commemoration of his quarter of a century of service Dr. Reeve delivered on that date the first sermon given by him in Clearfield. Dr. Reeve took charge of the pastorate on March 14, 1909, but paid a visit to Clearfield on January 17th of the same year. One of his sermons preached at the anniversary was delivered on that first trip to Clearfield, at which time Dr. Reeve stated he did not know he would later become pastor of the church.

After taking charge of the pastorate on March 14, 1909, Dr. Reeve delivered as one of his sermons, "If a Man Die, Shall He Live Again?" This sermon was repeated at the morning worship. On his visit here on January 17th he delivered as one of his sermons while a guest pastor, "The Crossed Hands of God." This sermon was repeated at the evening worship.

Since coming to Clearfield from the Diss-ton Memorial Presbyterian Church at Tacony, near Philadelphia, Dr. Reeve has given 25 years of the highest kind of service to his church, its congregation, and the community as a whole.

As a pastor Dr. Reeve has received into his church 1,410 communicants and has been greatly instrumental in building the Presbyterian Church to the point where it ranks with the finest churches in Clearfield. At the present time the membership is 820. Of those taken into the church more than half, 746, have been baptized by him. Children formed the greatest number of those baptized, of which there were 556. Adults baptized numbered 190.

Dr. Reeve has officiated at ceremonies which have joined more than 1,100 persons in holy matrimony. During the same time he has conducted 513 funerals. Also, estimating that he delivered sermons twice weekly on an average of 45 Sundays a year, in addition to the mid-week sermon on Wednesday, Dr. Reeve has delivered approximately 3,400 addresses during the quarter of a century at his present post.

Dr. Reeve's congregation have great admiration for his abilities and characteristics, indicated by the steady increasing membership of the church during the 25 years. His fellow pastors also have recognized his worth to Clearfield and took the opportunity to honor the occasion of his 25th anniversary with a commemoration service held in the Presbyterian Church on Monday, March 12th. All Protestant churches in town joined in this service.

## New England and New York

By the Rev. L. Craig Long

APRIL the fifth was celebrated by some Presbyterians as Greater New England Presbyterian Day. Meetings were held in the Church of the Covenant in Boston with the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and the Moderator of the United Presbyterian Church as guests and speakers of honor. The Rev. Robert L. Barbor has finished his work in the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Bridgeport. His resignation was reported as being due to extremely critical financial conditions. The press reported that the holders of the mortgage were making such large demands that it would be impossible to pay the Minister's salary for any longer period. Mr. Reginald Voorhees, one of the Elders of that Church, is now a student at Westminster Seminary. Another student at Westminster, Mr. Maxwell Lathrop, supplied the pulpit of the Westminster Church on March 11th. Mr. Voorhees also made contacts for two other Westminster students to supply in Bridgeport on March 4th and 11th in the Black Rock Congregational Church. These students were Mr. Donald Graham and Mr. Brainard Legters. We know that the Gospel was preached in Bridgeport through these servants of the Lord and His people must have been spiritually strengthened by feasting upon the Word. On March 11th Dr. Cornelius VanTil was the guest of honor in the pulpit of the Calvin Presbyterian Church of New Haven. The five young men who are planning to go to Westminster Seminary from the Calvin Church now know and love three members of that faculty, and Dr. VanTil's visit to New Haven served to strengthen and assure those young men and others that God was calling them to preach the unsearchable riches of God through Christ. Another defender of the essential doctrines of Christianity, Dr. Donald Gray Barnhouse, has been preaching in New England each Monday and Tuesday evening. Although his meetings were first held only in Boston, he also held two meetings in the First Baptist Church of Springfield, Mass., where large crowds welcomed him. Reports of Presbytery meetings which readers of this column would like to have included in this monthly column should be sent to Post Office Box 1000, New Haven, Conn. They will be welcomed if signed.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

## Eastern Pennsylvania Letter

By the Rev. John Burton Thwing, Th.D.

PHILADELPHIA NORTH PRESBYTERY, at its March meeting in the Italian Church of Our Saviour, voted down a resolution urging the Board of Foreign Missions to request the resignation of any of its members who approved of the Laymen's

Report. The measure, ably presented by Dr. Jesse M. Corum, of Norristown, was lost by a vote of 49 to 31, with many not voting. Dr. Corum's church has already placed itself in the front ranks in the nation-wide protest against Modernism by refusing to contribute further through the old Board.

Dr. Harold McAfee Robinson recently supplied the pulpit of the Second Church of Germantown, during the illness of the pastor, the Rev. John Harvey Lee. The Rev. Mr. Lassiter, stated supply at Ivyland, has been transferred to the Presbytery of Baltimore. The Rev. Mr. James was received from the Presbytery of Holston, Tennessee, and will become the pastor of the projected Church of Our Saviour near Narberth, for which an application signed with 120 names was presented to the presbytery.

The Rev. H. H. Crawford, pastor of the Hermon Church of Frankford, died March 13th, after a month's illness. Among other recent deaths are those of Dr. William H. Voorhees, of Eddington, a presbyter of long experience and scholarly attainments, and Dr. Edmund Morris Ferguson of Swarthmore, a former educational superintendent of the Board of Publication, and the author of several books.

The Rev. Melville B. Gurley, who recently resigned the Market Square Church of Germantown, as a result of his espousal of Buchmanism, was confirmed in the Protestant Episcopal faith by Bishop Taitt in the Gloria Dei (Old Swedes) P. E. Church, April 1st. He will seek ordination in that denomination.

The Rev. Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D., was elected Moderator of Philadelphia Presbytery on April 2nd, succeeding the Rev. Hilko de Beer, winning by a single ballot, 60 to 37, over his only opponent, Dr. J. B. C. Mackie. At this meeting Dr. McCormick's resolution regarding the Independent Board was postponed, and Presbytery set April 16th at 2 P. M. as the date for a hearing at which representatives of the old Board of Missions will also be present and the matter fully discussed.

Thomas C. Cannon of Fourth Church, Philadelphia, was licensed by the presbytery. Commissioners to the General Assembly are: The Revs. Hilko de Beer, Charles F. Ball, William McClung, J. G. Newman, J. Norris McDowell, David Curry and W. L. McCormick; and Elders M. M. Smith of Walnut Street Church, Edgar Frutchey of Tioga Church, D. T. Richman of Emmanuel Church, Alex. Proven of Ontario Church, H. C. Albin of Evangel Church, C. F. Hardie of Trinity Church, and H. F. Dittman of Temple Church.

A notice of complaint against Philadelphia Presbytery in the matter of its reception of Dr. J. Gresham Machen, signed by 44 ministers and elders, was read by the Stated Clerk for information. Dr. Machen, present up to this point, which arrived in mid-afternoon, then asked Presbytery's leave

to withdraw, which was granted. Since the presbytery has no knowledge that the notice has been followed by an actual complaint, the reading of the notice required no action and received none. Dr. Machen's statement that he did not refuse to answer any question was incorporated with the minutes. It is understood in a general way that Dr. Machen's connection with the Independent Board is the basis of this minority's objection to him. So vague are the terms of the notice, however, that it will be interesting to know just what the complaint deals with, if and when it appears.

The Rev. I. Sturges Shultz, Stated Clerk, Dr. Edward S. Bowman, Permanent Clerk, and Allan S. Sutherland, Treasurer, were re-elected. Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse announced a leave of absence of 16 months granted to him by the Tenth Church, and Dr. Merrill T. MacPherson was appointed to moderate the Session in his absence.

PHILADELPHIA

## Western Pennsylvania Letter

By the Rev. H. J. Ockenga

I HAVE just returned from a very unique and unusual Good Friday service in the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh. The auditorium seats, with extra chairs, fifteen hundred, the chapel with its two balconies one thousand more. At 10 o'clock in the morning a fair scattering of people were in the auditorium. They had come early to get a good seat. At 10.30 a large number were present; at 11.30 the auditorium was completely filled. At 11.50 the chapel was filled. By 12.05, when the service commenced, the standing room was taken and hundreds were in the church basement listening through an amplifier. During the service hundreds more were turned away. What is it that attracts such an audience to this meeting?

Certainly the choir, under the leadership of Mr. John Bell, who for fifty years has been organist in the First Church, is one of the nation's best. But music is not the magnet. When the text was announced, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," and the sermon began the answer was given. "God was present," said a Y. M. C. A. secretary. He was present, honoring His Word. It is seldom today that one hears a sermon like that on "Sin's Conqueror." The gospel was so simple and plain, presented as only a lover of the Bible and a man of literary parts could. Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney was at his best.

Said he, this was the first and the last Christian sermon that was and will be preached, for it brought the first two disciples into the church as believers on the Lamb of God, and it will be sung by the redeemed in heaven, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain." John the Beloved who was won by it, recorded both preachings. That sermon is the heart of the gospel for it

emphasized sin, original sin out of which come all others which cause the sorrow and woe of men and which separate from God, it presented the Lamb who, as interpreted by the rest of the Bible, saves men by His dying for them in substitution, and it told how sin was taken away. There can be no doubt about what John meant. Dr. Macartney made it clear that there are two kinds of churches today, those with the Lamb and those without the Lamb. It was by His bearing our sins by the shedding of His blood that sin is taken away. The sacrifice of the Lamb made evident that we cannot save ourselves no matter what we do, and so must believe on Him, that God here revealed the awful cost of sin which demanded that life of His Son, and so we must be holy, and that He placed a great value on the life of the sinner so that His gift of love should draw us unto Him. As that sermon had resulted in the conversion of John and Andrew who follow the Lamb in heaven the appeal was made that a re preaching of it might, by the grace of God, cause many of this vast audience to follow the Lamb.

Never could anyone of that vast crowd say that they did not hear the Way of Life made plain. How the world needs such preaching! That God blesses it is evident from the fact that the First Church was never in a more flourishing condition than it is now.

The Presbyterian Young People's Association had a very inspirational rally at the Second Church on March 22nd. Dr. Robert Galbreath of Westminster College presented a real challenge to the large crowd of youth for consecration. Dr. Galbreath is very popular among Pittsburgh young people.

The Buchmanites have invaded America again. Indirectly, the writer has heard that they have avoided Pittsburgh purposely because it is so conservative. That statement may or may not be true, but it is true that two important Pittsburgh pulpits have turned broadsides of attack against Buchmanism. All Bible-believing Christians should beware of the subtleties of the Buchmanite method.

PITTSBURGH

### News from Detroit and Vicinity

By the Rev. Roy L. Aldrich, Minister of the Central Presbyterian Church

THE Presbyterian Church at Dearborn, the Rev. John T. Newell, minister, recently observed its 100th anniversary. It is the second oldest church in the community.

The Cadillac Boulevard Presbyterian Church has called the Rev. H. E. Easley as supply minister for one year. He succeeds the Rev. Clarence A. Kircher, now of Sacramento, Calif. The Rev. William W. Townsend of Garden City has accepted a call to the Grace Presbyterian Church, Detroit. The Covenant Presbyterian Church is still without a pastor.

Dr. F. Paul McConkey, minister of Immanuel Presbyterian Church, was one of the speakers at the Tre Ore service in a downtown theatre building sponsored by the Detroit Council of Churches. The choir of the Central Presbyterian Church gave a splendid program of Easter music on Wednesday evening, March 28th. The pastor, the Rev. Roy L. Aldrich, gave an address on the subject, "The Resurrection and Song." Mr. Aldrich will be the speaker for the next meeting of the Detroit Baptist Ministers Association.

Sherwood Eddy, internationally known Christian layman, preached at the Central Methodist Church, Sunday, April 1st, and on Monday addressed the April meeting of the Protestant Pastors' Union of Greater Detroit at the Y. M. C. A.

The spring meeting of the Detroit Presbytery will be at Milford, April 16th.

DETROIT, MICH.

### Minnesota and Wisconsin Letter

By the Rev. H. Warren Allen

THE Easter season has come and gone. Large attendances at all church services have been reported. Three noon-day services were held in the city of Minneapolis during Passion Week and great crowds attended.

Three Minneapolis churches held their fiftieth anniversary services—Oliver, Dr. Norman B. Harrison, pastor; Highland Park, the Rev. H. W. Buck, pastor, and Bethlehem, the Rev. Paul S. Wright, pastor. The actual dates were March 7th, 19th and 1st, respectively. The First Presbyterian Church is the mother of two of these churches—Oliver and Highland Park—as well as three other churches of the city. Old First Church, the Rev. H. Warren Allen, pastor, will celebrate its one hundredth anniversary next year.

First Presbyterian Church, Duluth, held a Sunday School contest for attendance with Oliver Church of Minneapolis. Oliver won with nearly 1000 pupils on the closing Sunday.

Dr. Harry Rimmer, noted evangelist and lecturer on science and the Bible has accepted a call to First Presbyterian Church, Duluth, with much opposition on the part of modernistic ministers of the city.

The Rev. Frederick Mills, supply pastor of the House of Hope Church, St. Paul, has accepted a call to the Emerald Avenue Presbyterian Church of Chicago. Miss Jean Louise Smith, a graduate of Occidental College, has begun her work as director of religious education at the House of Hope Church, St. Paul. Dr. William Lee Odell is the recently installed pastor.

The Rev. Karl Buswell of Tucson, Arizona, preached in Stewart Memorial Church, Minneapolis, on March 11th. The Rev. H. S. Higgins, pastor.

Major Albert L. Evans, the newly appointed chaplain at Fort Snelling, is a Pres-

byterian minister and now a member of Minneapolis Presbytery.

The Presbytery of Minneapolis held its annual Spring meeting at Homewood Presbyterian Church, Dr. J. T. Bergen, pastor, on Tuesday, April 3rd. The Rev. C. C. Adams of Maple Plain, Minn., was elected moderator. He is a conservative. The Rev. Faris and the Rev. P. H. Pollock were elected commissioners to the Assembly.

Other meetings of Presbytery are: Duluth, April 9th and 10th; Adams at Hallock, Minn., April 10th; St. Paul, Tuesday, April 10th; Mankato at Mankato, April 16th and 17th; Winona at Rochester, April 17th; St. Cloud at Sartel, Minn., April 17th and 18th. MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

### Dr. McPheeters Unveils the "So-Called Investigation" of Dr. Hay Watson Smith

By Rev. Prof. Wm. Childs Robinson, Th.D.

DR. WM. M. MCPHEETERS, the veteran defender of the faith, has just issued a notable pamphlet entitled "Facts Revealed by the Records in the So-Called Investigation of the Rumors Abroad Concerning the Soundness in the Faith of the Rev. Dr. Hay Watson Smith." This hundred and twenty page pamphlet reveals the utter disregard of the accepted principles of judicial propriety, fidelity to truth and regard for the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (Southern) perpetrated by Arkansas Presbytery and its investigating commission by which the modernistic pastor was exonerated of doctrinal unsoundness. The pamphlet may be had from the author on request. Address Dr. W. M. McPheeters, Decatur, Ga.

*The Auburn Affirmation*

In accord with a suggestion from Dr. Smith the chairman of the commission charged with investigating these rumors mailed each member of the commission a copy of the Auburn Affirmation in January, 1930. The careful Southern scholar has this to say of the Affirmation:

"This is not the place to discuss the Auburn Affirmation. To do so would demand too much time and space, and would divert attention from the matter in hand. I must content myself with just two remarks. One is that the oftener I read it the more deeply I am convinced that its conception of Christian liberty in connection with subscription to the system of doctrine set forth in the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., is intellectually absurd, historically false, ethically detestable and pernicious, and religiously blasphemous. Of more fundamental importance is the fact that in our church the significance of the ordination obligation is far less open to misconceptions than it is in the case of the Presby-

terian Church in the U. S. A. For one thing, in our church the ordination obligation itself is perfectly explicit and is assumed not merely by the answering of questions propounded to applicants for ordination, but by a written formula to which the applicant, after he has answered the questions, subscribes his name in writing. Further, happily for our church, it has up to this time avoided unions effected by means of ambiguous phrases that lend themselves easily to misconstruction."

#### *The Test*

This pamphlet sets forth clearly the fact that the Southern Presbyterian Church is facing before God and the world such ultimate questions as her own respect for truth, honor, righteousness and the validity of her Constitution. Will the Church of Palmer, Thornwell, Dabney, Peck, Stuart Robinson, Beattie and other defenders of the Word and the Westminster Standards go the way of other Presbyterian communions or will the eternal Head of the Church give this denomination dedicated to Him grace to withstand the tremendous assaults of naturalistic "liberalism"?

DECATUR, GA.

## The Presbyterian Church in Canada

By T. G. M. B.

THE Sixtieth General Assembly is to meet in Knox Church, Toronto, on June 6th. The Presbyteries of Quebec, Montreal, Glengarry, Lanark and Renfrew, Brockville, and Kingston have nominated Dr. Norman A. MacLeod of Brockville, Ont., for Moderator, while the nominee of the Presbyteries of Peterborough, Barrie, and Guelph is Dr. James S. Shortt of Barrie, Ont.

Dr. MacLeod was born and brought up in Cape Breton, N. S., and was educated at Pictou Academy, McGill University (B.A., 1891), the Presbyterian College, Montreal (B.D., 1894), and Hartford Theological Seminary (Ph.D.). He was one of the youngest men ever to graduate from the Presbyterian College, and was ordained at Osnabruck in Glengarry Presbytery in 1894. His succeeding pastorates were Edinburgh Church, Ottawa Presbytery, 1898-1903; First Presbyterian Church, Brockville, 1903-13; Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Que., 1913-19, and Caintown and Lansdowne, Ont., near Brockville, since 1925. While in Ste. Anne de Bellevue, he taught Scripture at the Protestant Normal School connected with MacDonald College, and in 1919 went to Hartford Seminary to study Religious Education. In April, 1932, Dr. MacLeod received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the Presbyterian College, Montreal, and the same year was unanimously elected Moderator of Montreal and Ottawa Synod. He has also for some years been Budget Convener of the Synod, and is a member of the Board of Administration and the Assembly's Budget Com-

mittee. During the last year Dr. MacLeod has represented the Moderator, Dr. H. R. Grant, in various capacities throughout the Church.

Dr. Shortt was born in Walkerton, Bruce county, in 1874. He was educated at Queen's University (B.A., 1894; M.A., 1897); Queen's Theological Faculty (graduate, 1897, with Queen's Travelling Fellowship); and New College, Edinburgh (1899-1901). He was ordained in 1902 at Davisburg, Alta., and ministered at Knox Church, Calgary, as assistant, 1908-10; at Innisfail, Alta., 1910-16; at Olds, Alta., 1916-24; and at St. Andrew's, Barrie, Ont., since 1924. In 1932 he received the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity from Queen's University, a non-sectarian institution, many of whose trustees and senate are Presbyterian laymen. Dr. Shortt was Moderator of Synod twice—Alberta in 1913, and Toronto and Kingston in 1928.

Half of the graduating class of Knox College will go West—Douglas Davidson, M.A., to Norwood, Winnipeg; Wallace McClean to Nelson, B. C.; H. G. Lowry, B.A., to Portage la Prairie, Man.; and A. N. McMillan to Kimberley, B. C. The remainder stay in Ontario—John Y. Fraser in Streetsville; David Gowdy, B.A., in Durham; G. D. Little in Elmira and Alma; and Finlay G. Stewart in Huntsville.

TORONTO

## Scottish Letter

By the Rev. Prof. D. MacLean, D.D.,  
Free Church College, Edinburgh

THE Commissions of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland and Free Church met in Edinburgh on March 7th. The Commissions were well attended and work of importance was transacted.

In the Church of Scotland Commission reports on finances for the maintenance of the Ministry and Foreign Mission work were considered highly satisfactory. In respect to the former the minimum stipend of £300 a year could easily be paid, and in the case of Foreign Missions threatened curtailment of agencies will be averted by a remarkable response to appeals made to the people. The expansion and reconstruction of buildings to meet the growing need of new populous areas in Scotland received attention.

At both Commissions hearty support was given to the promotion of the Bill before Parliament to restrict Sunday trading. Scottish Christianity, except Romanism and high Episcopacy, was solidly behind the Bill. Yet the House of Commons "talked out" the Bill on March 9th. But even the minority who opposed the Bill, on alleged grounds of "class" discrimination in its details, accepted its principle, and paid lip homage at least to the claims of the Lord's Day. Scotland has been awakened to the seriousness of a situation for which the Church is not entirely blameless with its past indif-

ference to the craze for record breaking—even the Divine Record. The politicians will have a further opportunity to show the sincerity of their profession of acceptance of the principle of curtailing the present opportunities for Sunday trading.

At both Commissions attention was drawn to the European situation as it affected the Reformed Churches.

A long pronouncement was made from the Moderator's Chair in the Church of Scotland Commission. The Commission was asked "to sanction a declaration on religious liberty on the Continent, which, in view of the grave religious conditions prevailing over a wide area in Europe, and in particular the situation which had recently arisen in Germany, extended to their Continental brethren, both Presbyterian and Lutheran, their profound sympathy in their present anxiety and distress. . . . The Commission prayed that a way might speedily be opened up for the restoration in Church and State of peace and concord, and the dispelling of the menace of anarchy, violence and pagan unbelief, and appealed for public and private intercession during the season of Easter on behalf of all who were suffering by reason of the present distresses."

In the Free Church Commission a somewhat similar resolution of sympathy with the Reformed brethren in Germany was adopted. The present writer in moving that resolution drew attention to the appalling conditions in Russia. Russia was a land of hunger. To appease its pangs, men and women, in certain areas, had been driven to abandon all natural affection. To profess Christianity there was well-nigh impossible. There Christians were always on the cross. There were, however, two distinct features in the Church life of Europe today which were encouraging. There was a widespread return to the doctrines of the Reformed System and a renewal of emphasis on salvation by grace.

In Germany their Reformed brethren were, as in every Reformed country, the most loyal of citizens and the most valuable moral assets of the nation. Their struggle there was for the authority and freedom of the Holy Scriptures as against the claims of cultured paganism. Scotland, with tragic but heroic pages of endurance for the crown rights of Christ, was appealed to at the present time to sympathize with and pray for the Reformed brethren in Germany.

EDINBURGH

## Irish Letter

By S. W. Murray

AMONG recent visiting preachers to Belfast were Dr. George Jackson, formerly of Didsbury College, England, and Dr. Conrad Hoffman, secretary of the Jewish Missions Continuation Committee (Edinburgh Conference).

At the March meeting of the Belfast Presbytery the Rev. Samuel Simms tendered his resignation as he now wished to relinquish the active duties of the ministry. He received his training for the ministry in the U. S. A. and has been pastor of the Bethany Church for more than 40 years. He has maintained a strong Evangelical ministry and has been prominently associated with united evangelistic campaigns from time to time.

On March 15th a large and representative gathering met at a complimentary tea in Belfast to honour four members of the Presbytery who this year celebrate their ministerial jubilee. These ministers are the Rev. Dr. J. H. Morton, clerk of Presbytery, the Rev. Dr. J. A. Bain, editor of the "Missionary Herald," the Rev. J. M. McIlwrath, B. A., minister emeritus of Richview Church, and the Rev. Dr. Arnold Frank of the Jewish Mission, Hamburg, who was unfortunately unable to be present.

The Rev. Charles Orr, B.A., LL.B., formerly of Seaforde and Clough, was on March 13th installed as minister of First Ballymoney Presbyterian Church in succession to the Rev. A. H. Dill, M.A. (deceased).

The speakers announced for the Bangor Faith Mission Convention (March 29th to April 3rd) include the Rev. J. R. S. Wilson, B. D. (Leith), Dr. E. T. Pace of the "Sunday School Times," Mr. A. Paget Wilkes of the Japan Evangelistic Band, and Capt. Reginald Wallis of Liverpool.

The second issue of a unique publication has come to hand. It is the "Praise and Prayer Bulletin" of the Revival Fellowship which is an organisation for the mobilisation of prayer and is representative of various Evangelical agencies in Ireland. The editor of the Bulletin is Mr. R. E. Sloan, B. A., who is a student for the Presbyterian ministry and the Traveling Secretary of the Fellowship is Mr. J. Edwin Orr of Belfast.

The Synod of Belfast met for its stated meeting on Tuesday, March 20th. Among matters which came up at the Synod were church extension and the method of election of Moderators of the Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church.

BELFAST

### Letter from France "They Shall Not Pass"

By Pastor A. Cruvellier, of the  
*Eglise réformée évangélique*

(A Translation)

WE recently printed in this column the order of the day on the question of the unity of the Reformed Church unanimously voted by the Evangelical Pastoral Conferences of the South (January, 1934). This represents an action the importance of which will certainly grow. The evangelical pastors of the south—gathering near the

Tower of Constance, symbol of resistance—indicated their resolve to oppose modernism by maintaining as the foundation of the church the traditional principles of the gospel and of the Reformation, expressed in the Declaration of Faith of 1872. To this declaration all those who are charged with teaching in the church are obliged personally to subscribe. A new era filled with rich promise opens before our churches in France.

Profiting by the troubled years of the war and post-war periods, modernism has exercised such a nefarious influence on our French churches that it has largely paralyzed their evangelical action. Little by little it filtered into the Directing Committees of our large evangelistic and missionary Societies, whose fundamental principles are, however, clearly evangelical. In theory these principles continue to exist. In fact, they are no longer a barrier against destructive modernism. The modernists themselves are the first to admit this and to rejoice in the fact. However, their joy is incomplete. In order that it may be perfect, they must win one more victory—they must do to the church what they have already succeeded in doing with most of the undertakings and societies still called evangelical but whose doors are now wide open to modernists. They are quite ready to have resound through the church as many declarations of faith as any one wishes, provided that, in practice, they mean nothing consequential.

However, when it comes to the church itself the enterprise is more difficult. The Directing Committees of the undertakings and societies of which we have just been speaking are selected by co-optation. The modernists only needed to win over the members of these committees to their views and this was done with an ease such as would never have been expected. But one cannot proceed in the same way in the church. There one must reckon with its presbyterial and synodical organization, which makes higher committees agents of execution more than direction. The approval of the synods upon actions is necessary.

Difficulties, however, do not stop the modernists. The unlooked-for victories which they have hitherto won have encouraged them to go forward audaciously. They are also well aware that circumstances will never again be as favorable as now. They must win their objective before the movement of Calvinistic revival which, to an ever greater and greater degree, is attracting youth, develops too far. If they do not, there will soon not even remain the possibility of reaching the slightest accord on the basis of doctrinal indifference.

Therefore, in a brusque attack of wide scope, the modernist Reformed national synod in June, 1933, requested the Evangelical Reformed national synod to enter into discussions looking toward reconstituting the unity of the Reformed church.

Taken completely unawares and unable to refuse absolutely to enter into conversations with the liberals (and that was all they were asking), the Evangelical synod accepted the invitation without even attempting to impose the slightest conditions upon the procedure proposed by the synod of the left. Since that time, in accordance with this procedure, the conversations have been carried on in the silence of the Directing Committees. Of course, it will be necessary for the synods to act upon the result, whatever it may be, of these conversations. But how long are the conversations going to last? Only God knows. While we are waiting, uneasiness in the churches is growing because of the systematic silence in which everything is enveloped.

At present when the confusion in the church, as everywhere else, is extreme, the evangelical directing bodies do not consider themselves obliged to give to the faithful the comforting and reassuring words which they are awaiting. The evangelical pastors did, however, consider it necessary to let people know their firm intention of keeping the church in the path of fidelity to its fundamental principles, a fidelity not only theoretical but practical. That is what the pastoral conference at Lunel did. Modernists were not deceived. Their organ, "*Évangile et Liberté*," called the Lunel manifesto "unmistakable intransigence," and they did not hide the fact that the object of the modernists is to make of the Reformed church exactly what they have already made of our great evangelistic and missionary societies—a church proclaiming in its Declaration of Faith as many evangelical doctrines as any one may wish, but leaving the door wide open for contrary views.

But that shall not be. Lunel will be the Verdun of the evangelical resistance to which already victory belongs. Intolerant modernism will not triumph in the Reformed Church of France, the Church of the Bible, the Church of Calvin and of the Huguenot martyrs. "*They shall not pass.*"

Caution was necessary. It was necessary for the modernists and also for the modernizing evangelicals. In order not to embarrass the liberals, that is their constant preoccupation, modernizers were tempted to try in the church what they have already accomplished in our large evangelistic and missionary societies—the maintenance of the traditional evangelical faith, but, at the same time, the leaving of the door of the church open to modernist principles destructive of that very faith. The method of concessions to modernism has only too abundantly proven itself. It has produced nothing but deficits of every sort in our Societies. Even if, in spite of everything, the attempt is made to continue the system in the Societies, experience is too conclusive to permit its trial now in the church. It could not work.

VAUVERT, GARD.

## The German Religious Situation

By the Rev. Henry Smith Leiper, D.D.,  
Executive Secretary of the American  
Section, Universal Christian Council for  
Life and Work.

(Reprinted because of its high news value,  
from "The Living Church," by permission.)

IN my last statement made two weeks ago in these pages I indicated that the trend of things in Germany was distinctly discouraging. That trend has been accelerated in these recent days and at least two points stand out as being of particular moment.

In the first place, **Reichsbishop Muller** has appointed **Heinrich Oberheid** as "chief of staff," with the plain inference that Church administration is to be separated from the spiritual leadership of the Church. To the chief of staff the former responsibility is assigned while the Bishop elects to maintain the spiritual leadership. On the day of his appointment **Herr Oberheid** is credited with the remarkable prophecy that such changes would be made in theology as to bring into a unified organization the Roman and the Protestant groups in Germany. He did concede that it might take a year to arrange the details of the new type of administration—and presumably he has not ventured to risk his reputation as a staff leader on any prophecy concerning the length of time involved in removing difficulties created by the Reformation!

It becomes a little confusing to one who contemplates the place assigned to the leader in the actual government of the Church, to the Reichsbishop, to the Ministerial Cabinet, and now to the chief of staff. Of course, as a matter of fact, the cabinet has been virtually abolished, the constitution has been utterly disregarded, the synods have been displaced by executive order of the Reichsbishop and even such territorial division as that between Prussia and the rest of Germany has been overruled. His Holiness, the Pope of Rome, is infallible only when he speaks *ex cathedra*, but apparently the Nazi revolution in the Church in Germany implies that both **Hitler** and **Muller** are infallible at all times and now the latter has assigned to his new chief of staff the right of making decrees which will be of equal authority with those of the Reichsbishop himself. Thus infallibility broadens from precedent to precedent. As indicative of what this apparently may mean, one reads that **Pastor Petersen** of **Lichterfelde** has been suspended for praying in his church for "our misguided Reichsbishop."

The second of the two disturbing developments referred to above is the announcement that in the future candidates for theological training as future spiritual leaders of the Church are to be selected by the leaders of Hitler Youth. Readers of the news dispatches and of my articles in *The Living Church* would not need to be told of the disastrous effect that this regulation would be bound to have if carried through.

I quoted **Baldur von Schirach**, leader of Hitler Youth, in the March 10th issue as saying, "The German race, not a religious creed, should be venerated." It is as if the most militant wing of the American Legion were to be entrusted with the selection of future candidates for holy orders in the United States. And, to carry the figure further, one would need to assume that the oversight of theological faculties would be in the hands of the chief of staff under an army chaplain suddenly raised to primacy in the Church through a personal friendship with the President.

The appointment of the chief of staff for the Church and the announcement of the plan for selection of future theological candidates coincided almost exactly with another significant gesture of protest. The Associated Press is responsible for the report on March 8th from Berlin of a meeting at which 600 pastors and laymen declared openly their determination to stand together in refusing obedience to **Reichsbishop Muller**, approving resolutions declaring their adherence to the Bible alone and their rejection of the swastika as an emblem having no place beside the Cross of Christ. They constituted themselves a "free synod." What they will be able to accomplish is not clear, but their determination and the purity of their intentions appear as one more encouraging sign on a dark horizon. It is also encouraging to know that apparently the peremptory orders of **von Schirach** respecting the dissolution of Catholic youth organizations have not been obeyed to the extent that one might expect, in view of the ruthless methods used to enforce such decrees in Nazi Germany. The Associated Press for March 16th quotes **von Schirach** as complaining of the "defiance stubbornness" hampering his campaign. He insists that "the entire nation shall pass a verdict on the Catholic youth leaders because of their loyalty to the Church rather than to the Hitler henchmen."

Taking another look into the gloom one sees the rising tide of the genuinely German religionists, as the followers of **Rosenberg** like to call themselves. **Count Ernst Zu Reventlow**, **Professor Hauer** of **Tübingen**, and **Ernst Bergmann** of **Leipzig** are standing for the creation of a definitely non-Christian religious body to stand for "truth and iron." The last named professor has produced a catechism of German religion with twenty-five theses which rejects Christianity *in toto*, and seeks redemption of the world from Christianity. "The heroic man does not wait for grace but creates his own moral salvation without grace. Neither does he wait for God's coming." And obviously he would not be interested in God's commands! **Dr. Bergmann's** thesis is that the German has his own religion which "wells up spontaneously from the racially determined way of looking at things, feeling, and thinking." These natural religionists are to seek "an antidote to the effeminate, demor-

alizing ethics of Christianity, which like some sugared poison has eaten into the hearts of men."

No wonder that **Sir Philip Gibbs** writing from Germany and reported in the *North American Newspaper Alliance* this month says, as he watches all this development and particularly the response of youth to it, "There is something terrible in it for neighboring nations, and there is something in it not belonging to European traditions. It is tribal. It is the worship of old gods. It is pagan in its origins and teaching. It is very dangerous. The young Nazis proclaim their desire for peace, and I believe them; but if their leaders called one day for war they would go marching and singing to their sacrifice. Who can be sure of the minds directing and controlling this new force in Europe, this renaissance and young vigor of a great race marching toward the great unknown with old songs on their lips and old myths in their hearts?"

Another development of recent days which has been variously explained is the appointment of a bishop for the German Protestant diaspora, estimated at 10,000—probably by including all the Lutheran and Reformed people of German descent in the United States as well as in other non-German lands. I have on my desk official announcement from the Reichsbishop's office of the appointment of **Dr. Theodore Heckel** as Bishop for Ecumenical Relations. To him is to be assigned not only the spiritual welfare of the scattered German peoples above mentioned but likewise relationships with the Churches of other orders. **Bishop Heckel**, whom I know and who was present at the important ecumenical gatherings in Europe last summer, writes me of his recent visit to England for consultation with the Bishop of Chichester, chairman of the Universal Christian Council. It is too soon to say what policies the Bishop will follow in his novel and significant task. It is disturbing, however, to find him stressing the close connection between the Reich's Church and the Nazi State. The faith of the Church, he asserts, "has as its aim to synthesize revealed religion and the Nationalist Socialist *Weltanschauung*." According to him, the "Gospel turns not to the private and liberalistic individual but to the human being put within the order of God." This human being, he says however, must be of the proper race. In this respect he accepts the pernicious and outrageous racialism flowing from the springs of wisdom reputedly found by **Houston Stuart Chamberlin** and popularized by **Adolf Hitler**. It is obviously going to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the Christians in other Churches of the world to work in fellowship with the Church which so unreservedly commits itself through its leaders to such dangerous and devastating heresies.

## Netherlands Letter

By the Rev. Prof. F. W. Grosheide  
of the Free University, Amsterdam

PERHAPS it will be interesting news for our American friends to hear something about the journey of Dr. Stanley Jones in Holland. He was here but a few days, but in that short time he had two or three public conferences every day, and besides that many private discussions. In the commission formed to receive and to introduce Dr. Stanley Jones the professors and ministers belonging to the Reformed Churches refused to have a delegate, not because they have no estimation for the renowned American missionary in British India, but because they would not be deemed to approve the missionary method of Stanley Jones.

The meetings held by Dr. Jones were overcrowded. In the Hague the Queen and the Princess were among the public. And there is a certain circle, especially consisting of ladies, which has a nearly idolatrous veneration for Stanley Jones, as for every interesting man. However, I fear a large part of the public has not understood what Dr. Jones said, not that he does not speak well, but he speaks too fast for a public of strangers. Especially his parentheses were pronounced too rapidly.

I, myself, heard Stanley Jones at Amsterdam, where he gave an interpretation of Gandhi. It was a very interesting conference. Especially the last part of his address on the theme: When I survey the wondrous Cross, was beautiful. But here is also my objection. In the course of the address we heard too little about the cross, too much about disarmament and moral life. The dilemma: The Cross on the battleship is not a good one. Nevertheless, they who expected to hear that Gandhi was as good as a Christian and could remain what he is, were happily disappointed. Stanley Jones indicated for everyone, also for Gandhi, the necessity to become a Christian.

In former letters I have often spoken about the vacating of the chair of ecclesiastical history at Leiden and the fear that on account of economy no new professor would be appointed. But we have a new one now! It is Dr. J. N. Bakhuizen van den Buish, a learned man, especially versed in the history of the old church. He belongs to the middle party, while his predecessor, Prof. Eekhof, was a man of the pure Calvinistic type. Soon the chair of ecclesiastical history in Utrecht will be vacant. We hope that we will receive there a reformed theologian of the true stamp!

AMSTERDAM

## Letter from Melbourne, Australia

By the Rev. H. T. Rush  
(Secretary of the Bible Union of Victoria)

UPWEY CONVENTION is one of the great events of the year for evangelicals in Victoria. Founded 10 years ago, on

"Keswick lines," it has grown year by year. It is held among the beauties of nature 20 miles from Melbourne and provides a double program of holiday and spiritual uplift for the Christmas to New Year season. The special speakers this year were the Rev. E. Harries of New Zealand, the Rev. Hugh Paton, formerly of Sydney and just returned from a trip to the old land, with Mr. John Ridley the evangelist. Other local speakers were the Rev. C. H. Nash of Melbourne Bible Institute, who has year by year given morning Bible studies of great value; the Revs. J. E. Newnham and A. D. Shaw. Dr. Kitchen, as chairman, was as usual brief in speech and tactful in his control of proceedings. Many missionaries, ministers and Christian workers date their call to some chosen field of service from "Upwey."

Similar conventions are held, though not quite on such a large scale at Katoomba, New South Wales; Kingston in Tasmania, and Victor Harbour in South Australia.

The Rev. Hugh Paton occupied the pulpit of Scots Church, Melbourne, for a month. It was consistent with his great evangelical ministry at St. Stephen's, Sydney, that great congregations should gather. On the last Sunday evening after all available seating had been occupied, many were turned away. It was the old gospel—sin, redemption, the new birth, with a touch of humour, and faithful warning. The wooing note predominated.

There are some prominent features of Christianity today as it exists in our midst. Reference may be made to one or two. It is remarkable the way God is using Bible institutes. That of Melbourne usually known as "M. B. I." is an instance. Its history under the regime of the Rev. C. H. Nash, M.A., has been striking. Beginning with four students, it now numbers eighty. Missionaries in all fields of labour, workers in all avenues of service have been trained there. The report at the annual meeting on September 7th showed undiminished success, financial and in other ways, even during the anxious years of depression.

The Rev. C. H. Nash is a strong and dominant personality with many gifts and qualities. Undoubtedly he was God's choice. He speaks or teaches without notes, pouring out a wealth of matter enriched by his knowledge of the original language. Few can make things live as he does. In his report he referred to that "Vogue of Humanism, the dominating note of which was man's quest for truth by intellectual and scientific processes," but in regard to which there are "definite signs apparent that the tide has turned," and there is coming to be recognised, "the necessity for a true theology which begins with God and not with man, and postulates the Word of God as the primary factor in Divine revelation."

Mr. E. Lee Neil, O. B. E., was chairman. A prominent Christian citizen and business man of the city, the Institute owes much

to his generosity, and deep interest manifested from the beginning.

Other capitals also are represented in this field. The training college of the Rev. C. Benson Barnett in Sydney has sent out many fine missionaries. Though of more recent origin, Perth Bible Institute is making good progress. The principal is the Rev. Carmen Urquhart, a worthy son of that Rev. John Urquhart who stood on the watch tower and fought incoming error for so many years and so valiantly.

Another feature of our religious life is the way in which God is commissioning and using men who in the ordinary sense of the term have little or no ecclesiastical recognition or ordination. In most cases the University has not endowed them with credentials, or the Theological college given them diplomas. Not a few have come from M. B. I. They have that doctrinal emphasis on sin, the power of the blood of Christ, the work of the Holy Spirit, and other essentials, too often lacking in the ordained pulpit. Nothing of this is intended to depreciate culture of the university or college, but it shows that the Holy Spirit is not dependent on them. At the same time the university and college are made to bear their witness—instance the Evangelical Union at the former. The "Crusaders" also give the testimony of the student to the Bible. In these connections the visit of Dr. Howard Guinness is arousing much interest.

MELBOURNE

## China Letter

By the Rev. Albert B. Dodd, D.D.

IN VIEW of the steadily declining value of the United States dollar, now is the time to give to mission work in China. Six months from now your dollar may not go half as far out here as it goes today.

As an example of how far it will still go in China, the writer knows of a truly Christian orphanage in North China where one hundred orphans have been well-fed, clothed, bathed, spanked, taught, loved and evangelized at a total expense for the year of \$32.80 Chinese per child, or less than the value of one dollar U. S. A. per month for each child. Of this, 45½% went for food, 21% for clothing, 10% for schooling, and 4% for servants. The next highest single expense was 3½% for soap, but it seems to have been worth while, for it kept the medicine bill well under 2%.

A non-registered Bible-honoring girls' school of 151 pupils with a self-supporting high school department of 28 has been carried on at a total expense to the Presbyterian Mission Board of less than \$1.00 per year (U. S. A.) for each pupil, exclusive of the salary of the missionary who gave part time to this school. In the same station field over a score of Christian mass education schools are teaching hundreds to read the Word of God and winning many souls to Christ at a mission expense of less than

a quarter of a dollar U. S. A. per student.

While the more highly trained evangelists require, and all those worth using at all doubtless should have higher salaries, there are numbers of devoted soul-saving men and women giving their lives to the work of proclaiming the way of salvation at salaries of from three to four dollars, U. S. currency, per month and sometimes even less.

"Now is the time to buy" up unsurpassed opportunities for investment in the Lord's work in China. Don't let these opportunities slip by. Give just as much as you possibly can and see that every cent that you give is spent for the advancement of the one and only true gospel.

TENGHSIEN, SHANTUNG PROVINCE, CHINA

**Korea Letter**

*By the Rev. Bruce F. Hunt*

**DR. S. A. MOFFETT**, pioneer missionary to Korea, having reached the age of seventy on January 25th, automatically went on the list of *honorably retired* members of the Chosen Mission. Dr. Moffett came to Korea in 1889 so that he has now completed forty-four years of work among the Koreans. Dr. Moffett was the founder of the work in Pyengyang station, not only the biggest Presbyterian station in the world, but also the largest station of any one denomination. Dr. Moffett has been one of the chief exponents of the Bible-centered, self-support policy which has been adopted by the Korean Mission and he was one of the big factors in holding out against the Government's demands that the Bible be omitted from the curricula of Mission Schools. His, close rather than submit, was the policy which finally won for the Mission Schools what is known as "Designation"—the graduates of a designated school are accepted on the same footing with those of "Recognized" schools and yet the Bible is allowed in the curriculum, which is not true of the "Recognized" schools. "In 1893 he was the leading spirit in organizing the Presbyterian Council, has been an active member of the Bible Committee and Christian Literature Society, founded the Presbyterian Seminary and served for twenty-five years as its first president, was president of the Union Christian College for ten strenuous years, and has been moderator of the Korean Presbyterian Council, the National Presbytery and the General Assembly."

Dr. Moffett retires in full vigor. He was chairman of the Executive Committee of the Korea Mission for three years up to last June, and has been elected Honorary Chairman of the Mission's Findings Commission to act during the Jubilee celebration next July.

The annual report of the Christian Literature Society of Korea has just come to hand. In the year 1932-33 the Society had a circulation of 2,841,004 books, tracts and maga-

**Dr. Craig  
Commencement Speaker**

It has been announced that the speaker at the 1934 commencement exercises of Westminster Theological Seminary will be the Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D., Editor of "Christianity Today." The exercises will be held on the evening of Tuesday, May 8th, at 8 o'clock, in Witherspoon Hall, Walnut and Juniper Streets, Philadelphia. The public is cordially invited to be present.

zines in addition to the 1,400,000 "Lives of Christ" which were used in the Forward Evangelistic Movement, the edition of which was "the largest of any one book ever published in the Korean language." This brought the total to 4,247,104.

Five hundred men and boys enrolled in the Taiku Men's General Bible Class (conference). One thousand gathered for the evening meetings in the First Presbyterian Church of the city which were conducted by Dr. S. L. Roberts, president of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Pyengyang.

The Federal Council Minutes containing the statistics for the Korean Presbyterian and Methodist churches have just come to hand. Figures for 1931-32 are compared

with those of 1927-28. The figures show losses in the number of "Salaried Korean Church Workers," "Pupils in Primary Schools," "Church Contributions," "In-patients in Mission Hospitals," and "Dispensary Treatments."

Gains are recorded in the number of "Korean Pastors," "Places of Regular Meeting," "Church Buildings," "Regular Members," "Adults Baptized During Year," "Total Christian Constituency," "Sunday School Enrollment," "Number Enrolled in Bible Classes," and "In-patient Days" in the Mission Hospitals.

Dr. Koons, who has made up these statistics for several years, has several interesting observations to make concerning them. "Enrollment in Bible Classes (conferences)—154,385—represents a group of over 2,050 studying the Bible every day all through the year. But the gain over last year is only 8 per cent, when church members gained 10 per cent, and total Christians 21 per cent. It is a good time for the policy of intensive cultivation of the new believers." . . . "In 1926-27, the average patient spent less than 5 days in the hospital; in 1930-31, over 10 days, and in 1931-32, over 12." . . . "The British and Foreign Bible Society circulated in the past year: 7,367 Bibles and Old Testaments, 66,480 New Testaments, and 633,839 Scripture portions."

Government figures show that there were 9,320 licensed women of ill fame in Korea in 1931. In 1932 the Korean Government General received Y11,249,402 (\$5,624,701) in liquor tax alone, the total amount of liquor consumed in the same year being valued at \$66,000,000. In 1932 the Government reported 7,897 drug addicts in Korea and it claims to have cured 4,000 during the year.

Dr. Francis Shunk Downs has sent word that he expects to be present at the Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration of the Founding of the Presbyterian Mission in Korea. Representatives are also expected from Missions in Japan, China, Siam and the Philippines.

Concern was felt in the Northern Presbyterian Mission over a cable from the Board in January asking that the Mission name fifteen persons to be called home in case the financial situation does not clear up. Your correspondent, located in a "small station" in the backward south, feels things are on the verge of a break and prays that not one member of the working force here may be withdrawn—and in the North, where the work is already "developed," every worker seems needed. Christ's command was to "Go" and there seems something wrong somewhere when the church has to countermand that order. The Koreans in Manchuria are calling for more workers to shepherd their leaderless countrymen who are colonizing in that country in great numbers. "Pray—that he will send forth laborers into the harvest."

CHUNGJU, KOREA

**IN THIS ISSUE:**

Stop, Look, Listen . . . . .	4
J. GRESHAM MACHEN	
The Example of One Family . . . . .	8
FRANK H. STEVENSON	
Thou Shalt Say, No! . . . . .	10
CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY	
The Theology of Dr. Mackenzie . . . . .	12
CORNELIUS VAN TIL	
"Indigenizing the Christian Faith" . . . . .	16
WILLIAM CHILDS ROBINSON	
The Comfort of the Scriptures . . . . .	17
Sunday School Lessons . . . . .	18
News of the Church . . . . .	20