

The League of Evangelical Students

HEADQUARTERS

Philadelphia — Pennsylvania

Address—Reformed Episcopal Seminary, 25 S. 43rd Street

The League of Evangelical Students of China—Affiliated.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President, HARVEY MCARTHUR, Westminster Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Vice-President, JOHN BRATT, Calvin Theological Seminary
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Secretary, EMILY MACDONALD, Eastern Baptist Seminary
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

JACK HILLIS, Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

JOHN WILCOX, Columbia Bible College
Columbia, South Carolina

Field Secretary, CALVIN KNOX CUMMINGS

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D., *President*,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

LEWIS S. CHAFER, D.D., *Vice-President*,
Dallas, Texas.

CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D., *Secretary*,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

R. K. RUDOLPH, A.B., B.D., *Treasurer*,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

J. OLIVER BUSWELL, M.A., D.D.,
Wheaton, Illinois.

P. B. FITZWATER, D.D.
Chicago, Illinois.

LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.,
Springfield, Ohio.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D.,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

LINFORD MARQUART, M.A.,
Wollaston, Massachusetts.

WILLIAM C. ROBINSON, Th.D., D.D.,
Decatur, Georgia.

MELVIN A. STUCKEY, Th.M.,
Ashland, Ohio.

THOMAS WELLMERS, M.A.,
Holland, Michigan.

EGBERT W. ANDREWS, A.B.,
Republic of China.

JAMES M. DEFRIEND,
Dallas, Texas.

HENRY STOB, A.B.,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The League of Evangelical Students is an inter-denominational and international student movement for the defense and propagation of the Gospel in the modern student-world. The League welcomes correspondence with individuals or groups contemplating affiliation.

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

Printed in the United States of America.

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

CALVIN KNOX CUMMINGS, *Editor*

Volume XI Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April, 1936

No. 2

EDITORIAL

APOLOGETICS AND EVANGELISM

There is an ever recurring tendency among Christians to decry apologetics. It is persistently affirmed that what we need today is not apologetics but evangelism. It is urged that we never win anyone to Christ through argument; simply preach the Gospel. Explicit in this attitude are two erroneous ideas: the one—that apologetics and evangelism are mutually exclusive, the other—that apologetics is unnecessary if not positively harmful and un-Christian. It has become needful for Christians to realize that apologetics and evangelism, far from being mutually exclusive, are mutually inclusive and that apologetics, far from being unnecessary and un-Christian, is so indispensable and Biblical as to make it *un-Christian not* to engage in apologetics.

Apologetics and evangelism are mutually inclusive for two reasons. First, because there can be no true evangelism without some form of apologetics. Evangelism is the promulgation of the Gospel. The preaching of the Gospel involves the narration of certain facts in history and the interpretation of these facts. But the unregenerate person does not believe that those facts and interpretations are true. They seem unreasonable to him. Will the faithful evangelist abandon the unbeliever at this point? Not at all. He will do as Jesus did with the woman of Samaria and deal with the questionings of the mind. In the wisdom of God he can present the reasonableness of the truths of the Gospel and it may be that the Holy Spirit will use this testimony to enable that soul to see and accept the Gospel as true. It is emphatically true that reasoning alone will never save a single soul. There must be the mysterious working of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. But what the Holy Spirit does in regeneration is not to compel a man to accept what he believes to be false, but through the presentation of the evidences for the truth of the Gospel to convince the man that the Gospel is true and then enable him to accept it as true. The Holy Spirit convinces some men of the truth of the Gospel instantaneously with the preaching of the Gospel and apart from evidences. But there are Thomases who must behold the evidence. To withhold the evidence may be to abandon some soul to the darkness of unbelief forever. The Holy Spirit deals with men differently. The Bible and Church History are replete with proof that God has used some form of apologetics to bring men out of darkness into His marvelous light.

Apologetics and evangelism are mutually inclusive, also, because there can be no true apologetics without evangelism. Much of the modern antipathy toward apologetics is due perhaps to a failure to realize that apologetics is simply a method of evangelism. Apologetics is and never should be an end in itself. The reasoned defense of the Gospel is only to the end that men might be won to the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. It is quite possible that this all important purpose of apologetics is overlooked or minimized sometimes. This is a terrible sin. When this is done apologetics is no longer worthy of the name

apologetics. Apologetics has thereby degenerated into dialectics. Christians do well to pray that they may be kept from such a terrible sin. But let it not be said that because apologetics brings with it this danger that therefore apologetics should be avoided. There is a great danger that in preaching we will not present the full counsel of God, but this does not mean that preaching is therefore to be abandoned.

Apart from its relation to evangelism there are two other very important reasons why the Christian should engage in apologetics. One reason is that the Bible by precept and example instructs us to be apologetic; so that to reject apologetics is to reject what the Bible teaches. God's Word admonishes Christians to "be ready always to give an answer (apologia in the original) to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you." Christ in dealing with men who differed with Him repeatedly defended his position by reasoning with them. When man doubted the goodness of God, Christ reasoned—"if God so clothe the grass of the field which today is and tomorrow is cast into the oven how much more shall he clothe you, O ye of little faith." On another occasion Christ reasoned in one of His parables: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." Paul, in the book of the Galatians and on Mars Hill particularly, was quite apologetic in his approach.

The other reason why the Christian should engage in the use of apologetics is that failure to defend the Gospel leads inevitably to the destruction of the Gospel. The moment the Christian retreats from the defense of the Christian message at every point that it is attacked, the enemy advances to possess the ground that has been surrendered. These capitulations of the Christian lead, history shows us, to the ultimate destruction of the very citadel of our Faith. This is seen so clearly in the history of many seminaries and denominations. First, those who defend the Gospel are attacked. They are told that they must desist from defending the Gospel and content themselves with the mere preaching of the Gospel. This sounds very pious to some people but really at heart it is pernicious. This is simply to allow the enemy to possess one field after another without a word of protest. It becomes simply a matter of time before the enemy gains the ascendancy and the evangelical testimony is silenced.

Christians can never have too much apologetics or too much evangelism. Students need not fear that they will know too much about the reasonableness of the Christian Faith or that they will have too much concern for the souls of lost men. Our only fear should be that we may have one of these without the other.

NEW CONTRIBUTORS IN THIS ISSUE—

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., Trustee of the League of Evangelical Students and Professor of New Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary.

HENRY SCHULTZE, Th.D., Professor of New Testament at Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D., Trustee of the League of Evangelical Students and Professor Emeritus at Hamma Divinity School.

FALSE PREMISES OF MODERN PACIFISM

The true Christian earnestly desires peace and will seek to give enthusiastic support to every sane and Scriptural effort to attain national and international peace. But not every movement that purports to be a peace movement can be properly regarded as a peace movement. Indeed, one of the greatest threats to true peace today is current religious pacifism. Modern pacifism seeks to attain a perfectly noble end by a very pernicious method. The pacifist propaganda that surges through the student-world today is based upon utterly false premises.

Modern pacifism is based on the premise that man is inherently good. The Bible and human experience teach that man is inherently sinful. Mankind is by nature rebellious against God and against the good. To build upon the rotten foundation of man's depraved soul without a successful effort to clear away the rotten foundation and replace it with the bed-rock of a regenerated character will prove ruinous. Greece once tried to build a beautiful world upon the rotten foundations of sin to her utter doom.

Modern pacifism works on the premise that men can be educated and legislated into peace. By such methods we might succeed fairly well in convincing the populace that war is ruthless cruelty and that war should be outlawed. But when sin breaks out in all its horror, education and legislation is cast to the winds and man stands helpless before the onslaught of sin. It is only as our Sovereign God quickens men's hearts dead in trespasses and sin unto newness of life and places His restraining hand upon the unjust and the revengeful that the world has ever been and can ever be kept from race murder. Until men humble themselves before Almighty God and beseech His restraining grace there can be no expectation of peace.

Modern pacifism is based upon the false premise that war is sinful and that war is the greatest sin. To the Christian there are some things that are far worse than war. Sin is worse than war. To stand idly by and let the ravages of sin destroy defenseless souls would be sin; to defend would be a Christian duty. The man that stands idly by while a murderer seeks to kill his wife deserves not the praise of men but utter contempt. When the forces of atheism seek to crush God out of the life of the country, or when tyrannical powers seek to destroy our precious heritage of civil and religious liberty, to stand idly by is to share in the destruction of righteousness for ourselves and for our posterity.

AN IMPREGNABLE APOLOGETIC

The Christian student that seeks to speak a good word for his Saviour on the campus is brought face to face with students' disconcerting arguments against the truth of the Gospel as it is in Jesus Christ. Is there an answer to these arguments which will have the advantage of confronting these students with the Gospel and at the same time of presenting an apologetic that will stand impregnable before the most cogent attacks?

Various approaches might prove effective in dealing with students; but perhaps none would be quite so telling as to begin with the commonly accepted truth of the goodness of Jesus. The average unbelieving student is quite convinced that Jesus was at least a good man. Those most emphatic in their denials of the Deity and Saviourhood of Jesus are frequently the most vociferous in their

insistence upon the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was supereminently good. It is very evident to them that if we cannot accept the accounts which set forth Jesus as *good*, we cannot accept *any* information concerning Jesus; Jesus may not even have been a historical character. To deny the historicity of Jesus is "too much" for them. The moment the student admits that Jesus was good he has admitted all that is necessary to prove that Jesus is the God-man Saviour. For if Jesus was good He must have spoken the truth, and if what Jesus spoke was true then we must accept the fact of His Deity and Saviourhood because He taught that He was indeed the God-man Saviour. To say that Jesus was good but that He did not always speak the truth is to say that a man can be good and speak falsehoods. As Augustine has put it "If Christ is not God He is not good"—because Christ claimed He was God and if that claim is not true then Christ is not only not God; He is not even good.

The feature that makes this position so impregnable is the fact that there is incontrovertible evidence not only that Christ was good but that this Christ who was good claimed to be the God-man Saviour of the world. Evidence abounds that Jesus not only claimed this for Himself but placed this claim at the very center and heart of His teaching. Even the Sermon on the Mount concludes with Christ setting Himself forth as the great final judge of mankind. Yes, once we have acclaimed the goodness of Jesus we are forced by an inexorable law of logic to face the claims of the Lord of Glory. Not at all, it is interjected, we believe that Christ was good, that He claimed to be God, but He was deceived. But this is to say that a good man is predominantly a deceived man, because the predominant characteristic of Jesus was His claim of Messiahship. How unbelievable it is that the man who has made the deepest imprint upon men of all ages should have at the center of his character a basic deception. How easier it is to acclaim this good man "my Lord and my God." O that students might turn from the prejudiced and sinful reasonings of their depraved mind and turn unto Him and be saved.

THE STUDENT VOLUNTEER MOVEMENT—AN OBSERVATION AND AN INVITATION

At the recent Quadrennial Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement held in Indianapolis, Jesse Rodman Wilson, for ten years the General Secretary, of the Student Volunteer Movement, tendered his resignation as General Secretary of the movement. The *Intercollegian* and *Far Horizons*—organ of the Student Volunteer Movement—is significantly silent on the reason why Jesse Wilson resigned from his position of leadership in the Student Volunteer Movement. Delegates attending the Indianapolis Convention affirm that Mr. Wilson resigned because he felt that the Student Volunteer Movement by its affiliation with the Student Christian Movement will lose its distinctiveness as a missionary movement and thus incite the formation of a new missionary volunteer organization of an undesirable character.

Regardless of the full accuracy of these reports it is certainly a correct and timely observation that the recent moves to integrate the Student Volunteer Movement and the Student Christian Movement will mean the virtual silencing of the missionary note in the Student Volunteer Movement. Indeed, if *The Intercollegian* and *Far Horizons*—the organ of the three organizations that largely

constitute the Student Christian Movement (Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., and Student Volunteer Movement) is a fair criterion, it may be said without any fear of contradiction that the Student Volunteer Movement *has already* had its missionary note silenced. In the February issue of this magazine, for instance, there is not one single article of a distinctly missionary character.

But the more serious aspect of the intergration of the Student Volunteer Movement and the Student Christian Movement is that thereby the Student Volunteer Movement definitely commits itself to Modernism. The statement of purpose of the Middle Atlantic Region of the Student Christian Movement (p. 8) not only omits every cardinal fact and doctrine of the Christian Faith but commits the movement to Christ as "preeminently the revealer of the character of God" instead of preeminently the Saviour of men as He claimed to be.

The League of Evangelical Students at its recent Convention in Chicago made a constitutional provision for missionary volunteer groups that desire to continue their evangelical program. The Constitutional amendment states that

"Any independent missionary volunteer group may be accepted as an affiliated member of the League of Evangelical Students by a three-quarter vote at the annual convention. Any such group will maintain its identity as a missionary group, but in the schools where no Chapter of the League exists, the group shall have the full rights of a Chapter until a regular Chapter be formed. In a school where a Chapter of the League already exists, the group, while maintaining its identity, shall be counted as a part of the Chapter. These groups will of necessity affirm their accord with the Constitution of the League as required in Section 3 of the Constitution."

The League welcomes evangelical missionary volunteers into its fellowship in the confidence that mutual benefit will result. The League will bring to such groups provisions for a thorough study of the message of missions—a frequently neglected aspect of modern missionary programs. It will awaken missionary volunteers to a new sense of the opportunity and responsibility to begin their missionary labors by witnessing daily on the campus. At the same time, "volunteer" groups may be used of God to bring to the League a greater concern for the souls of the millions without Christ. There is a danger when the home and foreign missionary enterprises are separated. In the League of Evangelical Students these two aspects of the missionary enterprise are coordinated to the mutual strengthening of each.

GIFT OF "BORDEN OF YALE '09" OFFERED LEAGUE CHAPTERS

Through the generosity of a Christian friend there has been made available for each Chapter of the League a copy of the splendid biography of Borden of Yale, written by Mrs. Taylor. There is probably no finer biography for reading and circulation by college students than this biography. Each college Chapter that writes to Headquarters requesting this book will be mailed a copy free—with the understanding that it is to be circulated for reading.

A PRECIOUS FRAGMENT OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN*

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., LITT.D.

Some weeks ago, there appeared in the daily newspapers a truly astonishing piece of information, to the effect that among certain documents belonging to the John Rylands Library in Manchester, England, there had been discovered a fragment of a manuscript of the Gospel according to John dating from the former half of the second century after Christ.

Certainly that was a most sensational piece of news.

Until recently the earliest of the known manuscripts of the New Testament were two fourth-century manuscripts, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus.

These two manuscripts are written on vellum, which is an exceedingly durable writing material. But during the earlier period—say, up to, roughly, A. D. 300—the text of the New Testament was transmitted on a very perishable writing material, papyrus.

Until rather recent years no papyrus manuscripts of the New Testament coming from the period prior to the date of those two great vellum codices were known.

During the past forty years or so, however, great quantities of papyrus documents have been turning up in Egypt, where the dry air preserved them as was not the case in other parts of the ancient world; and among these papyrus documents are a few fragments of manuscripts of New Testament books. Of these the most important is "Chester Beatty Papyrus I," containing parts of thirty leaves (sixty pages) of a manuscript of the Gospels and Acts dating from the third century.¹

But now there has turned up a fragment of a manuscript of the Gospel of John which is said to be actually a century earlier still, coming apparently from the former half of the second century!

As a friend remarked to me, the thing seemed almost "too good to be true." In such a case one felt a little inclined to distrust newspaper reports, lest false hopes might be aroused.

Now, however, a careful edition of the precious little fragment is actually in our hands, and the high hopes which we had received from the newspaper reports seem really to be confirmed.²

It is true, when one examines the photographic reproduction of the fragment, appearing opposite the title page of this edition, one is tempted just at first to feel disappointed. Only about ten words have been preserved complete, with parts of some fifteen more. The question might even seem to arise whether we can be sure that these words do indeed come from the Gospel according to John.

A little consideration, however, and an examination of the editor's discussion, will serve fairly well to remove such doubts. The upper margin and part of the

* Reprinted through the courtesy of *The Presbyterian Guardian*.

¹ See *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Fasciculus I. By Frederic G. Kenyon, Late Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum, London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933 and 1934.

² *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library*. Edited by C. H. Roberts, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. With Facsimile. Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 8-10 Wright Street, Manchester, 15; And The Librarian, The John Rylands Library, Deansgate, MCMXXXV.

inside margin of the papyrus leaf have been preserved. The words and parts of words that can be read are partly on one side of the leaf and partly on the reverse side. By an examination of the way in which these words and fragments of words stand in relation to one another, the editor can identify them as coming from John 18:31-33, 37-38. One may admire very greatly the skill which was necessary in order that the identification might be made; but about the correctness of the identification, now that it has been made, there seems to be little doubt.

Then arises the all-important question of date. What was the date of the manuscript from which this fragment has come? At this point we find confirmation of the early newspaper reports. Competent expert opinion puts the probable date as being in the early half of the second century.

The editor himself, Mr. C. H. Roberts, is thoroughly competent in this field, having been chosen by Dr. Arthur S. Hunt, collaborator with Dr. Bernard P. Grenfell in the editing of the famous Grenfell and Hunt Papyri, to take on the work of editing the portion of the Rylands collection left unpublished at the time of Dr. Hunt's death (see the explanation by the Librarian of the John Rylands Library on pages 7 and 8 of the edition). Then the editor has had his judgment regarding the date of the fragment confirmed by Sir Frederic Kenyon, Dr. W. Schubart (a well-known German palaeographer) and Dr. H. I. Bell, "who," as the editor says, "have seen photographs of the text and whose experience and authority in these matters are unrivalled" (p. 16). Dr. Schubart even says (translating his words as quoted by Mr. Roberts): "Many traits remind us even of the first century, but in general the style of the handwriting leads us rather into the second century" (p. 30, footnote 7).

No doubt great caution in such matters is in place, and it is quite possible that the early dating of this fragment may be disputed by some scholars. A word of caution is uttered, for example, in *The Times Literary Supplement* (London), for January 4, 1936. Nevertheless, it seems on the whole probable that the manuscript of the Gospel according to John from which this fragment comes was made not later than A. D. 150.

At any rate the editor is justified in saying that if the argument in his introduction is correct the fragment "is the earliest known fragment of any part of the New Testament" (p. 12). Whether he is also correct in going on to say that it is "probably the earliest witness to the existence of the Gospel according to St. John" depends upon the estimate which we attribute to other evidence. But at any rate this fragment certainly does seem to constitute an exceedingly important addition to the evidence for the early date of the Gospel.

THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST CONFRONTING A RECALCITRANT WORLD

HENRY SCHULTZE, TH.D.

What Is the Gospel of Christ?

The good news of Christ! What is it? The phrase itself, just as it stands, is very informing. It gives at once the source, the characteristic and the essence of that something which it labels.

1. The source is designated as Christ himself. It is of Christ. Now that may seem to be exceedingly commonplace to many of you, but it is being denied, both practically and theoretically, by the vast majority of so-called Christian leaders in this and other countries. It is preferred to take the genitive "of Christ" objectively, meaning the gospel about Christ and not from him. This is an important distinction. It affects deeply the authority and the finality of the gospel they preach. If it be not from Christ, the preacher can't insist that men conform their thoughts and their lives to it—with a "Thus saith the Lord." If it be not from Christ, the representatives of the gospel cannot present it as the absolute truth not subject to changes so as to conform to the ever changing vagaries of human thought. They must insist upon the "Hands off" policy. They can't begin with a "We think," a "Science has demonstrated," or an "It is probable." The only appropriate introduction, expressed or implied is, "Christ has spoken and that is final."

If the distinction be valid and be of such far reaching importance, it behooves us to justify the claim that the gospel comes from Christ and that it demands man's enslavement both in thought and in life. This is a historical question. We'll have to go back to its origin.

Did Jesus regard himself as the source of his message? Paradoxical though it may seem the question will have to be answered with both a yes and a no. But in either case, if the facts are known, it will not invalidate the distinction above suggested.

In one sense Jesus certainly regarded himself to be the source of the gospel in a distinct and unique way.

The "But I say unto you's" in the Sermon on the Mount are revealing. Particularly when they are reflected upon in the contrasts in which Jesus himself places them. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time,—but I say unto you." Such combinations occur again and again. Jesus declares, as it were, what others have said and what has been held to be the truth must yield to my proclamation. I have something distinct and final. That consciousness on the part of the Christ is repeatedly expressed in the gospel with a "Verily, verily, I say unto you." Indeed, the courage that he displayed in condemning individuals to eternal torment because they did not believe his words or did not believe in him, could only grow out of his conviction of being fully responsible for his words and their final character.

How did his contemporaries think about it? Why, they said that he taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes. A. B. Bruce, after casting aside the suggestion that this is a reference to Christ's superior pedagogy, correctly comments, "The scribes spake by authority, resting all they said on traditions of what had been said before. Jesus spoke with (not by) authority, out of his own soul, with direct intuition of truth." That is to say, the comparison does not deal with the methods of teaching of Jesus and the scribes but with the

source of their respective teachings. Jesus spoke from or out of himself, and his contemporaries, even those not sympathetic toward his position, recognized it.

Now in the abstract it is possible that the gospel of Christ can only be so designated in the form in which it left the mouth of Jesus, and that subsequent generations may modify it, twist it, shift its emphasis to new points (as has actually been done) so that His Gospel has evolved and has become radically different and certainly better in the opinion of many Gospel students. However, let's examine the value of such a reflection for a moment.

Peter, unquestionably the first to assume leadership in the Christian community, stood before the problem of electing a new man to replace the late Judas. He insisted that the candidate must have been a close associate with Jesus throughout the whole of his ministry. And when he does that, he does it with a view to the candidate's future work as a preacher, or as a witness in compliance with the post resurrection commission, to wit, "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the world." They are to be witnesses. Their virtue will not lie in creative thought. They will not be asked to evolve new theories and strange doctrines. Their worth shall be measured by the fidelity with which they shall reflect the message which Jesus preached by his life and words.

To that principle Peter and John adhered. They spake and acted in the name of Jesus with the unflinching conviction that they were not to be credited for their messages nor were they to be blamed for it. "For we cannot," said they, "but speak the things which we have seen or heard." They didn't say that they had made a psychological study of religious experiences and that they recommended their findings to the serious consideration of all their contemporaries. Nor did they declare that they had made a thorough study of comparative religion and offer their views as the gospel of the greatest value. They weren't even capable of such psychological and historical study. They said in effect, all that we can do is to give you the gospel of Jesus.

Conceivably, some will say that Peter and John were ignorant men who realized the mental superiority of Jesus and therefore merely parroted what they had heard from him. But coming to Paul who had probably never seen or heard Jesus in the flesh and who was by no means an unlearned man, we find precisely the same conception of Jesus as the only true source of the gospel. Paul frankly admits to the congregation at Corinth, "for I have received of the Lord, that which also I deliver unto you." And he is so certain that he has the gospel which is from Christ that he does not hesitate to consign those who preach another Gospel, even though they be angels from heaven, to the place of eternal torment.

Even in the early post-apostoloic period, when devotion to Christ was still deep and loyal, the proclamations that were authoritative in the thought and lives of men were introduced with a "The Master hath said."

Early history therefore informs us very clearly that the gospel was and is from Christ. It was so regarded. Indeed the position was adopted that no formulary of religious truth can pose as the gospel of Christ, except it be traced back to Jesus.

At the beginning of this cursory historical review I suggested that there was a way in which Jesus did not regard himself as the author of his message. In his messianic capacity Jesus clearly taught that there was a subordination about him, even relative to the source of his message. He roundly proclaimed that all things were delivered unto him of his Father. And judging from the context

in which this declaration is made, he was thinking primarily, if not exclusively, of the things that were revealed by him (Matt. 11:27). This same idea is articulated in the Fourth Gospel again and again. He spake not of himself. The words which he spake are those of the Father. As he heard so he spake. Yet these acknowledgements were not made to disclaim any responsibility in the origination of his message, but to indicate its authority and finality. When Jesus spake, God spake. He, the Word incarnate, was and is the revealer and articulator of the message divine.

This conception of the gospel is widely different from that which is hawked from many a pulpit in our land. There is something about it that irritates the recalcitrant. It says, as it were, "I am unchangeable, you must make the adjustment."

2. The fundamental characteristic of the gospel is that it is *good* news. That sounds more hopeful. But a careful examination of this matter will reveal elements that induce recalcitrating reaction on the part of the world confronted by the gospel.

The world, even the world of alleged Christians, feels that the preacher must speak unctuous words, words of comfort, encouragement, and inspiration. That is, the Gospel must be good in the sense of being pleasurable and agreeable. That position is consistent with the very flattering conception of man that is being entertained. If man really be ethically and morally neutral, or perhaps even a bit to the right of the line that separates goodness from badness, I think that it would be pedagogically and psychologically indefensible to deliver anything but a message of hope and inspiration to man. But the hypothesis was never held by Jesus. If it were, his message is simply untenable. When Jesus speaks of the gospel as *good* news, he had something far different in mind than that the message of the gospel is necessarily and invariably agreeable to men.

Jesus always preached the gospel. But some terrible woes fell from his blessed lips. Severer words never fell from mortal lips than those with which Christ denounced the Jewish leaders for their hypocrisy, moral corruption and blind leadership. He spoke unambiguously of the time when certain individuals shall be condemned to the place of the undying worm and the unquenchable fire. Verily, if that be part of the gospel it can't be *good* news. And yet, paradoxical though it may seem, it is *good* news. However, I can well conceive that the spiritually uninitiated will declare, Can out of the same mouth proceed blessing and curse? Doth the fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?

The Gospel is not good news because man has so evaluated and appreciated it. It is good because it is the product of divine wisdom. God's omniscience makes it perfect. It is good because it promotes the highest values as they are embodied in the idea of the Kingdom. And such promotion calls for condemnation as well as for promises. In short, it is good because it comes from Christ, and seeks to promote the very things for which he emptied himself and assumed the form of a servant. But men today have little tolerance for such objective goodness. They want a gospel that is good to them regardless of their position, and then the goodness must be after their own heart. The Gospel refuses to become putty. Men then become recalcitrant.

3. The essence of the Gospel must be found in the fact that it is news. It consists of an articulation of definite historical events or series of events. These events do not change. Subsequent history never changes a fact.

A recalcitrant world doesn't want facts. They are too stubborn even though they be 2000 years of age. It doesn't want its working material to be made of steel, rock or any other non-resistant material. It would rather deal with live rubber that will twist and yield to men's own philosophical and scientific conceptions. I presume that in the religious field, the modernists are the fairest representatives of the world. They find themselves at the present time in an awful mess just because they have recognized no rock bottom foundation. Fosdick is attempting to leap high over the fence of modernism, as he holds aloft the banner upon which is inscribed, "Beyond Modernism." Morrison is clinging fast to his coat tails and declares, as it were, "Yes, but you are a modernist still." Niebuhr, Pauck, and Miller, pragmatists that they are, have become thoroughly disgusted with the accomplishments of modernism. They are sitting back waiting expectantly for the new prophet, who, they fail to realize, has already spoken. Wieman has attempted to analyze and systematize this crazy quilt of warring and dissenting conceptions. And Aubrey, parroting the ideas long ago expressed by Dean Matthews, informed the world that it must remember that Modernism is a method and not a creed. "Modernists" says he, "are unified by their approach to theology and not by their theological conclusions." But mere method—just method—leaves one stranded on the highway to eternity with an empty hand, a dizzy head, and an aching heart.

The gospel, however, is not a method, but an expression of hard undeniable fact or series of facts. Men will take these facts and reinterpret them so that they are suppressed, and then proceed to make facts of straw and to be guided by them. It is really a silly piece of business. The pot of clay can't make its own potter.

When Jesus came with the Gospel, he came with no opinions, but with the facts of his origin, character, work and message. He made careful inquiry among his disciples so as to be sure that they had the facts correctly. Indeed, he did not rest satisfied until he secured the correct confession of Peter, when he confessed, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." And he spoke so approvingly of this correct evaluation that the disciples could not but have been impressed with the need of correct possession of the facts.

Paul was equally impressed with the unmodifiable and objective character of the gospel. This great missionary felt so keenly about this matter, that he unhesitatingly would condemn to perdition any one, even if he be Gabriel, who would come and preach a distorted gospel. It is a matter of getting the facts straight or be anathema.

The Recalcitrant World Confronted by the Gospel

When speaking of the world confronted by the Gospel, I do not have in mind the world in general but that which the Gospel actually confronts. They are people who have the Bible. They read it. They regard it as a sort of text book. I am therefore not thinking of the atheist, nor of the agnostic, but of the world which is usually designated by the name modernism. Let's see how it faces the Gospel or how the Gospel faces it along four lines. These have been suggested by the sermon of Fosdick called, Beyond Modernism.

1. What is its conception of the good news about God, which Jesus himself did not teach? It is the idea of the universal Fatherhood of God. Of course, this would be good news in the sense of being pleasurable to all men. The proponents of this position are, in their own way, modest. They give Jesus the credit for it. Books on Biblical theology are pretty well agreed that Jesus

brought a new idea of God into the world, namely, that of universal fatherhood. One wonders at the ignorance, or is it perversity, that fails or refuses to recognize the fact that the idea of the fatherhood of God is not alien to the Old Testament at all. God speaks of calling his son out of Egypt. But how can he have a son without there being a father. God speaks repeatedly about his children, Israel. In the Psalms his reaction to his own is pictured as that of a father toward his children. Though it may be granted that the name father is seldom applied to God, yet the concept is quite frequent.

Now on what ground are we expected to believe that Jesus taught that God was a kind loving father of all men?

The first is the parable of the prodigal son. The father, it is said, receives both sons into his own fellowship; the one represents his own people and the other the unbelieving world. But as a matter of fact both sons represented classes that belonged and were regarded as belonging to the Israelitish commonwealth. The Pharisees and scribes criticized Jesus because of his social contacts with sinners and publicans. Jesus rebukes them for their attitude by presenting the three parables of the lost. The 99 sheep referred to in the first parable are no more members of the flock than the one that was lost. The lost coin belonged to the woman's collection. The lost son was the father's son just as much as the elder son was. In fact the point in all these parables is that a real possession of the shepherd, or the woman, or the father has been lost, and each is filled with joy over the return of the lost. The parable loses its point if the younger son was not a possession of the father before the loss was incurred. And after all, Jesus is not interested in teaching anything about the fatherhood of God, but is interested in justifying his welcome reception of the sinners and publicans.

It is also argued that Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount teaches this fatherhood of God when he declares "But I say unto you, love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be sons of your father who is in heaven, for he maketh the sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and the unjust." But this selection certainly does not teach us that he is father of the just and the unjust. He is definitely labelled as *your* father. He is the one that takes care of all. It has been correctly stated that the point of the statement depends upon the fact that he is not the universal father. He cares for those who are not his own, therefore his children should love those who are not their brethren, but their enemies.

It is downright forgery to sign the name of Jesus below a statement of the universal fatherhood of God. He will not own it. The idea came from the hearts of men. They would have him so. But God isn't as men would have him. He is what he would be, and Jesus knew what that was and he revealed it in the gospel. And that picture confronts the world and occasions its recalcitrancy.

Of course, Jesus taught the fatherhood of God. He recognized God as his own father in a very unique sense. No one else had a right to call God his father in the way that Jesus did. He alone could lay claim to divine sonship in a metaphysical and a messianic sense.

Yet he was fully aware of a divine fatherhood in a more general sense. Jesus revealed the fact that all believers can call him their father. They are urged repeatedly to respond to him and to address him as father, to find comfort and consolation in the fact that he is their father. It is a most blessed goodness of the good news for God's own. But the world at large can lay no such specific claim to such relationship to God. If it insists upon it, and in due time approach him crying, "Our Father, our Father," it will be as positively disowned as those

who will say in that day, "Lord, Lord, we have done wonderful works in thy name."

However, even the fatherhood conception of God, which is widely different from what the world vainly believes, is based upon and receives its value from a more fundamental conception of God, namely, his moral and metaphysical transcendence. The Old Testament Jews had no doubt about this aspect of God and their real religious problem was how to appear before such a God and live. Jesus didn't need to articulate that aspect of God's relationship to man, but he assumed it. God always insists upon the moral and ethical perfection on the part of his children. That is the reason why certain individuals will be cast out and consigned to eternal perdition. Now that is an indispensable part of the good news. It is just such a God that works out a complete and perfect Salvation, and that preserves heaven so that it will remain heaven by forbidding the slightest bit of sin to enter there. There is a severity there that can be good news only to those who are assured that he is their father. All others stand recalcitrant before it.

(To be Continued in Next Issue)

"WHETHER BY LIFE OR BY DEATH"

On January 13, 1936, God called to Himself Mr. Jacob DeVries, President of the League of Evangelical Students—a beloved friend and fellow-servant of the Lord Jesus Christ. Paul's words descriptive of himself have a peculiarly fitting application to this servant of God—"so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by life or by death." In life Christ was magnified by his diligence and fidelity as a student and steward of the mysteries of God. In death Christ was magnified by the testimony that went forth from his lips as he lay in great pain upon his death-bed and sang the desire of his soul—"The glorious gates of righteousness throw open unto me, and I will enter them with praise, Oh Lord, my God, to Thee." The expression of the Board of Trustees of the League is the expression of the many that had the privilege of association with Mr. DeVries:

"Whereas it has pleased the Sovereign God to take from our midst and unto Himself Mr. Jacob DeVries, President of the League of Evangelical Students, we the Board of Trustees of the League of Evangelical Students

"1—do humbly and reverently bow before Him whose ways are higher than ours, recognizing His inscrutable wisdom and infinite goodness to His children;

"2—do praise the grace of God which was so abundantly manifested in his beautiful character, his exceptional talents, his unswerving and winsome witness for his Lord, and his untiring zeal in the work of the kingdom, particularly in the work of the League of Evangelical Students;

"3—do pray that the God of all comfort may richly console those to whom he was especially dear, with the assurance that he who aimed to serve God in the militant church has been translated for higher service to the church triumphant."

AN INDICTMENT OF THE SOCIAL GOSPEL*

R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D.

It is not my present purpose to discuss with any degree of adequacy the place which social problems should or should not occupy in the preaching of the Christian minister. Timely and urgent though the earnest consideration of that question is, the brevity of this article obviously precludes even an attempt at it.

In order to prevent possible misunderstanding, however, it may be well for me to say at the outset that I do not and cannot agree with those who tell us that the preacher of today, living as he does in the so-called church age, in distinction from the coming kingdom age, should ignore social problems in the pulpit; that it is his sole business to try to rescue individuals out of society; and that he may well leave it to his King to save society at His second coming. I am sure that, for instance, the late I. M. Haldeman made too sweeping a statement when he wrote in his in some respects admirable review of Rauschenbusch's *Christianity and the Social Crisis*: "According to the Word of God, the work of the Church in this age is not to save society, but individuals out of it" (page 6). The very distinction between the church age and the kingdom age can be shown to be unscriptural. And not only did the Old Testament prophets preach against the social evils of their day, but Jesus had much to say about family life, and Paul in his epistles discussed, besides family problems, such matters as the proper relation of employers and employees to each other and the Christian attitude toward the civil government. Briefly put, while the primary emphasis of the gospel is indisputably on individual redemption, the gospel does have evident social implications.

After thus warding off conceivable misunderstanding, let me now present a criticism of the Social Gospel as it is being proclaimed today by many liberal preachers. My criticism will amount to a serious indictment. A great many weighty charges may be laid at the door of the Social Gospel. In the interest of brevity I shall do little more than enumerate some of its most flagrant offenses.

* * * * *

(The Social Gospel is evolutionistic in its approach. It assumes without argument that the trend of the times is in the right direction.) It takes for granted that ten thousand liberal preachers cannot be wrong. More specifically, the fact that the Church has of late years increasingly discussed social problems is considered conclusive evidence that such is the Church's task. L. O. Brastow, for instance, reasons in effect as follows in his book on *The Modern Pulpit*: The two great subjects of investigation in the nineteenth century were nature and man: natural science and anthropology. Great changes resulted. Social and political changes allied themselves with industrial and commercial changes in thrusting new tasks upon the pulpit. New social, political, and industrial problems are before the world and must be faced by the preacher (page 87). Obviously, from the fact that the spirit of the age has forced social problems upon the pulpit Brastow infers that they belong there.

As was already indicated, the Christian need have no dispute with those who say that there is room in preaching for the consideration of certain social problems. There is even need of it. However, it makes a world of difference why one admits social problems to the pulpit. The modernist does so because

* An abbreviated form of an address delivered at the Eleventh Annual Convention of the League.

of the trend of the times, the stress of circumstances, the spirit of the age, of all of which he is *a priori* certain that they are in the main good. The Christian does so only because the Word of God so teaches.

* * * * *

(The Social Gospel fails to distinguish sharply between moral evil or sin, on the one hand, and such physical evils as poverty and disease, which result from sin, on the other.) Because of this failure it frequently stresses alleviation of the consequences of sin more than salvation from sin itself. The word *sin* is not at all popular with the preachers of the Social Gospel. As some one has aptly put it, they are concerned much more about getting men out of the slums than about getting the slums out of men's hearts.)

The fallacy of this type of reasoning, if indeed it be not lack of reasoning, is self-evident. How superficial, to put it mildly, it is to seek to dispel the ravages of a disease without attacking the disease itself. What must one think of a physician who mistakes the symptoms of an ailment for the ailment itself and confines his treatment to the symptoms?

* * * * *

(The Social Gospel is based on the silly assumption that the providence of God does not control social evils.) Says A. E. Garvie in *The Preachers of the Church*: "Another error of popular thinking is the assumption that all that occurs is by or according to the will of God.—Evils which might be prevented by intelligent action are ascribed to 'a mysterious dispensation of the divine providence' " (page 154). And in his recent book on *Social Salvation* John C. Bennett of Auburn Theological Seminary informs us: "The recognition that God is limited in His dealings with men, that He does not will the social evils of our time or any time, but that those evils are the result of forces which operate in spite of God's will—such a recognition is the first step in attempting to discover any coherent conception of the work of God in the world" (page 189).

That this view overlooks the important distinction between God's secret will, embodied in His decree, and the revealed will of God, expressed in His law, is obvious. Of course, the fact that divine providence is over all things does not rule out human responsibility for the ills of the world, but neither does human responsibility for these ills rule out divine providence in them. To deny the latter truth is flatly to contradict the plain teaching of God's Word in Amos 3:6, "Shall evil befall a city and Jehovah hath not done it?" Nobody questions the full responsibility of Judas for his betrayal of Jesus; yet Scripture tells us in Acts 2:23 that he did it "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." When President McKinley, mortally wounded by the assassin's bullet, said: "God's will be done," he showed himself a better theologian than Garvie or Bennett. (The Social Gospel nonchalantly rejects divine sovereignty. It boldly denies that God is God.)

* * * * *

(The Social Gospel stresses the betterment of the group at the expense of individual redemption.) (It delights in stamping interest in one's own salvation narrow and selfish. If it cares at all about the salvation of the individual, it would accomplish this by changing his environment, by improving the society that surrounds him.)

The logical error underlying this type of preaching is so obvious that even H. G. Wells saw it. Therefore he wrote in *New Worlds for Old*: "I recognize quite clearly, that with people just as they are, with their prejudices, ignorances,

misapprehensions, their unchecked vanities, greeds and jealousies, their crude and misconstrued instincts, their irrational traditions, no Socialist state can exist—no better state can exist than the one you have now, with all its squalor and cruelty. (page 219). (After all, society is made up of individuals, and it is clear as light itself that society can never be better than the aggregate of individuals constituting it.) The only way, then, to improve society is by improving individual men and women. To reverse the order is to put the cart before the horse.

* * * * *

{ The Social Gospel manifests a decided tendency to make common cause with the advocates of such anti-biblical systems of society as state-socialism, collectivism, and communism. (It is generally known that a couple of years ago many of the leading liberal clergymen of America urgently requested President Roosevelt to give official recognition to the present government of Russia.) Personally I have heard at least one modernist preacher take up the cudgels for the Soviets in his pulpit.

{ While it goes without saying that the Christian Church may never condone the evils of the so-called capitalistic system, it surely does not follow that it is the Church's duty to advocate a type of communism. It should be superfluous to remark that the communism of the early Jerusalem church may not be appealed to as an argument for the various communistic schemes of our day. It was communism among Christians only. There was nothing compulsory about it. And there is no shred of evidence in the New Testament that it was copied by other churches in the apostolic age. (The right of private ownership is taught clearly and emphatically throughout the whole of Scripture. But what is that to the religious liberals of our times? They have rejected the Bible as the absolute norm for faith and life. And many of them, to say the least, are sympathetic toward an anti-biblical socialism.)

* * * * *

{ (The Social Gospel is not satisfied with the Word of God. It cannot think of preaching the Bible only.) For that matter, the Bible is a rather old book by this time. While it does contain much that is of lasting value, it can hardly be said to be up-to-date. To suppose that it contains the solution of distinctly modern social problems is manifestly absurd. In fact, on several points it is obviously in error. So say the advocates of the Social Gospel. Therefore they read books and magazine articles by university professors and brain-trusters and from them cull material for their sermons. In *The Preachers of the Church* A. E. Garvie advises: "However reluctantly and modestly, the Christian preacher must already make the venture to offer to others such solutions as many of the best minds concerned with these problems have agreed upon" (page 198). In consequence of throwing the Bible into the discard, many a preacher of the Social Gospel has come to the sweeping and dogmatic conclusion that all war is sin.

{ Comment is well-nigh superfluous. (It is a dismal day indeed for the Christian Church when its preachers substitute human theories for divine revelation.) "To the law and to the testimony! If they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them" (Isaiah 8:20).

* * * * *

The Social Gospel ridicules the *Jenseitigkeit* of the historic gospel and substitutes for it an exclusive *Diessseitigkeit*. That may seem almost too bold an accu-

sation to make, but it is borne out by the words of one of the most able advocates of the Social Gospel. Says A. E. Garvie in *The Preachers of the Church*: "Men are saved by Christ, not for safety hereafter, but for service here." Observe the extreme character of this dictum. Garvie does not say that men are saved by Christ, not only for safety hereafter, but also for service here. Nor does he say that men are saved by Christ, not merely for safety hereafter, but for service both here and hereafter. To either of those statements every orthodox Christian would gladly subscribe. But Garvie stresses service here to the absolute exclusion of safety hereafter.

How narrow, then, is the outlook of the Social Gospel. How broad in its purpose, on the other hand, is the historic gospel of the Christian Church. One is for this life only; the other is for this life and the next. And let no Christian preacher ever apologize for preparing men for eternity. Important though it is that man be relatively happy the little while that he bides here, it is much more important that he be perfectly happy hereafter forever. Differently and more accurately expressed, nothing is comparable in point of importance with man's serving God in perfection through the endless ages of eternity.

* * * * *

(The Social Gospel denies Jesus Christ.) To be sure, it emphasizes the prophetic work of Christ, but it does so at the expense of His priestly office. It claims to exalt Him as the greatest teacher of humanity, but it has nothing to say about His sacrificial death for the expiation of sin. It also says much about His kingdom, but by ignoring or misinterpreting the cross it seeks to demolish the very foundation of the kingdom.

Words fail me to express the enormity of this offense. While lauding Jesus to His face as a teacher of social ethics, the preacher of the Social Gospel calls Him a liar behind His back. He will have nothing, for instance, of the Saviour's solemn declaration that He came to give His life a ransom for many (Matthew 20:28). [While commanding men to be good and to do good, he destroys by his denial of the atonement the very basis of Christian morality.] He utterly ignores the inspired words of the apostle Peter: "Who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness" (I Peter 2:24). When rejecting the atonement, he denies Jesus Christ not only as Priest, but as Prophet and King as well. [Thus the Social Gospel would murder the true gospel, and itself is no gospel at all.] The historic gospel tells the criminal behind the bars that the bloody sacrifice of Jesus Christ on Calvary's cross has satisfied the just Judge, who, in consequence, has given orders for his release, and that this manifestation of love divine demands his soul, his life, his all. The Social Gospel has no other message for the prisoner than that he must by all means be good. That is not good news. It is not even news.

* * * * *

(The Social Gospel would save men from sin, if at all, by such external influences as education, culture, the clearance of slums, and the establishment of social centers.) Missionaries under the spell of the Social Gospel would save the heathen by teaching them the use of tooth-brushes and bath-tubs. [The Social Gospel completely overlooks, nay even denies, the emphatic teaching of Scripture that the very first requirement for the sinner's salvation is the uprooting of sin from his heart, to which God Almighty alone has access.] It contradicts the supremely significant statement of our Lord: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except one be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

It has already been remarked that the Social Gospel is narrow in its outlook. The charge of superficiality has also been suggested. Now it must be said that the Social Gospel is amazingly superficial. To be sure, no Christian will sneer at culture and education. They are beautiful and valuable gifts of God to man. But how on earth any one can make himself believe, and can in all seriousness try to make others believe, that these forces are able to make a wicked heart good, is difficult to comprehend. The appalling case of Leopold and Loeb and the oft-quoted claim of a warden of Sing Sing that he could supply a university with a complete faculty from the inmates of that institution testify against the Social Gospel. Nor will it help the liberal preacher to deny that the heart of man is desperately wicked and that the natural man is dead in trespasses and sins. History and experience are against him. And, most significant of all, when making these denials he is flatly contradicting God.

* * * * *

The Social Gospel is evolutionistic, not only in its approach, as was already indicated, but also in its program. It declares that humanity is able to save itself by resident forces; that it lies within the power of society to regenerate itself; in a word, that it can lift itself by its bootstraps. Differently expressed, it teaches that the kingdom of God will be ushered in and perfected by human effort. In still other words, the Social Gospel is thoroughly Pelagian, naturalistic through and through. Professor Shirley Jackson Case of the University of Chicago has expressed this unmistakably in his book *The Millennial Hope*. Says he: "The course of history exhibits one long process of evolving struggle by which humanity as a whole rises constantly higher in the scale of civilization and attainment, bettering its condition from time to time through its greater skill and industry. Viewed in the long perspective of the ages, man's career has been one of actual ascent.—Since history and science show that betterment is always the result of achievement, man learns to surmise that evils still unconquered are to be eliminated by strenuous effort and gradual reform rather than by the catastrophic intervention of Deity" (page 238). And Bennett is just as outspoken in *Social Salvation* when he writes: "There is one fact neglected by theologies strongly Augustinian which must be recognized, whether to recognize it be Pelagian in the current use of that word or not. It is that human salvation, yes even the grace of God, can be blocked by social and psychological conditions which only human effort can remove."

It is difficult to conceive of a teaching that goes more directly contrary to the central truth of Holy Writ. The fact that "salvation belongeth unto Jehovah" (Psalm 3:8) lies at the very heart of Scripture. To be sure, God is pleased frequently to use human endeavor for the amelioration of the ills of society. At times he thus employs the efforts even of the unregenerate. But then all the credit goes to God's common grace. However, the only sure cure for the ills of society lies in the supernatural regeneration of the individuals constituting it. That, no doubt, Isaiah had in mind when he said that wars will not cease until the earth is full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea (Isaiah 11:9). And how clearly God tells us in His Word that the promise of the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwells righteousness, will not be fulfilled until the day of the Lord, which will come as a thief, and in which the heavens will pass away with a great noise, and the elements will be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein will be burned up (II Peter 3:8-13).

In summary, the Social Gospel, in contradistinction from the historic gospel of the Christian Church, is anthropocentric, not theocentric; naturalistic, not supernaturalistic. It does not offer God's supernatural remedy for sin, but man's palliatives for sin's consequences. It proclaims not the Word of the living God, but human theories. It aims at the temporal welfare of man instead of the eternal glory of God.

All of which is but another way of saying that the Social Gospel is "a different gospel which is not another gospel," and that to it and its advocates applies the scathing denunciation of the inspired apostle: "If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema" (Gal. 1:6, 9). XXX

VISIBLE—TEMPORAL; INVISIBLE—ETERNAL

BISHOP ROBERT W. PEACH, PH.B., D. D.

PART II*

PART II. THE INVISIBLE GOD IS A PERSON.

Beware of anthropomorphism, which, primarily, is ascribing a man's body to God! Bodily form does not make personality, either in God or man. Three things make personality: thought, will, feeling—consciousness, volition, sensibility. God, invisible because incorporeal, has these three things. Nay more, He is their Source. Infinite in intellect, He is omniscient; infinite in will-power, He is omnipotent; infinite in love,—for "God is love,"—he is omnipresent in beneficence. God is a Person: He is our Creator, He is our Sovereign, He is our Father, even though no man hath seen Him, or can see!

(1) *God is Omniscient: All Knowledge is Invisible.* Hear David: "O Lord, Thou hast searched me, and known me. Thou knowest my down-sitting and mine uprising; Thou understandest my thought afar off;" and again, God "tellethe the number of the stars; He calleth them all by their names;" and once more, "Great is our Lord, and mighty in power; His understanding is infinite." Hear the Lord Jesus: "Are not five sparrows sold for two pence? and not one of them is forgotten in the sight of God. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered." And again, "God knoweth your hearts." Hear St. John: "God . . . knoweth all things."

How could God be anything less than omniscient? All visible things are His thoughts, made objective by His will. He did not think and will them yesterday or a million years ago, and sooner or later forget. With Him, there is no sooner or later, but an everlasting now. "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day," said St. Peter; and "God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM." Not only the visible, but all invisible things—spirits of angels in heaven, of angels fallen, and of men—are His thoughts, energized and endowed with consciousness by His will. If God were visible, He would have one center of consciousness, from which His thought would have to reach out with diminishing fulness; being invisible and infinite, His consciousness functions fully at once in what to us is nearest fellow-creature and farthest star. Said St. James the

* For Part I see the previous issue of *The Evangelical Student*.

Just, "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world." He who made all knows all.

(2) *God is Omnipotent: All Power is Invisible.* "The Lord . . . said . . . I am the Almighty God." "He hath made the earth by His power." "The creation of the world"—"the things that are made,"—make clearly seen "His eternal power and Godhead." "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord, the Almighty, who was and who is and who is to come." "Great and marvellous are Thy works, O Lord God, the Almighty." "Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

If God were visible, He would have one center of power, from which His potency would radiate with diminishing dynamic; being invisible and infinite, His power is exercised at once and fully in your own soul and in the Pleiades. He who made all rules all.

(3) *God is Omnipresent: All Spiritual Presence is Invisible.* David declared this in question and answer: "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me."

All of God is here, in this house of worship; again, all of God is present in the heart of each believer here; at the same instant all of God is present in the heart of every believer in the four quarters of this globe, and in every grain of sand, and in every cosmic ray, and in every swiftly receding cloud of stars a million light-years distant from this microscopic earth of ours. Almost three centuries ago Blaise Pascal wrote the sublime paradox: "God is a circle, of which the center is everywhere, the circumference nowhere." But how can God be present at once everywhere? Not in the sense of location in space, but in the sense of power—of consciousness and power—of omnipresent fulness of power. Just as you, a finite being, can direct your leg muscles to walk, your arm muscles to gesture, your throat and tongue muscles to talk, your eye muscles to look right and left, and your brain cells to generate and store thought of all these motions, and of the subject of conversation, and of things other than the subject of discussion, all at the same instant,—so God, present in His universe in the same sense as you are present in your body, can, at one and the same instant, hear a million prayers, note the fall of a sparrow, read your unspoken thoughts, and control the complex movements of untold trillions of stars. He controls! We speak of the laws of nature, but they are nought but our deductions from the observed operations of God's almighty will! If God were visible, His presence would be lo, here! or lo, there! Being invisible and infinite, His presence is lo, everywhere!—at the same instant He is wholly present in every particle of energy and in every finite spirit in the universe. He who made all is All, in all.

III. GOD THE SON IS INVISIBLE.

From everlasting, as most pure Spirit, the Son was invisible. Temporarily in the Theophanies of the Old Testament He took unto Himself a visible form. Still He—Himself, His Spirit—was invisible. In the incarnation He assumed a human form and added a human nature: that form was visible, He Himself invisible. In His resurrection body, a spiritual body, that body was visible to His disciples, but not He Himself. So shall it be when He comes again "on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory;" He will be still the invisible Christ in a visible body.

But here certain words of our Lord Jesus compel examination. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." They are not contradictory to our thesis. The verb "to see" is often used in the sense of "to perceive." It must be so understood here, for we have "seen" from the Scriptures that the Father has never taken visible form. So must also be understood the phrase of the writer to the Hebrews, "the express image of His (the Father's) person." St. Paul says explicitly of the Son that He "is the image of the invisible God." Recall, by way of illustration, the same usage in the record of Adam's creation: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," where the invisible Godhead is speaking. The Son is a Person not because He has kept His resurrection body, but because He is a Spirit: once more, personality inheres not in bodily form but in spaceless spirit, thinking, willing, feeling. The Son is invisible because spirit is invisible.

(1) *The Invisible Son is Infinite*: "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

(2) *The Infinite Son is Omniscient*: "Now we know that Thou knowest all things."

(3) *The Infinite Son is Omnipotent*: "All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made;" "By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in the earth, visible and invisible;" "Upholding all things by the word of His power." "I lay down my life, that I may take it again . . . I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." Risen, having proved that power, He declared, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth."

(4) *The Infinite Son is Omnipresent*: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." So spake He while in the body, on earth.

Later, about to reascend, He declared, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

IV. GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT IS INVISIBLE.

(1) *He is a Person*: "They rebelled and grieved His Holy Spirit;" "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God."

(2) *He is Omniscient*: "The Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I have said unto you;" "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God . . . The things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God."

(3) *He is Omnipotent*: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Almighty giveth me life;" "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

(4) *He is Omnipresent*: "The Spirit of truth . . . He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

Because of limited time, the Scripture proofs concerning the personal, invisible Third Person of the Holy Trinity, are here represented by only a few passages chosen out of many.

V. ANGELS ARE INVISIBLE: "Who maketh His angels spirits."

Whether Gabriel or Michael, or the multitude of unnamed angels; whether Satan or his host of demons—fallen angels all—are considered, their pictorial representation misleads us into thinking of them as dwelling in bodies. Even if,

at times, their Creator temporarily related them to bodies of any kind, they themselves all belong to the order of finite spirits, and spirits are invisible.

This is merely mentioned in passing, and as leading up to the discussion of ourselves.

VI. HUMAN BEINGS ARE INVISIBLE.

Man was created in the image of the Godhead, but the one God in the three Persons of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit has no bodily form. If man were a body, instead of simply being related by power to a body, his workshop, he would be visible and therefore temporal. Man is personal, his spirit, which is himself, having the functions of thinking, willing, feeling. We have these attributes of personality because God willed us into existence and endowed us with the same functions of the spirit as those which make of Him a Person. We have these attributes in finite measure, while He is infinite. We are, compared with Him, as atoms compared with the universe. But with us, as with Him, mind is the spirit thinking, will is the spirit deciding, heart is the spirit feeling.

Let us away at once and forever from a materialistic Theology and psychology! The brain does not think; the nerve-system cannot decide; the physical heart never feels. The most recent pronouncement of a materialistic psychology came from the noted surgeon, Dr. George W. Crile. In condensed form, as reported in the daily press, it is: The adrenal gland is a power station, the brain a dynamo, which generates an electric current responsible for all thinking and reasoning processes; that is, mind is a product of electricity manufactured in the brain.

We must ask whether the power-gland and the dynamo-brain are both named "Topsy." At any rate the finding is topsy-turvy. If evolution were true, and the co-ordination of these organs and the marvelous mechanism of the brain were the result of age-long development from protoplasm (we ask, whence came the protoplasm and its property of development?), then, at the moment of what we call death the dynamo would stop and the mind cease, and the person be no more existent forever. But the inversion lies in this: that the dynamo-brain is said to generate mind, whereas, if the brain does actually project electrons they are thoughts; and thoughts do not think. Finite man has no creative power; he cannot endow his thoughts with consciousness. One thought cannot be conscious of itself or aware of the next preceding or succeeding thought. A million or a billion thoughts, even if they could be massed together, would no more constitute a mind than a single lonesome thought, which could not so much as be conscious of its loneliness. Back of the dynamo-brain and back of the power-gland is the invisible dynamic spirit which is man; and back of the man-spirit is the invisible creative and sustaining Spirit who is God.

Nor will the mind cease when the body is abandoned. The soul will be dissolved—that is, the partnership between the spirit and the body will be dissolved, for "soul" is only the temporary title of the spirit while the spirit is functioning not independently but through the organs of the body—but consciousness, purpose, and feeling will not cease for so long as a split second. (A warranted translation of Genesis 2:7 is that God breathed into man's nostrils "the *spirit* of life, and man became a living soul.") It is not a rhetorical promise which the Lord Jesus made to the dying thief: "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise;" both Saviour and convert would be out of the body and both of them would experience companionship and joy. So Lazarus was comforted in the bosom of Abraham, both being out of the body. St. Paul's record of his marvelous experience in the third heaven shows how well he understood that one can "hear"

when out of the body; and he was "willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord."

Bodies are visible; human beings and all other spirits are invisible.

VII. THE THINGS WHICH ARE NOT SEEN ARE ETERNAL.

"Eternal," in its full sense, means that which is without beginning and without end.

(1) *God the Father, Invisible, is Eternal.* Hear the Scriptures: "Jehovah, the Everlasting God;" "the eternal God is thy refuge;" "from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God;" "the high and lofty One that INHABITETH ETERNITY;" "the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God."

God's attributes and sovereignty are eternal: "His ways are everlasting;" "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness;" "I have loved thee with an everlasting love;" "The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him;" "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom."

(2) *God the Son, Invisible, is Eternal and Sovereign.* Hear the Scriptures: "Before Abraham was, I AM," said the Christ; "He is before all things;" "His Name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace;" "but of the Son He saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;" "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;" "He shall reign for ever and ever."

(3) *God the Holy Spirit, Invisible, is Eternal:* He is called "the eternal Spirit" by the writer to the Hebrews; and our Lord Jesus said of "the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit," "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may be with you for ever."

(4) *Man, Invisible, is Eternal.* Hear the Word of God: "God . . . gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life;" "the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord;" "he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life;" "the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever."

Even the lost have everlasting existence: "These shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life."

No man or other created spirit has been personally existent from all eternity, but all beings now sentient have been from everlasting in the infinite thought and purpose. As to man this is clearly indicated in that "the Lamb," as the substitute for sinners, was "slain from the foundation of the world." It is in looking forward that we have assurance of never-ending blessedness. Not that God has endowed man, or any other creature, with inalienable existence; all are forever dependent upon Him, but that dependence should fill our hearts with joy; it involves no contingency: With "the Father of lights," saith St. James, "can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning." His Son, our Redeemer, "is the same yesterday and today, yea and for ever." Kept by infinite power, man's life shall never cease.

(5) While man, being spirit, is invisible, *at the resurrection he will receive a spiritual body which will be visible.* As will be true of the new heavens and the new earth that spiritual body will be eternal. The very next verse after our text says so: "we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens." Christ Jesus carried His resurrection body with Him into heaven,

and will so come again "in like manner." Doubtless He will dwell within that body for evermore: "We shall be like Him, for we shall see Him even as He is." This is a gesture of infinite love, condescending to the needs of our finite capacity to understand. You and I may use the verb literally when we sing:

"Face to face shall I behold Him—
Jesus Christ, who died for me."

We are passing, worlds are wasting,
Yet e'en now, new life foretasting,
Look we toward the City glorious
Where the Lamb, o'er death victorious,
Banishes decay and night,
Radiates eternal Light.

"So shall we ever be with the Lord"—safe-folded in the everlasting arms of unchanging Love. Amen: so shall it be.

"Now unto the King ETERNAL, immortal, INVISIBLE, the only God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen."

THE MODERN MISSIONARY MESSAGE*

FLOYD E. HAMILTON, B.D., TH.M.

During the last few years we have been deluged with a shower of books and articles by missionaries, Board secretaries, world travelers and others, telling us in effect that the missionary message of the past is no longer valid on the mission field today. We are told that we must get rid of our "superiority complex" in regard to religion and must present the "Christian way of life" not as the exclusive "way" but at the most as the best of a number of relatively good ways of life. We are told that it is presumptuous for missionaries to claim that Christianity is the one final and exclusive world religion. We are told that we should abandon the attempt to preserve the "long line of defense from Genesis to Revelation" and we should concentrate our message on Christ and the Christian way of life, paying no attention to the Bible as a whole and not attempting to defend it as the Word of God.

As a missionary and Christian I want to take exception to this whole attitude toward the Bible, the gospel, and the missionary message. If the missionary message of the past is no longer valid today, then I, for one, have no interest in remaining on the mission field. The Far East and the Near East have religions "to burn," and if Christianity is just another of the same kind, even though it is of a little easier "way" than the others and perhaps may be a better "way of life" it is hardly worth while to inflict it upon the peoples who are satisfied with their own "ways." I, for one, believe that Christianity is not merely a better way of life, but that it is the *only* way of *salvation*, and that the people of the world are absolutely *lost* for time and eternity unless they put their trust in Jesus Christ, the Divine Saviour who suffered as their Substitute on Calvary. If this is true, then no matter how unpopular I or my message, may be to the

* A timely reprint of a cogent missionary message.

peoples of non-Christian lands, I must present this message to a dying world or be unfaithful to the Lord who gave the Great Commission to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.

It is perfectly true that the people of non-Christian lands would rejoice in a different message. They do not like to be told that a Confucian, or a Buddhist, or a Shintoist, or a Mohammedan or a Brahmin, faces eternal punishment after death unless he humbles himself, gives up his old religion, and puts his trust exclusively in the crucified Son of God. Such a message is humbling to his national pride, and smacks too much of the "superiority complex" to be acceptable to the unregenerated native of the East. It would be relatively a simple matter to go to these countries and, with a message of Christian ethics, which merely claimed Christ as one of the great religious thinkers of the world, seek to obtain followers of a better "way of life." Doubtless many superficial followers could easily be obtained for such a religion, or system of ethics, provided we were not too strict in our moral requirements and did not demand the abandonment of the religion already accepted by the native. To claim that Christ is the exclusive Saviour of the world, gets one "in bad" right at the start. The non-Christian will easily tolerate us and our message if we are willing to present Christ merely as one of the greatest religious teachers of the world. He may not believe in Him but he is willing that others should do so, provided we are willing to accept Buddha and Mohammed and Confucius and all the others as teachers on the same plane.

But as a Christian and as a missionary of the Cross, I have no alternative but to present the truth that is in Christ Jesus. It is incumbent upon me to present a whole, and not a garbled gospel. Since my Christ placed His stamp of approval on the whole Old Testament, whether I will or no, I must defend the "whole line" from Genesis to Revelation. Abandonment of any portion of this line will sooner or later let the enemy into the citadel. Sooner or later the converts are going to ask how our Christ could be divine and say that Scripture could not be broken, if Moses did not write the Pentateuch, and if the story of creation is a mere Babylonian myth. Whether I will or no, if I am to defend Christ as the divine Saviour, I am forced to defend the whole Bible. No matter how unpopular such a message may be, and no matter how great the temptation to abandon some part of "the long line," I *must* present the *whole* gospel and the *whole Bible*, if I am to retain my allegiance to the Saviour, and hope to make converts worth the name.

Now let it not be thought that we are doomed to failure if we stick to this whole gospel message. Wherever, throughout the world, this message has been abandoned, diluted or compromised, there you may be sure you will find no strong, self-supporting, independent, native church. It is still difficult to make bricks without straw, and virile Christians are never produced by a "pinkish" theology. Some of you readers are doubtless contemplating spending your lives on the foreign mission field. For your encouragement I am going to tell you a little of the success that has met the proclamation of the true gospel in one mission field, that of Korea. There are many other successful mission fields where the true gospel has been preached, but because this is my own field, I may perhaps be excused for dealing with it exclusively.

Protestant Christianity is only forty years old in Korea, yet today there are over a quarter of a million Christians. Forty years ago there was not a single Christian in the city of Pyengyang where I live. Today there are eighteen Presbyterian churches and chapels, with an average attendance on Sunday of

over ten thousand people, besides six or more Methodist churches and chapels with over three thousand attendance. Forty years ago the city of Pyengyang had the reputation of being the most wicked city in the country as well as one of the dirtiest. It was noted for flies and dancing girls. Today one out of every seven Koreans in the city is a Christian. On Sunday morning one is struck with large numbers of stores whose fronts are closed, indicating that the owner is a Christian who will not buy or sell on the Lord's Day. Yet today we have with us a number of the first generation Christians. One of them, the man who as a boy stoned the first missionary, Dr. Moffet, is now an honored pastor in the Presbyterian church.

This success has not been easy. Some of the first converts were condemned to death and were saved only by a pardon which came while their heads were literally stretched on the execution block. From the very beginning whenever a man or woman decided to be a Christian he suffered more or less persecution and ostracism by his family and community. Only a year ago an evangelist who was seeking to establish a church in a non-Christian village within twenty miles of Pyengyang, was severely beaten by many of the villagers because he refused to stop preaching the gospel after being warned by them to withdraw. During this very year another evangelist, who was seeking to establish a church in a non-Christian village, was completely ostracized by the villagers who refused to sell him any food and who kept every one in the village from having anything to do with him. Let no one imagine that the reason there are so many Christians in Korea is because it is easier to make a Christian of a Korean than it is of the natives of other countries. The church was born and has developed amid the fires of persecution.

What has accounted for the success of Christian missions in Korea? There are really three fundamental causes. The first of these has been the fact that the missionaries from the very start brought a whole gospel, a whole Bible, a whole Christ and a whole salvation to Korea, and from the very beginning down to the present, have preached Christ as the only Saviour of the world. The second main cause has been the fact that mission work has been carried on according to what are called the Nevius principles,¹ the chief of which has been the insistence upon self-support for the Korean church from the very start. The second of the Nevius principles which has been very important in the growth of the church in Korea, has been the fact that from the very first the individual Christians were trained, and taught the Bible through a system of Bible study classes which is unique in Korea. The third main cause for the rapid spread of Christianity in Korea has been the fact that from the very first the individual Christians, and not merely the church officials or pastors, have been taught the Christian duty of telling others about the Saviour who has saved them.

Many people have attributed the rapid growth of Christianity in Korea to the lack of a virile native religion. It is true that we are not dealing with bigoted Mohammedans or self-confident Brahmans, but Shamanism and ancestor worship have been almost universal in Korea up to the coming of the missionaries. Even at the present time there are many sorcerers and sorceresses conducting their incantations and exorcisms in and around the city of Pyengyang. Throughout the country, almost every non-Christian house has its fetishes and sacrifices to the spirits. It has been far from easy to break the bands of these indigenous

¹ cf. C. A. Clark, *The Korean Church and the Nevius Methods*.

religions, but praise God, the pure gospel is still the power of God unto salvation to them that believe.

Korea is a living proof that it is not necessary to dilute or change the missionary message. Recent evangelistic services held for a week in our large college auditorium, which were attended every night by about six thousand people, won over seven hundred converts. There is still power in the gospel message if preached in purity and simplicity.

Doubtless it is worth while for the young missionary to study the religions of the region into which he goes. There is probably much good in some of these religions, but if he studies them with an idea that it is necessary to adapt the Christian message to the religious prejudices of the country to which he goes, he is falling into grave error and sooner or later will lose the respect even of his non-Christian opponents. I do not mean, of course, that he should be tactless in his presentation of the gospel message, or that he should not utilize every point of contact in the religions or customs of the land into which he goes, but sometimes tact is only another name for cowardice, and the missionary who looks for too many points of contact finds that the points of contact are like the arms of the octopus, slowly choking the life out of his distinctive missionary message. I do not mean that it is necessary for the young missionary to go about with a chip on his shoulder looking for trouble in the proclamation of the gospel message, but I do mean that he should not conceal or omit those features which are vital to the Christian religion and to the gospel message merely because they run counter to the religious ideas of the natives. Moreover, the missionary who spends most of his time pointing out the good in the native religions is going to find that the natural result of such a line of talk is the increasing of the native's pride and satisfaction with his own religion and aggressive defense of the points in his religion which the missionary attacks. I believe that, after, all the best ordinary method for the missionary to follow is the positive one of preaching Christ and Him crucified as the only Saviour of the world, with all that goes with this gospel message. The Oriental mind is not so weak that it cannot discover the points of similarity between the two religions, and the less the native is led to think about his own religion the more likely will he be to consider seriously the claims of the gospel message. After all, it is the Holy Spirit's business to convert sinners, not ours, and the Holy Spirit does not use a discussion about Buddhism or Confucianism to convict the world of sin and lead it to Christ. It is the gospel message, and the gospel message *only* that the Holy Spirit uses as His instrument in regeneration.

The modern missionary message should be modern only in the sense that all truth, however old, is modern. At the present time great stress is being laid upon the improvement of the economic standards of the people of mission lands. The writer is an enthusiastic supporter of agricultural mission work in Korea, but unless these efforts all have for their aim the building up of a strong, self-supporting church of Christ in mission lands, the missionary is wasting his time as a missionary, for the improvement of economic conditions alone, has never brought any people to Christ. The Christ of the Korean road—of every road is no different from the Christ of Calvary, or the Christ of Galilee, or the Christ of Ephesus, or the Christ of Luther and Calvin. He is the same yesterday, today, and forever, and as long as the heart of man remains dead in sin, so long should the missionary message be the unchanged gospel of salvation.

THE TESTIMONY OF A VENERABLE DEFENDER OF THE FAITH

LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

The writer of this article has now passed far beyond the meridian of life. By the time this appears in print, he will be numbered among the octogenarians. The accompanying physical weakness makes almost all physical effort real labor for him. For that reason he is unable to comply with the request of the kindly editor to contribute an article of about two thousand words to this magazine. The physical effort of pounding out such an article on the typewriter is too strenuous a task for him.

But he wants to bear testimony to the keeping grace of God and the continued preciousness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ through all the passing years of his life. Does the religion of Jesus Christ, as set forth in the Canonical Scriptures, grow more precious as the Christian believer advances in years? I wish to bear witness that it does; and I am all the more anxious to bear this testimony to the many young men and women of our League who may read these lines. To those who believe sincerely, our Lord becomes increasingly precious the longer we trust in Him.

This perennial freshness of the Gospel goes with the full acceptance of the evangelical doctrine of the person and blessed work of our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man. The Christian believer who is old and who must, perforce, look frankly into the face of eternity, feels that he needs a Redeemer who "is mighty to save." He cannot be satisfied with a mere human example and teacher. He feels his need of a *divine* Saviour—one who could, by His atoning sacrifice and death, make expiation for the sins of the whole world. Only a Divine-human Person could do that.

Yes, the aged Christian believer experiences through all the years that the Christ who was supernaturally conceived and virgin born is his Saviour; for if Christ had been naturally procreated, He would have been only a human person. But no mere human person could have atoned for the sins of the whole world. Moreover, if Christ had been naturally generated, He would have been a sinner, like the rest of us, and could not have saved even Himself, but would Himself have needed a Saviour.

And how about the Bible for the evangelical believer as he climbs the slopes of Mount Zion? Well, it becomes more and more precious to him. It has perennial resourcefulness. More and more he feels the need of an infallible divine revelation—one which speaks with the voice of authority on the fundamental problems of human inquiry; one which tells him infallibly whence he has come, why he is here, and whither he is bound. These are vital problems, and ought to be solved for us now in the present life; and they *are* solved for us by the Bible, and are most beautifully illumined. Yes, and the Bible also tells us just how we may live the best life here and attain the best destiny in the world to come. What a comfort such a doctrine is as one nears the borderland!

Have you a word to say about your prospects of the future? Yes! Yes! an uplifting word! an exhilarating word! Slightly paraphrasing one of the Proverbs, I would put it in this way: "The path of the justified believer is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." He knows that the gateway of an immortal and blessed futurity stands wide ajar. No clouds obscure his vision as he contemplates the future. When he takes the last step on his

earthly pilgrimage, he knows that the next step will plant his feet upon the golden street of the New Jerusalem.

For the evangelical believer as he approaches the end of his earthly journey, the holy truths of Biblical Christianity do not grow vapid and humdrum, but ever more engaging and luminous.

Springfield, Ohio.

YOUR FATHER WHO IS IN HEAVEN—A SCRIPTURAL MEDITATION

JOHN MURRAY, M.A., TH.M.

The Fatherhood of God the believer has in mind when he addresses God as the Father in heaven, the Fatherhood that is supremely precious to him as mediated through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus and as the result of a right graciously bestowed upon him as a believer, is not the universal, all-embracing relationship that God sustains to all men. But though not universal, it is none the less very real. And it is real, because it rests upon or is constituted by an act of God. It becomes particularly important to insist that the fact of sonship rests upon a distinct and specific act of God, as distinct and specific as any other of the saving acts such as regeneration, effectual calling and justification. It is true that all who have been regenerated have been also adopted; all who have been effectually called have been also adopted; and all who have been justified have been also adopted. These acts of God are all inseparably united. But neither regeneration, nor effectual calling, nor justification, is adoption. In regeneration and effectual calling God acts as sovereign Lord, in justification as righteous Judge, but in adoption He becomes in a high and transcendent sense *Father*. "Adoption," says the Shorter Catechism, "is an act of God's free grace, whereby we are received into the number, and have a right to all the privileges of the sons of God." It is by this act and by this act alone that we are sons.

This doctrine is calculated to correct two extremes, the extreme on the one hand of the universal Fatherhood of God, which empties our sonship of everything that is saving and redemptive, and the extreme on the other hand of a false and God-dishonoring modesty to which the people of God are sometimes liable. While on the one hand we must not attenuate the divine Fatherhood so as to nullify its significance and indulge in that flippant familiarity that denies or forgets the awful holiness and majesty of the Almighty, on the other hand those who are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ must to the full appreciate the meaning of their adoption into the family of God. It is sonship through adoption that is the ground and guarantee of the highest blessings and privileges.

It is an unspeakable privilege that we should be the partakers of the regenerative and sanctifying operations of the sovereign Lord who calls the things that be not as though they were, and who works in His children to will and to do of His good pleasure. It is an unspeakable privilege to enjoy the vindication of God as righteous Judge and Justifier before the bar of every accuser just and unjust. It is an unspeakable privilege to enjoy the protection of God as King eternal, immortal, invisible, against the assault of every enemy within and without. But surely it is the acme of unspeakable privilege that we should be introduced as sons and as daughters into the family of the Lord God Almighty, and thus enjoy

the care and love of Him as Father. Believers are not simply subjects of His kingdom; they are members of the divine household. "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God." (I John 3:1).

True believers will experience much in this world that will perplex and afflict. They must be tried and sanctified. Indeed they must be chastised. "If ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons." (Heb. 12:8). These experiences are not joyous but grievous, and they sometimes cause them to reel and stagger. Clouds and darkness may surround God's dealings with them; the providence of God is wrapped in mystery. "How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out!" (Rom. 11:33).

In the stress and strain of mysterious pathways, what is to be the final consolation of the people of God? Is it to be a bearing of Stoical indifference or fatalism? By no means. It is to be the assurance that the God who is over all, of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things, and of whose unerring plan all history is the unfolding, is their all-powerful and all-wise Father. He will withhold no good thing from His children. All things work together for their good. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" (Matt. 7:11).

CURRENT EVANGELICAL BOOKS—REVIEWED

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH IN THE MODERN WORLD

*J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D. The MacMillan Company, New York, 1936.
Pp. 258. \$2.00.*

A book from the pen of Dr. J. Gresham Machen will quite properly command the attention of every thoughtful Christian and informed Modernist. Widely recognized as the ablest and most influential defender of orthodox Christianity in America, a publication from Dr. Machen may be hated or despised but cannot be ignored. In the writings of this great man of God, scholarship combines with clarity in such an unusual degree as to make one loathe to think of defending the views that he opposes.

The Christian Faith in the Modern World is a cogent presentation of supernatural Christianity as set forth in the Holy Scriptures. It is far from being just another presentation of the basic doctrines of the Christian Faith. There are at least four great advantages which this presentation of the Christian message has over the average treatment of the same doctrines.

First, there is the freshness and originality of approach to many of the old truths which makes old doctrines throb with new life. This is due to the fact that Dr. Machen presents historic Christianity on the background of twentieth century thought and life—its criticisms and needs. This is to be seen in part from the headings of the various chapters: I—The Present Emergency and How to Meet it, II—How May God Be Known?, III—Has God Spoken?, IV—Is the Bible the Word of God?, V—Do We Believe in Verbal Inspirations?, VI—Shall We Defend the Bible?, VII—The Bible Versus Human Authority, VIII—Life Founded Upon Truth, IX—God, the Creator, X—The Triune God, XI—What Is the Deity of Christ?, XII—Does the Bible Teach the Deity of Christ?, XIII—The Sermon on the Mount and the Deity of Christ, XIV—What Jesus Said about Him-

self, XV—The Supernatural Christ, XVI—Did Christ Rise from the Dead?, XVII—The Testimony of Paul to Christ, XVIII—The Holy Spirit.

Second, as can be seen from the headings of the various chapters, this book has an advantage over other books of a similar character in that it presents in logical sequence the subjects discussed. These messages were delivered as radio messages and in the very necessity of the case had to present a coherent and unified series in logical sequence.

Third, there is combined with this *presentation* of the Christian Faith a *reasoned defense* of the same. The author does not evade the modern attacks upon Christianity and thus capitulate to the enemy. Rather, he faces the attack and wards off the attack upon the citadel of Christian truth with a convincing apologetic of the Christian religion. It is this feature of the book which perhaps more than any other commends the book as admirably adapted to use among students.

Fourth, the inimitable clarity and the elegant style with which the author writes makes the glorious doctrines of the Christian Faith flow before the reader in a richness and power seldom experienced.

This book should be read by every member of the League of Evangelical Students and will be found to be one of the finest books for use in personal work among fellow students ever published.

The student-world will eagerly await the publication of the continuation of this series dealing with the doctrine of man and the doctrine of salvation.

C. K. CUMMINGS.

* * * * *

THE BASIS OF EVOLUTIONARY FAITH

Floyd E. Hamilton. James E. Clarke, London. 1931. 222p. 6s.

For those who wish an introduction into the arguments against evolution this book is a prerequisite. It does not give a close technical presentation of any one argument against evolution, though in footnotes and bibliography it suggests further study. But it does show the beginner what arguments there are against this theory now so widely assumed.

The early chapters show the importance of the debate. The theory is now vulnerable, for the old causes are now shown to be inadequate. Darwinism is dead as the *Encyclopedia Britannica* is quoted as admitting (p. 122). But the debate is important for Christians for, logically or not, this theory has undermined Christianity in the colleges more, probably, than any one other influence. The theoretical possibility of "theistic evolution" is granted (with perhaps more concession than is necessary). But if the whole theory is wrong, by all means let us make a frontal attack.

The evidence is presented in eight chapters which we shall very briefly summarize: (1) We are told that the chromosome material in any one species is constant (p. 95), but the variation among the different species shows no rhyme or reason. "Evolutionists are forced to admit that the evolution (sic!) of chromosome numbers has taken place on the whole fitfully, irregularly and in various ways!" (2) The science of genetics with the rediscovery of Mendel's work in 1900 has come to our aid. The genes are the factors influencing heredity and they, being unaffected by environment may be reshuffled, but never added to. "No new characteristic is ever added by Mendelian variations" (p. 115). (3) The evidence from classification and (4) the evidence from comparative anatomy can be linked together for classification rests on comparative anatomy. The wing

of a bird, flipper of a whale, and arm of a man look very impressive on the first page of biology textbooks. But what about the eye of a cuttle fish, of a pecten (a bivalve mollusc), and of the vertebrates? In this case similarity of structure does not prove intimate relationship; why must it ever prove more than similarity of purpose? After all is it not proper for a bird to have wings, or must it have a propeller to prove its dissimilarity? (5) The old argument from embryology is rightfully scouted. In an embryo the heart develops before the blood vessels. Did it so develop first in the alleged process of evolution? (6) Vestigial organs are shown to arise merely from our ignorance of the true functions of some of the more obscure organs of the body. One by one most all of them have been proved to be indispensable to us or at least highly useful to us as now constituted. (7) The Nuttall blood tests also it seems are not what the newspapers claim. At best they would only prove a likeness in the chemical constitution of the blood. But as a matter of fact this blood relation between species is not quantitatively what the evolutionists would lead us to expect. (8) The geological proof and proof from the distribution of species is also well treated. Some of the self-contradictions of the current geology are pointed out, but the student is referred to George MacReady Price's work for fuller treatment (reviewed in the *Evangelical Student* January, 1936.)

The book impresses one with the fact that arguments against evolution are not lacking. Much of the experimental evidence is already collected by the evolutionists themselves. But there is a real need for Christian students and scientists to re-investigate the whole subject and show the fallacy of this theory that has had such baneful effects during the past century.

R. LAIRD HARRIS.

* * * * *

THE CHALLENGE OF KAGAWA TO THE CHURCH AND NATION

Rev. R. A. Ofstedal. Augsburg Publishing House. Pp. 104. Ten Cents.

The author of this pamphlet deserves much praise. He has done a vital and needed work, and has done it well. He treats Kagawa kindly and fairly, as a Christian should, and recognizes the many good things that the Japanese reformer says in his books and lectures. Due cognizance is also taken of Kagawa's sacrificial service in behalf of the poor and oppressed.

But our admiration of Kagawa's earnestness and devotion ought not to blind us to the serious errors in doctrine which he holds and advocates in his published writings. Perhaps these errors are all the more dangerous because of his religious fervor.

Rev. Mr. Ofstedal has carefully examined Kagawa's books, and has made numerous quotations from them, giving titles and pages, so that the reader can check them for himself if he desires to do so. These quotations will show clearly that Kagawa is far from being evangelical in his theology. He is not sound on the following vital matters: Biblical inspiration, the deity of Christ, His virgin birth, His substitutional atonement, and His bodily resurrection from the dead. If he does not always pointedly reject these fundamental doctrines, he makes ambiguous and compromising statements regarding them.

I wish to urge upon the public a careful and unbiased reading of Mr. Ofstedal's incisive pamphlet. Let the truth be told.

LEANDER S. KEYSER,
Springfield, Ohio.

CONVENTION NEWS

LEAGUE INITIATES SUMMER CONFERENCE FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS.

After having presented the question of a Summer conference to the Convention, some of the stronger Chapters in the East are making definite plans for sponsoring a seven day summer conference for college students immediately after the colleges disband for the summer. The use of a splendid site is being arranged and through the cooperation of every Chapter in the East with Headquarters, it is hoped that the first League summer conference may be sponsored this coming June. The purpose of this conference will be to draw students away from the numerous liberal student conferences held at this time of the year and afford students an opportunity to hear great scholars and men of God defend and expound the Scriptures. The mornings will probably be confined to systematic class room instruction with the afternoon's free for recreation and the evenings reserved for evangelistic meetings. This was a most necessary and important step. A summer conference for the mid-West is sorely needed. Pray God may raise up a summer conference for the students of the mid-West. (See announcement on cover.)

* * * * *

PROGRAM OF STUDY PREPARED FOR USE NEXT FALL. At the Convention the Committee on the Program of Study for the League of Evangelical Students reported that all but four lessons for the first year's portion of the program of study had been written and would shortly be submitted to the Board of Trustees for their approval. This Program of Study will supply undoubtedly the greatest need the League has ever had—the need for a systematic study of the Word of God. The course of study will present in a systematic way the basic truths of the Christian Faith, will defend them in the light of modern attacks, will study specific books of the Bible, provide daily Scripture readings, and suggest reading matter for further enlightenment on the subjects discussed. If every Chapter will use this program of study, the testimony of its members and of the League at large will be strengthened in a manner it has never been strengthened before. When one thousand students are armed with an intelligent knowledge of the Word of God and speak it forth we may expect a tremendous blessing from Almighty God.

* * * * *

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION MADE FOR "VOLUNTEER" GROUPS. In view of the growing apostasy of the Student Volunteer Movement, the League of Evangelical Students at its recent Convention in Chicago made a provision in its Constitution for such groups. The amendment in the final form in which it was adopted reads—"Any independent missionary volunteer group may be accepted as an affiliated member of the League of Evangelical Students by a three-quarter vote at the annual convention. Any such group will maintain its identity as a missionary group, but in the schools where no Chapter of the League exists, the group will have the full rights of a Chapter until a regular Chapter is formed. In a school where a Chapter of the League already exists, the group, while maintaining its identity, shall be counted as a part of the Chapter. These groups will of necessity affirm their accord with the Constitution of the League as required in Section 3 of that Constitution."

SERIOUS CONSIDERATION TO BE GIVEN TO HIGH SCHOOL WORK. Due to the growing anti-Christian teaching and the increasing amount of immorality in our high schools, considerable demand has been made for the League's assistance in high school work. The Convention went on record as favoring work in High Schools to be carried on under the supervision of local Chapters. A committee of three was directed to be appointed to study the proposed amendment to the Constitution for High School work and to report at the next Convention. This committee is to notify each Chapter in the fall as to their tentative findings. The High Schools present a tremendously needy field. High School groups would be splendid "feeders" for college Chapters of the League.

* * * * *

NINE NEW CHAPTERS VOTED MEMBERSHIP IN LEAGUE. The following Chapters were officially received into League membership at the February Convention—Wooster College, Oberlin College, University of Nebraska, Allegheny College, Hastings College, Puget Sound College, University of Georgia, University of Tennessee, and Converse College. Four Chapters were expeditiously excinded because of failure to carry on an active program of Christian testimony. The groups at Wooster and Oberlin have received official recognition from their respective faculties.

* * * * *

NEW OFFICERS AND TRUSTEES ELECTED. Student officers for the next year are: President—Harvey McArthur of Westminster Seminary, Vice-President—Mr. John Bratt of Calvin Seminary, Secretary—Miss Emily MacDonald of Eastern Baptist Seminary, Members at Large—Jack Hillis of Wheaton College, and John Wilcox of Columbia Bible College. Trustees Lewis S. Chafer, D.D., and Leander S. Keyser, M.A., D.D., were reelected. Dr. James Oliver Buswell, Professor Thomas Wellmers of Hope College, and Professor Linford Marquart of Eastern Nazarene College were elected to fill the places of Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, Dr. Herbert Mackenzie, and Mr. I. H. Linton. Mr. DeFriend of Evangelical Theological College was elected to fill the expired term of the student representative on the Board of Trustees—Miss Marjorie Erdman.

* * * * *

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FIELD SECRETARY. The Annual Report of the Field Secretary revealed that 105 visits were made to colleges and seminaries, 49 speaking engagements were fulfilled, 17,504 miles traveled, 1,007 first class letters, 2,000 second class letters, and 777 packages of propoganda were mailed.

* * * * *

ATTENDANCES AT THE CONVENTION. Thirty institutions were represented at the Eleventh Annual Convention of the League of Evangelical Students. Many of the delegates had to travel hundreds of miles over icy roads. The most distant points represented were—Oregon, Massachusetts, Toronto, and Texas. At one meeting of the League there were about fifteen hundred. At the closing service in the Moody Memorial Church approximately three thousand turned out to hear Dr. Machen preach on Micaiah the son of Imlah. At the more average meetings such as the afternoon and some of the evening meetings the attendances ranged from two to three hundred. When it is realized that numerous students were prevented from attending the Convention because of the terrible conditions of the road, it is rather remarkable that these attendances were had.

AN ANNOUNCEMENT AND AN APPEAL!

The League of Evangelical Students has frequently chosen to endanger its bank account in order that the testimony of "The Evangelical Student" might go forth to the student world and to our subscribers. It becomes increasingly evident that "The Evangelical Student" magazine is one of the most effective means of reaching the student world with the everlasting Gospel. To relinquish the regular publication of this organ of the League would be to seriously impair our Christian testimony. But this is inevitable unless God raises up friends who care.

Most of the student members of the League have helped magnanimously to support the League's testimony, but we cannot depend on them entirely. We must have the help of every subscriber and friend. If you believe in what the League stands for will you not lend your aid?

THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

Headquarters—Reformed Episcopal Seminary
25 S. 43rd St., Philadelphia, Pa.

ANNOUNCEMENT FOR ALL LEAGUE CHAPTERS IN THE SOUTH

On April 17th-18th there will be a Regional Conference for the South at Queens-Chicora College, Charlotte, N. C. A splendid program with such speakers as Dr. W. Childs Robinson, Rev. Professor R. B. Kuiper, Dr. Robert C. McQuilkin, Dr. William Wrighton, Rev. James E. Moore, and Calvin Knox Cummings has been arranged. There will be no registration fee, and lodging will be supplied free. Christian and non-Christian students of the Southland are cordially invited to attend. Every League Chapter in the South should be represented. The first Regional Conference for the South-east! Plan to attend! Send registrations at once to Miss Frances Query, Queens-Chicora College, Charlotte, N. C.

CHAPTER DIRECTORY of the LEAGUE of EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

- ALBANY COLLEGE,
Albany, Oregon.
- ALLEGHENY COLLEGE,
Meadville, Pennsylvania.
- ASHLAND COLLEGE,
Ashland, Ohio.
- BEAVER COLLEGE,
Jenkintown, Pennsylvania.
- BLOOMFIELD COLLEGE AND THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
Bloomfield, New Jersey.
- UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA,
Vancouver, British Columbia.
- JOHN BROWN UNIVERSITY,
Siloam Springs, Arkansas.
- CALVIN COLLEGE,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- COLUMBIA BIBLE COLLEGE,
Columbia, South Carolina.
- CONVERSE COLLEGE,
Spartansburg, South Carolina.
- CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, New York.
- UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE,
Newark, Delaware.
- EASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMI-
NARY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE,
Wollaston, Massachusetts.
- EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
Dallas, Texas.
- GENEVA COLLEGE,
Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania.
- UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,
Athens, Georgia.
- GORDON COLLEGE OF THEOLOGY AND
MISSIONS,
Boston, Massachusetts.
- HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE,
Hampden-Sydney, Va.
- HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- HASTINGS COLLEGE,
Hastings, Nebraska.
- HAVERFORD COLLEGE,
Haverford, Pennsylvania.
- JOHNS HOPKINS TRAINING SCHOOL,
Baltimore, Maryland.
- KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Pittsburgh, Kansas.
- LAFAYETTE COLLEGE,
Easton, Pennsylvania.
- LEHIGH UNIVERSITY,
Bethlehem, Pa.
- UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE,
Louisville, Kentucky.
- MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE,
East Lansing, Michigan.
- UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE,
Chicago, Illinois.
- NATIONAL BIBLE INSTITUTE,
New York, New York.
- UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebraska.
- UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,
Norman, Oklahoma.
- UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- OBERLIN COLLEGE,
Oberlin, Ohio.
- PHILADELPHIA COLLEGE OF PHARMACY
AND SCIENCE,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, New Jersey.
- PUGET SOUND COLLEGE,
Tacoma, Washington.
- QUEENS-CHICORA COLLEGE,
Charlotte, North Carolina.
- REFORMED EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- SHIPPENSBURG STATE TEACHERS
COLLEGE,
Shippensburg, Pennsylvania.
- SIoux FALLS COLLEGE,
Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
- TEMPLE UNIVERSITY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
Austin, Texas.
- UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
Knoxville, Tennessee.
- VASSAR COLLEGE,
Poughkeepsie, New York.
- UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
Seattle, Washington.
- WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Holland, Michigan.
- WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- WHEATON COLLEGE,
Wheaton, Illinois.
- WILSON COLLEGE,
Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.
- WOOSTER COLLEGE,
Wooster, Ohio.

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM LIBRARY

Announcing the

FIRST SUMMER CONFERENCE

OF THE

League of Evangelical Students

AT

The Old Mill Conference Ground

BRANDAMORE (Chester County, Pa.)

CANOEING - SWIMMING

COST PER PERSON ONLY \$8.00 (PROBABLY)

Tentative Program

- STUDIES IN GENESIS** BARNARD H. TAYLOR, M.A., D.D.
Professor of Old Testament Interpretation, Eastern Baptist Seminary
- CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE AND EVIDENCES** R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D.
Professor Practical Theology, Westminster Seminary
- STUDIES IN ROMANS** GORDON H. CLARK, PH.D.
Philosophy Department, University of Pennsylvania
- PERSONAL EVANGELISM** REV. WILLIAM CULBERTSON
Pastor and Professor, Reformed Episcopal Church
- MISSIONS** REV. HAROLD COMMONS
President, Independent Baptist Mission Board
- EVENING PREACHING** REV. JAMES E. MOORE
Southern Presbyterian Church
- DR. J. GRESHAM MACHEN
Northern Presbyterian Church
- REV. HORACE WOOD
Baptist Church
- REV. CHARLES J. WOODBRIDGE
Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions
- AND OTHERS

SEND REGISTRATIONS TO HEADQUARTERS