Theological Seminary
Library


# CHRISTIANITY TODAY

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

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor — H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

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

MID-OCTOBER, 1930
Vol. 1 No. 6

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# What Is a Christian?

A DEFINITION to have value must be exclusive as well as inclusive. It must tell what a thing is not as well as what it is. We do not expect, therefore, that our attempt to define a Christian will add to our popularity. No doubt if we could content ourselves with some definition inclusive of practically all those who are called Christians, whether by themselves or by others, we would offend some who belong to the religious minority but hardly any who belong to the religious majority at the present time. And yet despite the fact that there are few things more calculated to make a man unpopular in the sphere of religious discussion today we are going to answer the question, "What is a Christian?", in a way that will necessarily imply that many who are called Christians are not such at all. It seems to us highly important that this be done; because while we regard it as a matter of no special moment whether a man be a Christian in the loose sense in which the word is often employed—a sense that often means little more than that the man is not a Jew or that he regards JESUS as the ideal man—we regard it a matter of eternal significance whether he is a Christian in the restricted sense in which it is employed in the New Testament and which it has all but universally borne throughout the Christian centuries, at least until the rise of Modernism.

What is needed is a definition that will enable us to distinguish between the Christian and the non-Christian; more particularly, since it is often true that GOD alone is capable of doing this, a definition that will enable us to determine whether we ourselves are Christians and as such heirs according to the promise. Obviously there is a close connection between the questions, "What is a Christian?" and "What is Christianity?" (cf. our June issue) inasmuch as the answer we give to the latter necessarily determines the answer we give to the former. None the less the two questions should not be confused. It is one thing to say what Christianity is and another thing to say what a Christian is. The former assertion moves in the sphere of the objective, the latter in the sphere of the subjective. While there could be no such thing as a Christian if there were no such thing as Christianity, it is conceivable that Christianity should exist even if there were no Christians. And even if it be maintained that in view of the promises of GOD it is not even conceivable that Christianity should exist without there being some Christians, it will at least be confessed that the fact that Christianity exists carries with it no assurance that we ourselves are Christians. What we are concerned to point out now are those marks or characteristics lacking which a man is not a Christian but possessing which a man is a Christian no matter how lacking he may be in other respects.

In approaching this question it is of first importance that we realize that it is an historical question, and that history alone can furnish us with the right answer. Many, for instance, seem to assume that this question is more or less synonomous with the question, What is the ideal man? Now we are not all disposed to deny that men are moved by a true impulse when they assume that the terms "Christian man" and "ideal man" are more or less interchangeable, at least when we have in mind what the Christian man is to become rather than what he is. It does not follow, however, that these two questions can rightly be treated as synonomous. The first is primarily an historical question; the second is primarily an ethical or philosophical question. Conceivably history may give such an answer to the question, What is a Christian? that we will have no inclination to look upon the Christian man as the ideal man—witness NIETZSCHE. Be this as it may, we have no right to assume, prior to investigation, that the full-grown Christian man and the ideal man are one and the same person. Moreover if we ignore the fact that this question is first, last and always an historical question, it will be hardly possible to justify one

## IN THIS ISSUE:


The Reformation Gospel in the Modern World ..... 4
Walter A. Maier

The Present Position in the Presbyterian Church of England ..... 6
A. H. Fraser

Dr. Machen Surveys Dr. Speer's New Book ..... 9
J. G. Machen

Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice ..... 12

Letters to the Editor ..... 14

Current Views and Voices ..... 16

News of the Church ..... 18

answer as over against opposing answers. If, however, it be realized that the question is fundamentally an historical question, and that the word "Christian" has a specific content of its own, given it once and for all at a definite period in the world's history, it will be seen that the word is used legitimately only when it is used in that particular sense.

It is sometimes assumed, even by those who recognize its historical character, that we can obtain a sufficiently exact answer to it by ascertaining what is common to those professing and calling themselves Christians, what is common being regarded as essential and what is not common as unessential. This assumption is untenable whether we consider it chronologically or geographically—that is whether have in mind all those who throughout the ages have professed and called themselves Christians or merely those of one age who profess and call themselves Christians. Suppose that any of those who call themselves Christians are not really Christians at all. Then what is common to them all would include only what the Christian has in common with the non-Christian. But even if all such are really Christians such a method would give us a definition that would tell us not what a normal, representative Christian is, but of the least a man may be and still be a Christian. No doubt the method would be valuable if it would give us even this but inasmuch as it is as certain as anything can be that there is and always have been (even in the Apostolic age) Christians falsely so-called, it is as clear as day that such a method will not yield us even this.

It is not enough then that we realize that this question is an historical question; we must also realize that it is a question the answer to which must be sought in a particular section of a definite historic period, viz., that covered by the New Testament. The word "Christian" was coined in the city of Antioch—so LUKE tells us in the Book of Acts—to designate the new kind of people that were increasing in its midst, a people that were different both from those who worshipped in pagan temples and those who worshipped in Jewish synagogues; and only as the word is used to designate a people of the same type is the word used in its proper historic sense. We may or may not admire the type of man this and similar words were used to designate in the New Testament; but at any rate the word is properly used only when it is used in the sense that the writers of the New Testament attached to it. Certainly that is what we are concerned to indicate when we attempt to say what a Christian is. What is more, as already intimated, it is only when the word, "Christian," is taken in its New Testament sense that we consider it a matter of any great significance whether or no a man is a Christian. This is not to say that the Christian literature of later periods has nothing to contribute to our knowledge of what a Christian is. Far from it. Few of us have obtained our conception of what a Christian is directly from the New Testament. But it is to say that these later representations have validity only as they explicate that found in the New Testament. In a word the New Testament literature alone is normative in this connection.

If now we approach the question, "What is a Christian?" in the consciousness not only that the answer must be sought in the field of history but in that particular field of history covered by the New Testament, what do we find to be the marks lacking which a man is not esteemed a Christian but possessing which he is regarded as such?

It should be obvious to all that such marks will not be found among the things that may be common to Christains and non-Christians, such as honesty and truthfulness and kindness and devotion to ideals. What we are seeking are not the things that the Christian may have in common with the high-minded non-Christian, but the things that are distinctive of the Christian—not everything that is distinctive of the Christian but rather those of central significance. If we mistake not *the* distinctive marks of a Christian, according to the New Testament, are (1) the Christian is one who stands in a religious relation to CHRIST and (2) the Christian is one who receives and rests upon CHRIST alone for salvation from the guilt and power of sin. The New Testament knows nothing of Christians who do not both recognize CHRIST as an object of religion and look to Him alone for salvation. It is necessary to stress the word, "both" in this connection inasmuch as the Judaizers apparently recognized CHRIST as an object of worship; they did not, however, trust CHRIST and CHRIST alone for salvation with the result that PAUL refused to recognize them as Christians. But while the New Testament knows nothing of Christians who did not worship CHRIST and look to Him and Him alone for salvation yet all of whom this was true were unhesitatingly recognized as such, no matter how imperfect in thought and life they were in other respects.

A Christian, therefore, is to be defined as one who stands in a religious relation to JESUS CHRIST and who receives and rests upon Him alone for salvation. But while these two things are characteristic of all true Christians, it is not to be supposed that all Christians have anything like a clear understanding of their presuppositions. The informed and clear-headed Christian realizes that a religious attitude toward CHRIST is warranted only on the assumption that "being the eternal SON of GOD He became man, and so was and continueth to be GOD and MAN, in two distinct natures, and one person, forever." But while a religious attitude toward CHRIST is warranted only if CHRIST is Himself GOD yet in considering the question whether a particular individual is a Christian it is his attitude toward CHRIST rather than the warrant for such an attitude that should command our attention. Again the informed and clear-headed Christian realizes that we are warranted in receiving and resting upon CHRIST alone for salvation only on the assumption that He by virtue of what He is and did is qualified to save us; so that as a matter of fact He not only bestows forgiveness upon those who put their trust in Him but through the HOLY SPIRIT regenerates them and so enables them to walk in newness of life. And yet in considering whether a particular individual is a Christian, whether we ourselves are Christians, our attention should be directed not so much to what it behooves CHRIST to be and do in order that our faith in Him may be savingly effective as to whether we are actually trusting Him to save us from the guilt and power of sin. CHRIST is able to save and does save all those who put their trust in Him even though their knowledge of His qualifications for this task be very imperfect. We would not indeed go so far as to say that

# The Reformation Gospel in the Modern World

By the Rev. Prof. Walter A. Maier, Ph. D.

(Dr. Maier is a Professor in Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, and is regarded as one of the prominent and brilliant figures of American Lutheranism. This article is the abridgment of an address delivered at the "Luther Day Celebration" at Asbury Park, Ocean Grove, N. J., on August fifth of this year and takes the place of our sermon in this issue.)

CAN an enlightened, modern mind still believe in the Bible? Can we still hold that Scripture is what it claims to be, namely, the inerrant, complete, and convincing revelation of God to mankind; or must we reject the Bible as a disappointing relic of a superstitious day now happily removed. In short, is the Gospel of Jesus Christ still the power of God unto salvation in this twentieth and enlightened age, or is it simply tradition? To employ a less dignified designation, is it fairy-tale, folklore, and myth? This is the alternative that presents itself to us this afternoon, not merely as one of the tremendous issues of present day thought and present day tendencies, but also as a reflex of that epoch making battle that was fought four hundred years ago when the Lutheran clergy and the Lutheran laity united in presenting to Charles V the immortal pages of the Augsburg Confession.

Never before have there been as many who have risen up in bold determination to tear Christianity out of the hearts of their fellow men, to dethrone the God of the Bible, and to set up in His place as the supreme oracle and authority, human reason and human intelligence. We think almost instinctively of the tragedies of Red-ruled Russia where the greatest away-from-the-Bible movement that history has ever known is now being promoted with grim and desperate determination, where hundreds of churches have been desecrated and closed in the anti-religious campaign of the Soviet authorities, and where images of the Savior are torn out of the dismantled churches, dragged through the mud of the streets, and burned in public bonfires to symbolize the triumph of reason over religion.

So ruthless and so brutal are the inroads which the atheistic Bolshevists are making on the Christian Church that a wave of hot resentment and fiery protest has swept over the churches of our country; and so scathing is our denunciation of this bloody persecution that many have overlooked a very similar tendency right here within the confines of this so-called Christian country. Moscow may be 3,000 miles away; the Russian atheist in his racial affinities, in his appearance, in his dress, in his customs, in his morals, in his education, and in his whole philosophy of life may be as far from the American free-thinker and the American liberalist and skeptic preacher as any two conceivable extremes can differ from each other; yet when it comes to religion—or the lack of it and the opposition to it—we are not as far from Russia as we may think. The same rampant reaction against religion is faithfully re-echoed throughout the American nation.

How else can we explain the spread of atheism in the United States within the last decade or two, the formation of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, the organization of atheistic clubs and "Societies of Damned Souls" in our colleges and universities, the prominence given to Sinclair Lewis and men of his type when they rise up to deny the existence of God and to offer God five minutes to strike them down dead? How else can we interpret the desecration of Christian pulpits and the prostitution of Christian churches by preachers who call themselves Christian but who preach radical, destructive, anti-Christion sermons?

### God's Word or Man's?

As a result we are today engaged in a terrific conflict between reason and revelation, between the Word of God and the word of man. And as on the 25th of June, 1530, those pioneer protagonists of pure Protestantism affixed their signatures to that positive statement of clear-cut convictions, so today, as many Christian souls hover in uncertainty and ask themselves whether they too must bow down before the heartless idol of scientific atheism . . . the Church is called upon to sound forth its conviction that the Word of God is still the Word of Truth, that it is still a dynamic power, yea, that it alone gives a full and satisfying answer to those questions which must be answered if life is to be worth living and death worth dying. This conviction, we are persuaded, is not mere sentimentality incapable of proof. On the contrary we hold that it rests on reasons so convincing and considerations so forceful that unless one is hopelessly biased and permanently prejudiced he must come to the conclusion that the Gospel is what it claims to be, namely the power of God unto Salvation—not as many would have us believe the vestige of an ignorance now happily survived.

There is, first of all, the definite verdict of history. Men like to call Christianity a failure. The truth of the matter is that everything else has failed. While everything which human ingenuity has advanced for the improvement and amelioration of the world have proved themselves to be pitiful and disappointing subterfuges, while educationalism, intellectualism, fraternalism, the study and application of the sciences, legislation and theories of political economy, as well as other similar methods and agencies, have left the human heart unchanged and have done little or nothing to raise the moral tone of humanity; the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the one transforming power in the history of the world that has tamed the wild passions of men, subdued their selfish and self-centered greed, and given them an outlook on life which has perpetuated institutions of charity, enterprises for the alleviation of suffering, and work for the restitution of the downtrodden multitudes that have fallen by the wayside and lie hopeless and helpless in the slimy gutter.

The salutary influence of the Gospel is also being demonstrated today in practically every phase of our daily existence. Think of our home life and the finer, nobler forms of mutual devotion between husband and wife; think of the companionship between parents and children, the interest in the development of the home, the love of children and the respect for parents, the ideals of purity and clean living, and the corresponding abhorence of divorce and of marital inconsistencies which the power of Jesus Christ and that power alone has made possible! And to realize the full strength of this, compare these Christian ideals with the domestic shipwrecks in the homes where the power of the Gospel is willfully and ungratefully excluded. Compare it with the insistent efforts of religious liberalists to endorse companionate marriage, contract marriage, vacations from married life, and similar arrangements which so frequently amount to nothing more than free love in its most promiscuous forms. Compare the working of the Gospel with the tearful tragedies of morally and spiritually bankrupt Russia where the Soviet state hotel is to substitute for the home, where divorce may be granted in nine minutes for a few rubles, and without any legal red-tape and

a person can be a Christian without having some knowledge of CHRIST. The current distinction between "Whom" we believe and "What" we believe is false and misleading. There is no such thing as trust in a person without some knowledge of that person; not only are the two inseparable, the latter conditions the former. Moreover while a saving faith may exist where there is but little knowledge we must be on our guard against implying that ignorance or error is advantageous to salvation. It is only when we are seeking to guard our definition of a Christian against the charge that it would exclude many of CHRIST's "little ones" that there is need of stressing the fact that one need not be learned or logical in order to be saved. But that does not mean that either learning or logic is lacking in those Christians who most adorn the gospel they profess; rather the wider our learning and the greater our logical capacity the more Christian, other things being equal, will we be in life as well as thought.

If time and space permitted it could be shown that a whole system of doctrine and conduct is implied in the belief that CHRIST is an object of religious worship Who is able to save and does save those who put their trust in Him. One is hardly qualified to be a Christian Minister or teacher who does not have a clear apprehension of the presuppositions and implications of a recognition of CHRIST as LORD and SAVIOUR; but the matter is quite different when we are merely dealing with the question whether one is a Christian. It should never be overlooked, however, that when we put our trust in CHRIST as SAVIOUR we put our trust in Him as SAVIOUR from the power and pollution of sin as well as from its guilt. All Christians are "twice-born" persons. They have been regenerated as well as forgiven. Moreover, however imperfect they are today they are destined to become perfect. Those who do not desire moral perfection should have nothing to do with JESUS CHRIST. Why adopt means fitted to bring about ends we do not desire? There may be little observable in the Christian today to distinguish him from the non-Christian; but when we look at the Christian and the non-Christian not from the point of view of what they are but of what they are to become it is hardly possible to exaggerate the difference. The Christian may be a poor enough specimen now but the time is coming when by the grace of GOD all evil shall have been eliminated from his life and when purity and strength of character shall be his portion. For the present, however, most Christians are but "babes in CHRIST;" certainly all are to be spoken of not as full-grown but as growing.

Those who stand in a religious relation to CHRIST and who have the consciousness of having been redeemed by His blood constitute a peculiar people—and so a people that require a peculiar word for their designation. The word, "Christian" was once such a word and when used in its New Testament meaning is still such a word. If the loose sense in which the word is so widely used today—according to which even those who regard the GOD-MAN as a myth and who scoff at the thought of redemption through His blood are rightly called Christians—should become the generally accepted one, that would not necessarily mean that the sort of people it had been employed to designate for some nineteen centuries no longer existed. It would merely mean that there was need of coining a new word to take the place of the old. It is the reality for which the word stands rather than the word itself in which we should be mainly interested. We would be but little concerned about the loss of the word if we had the assurance that the kind of people it was used to designate in New Testament times were on the increase. We do not mean to suggest that the time has come for such people to give us the use of the word as a designation of themselves. Rather we think they should determine by GOD's help to maintain their exclusive right to this word as a self-designation—not forgetting as long as their claim is disputed to distinguish between those who are truly Christians and those who are merely called Christians. Whatever fate befalls the word we need cherish no doubt but that there will always be the sort of people in the world that it has, until the rise of modernism all but universally designated. All down through the ages there have been such people; there are millions of such in the world today; and inasmuch as the promises of GOD cannot fail we may be sure that there will be millions of such in the ages to come.

## Prayer and the Weather

THE recent drought led many to pray for rain, public gatherings being held in many instances for this purpose. As a result there has been considerable discussion of the possible effectiveness of such prayers. Widespread publicity has been given to the fact that seven out of the nine replies received by the *Christian Century* from a "group of representative American clergymen and theologians" to the question, "Does prayer affect the weather?" were to the effect that such prayers are futile. No doubt it was to be expected that the majority of the group selected by so modernistic a journal would sympathize with the notion that "it is only in pious legend that tempests are stilled at a word of command and rain descends in answer to prayer." A more orthodox journal could easily have selected a group the majority of whom would have agreed with Dr. MARK A. MATTHEWS and Dr. JAMES M. GRAY that even as regards the weather the supplication of a righteous man availeth much. Be this as it may, the group selected was sufficiently representative to indicate that a large percentage of the so-called Christian leaders of America are blind leaders of the blind. According to Dr. FOSDICK "the crude, obsolete supernaturalism which prays for rain is a standing reproach to our religion" but such a statement merely advertises the fact that he does not hold the Christian life and world view. Whether GOD will answer any particular prayer for rain depends upon His sovereign pleasure but no one who holds to the Christian view of GOD will deny His ability to send rain as He sees fit. What is more, the arguments advanced to show the folly of praying for rain may also with equal propriety be advanced to show the folly of praying for the conversion of sinners or for the guidance and protection of our loved ones. The whole question of the objective effects of prayer is here involved. Unless prayer has such effects its practice can hardly be justified. All believers in the supernaturalism of the New Testament, however, (i. e., intelligent Christians) believe that it has such effects.

embarrassments, and where, as a result, social diseases annually take a terrific toll, and children, unacknowledged by their parents and uncared for by the state, run over the fields as so many packs of wild, degenerate animals estranged from every helpful ideal. Think of all those and your human reason, as limited and fallacious as it is, will bring you to the conclusion that the Gospel of Jesus Christ can not be mythical tradition, nor a vapid fairy-tale, rather that it must be the power of God unto salvation in this present and modern order of things.

### The Power of the Gospel

The voice of missionary conquests lends its fervent testimony to the same truth. What was it that transformed some of the South Sea Islands and changed them from cesspools of cannibalism, iniquity, barbaric beastiality, and heathen hideousness into garden spots of the earth and into model communities which may serve as an example for many localities of our nation? What was it that wrought such a fundamental change in the life and habits of the inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego who, when Charles Darwin visited them on his scientific journey around the world, were found to be so depraved and degenerated that they hardly could come within the classification of human beings, but who through the efforts of Christian missionaries became so fundamentally and utterly changed that the man who was called the father of evolution gave the most eloquent possible tribute in the form of an annual subsidy to the Patagonian Missionary Society? . . . "How can these things be?" we inquire with Nicodemus. And once again the plain dictates of common sense tells us that these twice-born men have not entered into newness of life because of some folklore or antiquated fairy-tale, (for the world is full of that, and correspondingly full of frightful failures) but that the one really potential, actuating power in the world is the energy and force of Christ's Gospel, operative today wherever this Gospel is preached, operative here in Ocean Grove, as men in this audience can testify who have been brought to the Church and who have received the power to become the sons of God with a new spirit animating their being, with a new purpose and impulse in life.

But the greatest demonstration of the power of the Gospel and the clearest proof of its divine nature is shown to us in its influence upon the soul and spirit of men. I challenge any system of human invention, any modern "enlightened" conception of religion that sets Jesus Christ aside, any attitude which atheism and skepticism may engender in human beings, to give to mankind a definite and satisfying solution to the great problem of release from sin and death that has agitated the hearts and minds of humanity since the very cradle days of the human race.

When the destiny of our immortal soul hangs in the balance, when a ruined life comes tottering to the grave confronted by the inevitable thoughts of eternity, when a guilty mortal is brought face to face with the grim reaper and stands before the yawning abyss which ultimately confronts every one of us,—where is the Truth, the Light, and the Hope that definitely gives him the power to face the veiled uncertainties unflinchingly and confidently? By the death-bed confessions of skepticism and by dying hours spent in devastating despair by infidels and skeptics, this power can not be found in any branch of human attainment, in any theory of human intelligence, in any plans of human science. By the very denials of modernistic religion it can not be found in the creed which is being proclaimed in Christ-denying churches where the great questions of sin and salvation, life and death, God and man are answered with a suave question mark or with a polite denial of the revelation of God as it is preserved in our Bible. But it can be found and it will be found as long as men trustingly raise up their eyes to the hills of Divine Grace whence cometh our help.

It was confidence in the supreme validity of the word of the Scriptures that motivated and inspired the signers of the Augsburg Confession four hundred years ago. If we read over the twenty-eight chapters or articles of the Augsburg Confession, what else do these contain but the sound Biblical testimony of God? . . . If such were not the case there would be no room nor reason for celebrations of this anniversary throughout the Church today. But because from introduction to conclusion it is simply a restatement of the everlasting truth, a direct testimony to God's revelation to men, it has been placed alongside of the three creeds of the ancient Church—the Apostles', the Nicene and that attributed to St. Athanasius—to tell the world what the Lutheran Church teaches, and it has come down to us after four long and eventful centuries as an exhibition of the power of the pure and unadulterated Word.

### A Great Lay Movement

And let us remember today that the Augsburg Confession is the product of one of the greatest lay movements in history. While the Confession itself was largely the work of professional theologians, nevertheless, the men who signed it and who bore the brunt of the responsibility were members of the Lutheran laity and individuals of the highest civic and social attainments. There were, for example, those outstanding Lutheran princes, John, Elector of Saxony; George, Margrave of Brandenburg; Philip, Landgrave of Hesse; Wolfgang, Prince of Anhalt; with whom also we can group Gregory von Brueck, Chancellor of the Saxon Court. They were the men who, when they were told that the Lutheran preachers would have to desist preaching in Augsburg, declared through their spokesman: "Rather than allow the Word of the Lord to be taken from me, rather than deny my God, I would kneel down before your Majesty and have my head cut off."

They were the men who, with others, were summoned by the Emperor, immediately after his arrival in Augsburg, to take part in the Corpus Christi procession, but who answered: "Christ did not institute His sacrament to be worshipped."

They were the men who stood standing when the king and his courtiers bent their knees in the idolatry of the mass, and who remained unflinchingly fast before the taunts of an Italian archbishop who urged the king and his brother: "Sharpen your swords, wield them against these perfidious disturbers of religion, cut to pieces this unexampled hardness."

They were the men who did not flinch when the critical moment came for them to affix their signatures to the Confession, and at that crisis one of them declared, when Melanchthon suggested that the theologians alone should sign the document: "God forbid that you should exclude me. I am resolved to do what is right without troubling myself about my crown. I desire to confess the Lord. My electoral hat and my ermine are not so precious to me as the Cross of Jesus Christ. I shall leave on earth these marks of my greatness; but my Master's Cross will accompany me to heaven."

Another took the pen, and turned and declared: "I have fought more than once to please others; now, if the honor of my Lord Jesus Christ requires it, I am ready to saddle my horse, to leave my goods and life behind and rush into eternity towards an everlasting crown."

They were the men who truly could take the words of the One Hundred and Nineteenth Psalm and declare: "I shall speak of Thy testimonies also before kings and will not be ashamed."

### The Call for Today

We hardly need remind ourselves that the day of new and greater conquests for the Cross depends now as it did four hundred years ago on the active and intelligent participation of the laity in the work of our Church. More than 99½ per cent of the communicant membership of the Lutheran Church belongs to the laity, and even if the energy, and the Christian enthusiasm, and the power of our clergy could be increased tenfold, this alone would not suffice; it is a matter of common experience that only by the cooperation and whole hearted participation of all who are engaged in any building project or undertaking, can the desired results be obtained. The King's Business is no exception, and so this anniversary calls to us to reemphasize the second great principle of Luther's Reformation, namely that in the Church of Jesus Christ as it is delineated for us in the New Testament, we all, laity and clergy, are

members of a royal priesthood, and that individually we must bear active testimony to our faith. It has well been said: "The supreme need of twentieth century Christianity is personal devotion to Christ, together with full participation by lay members of the Church in all its plans and work. . . . The Church, the community, the nation, and the world wait for laymen to be such Christians as reveal Christ to others."

Remember that we are living in the greatest age of publicity and propaganda that the world has ever known. The total advertising bill for the United States annually aggregates more than two billions of dollars. The newspaper advertising in our country exceeds more than $700,000,000, and surely if men who dispose of the perishable commodities can exhibit such enthusiasm and spend such sums to tell the world of their products, then surely we, who have at our disposal the most priceless gifts that only God can bestow to humanity, and who offer these free and without charge, should take every opportunity at our disposal to speak of the testimonies of God, to send forth the message that the world needs more than anything else with an insistence and a clearness that will not leave men in doubt as to where we stand in religion and what our faith means to us.

### Dead and Dying Churches

That intensive lay activity is imperatively necessary is shown by the fact that we are experiencing an alarming rate of church mortality. The number of churches that are empty and deserted ranges from the conservative estimate of 8,000, offered by Frank L. Collins, writing in the *Woman's Home Companion*, to 25,000, the more generous figure of Mr. Houtsma of Chicago. This second figure seems to be the more correct, for we are assured that there are more than 1,000 abandoned country churches in Ohio alone.

Of even more practical importance than these dead churches is the still greater number of dying churches, concerning which we have read a good deal during the past weeks. Thus, the Men's Church League in New York asserts that not one convert was made in the 11,394 churches which it investigated,—one-third of all the Presbyterian, Northern Baptist, and Methodist Episcopal congregations in the country. Figures which were based on the official records of the Presbyterian Church showed that in this denomination 3,269 churches did not record a single convert, while 500 others made only one convert. The claim is advanced that altogether 60,000 of the 200,000 Protestant churches are dead, the evidence of their decease being furnished by the fact that they recorded no increase in membership during the past year. Almost as bad, in fact hovering in the throes of approaching death, are about 40,000 other churches which gained only one or two members.

And because there are similar signs and symptoms in our own Church, the prayer that expresses itself from our inmost conviction is the petition to the throne of mercy that God in His Providence would grant us men, farvisioned workers in the Kingdom, who realizing the tremendous challenge of the present conflict, will work and battle as their illustrious predecessors, the lay leaders of Augsburg did in 1530. And today, as we rededicate ourselves to the spirit of Augsburg, let us remember that this testimony of the confessors was emphatically offered in the interest of establishing a real, spiritual unity in outward Christianity. Anyone who reads over the preface to the Confession must be impressed with the ardent desire of the Lutheran signers to establish a true unity upon which the Scriptures lay so much and such repeated stress. A similar desire should animate us, and it is our sacred and unavoidable duty to pray and to work for a sincere unity of those who are really one in spirit and in the hope of their calling.

### True Unity

Our first duty in this direction will be fulfilled when we seek to preserve that unity in ourselves, without which we can not work for unity in others. Then, we must make our desire for unity felt, and we can do this when, individually as members of our Church and collectively as the Church at large, we demonstrate a kindly spirit of Christian love and charity. We dare not indulge in personalities, nor be influenced by fleshly bitterness, nor heap ridicule and sarcasm upon those who differ from us. While we must bear continued testimony to the truth, we must not do this in the "holier-than-thou" spirit, but in a sincere, humble, and when necessary, pleading manner which is based on the conviction that the vast majority of the members of other Lutheran synods and other fundamentally Christian communions are actually, if sometimes not in theory of their confession, sincere, well-meaning, and devoted Christians. And finally, we have at our disposal the power of victorious prayer. If from the homes of the million and a quarter members of our Church prayers should ascend regularly and repeatedly to the mercy seat, beseeching God that in His kindness He would grant us that measure of unity which is conducive to the welfare of His Kingdom, this steadfast petitioning would contribute one of the strongest forces ever offered for the establishment of a real unity in the Lutheran Church in America.

### Christ as Victorious Redeemer

And thus we hear the challenge that met us at the beginning: Is this Gospel fact or fiction, truth or tradition, the power of our salvation or the power of delusion? And we answer: By the very promise of a majestic and ever faithful God who tells us that though heaven and earth shall pass away this Word shall not pass away; by the testimony of the saints of all lands and ages who take upon themselves all the bitter persecution that an unbelieving world could heap up against them and have nevertheless found happiness in life and even greater joy in death; by the magnificent operation and the superhuman demonstration of the power of the Gospel in the course of human history, refining, and ennobling, as it has, every aspect of human existence; yea, and especially by the evidence of the power of this glorious, God-breathed, everlastingly victorious Word in our own hearts, offering, as it does, the firm assurance that this Jesus can not be a myth, nor a disappointing visionary, nor a mere human figure in history, even as you and I, but that He is by the full and overpowering conviction that manifests itself in every fiber of our existence and in every hope of our destiny, the mighty God of mighty God, the incarnate Conqueror of the ages, the everlasting Answer of Divine Wisdom to the great needs of humanity,—by all this we know and believe and confess that His Word and Gospel, above the strife and turmoil of this world, above all the petty bickering and denial of short-sighted humans, yea, above our own power fully to understand that it is, God be everlastingly praised, the power of God unto salvation, full, free, complete "to everyone that believeth."

# The Present Position in the Presbyterian Church of England

## By Lt.-Col. A. H. Fraser

[Editor's Note: This article is reprinted from the British "Bible League Quarterly" for July-Sept. 1930, in the hope that it will prove valuable news to our American Constituency regarding the attitude toward creed-subscription in one of the historic branches of the Presbyterian Church,—evidencing as it does the alarming progress of Modernism.]

IN the *Times* of 23rd January, this year, the Bishop of Birmingham was reported to have said that "the progress of Modernism during the last 15 years had been amazing." If for the word "Modernism" we substitute "Modern Views," it is probable that there would be a more general agreement as to the accuracy of the statement. The evidence of the progress of these views relative to the period previous to that mentioned, as well as to the period itself, is not always easily obtained, and there has been no great keenness to supply it for the

information of the average churchgoer. What follows is an attempt in some measure to make up the deficiency in so far as the Presbyterian Church of England is concerned.

In May, 1928, the General Assembly of this Church appointed a Special Committee "to deliberate and recommend what steps should be taken by the Church" in relation to her subordinate standards (the Westminster Confession of Faith and the two Catechisms based thereon), as it was acknowledged by a large majority in that Assembly that those standards "no longer represent the mind of the Church." To anyone acquainted with her Basis of Union (1876), but unacquainted with her subsequent history, this would undoubtedly seem to indicate a severance in spirit from that Basis, whatever the nature of the ties by which she was bound to her buildings and endowments. To appreciate correctly how far the Church has now travelled from that Basis the first two sections are here quoted:—

### Basis of Union, 1876

1. That the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule of faith and duty.

2. That the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms are the standards of this Church.

The phrase "contained in" nowadays usually indicates that the whole Bible is not regarded as the Word of God, but the first two questions of the Formula for Ministers, adopted with the Basis of Union, show a different state of affairs in 1876. They read as follows:—

1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and duty?

2. Do you sincerely receive and adopt the doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith as in accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture? etc.

This is plain language, but unfortunately it was not long retained, vital changes being approved ten years later.

### Special Committee on Standards

Turning our attention to the Special Committee on Standards, we find that Committee soon realising that the task before them would "raise large issues—doctrinal, historical and constitutional," and asking Assembly 1929 for authority to deal with these questions. A motion requesting Assembly to reaffirm its faith without qualification in that chapter of its own Standards dealing with the Holy Scriptures, in which their final authority is recognised, and also to direct the Committee to retain that chapter as an article of faith, only found some half-dozen supporters. The Committee were thus given a free hand to deal with all the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith. How have they dealt with them?

It should be understood that at every ordination and induction service a public declaration is made of the Church's attitude to the Holy Scriptures and to the Westminster Confession. The Committee submitted a new public declaration to Assembly 1930 which reads as follows:—

### New Public Declaration

"We are enjoined to make the following public declaration:—

"The Presbyterian Church of England acknowledges as her Supreme Standard the revelation of God recorded in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, progressively delivered and perfected in Jesus Christ, Who, speaking through the ever-living Spirit, is the final authority for faith and life; to Whom the loyalty of His disciples is ever due.

"This Church as a branch of the Church Catholic inherits the ancient creeds of Christendom, known as the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, and is one of that family of the Churches of the Reformation which further inherits the Westminster Confession of Faith. This Confession and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms are the subordinate standards of this Church.

### Creeds as Historical Relics

"In thus acknowledging her historic relationship to these documents, this Church declares her acceptance of the evangelical reformed faith, but is not committed to the doctrinal expression of that faith set forth in these subordinate standards, Christ having promised that the Church should progress in understanding of the truth through the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

"Her relationship to her subordinate standards is therefore defined, and her spiritual freedom safeguarded, in the following provisions:—

(*a*) "The Church recognises liberty of opinion on such matters of doctrine as do not enter into the substance of the faith; while she retains full authority, in any case which may arise, to determine what falls within this description and to guard against any abuse of this liberty to the injury of her unity and peace.

### Right to Modify Creeds

(*b*) "The Church further claims the right, as duty may require, to interpret, alter, add to or modify her subordinate standards and formulas, under the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit, and under a sense of direct responsibility to her ever-living Head.

"And now, that men may hear anew the Gospel which she declares to the world, she sets forth these central truths of her message:—

"*The Confession* of one God Who is Love—Eternal, Almighty, Holy; the Creator, Sustainer and Ruler of all things; Whom we know as our Father, through Jesus Christ His Son, our Lord and Saviour; and with Whom we have fellowship through the Holy Spirit as His children. To Whom—Father, Son and Spirit, One God,—be glory and praise.

"*The Gospel* that God so loved the world that He gave His Son Jesus Christ to be the perfect image and likeness of God, and the perfect pattern and example of man; and through His life on earth, His death, His victory over the grave, and His risen life, to reconcile men to God, bringing them the forgiveness of sins, the power of a new life and the assurance of immortality.

"*And the Call* to all men to accept Jesus Christ as their Lord and Saviour, finding in Him the light of life in all their relations alike to God their Father and to their brethren of mankind; to enter into the fellowship of His Church, that body of which He is the living Head, and to become fellow-workers with Him in the establishing of His Kingdom on earth in its fulness and joy."

### Assembly Refuses to be Doctrinally Bound

This Statement the Assembly resolved to send "to Presbyteries that any which may desire to do so may send their views thereon to the Committee," but the mover of this resolution said that he did not expect Presbyteries to make any great changes in it. An example of the kind of change that the Committee would not accept was supplied by the rejection of a resolution to delete the important word "not" from the third paragraph of the Statement. Another motion asking for a more complete and considered report was also rejected, the mover charging the Committee with having dared to alter John 3:16 in their statement of the Gospel. Assembly 1931 will probably approve this document with but slight amendment, so that we may study briefly the position, which has been growing steadily more vague and unsatisfactory since its adoption in 1886. It is supposed that the Committee, authorised to make "*clearer* the relation of the Church to the Scriptures, the position of the Confession and Catechisms as standards," etc., consider they have by this document discharged their duty. When then was the position in 1886, and have they succeeded in their task? In that year Assembly (or Synod) altered the relation of the Church to her standards for the first time since the Union of 1876 by adopting a Declaratory Statement, the fifth clause of which is nearly word for word the same as clause (*a*) in the new Statement. The phrase, "the substance of the faith," caused some misgiving at that time, one Presbytery asking Synod "to define those subjects on which liberty of opinion is allowed, and thus render definite those which constitute the substance of the faith." This phrase is undoubtedly the charter of freedom for the holding and teaching of "Modern Views" in the Church. The Rev. Dr. Dykes, who was in charge of the measure in 1885, replied to this request as follows:—

### Where Draw the Line?

"The Committee are of opinion that, in the nature of the case, it is impossible to meet the desire of the Presbytery of Carlisle by defining beforehand the points regarding which (under clause 5) liberty of opinion is to be recognised. Each generation is confronted by its own burning questions; and as new questions emerge, matters round which hot controversy had been formerly waged fall out of sight. Dogmatic positions are reduced in comparative impor-

tance, or, on the other hand, they become of larger relative consequence, through the shifting tactics of unbelief, or through some change in the condition of the Church, or by reason of a clearer apprehension of the revealed mind of God. The living Church must judge, when cases occur, what measure of liberty it is safe to allow, and what variations of belief must be excluded. The line cannot be drawn in advance."

If Dr. Dykes had said that he *declined* to draw the line in advance he would probably have indicated more accurately the feeling in Synod, but the acceptance of such a statement shows how even at that date the evil influences of Higher Critical thought in the previous decade had undermined "the faith once for all delivered to the saints." The demand was voiced in more than one Presbytery that the Church *should* define her position and avoid ambiguity, and this shows she could have defined it if she had wanted to, but, speaking generally, the will was lacking. She is now reaping what was then sown.

### Declaratory Statement Examined

Let us examine the new proposed Declaratory Statement a little more closely.

1. The Statement it is *replacing*, which was adopted in 1913, begins as follows: "We are enjoined to make public declaration of the Church's attitude towards her standards in the following terms: The Presbyterian Church of England acknowledges as her Supreme Standard of Faith and Duty the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and as her Subordinate Standards the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. . . . ." (Here follow clauses (*a*) and (*b*) as in the new proposed statement and another clause with reference to the 24 Articles of the Faith authorized in 1890 as a brief compendium of the faith.) It will be seen at once that whereas the Scriptures were the Supreme Standard in the past, in future it is to be some undefined "revelation of God recorded in the Scriptures," and whereas the Church "acknowledged" the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as subordinate standards in the past, in future she is "not committed to the doctrinal expression" of the faith set forth in those standards. In fact there are to be no standards worthy the name, and the declaration at the end of the second paragraph of the Statement is as "a well without water." Ever since the weakening of the formula for ministers, whereby in 1886 they were asked to subscribe to "the system of doctrine" in the Confession, and its further weakening, whereby in 1913 belief in "the substance of the faith" contained in the Confession was only required, the value of the standards as such has dwindled till it is now practically at vanishing point.

### Does God's Truth Change?

2. The seconder of the Report bringing forward the new Declaratory Statement said: "In respect of Scripture we no longer believe in a literal and equal inspiration of all its parts. In any affirmation of the Scripture as our standard that ought to be said." Why is it not then in the Statement? Has the Committee or the Church divided the Scriptures into categories of inspiration? If not, why not? He further said: "We state there is a progressive revelation and we assert in the same breath that the final authority is in the living Spirit of Christ." "We have a final authority for the interpretation of it (the Scripture) in our hearts and in the Church." Whether the last two sentences can be reconciled or not, there is in reality not much to choose between the claim for a progressive revelation, by inference from the above, vouchsafed to the living Church, and the claim to a progressive understanding of the truth in the third paragraph of the new Statement. In effect the claim is made that the living Spirit of Christ in this generation rejects the teaching of the same Spirit in a past generation, because this generation has presumably discovered that "what was pleasing to God at one stage was found to be wrong and forbidden by God at another" (Report of Moderators' Committee, 1922). In other words, this generation professes to have received, as is elsewhere stated, "a more complete revelation" of a "real Word of God" which causes it to "discard" as "imperfect" a doctrine which says that the Scripture is the supreme standard of faith and duty, "to which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men." So much is clear to those who have studied this movement, but is the general public likely to be made aware of this by the new Declaratory Statement, or will it be deceived thereby?

### Freedom—to Attack the Faith

3. Passing over the problematical value of the Creeds and Confession as an inheritance, when they are merely regarded as interesting historical documents, which do not express the doctrine of the Church now, clause (*a*) secures a freedom which is so wide that it would take a bold man to challenge the teaching of another and secure a pronouncement against him for unorthodoxy. The door to this freedom was opened in 1886, as previously stated, no doubt as the result of the nationalistic influences so strongly at work at that time. As a learned divine then said—it was "giving up our safeguard and letting every man have his own way." Let a recent statement give its own evidence as a fulfilment of that prophecy: "Not fifteen years ago . . . but nearer fifty my generation, at least those of them who did a little thinking, found themselves theologically homeless. . . . On (my generation) came the stress of the conviction that the old foundation had vanished"—but these thinkers of a new theology did not take long to establish themselves in the home of those they were attacking!

### The Modernist "Gospel"

4. As regards the Gospel declared "anew," this contains most of the features of a mild modernist gospel, more remarkable for its omissions than its inclusions. A missionary of the Church, writing of the theology of the ancient creeds, says: "They speak with assurance of many things towards which we now maintain an attitude of reverential silence." Even so does this new Gospel, making due allowance for the need of brevity, maintain a "reverential silence" towards the following central truths: (1) The justice of God, (2) Original sin, (3) Justification by faith, (4) Repentance unto life, (5) Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, (6) The substitutionary and propitiatory sacrifice of our Lord, Jesus Christ, (7) His physical Resurrection, (8) His Ascension, (9) His present High-priestly office, (10) His return in glory.

### Synods may err, but not God's Word

These omissions are significant, but they are hardly surprising where no "form of sound words" is recognised. It is sometimes argued that because the Westminster Divines themselves said that "synods . . . may err and many have erred," therefore the form of words in which they stated their doctrine cannot be accepted nowadays. The fact is that the doctrine itself is rejected, for the Divines have indicated their unqualified acceptance of the Scriptures as the rule of faith and life, and of final authority, declaring that their "decrees and determinations, if consonant to the Word of God are to be received." Wherever the chief thought of men is freedom from restraint rather than a willing submission to just authority, there lawlessness is prevalent. Any attempt to check abuses is largely rendered ineffectual because of the wide toleration by the Christian Church of so many forms of thought and even of opposing doctrines.

A sound, doctrinal basis is essential for good order, but such a document as this Declaratory Statement is an unworthy and inadequate exposition of the evangelical reformed faith of which the Church declares her acceptance.

### Justification by Faith alone Repudiated

The Moderator this year spoke of "the imperative call to the Church to make its message effective in our own land," signifying his emphatic approval of the statement that "it is enough to make a man, in the eyes of the orthodox, a Christian," if "he is one who strives, yet fails, to make his life conform to Christ's teaching." The Church's message and Presbyterian orthodoxy may be estimated from other parts of this paper, but the real emphasis here is on works rather than on faith. The Confession says: "By this faith a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word."

As has been well pointed out elsewhere, faith takes precedence of love, and doctrine of practise both in the order of nature and of historical development. Even as late as 1922 (Report of the Moderator's Committee) it was considered by Presbyterians that to be a Christian was to "believe," whereas now it is, "strive even if you fail." Paul's answer to the question, "What must I *do* to be saved?" was, "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts xvi. 30). Peter's answer to the question, "Men and

(*Concluded on Page 24*)

# Dr. Machen Surveys Dr. Speer's New Book

(The review appearing below concerns Dr. Robert E. Speer's most recent book, and was written especially for "Christianity Today" by Dr. J. Gresham Machen.)

*SOME LIVING ISSUES. By Robert E. Speer. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, London and Edinburgh, 1930. Pp. 280.*

THE author of this book has been for many years one of the most distinguished missionary leaders in the world. As a secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., he has wielded an influence that extends far beyond the bounds of any one church or any one country, but rather is in the truest sense world-wide.

This world-wide influence has been due not merely to administrative experience and to a wide acquaintance with the mission fields, but also, and primarily, to spiritual gifts of a high order. Dr. Robert E. Speer is a truly eloquent man. Though quiet and restrained in the manner of his public address, he yet exerts an extraordinary power over his hearers. What sympathetic hearer does not fall under his spell? For nearly forty years Dr. Speer has been a real leader of men.

It cannot be an event without importance when such a leader, at a time of uncertainty and transition in the Church, publishes a book which sets forth in something like comprehensive form his position with regard to the issues of the day. Such a book is the one now under review. The book is not, indeed, intended to be comprehensive; it is in part made up of addresses delivered at various times, and it deals with somewhat disconnected subjects. Yet, when it is taken as a whole, it does serve to indicate fairly well the general trend of the teaching of its distinguished author.

With that general trend we find ourselves, if we may speak plainly and briefly, in disagreement. There are, indeed, many things in the book with which we heartily agree. We do not mean the general declaration on p. 136 that the author "accepts the whole of Christianity as set forth in the New Testament," and that he accepts the doctrine of the Westminster Confession as to the Bible. Such general declarations are constantly being interpreted in so many diverse ways at the present time that in themselves they mean almost nothing. But, as will appear in what we shall say presently, there are many points at which our agreement becomes far more specific.

Nevertheless, when the book is taken as a whole, our general attitude toward it is one not of agreement but of disagreement. The disagreement is due to the fact that Dr. Robert E. Speer shows himself in this book to be, as indeed he has with increasing clearness become, a representative of that tendency in the Church which seeks to mediate and obscure an issue about which we think that a man must definitely take sides.

That issue is the issue between Christianity as set forth in the Bible and in the great creeds of the Church and a non-doctrinal or indifferentist Modernism that is represented in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. by the "Auburn Affirmation" and that is really more or less dominant in most of the large Protestant churches of the world.

With regard to that issue, three positions are possible and are actually being taken today. In the first place, one may stand unreservedly for the old Faith and unreservedly against the indifferentist tendency in the modern Church; in the second place, one may stand unreservedly for Modernism and against the old Faith; and in the third place, one may ignore the seriousness of the issue and seek, without bringing it to a head, to preserve the undisturbed control of the present organization in the Church. It is this last attitude that is represented by the book now under review. Dr. Robert E. Speer certainly presents himself not as a Modernist but as an adherent of the historic Christian Faith; yet he takes no clear stand in the great issue of the day, but rather adopts an attitude of reassurance and palliation, according high praise and apparently far-reaching agreement to men of very destructive views.

It is this palliative or reassuring attitude which, we are almost inclined to think, constitutes the most serious menace to the life of the Church today; it is in some ways doing more harm than clear-sighted Modernism can do. The representatives of it are often much farther from the Faith than they themselves know; and they are leading others much farther away than they have been led themselves. Obviously such a tendency in the Church deserves very careful attention from thoughtful men.

But when it is considered, fairness demands that it should be considered not in its poorest, but in its best, representatives. That is our justification for occupying so much space with the present review. Dr. Robert E. Speer is perhaps the most distinguished and eloquent popular representative of what is commonly called the "middle-of-the-road" or pacifist position with regard to the great religious issue of the day. As such, he is certainly worthy of a careful hearing by those who differ from him in the Church.

The first chapter of the book deals with "The Place of Christ in the World Today." That chapter begins well. Dr. Speer refers with evident condemnation to the common view that Jesus had a religion which was "the religion of Jesus" and not "a religion about Jesus that made Him its object and elevated Him to the place of God to be regarded and worshipped as God," a religion about Jesus which "was the doing of His disciples in later years." Surely, we may be inclined to say, a book that states the issue so well on its first page and evidently rejects the prevailing non-redemptive view of Christianity will be a book that evangelical Christians can heartily commend.

But we are not left very long in this state of favorable anticipation. On the very next page, we find Dr. Speer actually appealing to the late A. von Harnack of Berlin in support of "the historic judgment of the Church" regarding Jesus' "character and significance." Now we share to the full Dr. Speer's admiration of Harnack's intellectual ability. We will not, indeed, call him, as Dr. Speer does, not only the ablest but the "most authoritative" of the critics; for we do not think that any critic is "authoritative," the plain man having an inalienable right to make up his own mind regarding the credentials of the New Testament books. But certainly Harnack was an exceedingly able scholar. Who would not admire such prodigious learning, such limpid clearness of expression, such earnestness in the search for truth? Yet, after all, Harnack, with all his extraordinary gifts, was a representative of just that view of Christianity as "the religion of Jesus," just that view that regards as later accretions the whole redemptive content of Christianity, which Dr. Speer has apparently rejected. What possible comfort can the evangelical Christian obtain from being told that Harnack regarded the Gospels as being essentially true? The plain fact is that Harnack removed from the pages of history those things in the Gospels that are dear to the Christian's heart—namely, their whole supernatural and redemptive content. Yet we are told by Dr. Speer that the Christian need not fear New Testament criticism because Harnack, "the ablest and most authoritative of all the critics," has assured us that New Testament criticism has resulted in a confirmation of the plain man's reading of some, at least, of the New Testament books!

Does Dr. Speer mean that we are to accept Harnack's historical criticism, or at least regard as essential no more of the Biblical account of Jesus than Harnack retains? Does he mean that the plain man is well enough off if he contents himself with that reading of

the New Testament which Harnack thinks modern criticism confirms? Or is the reference to Harnack due only to unawareness of what Harnack's real position is? We should like to think that the latter is the case. It seems, indeed, almost incredible that such unawareness of Harnack's position should exist in the mind of any modern educated man who has ever dealt with these questions at all, especially in the mind of one who pronounces Harnack's book on "The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries" to be "one of the greatest missionary books ever written" (p. 96); but on the other hand the other explanation of Dr. Speer's attitude toward Harnack seems to be excluded by the fact that Dr. Speer does believe in the virgin birth and no doubt in the true, bodily resurrection of Jesus, which, with all the other miracles of the New Testament, Harnack rejects. A middle position, we surmise, is correct—Dr. Speer no doubt affirms many things that Harnack denies, but we hardly think he could speak of Harnack as he does unless he had gone much farther with Harnack, and much farther away from clear-cut evangelicalism than a careless reader of his book might suppose. One thing at least is plain—there can be no real compromise between the naturalism of Harnack and the supernaturalism of the Bible and of the Christian Faith. Was the real Jesus the Jesus reconstructed by Harnack or was He the stupendous Redeemer whom the Bible presents —that question ought never to be trifled with, but must be resolutely and clearly faced.

In the facing of the question, the reader obtains no help in the rest of Dr. Speer's first chapter. A considerable amount of space is occupied by testimony from non-Christians in support of the thesis that "Christ is more looked up to today throughout the whole world as the supreme moral authority and the ultimate and absolute ethical ideal than ever before in human history." We confess that sadness comes over us as we read these testimonies. If the true Jesus, with His stupendous claims, had always been presented in mission lands, would there ever have been this polite recognition of Him as a moral leader by those who have not been born again and are not willing to desert all other saviours and endure the offence of His name? Dr. Speer does recognize, indeed, the inadequacy of these testimonies in themselves. Jesus Christ, he observes, claimed to be more than the moral Lord of life; He claimed also to be "the unique Son of God." But even with regard to this claim, he continues, important acknowledgments have been obtained from adherents of non-Christian faiths. Here again, however, we are filled with little but sadness as we read. The testimonies cited here do not really go beyond those cited under the other head; and it seems very sad that a great missionary leader should regard such testimonies as these as in any sense testimonies to the Christian view of Christ. But, says Dr. Speer in the same chapter, modern ideas of development and personality have "helped many minds toward faith in the Incarnation." Then follows a long quotation from Dr. George A. Gordon, of the Old South Church in Boston, in the course of which it is said that "the true relation of mankind to the Lord Jesus is not grasped until He is regarded as the Incarnation of the Eternal Humanity in which the race is constituted." We can only say that if it is easier for the modern world to accept an incarnation like that, it is no doubt correspondingly harder to accept the incarnation spoken of in the fourteenth verse of the first chapter of John. Here, as always, a minimizing apologetic ends logically in the loss of everything distinctive of the Christian Faith.

Finally, in the same chapter, Dr. Speer points out that "the Church's claim for Christ has involved not only His moral authority and His Deity, but also His Saviourhood." Is Christ "any nearer His rightful place in these regards in the life and thought of the world"? Here again Dr. Speer appeals to the testimony of non-Christian men—particularly to one who "was, at the time of his death in 1923, the leading Indian in eastern India." This leading Indian said: "I am a Hindu, but I believe in Christ as the highest fulfilment of Hinduism." And more in that vein. Dr. Speer can see in such testimonies "the evidence of Christ's steady advance toward His sovereignty as moral ideal, as Son of God, as Saviour of mankind." We, however, can see little in them but evidence that the visible Church has mitigated the true offence of Christ's words and has lowered His lofty claims. The true and stupendous Lord and Saviour presented in God's Word could hardly thus be treated with complacent admiration by those who will not bear His name. God keep us in the Church from seeking testimonies such as these! The world will never be saved by "the mind of Christ" becoming in this manner supreme; it will only be saved when men and women lost in sin are begotten again by God's Spirit and have their sin washed away in the blood of the Lamb. If missionaries always proclaimed that message in all its poignancy and offence, no doubt fewer distinguished Hindus would testify to the value of Christ's moral ideals. But, on the other hand, more precious souls would be saved.

The second chapter deals with "The Grounds for Belief in the Deity of Christ." The essential and conclusive ground, Dr. Speer says, is to be found not in the inimitable uniqueness of Christ's moral character, not in his "unique character and message as a teacher," not in the miracle of His "spiritual consciousness, His sense of perfect harmony with God," not in His "central place in history," not in the miracles of His ministry, but rather in His resurrection from the dead. So thought Paul, says Dr. Speer, and so we ought to think. "So today the Resurrection ought to be conceived by us as the demonstration of our Lord's deity, and the power and principle of the Resurrection as the central essence of Christianity."

Here, as so often in connection with the book, agreement is mingled with disagreement as we read. Certainly we agree with the author's attribution of importance to the resurrection of Christ. We do not, indeed, think that the resurrection of itself would be sufficient to establish the deity of our Lord. Lazarus was raised from the dead; yet he was not God. But when taken in connection with the whole New Testament account of Jesus, above all when taken in connection with Jesus' own stupendous claims, the resurrection does set the seal upon the testimony. We confess, further, that we do not know what Dr. Speer means by "the power and principle of the Resurrection" as being "the central essence of Christianity." To us, the really essential thing to say about the resurrection of Christ seems to be not that it was a principle or possessed a principle, but that it was a fact. By it our Lord completed the redeeming work that He had come into the world to do. At any rate, however, we do not think that we attribute less importance to it than does Dr. Speer.

The third chapter, entitled "The Son of God is the Son of Man," deals largely with the significance of the title "Son of Man" as it appears in our Saviour's words. Here the author, as is unfortunately very common, has missed the origin and significance of the term with which the chapter deals. The true key to the term is almost certainly to be found in the stupendous vision of the seventh chapter of Daniel, where "one like unto a son of man" appears in the presence of the Ancient of days. The title "Son of Man" in the Gospels is not a designation of our Lord's humanity as distinguished from His deity, still less a designation of any real or supposed character of His as a summation or recapitulation of humanity as a whole, but rather is expressive of His supernatural office as heavenly Messiah. Dr. Speer regrets the avoidance of the title in the usage of the Church. Yet he himself admits that in the New Testament the title occurs almost exclusively in the words of Jesus Himself. Apparently the only exception is found in Acts 7:55f., where the ultimate origin of the title is particularly plain. The dying martyr, Stephen, like Daniel, saw the heavenly Messiah in the presence of God. We must say plainly that in our judgment the Church would do well to imitate the reserve of the New Testament writers in the use of this title in referring to Christ. Certainly the use of the title would be very unfortunate if it led to any confusion between the humanity and the deity of our Lord. Dr. Speer, in this chapter which deals with "the Son of Man," actually quotes from Myers' "St. Paul," which he calls "one of the most nobly Christian of all the poems of the centuries," a passage ending with the line:

"Jesus, divinest when Thou most art man!"

That line, from the Christian point of view, is little short of blasphemous. Never should we forget that our Lord is "God and man, in two *distinct* natures, and one person, forever." A supremely important truth is involved in that word, "distinct." It was well worth the theological conflict that led to its inclusion in the creeds of the Church.

In connection with the fourth chapter, which deals with "The Virgin Birth," our agreement with Dr. Speer is probably as great as it is at any other point in the book. The author ac-

cepts the virgin birth of Christ and so do we; and in that agreement we greatly rejoice. But then, in the next chapter, entitled "Why Was Christ Crucified?", our disagreement becomes particularly acute, and it is a disagreement not only of the head but also of the heart. Dr. Speer, like so many other modern men, seems to linger at the threshold of the great truth of the atonement without ever really entering in: he says many fine and true things about the Cross of Christ; but neither here nor in any other of his recent books, so far as we have been able to observe, does he give any clear expression to that which seems to us to lie at the inmost heart of Christianity—the true substitutionary death of our Lord as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God. He comes near to the great doctrine; he quotes on page 79 a passage of Scripture which implies it: but he himself somehow always stops short at the really decisive point. After quoting the words, "Unto him that loveth us and loosed us from our sins by his blood," and a verse from an old gospel hymn, he says:

> "We do not know how. We only know that nineteen hundred years ago a tragedy had to be wrought to cure the tragedy of the sin of mankind."

And then he trails off, in the customary way, about "the illustration of God's absolute and utter faithfulness and His willingness to pay the price, even with His own life, for the failure of man." Thus the true and blessed doctrine of the Cross is passed by.

Here our disagreement, we must say frankly, concerns the very heart of the Christian faith and life. Dr. Speer says with regard to salvation by the Cross of Christ: "We do not know how." We say, on the contrary: "Praise be to God, we *do* know how." There are many things that we do not know. But one thing, thank God, we do know; we do know that the Lord Jesus took upon Himself the just penalty of our sins and bare it in our stead upon the cross. We do not know it by any wisdom of our own. Indeed, all the wisdom of all the philosophers, all the insight of all the poets, all the experience of all the ages were quite powerless to discover it. But it can be well known to every simple reader of God's holy Book. This mystery at least God has forever hidden from the wise and prudent; but, thank God, He has revealed it unto babes.

In the sixth chapter, which deals with "The Resurrection—The Centre of Christianity," we agree with much that is said. Certainly we agree as to the supreme importance of the resurrection in the Christian Faith. But we cannot see why the resurrection should be used, as Dr. Speer uses it, to belittle the Cross. Dr. Speer says with regard to Paul: "In some of his Epistles he says nothing of the Cross, but in almost every one he makes much of the Resurrection." To our mind, that is a very unfortunate assertion. The fact seems to be that the death of Christ, in one way or another, is mentioned in every one of the Pauline Epistles except II Thessalonians and Philemon, while the resurrection is not mentioned in II Thessalonians or in Philemon or in Titus. But how utterly useless is such a calculation! It is perfectly clear, when Paul's teaching is taken as a whole, that both the Cross and the resurrection were quite fundamental to everything that he said, being presupposed even where they are not mentioned. Why should the one be pitted against the other?

We cannot pass the other chapters of the book in any sort of detailed review. They contain many things with which we heartily agree, many things, too, which are eloquently and finely said. Thus, on page 118, Dr. Speer points out well and forcibly the unfairness of the charge of narrowness which is so often brought against evangelical Christianity:

> "Men will speak tolerantly of liberalistic Christianity or of institutional or sacerdotal or prelatical or Papal religion, or of the use of religion as a force to control the ignorant, but evangelical Christianity, with its clear doctrinal convictions and its warm religious experience, is narrow.
>
> "Now let us at once recognize that there is an element of truth in this view. Truth is narrow and exclusive. All truth is so. The search for it, whether in science or religion, involves the rejection of every false and untenable hypothesis."

That is well said indeed. Our central criticism of Dr. Speer is that he does not apply it in his own teaching and in his own attitude in the Church. Certainly he does not apply it in the present book. Particularly does he fail to apply it in what he says, on pp. 141ff., with regard to "the limits of tolerance." What becomes of the Christian message if "the possession of Christian spirit ["spirit" being spelled with a small letter] is the essential and sufficient credential" (p. 142)? Dr. Speer seems to forget, here and at other places, that which he himself recognizes (see, for example, p. 227), that the world cannot be saved by the loveliness of Christians or by any human goodness, but only by the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Certainly the New Testament passages cited in such profusion on page 144 do not at all warrant the inclusiveness for which Dr. Speer seems to plead.

Finally, we come to the last chapter, on "Returning to Jesus." The title is somewhat ominous. It recalls the famous shibboleth of modern Liberalism, "Back to Christ," by which the followers of Harnack and of others of his way of thinking sought to justify their rejection of the way of salvation as it is set forth, in particular, in the Epistles of Paul. Here, indeed, as at other places in the book, Dr. Speer detects the lurking danger; he shrinks back from the apparent implications of his words. He says (p. 258):

> "There is a second sense in which the conception of returning to Jerusalem to find Jesus is inadequate and untrue. It is inadequate and untrue if it is a proposal to go back of John's Gospel and Paul's Epistles and to eliminate the miracle and mystery from the Synoptic Gospels and to reduce Jesus to the naturalistic figure of a good man who taught nobly but was self-deceived, and around whom delusion soon grew up which transformed the simple, human teacher of Galilee into a supernatural Saviour and a dying God."

And again (p. 260):

> "The Jesus we return to Jerusalem to find is the full Jesus of the New Testament, of Matthew and Mark and Luke, of John and Peter and Paul."

These are salutary words. But the trouble is that they have little influence upon the main current of the book. Only a few pages after the words that we have just quoted, we find the author saying (pp. 263f.):

> "Jesus only is the fundamental and adequate theology. What was enough for Peter and James and John, when Jesus was transfigured before them, is enough for us."

What becomes, then, of the Cross; what becomes of Pentecost? What becomes of that which Christ *did* for us once for all, as distinguished from that which He *was* and *is?* It is all pushed, as non-essential, aside. We can return without essential loss, according to Dr. Speer, to the experience of Peter and James and John, in the days before Jesus had yet died for men's sins.*

The truth is that in this book we have two distinct strains. We have, in the first place, elements of evangelical conviction; and we have, in the second place, a type of religious faith and life in which those elements have no logical place. This latter type has exerted a large influence upon Dr. Speer's book. The author does manfully strive, indeed, to hold on to elements of the former type. We do not for a moment mean to imply that the evangelical utterances in the book are put there by the author merely in order to quiet the fears of evangelicals in the Church. Rather is Dr. Speer, in those utterances, really striving to be conservative; he is really striving to avoid the radicalism that is so prevalent in the religious world today. But the trouble is that logic is a great dynamic, and that things contradictory to each other cannot permanently exist side by side. Whether or not Dr. Speer ever draws the full logical conclusions from the erroneous elements in his thinking, many of those who are influenced by him will probably draw those conclusions only too well. Indeed, we find even Dr. Speer himself, almost at the very end of his book, quoting with the utmost enthusiasm vague and verbose utterances of the Lausanne and Jerusalem Conferences. That is surely a sad ending for a book that contains so many things that are true. It is as though the verbiage of church-unionism had at last swept away as in a mighty flood the elements of the historic Faith that Dr. Speer had tried so manfully to maintain.

Dr. Speer pleads, in his last chapter, for simplicity. But we venture to think that in doing so he is confusing very different things. He is confusing simplicity with vagueness, and the two are really quite distinct. Dr. Speer's teaching is often vague; but is it really simple? We venture to think that it is not. We venture to think that in its combination of tendencies really opposite, in its attempt to be evangelical and yet make common cause with profoundly anti-evangelical tendencies in the Church, it is a highly subtle, a painfully labored, thing, that the plain man can never really grasp. Many great theologians, on the other hand—perhaps all really great Christian theologians—possess a true simplicity which comes straight from God's Word. And that

*(Concluded on page 15)*

*We cannot think that this objection is removed by the fact that Dr. Speer himself, almost in the same breath with the passage just quoted, mentions the Cross and the empty tomb among the things that designate the Christ who is sufficient for us.

# Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

## Rome and the "Apostolic Succession"

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*I am enclosing a copy of a Catholic paper which some relatives of mine sent me recently, containing an article about "Apostolic Succession." I am a Presbyterian and have no idea of changing my Church connections but I am asking you to look it over and let me know if the Roman Catholic Church is the real Church of the Apostolic Succession. You need not return the Catholic paper; but I would like to know the truth on this subject. . . . .*

*Sincerely yours,*

*G. W.*

THE article referred to above is some 5000 words in length, and so cannot be cited. It is in substance, however, a popular exposition and defense of that conception of the Christian Church succinctly expressed by Cardinal Gibbons in *The Faith of our Fathers* by the following words: "The true Church must always teach the identical doctrines once delivered by the Apostles and her ministers must derive their powers from the Apostles by an uninterrupted succession. Consequently no Church can claim to be the true one whose doctrines differ from those of the Apostles, or whose Ministers are unable to trace, by an unbroken chain, their authority to an Apostolic source."

It is impossible, of course, in the space at our disposal to deal in any adequate way with the claim of the Roman Catholic Church that is the one true Church because it alone has the note or attribute of Apostolicity. There is nothing new in the article sent us unless it be the use made of the *Didache*. The writer says that "it is generally believed to have been written between the years fifty and fifty-five" and so finds in it evidence of Catholic teaching and practice before most of the New Testament was written. Dr. N. B. Stonehouse of Westminster Seminary, however, states that "most scholars now consider it quite certain that it was written between 135 and 160" and cites Harnack, Robinson, and Lietzman in support of his statement. (The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church, p. 13.) The article as a whole is an attractive and to the uncritical at least a persuasive setting forth of the common Roman Catholic claim that the Roman Catholic Church alone has the note of Apostolicity as defined above.

Perhaps nothing more is necessary in this connection than to point out that if "the true Church must always teach the identical doctrines delivered by the Apostles and her Ministers must derive their powers from the Apostles by an uninterrupted succession," then, there is no such thing as a true Church on earth. Certainly the Roman Catholic Church is not such a Church. And that because not only are its teachings quite different from those of the Apostles but because its Ministers do not derive their powers from the Apostles by an uninterrupted succession. It is true no doubt that the Roman Catholic Church has been in existence much longer than any of the Protestant churches; but that it is nothing to the point unless it can be shown that it goes back to the Apostles themselves. What does it avail for Cardinal Gibbons to ask, "Whoever heard of a Baptist or Episcopalian or any other Protestant church prior to the Reformation" when it is open to the Protestant to retort, whoever heard of the Roman Catholic Church in New Testament times or until long after all the Apostles were dead? We agree with the Roman Catholics that the Apostles constituted an extraordinary supernaturally endowed body of men as over against those who look upon them as merely the first Ministers of the Church. We do not indeed think that there is any reason to think that Peter had any official preeminence among them and yet we do think that they as a body had a significance for the Church of all ages. If the Apostles were living today, or if there existed today a body of men who had succeeded to their powers, they would speak with authority in the Church of Christ in such a sense that to reject their authority would be to reject the authority of Christ himself. Where Rome errs is not so much in the significance it attaches to the Apostles as in its holding that the Roman Catholic clergy are their successors. As a matter of fact they have had no successors, and the significance of the Apostolate for all ages lies in the fact that the Apostles not only spoke but wrote. As a result there is not, and in the nature of the case could not be a Church on earth that has the note of Apostolicity in the sense that its Ministers derive their powers by an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles; and yet every true Church has the note of Apostolicity in the sense that it teaches the same doctrines that the Apostles taught. Doubtless they do this with different degrees of purity but it seems to us as clear as day that it is the historic Protestant Churches rather than the Roman Catholic Church which can best justify their claim to Apostolicity in the only sense in which any Church can rightly claim to be an Apostolic Church. We agree with Cardinal Gibbons that no Church can claim to be a true Church whose doctrines differ from those of the Apostles—though we would not insist that its doctrines must be "identical" with those of the Apostles—but hold that as a matter of fact no Church has a Ministry that can trace their authority, through a visible organization, by an unbroken chain, to the Apostles. In our judgment the claim of the Roman Catholic Church that its Ministers, more especially that the Pope is the successor of the Apostles detracts from rather than adds plausibility to its claim to be the true Church of Christ.

## Are Affirmationists Orthodox?

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Is it not true that the "Auburn Affirmation" was an attack not on the five doctrinal statements made by the General Assembly of 1923 (cited in your August issue) but on the attempt to elevate them to the position of tests for ordination or for good standing as Ministers in the Presbyterian Church? If that is the case, is it fair for you to give the impression that all signers of the Affimation are unorthodox? It may be that you have good reasons for thinking that some of these signers are unorthodox, but it seems to me that, if so, your evidence was gotten from some source other than the Affirmation itself. How is it possible for you to say that these men are all unsound in the faith when in the Affirmation itself they say: "We all believe from our hearts that the writers of the Bible were inspired of God; that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh; that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, and through Him we have our redemption; that having died for our sins He rose from the dead and is our everlasting Saviour; that in His earthly ministry He wrought many mighty works, and by His vicarious death and unfailing presence He is able to save to the uttermost?" Is there anything unsound about a statement like that? . . . . Unless you can show on the basis of the very words of the Affirmation itself that those who signed it are unsound what real warrant have you for criticising Princeton Seminary and the General Assembly and its Boards and Agencies on the ground that they are friendly or at least not unfriendly to Auburn Affirmationists? . . . .*

*Yours sincerely,*

*S. C.*

THE source from which this question comes, together with the statements that accompanied it, indicates that there are fairly well informed persons who think that the fact that a man signed the Auburn Affirmation is not evidence that he is something of a heretic. No doubt most of these persons have not read the Affirmation for themselves; but, strange as it may seem, there are not lacking those who have actually read it for themselves who have apparently done so without discovering any-

thing to warrant the representation that its signers are doctrinally unsound.

It is true that the Auburn Affirmation was aimed, in part at least, at an alleged attempt to impose extra constitutional tests on ministers and elders. If that exhausted its signficance, if it was merely a protest against a supposed attempt by means of Assembly deliverances to in effect alter the Constitution of the Church, it would deserve our sympathy if not our approval. As a matter of fact, however, the Auburn Affirmation did not content itself with protesting against an alleged effort to elevate the "five points" to the position of tests for ordination or for good standing in our Church. It openly and explicitly took exception to the representation of the General Assembly that the "five points" express essential doctrines, and affirmed that not a single one of these doctrines need be believed by a Presbyterian Minister. Thus according to the Auburn Affirmation a man may properly be a Minister of the Presbyterian Church even though he does not believe that the Bible is trustworthy, that a Virgin was the mother of Jesus, that the death of Christ was a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God, that Christ rose from the dead on the third day as recorded in Scripture, or that Christ wrought miracles in the days of His flesh as the Scriptures assert. If that does not constitute warrant for stating that its signers, together with all those who approve their action, are unsound according to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, we are at loss to know what would constitute such warrant.

It is true, and we have no desire to conceal the fact, that the Auburn Affirmation contains the brief creed cited by our questioner. This brief confession is expressed in Scriptural language, and, taken by itself, could be subscribed to by every loyal Presbyterian as satisfactory—as far as it goes. Unfortunately, however, it does not stand alone. It stands in a definite context and when interpreted in the light of that context, as of course it must be interpreted, it affords not the slightest evidence (rather the contrary) that those who have subscribed to it are sound in the faith. Allow us to briefly indicate how true this is.

The first article of this brief creed is that "the writers of the Bible were inspired of God." The context makes clear, however, that this does not mean, as might be supposed, that the Auburn Affirmationists hold that they have been kept from error or rendered authoritative as teachers of doctrines. Rather the Affirmation expressly asserts the contrary. It even states that the doctrine of Scriptural inerrency is harmful not helpful.

Its second article states that "Jesus was God manifest in the flesh" and that "God was in Christ." Such language, however, does not necessarily mean that Christ is the God-man because as widely used these phrases merely mean that He was in a remarkable degree a God-filled man. As a result this article can be subscribed to both by those who believe in the real deity of Christ and those who do not. But while this article leaves it an open question whether its subscribers believe in Christ as the God-man, they make clear that such an incarnation as they subscribe to is one that can be held apart from belief in the Virgin Birth and bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ. We submit that it is impossible to hold to the Christian conception of the incarnation and the continuing life of our Lord while rejecting the Virgin Birth and bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ.

This creed also asserts that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, that through Christ we have our redemption, etc. It is impossible, however, to overlook the fact that according to the Affirmation itself such assertions do not necessitate the belief that "Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God"—despite the fact that this belief expresses the very heart of the doctrine of the atonement as expressed alike in the Scriptures and in the standards of the Presbyterian Church. We submit that any and every theory of the atonement is unsound, both according to the Scriptures and the standards of the Presbyterian Church, that denies or ignores the death of Christ as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God.

The limits of our space forbid that we point out more fully that this brief creed, when interpreted in the light of its context, affords not the slightest warrant for affirming the doctrinal soundness of the subscribers to the Auburn Affirmation. In our judgment none can rightly claim to be loyal and intelligent ministers of the Presbyterian Church who look upon the writers of the Bible as untrustworthy both as recorders of historical facts and as doctrinal guides, who regard such doctrines as the Virgin Birth and bodily resurrection of our Lord as non-essential doctrines, who are unwilling to affirm that He wrought miracles in the days of His flesh, and most of all who deny that "it is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God." In a word a man may hold the creedal position of the Auburn Affirmation *or* that of the Westminster Confession of Faith but he cannot possibly hold *both* positions at the same time.

## Is This Man a Christian?

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Last Sunday the radio speaker for the Church Federation answered the question, "Am I a Christian?" that had been sent to him by a man who evidently patted himself on the back for his fidelity to his home and wife, in fact for his goodness in general, and who said among other things, "I believe Jesus was the natural son of natural parents." The reply of the reverend speaker was in substance, "Yes, a man who is as good as you are is a Christian." How can one be a Christian who expresses himself so about Jesus? . . . . What do you think?*

*Yours,*

*C. C. N.*

WHAT we think about this matter is indicated in a broad way in our leading editoral in this issue. In our judgment this question should have been answered with an emphatic "No." A Christian is necessarily one who stands in a religious relation to Christ. It passes comprehension, however, to suppose that one who looks upon Him as 100 per cent human can regard Him as an object of religious worship. It is perhaps even more important to note that the information given indicates not only that the man putting the question is not a Christian but that the radio speaker himself is fatally ignorant of the right answer to the question, What is a Christian? Nothing is more characteristic of the genuine Christian than the fact that he receives and rests upon Christ alone for salvation. He may have very imperfect views about Christ, of what it behooved Christ to be and do in order that He might save him, but no man is a Christian who proceeds upon the assumption that he is to be saved on the ground of what he is or what he has done. All men have sinned and come short of the glory of God to such an extent that it is forever true that by the deeds of the law no flesh shall be justified in His sight. It is indeed true that the Christian man will become a good man, is in fact the only man that will become the good man in a God-pleasing sense, but no man has ever been saved or ever will be saved on the ground of his own goodness. It is sad indeed that Christian Ministers, so-called, should lead men to put their trust in that which is of no avail and thus use their influence to keep them from putting their trust in the one name given under heaven whereby they may be saved.

## Is Predestination an "Infamous Doctrine?"

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*I am one of your new subscribers, having been pleased by the Christian spirit and attitude shown in your editorials in the two issues of the paper that I have seen.*

*Though a Congregationalist by choice, I have been for twelve years member of a small Presbyterian church needing the support of all our local people.*

*I am writing not from any captious spirit but for information. Just what is meant by the Westminster Confession "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Bible?" Do many Presbyterian Ministers or elders really believe in the doctrine of election as taught in that Westminster Confession, with its frightful assertions that God* of His own good pleasure *chose some for everlasting life and others for everlasting punishment, and even worse, its logical and unmistakable implication that non-elect infants, dying in infancy, go into everlasting punishment? . . . .*

*If the Ministers of today reject this infamous doctrine, why do they not strike out that portion from the Confession? Or have they done so, without my knowing?* I hope they have. *If they have not, it seems to me that Ministers rejecting such doctrine yet apparently endors-*

*ing and revering the entire Confession, are every bit as inconsistent as any Minister can be who takes his vows with certain liberal "reservations."*

*G. W.*

WHEN Ministers and elders at their ordination "receive and adopt" the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures" they affirm (1) the teachings of Scripture constitute a system of doctrine, not a mere aggregate of unrelated doctrines and (2) that the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures is set forth in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church. It should be clearly noted, however, that while the candidate for ordination is required to affirm that he believes the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments "*to be* the Word of God" he is merely required to accept the Confession of Faith "*as containing* the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." This means that while he is required to affirm his belief in the Bible as completely trustworthy in all its statements he is required to accept the Confession of Faith only in the broad sense that it contains the system of doctrine taught in the Bible. Obviously this means that he is not required to profess belief in the infallibility of the Confession of Faith or even to profess belief in all its teachings as long as he embraces the system of doctrine therein taught as divinely revealed. The system of doctrine set forth in the Confession of Faith is, of course, what is known as the Calvinistic or Reformed in distinction from those known as Lutheran or Arminian or Roman Catholic, not to mention others. This means that none except Calvinists can honestly and intelligently accept ordination as Presbyterian Ministers or elders.

If the second question put to us above ended with the words "Wesminster Confession," we would reply that all Presbyterian Ministers and elders who are both honest and intelligent believe in the doctrine of election as taught in the Westminster Confession. Of what proportion of the some 10,000 ministers and some 50,000 elders of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., this is true we have no means of knowing. Nothing can be more certain, however, than that the doctrine of election as taught in the Confession of Faith is fundamental to the system of doctrine therein set forth; and hence that only those who believe in that doctrine of election can honestly and intelligently accept Presbyterian ordination. We fully agree with our questioner that Ministers and elders who reject this doctrine are as truly inconsistent as those who have taken their vows with "liberal reservations." Whether they are "every bit as inconsistent" depends upon the extent of those reservations. If they take their vows with mild reservations they may be no more inconsistent, or even less inconsistent, than if they rejected the doctrine of election as taught in the Westminster Confession of Faith; but if they be at all thoroughgoing in their reservations they are much more inconsistent. This follows from the fact that while "Liberalism" in any of its consistent forms of expression is something other than Christianity yet that there are a number of systems of doctrine, notably those known as the Lutheran and the Wesleyan Arminian, which while they reject the doctrine of election taught in the Westminster Confession are not only Christian but evangelically Christian.

It will not have been overlooked, however, that the second question put to us above does not end with the words, "Westminster Confession." It not only asks whether Ministers and elders believe in the doctrine of election as taught in the Westminster Confession, it also asks whether they believe "its frightful assertions that God of His own good pleasure chose some for everlasting life and others for everlasting punishment, and even worse, its logical and unmistakable implication that non-elect infants, dying in infancy, go into everlasting punishment?" Relative to the latter part of the question, we would reply that as far as we know no Minister or elder believes such things, certainly no Minister or elder is required to confess belief in such things for the simple reason that these things are not taught in the Westminster Confession of Faith. It is true of course that the Confession of Faith teaches that God has chosen some to everlasting life—without any implications as to the relative number of the saved and the unsaved (see our August issue, p. 12)—but it nowhere teaches that God chose others for everlasting punishment. What it teaches is that out of the mass of the lost, God elects a multitude that no man can number, purchases them to himself by the precious blood of His Son, operates creatively by His Spirit in the inmost core of their being, in short saves them in the New Testament sense of that word. It should never be forgotten, however, that while none would be saved apart from the electing love of God those who are lost are lost because of their sin. It is of course sheer caricature (though in this instance unintentional) to say that a "logical and unmistakable implication" of the doctrine of election taught in the Westminster Confession is that "non-elect infants, dying in infancy, go into everlasting punishment." The Confession of Faith never *taught* that there are any non-elect infants. The most that can be said is that previous to the adoption of the Declaratory Statement it left it an open question whether all infants are included among the elect. The Declaratory Statement explicitly affirms that all dying in infancy are included in the election of grace. Whether the Confession of Faith goes beyond the Scriptures at this point may be an open question; but be that as it may the Westminster doctrine of election does not carry with it the implication that any of those dying in infancy are lost. Rather is it true, as we hope to show in the near future in reply to another question, that it is the Calvinist and the Calvinist alone who can consistently hold that all those dying in infancy are saved.

# Letters to the Editor

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

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am in whole-hearted sympathy with your position—your loyalty to the Lord Jesus and His supernatural and inerrant Word—and praise the Lord that He has called you to "contend earnestly for *the* Faith" and that He has granted you grace and ability to testify with such clearness and virility. May your "bow" long abide in strength. Never was the need greater for such witness.

Yours sincerely,

A. B. WINCHESTER.

Knox Presbyterian Church, Toronto, Ontario.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Permit me to congratulate you upon the publication of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Each issue is valuable from cover to cover and if anything can save the Presbyterian Church from degenerating into an empty organization with all the spiritual power gone from it, your paper's wholesome and dignified presentation of the truth will be effective to that end.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY and Westminster Theological Seminary have the same reason for existence. Both stand for the whole message of Christianity in these radical and demoralized times when "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" are far too definite for those who seek a convenient religion and have not enough faith to believe anything beyond what can be demonstrated to them by some current experiment.

I attended the meeting of the General Assembly in Cincinnati on the day when a Presbyterian Minister gave a long address with many pagan illustrations about the home and marriage and the life of young people. It was in deplorable taste and by the widest stretch of the imagination could not be considered helpful to the cause of sound morals. The real Presbyterian Church has a loftier purpose than was indicated by the vulgar claptrap that took so much time that afternoon. I appreciated the comment of the American Episcopalian bishop who reported that the prolonged discussion of these intimate phases of social life at the Lambeth Conference had but one noticeable effect upon him. They made him "seasick."

I hope, as thousands of Presbyterians hope, that those who now are trying to control the Presbyterian Church and who have no connection with this paper or Westminster Seminary, will return to the fundamental principles of our

faith. How can they claim to be Presbyterians when they question (1) A truthful Bible, (2) The miracles of the Bible, (3) The Virgin Birth of Christ, (4) Christ's giving of Himself as a substitute for us in His death on the cross, and (5) His bodily resurrection? My hope is that the public is thoroughly aware of the difference existing between genuine Presbyterians and the radical wing of the Church which apparently predominated in the Cincinnati General Assembly.

Enclosed herewith are subscriptions for your paper to twenty-five college libraries. Assuring you of the great satisfaction derived from reading CHRISTIANITY TODAY which is the best publication of its kind, I am

Cordially yours,

BEATRICE SHILLITO.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Some one has kindly sent me a copy of your noble new venture for God, CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I hail it and hasten to send you my subscription for one year. If in addition to this —together with the New Westminster Seminary there now could be started a daily newspaper with the Bible as its standard, there might be among us, as Dr. Kuyper did in the Netherlands, an *atmosphere* created and a sphere where Christ would be honored and which the God of the Scriptures could bless.

Assuring you of hearty sympathy in the noble work you are doing though this venture of your new monthly, I am in Our Blessed Savior,

Yours faithfully,

The REV. JOHN H. DE VRIES.
(Translator of Kuyper's Works.)

Daybrook, Conn.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have read the first issue of my subscription from cover to cover including the covers. I must say that I have thoroughly enjoyed its contents.

If I understand the policy of the editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, we adherents of "historic and scriptural Christianity" must follow the example of Paul in "contending" for the Faith.

Tolerance has its virtues, but it also has its limits. The Christian without backbone and loyalty to convictions is worth about two cents, in my estimation, to Christianity. Those "yes" and "no" men from "anywhere" have put a monkey wrench in the cogs of *pure* Christian thought and practice, as it were. Is it any wonder that the nation is breeding a generation of citizens who have no moral standards, no principles of conduct and no God in Whom they can trust?

So, hew to the line, my Christian brethren, and let the chips fall where they may.

My subscription has already been placed with you, but I would like that the enclosed names should be mailed a copy of "that standard bearer," CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Fraternally in Christ,

WILLIAM O. MILLER.

First Reformed Church, Tamms, Ill.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I write to thank you for that most excellent and timely article by Rev. F. H. Stevenson, D.D. It ought to be placed in the hands of every member of our Presbyterian Church to inform them of what is going on in the high places (and in the places not so high) of the Church. How can a Minister boost the offerings for the work at home and abroad when at 156 in New York, and in the Witherspoon Building in Philadelphia, Pa., there are those in official positions that are fitly labelled as the "Yes and No" men. How can we Ministers who still are loyal to "Christ and the Church" enthuse over the appeals, the Pentecostal suggestions, and of other "You Ought To Do" say so's of the powers that be when they treat so indifferently the tragic facts of the "Auburn Affirmation."

Very recently a dodger has been sent abroad "to the clerks of our Church sessions" urging them to boost *The Presbyterian Magazine,* when the editor is an avowed modernist and one of the 1300 signers of the Apostate Auburn Declaration! Much stress is put upon the fact, by this letter to the sessions, and a special reason why we are to enlarge its circulation in this, it is "Our Official Magazine." So there is an "Official" backing of the editor and those associated with him in its management—most of them modernists.

Surely no pastor who is anxious to keep his people in touch with "The Gospel of Christ" as set forth in the New Testament, can put into the homes of his people a paper whose "Official" people are hostile to the Virgin Birth of our Lord, His diety, His bodily resurrection, His atoning sacrifice, His second coming, and deny the trustworthiness of God's Holy Word.

So long then as the "Magazine" is in the hands that it now is, not many loyal-to-Christ pastors will wear their shoes out running about their parishes seeking new subscribers to *The Presbyterian Magazine.*

Sincerely yours,

G. WILLIAMSON.

Binghamton, N. Y.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Your paper is most refreshing. I rejoice that there are able editors and profound scholars who are among the seven thousand who have not yet bowed the knee to the Baal of liberalism, but, as Elijah, militantly champion the cause of the living God and "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints." May you long continue to do so.

It is my hope that CHRISTIANITY TODAY may become closely linked with that well-nigh impregnable fortress of Fundamentalism in the South—Hampden-Sydney College. As an alumnus of that institution I wish to do all that I can to help cement this bond. Your readers in the North and West, for I believe that your circulation is largely in these sections, who do not know of Hampden-Sydney, should certainly know how faithfully the administration and faculty of this college stand by the "faith of our fathers." They will rejoice that Hampden-Sydney is such a place that one need have no fears in sending his or her son there. For wise advice and scholarly attainments her faculty cannot be equalled; and in genuinely Christian atmosphere I have never heard of a place which was (or could be) her superior. CHRISTIANITY TODAY stands in the world of religious journalism as Hampden-Sydney stands in the world of religious education.

Yours very truly,

Richmond, Va. H. C. BRADSHAW.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I inclose my subscription, and also a list of names representing families in our Church.

I was a Commissioner to the General Assembly, and fully agreed with Dr. Craig's position, both as to Princeton Seminary and as to the "Auburn Affirmation." I do not see how any man who subscribed to the "Auburn Affirmation" could qualify as a Minister of the Gospel.

Yours very truly,

CHAS. M. CALDWELL.

Waverly, Ohio.

## Dr. Machen Surveys Dr. Speer's New Book

*(Concluded)*

true simplicity can be the possession of every humble Christian as well. "How can I learn about God and my relation to Him?", says the truly simple-minded man. "I can learn it in God's holy Book. What does that Book tell me about the present state of my soul? It tells me that I am a transgressor of God's law and under its wrath and curse. Is there, then, for me no hope? Oh, yes, the Book tells me that God sent His own Son to be my Saviour. What, then, did He do to wash away my sin? He took my place and died in my stead upon the cross. But how can I, who am dead in trespasses and sins, ever lay hold upon the benefit of Christ's death? The Holy Spirit can make me alive by the new birth. How, then, when I am born again, am I justified before God? Not by good works, not by love, but by faith alone. What, then, must I do henceforth, with my new life in Christ, and with the guilt of my sins washed away? I must use the weapons that God has given me in the battle of this world; I must read His holy Word, I must partake of the sacraments that Christ instituted, I must pray in Christ's name. How then shall I show that I am truly Christ's? By living a life of love and by telling others the blessed story of God's grace."

Such is the simplicity that is found in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church; such is the simplicity that is found in God's Word. Those who hold to that simplicity are at present undergoing hardship and reviling in the Church. But it is worth all that it costs. Those who possess it would not exchange it for all the favor of all the churches or for all the kingdoms of all the world.

# Current Views and Voices

## Getting Rid of Sin

*(Editorial in the Evangelical Christian, Toronto, Canada.)*

THERE are two ways of getting rid of sin —an old way and a new way, the way laid down in the Word of God and the way set forth by Modernism. The great gulf that is fixed between the modern conception of Christian truth and the old is well illustrated in an interview with Dr. Shailer Mathews, Dean of the Divinity School of Chicago published in a recent issue of *The American Magazine.* Dr. Mathews is one of the great exponents of Modernism in America. At the same time he is, to our way of thinking, one of the most deluded men on the continent, living in a fool's paradise of his own creating, obsessed by plausible theories of "religious experimentation" and oblivious to the patent elementary facts of life and the most desperate need of humanity. According to Dr. Mathews the doctrine of "original sin" dates only from St. Augustine, and, "biology and psychology have shown that many things charged to original sin are natural human functions, survivals of outgrown goods." The new facts, he contends, have made the theory of original sin obsolete, with the result that old standards of morality have become outworn and outgrown.

It is amazing how people will swallow any kind of rubbish in the name of psychology or biology if it has the name of a prominent man attached. Dr. Mathews does not explain in what manner science has shown original sin to be an error. Has not the study of the laws of heredity abundantly proved the truth of the doctrine if any proof were needed? Has it not been shown and demonstrated in countless ways that the stream of human life from Adam was poisoned at its source and has contaminated the entire race since then? But one does not require to be a scientist to see the fallacies of Dr. Mathews' argument. The fact that all have sinned from an inborn tendency is written large in human experience and was set forth as Divine truth long before Augustine meditated on the Divine mysteries. One trembles to think what would happen if the theories of Dr. Mathews and his school gained world-wide credence. Can Dr. Mathews tell us when his "Gospel" ever reclaimed a gangster, gunman or hoodlum of Chicago and set his feet upon the rock and established his going? Has his theory regarding sin ever made a saint out of a sot or lifted the load from a burdened heart and washed white the soul? What good news has he to offer to the multitudes of weary hearts sick of sin and seeking for the Saviour? This attempt to get rid of sin by calling it "outworn good" will not do. It is too stubborn, too terrible a fact of human life to be explained away so easily. It must be reckoned with and dealt with, as every human being who is honest with himself knows. God has provided the one and the only way to get rid of original sin. The stream of human life has been poisoned, but thank God it can be cleansed. Into the bitter waters can be cast the tree of Healing, and "where sin abounded grace can much more abound." "The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son cleanseth us from all sin." Here is the only way to get rid of sin.

## It is Time to Be Militant

*(H. C. Marlin, in the Moody Bible Institute Monthly, Chicago.)*

THE average man is not indifferent to religion. He is disgusted. He is bored. He is tired of hypocrisy and sham and the evident greed and love of money; the unbelief of many churchmen and ministers, and is weary with their propaganda. In his heart there is a great longing that has not been satisfied, and it leaves him restless.

Many of these men have been raised under Christian environment and in their early youth entered some church, formed their own conclusions regarding the truth, and now are amazed at the sudden turn of affairs which has taken the infidelity of the soap-box orators into the pulpits of the land. They have left churches and become wanderers.

I consider it a terrible arraignment against Modernism which has not only sapped the life blood out of many churches, but driven many people away. Modernism has been crying, "Be tolerant," and at the same time played the double-crosser with the fundamentalists who have tried to be tolerant. Fundamentalists have been so tolerant that they have lost the control of conferences, colleges, churches and pulpits. Modernism, thoroughly organized, has spread its propaganda by press, radio and pulpit until there is but a remnant left who attend the average church service, and they do it through loyalty only.

I am convinced that the time is at hand when God will not hold fundamentalists guiltless if they do not withdraw their support from the programs sponsored by modernists, in fact do not arise and fight them. In every community the cry should be, "Come ye out from among them," and the passive attitude should give way to a militant and aggressive one.

I realize that it means in many instances the breaking of sacred ties and memories for many of us. I know that it is hard to break these ties, but it will have to be. In many places it is being done. But so far as I am able to learn there is no concerted effort being made to urge it.

There should be an organization formed that would sponsor such a move. Fundamental magazines should by editorial and article advocate it. The spirit of drifting should be stopped at the earliest possible moment. A press bureau should see that the other side of the picture be given the public to read. The public should be made conscious of the difference between Modernism and Fundamentalism. The average man does not know and damns the whole thing, which is the greatest cause for the seeming indifference.

I have observed that in every generation the Lord has raised up a man who saw this and, like Mr. Moody, went forth in the spirit of the conqueror to fight for the faith once delivered. What was done then can be done now. All that is needed is leadership, a Spirit-filled man who can by his example and leadership cause a united attack on the present day apostacy.

Let the fundamentalists overcome the inferiority-complex that has routed them from control, and arise in the Spirit of God and in the faith of our fathers to fight to the bitter end. Where they cannot lead let them withdraw; where they cannot control let them refuse to support. The faith needs defenders these days.

## The Last General Assembly as Seen by Union Theological Seminary of New York

*(From the Union Seminary Alumni Bulletin, New York.)*

"THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. at Cincinnati was a happy occasion undisturbed by such heated discussion and acrimonious debates as have marred recent meetings of that body. Even the presence of some thirty or more Union graduates as commissioners did not create so much as a ripple on the surface of the peaceful waters. The sessions were conducted with dignity and the important work of the Assembly was expedited by the tact and courtesy and skill of the moderator, Dr. Hugh T. Kerr of Pittsburgh. Union men were gratified at the manner in which President Coffin's address was received, when he reported on his visit to the reunion of the Scottish Churches as a delegate from the Presbyterian Church. A local news report from the *Cincinnati Times-Star* thus describes the scene:

"'One is amazed at the variety and importance of the subjects which 950 commissioners handle so expeditiously. Their interest is real and intelligent. They know more ways of expressing their mind than by formal vote. A woman may reveal her sentiments by a swift glance of the eye, or by gradations of a smile. This big body shows what it thinks by the way it bestows or reserves applause.

"'Thus, all unpredictably, it bestowed its accolade upon President Henry Sloane Coffin, of Union Theological Seminary, New York. He

had made a brilliant news report of the recent reunion of the Scottish Churches, to which he was an official delegate. His portrayal was adequate to the historic occasion, and shot through with flashes of interpretive comment. The Assembly was both inspired and instructed.

"'As Dr. Coffin finished he was given a salvo of applause. Then, apparently remembering the hard knocks that have in the past been given to Union Seminary, the commissioners decided to show the president what they now think of him, and the burst of applause swelled into a sustained ovation, the highwater mark of Assembly approval up to date.'

"On the evening of June 2nd a dinner of Union alumni was held which brought together nearly 40 men. Princeton Seminary and Chicago Seminary (formerly McCormick) were holding similar meetings at the same place and there was a pleasant interchange of greetings between these Seminaries and Union. One came away from the Assembly with the feeling that a new day has set in for the Presbyterian Church, that it is determined to forget the things which are behind and press forward with united front to accomplish its great tasks for the Kingdom."

## The Religious Pacifist

*(Editorial in the Gospel Witness, Toronto, Canada.)*

THERE is a type of religious pacificist who presents a very interesting and instructive subject for psychological analysis. Our pacific friend is averse to religious controversy. He insists that no good can come from combating erroneous opinions. Of course, he is himself thoroughly orthodox. He subscribes to every doctrine of Evangelical Christianity. He regrets that anyone should propagate, or even hold, heretical opinions; but if perverse human nature entertains that which is contrary to the revealed Word of God, while it is to be regretted, and even deplored, it should never be combated.

Our pacific friend hears the Bible belittled, and the idea of its divine inspiration held up to scorn. He is very sorry that men should do this, but his pacific spirit forbids his making any protest against it. He hears the person of Jesus Christ discussed: His virgin birth denied, and all His claims to divinity thereby invalidated. The record of His miracles is set aside as being untrue, or at best "heightened" or highly coloured. As for the blood of Christ: the New Testament emphasis upon the blood and its expiatory value he hears attributed to pagan influences,—indeed, he sees men trample under foot the blood of Christ.

Our pacific friend is, of course, extremely grieved that men should speak thus of One Whom he has called Saviour and Lord. But notwithstanding the attack upon the person of Christ, which would rob Him of His deity, His authority, His honour, and which casts a stain even upon His birth, our non-controversial friend refrains from protest.

Someone will say that such a spirit is highly commendable, and is deserving our emulation. But is such pacificism sincere? Let us examine it a little. Suppose someone questions the veracity of our pacific friend, and charges him personally with untruthfulness—what then? His pacificism vanishes in a moment; fire flashes from his eye, his fists are clenched, and a torrent of vituperation flows from his lips. Yes, he will fight for his own honour, but not for the honour of his Lord. And if one should reflect upon Mr. Pacificist's ancestry, though it were in a way that would fall far short of the dreadful implication involved in the denial of the virgin birth of Christ, what follows? A most vigorous defence of our friend's family tree would certainly be put forth. Or if even a lesser criticism were offered, impugning the "scholarship," or even the natural intelligence, of our friend, how the academic guns would boom in answer! How certainly all the diplomas would be brought forth and exhibited!

What, then, is the explanation of this strange attitude? There can be only one, and that is that our friend's personal reputation is of far greater importance to him than the honour of his Lord. The security of his own position among his fellows is of greater moment than the salvation of such souls as may be led astray by another gospel "which is not another."

Or, let us suppose our pacific friend to be a business man, a shareholder in certain corporations, the president of certain companies, perhaps the president of a bank. And what if these companies' rights are infringed upon by business competitors? What if the financial interests of certain corporations are put in jeopardy by the shrewd manipulations of some unscrupulous rival? What if the bank's credit is threatened by the unwisdom of some branch manager who has permitted the funds of the bank to be used for speculative purposes? What action does our pacific business friend take? Does he hold a prayer-meeting, as he so often recommends those who contend for the faith to do? (And we believe we ought to pray more, and still more earnestly.) But is that all our friend does? On the contrary, this friend who is opposed to religious controversy, the moment his personal interests are affected, and the interests of the companies he is connected with are jeopardized, if those responsible for these things have brought themselves within the law, how quickly will the machinery of the law be set in operation! The teller is brought into the police court, the manager is perhaps put under arrest; or, if a copyright or patent be infringed, a civil suit is immediately instituted; for in the material realm our pacific friend is a valiant warrior, a formidable foe, who will fight to the death for the last cent that anybody owes him.

But if men rob God, infringe upon the heavenly copyright of the only gospel proclaimed from heaven, if men substitute something devoid of healing power for the blood-remedy, the only cure for human sin, our pacific friend says nothing.

* * *

Some of the bitterest letters which come to us are penned by people who profess to deplore controversy. They will not fight the enemies of the truth, but they are ready always to fight those who would defend the faith. They have no quarrel with the infidel who tears God's Word to pieces, but reserve the vials of their wrath for those who endeavour to maintain the faith. Their attitude toward the Fosdicks, the Glovers, the Mathews, the Marshalls, and others of that school, must be determined by the thirteenth chapter of first Corinthians. But the only appropriate accompaniment of their attitude toward evangelicals, believers in the Bible, contenders for the faith, who are animated by the apostolic spirit which says, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard," is fire and brimstone.

## Presbyterians Lose Ground

(From *The Christian Standard*)

FOLLOWING on the heels of Methodism's losses comes the report by Dr. Lewis Mudge, stated clerk of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., of a loss of 20,359 members of his denomination during the past fiscal year.

And that is not all the story. The report showed a loss of thirty-four churches, $3,000,000 less in total contributions and $2,000,000 decrease in giving to various missionary and benevolent enterprises.

The *Presbyterian Advance* justifies the losses because Easter Sunday, with its large ingatherings of members and money, was not included in the fiscal year, and adds: "On the whole, there is no reason to be depressed by the statistics." The *Presbyterian Banner* comments: "There is nothing to do about these statistics except to make closer inspection of our work in all departments, in large churches and in small, and resolve to go forward. Let such resolution begin at home in our individual hearts and lives. 'The soul of improvement is the improvement of the soul.' A greater degree of spirituality in our hearts and lives will soon register itself in our churches, and nothing else will work any real improvement."

Presbyterians know more about their own troubles than any one else, but if I were to venture an opinion about the causes of their backslidden state it would be—the cankerous growth of modernism with an attendant loss of vital and aggressive evangelism. It is a far cry from John Knox and his passionate "Give me Scotland or I die!" to the modern smug, blue-stocking cult which has canonized him. Calvinism, the only excuse for their existence as a separate denominational body, has been embalmed and quietly laid to rest in the theological dust of the ages. The future for Presbyterianism is dark unless they turn to the leadership of such souls as Craig, Machen, Wilson and Stevenson—the last remaning sincere devotees of an outworn creed.

# News of the Church

## Westminster Seminary Opens Second Year

WITHERSPOON Hall in Philadelphia was the scene, on the afternoon of October first, of the opening exercises of Westminster Theological Seminary. This Presbyterian Seminary, new in organization but not in tradition, has begun its second year with increasing confidence and optimism. The large gathering that assembled to watch the beginning of the second year of this venture of faith included many men and women prominent in the ecclesiastical life of the Eastern States.

The exercises began with the singing of the long metre Doxology by all present. Following this, the blessing of God was invoked by the Rev. Everett C. DeVelde, Minister of the Center Presbyterian Church of New Park, Pa. Added significance was attached to Mr. DeVelde's participation due to the fact that he was a member of the first graduating class of Westminster, and is the first alumnus thus to return to take part in an opening.

Following the invocation the whole company rose and sang the Ninetieth Psalm in metre, in the version of Isaac Watts:

"Our God our help in ages past
Our hope for years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast
And our eternal home."

As the strains of the psalm were lifted up from hearts and voices, they bore eloquent testimony to the oneness of Westminster with the great stream of Presbyterian history and faith.

When the Psalm had been sung, the Scripture from Acts 4:1-22, was read by the Rev. Albert Barnes Henry, Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Kensington, Philadelphia. Prayer was then offered by the Rev. W. B. Greenway, D.D., President of Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa., who carried all hearts Godward in an earnest and fitting petition to the throne of all grace.

The exercises were conducted by the Rev. Frank H. Stevenson, D.D., LL.D., President of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, who made, at this point, a statement on its behalf.

"We are not alone as we are gathered here," declared Dr. Stevenson. "Standing as we do for the historic faith of the Church, we are surrounded by a great cloud of witnesses. Paul is here,—Athanasius, Augustine, Anselm, Bernard of Clairvaux, Calvin, Knox, the covenanters of Scotland, the martyrs of the Low Countries,—they all are with us. We stand today where they stood in their generation.

"In the Providence of God, when great crises have come in His Church, He has in past ages used the determined witness of irrepressible minorities to maintain and transmit the faith. How often it has been the lot of the little group to hold fast until by God's grace the tide has turned and victory has come! God's faithful minorities of today are His triumphant majorities of tomorrow.

**It is with profound sorrow that we record the death of the Reverend Robert Dick Wilson, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D. on Saturday, October 11th. A full account of the life and work of Dr. Wilson, together with tributes to his character and scholarship will be given in our November issue.**

"Let no one doubt that Westminster Seminary is needed. If there was ever a time for such speculation it has passed away. The Seminary's witness has gone out into all the earth. Had we ten times the number of students to send forth there are more than enough churches that desire men with the Westminster stamp, to place them all.

"I am glad to announce a substantial increase in the number of students. Today we welcome a class of new students composed of men of exceptional ability and promise. If they were not men of conviction they would not be here.

"The Trustees announce that the Rev. R. B. Kuiper D.D., has resigned as Professor of Systematic Theology to accept the Presidency of Calvin College. We regret exceedingly to lose Dr. Kuiper and congratulate him upon his new field of usefulness and wish him God's blessing. In his place we have been fortunate in being able to secure Mr. John Murray, of Scotland. Mr. Murray taught Systematic Theology last year at Princeton, but declined a proffered reappointment there, to come with us, because he was persuaded that it was the right thing to do."

(Late advices from the office of the Registrar place the registration at the Seminary at at least 55, a gain of ten per cent over the first year, with the possibility of further additions.)

Following the statement by Dr. Stevenson, greetings to the new students were extended by the Rev. Prof. R. Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. As he arose to speak, the venerable and distinguished scholar was accorded an ovation by the audience, bearing testimony to the affection in which he is held by all.

Dr. Wilson told the new students that he offered to them a two-fold congratulation: First,—that they had had the *common sense* to come to Westminster. They would not have come had they not believed in God, in God's Bible, and if it were not their purpose to preach the Gospel. Westminster Seminary believed that Bible and believed that it was capable of scholarly defense. The students would be called upon to prepare themselves to be able to defend the Word against the world, the flesh and the Devil!

Secondly,—they were to be congratulated upon having been *given* faith and courage to stand up for Jesus in the midst of a faithless generation. He emphasized the word "given." They were good Calvinists. It was all of grace. No man could boast. To them it had been *given* to stand for the Gospel. Let them stand, then, like men!

The main address of the afternoon was delivered by the Rev. F. Paul McConkey, D.D., Minister of Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Michigan, and a member of the Board of the Seminary. Tall, and with a superb presence, Dr. McConkey, speaking in graphic, memorable sentences, delivered an eloquent and powerful address upon "The Modern Crucifixion." It was not the soldiers who crucified our Lord, he asserted. They were but the instruments of others whose wills and affections had rejected Jesus. The atonement made by our Lord had, of course, been accomplished once for all, and God's justice forever satisfied. But there was a sense in which those of every generation could so join their wills to the will of those who cried "away with Him" that, in effect, they would be "crucifying Christ afresh." There were three classes of these. They were:

*First, those who crucify Christ by choosing material things in preference to Him.* This class of person is symbolized by Judas. His price was thirty pieces of silver. He preferred the silver, and got it—together with what went with it. Today in our so-called Christian countries, material comfort and complacency are being enthroned above all else. They are content to sell out their loyalty to the Lord Jesus for the sake of animal comfort and monetary advantage. Yet still He looks down upon them with pity and love,—upon a world that is rejecting Him because it wants material advantages more than it wants Him.

*Second, those who crucify Christ by the spirit of indifference.* This group finds its symbol in Pilate. Had Pilate been a true man he would have defended Jesus with all the power of his office and with all his soldiery. But he was indifferent. He didn't care. And it was becoming more and more so in nation and Church today. People were not so much hostile and antagonistic to the Gospel as simply indifferent to it. Whether it was true that Christ died for them they did not consider a matter worth worrying about. But indifference is crucifying Christ afresh. It has come into the Church from the world. And indifferentism in the pul-

pit will never meet indifference in the pew. Men who did not care about the great truths of the Gospel, men who were willing to sit idly by when these truths were being ridiculed or assailed, would only fortify the world in its indifference to the Gospel.

*Third, Christ is "crucified afresh" by the spirit of unbelief.* Modern unbelief is symbolized by the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Unbelief today is, in many quarters, not as open and crude as in other years. It is unbelief all the same,—even when lip homage is being rendered to our Lord. In a striking figure, Dr. McConkey said, "They press on His brow a thorny wreath of roses, and nail Him to a cross of hollow and heartless praise."

The world, and worldly sections of the visible Church had rejected both Christ and the Bible. In trying to do away with the authority of the Word, they had at the last destroyed all authority of any sort. Following Ritschl, they had "shifted their house of faith from the Rock, and built it, not upon a sand bar, but upon a fog bank."

Dr. McConkey concluded his masterful address with a thrilling appeal for a return to the "Faith once delivered," by which alone the Church could recover its lost vigor and spiritual glory.

After Dr. McConkey's great sermon, all arose to sing:

"O could I speak the matchless worth
O could I sound the glories forth
Which in my Saviour shine . . . ."

The concluding prayer was then offered and the benediction pronounced by the Rev. Stanley V. Bergen, Minister of Union Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. All present arose from the exercises of the day edified and inspired, full of faith and confidence in the grace and power of God to make Westminster Seminary a strength and blessing to the whole Church of Christ.

## The "Barnhouse Case"

THE 1930 session of the Synod of Pennsylvania referred to its judicial commission a complaint by a minority in the Presbytery of Philadelphia against the action of Presbytery in refusing to institute judicial proceedings against the Rev. Donald Gray Barnhouse, for alleged slanders of other Ministers. The Presbytery had appointed a committee to investigate the matter, and had decided, after receiving its committee's report, that the facts did not warrant the Presbytery's taking action. The way was left clear, however, for any private members of Presbytery who might consider themselves aggrieved to file charges against Mr. Barnhouse. This none of Mr. Barnhouse's opponents were willing to do; instead, as has been indicated, they carried the matter to the Synod of Pennsylvania, asking that Presbytery (which had already decided that it could not try Mr. Barnhouse on the basis of the evidence submitted) be *compelled* to try him. It has never been clearly explained why the parties considering themselves aggrieved did not file charges in their own names as is provided for in the Book of Discipline but insisted that an unwilling Presbytery be made to prosecute, which prosecution is allowed by the Book of Discipline only when "a judicatory finds it necessary for the ends of discipline to investigate the alleged offense."

The Judicial Commission of the Synod decided in favor of the complainants, as follows:

"IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE COMMISSION:

"(1) That the Presbytery of Philadelphia exercised its discretionary power unwisely in declining to initiate a judicial investigation of certain evidence submitted to it which alleges that the Reverend Donald Gray Barnhouse, one of its members, had violated the ninth commandment of his ordination vows.

"(2) That the Presbytery of Philadelphia permitted attacks upon the integrity and orthodoxy of a number of its Ministers to remain unchallenged in declining to initiate this judicial investigation.

"(3) That the record in the case warrants the contention of the minority report of the judicial committee that prosecution should be initiated by the Presbytery, upon which body the Constitution places such responsibility.

"(4) That the Presbytery of Philadelphia in declining to initiate proceedings against the Reverend Donald Gray Barnhouse is at variance with the repeated deliverances of the General Assembly to the effect that the brethren refrain from making accusations against the doctrinal integrity of Ministers save in the manner prescribed by our Book of Discipline.

"THE COMPLAINANT IS THEREFORE UNANIMOUSLY SUSTAINED and the Presbytery of Philadelphia is hereby directed to appoint a judicial committee to formulate charges and specifications on the basis of the evidence submitted by the complainants; elect a judicial commission; proceed to the trail of the Reverend Donald Gray Barnhouse, in the name of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and in accordance with all the provisions of the Book of Discipline."

At the September meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia the decision of Synod's Commission (which became when read the decision of Synod) was received by the Presbytery. In obedience to the mandate of Synod, Presbytery appointed a committee to "formulate charges and specifications on the basis of the evidence submitted by the complainants."

A special meeting of Presbytery for the purpose of receiving the report of the Committee, and of proceeding further, was appointed for September 29th. On that day the Committee reported that on the basis of the "evidence" submitted by the "complainants" there were two charges, with fifteen specifications alleged to prove them. The charges are, in substance,

(1) That Mr. Barnhouse failed "to be zealous and faithful in maintaining . . . . the . . . . peace of the Church" in accordance with his ordination vow.

(2) That Mr. Barnhouse violated the ninth commandment ("Thou shalt not bear false witness against they neighbor") by casting reflections upon the doctrinal soundness of certain other Ministers of the Presbytery.

After having received the report of the committee (which did not itself prefer the charges but merely transmitted them in a clerical capacity), an effort was made by the friends of Mr. Barnhouse to have the trial take place in open Presbytery, so that the Church at large might be fully informed of the charges. The direction of Synod was that a Judicial Commission be appointed by Presbytery, but Mr. Barnhouse stood upon his right as a Minister to be tried by the whole Presbytery and claimed that Synod could not take his constitutional right from him. After a stormy debate the Moderator ruled that Mr. Barnhouse must be tried by a commission. An appeal was taken from the decision of the chair, and amid great confusion the vote was announced as 43 to 42 for sustaining the Moderator. An immediate request was made for a retabulation of the votes because it appeared that one of the members of Presbytery had voted to sustain the Moderator, while thinking that he was voting the opposite way. The request for a recount was refused by the Moderator. Immediately notice of complaint was given by Mr. R. K. Armes, Elder from the Tenth Presbyterian Church.

Presbytery then passed to the difficult task of selecting a Judicial Commission. Many suggested as members of the Commission flatly refused to serve. It was not until the next meeting of the Presbytery, on October sixth, that all members of the commission were finally selected. They are:

*Ministers*

Geo. M. Oakley, D.D., *Chairman*
Geo. H. Bucher
David Freeman
Howard J. Bell

*Elders*

Jos. McCutcheon, *Clerk*
G. F. Norton
H. C. Albin
D. T. Richman

A number of members of Presbytery refused to act as prosecutor, among them the Rev. Dr. O. T. Allis, Professor in Westminster Theological Seminary, who, it was reported in the daily press, considered several of the charges "petty." The Moderator's nomination of the Rev. Robt. B. Whyte, D.D., as prosecutor was received with disfavor by the Presbytery, which it is said is due to the fact that Dr. Whyte is alleged to be among those who have been active in opposing Mr. Barnhouse. Dr. E. A. Freeman, Associate Minister of Chambers-Wylie Church was finally appointed as prosecutor.

In pursuance of the announcement by Mr. Roland K. Armes that a protest would be filed, a protest signed by more than one-third of the members of Presbytery recorded as present at the time of the vote was filed on October seventh with the Rev. I. Sturger Shultz, Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. Under the law of the Church, proceedings, it is said, should now be suspended pending the action of the Synod of Pennsylvania of 1931 on the merits of the complaint. Whether action will be thus sisted is not definitely known at the present writing.

## Dr. Fosdick Makes Darwin a Saint

IT has just been announced that the new "Riverside Baptist Church" of New York, financed, it is said, by the Rockefellers, and ministered to by Harry Emerson Fosdick, will, in its scheme of decorations, glorify a number of historical personages who were either entirely non-Christian or else antagonistic to the Evangelical Faith. In addition to the usual carved stone images of our Lord, the saints and angels over the doorway of the structure that is nearing completion, will be figures in successive rings above the doorway: first, the likenesses of sixteen of the world's greatest scientists, beginning with Hippocrates and ending with Darwin, Pasteur, Lister and Albert Einstein; next, an arch honoring the distinguished philosophers, including Pythagoras and Ralph Waldo Emerson, and finally an arch paying the same kind of tribute to the outstanding religious leaders, from Moses to David Livingstone.

Dr. Fosdick was, prior to the General Assembly of 1923, a temporary ornament of the Presbyterian Church as the special weekly preacher of the First Presbyterian Church of New York.

## The Presbyterian Church in Canada

BANFF, in the heart of the Rockies amid scenes of surpassing grandeur, invites the tourist from every part of the world. Very early the Presbyterian Church established a cause there and it has been sustained. When the vote was taken on Union the congregation decided to remain Presbyterian. The building has not been in keeping with the requirements, and a new structure has been planned. The town is built on a Government reservation. Recently the privilege of having a better site was secured and now the new church is in course of erection. It will be very much in keeping with the place and the importance of the work.

Though so many new churches have been erected since 1925 as the result of the losses to the Church in property, the building program still continues. Two new buildings in Saskatchewan are almost completed, one at Indian Head and the other at Moosomin, both thriving agricultural centres.

Near the city of Winnipeg eastward the Church has had for many years a mission among new Canadian citizens,—most of them from southern Europe. This work has been under the care of a devoted woman, Mrs. MacKenzie, and her labors, particularly among the young people, have been highly successful. A site having been procured, the gift of Mrs. MacKenzie's sister, a church was erected and opened a short time ago. This necessary equipment will contribute greatly to the progress of the work.

Another building almost completed in a manufacturing centre in Ontario, Oshawa, has engaged deep interest. It is being erected in the interests of our Ukrainian work. Some time ago this congregation, which had entered the United Church became dissatisfied and withdrew, leaving their property. They sought and obtained admission to the Church in Canada. Instead of drawing upon the Church erection funds they proceeded to erect the building required, largely by their own labor. On September 20, the cornerstone of the Church was laid. The devotion of this company seems the greater in the light of industrial depression, many of them having had their incomes materially reduced. Splendid workmanship has been displayed by these volunteer laborers and the building will be a credit to all concerned.

Rev. Paul Crath a Ukrainian who prior to Union was a Minister of the Church but who was in his homeland at the time the vote was taken found himself upon return a Minister of the United Church. At the last meeting of the Presbytery of Toronto he applied for re-admission to the Presbyterian Church and was recommended by Presbytery to the Assembly Commission for the Reception of Ministers. There will be no question about his re-admission. He is now under appointment of the General Board of Missions to return to Ukrainia as a missionary to lead in the great revival among that people in the southern part of Poland. They have earnestly sought the help of Canadian Presbyterianism, feeling deeply their need for both Ministers and teachers.

Another Minister of the United Church who has recently sought re-admission is Mr. Ma of the Chinese Mission in Toronto. The Chinese congregation there was organized a short time ago in connection with the United Church of China, a body of course quite different from the United Church of Canada. The work however was carried on jointly under the Presbyterian and United Churches. This co-operation seemed latterly to be impossible and the Chinese themselves have solicited the privilege of continuing under the care of the Presbyterian Church.

Progress in Chinese work in British Columbia is in evidence in the fact that a splendid new building has been opened, and with it is a manse for the use of the Minister. This building was formally dedicated by the Presbytery of Westminster on Tuesday evening, September 2nd.

Deep interest has been shown by the Church in the Salt Springs case which has been referred to already in the columns of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. The Privy Council judgment was given in full in the September issue of *"The Presbyterian Record"* Toronto.

The point emphasized by the Privy Council is that the United Church of Canada having obtained its constitution from the Federal Parliament, that constitution cannot be modified by provincial legislation. This is an important judgment particularly in view of the fact that in seven provinces the vote for "Union" was taken under the authority of provincial statutes instead of under the Federal Act of Incorporation of the United Church.

The Church is pushing its work in new areas. This summer it had four men in the Peace River country, two of them ordained. One church has been erected and there are at least three others anticipated. The missionary there is Rev. A. E. Wright who formerly served the Church in southern British Columbia.

The General Council of the United Church has been in session for some time in London, Ontario. The Presbyterian Church was advised by the Moderator and the Secretary of the United Church that its representatives would be welcome at the General Council. The reply sent was that no provision had been made by the Church in this particular. It seems impossible for those on that side to realize that fraternal relations are out of the question whilst hostile action against the Presbyterian Church on their part is sustained. Such action was manifest a year ago at the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance when the representatives of the United Church with vigor and determination opposed the Church being designated on the records of the Alliance as *The Presbyterian Church in Canada.* Neither their mind nor their action in this particular has changed. The retiring Moderator with strange logic refers to the Presbyterian Church as having withdrawn from The Presbyterian Church in Canada, using the following language:

> "We do not deny to non-concurrents the liberty to withdraw from the Church. We simply deny their claim to be *The Presbyterian Church in Canada,* as we deny their power to continue the Church which, by its own free decision, has resolved to enter the union."

This is a new theory of schism quite in conflict with the traditional view, with the judgment of civil courts, and with common sense. According to this view, those who remain loyal to the standards constituting the confession of faith of a religious body are the dissenters whilst those who, leave that body, abandon these standards and erect a new organization, claim to be the continuing body! Another circumstance worthy of note is the remarkable silence which has prevailed in United Church circles with respect to the dismissal with costs of their appeal to the Privy Council in the Salt Springs Case.

Through a bequest the Church has recently been put into possession of a fine home and grounds which is to serve as a Rest Home for retired or disabled Ministers and missionaries. This legacy is from Mrs. Mary Morgan, Markham, Ontario, whose interest in the Church during her lifetime was very great. In addition to the home a sum of money was left which will in part sustain the institution.

Another instance of a return to the fold is that of Markdale congregation in the Province of Ontario. After having been a little more than five years in the United Church this body decided to seek re-admission to the Presbyterian Church. The decision appears to have been unanimous. The congregation is not large but the petition presented to Presbytery was signed by 123 members and 44 adherents. The Presbytery granted the prayer of the petition

and now that Markdale is united with another station a substantial congregation has been formed.

The Church has recently suffered great losses by death. The Rev. F. G. Mackintosh, M.A., of Nova Scotia, had served the Church faithfully and efficiently as Synodical Missionary for the Maritime Provinces. Some months ago he was compelled to give up his work and since that time he steadily declined until on September 15th at his home in Pictou, N. S. he passed to his reward.

Another loss to the Church in the Maritime Provinces occurred in the death of the venerable Rev. William Dawson, M.A. recently in the Victoria General Hospital, Halifax. He was a native of Fyvie, Aberdeen, Scotland, and came to Canada in 1875. Three pastorates in Nova Scotia, at Upper Canard, Glenholme and MacLellan's Mt. and Brook, extended over a period of forty years. A man of scholarly attainments, he occupied a large place in the life of the Church in Eastern Canada.

## Renewed Charges Against Bishop Cannon

TWICE in the past five months Bishop James Cannon, Jr., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South has withstood the bombardment of public investigation of his widespread activities—once by the Methodist General Conference, and once by a Senate committee. Neither inquistion seemed to injure the Bishop's position or prestige within his Church.

Last month, while he was engaged upon episcopal work and a honeymoon in Brazil, came news that a third, more elaborate attack was being prepared. Four "traveling elders" of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South had sent recommendations to Bishop William Newman Ainsworth, chairman of the College of Bishops that their colleague be tried once more.

Although the text of the charges has not been made public, it was reported that not only would Bishop Cannon's political and financial operations be reviewed, but also his private life. Following the death of his first wife in 1928, he married in London, Mrs. Helen Hawley McCallum of New York, who had traveled with him as his secretary last year on the trip to the Holy Land awarded him by the *Christian Herald* for "distinguished religious service" in 1928.

Upon receipt of the charges filed by the traveling elders, it becomes the duty of Bishop Ainsworth to assemble a committee of not less than twelve "traveling elders." Should two-thirds of the committee find that the unpublished accusations have sufficient basis to require explanation they will immediately refer the matter to the next General Conference, and suspend Bishop Cannon until the conference convenes in 1934.

Upon receiving information of the renewed charges against him, Bishop Cannon cut short his honeymoon, and returned to the United States to face his accusers. It has been reported that the distinguished Bishop DuBose, also of the Southern Methodist Communion, has advised Bishop Cannon to resign his office. It is not anticipated, however, that Bishop Cannon will retire without a struggle and a vigorous attempt to vindicate himself.

## Bryan Memorial University Begins Its First Year

ON September 18, at Dayton, Tenn., the "William Jennings Bryan University" opened for its first academic year. Approximately five years after the famed "Anti-evolution trial" in the same town, the friends of Mr. Bryan have begun a work which is intended fittingly to carry on the ideals and cause for which he stood.

Four days before he was suddenly stricken in his sleep, Mr. Bryan had suggested the establishment of a school for young men upon one of the hills suburban to Dayton. This idea did not die with Mr. Bryan, for his friends felt that this movement, inaugurated by him, should be amplified, and that a great Christian co-educational institution should be built in the place where he "fell on sleep." Nearly a million dollars has been subscribed for this purpose, a beautiful site of eighty-one acres has been acquired, and an administration building, planned to accommodate four hundred students in all departments of collegiate life, and to cost approximately $400,000.00 is now nearing completion. Thus, after five years of preliminary effort, the University has been launched.

Between forty and fifty students have been enrolled for the freshman year. The administration of the University aim to begin on a small scale, and to build up both faculty and student body on the basis of quality.

The President of the new institution is Dr. Geo. E. Guille, one of America's best known Bible teachers. He was educated at South Western Presbyterian University, formerly of Clarksville, now of Memphis, Tenn., and has served as Minister of Presbyterian Churches in Athens, Tenn. and Augusta, Ga. For the last sixteen years he has served as one of the extension teachers of the Moody Bible Institute, with headquarters in Chicago. In connection with his duties as President of the William Jennings Bryan University Dr. Guille will conduct Bible conferences throughout America, as part of the extension work of the institution.

Other members of the faculty are, Malcom Lockhart, Vice-President in charge of promotional activities; A. P. Bjeeragaard, Professor of Science; Dwight W. Ryther, Jr., Professor of English; and C. A. Montoya, Professor of Modern Languages.

The charter of the University contains the following provisions, which are especially interesting in view of the effort made in them to insure that the institution will never depart from the faith of its founders:

"Be it known, That F. E. Robinson, H. H. Frasa, Wallace C. Haggard, Joe F. Benson, A. M. Morgan, E. M. Williamson, and Euclid Waterhouse, together with others to be elected by them, not to exceed thirty in all, are hereby constituted a body politic and corporate by the name and style of The William Jennings Bryan University, for the purpose of establishing, conducting and perpetuating a University for the higher education of men and women under auspices distinctly Christian and spiritual, as a testimony to the supreme glory of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to the Divine inspiration and infallibility of the Bible.

"All departments of the University shall be open alike to students of any religion or sect, without imposing denominational or sectarian tests.

"While no statement of belief shall be required of any matriculating student, no one shall be placed in a position of leadership or authority either as Trustee, Officer, or member of the Faculty who does not subscribe with us to the following statement of belief,

"1. We believe that the Holy Bible, composed of the Old and New Testaments, is of final and supreme authority in faith and life, and, being inspired by God, is inerrant in the original writings.

"2. We believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, this trinity being one God, externally existing in three persons.

"3. We believe in the virgin birth of Jesus Christ; that He was born of the Virgin Mary and begotten of the Holy Spirit.

"4. We believe that the origin of man was by fiat of God in the act of creation as related in the Book of Genesis, that he was created in the image of God; that He sinned and thereby incurred physical and spiritual death.

"5. We believe that all human beings are born with a sinful nature, and are in need of a Saviour for their reconciliation to God.

"6. We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only Saviour, that He was crucified for our sins, according to the Scriptures, as a voluntary representative and substitutionary sacrifice, and that all that believe in Him and confess Him before men are justified on the ground of His shed blood.

"7. We believe in the resurrection of the crucified body of Jesus, in His ascension into Heaven, and in 'that blessed hope,' the personal return to this earth of Jesus Christ where He shall reign forever.

"8. We believe in the bodliy resurrection of all persons, judgment to come, the everlasting blessedness of the saved, and the everlasting punishment of the lost."

* * * * * * * *

"Inasmuch as this institution is being builded and subscriptions and donations solicited and received on the basis of the above statement of belief, in justice and equity to those contributing, this platform shall never be changed or amended, but shall constitute the religious position and belief of the Institution as long as it shall endure . . ."

## Bible Institute of Los Angeles Enters Twenty-Fifth Year

IN this age of intense material appeals it is rare to find the embodiment of a spiritual ideal dominating the very regions where commerce is presumed to hold sway.

The Bible Institute of Los Angeles is the result of such an ideal. Standing in the very heart of a great business district, surrounded by department stores, insurance offices and professional buildings, it yet remains unique—an embodiment of the dream of a man who had achieved earthly success but knew that only the things which are unseen are eternal. That man was the first President of the Institute, Lyman Stewart, Los Angeles oil pioneer and magnate.

The Institue is about to enter its twenty-fifth year of Christian service, and the record of its achievements has blessed every part of the world. The secret of its success is two-fold: It has but one foundation for all its work—the Holy Scriptures; it preaches the same message to those of every race: "Jesus Christ and Him Crucified." Its educational method is profoundly practical.

"Our Bible Institute," Lyman Stewart said on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the new building in 1913, "was conceived in prayer, founded by faith and established through sacrifice. These buildings are forever to stand solely for the promulgation of the eternal truths of God's Holy Word.

"For the teaching of the truths for which the Institute stands, its doors are to open every day in the year, and all people, without reference to race, color, class or creed . . . . will ever be welcome to its privileges.

"It will ever be its purpose to have the gospel, as far as possible, brought to every home in our state. The Institute's missionary work will not be confined to our own coast, but a steady stream of Bible-trained men and women will, with increasing volume, be steadily following into the dark places of the earth, carrying the glad tidings of salvation."

Nine years after Lyman Stewart had seen the inception of his Bible Institute he fell asleep content in the knowledge that an endowment of friends was more to be desired than an endowment of dollars Today activities radiating from this institution and from the Hunan Bible Institute in China, which is sponsored and supported by the Institute in Los Angeles, touch the uttermost parts of the world. Villages, towns, and cities in every State in the Union and in many foreign lands know of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, because Lyman Stewart lived and labored for God.

Fifteen thousand students, including those in correspondence courses, have learned the truths of the Bible and have been prepared for Christian Leadership. The Bible Institute offers a four year course in Bible study, including Christian education and specialized shorter courses in Missions, music and church work. These are open to all without tuition fees.

Lyman Stewart knew the power and beauty of the Bible. He believed that each student at the Bible Institute should be given practical training in carrying the gospel into the world. From this idea has developed the active student participation in all outside activities conducted by the Bible Institute. These include shop meetings for working men, service in city missions, visitations in hospitals, jails and private homes, extension Bible classes for adults, for boys and girls of elementary and young people of high school and business ages.

Another example of the practical work required of the students is their aid to the facutly in "church cooperation." This diversified work includes supplying of pulpits, conducting Bible conferences and Evangelistic campaigns, furnishing special musical and inspirational programs.

After serving for fifteen years in Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Dr. R. A. Torrey took his famous world evangelistic tour. Then he became the head of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles—and Dwight L. Moody's influence was felt upon the West Coast. It was a fitting union of the work and spirit of the two Bible institutions. While their services have been distinct and their programs not identical, their underlying purposes have been the same.

Men's and Women's Glee clubs, quartets and soloists, trained leaders and choristers from the Institute are using music to tell the story—"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

The Institute's presses, mailing bureau and book store distribute the best in Christian literature to all parts of the world and the 1000-watt Radio, K.T.B.I. broadcasts Christian thought and entertainment.

Shortly after the Bible Institute had come into being, Mr. Stewart foresaw the dangers of the Church through attacks against its doctrines and caused defenses of the Christian faith to be gathered from all parts of the world and assembled into twelve volumes which were sent to every Minister and evangelist in the English-speaking world under the title of "The Fundamentals." There is little doubt that the great fundamentalist movement which today spreads over the Christian world is greatly indebted to this man and his brother Milton, who joined in financing the project so modestly and anonymously undertaken by "Two Christian Laymen."

## The Lambeth Resolutions

*(Concluded)*

22. The Conference affirms its conviction that all communicants without distinction of race or colour should have access in any church to the Holy Table of the Lord, and that no one should be excluded from worship in any church on account of colour or race. Futher, it urges that where, owing to diversity of language or custom, Christians of different races normally worship apart, special occasions should be sought for united services and corporate communion in order to witness to the unity of the Body of Christ.

The Conference would remind all Christian people that the ministrations of the clergy should never be rejected on grounds of colour or race, and in this connection it would state its opinion that in the interests of true unity it is undesirable that in any given area there should be two or more Bishops of the same Communion exercising independent jurisdiction.

* * *

PEACE AND WAR

25. The Conference affirms that war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

26. The Conference believes that peace will never be achieved till international relations are controlled by religious and ethical standards, and that the moral judgment of humanity needs to be enlisted on the side of peace. It therefore appeals to the religious leaders of all nations to give their support to the effort to promote those ideals of peace, brotherhood, and justice for which the League of Nations stands.

The Conference welcomes the agreement made by leading statesmen of the world in the names of their respective peoples, in which they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another, and agree that the settlement of all disputes which may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means; and appeals to all Christian people to support this agreement to the utmost of their power and to help actively, by prayer and effort, agencies (such as the League of Nations Union and the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches) which are working to promote good will among the nations.

27. When nations have solemnly bound themselves by Treaty, Covenant, or Pact for the pacific settlement of international disputes, the Conference holds that the Christian Church in every nation should refuse to countenance any war in regard to which the government of its own country has not declared its willingness to submit the matter in dispute to arbitration or reconciliation.

28. The Conference believes that the existence of armaments on the present scale amongst the nations of the world endangers the maintenance of peace, and appeals for a determined effort to secure further reduction by international agreement.

* * *

31. The Conference records, with deep thanks to Almighty God, the signs of a growing movement towards Christian unity in all parts of the world since the issue of the Appeal to all Christain People by the Lambeth Conference in 1920.

The Conference heartily endorses that Appeal and reaffirms the principies contained in it and in the Resolutions dealing with Reunion adopted by that Conference.

THE MALINES CONVERSATIONS

32. Believing that our Lord's purpose for His Church will only be fulfilled when all the separated parts of His Body are united, and that only

by full discussion between the Churches can error and misunderstanding be removed and full spiritual unity attained, the Conference expresses its appreciation of the courage and Christian charity of Cardinal Mercier in arranging the Malines Conversations, unofficial and not fully representative of the Churches though they were, and its regret that by the Encyclical *Mortalium animos* members of the Roman Catholic Church are forbidden to take part in the World Conference on Faith and Order and other similar Conferences.

THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

33. (*a*) The Conference heartily thanks the Œcumenical Patriarch for arranging in co-operation with the other Patriarchs and the Autocephalous Churches for the sending of an important Delegation of the Eastern Orthodox Church under the leadership of the Patriarch of Alexandria, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the help given to its Committee by the Delegation, as well as its sense of the value of the advance made through the joint meetings in the relations of the Orthodox Church with the Anglican Communion.

(*b*) The Conference requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint representatives of the Anglican Communion and to invite the Œcumenical Patriarch to appoint representatives of the Partriarchates and Autocephalous Churches of the East to be a Doctrinal Commission, which may, in correspondence and in consultation, prepare a joint statement on the theological points about which there is difference and agreement between the Anglican and the Eastern Churches.

(*c*) The Conference not having been summoned as a Synod to issue any statement professing to define doctrine, is therefore unable to issue such a formal statement on the subjects referred to in the *Resumé* of the discussions between the Patriarch of Alexandria with the other Orthdox Representatives and Bishops of the Anglican Communion, but records its acceptance of the statements of the Anglican Bishops contained therein as a sufficient account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England and of the Churches in communion with it, in relation to those subjects

THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH

35. (*a*) The Conference heartily thanks the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishops of the Old Catholic Church associated with him for coming to consult with its members on the development of closer relations between their Churches and the Anglican Communion, and expresses its sense of the importance of the step taken.

(*b*) The Conference requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint representatives of the Anglican Communion, and to invite the Archbishop of Utrecht to appoint representatives of the Old Catholic Churches to be a Doctrinal Commission to discuss points of agreement and difference between them.

(*c*) The Conference agrees that there is nothing in the Declaration of Utrecht inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England.

* * *

SOUTH INDIA

40. (*a*) The Conference has heard with the deepest interest of the proposals for Church union in South India now under consideration between the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Methodist Church of South India, and expresses its high appreciation of the spirit in which the representatives of these Churches have pursued the long and careful negotiations.

(*b*) The Conference notes with warm sympathy that the project embodied in the Proposed Scheme for Church Union in South India is not the formation of any fresh Church or Province of the Anglican Communion under new conditions, but seeks rather to bring together the distinctive elements of different Christian Communions, on a basis of sound doctrine and episcopal order, in a distinct Province of the Universal Church, in such a way as to give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought and the life of the Church Universal.

(*c*) We observe further, as a novel feature in the South Indian Scheme, that a complete agreement between the uniting Churches on certain points of doctrine and practice is not expected to be reached before the inauguration of the union; but the promoters of the scheme believe that unity will be reached gradually and more securely by the interaction of the different elements of the united Church upon one another. It is only when the unification resulting from that interaction is complete that a final judgment can be pronounced on the effect of the present proposals. Without attempting, therefore, to pronounce such judgment now, we express to our brethren in India our strong desire that, as soon as the negotiations are sucessfully completed, the venture should be made and the union inaugurated. We hope that it will lead to the emergence of a part of the Body of Christ which will possess a new combination of the riches that are His. In this hope we ask the Churches of our Communion to stand by our brethren in India, while they make this experiment, with generous good will.

THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

43. The Conference expresses its gratitude to the distinguished members of the Church of Scotland who accepted the invitation to confer with its Committee. It hopes that an invitation may soon be issued to the now happily united Church of Scotland to enter into free and unrestricted conference with representatives of the Anglican Communion on the basis of the Appeal to All Christian People issued in 1920.

* * *

49. The Conference approves the following statement of the nature and status of the Anglican Communion, as that term is used in its Resolutions:—

> The Anglican Communion is a fellowship, within the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces or Regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, which have the following characteristics in common:—
>
> (*a*) They uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common Prayer as authorised in their several Churches;
>
> (*b*) they are particular or national Churches, and, as such, promote within each of their territories a national expression of Christian faith, life and worship; and
>
> (*c*) they are bound together not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the bishops in conference.

The Conference makes this statement praying for and eagerly awaiting the time when the Churches of the present Anglican Communion will enter into communion with other parts of the Catholic Church not definable as Anglican in the above sense, as a step towards the ultimate reunion of all Christendom in one visibly united fellowship.

## Louisville Seminary

OPENING exercises of the Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, at Louisville, Ky., were held on Wednesday, September 24. The attendance of local ministers, alumni and friends, together with the faculty and students, taxed the seating capacity of the chapel, in which the service was held. Rev. Dr. John M. Vander Meulen, former president of the seminary, presided. The principal address was given by Rev. Dr. John Rood Cunningham, the new president. His topic was "The Minister and the Modern Church."

Terming the ministry as an "Indispensable Function" of the Modern Church, Dr. Cunningham pointed out that there must be a faithful ministry if the Church is to exist and God is to be represented to His people; and that in all the records we have of God's dealings with His people, there is no evidence of any attempt on His part to guide their destinies without the ministry. He called attention to the fact that there is no serious shortage of men in the ministry just now stating that "quality, more than quantity, would seem to be the need of today." "The chief problem of the Church," said the new president, "is not her God, nor her Saviour, nor her Book, nor her Message,—it is primarily a problem of the quality of her leadership." In giving a few of the qualities which seem requistite to an effective ministry in the modern Church Dr. Cunningham stated that the modern Minister must, first, embody the spirit of heroic sacrifice; second, that he must have a trained mind; and, third, that he must have a vital religion—an experience of Christ that touches the deep places of his life.

Three new members of the faculty were inducted into office at these exercises: the Rev. Frank Hill Caldwell, called to be Professor of Homiletics; Rev. W. D. Chamberlain, D.D., Professor of New Testament; and the Rev. Lewis J. Sherrill, who will be the new Dean. Dr. Vander Meulen will be Professor of Doctrinal Theology.

The total number of students is reported to be approximately the same as last year.

## Religious Freedom in Japan

THE *Japan Chronicle* says in a recent issue, that "Four students of the Antung Girls' High School have been suspended for disobeying the order of their teacher to visit a Shinto shrine. The *Seoul Press* in reporting the affair says that according to the custom on April 4th last, after the ceremony in honor of the commencement of the new school year, all the faculty and students visited the shrine to pay homage except four students in question who flatly refused to do so, insisting that they were not idolatresses but believers in one God, being Christians. They therefore remained behind in the class room. The school authorities put forth every effort later to prevail upon them to reconsider their attitude, but in vain and finally suspended them. The case is being watched with interest."

The Japanese Government at the meeting of Parliament in 1929 appointed a committee to study the whole Shrine Problem. It does not seem to be clear just what Shinto is. Some say that it is a patriotic cult, others say it is a religion. The Buddhists seem to think that it is a religion and ask that if it is not a religion, everything that savors of religion be removed from the shrines. Recently the authorities in two provinces placed Shinto god shelves in the public schools. The Buddhists have asked that these be removed.

A group of Christians have been holding meetings about this matter in Tokyo. Recently they asked the Government Committee to remove all ceremonies that are of a religious nature from the shrines if they decide that Shinto is not a religion and in case they decide that it is a religion to grant believers of other faiths freedom as provided under the Imperial Constitution.

The investigation has not been given extensive publicity in foreign papers but it is a very important matter to the Church in Japan. Multitudes of Christians have been sorely troubled about their children being forced to go to the shrines. Some Christian schools have compromised, allowing their students to go to the shrines. Christian people the world over have been requested to make this a subject of prayer, asking that God may guide the Committee of the Government to make it possible for religious freedom to be given to all the people of Japan.

## Religious Freedom in China

LAST year the Nationalist government of China announced what seemed to be drastic restrictions upon the teaching of the Christian faith in Christian mission schools. These regulations forbade the teaching of Christian faith to those in the lower grades. In order to retain their Christian character, some of the schools were converted into "Doctrine Courts." (We are informed by a correspondent in China that "the term 'doctrine court' or 'yard' here bears the pregnant sense of institute for the promotion of Christian faith and life." The same correspondent also writes that certain schools of the Yihsien Station of the Shantung Mission have "all been converted into 'doctrine courts' rather than compromise their distinctive Christian character and aim by submitting to the government requirements for registration. As such, they frankly declare their sole object to be the training up of Christian workers, and give Bible study the central position in their curricula. They would prefer if necessary to drop all secular subjects rather than give any but first place to their courses in God's Word."

A number of strongly worded protests against these restrictions were sent to the Nationalist government of China by Christian Churches and other organizations. The answer of the government has been to make the restrictions more, instead of less, severe. As newly promulgated, the regulations ban the teaching of Christianity in all mission schools below the rank of Junior College.

The Minister of Education in the Nationalist government, Moling Tsiang, defends the government's action on the following grounds:

First, he objects to the teaching of the Christian faith without also including the teachings of other faiths.

Second, he thinks that unless children are kept from the approaches of religion that they will not be free, when mature, to choose a religion rationally.

Third, he says that if the churches are not conducting the schools merely as a means of gaining members, they will not be deeply affected by the dropping of Christianity from the curriculum.

Fourth, he considers religion to be not a fit subject for inclusion in a modern, scientific education.

When the decision was given out it was declared to be "final, and not subject to review." One effect of the new regulations may be to force missionary effort into more purely evangelistic lines, as exemplified in the "doctrine courts," with the possibility that the cause of Christ may be ultimately more helped than hindered by these attempts to suppress it.

## Princeton Seminary Opening

PRINCETON Seminary opened its second year as recently reorganized on Wednesday morning, Oct. 1, with services at the First Presbyterian Church of Princeton. At this service, the Rev. Samuel M. Zwemer, D.D., LL.D., F.R.G.S., distinguished missionary was inducted as Professor of Missions.

Dr. Zwemer made the principal address of the day, his subject being the place of study of the history of religion in a theological discipline. The new professor maintained in his address that the Christian Minister must be acquainted with other religions, with their "elements of truth and beauty," so that he may be adequately prepared "to preach Jesus Christ who is altogether truth and beauty, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge because in Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

Professor Zwemer asserted that the purpose of missions stands sure, and its accomplishment is certain, because it is the carrying out of a God-given commission. Nevertheless, he said, sympathy with and understanding of, the other religions is the only means whereby the missionary and preacher can begin his evangelistic work with any hope of success, for they all contain broken lights which are gathered up in the intense light of Christ, who is the Light of Light, and the unique and supreme manifestation of God.

It was noted by many that among those marching in the academic procession was Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, President of Union Theological Seminary, New York, long the stronghold of Modernism in the Presbyterian Church.

At this writing, figures regarding the enrollment at Princeton Seminary are unobtainable.

## Omaha Seminary

THE opening exercises of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Omaha were held September 17, in the North Presbyterian Church of that city. The address was delivered by the Rev. Henry Dale White, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, who spoke upon "A Thoroughly Furnished Ministry."

Twenty-three new students have registered at Omaha Seminary this year, one of the largest classes in the history of the Seminary. Sixteen of these men are college graduates; and two are within a few credits of graduation. Three of the new men have entered for graduate work, and two have come as special students.

## Westminster Seminary Notes

FRIENDS of the Rev. Robert Dick Wilson, D.D., LL.D., are greatly concerned by his sudden illness following the opening of the Seminary year. Dr. Wilson is now a patient in the Presbyterian Hospital, Philadelphia, and his many friends are praying for his speedy and complete recovery.

The Seminary has recently announced that the Homiletics Department will be assisted in its practical work by noted Ministers of the Presbyterian Church, who will act as advisers to the students. Each adviser will take charge of the practical preaching for a period of a month or six weeks, enabling the students to receive the impress of the differing practical points of view of preachers of ability and experience. The first adviser will be the Rev. Aquilla Webb, D.D., LL.D., Minister of the First and Central Presbyterian Church of Wilmington, Delaware.

## Presbyterian Church in England

(*Concluded*)

brethren, what shall we *do?*" was, "*Repent* and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). Our Lord's answer to the question, "What shall we *do* that we might work the works of God?" was, "This is the work of God, that ye *believe* on Him Whom He hath sent." May the Presbyterian Church of England never forget that "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God," and that to maintain that faith loyalty to the whole Scripture as given by inspiration of God is the first essential.

BENJ F. EMERY CO., PHILA