# 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-JULY, 1930
Vol. 1 No. 3

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# Is Christianity True?

IT is futile to discuss this question except as we are agreed as to *what* Christianity is. To a superficial observer it may seem as though Christianity had all but won its victory in the forum of the world's thought, however it may be in the world's market place. There is little discussion of the question, Is Christianity true? Most everybody—with significant exceptions—either call themselves Christians or claim to be exponents of essential Christianity. It is, however, only necessary to consider the answers given to the question, What is Christianity?, to perceive that here, also, appearances are exceedingly deceptive. If these answers differed only as regards details there would be nothing to occasion comment. That would be what was to be expected in view of the limited knowledge and ability for clear thinking that characterizes us all. These answers, however, do not differ merely as regards details. They differ so radically that if the one is true the other is false.

It is no comfort to us to have a man tell us he believes that Christianity is true if what he calls Christianity lacks all the distinctive marks of what we call Christianity. Because in that case he says in effect that what we call Christianity is false. Christianity, according to many of its present-day professors, is a religion in which JESUS CHRIST is not an object of worship and in which His death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice has no place whatever. Even if such a religion could be shown to be true, that would have no bearing on the question whether Christianity is true as we understand Christianity—except as it would affect Christianity's claim to be the only true religion. Unless the word "Christianity" is a word without definite meaning, unless it be a word that can be used to designate the views of those who deny the GOD-MAN and scoff at His death as an atoning sacrifice as well as those whose only hope in life and death is that the SON OF GOD bore their sins in His own body on the tree, we are living in a fool's paradise if we suppose that all the things calling themselves Christianity are really such.

As used today it can scarcely be denied that the word *Christianity* is threatened with the fate that has befallen the word *gentleman*—that word of which TENNYSON sang: "The grand old name of gentleman, defamed by every charlatan, and soiled with all ignoble ease." Just as the word *gentleman* became a word of no particular significance through being applied indiscriminately to all sorts of men, so the word *Christianity* is in danger of becoming a word of no particular significance through being used to designate all sorts of belief or lack of belief. Be this as it may, it is the truth of a particular religion, not of every religion that may label itself with the Christian name, that concerns us when we discuss the truth of Christianity. Our interest is in a great historical reality, not a mere word. We could view the passing of the word with small concern if we had the assurance that the thing itself was being retained; but the retaining of the word would afford us no satisfaction if the thing it has expressed for well-nigh two thousand years should pass.

Those who define Christianity as the Church has all but universally defined it will not be content to maintain that it is true in the sense of "truth of idea." They will also insist that it is true in the sense of "truth of fact." Strange as it may seem to the ordinary, common-sense Christian, there are many alleged Christian leaders who are not only content with maintaining that Christianity is true in the sense of "truth of idea" but who assert that that is the only sense in which it is true. Facts have significance, they tell us, only as they express some idea or principle. The idea or principle is the main thing and provided we grasp that it matters not whether the fact that expressed it be real or supposed. Just as the value of the Parable of the Prodigal Son is the same whether the father and

## IN THIS ISSUE:


The Office of Ruling Elder ..... 5
F. P. Ramsay

"A Man . . . Whom God Hath Hedged In." ..... 6
D. D. Burrell

"The Gospel of Jesus." ..... 7
Wm. Childs Robinson

Books of Religious Significance
The Christ of Every Road ..... 9
Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas ..... 10

Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice ..... 11

Letters to the Editor ..... 14

News of the Church ..... 16

Westminster Seminary News ..... 24

son of the parable be regarded as real or fictitious, so, we are told, the value of the Bible as a whole is the same whether ABRAHAM and MOSES and MARY and JESUS be regarded as having the reality that attaches to historical figures like WASHINGTON and LINCOLN or the reality that attaches to one of SHAKESPEARE'S characters or a character in a modern novel. Edification, judgment of value, moral and spiritual instruction, not objective history or science, we are told, is the aim and purpose of the Bible; hence its value is not destroyed by reason of the fact—if fact it be—that its history and science are not true to fact. In harmony with this we are told that the value of Christianity is independent of the question whether its facts and doctrines are true in the sense in which the scientist and the historian understand truth.

One of the impelling motives leading many to welcome such a representation is the desire to make Christianity independent of historical criticism. If the value of Christianity is independent of the question whether the Biblical narratives are true in the sense of "truth of fact," the Christian can view with unconcern the alleged findings of even the most radical Biblical critics. In that case it is a matter of no vital importance that critics allege that many of the Biblical characters are legendary or fictitious beings and that such events as the Virgin Birth and bodily resurrection of JESUS CHRIST, not to mention other miraculous events, never happened.

Why not adopt this view? It would certainly make the task of defending Christianity much easier. In that case we could throw all the miracles overboard and concern ourselves not at all about the question of the historical truthfulness of the Bible. After all what real difference does it make whether the events recorded in the Bible actually happened? We reply that it makes little or no difference if Christianity be what many today say it is. If the essence of Christianity be the fatherhood of GOD and the brotherhood of man, we may sit loosely to the question of the historical truthfulness of the Bible.

But if Christianity be what the Church of all ages has held it to be, that religion that brings to mankind salvation from the guilt and pollution of sin through the expiatory death of JESUS CHRIST, it makes all the difference in the world. A modern scholar puts it thus:

> "The difference between those who think they can do without the facts and those of us who feel we must have the facts, does not lie on the periphery of the Christian faith. It relates to nothing less than the claim of our holy religion to be a supernatural religion and a religion which objectively saves from sin. . . . He who has once clearly perceived this will not even for a moment consider the possibility that his faith and such criticism as destroys the the supernatural facts can dwell peacefully together in the same mind. To him, the facts are become the very bread of life. Though you tell him a thousand times that the value of the Biblical narratives for moral and spiritual instruction remains precisely the same, whether the facts occurred or not, it will not satisfy him, because he knows full well that all moral instruction and religious impression combined cannot save his soul. In his thirst for redemption from sin, he will not rest in anything short of an authentic record of how GOD wrought wonders in history for the salvation of His people. History we need, and that not only in the form of the tale of a certain perfect ethical and religious experience, which has somewhere come to the surface on the endless stream of phenomena, but such a history as shall involve the opening of the heavens, the coming down of GOD, the introduction of miraculous regenerative forces into humanity, the enactment of a veritable drama of redemption between the supernatural and the natural world. Whether we like it or not, criticism can touch the essence of our religion, because religion has become incarnate, and for our sakes had to become incarnate and make itself vulnerable in historic form. As the SON OF GOD while on earth had to expose Himself to the unbelief and scorn of men, so the word of the Gospel could not be what it is for us unless it were subject to the same humiliation."

When, therefore, we speak of Christianity as true we mean that it is true in the sense of "truth of fact" as well as "truth of idea." Reject either the fact-content or the truth-content of Christianity as set forth in the Bible, and Christianity for us would no longer exist.

Is Christianity true in the sense indicated? It has been so contended by the Church of all ages. In that conviction it was established, in that conviction it has grown, and only as that conviction is maintained can it escape decay and go on from strength to strength. The fundamental reason for the present-day defection from Christianity, especially in academic circles, is that men have been led to believe that Christianity is not true. If Christianity is to shape the future, it will be because men will continue to maintain, as all the great heroes of the faith have maintained, that the Christian is the only true rationalist, the only religious believer who can soundly prove his position. The court of reason is at least the court of original jurisdiction. If non-suited before this court Christianity will be denied a hearing in every appellate court. Christianity will soon cease to move our hearts and guide our hands when it is no longer approved by our heads.

The task of convincing the present age that it has been over-hasty in concluding that Christianity is not true in the sense indicated may not be shirked. It is true that rational assent does not make a man a Christian. To be a Christian is much more than to have an intellectual conviction of the truth of Christianity. "The devils also believe—and tremble." It is futile, however, to expect a rational being to become a Christian as long as he withholds rational assent. "Believe on the LORD JESUS CHRIST, and thou shalt be saved," we are told. And yet such advice is worthy of the consideration of an intelligent being only if there is adequate warrant for believing that JESUS CHRIST exists as a living reality, both able and willing to save those who put their trust in Him. We are not Christians merely because we find it comforting to believe in the existence of a FATHER-GOD and a SAVIOUR-KING. Not a bit of it. We are Christians because it is the only reasonable as well as the only right thing to be. Otherwise Christian piety and devotion is a child of ignorance and Christian churches but asylums for the feeble-minded. All Christianity asks for from this standpoint, but what it is so often denied, is a fair hearing and a just verdict.

It will be seen that we are not disposed to minimize the importance of apologetics, as is the manner of some. Because we cannot argue a man into becoming a Christian, many seem to think it is a matter of no moment whether arguments be presented at all. How frequently the words are quoted: "He argued not, but preached, and conscience did the rest." Unquestionably a clear statement of what Christianity is is often the best argument in its favor; but it is equally unquestionable that something more is often needed. It is indeed true that only the HOLY SPIRIT can make a man a real Christian, but it

is not a blind, ungrounded faith that the HOLY SPIRIT works in the sinner. PAUL may plant and APOLLOS may water; it is GOD alone who gives the increase. That is not to say, however, that it is a matter of no moment whether PAUL plants and APOLLOS waters. In all ages there has been need of those set for the defense as well as for those set for the proclamation of the gospel. Surely our age, an age in which Christianity is everywhere spoken against, is no exception.

## Roman Catholic Comment on Assembly Action

THE Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Re-Marriage, in its report to the last Assembly, recommended "as consonant with the religious temper of our day that there be stricken from our Confession of Faith, Chapter 24, Section 3, the following words: "And, therefore, such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, Papists, and other idolaters; neither such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life or maintain damnable heresies." When the matter came up for discussion, however, the Assembly voted against the amendment and so in favor of leaving the Confession of Faith as it is, in this respect.

A Roman Catholic organ, *The Catholic Standard and Times,* of Philadelphia, comments in part as follows:

> "We Catholics must now understand that by deliberate vote of the Presbyterian Church—North, not South, be it noticed—we are considered to be idolaters, and we are officially designated by the purposely opprobrious term 'Papist.' Nor is this all. We are classed with infidels, the notoriously wicked and the maintainers of damnable heresies. From this we may gather that all the honied words offered in the name of sweet charity are only courtesies that will not bear the strain of official definition. Officially we are idolaters; officially we are linked with the reprobate. Nor is this the decision of a few hot-heads, but the considered verdict of the Presbyterian Church, North, assembled in solemn conclave. . . .
>
> "We are not objecting to the mere fact that we are called 'idolaters.' If the Presbyterians really think that we are idolaters, then we have a certain respect for their honesty. If they really think that the veneration of the saints and their images is idolatry, then we do not object to their saying so. If they think with their Episcopal brethren, that the sacrifices of Masses are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits, then we may let the matter pass. They are consistent and consistency is above price. But that is not the point of our objection. The point is that the modern Presbyterians, by actions that no one can mistake, do not regard orthodoxy of faith as a matter of importance. Their ministers teach every kind of heresy which is condemned by their own printed standards. They openly deny the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection of CHRIST and the resurrection of the body; even the Divinity of our LORD is questioned, or explained away. Advanced Modernists have captured the seats of learning from which they have cast those who still adhere to the spirit and letter of their own constitution. Yet with this flouting of orthodoxy, they vote to retain in their Confession of Faith words that cannot express any longer any other meaning than that which is offensive. They say, in effect, that any one can believe anything; that theology does not count; that creeds are outworn; but that words that might now seem to be insulting must be kept for no other reason than that they are insulting."

It was hardly to be expected that Roman Catholics would derive any satisfaction from the action of the Assembly. It seems to us, however, that our contemporary over-estimates the significance of the Assembly's action. The Assembly did not vote to add to the Confession of Faith a statement offensive to the Roman Catholics. What it did was to refuse to exscind the statement already there. Moreover it did this, if we mistake not, not to express its dislike for the Roman Catholics, but because to have voted to exscind this statement, as recommended by the Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Re-Marriage, would have been in effect to approve what Roman Catholics themselves disapprove, viz., marriages between Presbyterians and Roman Catholics. This was the real point at issue before the Assembly when it voted to leave the Confession as it is in this respect. Many who voted against the recommendation would no doubt have voted in its favor if it had proposed a substitute expressed in more suitable language, provided the substitute made clear its disapproval of marriages between Presbyterians and Roman Catholics. As the matter stood, however, the Commissioners to the Assembly had to choose between registering their votes in a way that seemed at least to favor such marriages and retaining the existing statement with its needlessly opprobrious language—and choose the latter as the lesser of the two evils.

But while it seems to us that our contemporary somewhat exaggerates the significance of the Assembly's action, it does not seem strange to us that it has drawn the inference it did. An Assembly that did not regard orthodoxy of faith a matter of importance voting to retain terms so out of harmony with the religious temper of the day is certainly an anomaly. It is not true, of course, that all modern Presbyterians regard orthodoxy of faith as a matter of no importance. That is not even true of all those who voted against the recommendation. In fact it was that vigorous representative of Presbyterian orthodoxy, DR. GEORGE B. BELL of Philadelphia, who led the opposition to the Commission's recommendation. None the less it can hardly be denied that our Roman Catholic contemporary's strictures on the Assembly, on the Presbyterian Church as a whole in fact, are largely deserved. Whatever may be the relative number of those within the Presbyterian Church who prize and those who flout orthodoxy, it is true that the Presbyterian Church "assembled in solemn conclave" has not recently taken any action that indicates that it regards "orthodoxy of faith as a matter of importance." Our contemporary writes not without knowledge when it says:

> "Their ministers teach every kind of heresy which is condemned by their own printed standards. They openly deny the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection of CHRIST, and the resurrection of the body; even the Divinity of our LORD is questioned or explained away. Modernists have captured the seats of learning from which they have cast those who still adhere to the spirit and letter of their own constitution."

In the prophecy of JEREMIAH we read: "A wonderful and horrible thing is come to pass in the land: the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof?"

## "The Gospel of Jesus"

ON another page we are privileged to publish an article, by Professor W. CHILDS ROBINSON of the Southern Presbyterian Church, that deals in an informing way with that substitute for genuine Christianity that is most frequently offered to those seeking the bread of life. In a scholarly way he makes clear that what is usually offered under this name comes under the head of serpents and scorpions rather than of eggs and

fishes (LUKE 11:11). It is not our purpose to add anything to his criticism of this pseudo-gospel; that would be a case of sending coal to Newcastle. It may not be out of place, however, for us to say a word, for the benefit of the ordinary reader, having to do with the meaning of the phrase, "The gospel of JESUS," as it is widely used today.

It is perfectly proper, of course, to speak of Christianity as the gospel of JESUS. Christianity was founded by JESUS, derives its main content from Him, is what it is by virtue of what He was and is. None the less when we find a present-day religious teacher employing this phrase as his favorite designation of Christianity, we may be all but sure that he is the advocate of "another gospel, which is not another." The reason for this is that those who favor this designation of Christianity, or rather of what they call Christianity, almost invariably identify Christianity with the religion that JESUS himself taught and exemplified and that to be a Christian is to believe *with* JESUS rather than *in* or *on* JESUS. They almost invariably distinguish between a religion *about* JESUS and the religion *of* JESUS and maintain that Christianity consists not at all in believing certain things about JESUS (such as that He was Himself GOD or that His death was sacrificial) but wholly in believing with JESUS, in sharing His religious experience and in manifesting the same attitude toward GOD and man. They almost invariably hold with HARNACK that the Gospel has to do with the FATHER only, not at all with JESUS Himself except as JESUS was its first and best exponent. This means that JESUS was merely a subject of religion, not its object; and that the intelligent Christian is not one who worships JESUS or one who trusts JESUS as his Saviour but one who imitates JESUS. It must be obvious to all that when so used the phrase, "The Gospel of JESUS" is used to commend "another gospel, which is not another."

There are many religions in the world but fundamentally there are but two kinds. The one, whatever the historic form it may take, is built on the assumption that man saves himself; the other whatever its historic form, on the assumption that, if man is to be saved at all, he must be saved by a power outside of himself. The contrast between these two types of religion is clear and unmistakable. The one calls upon man to save himself; the other brings him into contact with a power that saves him. The one is a religion, replete it may be with lofty moral and spiritual lessons and with wise counsel and good advice, but with no dynamic save that which inheres in man as man; the other while it stresses these things yet finds its distinctive note in the fact that it tells us of a living Redeemer and so of a saving power other than that which is our own. "The Religion of JESUS" as it is currently proclaimed is a religion of the first kind, but the religion that JESUS actually established in this world and that finds its center and goal in Him as truly today as it did 1900 years ago is a religion of the second kind —in fact it is the *only religion of this second kind* inasmuch as genuine Christianity is the only religion that even professes to offer the world a divine redemption in and by the work of another, and so to do more than first instruct and then arouse into activity those powers of conscience and sensibility and will that belong to man as man.

## Rights Vs Duties

THE sovereignty of the individual personality within its proper sphere should not be waived. As individuals we have rights as over against all others and there are occasions when, if we are to maintain our own self-respect as well as the respect of others, we must see to it that these rights are respected. Otherwise we virtually assume the status of slaves and underlings. And it is because in every age there have been those who have had the courage to insist upon their rights that we enjoy that measure of civil and political and religious liberty that we possess. Moreover Christianity has been the most prolific mother of those who have led in the age-long struggle for the practical recognition of the just rights of men in every sphere of life. None the less the New Testament has but little to say about our rights and a great deal to say about our duties. The New Testament is indeed a Declaration of Rights but is to a much larger extent a Declaration of Duties. It is a book that creates within us a high sense of our own value and dignity but it directs our attention not so much to the maintenance of our rights as to the performance of our duties. It tells us in fact that such is our intrinsic value that GOD sent His SON for our redemption but at the same time it teaches us that service is the true measure of greatness.

Beyond question the placing of the emphasis elsewhere than where the New Testament places it is at the root of much of our present-day unrest and dissatisfaction. Everywhere men are placing the emphasis on their rights rather than on their duties. Instead of seeking to pay the debts they owe others they are seeking to collect the debts that others owe them. So intent are they on the latter that too often they quite forget the former. This is particularly evident in the industrial world. It is proper that labor should insist on its rights. It is only too true that labor has often received less than its just dues, that not infrequently it has been exploited and shamefully treated; so that those who have led in the struggle for industrial rights are no less deserving of praise than those who have led in the struggle for civil and political rights. In insisting on its rights, however, labor too often forgets its duties, what it owes to capital, what it owes to the general public. It needs to be more conscious not only of its obligation to earn what it gets but to promote the general good. It is also proper that capital should insist on its rights. For capital has its rights even though it be true that in many instances, for long periods, it has obtained more than its rights. But in insisting on its rights, capital should not be forgetful of what it owes labor, of what it owes the general public. Suppose that capital and labor were both as much concerned about their duties as about their rights. Would this not of itself put an end to most of our industrial unrest and dissatisfaction? And it is because the gospel is the only power that is capable of leading men to place the emphasis on their duties rather than their rights that it offers the only hope of anything like a satisfactory solution of industrial unrest. But it is not in

*(Concluded on Page 23)*

# The Office of Ruling Elder: Its Obligations and Responsibilities

By the Rev. F. P. Ramsay, Ph.D.

The following address was made by the late Dr. Ramsay on the occasion of the installation of his son, R. L. Ramsay, Ph.D., professor of English in the University of Missouri, as an elder in the First Presbyterian Church of Columbia, Mo., on March 25, 1925. It came into our hands through another son, the Rev. Mebane Ramsay of Staten Island, N. Y., who found it among the papers left by his lamented father.

As one is to be here inducted into the office of Ruling Elder of the Presbyterian Church, my remarks will seek to be appropriate to the occasion.

At this induction into office the elder makes a declaration of his doctrinal belief, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and that the Confession of Faith (and Catechisms) contain the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures; and he promises to study the (doctrinal) purity of the Church. This is the covenant that he enters into with the Church when inducted into this office. Here is the difference between an unofficial member and an officer in the Presbyterian Church: the member simply professes his personal faith in the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; the officer professes his belief in the Church's doctrinal system. One may become a member who does not believe that the Confession of Faith contains the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures, or even that the Scriptures are the Word of God, if only he trusts in Jesus Christ and means to obey Him; but one cannot become an officer in the Presbyterian Church without accepting its doctrinal system and intending to strive for the Church's doctrinal purity—unless he is willing to come into his office on a false profession.

Let me stress this a little. Note the difference between the unofficial members, who are required only to profess faith in Christ, and the officers, who are required to profess acceptance of a body of doctrine. Thus the Presbyterian Church is both liberal and intolerant.

Note that it is intolerant of disbelief in its system of doctrine on the part of its officers. Why? The Church is a propagandist institution, an organization for the purpose of advocating and propagating certain beliefs. It is true that the Church's end is to produce and nourish a certain life; but belief is an inseparable element of that life and necessary to it. Or be that as it may, the Church is organized and works upon that assumption, and so sets itself to propagate certain beliefs. This system of beliefs its officers are required to accept and maintain and propagate.

Here is a striking difference between the Church and the University. The University is organized to search for truth; the Church, to propagate the truth. The University, assuming that there is truth still hidden, sets itself to investigate and discover new truth; but the Church, assuming that certain truths have been given to it by revelation from God, sets itself to teach and disseminate that truth. The University asks questions, the Church answers questions.

The candidate on this occasion is a University man, filled with the University spirit; and I therefore say to him that the Church is organized on the assumption that it already has the truth and exists for the purpose of disseminating and propagating this truth. If a society were organized for the purpose of propagating Socialism, a man might conceivably belong to that society, and yet be a professor in the University. If in the University he were teaching social science, he would endeavor to lead his students in investigations that would enable them to judge for themselves between Socialism and Individualism, seemingly indifferent whether they became Socialists or Individualists, but only concerned that they became capable of weighing the claims of both. But if this same man joins the Socialistic society, and is sent out as one of its speakers to expound and advocate its system of beliefs, and make converts to it, and ground them in it; he is then a propagandist of Socialism, and will endeavor to gain adherents to the system. He is then at work on the assumption that Socialism is true and established, and now needs to be propagated. So the Church is a propagandist society; and its officers, and especially its elders and ministers, are its agents to disseminate its system.

Now one may not believe that the system of beliefs held by the Presbyterian Church is truth, or that it is wise to have an organization for advocacy and propagation of this system; but if he becomes an officer in this Church, pledged to promote its system and propagate its beliefs, then he professes himself to receive this system and covenants to cooperate with others in disseminating it. He is not obliged to assume this obligation; he is not obliged to make this profession and pledge, any more than he is obliged to become a lecturer for the Socialistic society. But if he does make this profession and pledge, and does become an officer in the Presbyterian Church, he must be loyal to this profession and pledge, or disloyal. If a man should join the Socialistic society, not believing in Socialism, or not believing in its type of Socialism, and should accept a commission from it to go out as one of its speakers, and as such should really oppose its type of Socialism; we and other honest men would accuse him of boring from within, of betraying his trust, and of paltry dishonesty. I trust that the man to be now ordained will never sink so low.

Now the Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church is not indeed a lecturer to advocate its principles to the same extent as the Minister is; but he is, all the same, the conserver and guardian of its doctrinal purity. The eldership has equal voice with the Ministers in the Presbyteries and higher courts of the Church, which judge its Ministers and administer its whole government and discipline, and control its administration; and the eldership in the local Church, always more numerous than the ministry, have the control. And it lies as a special obligation on the elders to see that the teaching in their church is loyal to the Confession of Faith of the Church. If the pastor should be somewhat erratic, and yet in life and spirit is loyal to the system of truth, the elders should bear with him, and cooperate with him on the whole; but if at any time the pastor departs from the system and becomes disloyal to the system, the elders are there to protect the Church against his false teaching. So I say that the elders are the conservers of our system of doctrine.

Nor need we be ashamed of being members and agents of a propagandist society. True, there is such a thing as progress in understanding religious truth; and the Presbyterian Church makes provision for this progress. It provides for amending its doctrinal standards; and it has amended them again and again. We do not say that we believe them to be errorless, but to contain the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures; and any elder or minister may propose amendments. So new truth may be discovered, or better statements of truth may be invented; but this improvement of the system is to be made by those who believe in the system, and by methods that insure full discussion.

But while there is this provision for progress and change, the very nature of Christianity makes it a stable thing. The process of revelation runs through many generations, a growth from its germinal beginning in the beginning of human history up to its fruitage in Jesus Christ. This revelation of truth through the ages has reached its consummation in the Per-

fect Word. We cannot now go back and make the history different. We cannot go back now, and prevent the entrance of sin into the world. We cannot change or improve the covenants with Abraham. We cannot make the redemption from Egypt, and the Mosaic legislation, and the settlement in Canaan, throw any finer light on the teachings of Christ. We cannot build the tabernacle or the temple, or fashion the priesthood and sacrifices, or turn the music of the temple, to clearer significance on what the Christ was to be. We cannot alter the development of the Messianic monarchy, so that the Son of David shall mean more than it does. We cannot adjust the birth of Jesus, or His miracles, or His resurrection, more in accordance with modern skepticism, or make His bloody death more esthetic. We cannot call Him down from heaven and instruct Him how to guide His Church and to apply His religion. There are the facts, and we cannot now change them; there is the Christ that God has given us, and we cannot modernize Him; there is the unalterable revelation shining in the heaven of history, and we cannot remake it.

We can only accept Him as He is, and enthrone Him in our hearts and lives. Let us be loyal to Him, and loyal to His Church.

And especially may educated men, men whose very occupations require them to push on the frontiers of inquiry in science and philosophy and literature, render this service to their Lord: they can be loyal to Him, and loyal to His revelation made once for all, and thus testify that progress in investigation does not mean putting out the light of the past; and can show that humble faith in Christ is consistent with the scientific humility of willingness to learn.

Christianity as a system of truth is a great building. Its foundations have been laid, and even its walls have already risen into the skies. It rises like the Memorial Tower yonder on the campus. We may come and build upon this building; but we will not wreck its walls nor raze its foundations. We will build ourselves and our lives into the rising structure, sure that we shall be safe on its walls that waver not, and on its foundations that tremble not. For here is Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and today and forever.

# "A Man . . whom God hath Hedged In"

## A SERMON

**By the Rev. David De Forest Burrell, D.D.**

**Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Williamsport, Pa.**

WHERE Job lived, a man shut in by a hedge would have little chance to get out. The hedge was of acacia bushes, bristling with an array of thorns stiff as steel bayonets, sharp as needles. So Job thinks himself imprisoned by unkind circumstance. His life has been free, prosperous and happy; now, suddenly, a succession of calamities has fallen upon him, and he sits here, bewildered, disconsolate, stripped of all he has held dear. "I am a man," he cries bitterly, "whom God hath hedged in."

Plenty of men feel as Job felt: that they are by force of circumstance compelled to live one life when they would far rather live another; shut in to small things when they feel equal to great endeavors. Some are confined by poverty, and that frequently not of their own making: many a woman is hedged in to a poor and barren life by her own husband's laziness or vice; others are bowed down to a life in which pride is broken, friendships are lost, existence seems a burden. Some are hedged in by the weakness of the flesh, unable to attempt the larger tasks their souls hunger to undertake, simply because their poor bodies will not stand the strain. Some are hedged in by heavy responsibilities placed on them in youth and never removed. One of the best men I have ever known, a man of brains and power, told me he had been forced to support dependent relatives since he was eight years old: he had never had the right to take the risks incident to accepting a larger position in business, for fear his loved ones might suffer. And many are hedged in by the limitations of age, the failing of sight or hearing or bodily strength. Few troubles are much harder to bear than the consciousness of uselessness to one who has always been active and serviceable at home and in the world. So many, many people there are, tempted to cry with Job, "God hath walled up my way, so that I cannot pass!"

Well, what is the philosophy of life-within-the-hedge?

Every little while some poor creature, desperate, tries the short cut and takes himself out of the world by his own hand. But that is the coward's way, bringing no relief: to carry trouble from this world to the next is not to lose it at all, but to intensify it. Hamlet did well to hesitate:

> "Who would fardels bear,
> To grunt and sweat under a weary life,
> But that the dread of something after death—
> That undiscovered country from whose bourne
> No traveller returns—puzzles the will,
> And makes us rather bear those ills we know
> Than fly to others that we know not of."

Or let us try the Stoic's philosophy. "Grin and bear it." Stiffen your upper lip and your backbone, and go ahead doggedly, crying like the tragic poet Henley, "My head is bloody but unbowed." This is popular doctrine today: the humanists are teaching it. But it has a fatal defect: it brings no happiness, provides no spring of joy here within the hedge. That is enough to condemn it.

Then there are some that try to solve the puzzle by breaking through the hedge. They run away from responsibility, escape selfishly from under burdens. You call him a coward who flinches under fire in the trenches; but in all the world I know no greater coward than the man who deserts wife and children—as one of our popular novelists has done—to find for himself an easy, carefree life. The reprobation of society, the penalty of the law, the surer penalty of conscience, fall justly upon the selfish soul that breaks through the hedge of moral responsibility. This is no honest way out.

But there is a fine and happy philosophy of life-within-the-hedge. You can sum it up in three simple propositions:

First: *Here within the hedge is my proper place.* Mind you, I do not say that you are to be completely satisfied with life within the hedge: I do say you are to be contented there. There is a world of difference between satisfaction and contentment. If William Carey had been satisfied with his cobbler's bench he would never have become a pioneer missionary to India; but until God opened the way to India, Carey was content with his cobbling. Satisfaction breeds a state of mind like that of Tennyson's lotos-eaters; but contentment, like Carey, sings happily at its cobbling, with a map of India nailed to the wall before its eyes. Paul the apostle was a restless man, always looking forward to the conquering of more worlds for Christ; but Paul had learned wisdom when he wrote: "I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content."

This is the first step in hedge-philosophy: to acknowledge that evidently God expects you to stay within the hedge for a while, and therefore to make the best of it. When physical weakness, or responsibility for others, or some other hedge shuts you in, it is clear that God is not shutting you *away* from your proper place, but *shutting you in to it.*

> "Lord, I would clasp Thy hand in mine,
> Nor ever murmur nor repine;
> Content, whatever lot I see,
> Since 'tis my God that leadeth me."

Here, then, is our second proposition: Since this narrow place is where God wants me to be, *then here, too, lies my proper work.* Shut in, under the kindly, wise hand of God? Then it must be that you are shut in for service. *Opportunity,* therefore, lies not without the hedge,

but within it; *privilege* lies not without the hedge, but within it; *power* lies not without the hedge, but within it; *liberty* lies not without the hedge but within it.

Ah, but here's the rub, right at this point! We are so sure that we are fit for greater things than Providence permits us to do! so confident of the extent of our talents, so eager for the larger fields that seem to lie just without the hedge! We fret and rebel, when all the time God is simply shutting us in to do the thing He wants done in this narrow little place, and to learn the lessons we never could learn outside the hedge. Here is *Belle Smith,* Gipsy Smith's cousin, an invalid for thirty long years in a bare little back-bedroom in a New York tenement. Hedged in! but helpless, bedridden, she thinks and plans and prays for her poor neighbors until the whole neighborhood wears a path to her door and her little room becomes a sanctuary, gilded with the very light of heaven. And here is a *little woman in Williamsport,* crippled for life—for *this* life—fast in a wheel-chair. Hedged in! But her hands are busy all the time, knitting, sewing, helping the children; she wheels herself to the kitchen and bakes bread for the household, cookies for the youngsters; her lips are full of kindly words; and on her face is the light of heaven. Work, God's own work, to be done within the hedge! little tasks to be done, kindly words to be spoken, good cheer to be spread about, hearts to be warmed, lives to be moulded: plenty to do in the narrowest place!

But here is a third proposition: *Here within the hedge is not my permanent dwelling-place.* What we said about the difference between satisfaction and contentment applies again at this point. None of us lives in ideal circumstances in this world; but here within the hedge God is using us, and preparing us for better, larger things. Some day He will level the hedge about us, and by His grace we shall step forth.

"All my life I still have found—
And I will forget it never—
Every sorrow hath its bound,
And no cross endures forever.
After all the winter's snows
Comes sweet summer back again.
Patient souls ne'er wait in vain;
Joy is given for all their woes.
All things else must have their day;
God's love only lasts for aye."

God does not ask us to be satisfied here: He does ask us to be content, knowing that there are better things ahead. If this life were all, we would be in a bad way: the deprivations, the inequalities, the burdens, the sufferings of life would have no explanation. But God be thanked, this life is not all. Heaven lies beyond. Jesus' word and Jesus' resurrection settle that forever: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you."

Here is *Fanny Crosby,* stone-blind all her life, shut within a hedge of darkness. But Fanny Crosby has the certain light of heaven within her heart, and oh, how she sings!

"Some day the silver cord will break,
And I no more as now shall sing;
But oh! the joy when I awake,
Within the palace of the King!
And I shall see Him face to face,
And tell the story, Saved by grace!"

Within the hedge we shall not stay. "Our light afflictions, which are but for the moment, work for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. For the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." Even here, we catch glimpses of the towers and pinnacles of the Holy City, we hear the sound of voices singing by the crystal sea. Soon the hedge will go down, and we shall be—Home!

And to those who look at life-within-the-hedge in this way, a strange thing happens. Day by day the hedge seems to recede, the space within it to grow larger, the soul becomes less cramped, life grows richer and happier. When Gipsy Smith goes to visit Belle Smith, shut in her tenement room, he asks her, "Belle, have you peace?" And the invalid smiles at him as she answers, "Peace? I have the Author of peace!" There's the secret. The Saviour's presence with us, within the hedge; and work at hand to do for Him; and Heaven ahead: and the hedge forgotten! We fret no more; our unrest, our envy, our unhappiness have gone. For God does not shut us away from the life we have a right to live; He shuts us in that we may pass our apprenticeship well and learn to work and live. Do not waste time pitying yourself. Look about you. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." And look up and away, beyond the hedge: life eternal is before you. God has planned your career not on the scale of threescore years and ten, but on the scale of eternity. William Carey, at his cobbler's bench, kept the map of India pinned on the wall before his eyes, hoping and expecting to go there when God levelled the hedge. So with you: Keep cheerfully at your cobbling, with the glorious view of heaven before your eyes: and some day God will bring you out, as He brought David, "into a large place." For heaven has no hedges!

# "The Gospel of Jesus"

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

THE phrase "the gospel of Jesus" is being used as a veritable conjurer's wand. The "liberal" religious mind seems to be obsessed by it. If, as ordinarily used today, this phrase were employed to designate the whole of that message from God to man which the canonical gospels attribute to Jesus, its wide-spread use would be a source of much satisfaction to all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth. Unfortunately, however, most of those who use this phrase to express "the essence of Christianity" have such an attenuated conception of that essence as to suggest that the word "essence" is being used in an apothecary sense, i.e., as referring to the faint odor left in the bottle after the liquid is all evaporated.

Several forms of this so-called gospel of Jesus may be distinguished. In the first place there is the naive, often unconscious parroting of the old platitudes of Unitarianism, "the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the leadership of Jesus." One of the great orators of a sister denomination recently expended a great deal of eloquence in stating that even the cosmic mind would never outgrow such conceptions; seemingly oblivious to the fact that he was merely parading the old Unitarian shibboleths in new clothes. Another form of the so-called "gospel of Jesus" is that the heart and essence of Jesus' gospel is "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind—and thy neighbor as thyself." A third form of this theme may be described as the Harnack distillation, revamped and popularized by many recent American writers and preachers. Jesus is a simple and gracious figure, preaching an ethical gospel, emphasizing such notes as, the Fatherhood of God, the duty and joy of self-sacrifice and brotherhood, the inwardness of true religion. Another common type is frequently met with among the leaders of academic religious thought. In these groups international relations or world peace, interracial relations, industrio-economic relations are presented as the substance of Jesus' way of life. Other forms might be mentioned. These, at least, are typical. Concerning such representations the following remarks are offered:

1. Such so-called "Gospels of Jesus" are not Gospels at all. They have no good news in them. In Luther's trenchant words they are wholly Old Testament, commandments, precepts; they have no New Testament in them, no promise. They are what God requires of us; not what God does for us. They ring the changes on "thou shalt," they offer no message of what God has done. Yea, though they demand and command love toward God and toward man; they do not elicit love by declaring that God has so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish but have everlasting life. If Christ only came to say something and that something innocuous platitudes; or summations of the law already given centuries before, then His mission and His message has no gospel in it. The law that declares "thou shalt love the Lord with all" and "thy neighbor as thyself" pronounces an awful judgment and a solemn curse upon any want of conformity

thereunto—it breathes no good news to the soul who really sees himself in his evil, his sin, his crisis of separation from God.

2. These so-called "Gospels of Jesus" are not historic Christianity. In the course of his class room discussion Dr. G. F. Moore, professor of the History of Religions at Harvard University, took occasion to remark that the liberal gospel of Jesus is not historic Christianity; but first century Judaism; but that the gospel about Jesus is historic Christianity.

Unquestionably Dr. Moore was right in this generalization—a generalization that applies particularly to the second form of the "Gospel of Jesus" indicated above. In Luke 10:27 a first century Jewish lawyer gave expression to the identical summary of the Mosaic law which is now called "the essence of Christianity." What was the need for Jesus if the sum of his message was already so well known?

But if the content of this magical phrase is construed a la Harnack, i.e., as the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the infinite worth of the human soul, then Emil Brunner, in *The Theology of Crisis* is undoubtedly right in characterizing it as later idealistic Stoicism.

Critical historical study justifies the same conclusion. The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch—in a church in which Paul was preaching his gospel *about* Jesus as the crucified Redeemer—making the welkin ring with the glory of his Lord. The Gospel, which gave birth to the name Christian may be most conveniently seen in the Epistle to the Galatians—an epistle written by Paul while he was at Antioch, and regarded by several able scholars as his first epistle. If something radically different from the gospel set forth in Paul's epistles be offered as the gospel, ought not those who offer it be historically, or critically minded enough to disavow with that offer the name of Christian? It was Paul's preaching, Paul's message that resulted in the coining of the epithet "Christian"; if something fundamentally different from Paul's message be preached, is it historically justifiable to call this "other gospel" a re-interpretation of Christianity?

3. The so-called "Gospel of Jesus" is not in any of its forms an historic entity in any proper sense of the phrase. The fundamental dictum for students of historical methodology is, "no documents, no history." Where are the documents for this "gospel of Jesus"? By what process of critical alchemy can they be distilled? Certainly the "gospel of Jesus" was not learned from Roman historians; though possibly three of them casually mention Christianity and Christ (not Jesus). Of the three one mentions the fact that Christian believers sing a hymn antiphonally to Christ as God! Surely the incidental and somewhat doubtful mention in Josephus will not be set up as the documents for this thesis. But if recourse be had to the New Testament, every up-to-date scholar knows that the old distinction between John and Mark has been utterly discredited. Bousset, in *Was Wissen Wir von Jesus?* finds a divine supernatural Son of God even in Mark. A. T. Robertson. shows that it is present in Harnack's reconstruction of the Logia. Rawlinson regards it as generally accepted that every one of the New Testament books is written from the standpoint of faith in Jesus Christ. W. E. Bundy, in *Our Recovery of Jesus* says that "throughout, the New Testament centers exclusively on the Person and work of Jesus as dying Saviour and as Risen Lord."

Writing as a radical critic, Emil Brunner affirms that "the most radical criticism will never succeed in proving that Jesus did not consider himself to be the Messiah, i.e., that he did not make a claim for himself that goes far beyond his humanity—no historical criticism can deny, with any reasonable hope of success, that the first church already revered Jesus as the risen Lord." The shortest Gospel, Mark, is no emasculated "gospel of Jesus"; it is the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This so-called gospel of Jesus has no documents; therefore, it is not history.

### Other Elements Lacking in the "Gospel of Jesus"

In particular the so-called gospel of Jesus leaves out certain elements in Jesus' teaching which on any tenable historical, scientific or critical theory are at least as well attested as are the morals of Jesus. Canon Gore justly charges Harnack with neglecting three of the four main elements in Jesus' ministry (Reconstruction in Belief, pp. 462-3).

A. The so-called "Gospel of Jesus" neglects Jesus' Messianic and Divine self-consciousness.

Passages in which Jesus describes Himself as the Bridegroom, as David's Lord (kurios), and as the Son of Man who shall come with the clouds of heaven in judgment, are common to the three synoptists; and must find a place in any objectively verifiable primitive tradition or primitive sayings. According to the "Primitive Tradition" Jesus in the earliest period of his ministry described Himself as the Bridegroom (Mark 2:19, 20); thus showing that he regarded himself as the Messiah and identified His coming with the Old Testament predictions of the coming of Jehovah, the husband of Israel. It is difficult to find any element in the teaching of Jesus better attested, critically, than His use of the 110th Psalm in the Synoptics, the earliest speeches in Acts and the Epistles. According to the weight of this evidence Jesus described the Messiah as David's Lord (kurios) who sits on the right hand of Jehovah until His enemies are made His footstool. And in His Great Confession to the High Priest, Jesus mingled the two loftiest strains of Messianic anticipation, the Son of Man of Daniel, with the Lord of Psalm 110 and applied this transcendent synthesis to Himself (Mark 14:60-63).

If reference be made to the alleged primitive sayings (Q. as reconstructed by Dr. Harnack), we find that the Messianic consciousness reaches back and rest upon a Divine self-consciousness. Rejoicing in the Holy Spirit, Jesus affirms a uniqueness which equates Himself with the Lord of heaven and earth, in knowledge, sovereignty, and revelation (Matt. 11:25-27; Luke 10:21, 22). Every spiritually minded man must acknowledge the truth of Augustine's insight, when addressing the Creator, he confessed: "Thou hast made us for thyself; and our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee." And yet from the rapture of His unique Sonship Jesus calls weary hearts to find in Him rest for their souls. Scan all the pages of religious history and you will find nothing just like this. Jesus is the heart of His own Gospel. His invitation is: "Hither to Me! Ye shall find rest for your souls."

B. The so-called "Gospel of Jesus" seems utterly oblivious to the apocalyptic and eschatological claims of Jesus in the Gospel, although they stand on as secure a critical foundation as do the moral axioms. The stone which the Ritschlian builders rejected has become the head of the corner.

An age, ushered in with James' pledge to "forge every sentence in the teeth of irreducible and stubborn fact," can never accept liberalism's uncritical forcing of first century Son-of-Man messianism into conformity with nineteenth century German idealism or twentieth century American humanism. The Markan Son of Man must either be interpreted by a wide reference to the causal efficacy of its own irrevocable past, i.e., Daniel 7, the Parables of Enoch, and use made thereof by the Tannaim rabbis; or better still by the sovereignty of its immediate context. So interpreted the Son of Man is seen to be a transcendent, supermundane figure who existed prior to His birth in Bethlehem of Judea. Trailing clouds of unquenchable heavenly glory He comes to the judgment throne of God with the reins of eternal destiny in His grasp. Jesus used this title to suggest the manner of His return as the sequel to His death and resurrection. "Nothing else in the Gospels has so impressed the stamp of the supernatural and the superhuman upon the self-portrayal of Jesus as the parousia Son-of-man passages."

Have those who talk so glibly of the "Gospel of Jesus" ever considered the investigations of the eschatological school, as presented, for example by Schweitzer in *The Quest of the Historical Jesus;* or the effect of these findings upon current Anglican criticism, e.g., Canon Gore; or the eschatological conception of the kingdom held both by the Barthians and by the German Positive School; or the soteriological eschatology of Dr. Gerhardus Vos?

Or do they think it scholarly to ignore inconvenient facts? Or are they trying to "high-hat" the premilleniarian Bible student who knows just how many times the Lord predicted His Second Coming? That blessed hope is not so easily expunged either from the real Gospels or from the hearts which love His Appearing.

C. The so-called "Gospel of Jesus," in striking contrast to the canonical Gospels, omits entirely our Saviour's reference to His death and our salvation thereby. Roughly speaking, half of Mark is devoted to the death of Jesus. Even such a radical as Rashdall acknowledges

(*Concluded on Page 23*)

# Books of Religious Significance

*THE CHRIST OF EVERY ROAD: A Study in Pentecost. By E. Stanley Jones. The Abingdon Press.* 1930. 271 *pp.* $1.50.

WE have found this a "confused and confusing" book. Rarely have we read a book in which we have found so much that we both approved and disapproved. It contains so much of good that we mourn because it is not better; it contains so much that is bad that it is to us a matter of surprise that it is as good as it is. It may be due to our inability to gather the representations of this book into one consistent whole that it impresses us as it does; but at any rate we have laid it down with the feeling that Dr. Jones is in the unfortunate condition of having two more or less inconsistent conceptions of the Christian religion struggling together in his mind, and that we approve when the one is in the ascendancy and disapprove when the other is in the ascendancy. The situation seems to be further complicated by the fact that Dr. Jones holds a view of the relation between doctrine and experience, as well as a doctrine of the will, that are other than those which Christianity as set forth in the Bible presupposes. We do not want to do Dr. Jones an injustice but it seems to us that he is a living illustration of the fact that the faith which lays hold upon Christ as Lord and Saviour is not necessarily conditioned by the thoroughness with which the intellect grasps either the content of that faith or its presuppositions and implications.

That Dr. Jones is a man who has had a genuine Christian experience of the saving power of Christ and who is utterly devoted to Christ is not questioned. Rather it is unhesitatingly affirmed. Like everything that Dr. Jones writes this book fairly palpitates with a passionate love and devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ combined with a whole-hearted longing to share Him with others. Dr. Jones is not content that men be vaguely religious, when what is needed is that they be definitely Christian (p. 244). He realizes the distinction between Christianity and other religions expressed by Paul when he wrote, "By grace are ye saved by faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God" (p. 214); and that to stop with Christ as the supreme example is to miss the heart of the gospel inasmuch as "sinful men need not merely the Gospel of example but the Gospel of expiation" (p. 74). Moreover he realizes that the Christian life is not a mere quickening and developing of our own latent resources, that we must be born "from above" if we are to walk in newness of life (p. 167); also that the need of the Church is not more machinery but more power to run the machinery we have, whether old or new (p. 26). We approve also when he insists that the danger is not that men will become too scientific but that they will not be scientific enough because we too hold that Christianity has nothing to lose, rather everything to gain by the most fearless facing of the facts. Much more might be said in this connection in commendation of the better side of the book, if our space-limits did not forbid.

Over against what has been said—and might be said—in favor of the book, however, there are other things to be said that seem to us to greatly detract from its value, some of which may be mentioned. While Dr. Jones confesses that salvation is wholly a matter of grace he holds to a doctrine of the will which makes salvation hinge on what man himself does, as though the omnipotent God stood helpless unless and until the sinner himself acts. Even the coming of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, according to Dr. Jones, was contingent upon human wills. Again while Dr. Jones makes the cross central yet he allows himself to say that "God being what He is and we being what we are, the cross was inevitable" which seems to us to imply that salvation was something that God was bound to provide for us rather than an undeserved gift of his love. Unquestionably the cross was inevitable if mankind was to be saved; but if salvation is wholly of grace, as it is, it is a somewhat that could have been withheld.

A grave defect of the book, if we mistake not, is its anti-intellectualism with its accompanying belittling of the value of doctrine. Dr. Jones apparently holds that doctrine is the expression of life rather than life the product of doctrine and, so, that the doctrines of Christianity are among its secondary rather than its primary things. This leads him to minimize the differences between the Modernists and Fundamentalists and to even write at times as though we need not greatly concern ourselves about the content of the Christian message. Talk about settling the "Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy" by "transcending it" (p. 128), merely calls attention to the fact that the speaker has no realization of the fact that Modernism in any of its consistent forms of expression is a denial of all that is distinctive of Christianity. Our author even allows himself to write as though the difference between the "conservative" and the "radical" was of the same order as the difference between the viewpoint of old age and youth. Dr. Jones' anti-intellectualism with its undue stressing of experience as the source and norm of truth, as was to be expected, leads him, if we understand him aright, to reject the thought of the Bible as an external authority. How inadequate is his view of the Old Testament appears when he repeats with apparent approval the statement of the child that the Old Testament tells us about God before He became a Christian (p. 60).

A particularly distressing thing about the book is that its author repeatedly permits himself to use that dreadful phrase "a Christ-like God" especially in view of his attitude toward the metaphysical attributes of God such as His omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence—the very things without which God would not be God (p. 61). It is indeed true that God is Christ-like. Did not Christ Himself say, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father?" It should never be forgotten, however, that these words meant so much to the disciples because like Jesus Himself they had a previous knowledge of God as almighty, omniscient and omnipresent. Moreover we have no solid basis for saying that God is Christ-like except as we see in Christ Himself one who was God as well as man. Doubtless Dr. Jones is a theist who believes that Christ is God in a real sense of the word, but this phrase "a Christ-like God" is one that is currently used by those who hold anti-Christian and even anti-theistic views; and it seems to us regrettable, to say the least, that Dr. Jones should have employed it. It is certainly an ambiguous and unless carefully guarded a highly misleading phrase.

We are not forgetting that this book has as its sub-title, "A Study in Pentecost" and that the occasion of its writing is the fact that the Church is celebrating the nineteen hundredth anniversary of Pentecost. It does not seem to us, however, that the book has much value in this particular connection. It even seems to us that Dr. Jones is more or less disqualified to deal adequately with the work of the Holy Spirit because of his Pelagian conception of the will. As Dr. Warfield pointed out in his introduction to Dr. Abraham Kuyper's "The Work of the Holy Spirit" it is only in Reformed circles that there has been much profound study of this subject due to the fact that in these circles alone there has been extruded in any adequate measure both the sacerdotal and the libertarian tendencies. Dr. Jones is too much of a libertarian, believes too much in the autocracy of the human will—he even says that at Pentecost "the attitude of the disciples was the decisive factor"—to do justice to the work of the Holy Spirit as the Author and Lord of life in those who apart from His operations would be dead in trespasses and sin. Even if Dr. Jones was a profound theologian, which he obviously is not, we would not, therefore, expect anything like a satisfactory discussion of this matter from his pen.

It is perhaps more pertinent to remark, however, that Dr. Jones himself has no real understanding of what happened at Pentecost. He deals with Pentecost as an event that can be brought to pass again by the use of a certain "technique of finding," whereas as a matter of fact Pentecost belongs to the once-for-all events in the establishment of Christianity—like the incarnation, the atonement and the resurrection and ascension of our Lord. Unquestionably there is an outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the Church today. Otherwise there

would be no regeneration, no salvation. None the less we must distinguish between the outpouring at Pentecost and these later outpourings of the Holy Spirit if there is to be any fruitful study of Pentecost. No doubt there is a measure of truth in saying that at Pentecost "God, the Living Spirit, became . . . immediate, experimental, vital," that "religion here broke its fetters and became universal," and that there "potential life and actual life were fused into a living whole"—not to mention more of the same sort—but such representations do not go very far in the way of stating and explaining what happened at Pentecost. The outcome, generally speaking, is that while Dr. Jones calls our attention to much that is significant in connection with Pentecost yet he does little in the way of making clear just why we should commemorate the day of Pentecost. Much of what he says seems to us decidedly far-fetched, dragged in by the hair so to speak, as when he tells us that Pentecost emphasizes the worth of personality, affords warrant for female preachers, sets the seal of its approval on the notion that conservatives and radicals should agree to differ but resolve to love and unite, teaches the evils of denominationalism and the benefits of one great Church—not to mention more of the same sort. Dr. Jones does well to emphasize the importance of Pentecost, but it seems to us that what happened on that day was more significant rather than less significant for both the being and well-being of Christianity than Dr. Jones intimates.

S. G. C.

* * *

*MAHATMA GANDHI'S IDEAS. By C. F. Andrews. The Macmillan Company, New York. 382 pp.* $3.00.

THE world is interested in Gandhi quite as much as in Mussolini and Henry Ford, and for the same reason. He is able to do spectacular things with the human race. We Occidentals hesitate to investigate Gandhi too intimately. When we look on such of his portraits as reach our western shores we are at once struck with the pictures' repulsiveness. In all of them he is unclothed, weather-beaten, apparently glorying in his emaciation, toothless and certainly chinless, a figure of almost obscene ugliness. Gandhi's appearance is the more revolting because it is evident that he need not look like a caricature of humanity. The slightest attention to his physical well-being would immensely improve him. And it is doubtful if the advertisement of a ruined body helps his cause with anyone.

Mr. Andrews has prepared a book intended to explain, in Gandhi's own speeches and conversations, the main ideas for which he stands, and a reader is bound to confess he manages to make his unattractive master a very great man before he is through. Gandhi's principles are not new. His fellow-Asiatic, Tolstoy, worked out most of them and Gandhi freely acknowledges the debt. But while Tolstoy found himself alone in practicing the virtues he found in the Sermon on the Mount and in other religious writings, so much so that he ate, slept and lived like an exile in his own home, Gandhi has gone far ahead with their propagation until a vast multitude thinks as he thinks and acts as he acts. No arm-chair theorist is Gandhi, but a Peter the Hermit who calls millions to a crusade.

Gandhi's boyhood and entire education had the benefit of a British environment. He was equipped for the law in first-class London schools. Like other Indians he was married as a child, and he was a father when he journeyed to England to mingle with the boys in the elementary schools. Before his education was finished his father and mother were dead. A photograph of the future Mahatma, taken in London forty years ago, shows a dapper, rather handsome young man, dressed in fashionable clothes, sufficiently urbane to be comfortable in the society of Mayfair and the West End. Except for his deep set eyes, there is no hint of unusual gifts of mind and heart in him. He is simply a well-to-do son of the British Empire who finds himself both lonely and satisfied in London's friendly schools, homesick for old associations but glad, perhaps, to have escaped for a while from the great oven of India. Mr. Andrews is wise to have made this photograph the frontispiece of his book: the introduction to Gandhi is pleasant.

Following a conventional course, we find that Gandhi had the ordinary difficulties in establishing a law office. He tried India, then removed to South Africa. There he developed a good practice, his income steadily increasing until it amounted to fifteen thousand dollars a year. He was temperamentally shy, but he was honest and very able. Rich East Indians, doing business in South Africa, discovered him to be an unexcelled advocate before the British courts.

Gandhi's fame rests upon his policy of non-resistance which he has turned into a formidable political weapon against British rule in India. He seems to have planned his whole economic campaign while at the top of his career in the legal profession in South Africa. Tolstoy was responsible, and beyond Tolstoy, Christ's Sermon on the mount. Gandhi returned to India in 1915 when he was forty-five years old, after several years experience in conducting Tolstoy Farm, an ideal community he had set up near Johannesburg. Arriving in India, he chose to deny himself every comfort of western civilization, took on the appearance of a wayside beggar, and launched a movement in behalf of his countrymen without swords or guns that has given the English viceroy something to think about. The sheer power of a moral ideal as over against the might of shot and shell presents a type of warfare that can be terrifying. How can soldiers contend with passive resistance? Nobody knows.

The sincerity and courage of Gandhi are as contagious as they are uncommon in this world of timidity and compromise. Here is a leader who leads, reckless of the cost. His influence does not wane. Mr. Andrews vouches for his hold on the masses of the Indian people and says it has not declined in recent years and is now firmer than ever. He describes Gandhi's desire to prohibit alcohol in Indian and his warfare on drugs, two reforms that may be accomplished. He shows Gandhi's chivalry where women are concerned, and points to the rising tone in India's attitude to women, due to him. Gandhi has tackled a still more difficult problem in the ineffaceable blot on Hinduism due to the detachment of millions of "untouchables" from their fellows. Even here his emphatic protest carries weight. His preaching and conspicuous practice of love to all men, to Mohammedans, to Jews, to Christians, to the British officials who govern India against her will, is impressing the Hindu population, and offers the prospect of uniting many warring factions into a fairly harmonious continent provided Gandhi lives long enough to coax Brahman and Moslem to forget their ambitions. There is no question that Gandhi is a tremendous influence for good. For his people he is always ready to suffer; in their behalf he is expecting to die.

If Gandhi were a Christian he might build in India a permanent structure of righteousness upon the foundation which is Jesus Christ. But he is not; and at best his building will be hay, wood and stubble with somewhat of gold, silver and precious stones. It will not stand. There is nothing to hold it together when the magnetism of his example is gone. And his own weakness will communicate itself to India; a weakness of faith. For him there is no means of grace and no hope of glory. Heaven does not interest him. And in his vague and bottomless mysticism there is no Saviour who is able to keep men from falling. Gandhi's appeal to mankind is temporal, and he ignores the Gospel of Redemption, forever established on Calvary's Cross where God came down to give Himself for every sinner on earth, including the helpless and burdened children of Mother India. Without a divine Saviour, Gandhi labors in vain, and the best he can do will be to prepare the way.

Gandhi is a Hindu, believing in earthly reincarnations for men. His ideal, always before him, is to return to primitive life, away from the "abominations" of civilization. For him, it will be heaven to come back to earth and find no telegraphs or railways, no machinery and no strong-armed government. He wants India now to unlearn what the last fifty years have taught her people of modern advantages. He would go back to the spinning wheel and tribalism. He takes the Sermon on the Mount, but the rest of the New Testament including our Lord's death, resurrection, ascension and coming again, mean little to him. Gandhi reminds one of the Roman guards who took Christ's garments; they took His garments but would not take Him.

And yet God may be saying to Gandhi as He said to Cyrus the heathen king of Persia: "I have girded thee, though thou hast not known Me." The time came when this heathen monarch was so endowed with kindness of heart that he delivered the Jews from Babylon, set them free from captivity, and helped them build

(*Concluded on Page 23*)

# Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

## Ecclesiastes: Is it a pagan Book?

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*In its issue of May,* 1930, (*pp.* 173-174), *"The Westminster Adult Bible Class" reprints as "worth repeating" an article by Rev. Bernard C. Clausen, entitled, "Is It 'Gonna Rain'?", which deals with the book of the Old Testament known as Ecclesiastes. I would like to know whether this article which appears in one of the official publications of The Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. expresses the Presbyterian view of this book? Is not such an article fitted to cast discredit on the Bible as the Word of God, the infallible rule of faith and practice?*

*Very truly yours,*
*W. C. C.*

THE article referred to includes the following concerning the book of Ecclesiastes: "Ecclesiastes is a most embarrassing book to the people who claim to believe the Bible from cover to cover. If you still insist that you can turn to any page in the Bible and place your finger upon any verse upon that page and there locate a statement of absolute and unassailable truth, it is sure evidence that you have never read Ecclesiastes. This strange book contains paragraph after paragraph that stands out in fundamental contradiction of all we know to be Christian truth. . . . Some people profess to be embarrassed when a scoffer like Robert Ingersoll finds the Bible contradicting itself upon tiny matters of fact. For myself I am much more troubled when I discover in the Bible page after page of eloquent teaching like this in Ecclesiastes, every sentence of it denying what Jesus came to teach. Here is a whole philosophy absolutely pagan, presenting from the Christian point of view no spiritual light."

It would be interesting to know who the people are who hold that you can turn to any page of the Bible and place your finger on any verse of that page and find an absolutely truthful statement. Such a representation is a sheer misrepresentation of those who "believe the Bible from cover to cover." Such take into consideration not only *what* is said but *by whom* it is said. A statement by Herod or Pilate or by Satan, for example, does not become a Word of God by being included in the Bible. Belief in the plenary inspiration of the Bible merely carries with it the thought that the Bible gives a trustworthy report of what Herod or Pilate or Satan, not to mention others, said; it emphatically does not carry with it the thought that what they said was "absolute and unassailable truth." No doubt Ecclesiastes would be an embarrassing book to belief in the Bible as the Word of God—as would other parts of Scripture—if such belief involved the idea that every verse in the Bible was a "statement of absolute and unassailable truth;" but as it is, if such a representation offers "sure evidence" of anything, it offers sure evidence that the person making it has no understanding of the position of those he contravenes.

It is hardly necessary to indicate our reasons for believing that Ecclesiastes was legitimately included in the Bible in order to answer the above question. It lies upon the surface of the article written by Mr. Clausen, and reprinted with apparent approval by representatives of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church, that it is fitted to cast discredit on the Bible as the Word of God, the infallible rule of faith and practice. It is equally obvious to all who have any knowledge whatever of the standards of the Presbyterian Church that this article does not express the view of Ecclesiastes expressed in those standards. The Confession of Faith expressly includes this book among those "given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and practice" and speaks of this book, along with the other books of the Old and New Testaments as "the Word of God written," and as having "authority in the Church of God." Moreover it should be remembered that the book of Ecclesiastes belonged to the Bible that Jesus himself read. Had He judged of the book of Ecclesiastes as does this article, would He have said to His contemporaries, "The Scripture cannot be broken" or "Ye do err, not knowing the Scripture?" The appearing of such an article in a "free thought" publication would not be at all surprising; its appearance in a publication of the Presbyterian Church certainly is.

## Was Jesus a Christian?

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*I recently heard a discussion of the question, Was Jesus a Christian? I am of the opinion that others beside myself would like to know your answer to this question.*

*Sincerely yours,*
*H. B. D.*

THIS question is timely as well as important because it goes to the very heart of the issue in the Church today—the issue between those who look upon Jesus as merely a teacher and example and those who regard Him as also Lord and Saviour. If the former are right, it is proper to speak of Jesus as a Christian but not if the latter are right. Thinking of Jesus as we do, it would seem little short of blasphemy for us to call Jesus a Christian. Such a mode of speech takes from His head the crown and from His shoulders the robe that marks the distinction between the King and his subjects, between the Lord and His followers. What is worse it erases the distinction between the Saviour and the saved, between the Redeemer and the redeemed. No doubt many who have given the matter no thought will be amazed that we should refuse to say that Jesus was a Christian but not those who really understand what such a statement involves. This does not apply to Unitarians, whether so called or not, but it does apply to all who worship Christ as God and trust Him as their Saviour from the guilt and power of sin. Jesus was not a Christian though apart from Him there is not and could not be such a thing as a Christian.

## Paul's Meaning?

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*What is your understanding of the meaning of Paul's statement in II Corinthians* 3:6: *"The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life?" Does this mean that Paul was not concerned about the detailed accuracy of Scripture and thus that his attitude toward Scripture was that of the "Modernist" rather than the "Fundamentalist?" I would be glad to know your understanding of this text.*

*Very truly yours,*
*D. B. S.*

OUR task in replying to this important question—important because of the constant misuse of this text that is being made by the "Modernists"—has been made easy by the fact that Dr. J. Gresham Machen has dealt with it so satisfactorily in his book, *What is Faith?* (pp. 187-194).

After stating that this is "perhaps the most frequently misused utterance in the whole Bible" and that at no point do we have a clearer illustration of the "abandonment of scientific historical method in exegesis" on the part of Modernists than in connection with this verse he writes:

"What Paul is really doing here is not contrasting the letter of the law with the spirit of the law, but contrasting the law of God with the Spirit of God. When he says, 'The Letter killeth,' he is making no contemptuous reference to pedantic literalism which shrivels the soul; but he is setting forth the terrible majesty of God's law. The letter, the 'thing written,' in the law of God, says Paul, pronounces a

dread sentence of death upon the transgressor; but the Holy Spirit of God, as distinguished from the law, gives life.

"The law of God, Paul means, is, as law, external. It is God's holy will to which we must conform; but it contains itself no promise of its fulfillment; it is one thing to have the law written, and quite another thing to have it obeyed. In fact, because of the sinfulness of our hearts, because of the power of the flesh, the recognition of God's law only makes sin take on the definite form of transgression; it only makes sin more exceeding sinful. . . . The law of God, however it comes to us, is 'letter;' it is a 'thing written,' external to the hearts and lives of men. It is written in the Old Testament; it is written in the Sermon on the Mount; it is written in Jesus' stupendous command of love for God and one's neighbor; it is written in whatever way we become conscious of the commands of God. . . . And that law, according to Paul, issues a dreadful sentence of eternal death. 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die;' not the hearer of the law is justified but the doer of it. And, alas, none are doers; all have sinned. The law of God is holy and just and good; it is inexorable; and we have fallen under its just condemnation.

"That is at bottom, what Paul means by the words, 'The letter killeth.' . . . But that is not all of the text. 'The letter killeth,' Paul says, 'but the Spirit giveth life.' There is no doubt about what he means by 'the Spirit.' He does not mean the 'spirit of the law' as contrasted with the letter; he certainly does not mean the lax interpretation of God's commands which is dictated by human lust or pride; he certainly does not mean the spirit of man. No real student of Paul, whatever be his own religious views, can doubt, I think, that the Apostle means the Spirit of God. God's law brings death because of sin; but God's Spirit, applying to the soul the redemption purchased by Christ, brings life. The thing that is written killeth; but the Holy Spirit, in the new birth, or, as Paul says, the new creation, giveth life.

"The contrast runs all through the New Testament. Hopelessness under the law is described, for example, in the seventh chapter of Romans. 'Oh wretched man what I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' But this hopelessness is transcended by the gospel. 'For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.' The law's just sentence of condemnation was borne for us by Christ who suffered in our stead; the handwriting of ordinances which was against us—the dreadful 'letter'—was nailed to the cross, and we have a fresh start in the full favor of God. And in addition to this new and right relation to God, the Spirit of God also gives the sinner a new birth, and makes him a new creature. The New Testament from beginning to end deals gloriously with this work of grace. The giving of life of which Paul speaks in this text is the new birth, the new creation; it is Christ who liveth in us. Here is the fulfillment of the great prophecy of Jeremiah: 'But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, sayeth the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts.' The law is no longer for the Christian a command which it is for him by his own strength to obey, but its requirements are fulfilled through the mighty power of the Holy Spirit. There is the glorious freedom of the gospel. The gospel does not abrogate God's law, but it makes men love it with all their hearts.

"How is it with us? The law of God stands over us; we have offended against it in thought, word and deed; its majestic 'letter' pronounces a sentence of death against our sin. Shall we obtain a specious security by ignoring God's law, and by taking refuge in an easier law of our own devising? Or shall the Lord Jesus, as He is offered to us in the gospel, wipe out the sentence of condemnation that was against us, and shall the Holy Spirit write God's law in our hearts, and make us doers of the law and not hearers only? So and so only will the great text be applied to us: 'The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.'"

Such is the meaning of this text as used by Paul and such is the meaning that we must attach to it if we are to hold Paul responsible for the use we make of it. As commonly quoted by "liberals" this text does not at all mean what it meant as employed by Paul. As used by Paul it has no bearing on the differences between the "Fundamentalists" and the "Modernists" except as the former affirm and the latter deny that "by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." In a word the text condemns every religion of merit; but commends Christianity as the one religion that ascribes salvation to the grace of God and the grace of God alone.

## Is the Bible Completely Trustworthy?

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*In your first issue you put first among the convictions that are to determine the character and policy of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY *"the conviction that the Bible is the Word of God and as such completely trustworthy whether as regards its factual, doctrinal or ethical representations." Has not modern scholarship rendered such a view of the Bible quite untenable? Can it be held without ignoring the assured results of historical, scientific and Biblical scholarship, not to mention the fact that much of the ethics of the Bible is out of harmony with present-day ethical conceptions? Did not Dr. S. Parkes Cadman have such a view of the Bible in mind when he wrote: "The claim that the books of the Bible are a perfect whole has wrought more mental distress and created more scepticism than any other dogma of Christian or Jewish theology known to me." I would like to hold your view of the Bible but is it possible to do so in the light of modern knowledge?*

*Sincerely yours,*

*J. B. C.*

THOSE who desire anything like a complete answer to this question are referred to the volume *Revelation and Inspiration* by B. B. Warfield, recently published by the Oxford University Press. This volume of itself is sufficient to make clear that the view of the Bible, questioned above, is not only tenable in the light of the widest and most exacting scholarship but that the most searching critical and historical investigation strengthens rather than weakens faith in the Bible as the infallible Word of God. If Dr. Cadman had even a small fraction of that knowledge and thought-power that characterized Dr. Warfield we may be sure he would never have been guilty of so loose and untenable a statement. No doubt the matter cannot be settled by citing authorities but certainly this applies as much to those who reject as to those who maintain the view of the Bible which the Church, until the rise of Modernism, all but universally held. In other words, it is quite unwarranted to say that it is impossible to hold this view in the light of modern knowledge in view of the fact that men second to none in the field of modern scholarship hold such a view. If the view were as untenable as many would have us believe, how explain the fact that scholars of the first rank defend it?

We have much sympathy with those who maintain that the view of the Bible we hold is not only untenable but injurious. And that because we believe that any view that is untrue is in the long run injurious. If the view is untrue it should be discarded in the interest of right living as well as in the interest of sound thinking. If, however, the view we hold is the true view, as we are convinced, we need not have any fears about the alleged bad effects of teaching such a view. Rather we may be sure that the results will be good and only good. We cannot tarry to point out how important it is that we hold this view of the Bible but it may be said (1) that only as we hold it can we be sure that the Bible as a whole and in all its parts is true, not partly true and partly false, and (2) only as we hold it can we read the Bible with the conviction that we are being brought into immediate relation to God in his revelation of truth. How important these convictions are to our peace of mind and liberty of soul as Christians it is hardly needful to point out.

We do not, we trust it is needless to say, hold this view in ignorance of the fact that it is widely denied. That is hardly a sufficient reason for rejecting it, however. Our creed will indeed be brief if we hold only what is gener-

ally believed. Even the primary assertion of the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth" is widely denied. Neither is the fact that there are difficulties in the way of holding this view of the Bible any sufficient reason for rejecting it, seeing that there is not a single distinctive Christian belief that is not held, if held at all, despite many and serious difficulties.

We freely confess, of course, that if the Bible contains *proved errors* our view of the Bible is untenable and so should be discarded. We submit, however, that such *proved errors* have not been established and until that is done we are warranted in accepting the Bible's own claim to be the Word of God. If the testimony of the Bible to its own trustworthiness was not a part of the phenomena of the Bible we would hardly be warranted in affirming that the Bible contains no errors, but since the Bible makes this claim in its behalf and since this claim as far as it can be tested stands the test—a truly remarkable fact—it seems to us that its reputation for trustworthiness is such that we are warranted in taking its testimony at its face value even as regards those statements we have no means of verifying. Many of the loose statements made about alleged Biblical errors find their explanation in the failure to distinguish between difficulties and proved errors.

We are aware of course that many proved errors are openly and confidently predicated of the Bible. And while we would not be understood as claiming that all of these alleged errors can be clearly shown not to be real errors yet we know of no instance in which they have been clearly shown to be real errors. When it is considered that even the latest parts of the Bible were written nearly two thousand years ago and that the Bible as a whole deals with periods of history with which at best we are very imperfectly informed, it is not at all surprising that many errors can be ascribed to the Bible that it is more or less impossible to disprove. It is worthy of note, however, in this connection that most of the "proved errors" that were confidently paraded a generation or two ago have been discovered to be nothing of the sort—a consideration that justifies the belief that where all the facts are known the Bible will be found to be correct in its statements. It is one thing to point to a statement that is in apparent discord with other statements, either within or without the Bible, but it is quite another thing to prove that this apparent discord is real. It is perhaps even more important to note that it is one thing to say that the Bible contains statements out of harmony with the teachings of present-day science, philosophy, ethics, Biblical criticism and such like and quite another thing to say that the Bible contains "proved errors"—unless we assume the infallibility of present-day scientists, philosophers, moralists and Biblical critics. We believe that the words of the late James Orr—a scholar of high rank who did not think it necessary to maintain the inerrancy of the Bible—still hold good: "It remains the fact that the Bible, impartially interpreted and judged, is *free from demonstrable error* in its statements" (italics ours).

It is not fair of course to expect the believer in the infallibility of the Bible to prove that there are no errors in the Bible—that would be to ask him to prove a universal negative. All that can be expected of him is to provide reasonable grounds for holding that the errors alleged are not really such—unless the Bible is to be treated like a witness who has such a reputation for inaccuracy and misstatement that nothing he says is believed except as it is confirmed by others. It is not difficult to show, however, that most of the "proved errors" ascribed to the Bible are not really such. As a matter of fact most, if not all of the "proved errors" ascribed to the Bible will be seen not to be such—to be at the most difficulties in the way of believing in the full trustworthiness of the Bible—if the following considerations are kept in mind:

(1) Errors are often alleged when there is a reasonable doubt as to whether the alleged error is in the original manuscript. This consideration may be abused. It is abused when it is used as an ever-ready refuge to which to fly when confronted with alleged errors, in defiance of sound textual criticism. No one claims, however, that copyists and translators have kept from error.

(2) Errors are often alleged because the Biblical writers do not always give precisely the same content or use precisely the same words in reporting an event or speech or expounding a doctrine or because when quoting Scripture they do not always quote in precisely the same words and sense as the original. Such ascription of errors rests on the notion that believers in the infallibility of the Bible regard it as a sort of code, expressed in notarial form and with notarial exactness. Such a mechanical, mathematical, code-like accuracy, however, has never been ascribed to the Bible by any Christian theologian worthy of the name. Abraham Kuyper speaks for representative defenders of the Bible everywhere when he writes: "The writing down by the Holy Spirit of what was inspired has nothing in common with the protocolization of an authentic official report, but the several events and truths, yea, the same events and truths in their many-sided significance, have been brought to the canvass by the Highest Artist with a diversity of color and many-sidedness of interpretation which may indeed confuse the near-sighted cabalist, but which by its delightful harmonies fills the master-student, standing at a distance, with heavenly raptures."

(3) Errors are often alleged because of the "assured results" of modern Biblical criticism. This is to forget that there are critics and critics and that while some of them parade as "assured results" conclusions which if well-grounded make clear that the Bible is a highly erroneous book yet that others, equally competent to say the least, hold that the most stringent literary and historical criticism leaves the trustworthiness of the Scriptures unimpaired. It is one thing to say that the Bible is out of harmony with the findings of a particular school of Biblical criticism—the Graf-Wellhausen-Driver school for instance—and quite another thing to say that it contains "proved errors." Let it not be forgotten that there are no "assured results" that are accepted as such by all Biblical critics.

(4) Errors are often alleged on the ground that the Bible contains moral teachings out of harmony with present-day ethical conceptions. It is one thing, however, to say that the Bible contains moral teachings out of harmony with those of many moderns and quite another thing to say that its moral teachings are such that no enlightened man can accept them. We can admit the former while flatly denying the latter.

(5) Errors are repeatedly ascribed to the Scriptures on the ground that they contain statements out of harmony with the conclusions of modern science and philosophy. Strictly speaking, however, there is no modern science and philosophy but only modern scientists and philosophers—who differ endlessly among themselves. It is only on the assumption that the discordant voices of present-day scientists and philosphers are to be identified with the voice of Science and Philosophy that it can be said that the Bible contains errors on the ground that its representations do not accord with the teachings of these scientists and philosophers. We have the happiness to believe that when the day arrives when the voice of the scientists and philosophers may be identified with the voice of Science and Philosophy that the teachings of the Bible will be found to be in complete harmony with their utterances, but as matters now stand it is quite certain that if the Bible were in harmony with the science and philosophy of today it would be out of harmony with the science and philosophy of tomorrow. This point may not be developed here but it must be obvious that there is a big difference between saying that the Bible is out of harmony with the dominant science and philosophy and saying that it will be out of harmony with science and philosophy when these have reached their final forms. Unquestionably, if the anti-supernaturalism of the dominant science and philosophy of today is to characterize science and philosophy in their final forms, the Bible not only contains errors but is through and through erroneous. Who, however, is competent to affirm that such will be the case? In the meantime, however, we possess our souls in patience, amid the discordant voices of modern thought, in the conviction that when all truth is known, not only will our faith in the unity of truth be vindicated but it will be found that both the fact-content and the truth-content of Christianity are integral arcs in the circle of truth.

# Letters to the Editor

[The letters herewith reprinted 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.]

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

DEAR SIR: I have received a copy of your paper CHRISTIANITY TODAY with a request that I subscribe for it. I am ashamed that Christian men can put forth a sheet like this and I certainly would not subscribe for it because I should be mortified to have anyone find it on my library table.

I have been a member of the Presbyterian Church for 55 years and have a record of membership in its Sunday School for 63 years, for many years I have been an elder and I confess I do not see how anyone can write of brother Christians as you do in this paper. You criticise the late General Assembly as if nobody among the one thousand commissioners knew anything but Dr. Craig. You set yourself up against the whole body when you speak of the decision of the chair as "obviously an error." I think your statement that "the ecclesiastical machine was working smoothly" is the kind of thing we should find in political conventions but not in a paper called CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I feel sorry that you should speak of Dr. Coffin, a beloved minister, in the way you do. I am quite sure that a great many did grasp the real significance of Dr. Coffin's remarks but I am very glad that not many were willing to accept your interpretation of his remarks. It seems to me that the whole report of the General Assembly in your paper is unworthy of anyone who is interested in the advancement of Christ's Kingdom. I return herewith the request for a subscription.

WM. D. MURRAY.

New York, N. Y.

[Editor's note: We regret as much as does this friend that we were forced to call attention to the ecclesiastical machine in the Church. But sad as it is that such a statement should have to be made in CHRISTIANITY TODAY, another fact is even sadder: namely, that the statement is *true*. Truth may be unpleasant, but that is no excuse for suppressing it. The same applies to the rest of our report of the 142nd General Assembly, a report which we believe was scrupulously fair, accurate and honest, withholding neither praise nor criticism when warranted by the facts.]

* * *

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have received the second number of your valued paper, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, this morning. I certainly am agreed with your motive and course you have taken. I wish to express my sincere joy over the fact that your backbone did not fail you. The Modernists know of no financial difficulties, the easy going element finds an easy going religion there by all means suitable for them and all ready to pay for the salve so proficient in easing their consciences.

God bless you and strengthen you in your noble undertaking.

REV. R. KLAUDT.

Manitomac, Wisc.

* * *

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: After reading the copy of CHRISTIANITY TODAY which I received yesterday, I feel like praising God for giving you courage to do what you are doing. I am enclosing one dollar for a year's subscription to your valuable paper and also names of prospective subscribers. I returned yesterday from a Presbyterian young people's conference where a college professor tried to make me believe that the Bible was not absolutely true but that the Christian conscience was the final authority in religion. Other conference leaders frowned on me for daring to contradict this learned professor. I showed them that one who is true to his ordination vows can do nothing else. It seems to me that those who stand by the Bible as the Word of God will have to perfect an organization very soon within the Presbyterian Church if it is to be saved from ruin. The article by Gertrude Smith in your June number, is certainly a true analysis of the Church situation today. The fear of men is causing many so-called conservatives to tone down their messages. What is being done and what can one do to rally conservatives for this battle?

REV. E. EDWIN PAULSON.

Foley, Minn.

* * *

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: A friend sent me the new magazine. After I read the first issue *through*—I thanked God for such a sure testimony. For long years, I lived *in Modernism* in the *Presbyterian* Church. Modernism is deadly and is deceiving its thousands—yes—its tens of thousands.

I read Dr. McAfee's sermon before General Assembly—what can he be thinking of when he says—"It is a notable fact that we have among us now no divisive issues?" I have a Bible class and am young peoples' counsellor. I think the conditions should be put before all church groups—but I find many seemingly true Christians who insist I keep quiet. I know *all* should be done in love—I pray God that I be enabled to do it that way. However, I have a firm conviction that God wants me to tell the truth. I am going to do it knowing I may become unpopular—my Lord suffered for the truth, why should I so shrink?

Will you kindly tell me where I can get a copy of the Auburn Affirmation? If there is any cost I will gladly pay it. I just want to show some of my beloved friends that it is Modernistic in its teaching. I believe in peace —but I believe it is folly to cry peace when there is no peace.

MRS. V. J. BLAIR.

Langhorne, Penna.

[Editor's Note: Copies of the "Auburn Affirmation" may be secured gratis, by writing to the "Committee on Protestant Liberties," 10 Nelson St., Auburn, N. Y.]

* * *

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: In your June, 1930, issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY you presume to answer (for the rest of us) the ancient and important question "What Is Christianity?" As a matter of course your answer is not only impertinent but "archaic" (as Paul says in Hebrews 6:1 to certain Jewish Christians just like you).

Condescend, if you please, to allow me to take one sentence from your said editorial, for this is a sufficient index to all you say and are. The sentence follows: "But even if all those who profess and call themselves Christians were really Christians, such a method would at best give us an answer that expressed the minimum of Christianity, the very least that a man can *hold* and still honestly and intelligently call himself a Christian"—the very least that a man can "hold," this is the index to which I refer.

In other words, "hold" everything, especially "the bag;" as though what a man "holds" makes him a Christian, without regard to what he "is" or "does!" It is most amazing, indeed; and quite typical of your entire cult, historically Jewish and Pharisaical.

My dear Mr. Editor, your correspondent "holds" all that you hold (except the bag), and then some. All these things that you are so concerned and noisy about he has held most devoutly and ardently from his youth up. Nevertheless he might lack the "one thing" essential; and this is a matter of "being" and "doing," not a matter of "holding."

Here I am (dear me!), "fallen among thieves," a world condition. For what you "hold" I do not care a continental, as you pass by on the other side with an air of external, exclusive, pretentious piety. What you "hold" never touches me. It is "all Greek" to me at best. Pass on. You do not interest me. I have no use for you.

Your friend, a fundamentalist of the second class (who lives away back in Leviticus), is much nearer the Kingdom; for he crosses the road to where I lie dying and somewhat sympathetically looks me over. Apparently he "has a heart." He "is" something, at the same time that he presumably "holds" something. He speaks, and it is in a language that has at least a familiar and appealing sound.

Then comes this unorthodox, ostracized, half-breed Samaritan. Apart from his donkey (bless the donkey!), and his "oil and wine" (bless his preparedness!), I do not know, and (really) do not care at present, what he "holds." Neither do I know anything about what he "is," except that he seems to be human, al-

most as human as Jesus was! To me in my predicament the glorious thing lies in what he "does," for what he "does" saves me!

Only my body, you say? Fiddlesticks! My body is the third person of this divine trinity called "me," through which alone he can reach all there is of "me." I believe in the redemption of the body, therefore.

Now this Good Samaritan speaks not a word. He is not testy and irascible. He does not even ask me "What is the chief end of man?" His present business is somewhat different, yet all of the same Spirit. It is the King's business; and the King's business requires haste. At all events, under the circumstances, *I* think so, you may be very sure.

Though silent, however, he speaks to me in my native tongue, wherein I was born, the universal language of humanity. I understand him. There is nothing "Greek" about it. Certainly not Hebrew!

And I am drawn to him with cords that naught can sever. He woos and wins me with loving, self-sacrificing, courageous service!

But he caps the climax when he pays the bill!

God bless him! He has delivered to me the only true creed of Christianity. Here is what Christianity is. And the suffering world is "on to it!"

"Go, and do thou likewise."

Sincerely yours,

REV. HENRY A. BOMBERGER, D.D.

Philadelphia, Pa.

* * *

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am already a subscriber to CHRISTIANITY TODAY, having sent in my subscription upon receipt of the first issue. The publication meets a very real need, I am sure, and if it can get into the hands of the vast number far and wide who are faithful to evangelical belief the list of subscribers ought to grow amazingly. I hope you will be able to reach these, because they need the help and encouragement which CHRISTIANITY TODAY will give them.

The Presbyterian Church is today under such absolute domination by Modernism that it is impossible to get any real information as to what is actually going on through any channel which is under ecclesiastical control. The publications are either directly managed by Modernists, or are so intimidated by Modernist influence that nothing inimical to the plans and purposes of the ecclesiastical "machine" is allowed to appear. From what went on at the recent General Assembly it is evident that this control is so sure that the Moderator must favor the Modernists at every turn. Indeed if this was not assured beforehand, I presume he would not get the job. How long can this go on, how long will it be before the faithful will become tired of such ecclesiastical tomfoolery?

If it were not for CHRISTIANITY TODAY those who want real information as to what is going on would have no way of knowing what the Auburn Affirmationists and other Unitarians under the Presbyterian banner are doing to systematically kill the Presbyterian Church. With more than twelve hundred ministers in the Presbyterian Church willing over their own signatures to repudiate Christ in order to curry favor with the world—what wonder "the showing is not good?" What can be expected of a laity led by such a ministry? How can a Church divided against itself hope to stand?

The article "If One Resorts to Ordinary Logic," in the June issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY is illuminating and certainly much to the point. It should be issued in pamphlet form and put into the hands of every layman in the United States, regardless of denomination. It is quite apparent that all the denominations are fighting the same enemy, and that the ministry is to a large extent playing into the hands of the enemy by its irresponsibility, indifference, or definite antagonism to evangelical faith. Yet it may be by this means that the split will come which will divide all the denominations, separating those who believe that Christ *is* God from those who believe He is *not* God. Certainly when such a split does come it will give us two groups which are *logically* divided, which is more than can be said for present-day divisions.

Your report of the Assembly is appreciated very much, and future issues of CHRISTIANITY TODAY are anticipated with keen interest.

Very sincerely,

RUSSELL T. BARR.

Germantown, Pa.

* * *

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I received the second number of Vol. 1 of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Would you believe it if I say, the denominations will gravitate to two general divisions: Fundamentalism and Modernism?

There is no denomination that is not affected by Modernism. The Modernist calls himself the educated, smart, and intelligent Christian. The Fundamentalists are simply the has-beens, back-numbers and behind the times.

Church divisions are disintegrating and destructive yet we must take a stand against damaging inroads upon the true faith, and *defend* the faith.

Will you come out in a real way against Modernism, or will you carry water on two shoulders? Will you lay hold on the handle of least resistance?

How can a Christian let go at the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Jesus? I shiver and I shudder! So with the Atonement, so with resurrection of the body. The Modernists lay another foundation. They spiritualize the Bible and stretch its verses over their notions. They add to, and take from the Bible, and jeopardize their salvation. My guide in all things in preaching, praying, teaching, living, feeling and loving is Christ, the Son of God, the Risen, living Saviour; my Judge, my Vindicator, my All in All. My house stands on a rock-bottom foundation.

REV. J. E. FREEMAN.

Lehighton, Pa.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: In reply to your solicitation for support, as evidenced in your first issue, received today, may I suggest that you have slightly misinterpreted the issue, and consequently the name of your publication. It should not be CHRISTIANITY TODAY, much less "Christianity of the New Testament" but, rather, "Christianity Four Hundred Years Ago."

I sincerely hoped and thought, when the *Presbyterian* changed editorship, that the rancor and bitterness which was characteristic of its pages would be abated within the Church. I deplore this recrudescence of that spirit. Allow me to quote from page 29 of Dr. Oman's "The Office of the Ministry." "The trouble about Fundamentalism is not that it is obscurantist, but that it is brutal. It is as much sown with anathemas as the Decrees of the Council of Trent, which just as much means that, if you don't swallow what you are told, you will go to an unhappy place.—It lacks faith to appeal to every man's conscience."

The Gospel needs not so much defence today as incarnation and embodiment in human life that it may be seen and desired. I can have no hope that your new effort will further it in any real sense.

Goldendale, Washington. REV. E. W. PERRY.

* * *

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have received the first two issues of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, and I am highly pleased with it. The only unfavorable feature about it is the fact that it is a monthly publication, whereas it ought to be a weekly paper. You would be surprised to know the interest and zeal that Southern Presbyterian people are manifesting in the twin enterprise of Westminster Seminary and CHRISTIANITY TODAY. This double movement was started at a time when the outlook on the religious field was becoming dark, and there can be no doubt that this is the direction of God. Evangelical believers in this section are lining up with you in a great cause.

Cross Hills, N. C. REV. F. T. MCGILL.

* * *

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Enclosed check is from an aged, infirm and retired Southern Presbyterian Minister, who bids you God speed in your great undertaking. CHRISTIANITY TODAY is answer to longing and prayer. Opposed to the Organic Movement as premature, I certainly feel that the time is ripe for the junction of evangelic forces. Gertrude Smith's "Protest" in your last issue is timely. There must be an open breach between the followers of the Lord Jesus and Modernism, Humanism, *et id omne genus,* and cleavage begins with Westminster Seminary and your journal. "The Lord God Omnipotent REIGNETH!!" Therefore, whether you succeed or fail in this venture, drop any suggestion of pessimism and sound the optimistic note. But—you'll not fail. God bless you.

Clarkesville, Ga. J. R. MCALPINE.

# News of the Church

## Dr. C. B. McAfee New Board Secretary

THE Rev. Dr. Cleland B. McAfee, professor of systematic theology for the last eighteen years at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, has been elected a secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. He will begin the duties of his new office on Sept. 1.

Dr. McAfee, who was moderator of the 141st General Assembly, will succeed the Rev. Dr. Arthur J. Brown, who retired in May, 1929.

For the eight years before going to the Chicago institution Dr. McAfee was pastor of the Lafayette Avénue Presbyterian Church at South Oxford Street, Brooklyn.

Dr. McAfee is the fourth son of the Rev. Dr. John Armstrong McAfee, who was for many years president of Park College, Parkville, Mo., known for the number of its graduates sent into the Presbyterian ministry. His brothers are the Rev. Dr. Lapsley A. McAfee, Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, Cal.; Earnest M. McAfee, director of social service work in the Community Church in New York City; Lowell Mason McAfee, who from 1913 to 1916 was president of Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa.

The new secretary is 63 years old. He was born in Ashley, Mo., and was graduated from Park College in 1884 and from Union Theological Seminary in 1888. He was married to Miss Harriet Brown of Girard, Kan., in 1892. They have three daughters.

After being ordained to the Presbyterian ministry in 1888 Dr. McAfee became a professor in Park College. His first pastorate was at the Forty-first Street, now merged into the First Presbyterian, Church, Chicago. After three years he accepted a call to the Brooklyn church.

The appointment takes on added significance as fresh evidence of the ascendancy of the "liberal" party in the Presbyterian Church.

## Conscience and War

THE Presbytery of Los Angeles overtured the last Assembly to give some clear deliverance on the question as to whether the right of American citizenship should be withheld from those who conscientiously refuse to promise to take part in war. In its reply to the overture, the Assembly stood upon the sound principles, Scriptural and Confessional, that God alone is Lord of Conscience. The reply was as follows:

That the General Assembly reply to the Overture of the Presbytery of Los Angeles:

WHEREAS the General Assembly has repeatedly declared the aversion of the Church to the settlement of international differences by war, or by the appeal to arms, and its belief in the substitution therefor of peaceful processes of conference and adjudication, and

WHEREAS the Standards of the Church declare "that God alone is Lord of the conscience," and

WHEREAS the Church has always taught that it is the duty of men to obey their conscience in the fear of God and in fidelity to His Word, and

WHEREAS all should stand on the same basis of principle, enjoying equal rights and having equal duties in the Church and in the State,

THEREFORE, Resolved that the Assembly declares its belief that the right and duty of citizenship should not be conditioned upon the test of ability or willingness, contrary to conscience, to bear arms or to take part as a combatant of war.

That a copy of the above answer be sent to the President of the United States and to the Congress of the United States.

## Rights of Conscience Upheld by Court

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in New York, on June 30th, reversed the opinions of the District Courts of Connecticut and New York and ruled that Professor Douglas Clyde Macintosh, of the faculty of the Yale Divinity School, and Miss Marie Averil Bland, a World War nurse, now living in New York are entitled to American citizenship. Presiding Judge Martin T. Manton, who wrote the decision, concluded his long document by ordering the District Courts to accept their applications.

Citizenship was denied Professor Macintosh more than a year ago because he had refused to take the oath of allegiance without reservations. He adopted the attitude that he possessed the right to question the righteousness of any war in which this country might become involved before bearing arms. Miss Bland, a Canadian who nursed American soldiers in France, said she did not believe the bearing of arms against an enemy to be consistent with the Christian religion.

### Placed Will of God First

Reviewing the circumstances which brought about the rejection of Professor Macintosh's petition, which caused much discussion throughout the United States, Judge Manton wrote:

"It appears that the appellant stated he was ready to give to the United States, in return for citizenship, all the allegiance he had ever given or could give to any country, but that he could not put allegiance for the government of any country before allegiance to the will of God."

Judge Manton defended that attitude. "A citizen sharing views which amount to conscientious or religious scruples against bearing arms in what he regards as an unjustifiable war, is akin to one having scruples against all wars. There is a distinction between a morally justified and an unjustifiable war as recognized in international law. Recognition was given to such distinctions in the recent Kellogg pact. It strongly lies in the desire to maintain peace and abolish war."

### Defends Right of Conscience

Judge Manton declared that "the rights of conscience are inalienable rights which the citizen need not surrender and which the government or society cannot take away." He quoted this passage from "Story on the Constitution": "The rights of conscience are, indeed, beyond the just reach of any human power. They are given by God and cannot be encroached upon by human authority, without criminal disobedience on the precepts of natural as well as revealed religion."

Miss Emily Marx, attorney, who represented Miss Bland, said, following the announcement of the reversal, that as far as she could ascertain this was the first instance where a court had ruled in such matters that individual "religious beliefs" are to be so respected. John W. Davis presented the case for Professor Macintosh, the hearings having begun before the Circuit Court late in May.

### Both Are Canadians

Dr. Macintosh, as well as Miss Bland, is a Canadian by birth and served in the Canadian army as chaplain under fire at Vimy Ridge, the Somme and other battles of the World War.

In defending Miss Bland's case, Judge Manton was of the opinion that "this appellant said that she would promise to defend the Constitution as far as her conscience as a Christian would allow. The government, by its Constitution and the acts of Congress, never exacted more from any applicant."

Miss Marx contended that never had the term "to support and defend the Constitution" necessarily embodied the doing so by bearing arms.

Judge Manton explained also in detail that neither of these cases paralleled that of Mme. Rosika Schwimmer, the Hungarian pacifist lecturer who was denied citizenship in 1929 on the strength of her statement that she would do everything an American citizen must do except fight.

### Notes Difference in Cases

"Madame Schwimmer," wrote Judge Manton, "stated she was an absolute atheist and said: 'I am not willing to bear arms.' This applicant (Professor Macintosh) was willing to bear arms and reserved merely the right to determine for himself only whether the war was justified according to the dictates of his own conscience. Mrs. Schwimmer said she was an uncompromising pacifist and was found to have no sense of nationalism but only a cos-

mic sense of belonging to the human family and opposed the use of military force as admitted by the Constitution and by the laws. She had 'no nationalistic feeling.'"

Judge Manton concluded that Professor Macintosh by his answers, "indicates an upright sense of the obligation to his God and has carefully explained his willingness to be a citizen of the United States, assuming the responsibilities and obligations of its form of government, and at the same time he has a high regard for his general duty to humanity. He wishes to keep pure his religious scruples."

The opinion began with a review of Professor Macintosh's career, stating that he first entered this country in 1904, that he had been ordained as a Baptist minister in 1907 after studying here, and that except for the years from 1907 to 1909 and of his service in the Canadian Army, he had lived in the United States and had taught at Yale ever since.

### Qualified Answer on War

Dr. Macintosh's application was held up in Connecticut last year because of his qualification in answering Question 22 in the list of formal questions, which reads: "If necessary, are you willing to take up arms in defense of this country?" Instead of answering categorically, he replied, "Yes, but I should want to be free to judge as to the necessity." To that he attached the memorandum which has been so quoted since that time. It was in brief that he did not contract to defend his country "right or wrong," however "necessary" the war might seem to be to "the government of the day."

Judge Manton found that the professor explained also "that if he were to be a citizen of the United States he would recognize special duties and obligations by virtue of that citizenship over and above his general duty to humanity as such."

He declared Professor Macintosh believed there was a rightful use of force in the exercise of international relations and that there were instances under which force could also be used with justification. The professor, Judge Manton continued, stated that he believed his position would help make for the peace of the world. "The court," he found, "denied his application for citizenship, reciting in the decree that the petitioner is not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States.

### Says Laws Cover Exemptions

"But," the judge declared, "there is also the well recognized affection for his government if, by reason of a conscientious religious scruple, he requests being excused from bearing arms." Judge Manton explained that "historical evidence of a citizen to be excused from military service based on conscientious religious scruples" is found in the provisions of some of the state statutes and constitutions as well as in various acts of Congress.

"Nor is there any fixed principle of the Constitution of this country requiring a citizen," the opinion continued, "with conscientious religious scruples against bearing arms to nevertheless bear arms in time of war. Congress has recognized that persons having conscientious scruples against bearing arms shall be exempt."

Judge Manton declared that Professor Macintosh's answer to Question 22 "is not in disobedience of the Constitution or the laws of the land;" also, "No more is demanded of an alien who becomes a citizen than a natural-born citizen, and when an alien becomes a citizen he is accorded all the rights and privileges afforded to a natural-born citizen except eligibility to the Presidency."

In referring to Miss Bland and ruling "that she may take the oath," Judge Manton said her case differed from Madame Schwimmer's in that the latter "had a conscientious objection, possessed of pacific ideas with propagandist proclivities, and of cosmic internationalistic desires and purposes." Miss Bland, he said, "will be fully protected if (on taking the oath) she will make known her conscientious objections."

## Reformed Church in America

THE one hundred and twenty-fourth General Synod of the Reformed Church in America convened at Asbury Park, N. J., and within the Grand Avenue Reformed Church there, on the afternoon of Thursday, June 5th. The Synod was constituted with prayer by the retiring President, the Rev. Daniel A. Poling, D.D.

The first business was the election of a President and a Vice-President for the Synod. The Reformed Church in America does not nominate with speeches, but rather with a "nominating ballot." At this ballot, it was discovered that thirty-nine names had been suggested by the delegates. The first electing ballot disclosed that the two names in the lead were those of the Rev. Milton J. Hoffman, D.D., of New Brunswick Seminary, and the Rev. J. Harvey Murphy, D.D., of Hudson, N. Y. Dr. Hoffman was elected in the second electing ballot, receiving 106 votes to 75 for Dr. Murphy. Thereafter Dr. Murphy was elected as Vice-President.

At the evening session of the same day, Dr. Poling preached his Assembly sermon as retiring President. He delivered a striking and at times brilliant discourse, challenging the Church to follow Christ in every call that might come to it. Dr. Poling made clear his own passionate desire for organic union, and called for a renewed preaching of "Christ and Christ alone as the world's sufficient savior."

Evidently attempting to steer a middle course between present-day theological positions, Dr. Poling continued: "Will this preaching be doctrinal? Yes, but doctrinal in the sense that only those doctrines that can be translated into human experience, known and lived in the home, school, industry, church and government have a right to claim the time and passion of the Christian ministry. In these days it is a crime against Calvary for Christians to do balancing stunts on theological pin points."

The Synod adopted the report of the Committee on Revision of the Constitution, which was given by the Chairman, the Rev. James Boyd Hunter, of New York. By the terms of the amendment, which had been adopted by the Classes 30 to 10, the term of elders and deacons is to be made for either two or three years, at the option of any Consistory.

Dr. Poling presented the report on the state of religion in the Church. The report called attention to many decreases. Some of these were large and significant. Sunday Schools and Sunday School enrollments, however, showed a decided increase.

The report of the Committee on Closer Relations with other Denominations came on Friday afternoon. Debate took up most of that afternoon, and was continued on Saturday. The Chairman of the Committee, the Rev. Malcolm J. MacLeod, D.D., read the report and its recommendations, which were all adopted.

On the reading of the first recommendation: "That the Committee be instructed to continue its work of study and conference with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and other members of the Presbyterian family," Elder Robert H. Robinson of the Collegiate Church, New York City, offered a substitute resolution that since the report evidenced a lack of practical unanimity, the matter be dropped. After debate, this motion was defeated. The recommendations were all adopted by about a three-to-one vote. They continued the committee to study the matter of union, required it to keep the Church informed, and authorized conferences with the committees from other churches. At first the Synod had in view union with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. only, but after the fraternal address of the Rev. J. R. Reid, D.D., Editor of the *United Presbyterian*, on behalf of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, the Synod enlarged the scope of its resolutions to include the whole Reformed and Presbyterian family. The sentiment of the Synod was without doubt favorable to organic union.

The item of the docket causing the most intense interest and debate of any matter brought before the Synod was the Report of the Committee on Education for World Peace. Out of eleven recommendations offered by the committee, two were rejected, and two were referred to other committees. The resolutions rejected were No. 3, on "Conscience and Citizenship," and No. 7, "The League of Nations." The Synod refused to favor the entry of the United States into the league, mainly because the matter was regarded by the Synod as civil and not ecclesiastical. The resolution "to stand against the program of enlarged and popularized military training in schools and colleges" provoked keen discussion. The vote on the resolution was a tie—67 to 67. The President of the Synod broke the deadlock by casting his vote for the resolution. The portions of the report commending the London Naval Treaty, the World Court, condemning a billion dollar American naval program and advocating cooperation with other bodies for peace, were carried by substantial votes.

The Rev. James B. Hunter, Editor of the *Christian Intelligencer,* the official paper of the Church, was given a surprise when, on being called to the platform of the Synod, he was presented with the degree of Doctor of Divinity, by the Rev. John Wesselink, President of Central College. This year was the 100th anniversary of the *Christian Intelligencer.*

Eighty-nine students, of whom eight are hoping to become Medical Missionaries, are under the care of the Board of Education, the Board reported receiving $130,150 for its work during the year.

At the Monday afternoon session, the Synod faced the facts with reference to the Foreign Mission situation. The past year resulted in a deficit of $23,000 and the debt of the board now stands at $82,500. Should the board reduce its work? The debate was deeply earnest and, during the prolonged discussion, many were moved to tears. At the end the Synod determined, in true Reformed fashion, not to retreat, but to ask the Church to give sacrificially, at least five per cent extra, without decreasing gifts to other boards and agencies.

On Monday evening, Foreign Mission night, Dr. Paul Harrison, famous missionary to Arabia, delivered a thrilling address to the Synod, full of enthusiasm for the work of bringing Christ to those who have never known Him. Dr. Harrison spoke under a great strain because of the recent accidental death of his wife. Dr. F. M. Potter, Treasurer of the Foreign Board, who has just completed a round-the-world trip of inspection, also delivered an address. After this, seven young people who are to go out as Missionaries came to the platform, and were introduced by name. Each one was given a few minutes to tell the Synod and the great throng of others also present why he or she was going to the foreign field. Their words were few but simple and their hearts burning with love for those "other sheep" for whom Christ died. Following their testimonies —for such they really were—all Missionaries present were called to the platform; while the President of the Synod commissioned them in prayer for their labors. It was a solemn and an inspiring service.

Tuesday was occupied with items of important routine business, and with the report of the Committee on Domestic Missions. This board has had a very successful year. It organized eight new churches, helped to support two hundred and fifteen congregations, and has fifteen active missionaries at work. Five churches formerly helped have become self-supporting. Receipts of this board were $223,172. A Resolution was adopted commending President Hoover for his stand on law enforcement and assuring him of the support of the Synod.

After having exhausted its docket, the Synod adjourned late in the evening of Tuesday, June 10th, to meet next year at the same place.

It was a Synod of earnestness and unusual intensity of feeling, coupled with an unwavering determination to press forward regardless of losses and obstacles. The Reformed Church in America now enters upon its 303rd year.

## Christian Reformed Church

THE Synod of the Christian Reformed Church convened in session in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and within the chapel of Calvin College there, on Wednesday, June 11th. The formal opening of Synod was preceded by a prayer service on Tuesday, June 10th, held in the Neland Avenue Church. After the opening exercises, conducted by the Rev. H. J. Kuiper, Minister of the church, the Rev. H. Keegstra, President of the last Synod (held in 1928) preached an inspiring and beautiful sermon on Joshua 5:13-15.

On Wednesday, at the opening of the business session, the Rev. H. Keegstra, after devotional exercises, delivered a brief address in which he called attention to the many difficult problems faced by the Synod. He exhorted the Synod to be prayerfully eager to do the will of God, remembering the motto of Calvin: *Coram Deo.* By this the reformer meant to say: "I stand in the presence of God!" So he hoped the Synod would be led to unanimity on matters in which differences were possible.

Thereupon, Synod elected its officers as follows: The Rev. W. P. Van Wyck, Minister of Eastern Avenue Church, Grand Rapids, to be President; the Rev. Watson Groen, Minister of the Christian Reformed Church of Los Angeles, Calif., to be Vice-President; the Rev. Daniel Zwier, Minister of the Maple Ave. Church in Holland, Mich., to be Secretary; the Rev. Geo. W. Hylkema, Minister of the Orange City II, Church, Orange City, Iowa, to be Assistant Secretary.

It is always a solemn moment at the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church when the newly elected President requests the delegates to rise, and to answer with an audible "aye" to the Declaration of Faith by which the representatives of the various churches bind themselves in all their decisions to the principles and rules of the Christian Reformed Church.

The Committee on Committees was then appointed, consisting of the following: Rev. J. De Jonge, Rev. J. L. Heeres, Rev. J. Manni, Elder J. Rienstra, Rev. L. Veltkamp, Rev. C. Spoelhof, Dr. Herman Kuiper, Rev. L. J. Lamberts, Elder B. De Ouden, Elder B. Eekhoff, Rev. A. J. Brink, Elder B. Sjaardema, Elder A. Ten Harmsel, Rev. R. J. Frens, Elder J. Barema. Later in the day this Committee presented nominations for Pre-advisory Committees, on Theological School and College, Mission Matters, Publication Matters, Church order and Emeriti, Order of Worship, Question of Hymns and Choir singing, Varia, Protests and Appeals. In order to give these Committees an opportunity to begin their work, the Synod adjourned on Wednesday afternoon until Friday morning at 8:30 o'clock.

The Synod of the Christian Reformed Church meets once every two years, and when in session, sits for two or three weeks, as the need may be. Small enough to be a truly deliberative body, it decides nothing without prayerful and careful consideration. The feverish desire to "rush things through" evidenced in some other ecclesiastical bodies, is conspicuously absent. Discussion is full and free, ample time being given to hearing all sides of any question.

On Friday morning, the Synod listened with thanksgiving and approbation to the report of the Theological School and Calvin College. In ten years the school had grown almost phenomenally. Formerly burdened by a heavy debt, it was now practically unencumbered. The student total for College and Theological School had risen from 164 to 407. A decade ago the College possessed but one building; today there are three, and a fourth under construction. The Resolution concluded: "When we consider all these things, we have abundant reasons for gratitude, and we may say with the Psalmist: 'The Lord hath done great things for us; wherefore we are glad.'"

Synod accepted as information that part of the report of the Curatorium which recorded the appointment of the Rev. R. B. Kuiper, Professor in Westminster Theological Seminary, to be President of Calvin College.

Fraternal delegates were heard by the Synod, among them, the Rev. J. G. Vos, representing the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the Rev. Prof. V. Hepp, from the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands. Dr. Hepp said in part:

"Permit me to address your moderator. In the Netherlands we used to say, Fathers and brethren, but we never knew exactly who were the fathers and who the brethren! I feel that this is my second fatherland. Our Synod delegated me to attend your gatherings, and I am sorry that I will not be able to stay longer. Your synodical menu is so rich and tasty that I would fain stay to the end. Consider this my word of farewell to the brethren of the Christian Reformed Church.

"The relations between your Church and ours are indeed cordial. We would be happy to see your Church flourish even more than ours. It is certainly providential that many of the problems with which you are now wrestling will also come up at our Synod in August; for example, the status of ministers not serving local churches, the expansion of our creed, the revision of our liturgical forms and the question of the singing of hymns in public worship. Your attitude on these matters will interest us keenly.

**"The Synod of Groningen decided not to make changes in things we have in common with our sister churches in other lands without consulting them. In this manner the unity of the various Reformed bodies can be promoted and the cause of international Calvinism will be advanced.**

"It is easier to be and remain Reformed in the Netherlands than here in America. I have often heard it said among you, We must not copy the Netherlands. I agree most emphatically. But this does not mean that we should not value each other's counsel. Besides, there is an even greater danger, viz., that you copy the churches of America! Be on your

guard against applying worldly standards to the Church. Be conservative and progressive at the same time. Study the historic principles of Calvinism, but supplement these with such new principles as are an advance upon the old, but still fully harmonize with them. Continue to emphasize fundamental principles. You have a great but difficult task in this country. Be faithful to your confession till the day of the Lord Jesus Christ."

The response to Dr. Hepp was made by Dr. Herman Kuiper, who expressed keen appreciation of the theological literature so abundantly produced in the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, and gave voice to the hope that it will soon be possible to hold an International Council of Calvinistic Churches.

Regarding calendar simplifications, the Synod, on Tuesday, June 17th, discussed various proposals, suggested especially by commercial organizations, for Calendar reform.

Special mention was made of the Cotsworth Calendar according to which a "Year-day" will intervene between a Saturday and a Sunday in December and two of these every leap year. Synod decided to forward the following statement to the National Committee on Calendar Simplification:

"We are not opposed to calendar changes as such, provided such changes preserve the ancient and divine arrangement of the fixed days of the week. The weekly cycle ordained by God Himself in the very beginning of time, according to the Word of God, should not be altered."

The Synod supported the overture of Classis of California to register a vigorous protest with the American Bible Society against statements made by Dr. Parkes Cadman in an article, "How to Read the Bible," appearing in the *Bible Society Record* of January, 1930. The objectionable statements are as follows: "As a collection of tracts, treatises, and histories, it includes every type of literature. Folklore, myth, legend, drama, idyll, poetry, and biography are here associated with meditations, maxims, letters, sermons, parables, prayers, psalms, and canticles. Transmitted to successive generations by providential oversight, the Bible's teachings reflect the ever-advancing moral and religious intelligence of the nations."

Regarding Christian Industrial organizations, the report of the standing committee on the question of what the Church can do to further such groups, was adopted, and is in part as follows:

"The Church in its official capacity cannot engage in establishing such organizations."

"Christian labor organizations and similar organizations in social life cannot be called into existence to order, but can only originate in a voluntary and spontaneous desire of the communal Christian life to express itself in an effective way."

"There are certain communities in which laboring men do not feel the necessity of organizing their forces, because the relation between capital and labor, even if not entirely what it should be, is at least tolerable. . . . . It is only in places where industrial conditions really call for labor organizations that Christian laborers can be expected to organize."

"But even in such cases they may not feel the necessity of organizing separately. There may be organizations which are based on general principles of justice; which in their constitutions, their official propaganda, and their methods of procedure, do not violate Christian principles; which conduct their meetings in a perfectly respectable way without giving offense, and which, therefore, a Christian can join without qualms of conscience or moral scruples. But it is also possible, however, that Christian laborers join the existing unions without any compunction, even when these do violate the fundamental principles of justice and . . . go contrary to Christian principles . . . and it is especially in connection with such cases that the question arises whether the Church can do anything to promote the organization of Christian labor organizations."

According to this report the Church can do the following:

"1. Preach unceasingly the Biblical principle of the Christian's separation from the world.

"2. Set forth clearly the anti-Christian spirit of Marxian Socialism with its glorification of class hatred, class struggle, and class ethics and its principle that might makes right; and place over against this the great fundamental, Biblical principles of justice.

"3. Call particular attention to the principle of corporate responsibility, clearly taught in the Word of God (Acts 2:23; 3:13-15; 2 Cor. 6:14-17, etc.).

"4. Exercise discipline in the spirit of love, but nevertheless with a firm hand whenever members become guilty of propagating un-Christian principles in the world of labor . . . or refuse to break with organizations avowedly anti-Christian in character."

Regarding the American Federation of Labor, Synod decided not to pass judgment on this organization, but to thank the committee for its report and pass the information given by it on to the churches. Grounds:

"1. We have no assurance that the American Federation of Labor will retain its present character and remain free, for example, from radical socialism and communism.

"2. If Synod commits itself on the American Federation of Labor, the danger arises that similar investigation and commitment will be requested for other organizations."

With regard to singing of Hymns, the Synod, after long and earnest debate, decided to allow more Hymns (in addition to Psalms in metre,) to be sung in the churches. These Hymns, however, must be carefully selected, by a committee appointed for that purpose, and must be approved as doctrinally sound by the Synod of 1932. The use of hymns, however, will not be compulsory, and the Psalms will still be sung.

A communication was received from the Committee on Presbyterian Union requesting the cooperation of the Church in the movement to establish organic union between all the churches holding the Presbyterian or Reformed faith. The denominations represented by this committee are the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. (North), the Presbyterian Church U. S. (South), the Reformed Church in America (Dutch), the Reformed Church in the U. S. (German), and the United Presbyterian Church.

The committee of Synod recommended that it should reply that the Church does not favor organic union with the churches mentioned. It was deemed more advisable, however, to acquaint these churches with the reasons for the objections to this movement. Professors Berkhof and Bouma were appointed to draft a reply, which was accepted at a later session and which reads as follows:

"However much we believe in the unity of the Church of Jesus Christ, a unity which though essentially spiritual should also as much as possible come to visible expression in the organized Church; and

"However much we desire to cultivate the spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation between the Calvinistic branches of historic Christendom,

"We cannot cooperate in any movement whose avowed purpose is to effectuate organic union between our Church and the five affiliated churches mentioned.

"Reasons:

"1. The Christian Reformed Church stands foursquare for the Reformed interpretation of Christian truth as expressed in its confessional standards and cannot consider an organic union with ecclesiastical bodies in which there is widespread indifference toward the great essentials of the Reformed faith, such as we are persuaded is the case in at least one of the cooperating bodies.

"2. In the struggle between Modernism and Orthodoxy which is raging throughout the historic Christian churches today, the Christion Reformed Church stands committed to the orthodox, Biblical and supernatural view of the Christian faith and cannot consider organic union with ecclesiastical bodies in which this position is not unequivocally affirmed and maintained. It is a matter of common knowledge that in at least one of the five aforementioned cooperating denominations Modernism is not only tolerated ecclesiastically, but is also being openly propagated in pulpit, press and theological education.

"3. The Christian Reformed Church maintains discipline over its members both in matters of doctrine and of Christian living. It believes that such discipline is demanded by the Word of God and that it is indispensable for the welfare of the Church. We deeply deplore here to register the fact that ecclesiastical discipline, as we conceive it and as we believe a Church of the Reformed persuasions should maintain it, has in some of the cooperating churches practically fallen into disuse, and we cannot seriously contemplate organic union with them.

"4. In the matter of membership in secret, oathbound organizations the Christian Reformed Church not only holds that such membership is incompatible with membership in the Church, but also maintains and enforces this position, debarring from its membership those who are so affiliated. Organic union with the five aforementioned cooperating churches could be effected only at the expense of this prerequisite for church membership.

"We welcome all efforts which may strengthen the bonds of true unity between the churches of Christendom and especially between those historic denominations whose creedal position is historically rooted in the Calvinistic Reformation, but we cannot cooperate in any movement for organic union of Presbyterian and Reformed bodies for the above reasons."

After three weeks of busy sessions, the Synod was dissolved to meet again in 1932.

## World's Christian Fundamentals Convention

THE thirteenth annual convention of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association was held beginning June 8th in the Church of the Open Door, Los Angeles. The Church of the Open Door meets in the auditorium of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, and is closely connected with the Institute.

The Convention was one of unusual spiritual warmth. At nine o'clock each morning nearly a hundred men and women met to pray for the speakers, the audience, and the program of the day. The result was, that speakers came to the platform unusually conscious of the power and presence of the Spirit.

Since the Convention was meeting on the 1900th Anniversary of Pentecost, special emphasis was placed upon that fact. The Convention theme was "The Ministry of the Holy Spirit." Said Dr. C. G. Trumbull, Editor of the *Sunday School Times* in the July 5th issue of that paper: "If our faith did not dare to reach after the wondrous blessings so plentifully given, God's faithfulness did. Anniversaries may, of course, be perfunctory, or superficial, or even superstitious in their observance, but God did not let this occur at Los Angeles. As the days went on, and we returned every night to our homes or hotels bowed down with awe and gratitude before the manifested presence of God, we found ourselves asking why there should be such great blessing; and then we remembered—if for the moment we were forgetting it—that it *was* Pentecost's Nineteen Hundredth Anniversary; and why should not the Holy Spirit honor in a notable way the longing and prayer of vast multitudes of His people throughout the world?"

In a notable address regarding the Holy Spirit, the Rev. W. P. White, D.D., Dean of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, included the following striking and timely words: "Before the Day of Pentecost our Lord told His disciples to tarry in the city of Jerusalem, waiting there for the promise of the Father. It was the only time our Lord ever told his disciples to tarry, and Jerusalem was the only place where they were to tarry. It is a great mistake, it is an insult to the Holy Ghost, to tarry for Him now. The Holy Ghost is *here*. He came on the Day of Pentecost and He never went away. . . . Do not pray for *more* of the Holy Spirit. Pray that the Holy Spirit may have *all* of you."

The following resolution was adopted unanimously by the Convention: "The Convention expresses its grateful appreciation of the contribution made by the President of the Association, the Rev. Paul W. Rood, in the building of the convention program and in the important spiritual themes and topics covered. In view of the fact that there is always danger, in a movement of this sort, of merely intellectual orthodoxy which touches the head rather than the heart, the convention records its grateful conviction that all the meetings have been characterized by the Holy Spirit's presence and power, the vital need of Fundamental living as well as Fundamental speaking. The convention further expresses its prayerful hope that the Fundamentals Association may always sound the note of personal devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ in full surrender and faith, the need of feeding on the Word and the life of prayer, and the service of personal and public evangelism at home and abroad."

The Rev. L. D. Keyser, D.D., professor in Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College, gave three addresses upon: Why Every One Must Be Born of the Spirit, The Holy Spirit and the Bible, and The Holy Spirit in the Trinity.

Addresses concerning the Jews as God's ancient covenant people were made by the Rev. David L. Cooper, and the Rev. Mr. Vaus. After they had spoken, the following resolution was adopted: "The convention expresses its appreciation of the unusually valuable addresses on God's plans and purposes for Israel, 'to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever' (Rom. 9:4, 5). The convention calls upon Christian people everywhere to unite in thanking God for the manifest stirring of the dry bones of Israel, and to pray for God's guidance in the remarkable plans now being formulated by the Jews for the re-assembling of the Great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem to review the historical facts entering into the earthly trial and crucifixion of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to pray also that God may use this movement to open the eyes of many of Christ's brethren after the flesh to look upon Him 'whom they have pierced' and receive Him as their Messiah."

One of the striking features was the strong note sounded by representative laymen. Mr. Charles L. Huston, of Coatesville, Pa., spoke on "When the Fire Falls;" Mr. Wm. H. Ridgway, also of Coatesville, Pa., on "Busy Men's Corner;" Mr. Henry West of Portland, Oregon, on "The Layman and Evangelism;" and Mr. Almin Swanson, of Tacoma, Washington, on "The Layman and Fundamentalism."

Dr. Paul M. Kanamori, the great Japanese evangelist, spoke before a session of the Convention on "The Triumph of Fundamentalism in Japan." He told of his desire that God would give him a million souls for Christ in Japan, and the convention was deeply stirred.

Addresses were given by the Rev. P. W. Philpott, D.D., Minister of the Church of Open Door, who spoke on the text: "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth;" and by the Rev. W. B. Riley, D.D., Minister of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis, Minnesota, who delivered upon the closing day a great address upon the history of the Christian Church's fight for her existence from the beginning until now.

Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, President of Wheaton College, arranged a day set apart for Christian Education. Dr. Buswell pleaded that educational standards be kept high and raised even higher. He had recently sent out a questionnaire to Bible Schools, Institutes, Christian Colleges and other institutions of learning. He estimated that there were approximately two hundred such institutions that desired to be put down as fundamentalist.

Several schools had sent delegates to the Education day. Among them were: Omaha Bible Institute, Omaha, Nebraska; Missionary Training Institute, Nyack, New York; Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary, Los Angeles; Wittenberg College and Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; Houghton College, Houghton, New York; Beulah College, near Los Angeles; Training School, Wheaton, Ill.; Columbia Bible College, Columbia, South Carolina; the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, and the Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Texas.

A period was set apart for the discussion of "The Holy Spirit and the Children,"—Sunday School day. Emphasis was placed on giving the children the one true Gospel, and on the training of Spirit led teachers for this essential task. Dr. Trumbull's address on "What Makes a Spirit-filled Sunday School" had a profound effect upon the delegates.

The Convention adopted a "Three-year World-Wide Program, 1930-1933," as an evidence of the fact that the Association, while it protests against Modernism, is more than a protest, and has a constructive mission:

1. Unite evangelical believers throughout the world on a cooperative basis.

2. Coordinate evangelical movement, periodicals, schools and faith missions.

3. Call believers throughout the world to a night of prayer on the last night of the year.

4. Pray for a world-wide revival in the Body of Christ.

5. Instigate an aggressive, forward movement on the part of evangelicals to evangelize the world as quickly as possible.

6. Conduct a world-wide crusade touching every continent during the three-year period.

7. Conduct Bible Conferences and Evangelistic Campaigns in every continent.

8. Place the Gospel of John in every home of the nation.

9. Evangelize and indoctrinate the children of the world through summer Bible schools, Bible camps, and Bible classes.

10. Continue the work of preparing textbooks on scientific subjects.

11. Utilize the radio whenever possible in the work of evangelization and Bible teaching.

12. Prepare articles contending for the faith, for the secular press.

13. Organize a State Fundamentalist Organization in every State in the Union.

14. Conduct a World-Bible Conference and Revival Campaign in Chicago during the World's Fair in 1933.

At the business session, the Rev. Paul Rood, of Turlock, California, was reelected President, and the Convention was adjourned to meet in Philadelphia in the Spring of 1931.

The Doctrinal statement of the Fundamentals Association is as follows:

1. We believe in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as verbally inspired of God, and inerrant in the original writings, and that they are of supreme and final authority in faith and life.

2. We believe in one God, eternally existing in three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

3. We believe that Jesus Christ was begotten by the Holy Spirit, and born of the Virgin Mary, and is true God and true man.

4. We believe that man was created in the image of God, that he sinned and thereby incurred not only physical death but also that spiritual death which is separation from God; and that all human things are born with a sinful nature, and, in the case of those who reach moral responsibility, become sinners in thought, word, and deed.

5. We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, as a representative and substitutionary sacrifice; and that all that believe in Him are justified on the ground of His shed blood.

6. We believe in the resurrection of the crucified body of our Lord, in His ascension into Heaven, and in His present life there for us, as High Priest and Advocate.

7. We believe in "that blessed hope," the personal, premillennial and imminent return of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

8. We believe that all who receive by faith the Lord Jesus Christ are born again of the Holy Spirit and thereby become children of God.

9. We believe in the bodily resurrection of the just and the unjust, the everlasting felicity of the saved and the everlasting, conscious suffering of the lost.

## The Barnhouse Cases

ON June 27th the Synod of Pennsylvania of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. received the decision and judgment of its special judicial commission concerning two complaints against the Presbytery of Philadelphia dealing with matters affecting the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse, Minister of the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. By a unanimous judgment the commission upheld the complainants, and enjoined the Presbytery to conform its actions to its findings. Acting under its standing rules, the Synod received and accepted the judgment without debate.

The two complaints against the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, while both affecting Mr. Barnhouse, deal with separate issues. Some who support Mr. Barnhouse on one issue oppose him on the other.

### The First "Barnhouse Case"

The first complaint was against the action of the Presbytery for not bringing Mr. Barnhouse to trial for alleged slanders of fellow Ministers, including imputations of unorthodoxy. When the charges were first made, they were referred to a committee of Presbytery, which, after hearing the evidence in the case, recommended that no action be taken. When this report was presented to Presbytery, the matter was debated on the floor, with the result that the whole matter was recommitted to a judicial committee. After an exhaustive study of the whole matter, and after having heard witnesses, the judicial committee presented a majority report to Presbytery, recommending that no judicial action be instituted. A minority report was also filed, which recommended that the Presbytery proceed to the trial of Mr. Barnhouse, on the ground that the evidence presented made out a *prima facie* case. Presbytery, after warm debate, adopted, by a majority vote, the majority report of the judicial committee. Thereupon Mr. Barnhouse publicly expressed his sorrow that any words of his had injured anyone, and assured them that he had never intended hurt to his fellow Ministers.

The minority party in the Presbytery, however, not being satisfied, complained formally to the Synod of Pennsylvania that Presbytery had abused its discretionary power, and that it should have brought Mr. Barnhouse to trial.

In rendering its decision, the judicial commission of Synod upheld the complainants at every point. A portion of the judgment is as follows:

"The Presbytery of Philadelphia exercised its discretionary powers unwisely in declining to initiate judiciary investigation of certain evidence submitted to it which alleges that the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse violated his ordination vows.

"The Presbytery of Philadelphia permitted attacks upon its integrity and orthodoxy to remain unchallenged in declining to initiate a judicial investigation.

"The records of the case warrant the contention of the minority report of the commission that prosecution should be initiated by Presbytery, upon which body the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America places such responsibility.

"The Presbytery of Philadelphia, in declining to initiate proceedings against the Rev. Donald Grey 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 described in the Book of Discipline.

"The complaint is unanimously sustained, and the Presbytery of Philadelphia is hereby directed to appoint a committee to formulate charges and specifications on the basis of evidence submitted by the complainants; elect a judicial commission; proceed to the trial of Dr. Barnhouse in the manner of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in accordance with all the provisions in the Book of Discipline."

By the terms of this judgment, the Presbytery of Philadelphia will try Mr. Barnhouse during the coming fall and winter. The next meeting of Presbytery is scheduled for September 15th. At that meeting the most that can be done will be the appointment of a committee to draw up charges and specifications as directed by the higher court. A judicial commission can not properly be appointed by Presbytery until it has the charges actually before it for determination. It is freely anticipated that, whatever the judgment of the judicial commission may be, the case will eventually reach the General Assembly. Mr. Barnhouse's friends state that the charges against him are made because of his conservatism, but this is denied by those who have complained against his alleged utterances.

### The Second "Barnhouse Case"

The other case regarding Mr. Barnhouse was referred to in our May issue, under the caption The "Barnhouse Case."

The Sunday services in the Tenth Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia are held mornings and afternoons. Consequently, Mr. Barnhouse is free on Sunday evenings. The Christian Business Men's League, an organization of laymen residing in and around Philadelphia, desired to hold evangelistic services on Sunday evenings in various theatres (all theatres being closed as places of amusement in Pennsylvania on Sundays), for the avowed purpose of bringing the gospel to those who would not attend a regular church. They secured the Tower theatre, in what is known as "Upper Darby," a rapidly growing suburb outside the city limits of Philadelphia. Upon their invitation Mr. Barnhouse took up the work of preaching at these services. Almost from the first large audiences were gathered. Then it became known that Ministers of various denominations in charge of churches in that general region felt that the services in the Tower theatre were hurting their own regular work and attendance. A ministerial group of the section wrote a letter to the Presbytery of Philadelphia, which

was read by that body on April 7th. Opponents of Mr. Barnhouse declared that as a matter of comity the services should cease. Those who favored the continuance of the services argued that they were only temporary, that people came to them from all over the city of Philadelphia and its suburbs, and that to prohibit Mr. Barnhouse from preaching there was to limit his freedom as a Minister to preach the gospel. Presbytery, on that day, however, inclined to the view of the complainants, and the following resolution was adopted:

"In view of conditions subversive of the best interests of the Kingdom of Christ, which have been brought to the attention of many of this Presbytery and clearly stated in a letter from a ministerial group in the 69th Street Section, . . . this Presbytery hereby directs the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse immediately to cease conducting these meetings in the Tower Theatre or in any other place in the neighborhood, without the approval of the ministry of the community."

On May 5th, as reported in the May issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, the Presbytery rescinded this action in adopting a resolution offered by the Rev. W. P. Fulton, D.D. It was printed in full in our original report. The last three paragraphs are as follows:

"And, WHEREAS, the letter from the ministerial group, above referred to, has no ecclesiastical standing in this Presbytery but should have been returned to said ministerial group and not made a part of Presbytery's records, as it is now,

"And, WHEREAS, the action of Presbytery in 'directing Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse immediately to cease conducting meetings in the Tower Theatre or in any other place in the neighborhood, without the approval of the ministry of the community,' is an unwarranted restraint upon the rights and liberties of a brother minister of this Presbytery, who is in good and regular standing, and, if said action is permitted to remain on our records, it will establish a precedent for future action that would curtail the rights and liberties of ministers and elders of this Presbytery, diminish evangelistic effort in all places, except in regularly established churches, without the approval of the community,

"Therefore, be it RESOLVED, that Presbytery rescind its action of April 7th, 1930, relating to this whole matter and instruct the Stated Clerk to expunge all reference to it from the records of Presbytery."

Immediately, notice of complaint was given, and within the period allowed by the law of the Church a complaint was filed signed by more than one-third of those voting, which served as an automatic stay of the action of Presbytery. Upon the complaint being placed before the judicial commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania, the action of Philadelphia Presbytery was reversed, but for a reason that had not been brought out with any definiteness in the Presbytery. Upper Darby, where the Tower Theatre is located, happens to be outside the bounds of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. It is the law of the Church that no Minister may labor within the bounds of another Presbytery without the consent of that Presbytery. The commission therefore held that the services could not be held in Upper Darby without the consent of the Presbytery of Chester, which has jurisdiction. As nearly as can be ascertained the commission did not decide the case upon any other ground. It is therefore presumed generally that if Mr. Barnhouse asks for and secures the permission of the Presbytery of Chester, he will be allowed to continue his services at the Tower Theatre in the autumn.

## CANADA

### "The Saltsprings Case"

ON June 23rd, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the highest court in the British world, delivered judgment in the first case to come before it relating to the disruption in the Presbyterian Church in Canada consequent to the attempted "Union" of 1925. The case, officially known as "The Trustees of St. Luke's Church v. Cameron," arose in the country community of Saltsprings, in Nova Scotia. Prior to the forcing through of the so-called union of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches in Canada, those who favored organic union (popularly referred to as "unionists") came to the Federal Parliament for an act incorporating the "United Church of Canada." Provincial acts were also sought and received. The Nova Scotia act was actually passed before the passage of the Dominion-wide act. Both acts contained a provision to the effect that if any congregation did not wish to enter the proposed amalgamation of the churches, it could, by a majority vote at a meeting properly called, vote "not to concur." It was proposed by the "unionists" to the Parliament of Nova Scotia, and to the Parliament of Canada as a whole, that a clause be embodied in the Acts providing that any congregation might at any future time leave the "Continuing Presbyterian Church" (as they usually called it) and enter the United Church. In this way it was planned that the Presbyterians who would not enter the "union" would always be subject to "raids" on the part of the United Church by which the latter might induce some congregations to switch from one church to the other. No provision was made for congregations being able to leave the United Church and return to the Presbyterian Church. (Later, when two Italian Congregations in Montreal *did* decide to leave the United Church and were received back into the Presbyterian Church entirely without solicitation, the United Church entered legal action and deprived them of all their property.) In both the Provincial and Federal Parliaments the United Church acts were bitterly fought, and only passed after a great deal of lobbying and pressure on the part of United Church advocates. In the Nova Scotia act the provision to allow a second and other votes was retained, but at Ottawa the Federal act was only passed after the clause had been stricken from the bill.

The congregation at Saltsprings held a meeting in December of 1924, as provided by legislation, and voted not to concur in the "union." After this, the Minister, who favored "union," resigned, and the Presbytery of Pictou of the Presbyterian Church in Canada as it existed before the disruption, appointed the Rev. Robert Johnston, D.D., then of New Glasgow, now of Ottawa, as Interim Moderator of the Session. Following June 10th, 1925, and the reorganization of the Presbytery of Pictou by those who remained loyal to the Church, the former appointment of Dr. Johnston was confirmed, and he was instructed to supply the congregation with ordinances.

In the meantime, those who had voted in favor of "union" remained in the congregation, as they had every right to do. But instead of allowing the Church and community to remain at peace, United Church partisans from outside began an agitation for a "second vote" (an agitation not confined to this congregation alone) under the Nova Scotia act. All the elders favored the United Church, and aided and advised by "unionists" from without, prepared a notice calling for a meeting for the purpose of entering the United Church. Attempts were made to have this notice read from the pulpit, but as the Interim Moderator of the Session had not been consulted, and as no meeting of the Session could legally be held without him, Dr. Johnston prevented the reading of the notice from the pulpit. It was read, however, in an irregular manner from the choir stalls, once by a Minister and once by an elder. The "meeting" thus irregularly called was attended by "unionist" partizans only, and the vote cast was unanimous in favor of entering the United Church. Subsequently the United Church occupied the church edifice, prevented the Presbyterian student from preaching, and locked the church doors against all Presbyterian services. An action at law was instituted by those who felt that they had been unjustly and illegally deprived of their church. At the trial the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, trying the case without a jury, decided the issue in favor of the United Church. Upon appeal to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia the judgment of the Chief Justice was reversed. The case, of course, rested upon the validity or invalidity of the "second vote," which in turn rested upon whether the meeting had been regularly called. The Supreme Court of Nova Scotia decided, in March 1927, that the meeting was not regularly called, and that the vote was invalid. Strangely enough, however, the court called for a *third* vote, to be held under its own direction. Two appeals were at once entered, the "unionists" appealing from the main judgment, and the Presbyterians entering a cross-appeal against the order of the court for a third vote, on the ground that the civil courts have no right to order the courts of the Church to do anything unless the latter are under a

duty to do so laid down by the law of the Church. In February of 1929, the Supreme Court of Canada delivered judgment, and by a four to one vote confirmed the Presbyterian position in every particular. It decided that the Saltsprings congregation was still outside the United Church; that the "second vote" was null and void; that St. Luke's congregation was still a Presbyterian congregation, bound by "The Rules and Forms of Procedure of the Presbyterian Church in Canada;" and that the provision in the Nova Scotia act allowing a second vote contradicted the Federal act and was therefore also null and void. It overruled the Nova Scotia judgment ordering a "third vote." This was everywhere regarded as a stunning defeat for the United Church. It was pointed out that if the Saltsprings congregation was subject to the "Rules and Forms of Procedure of the Presbyterian Church in Canada" (commonly known as the "Blue Book"), then the Church therein named must be regarded as existing, and as being subject to those rules. To the United Church claim that "The Presbyterian Church in Canada" existed only within the United Church, and that Presbyterians had no right to use that name, it was pointed out that the United Church, having changed its rules and forms, so that they are no longer Presbyterian, was not the "Presbyterian Church in Canada" to whose rules and forms the Supreme Court had referred. The "unionists" had always told non-concurring congregations that they would lose their "ecclesiastical color" by not entering the United Church, and be only isolated congregations, hence not Presbyterian. But the Court declared them still to be a Presbyterian congregation. No outside power or law could take away their Presbyterian convictions or standing without their consent.

Shortly after the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, the United Church was granted leave to appeal the case to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in London. As above noted, the decision of the "Law Lords" was delivered on June 23rd last. In an apparently unanimous judgment, their Lordships affirmed the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada. They expressed themselves as in general agreement with the Chief Justice of Canada, and were unable to accept the appellants' arguments "notwithstanding the powerful assistance they derive from the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Duff."

The Presbyterians thus retain the Saltsprings Church and Manse, but more important, certain great Presbyterian principles have been vindicated despite the forecast of "unionists" that their United Church of Canada Act was "Lawproof." The judgment is also regarded as a personal vindication of Dr. Robert Johnston of Ottawa, and as being in no small measure due to the unfailing industry and skill of the Rev. Frank Baird, D.D., of Pictou, Nova Scotia. Dr. Baird, who was Moderator of the recent General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, has had the responsibility of the case almost from the beginning.

## "The Gospel of Jesus"—Concl.

that the basis of the penal substitutionary doctrine of the atonement is Paul's interpretation of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. But why not Jesus' interpretation of this passage? He was familiar with it.—Luke 22: 37. At His baptism Jesus was identified with the Servant of the second half of Isaiah, the Servant in whom Jehovah is well pleased. Present-day students of the Messianic consciousness freely acknowledge that the Isaianic Servant is one of the most prominent elements therein; the English scholars generally make it the dominant strain. Jesus is represented in Luke as inaugurating His ministry at Nazareth with the declaration that the Isaianic proclamation was fulfilled in Himself. There are references to the same Isaianic terms in His answer to John as given in the synoptists. But, in addition to this general supposition that in identifying Himself with the Isaianic Servant He identified His work with the substitutionary work of the Servant in the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, there is the definite statement in the first two gospels that Jesus did so construe His death, in phraseology in which there is clearcut reminiscence of the 53rd chapter of Isaiah. It is true that liberals have tried to draw the fuse from this text and cast it aside as an empty shell, solely because it does not fit their theses. Schweitzer reminds them that it is more critical (therefore more modern) either to take it or leave it as it stands. Whether or no Jesus fits the liberal mould; His words in the real Gospels are: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom instead of the many." And the great meaning of that text has been reaffirmed by well nigh two millenniums of disciples since, as in obedience to His command recorded four times in the New Testament, they have taken the bread and drunk the cup remembering His words "my blood of the new covenant shed for many for the remission of sins."

Yours for the true Gospel of Jesus Christ, the only hope and refuge for the estranged sinner; God's great work done for the sinner once for all. But may He who did this work for us deliver us from a man-made, man-marred so-called "gospel of Jesus" which proves to be only a counsel of despair.

## Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas—Concl.

Jerusalem. He did not know God, but God knew him and made him an effective instrument for good. It may well be that through Gandhi, God is breaking down the barriers of prejudice, hatred, suspicion and contempt which the Hindu raises against Christianity. He who makes even the wrath of man to praise Him may be opening a door to India's salvation through Gandhi's life and influence. If the door is opened, let us pray that missionaries who believe the Gospel and can live according to its holy truth, and only they, will be the representatives of Christ in the mission stations of India.

FRANK H. STEVENSON.

## Rights Vs Duties—Concl.

the industrial world alone that this principle offers a solution of our troubles. Everywhere, in the home, in the church, in the club—and where not?—men and women dwell together in peace and happiness and with mutual profit in proportion as they think not only of their own things but also of the things of others.

Here as elsewhere JESUS is our one perfect example. He was not forgetful of His rights or of the recognition due Him. It was in full consciousness of His divine origin and dignity that He performed His task on earth. "JESUS, knowing that the FATHER had given all things into His hands, and that He came forth from GOD, and goeth unto GOD, riseth from supper, and layeth aside His garments; and took a towel and girded Himself"—this text expressed the spirit of His life not only on the night when He washed the feet of His disciples but throughout the whole of His ministry. He had the right to live as one whose rank was that of the SON OF GOD, but for our sake and the world's sake He waived that right and lived as one who came not to be ministered unto but to minister. JESUS is an example not of the weak serving the strong, but of the strong serving the weak; not of the unfit serving the fit, but of the fit serving the unfit; not of one zealous of His rights but of one who voluntarily gave up that glory He had had with the FATHER, before the world was, and took upon Him the form of a servant that He might save a lost world. And only as men in an increasing measure walk in His footsteps—not in the sense of doing more than their duty, as did JESUS, but in the sense of doing their duty more adequately—can we hope that peace and contentment with justice and righteousness will prevail on the earth. An outstanding need of this age, as of every age, is men who are more concerned about performing their duties than they are about maintaining their rights.

## Book Service

As a convenience to our readers, we have arranged that books reviewed or mentioned in these columns may be ordered through Mr. H. Trumbull Howard, 401 W. Durham Road, Philadelphia, Pa.

## Westminster Seminary News

ALTHOUGH there are no classes in session during the summer, the temporary building of Westminster Seminary is the scene of activity.

To further more efficient operation in the fall a number of changes are being made in the structural lay-out of the building. Three new classrooms are being prepared on the third floor. They will provide ample space for an increase in both the number and the size of the classes. The introduction of post-graduate work this year makes the additional rooms a necessity.

The library has grown this year, largely through the generous and well-selected gifts of friends of the institution, and partially through necessary purchases. Its volumes demand more shelf-room. The number of students in the institution also calls for an increase in available study and reading space in the library, and a new room, which is immediately adjacent to the present library and stacks, will meet both of these needs. It is excellently lighted, two sides being largely given up to windows. The whole library will be available for use from early in the morning until ten o'clock in the evening.

The Faculty of the Seminary is offering congratulations to one of its members, the Rev. R. B. Kuiper, A.M., B.D., on his election as president of Calvin College. Professor Kuiper has been a strength to Westminster during the past year in his capacity of professor of Systematic Theology, and his genial personality has been a blessing and delight. We regret to see him go, but are glad that his new position will but bind more closely together in warm and friendly relationships Calvin College and Westminster Theological Seminary. As the principal educational institution of the Christian Reformed Church in North America, Calvin College is increasingly important and useful in the sphere of truly Christian education in this country.

Professor Kuiper's resignation takes effect August 31st. To fill the vacancy thus created the Trustees announce that they have appointed to conduct the work of the department of Systematic Theology, John Murray, M.A., Th.M. He is thirty-one years old, a Scotsman, a soldier of the Great War, a man of fine theological education. In 1917-18 he was in the famous Black Watch battalion of Scottish Highlanders, fighting on the Somme in France, and he still bears some of the scars of war upon him. In 1923 he graduated from the University of Glasgow with the degree of M.A. During 1924 he was tutored for the gospel ministry by a Minister of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland. In 1927 he graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary with the degrees of Bachelor of Theology and Master of Theology. As holder of the Gelston-Winthrop fellowship in Systematic Theology from Princeton he continued his studies for two more years at the University of Edinburgh. In 1929 he was called back to Princeton Theological Seminary as instructor in Theology. His teaching at Princeton has been eminently successful. Mr. Murray found himself, however, quite unable to approve the course of events at Princeton and declined reappointment. God has prepared him for a great work, and we look forward to welcoming him this fall at Westminster Seminary.

> We invite and urge all our readers who desire to extend the scope and ministry of "CHRISTIANITY TODAY" to send us names and addresses of sympathetic persons to whom a sample copy might profitably be sent.

Inquiries from new men, who have not formerly been enrolled at Westminster, continue to reach the Registrar's office. The volume of these inquiries indicates continued interest, constantly growing. From them come the registrations for the entering class this autumn. They come from men whose academic training has been secured in institutions separated by thousands of miles. To date the largest number of registrations for next year's junior class have come from graduates of Wheaton College, and it seems possible that Wheaton will bear away the honors for this year.

Registrations are also coming in from men who have already completed part of their theological training and who will enter the middle or senior classes this year.

In view of the comfortable quarters which they furnished last year, rooms for students will be secured again this year at the Gladstone Hotel. Further arrangements are being made, however, so that sections of the hotel will resemble a Westminster dormitory. It is anticipated that the number of single rooms will be increased. The steward of the dining-club, Mr. R. H. McIlwaine, is engaged during the summer in home mission work in the state of Montana, but his thoughts are frequently on the provision for an enlarged and improved club for the coming year.

Graduates of the Seminary from the class of 1930 are busily engaged in entering upon their new fields of labor. One of them expects to sail for China, under the China Inland Mission, this autumn. Another, in spite of many opportunities in this country, has accepted a call to a church in a community in the Province of New Brunswick, Canada, whose people he knows, loves and wishes to serve. The other members of the graduating class are all accepting pastorates in this country. Our only regret at Westminster is that the graduating class was not larger, as several definite and distinct calls for Westminster graduates have come in to the Registrar's office, and there were no more men available to fill them. It is our earnest hope that the student body may increase in size with sufficient rapidity to provide a Westminster graduate for every church that longs for a preacher who proclaims the Word and the gospel in its fulness and in sincerity and truth.

The last month has seen the addition to the permanent endowment funds of the Seminary of a memorial gift of $5,000, from a member of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, sent through Dr. C. E. Macartney. The income from this gift is to be devoted to scholarship purposes, assisting men to secure the needed training who otherwise would be unable to prepare themselves for the ministry. Such funds are particularly necessary in connection with a theological institution, for recent statistical studies have indicated that ministerial students usually come from homes of much less average wealth than students in medical and law schools. This is partially due, of course, to the fact that a Minister's son is often found following in his father's footsteps, strange as this may seem to those who believe the opposite to be usually the case.

During the past thirty days the Board of Trustees has received pledges and cash amounting to $32,774 and tentative pledges for $3,600.00 for the expenses of the Seminary for the approaching academic year. This is approximately one-half of the required amount, and indicates the loyalty of many men and women to our great cause. It would be advantageous if the friends of Westminster, who are willing and able to contribute to the 1930-1931 budget, or whose churches are willing to help, would advise the Seminary office, 1528 Pine Street, Philadelphia, with reference to the assistance which they expect to be able to render, even though it is not possible to make any cash payment at the moment. It would be fine if the immediate needs of the Seminary for the coming year could be provided for during the summer and every anxiety lifted.

Professor Machen's preaching appointments this summer include the Tioga Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, the South Presbyterian Church of Syracuse, the Broadway Presbyterian Church of New York, the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh and the Memorial Presbyterian Church of St. Louis.

Professor Van Til's appointments include the Church of the Covenant, Bala-Cynwyd, and the Young People's Conference of Chester Presbytery.

As observed in the editorial note concerning Dr. R. Dick Wilson, in the Mid-June issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, a great deal of attention is being attracted in the scholarly world by the efforts of Drs. H. H. Rowley and R. H. Charles, to combat Dr. Wilson's refutations of certain contentions of the late Canon Driver concerning the book of Daniel. It is reported that Dr. Wilson is hard at work this summer on a paper that will effectually refute the latest arguments of these critics and give fresh evidence of the genuineness of the book of Daniel.

BENJ F. EMERY CO., PHILA.