# CHRISTIANITY TODAY

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

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

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

MID-JUNE, 1930
Vol. 1 No. 2

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# What is Christianity?

IT may seem strange that in this year of our Lord, 1930, men should be discussing the question, What is Christianity? But whether it be strange or not, the question is being everywhere debated and the most divergent answers given, and passionately defended, even by those calling themselves Christians. Nothing in fact is doing more to render matters "confused and confusing" in the sphere of religious discussion at the present time than the fact that those who are carrying on the discussion have radically different notions of what Christianity is. When the doctors disagree—men of equal ability and sincerity it may be—what is the plain man to do? Many will agree when a modern scholar says: "I can imagine a man exclaiming, in no flippant spirit, that it is more difficult to discover what Christianity is than to believe it when it is discovered."

Some define Christianity as "the religion of JESUS," meaning the religion that JESUS Himself taught and practiced, and so look upon JESUS as little more than the first Christian. Others think it little short of blasphemy to speak of JESUS as a Christian at all, as such a mode of speech erases the distinction between the Saviour and the saved, between the Lord and His followers; and so define Christianity rather as the religion that has JESUS as its object. Some identify Christianity with loyalty to a cause or ideal, some with altruism, some with CHRIST-like morality, some with man's religious and ethical life at its highest. We hear of a Christianity without miracles, without doctrines, even of a Christianity without CHRIST—and, as though nothing was too extreme to lack advocates, of a Christianity without GOD. Moreover Christian Science and New Thought and Theosophy and Russellism and Mormonism and Spiritualism—and what not?—either call themselves Christianity or claim to include its essential values. Surely if everything that is called Christianity today is rightly so-called it must be confessed that the word, "Christianity," is a meaningless word, a word into which we can pour whatever content may suit our convenience.

The seriousness of the situation is greatly enhanced by the fact that divergent answers to our question are being given within as well as without the churches. It would be natural to expect that in the pulpits of professedly Christian churches and in the class-rooms of professedly Christian schools of learning essentially the same answer would be given to this question. Such is not the case. The situation is rendered even more serious by reason of the amazing ignorance that exists among the rank and file of the Church. In no respect has the modern Church failed more signally than in the exercise of its teaching function. As a result there are multitudes in the pews unable to discriminate between true Christianity and Christianity falsely so-called. Do we need to look further to account for the fact that so many members of Christian churches fall easy victims to every popular expounder of a new Ism, provided it is labeled with the Christian name? The saddest phase of the matter is that multitudes are embracing systems of thought and life that lack everything distinctive of genuine Christianity, that in fact are positively hostile to all that is distinctive of such Christianity, while cherishing the delusion that they are Christianity's purest confessors and exemplars and as such its heirs and beneficiaries.

We are not indeed to suppose that our age is the only age that has debated this question. In the nature of the case it takes precedence of all others whenever Christianity becomes a subject of discussion. Such questions as, Is Christianity true? What is the value of Christianity? What are its claims on our belief and acceptance? are meaningless until we know what Christianity is. Christianity may or may not be true; how can we judge until we know what it is? It may be worthless or beyond price; how can we

## IN THIS ISSUE:


The Study and Defense of the Bible in Westminster Seminary ..... 5
R. Dick Wilson

The Concentrated Life ..... 6
H. H. MacQuilkin

If One Resorts to Ordinary Logic ..... 9
Gertrude Smith

Books of Religious Significance:
What is Hell? ..... 11
Humanism ..... 12

Voices from Many Quarters (Second Series) ..... 14

General Assemblies:
Pres. Church U. S. A. ..... 17
Pres. Church in Canada ..... 22
Pres. Church in U. S. ..... 23
United Pres. Church ..... 23

An Important Appeal ..... 24

appraise its value until we know the thing that is to be appraised? It may or may not be entitled to our belief and acceptance; how can we decide until we know what sort of thing it is? Whenever Christianity has been discussed, therefore, this question has been central. This was the question at issue in the first century between PAUL and the Judaizers, in the fifth century between AUGUSTINE and PELAGIUS, in the sixteenth century between the Reformers and the Romanists, in the eighteenth century between the Evangelicals and the Deists. There is this significant difference, however, in the situation in the twentieth century as compared with previous centuries, at least if we except the conflict between Christianity and heathenism in the first three centuries. In previous centuries the issue was, for the most part at least, between more or less perfect and more or less imperfect answers to our question. Today, however, the issue is between answers that involve the very right of Christianity, as it has all but universally been understood, to exist.

It is often assumed, especially by popular writers and the less responsible advocates of Church union, that we can obtain a sufficiently exact answer to our question by ascertaining what is held in common by those professing and calling themselves Christians, what is held in common being regarded as essential and what is held in distinction being regarded as non-essential. Suppose, however, that among those who profess and call themselves Christians there are some who are not Christians at all. Then what is held in common would include nothing distinctively Christian and the answer obtained radically false. But even if all those who profess and call themselves Christians were really Christians, such a method would at the 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. Otherwise the most attenuated forms of Christianity of which we have any knowledge would be excluded. Suppose we are asked the question, What is a man? Would it be sufficient to include in our answer only what all men have in common? If so, our definition of a man would fully apply only to the poorest, meanest, least developed specimen of a man that exists. Otherwise there would be something in our definition that all men do not possess. Surely when we ask, What is a man? we want to know what constitutes a normal representative man. And surely when we ask, What is Christianity? what we want to know is not what is the most attenuated, contentless form of thought that can possibly be called Christianity but what constitutes typical, representative Christianity. We may learn much by questioning those who call themselves Christians, but we need only remind ourselves of that diversity of belief that exists among professed Christians to perceive how impossible it is by such a method alone to obtain anything like a satisfactory answer to our question.

In seeking an answer to our question, it is of first importance that we realize that it is an historical question, and that history and history alone can supply us with the right answer. Our question does not differ in kind from the question, What is Darwinism? In answering the question, What is Darwinism? much help may be obtained from the writings of DARWIN's disciples, but unless there is constant reference to the writings of DARWIN himself we may find at the end of the day that we have substituted what is merely called Darwinism for what is really Darwinism. And so in answering the question, What is Christianity? unless there is constant reference to the New Testament, in which alone the beliefs which are specifically Christian are authoritatively set forth, we may end by substituting in greater or less degree what is merely called Christianity for what is really Christianity. Only as we realize that Christianity is an "historical" or "positive" or "founded" religion that had a definite beginning in the life, teaching and work of a particular historic person, and so derive our conception of what Christianity is from the teachings of CHRIST and His apostles, will we arrive at results that will enable us to say to what extent the things called Christianity today are real Christianity and to what extent they are Christianity falsely so-called.

There is special need, perhaps, to point out that the question, What is Christianity? is not to be confused with the rational question, What is true? or with the ethical question, What is moral? or with the practical question, What is valuable? When men argue that certain doctrines are not truly Christian because they are irrational or immoral or worthless, they are forgetting that history and history alone can decide what doctrines are truly Christian. Christianity may be as false as some suppose, as worthless as others suppose, as harmful as still others suppose; but what has that to do with the question as to what manner of thing it is? We have no more right to approach the question, What is Christianity? with the assumption that it is the rational, moral and ideal religion than we have to approach the question, What is Mohammedanism? with the same assumption. We may or may not agree with those who think that the time has come to abandon the religion founded by JESUS CHRIST and practiced ever since by His disciples, and substitute something better for it, but at any rate we can discover what is truly Christian, what is legitimately called Christianity, only by an appeal to history, more particularly to that period of history that is recorded in the New Testament. This is not to say that nothing is to be learned from the later historical manifestations of Christianity. ATHANASIUS and AUGUSTINE and ANSELM and LUTHER and CALVIN, not to mention others, have not labored in vain. But it is to say that everything that is essential to Christianity must be able to present New Testament credentials.

It is true, of course, that even those who recognize that the question, What is Christianity? is an historical question, the authoritative answer to which is found in the Bible and the Bible alone, do not altogether agree in the answer they give to the question. Lutherans, Calvinists and Arminians give answers that differ in important respects. The time is past, however, when Unitarians and such like can claim that their peculiar views are taught in the Bible, true as it is that the older Unitarians so claimed. Now it is all but universally recognized that the Bible is on the side of orthodoxy as expressed in the great historic creeds. Everywhere it is confessed that according to the Bible Christianity is that specific religion that had its origin, and that

has its continuance, in the person and work of JESUS CHRIST, He being conceived of after so exalted, so supernatural a fashion that He is placed side by side with GOD as a proper object of worship; more particularly that redemptive religion that brings to man salvation from sin, felt as guilt and power and pollution, through the expiatory death of JESUS CHRIST, for eternity as well as for time—a religion, therefore, that is confessedly through and through supernatural not only as regards what happened some two thousand years ago but as regards what happens in human hearts today and as regards what is yet to happen in the days to come.

But while modern scholars of diverse types freely admit that the Christianity set forth in the Bible is the kind of religion that has been indicated, and that such is the meaning that it has all but universally had for its adherents, it is well known that this is not the conception of Christianity that prevails among "liberal" scholars. In order to maintain that genuine Christianity is other than what we have indicated, however, they are compelled to maintain that the Church has all but universally been mistaken as to what true Christianity is. What they assert is in brief, that Christianity was no sooner established than it departed from type, that "the religion of JESUS" almost immediately after His death was transformed, refashioned, made over, under the influence of the beliefs of His earliest followers, that a little later it was still further modified by the theological constructions of PAUL; so that it is with Paulinism rather than Christianity with which Church history for the most part concerns itself since it is only recently, thanks to modern research, that true Christianity has been recovered, dug out as it were from the debris that had covered it for some 1800 years. We are confident, however, that a sounder scholarship has abundantly shown the flimsy basis on which this rewriting of Church history rests. As a matter of fact there is no such line of cleavage between PAUL and the primitive Christians, or between the primitive Christians and JESUS, as these would have us suppose. Not only in the mind of PAUL but in the minds of the primitive Christians, and not only in the minds of the primitive Christians but in the mind of JESUS himself, Christianity is a religion that centers in JESUS CHRIST as the GOD-MAN and in Him as crucified.

We may or may not like such a religion. We may accept it or we may reject it. We may regard it as rational or irrational. We may think it moral or immoral. We may value it as our chief treasure, as that without which we would be utterly undone, or we may regard it as without value or even as a thing to be gotten rid of because positively harmful. But be our judgment of it what it may, it is utterly futile—in the presence of the informed—to deny that as a matter of fact Christianity is the sort of religion we have indicated.

## "Speaking the Truth in Love"

IT is an important but difficult obligation which PAUL lays upon us when he exhorts us to speak the truth in love—important because the truth as revealed in CHRIST is the supreme need of our fellows, but difficult because it is so hard to maintain that healthy union between zeal for sound doctrine and love for others which is necessary on the part of those who would bear effective witness to the gospel of the grace of GOD.

In this exhortation the primary emphasis is on speaking *the truth*. Here the golden words of CALVIN are to the point: "Necessary duties must not be omitted through fear of any offence; as our liberty should be subservient to charity, so charity itself ought to be subservient to the purity of the faith. It becomes us, indeed, to have regard to charity; but we must not offend GOD for the love of our neighbor."

At the same time the emphasis on speaking the truth *in love* is hardly less strong. We must place the emphasis on both nouns if we would rightly grasp the meaning of this exhortation. Love should be the element in which the truth is spoken and speaking the truth should be a manifestation of love. On the one hand we can do our fellows no greater disservice, can no more clearly exhibit our lack of intelligent love for them, than by withholding from them the truth. On the other hand we render them an almost equal disservice, in some instances perhaps an even greater disservice, if we set forth the truth, no matter in how pure a form, in an unloving manner. The history of doctrinal controversy teaches us only too clearly that the truth may be proclaimed in pride and bitterness and hatred rather than in love, to such an extent that it is often uncertain to what extent the world's hatred has been provoked by hatred of the truth itself and to what extent it has been provoked by lovelessness, bitterness and fanaticism on the part of those proclaiming it.

Love itself, provided it be an intelligent love, will sanction no paltering with the truth. It will insist that the truth be proclaimed without fear or favor not only because it is worse to offend GOD than to offend man but because the truth as it is in JESUS (which PAUL had in mind when he penned this maxim) is the supreme need of our fellows, that without a knowledge of which they can have no well-grounded hope either for this life or the life to come. In proportion therefore as we truly love our fellows, and so desire to promote their truest and their highest welfare, we will feel constrained to bear witness to the gospel of the grace of GOD whether men bless or whether men curse. It is equally true, however, that in proportion as we love our fellows there will be lacking in us an egoistic interest in salvation, unconcern and indifference as to whether others share our faith and hope. In fact in proportion as we both rightly value the truth and truly love our fellows will we be able to appreciate those other words of PAUL'S: "I have great sorrow and unceasing pain in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were anathema from CHRIST for my brethren's sake." Such was PAUL'S realization of the indispensableness of the Gospel and such was his concern for the salvation of his "kinsmen according to the flesh" that he would have been willing to sacrifice his own salvation if thereby he could have redeemed his brethren. But while PAUL expressed himself as willing to sacrifice *himself* in the interest of his fellows he never manifested any tendency to sacrifice the *truth* in their interest; and that because love itself, not to mention loyalty to Him whose he was and whom he served, would not allow him to pare down or otherwise weaken his testimony to the gospel of the grace of GOD as made known in JESUS CHRIST.

## The Passing of Professor Harnack

THE death of ADOLPH VON HARNACK on June 10th, at the age of 79, was widely reported in American newspapers under the date of June 11th, as was to be expected in view of the powerful influence he has exerted on religious thinking, in America as well as in Europe, during the last three or four decades.

Professor HARNACK's influence was particularly significant in furthering the interest of the so-called liberal theology with its identification of Christianity with the "religion of JESUS" rather than with the religion that has JESUS as the object of its worship, trust and obedience. According to Professor HARNACK "the Gospel, as JESUS proclaimed it, has to do with the FATHER only and not with the SON." This means that according to HARNACK, JESUS Himself occupies no indispensable place in the Christian religion, any more than CALVIN occupies an indispensable place in Calvinism or WESLEY in Methodism, that the uniqueness of JESUS lies in the fact that He was the first Christian, and that to be a Christian is to hold views concerning God and man and the world similar to those held by JESUS and to manifest in our lives those graces of the SPIRIT that were so conspicuous in Him.

Inasmuch as according to the all but universal belief of the Christian Church, at least until the rise of modern religious liberalism, JESUS occupies an absolutely indispensable place in the Christian religion—He being in fact its present object of worship and the constant source of its vitality—it is obvious that in order to hold that JESUS Himself is not central to the Gospel we must hold that almost the entire historical manifestation of what we call Christianity has to do with something other than the Gospel as JESUS taught it. This is in fact what those who define Christianity as the "religion of JESUS," rather than the "religion that has JESUS as its object," hold. What HARNACK, BOUSSET, WREDE, and their host of followers, assert in this connection has been mentioned in our leading editorial. In addition to what was said there—the "sounder scholarship" to which we there referred is represented by such men as WARFIELD, DENNEY and MACHEN—attention should be directed to the fact that there is today a vigorous revolt against the conclusions of the "liberal theology" even in unorthodox circles (see review of DR. BRUNNER'S *The Theology of Crisis* in our last issue) and that as a result the influence of HARNACK and his school is decidedly on the wane. If reports are well-grounded it is the lecture-rooms of the Barthian rather than those of the Ritschlian theologians which are being crowded by present-day students in Germany.

If we mistake not the death of Professor HARNACK marks not only the passing of a great scholar but the passing of a religious epoch. The epoch to which we refer is that of the dominance of the so-called "religion of JESUS." We do not mean to imply that the "religion of JESUS" movement is dead. It still supplies the main content of countless sermons and popular articles, but Professor HARNACK who did so much to secure for it such wide-spread acceptance lived to see its influence begin to wane. Had he lived another decade we are confident that he would have been conscious of occupying an outgrown point of view. There is something pathetic in the thought of a great scholar having devoted his splendid talents with unwearied energy for more than fifty years in the erecting of a scholastic superstructure that begins to crumble ere he lays down his tools; but that, sooner or later, is the fate that awaits every workman who fails to give adequate recognition to the fact that the Bible is the Word of God, and that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is JESUS CHRIST"—JESUS CHRIST being none other than the GOD-MAN who bore our sins in His own body on the tree.

## The Moderator of the 142nd Assembly

DR. HUGH THOMSON KERR was elected Moderator of the 142nd General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. on the first ballot by the largest vote received by any candidate in recent years. As a presiding officer DR. KERR would be difficult to improve on. He was particularly felicitous in his responses to delegates and others who brought greetings to the Assembly. Throughout he manifested a commendable desire to be just and fair in his rulings and exhibited no tendency whatever to railroad matters through the Assembly. What is more while maintaining the dignity of his high position he kept the Assembly in happy mood by his genial yet always courteous wit. In our judgment he plainly erred when he ruled that the writer was out of order in raising the question whether a signer of the "Auburn Affirmation"—an Affirmation which was an attack on a deliverance of previous Assemblies to the effect that the Virgin Birth of our LORD and four other verities of the Christian faith are essential doctrines of the WORD OF GOD and our Standards—is a proper person to be the editor of the "official magazine" of the Church. But apart from that ruling we have nothing but praise for the manner in which he presided over the Assembly.

In recent years those who have been elected Moderator of the General Assembly have manifested a disposition to look upon themselves as the official spokesman of the Church until their successor is elected. There is no warrant, however, in the Standards of the Presbyterian Church for any Moderator taking himself so seriously. The Assembly having adjourned DR. KERR's work as Moderator is ended except as the General Assembly itself has assigned certain duties to him. His utterances during the coming year will carry no more weight than they did during the year that preceded his election as Moderator, that is to say they will carry only such weight as attaches to the words of a man of his ability and wisdom. This is not to minimize beforehand what he may say—DR. KERR is admittedly a man of conspicuous gifts—but it is to say that his election as Moderator has not made him a sort of Presbyterian Archbishop and hence that he has no more right to speak "officially" for the Presbyterian Church than has any other Presbyterian Minister or elder. There can be no difference of opinion at this point between well-instructed Presbyterians.

## An Explanatory Statement

WE apologize to our subscribers for the delay in getting out this issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY even though this delay has been due to circumstances be-

*(Continued on Page 16)*

# The Study and Defense of the Bible In Westminster Seminary

By R. Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.

Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism,
Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

(Dr. Wilson is by common consent the leading scholar in the world holding to the historic position of the Christian Church concerning the Old Testament. Recently Professor R. H. Charles and Dr. H. H. Rowley, famed British critics, have attempted to answer Dr. Wilson's criticism of the late Dr. S. R. Driver with reference to the significance of the Aramaisms of Daniel, as has likewise Professor W. Baumgarten of Marburg, Germany. It is safe to say that no Old Testament scholar in the world is today commanding such attention as is Dr. Wilson.)

WESTMINSTER Seminary has been founded by men who believe that the Westminster Confession is a correct synopsis of the Word of God, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which we hold is the only infallible rule of faith and practice, teaching us what we are to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man. This God whom we worship is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.

The Boaz and Jachin of the temple of our faith are: Our God is the God of the Word; and, The Word of God is true. In short, our motto is: The God of the Word and the Word of God.

We professors are set to do our level best by tongue and pen to remove the doubts from the minds of the doubting Thomases in the seminary and in the Church, and to produce such faith in God and in His Word among all who hear or read our words that they will go and preach the gospel and teach Christ's commandments to every creature. Now, fifty years ago, most of the men who came to the seminaries believed with all their heart in the God of the Bible and in the Word of God. Today, alas, many of them come filled with doubts as the sparks fly upward. They know little about the Bible but are bristling with objections to it like a porcupine with spines. And yet many of them have never learned that there are certain rules that govern thinking, commonly embraced under the head of logic, such as: that the validity of a conclusion depends upon that of the major and minor premises; that a statement as to fact is never self-evident but always is true only as the evidence is in its favor; that a definition is correct only when based upon a complete induction of the facts entering into and bearing upon it; and, especially, the introduction of the fourth term, that "nigger in the woodpile." They have never learned that it does not prove that a thing is not true that you cannot prove that it is; nor, that an event is not impossible simply because you cannot see how it could have occurred.

Now, in the fifty years since I began to teach, I have learned that if they give me a student who wants to believe in God and his Word, his objections and doubts as to both will be dissipated by showing him the fallacies and absurdities that underlie the objections and doubts which he has had; and, on the other hand, his faith will be awakened and strengthened by presenting the evidence in favor of it and the reasonableness of it in the light of the divine revelation presented in the Scriptures.

This then, as I understand it, is the great work that is incumbent upon us at Westminster Seminary. We are defenders of the Christian faith: negatively, by the removal of doubts and objections; positively, by the increasing of it through showing the reasonableness of it, and more specifically, by presenting its content and its claims,—the subjective and objective evidence for it.

For example, to illustrate from my own department which is that of Old Testament criticism: I have made it an invariable habit never to accept an objection to a statement of the Old Testament without subjecting it to a most thorough investigation, linguistically and factually. If I find that the objector bases his objection upon a general theoretical consideration such as the denial of miracles or of predictive prophecy, I just smile at the objector and turn him over to the department of Theism to learn who and what the God of the Bible is. "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh" at them, and I for one laugh with Him. But if a man believes in the probability or certainty of miraculous events wherein God is working but is precluded from faith in the claims of the Bible to be a divine revelation by doubts arising from objections to its trustworthiness based upon alleged historical, scientific, or philological evidence, then I consider it to be my duty to do my best to show that this alleged evidence is irrelevant, inconclusive, and false.

At last, then, behold the professor and his boys sitting down together and taking up with avidity the investigation of the writings of the old Hebrew prophets. Where shall we begin? Why begin, of course, with a careful reading of the books to see what they contain and what they claim to be. Read them all through once at least. Do they claim to contain a revelation from God and to have been written under his supervision? They do. Then here we have a new and marvelous thing among the literary productions of the world. No class work of the college curriculum, no Homer, no Vergil, no work of Goethe or Schiller, no Dante or Victor Hugo, makes claims like these of Moses and David and Isaiah, that God speaks through them; nor grips like them at the very vitals of our intellect and imagination. Here are works which treat of God the author of all beings, the Alpha and the Omega of the ages. He lifts the veil that hid His face and the brightness of His glory and the revelation of His will from Sakya Mouni and Confucius and Plato, and speaks apparently face to face with His chosen ones as a man speaketh with his friends. Can these wonders of love be true? Come, let us see. A revelation, we must admit, is what we must expect from the Creator who made us what we are, and who is represented by the prophets as being what they portray in their writings.

But could these works have been put into writing as early as Abraham and Moses? Why, certainly, they could and must have been. For writing was practiced in Egypt and Babylonia long before their time. Can they have been written in Hebrew? Yes. For we have documentary evidence in both Egyptian and Cuneiform that Hebrew was known in Syria and Palestine and Egypt as early as the times of Abraham. And was this Hebrew written in Palestine down to the time that the last book of the Old Testament was written? Yes. For we have Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew from the second century B. C., and the Zadokite Fragment and the Pirke Aboth from about the time of Christ. And the forms of literature from the earliest book of the Old Testament down to the latest—unless we except the somewhat peculiar style of the prophetic rhapsodies (?)—are found in the literature of Egypt and Assyria and Babylon.

But, admitting that these works could have been written, could they have been handed down? Why, certainly. We have a part of the Egyptian Book of the Dead in manuscripts from the twelfth, the eighteenth, the twenty-second, and the thirtieth dynasties. The three last are not copies from the first, but all are from an earlier and complete original. Some lines of these manuscripts are exactly alike although the earliest and the latest are separated by two thousand years at least. And, further, Assurbanipal has left us thousands of tablets which were copied by his scribes

from other tablets going back to the time of Abraham. So the works of Abraham and Moses could have been handed down to the time of Ezra and to that of the translation of the Seventy.

But have we any evidence that the text not merely could be but that it has been handed down from the original writers to our own time? Yes. Here again God has not left us without sufficient witnesses. More than a thousand manuscripts of the Old Testament, in whole or in part, now exist in the libraries of the world, from 250 to 400 of every book. From these we learn that the variations of one manuscript from the others are unimportant, mostly affecting neither the form or the sense of the common text. The notes of the old scribes, which were affixed to the Hebrew text about 500 A. D., corroborate the care and accuracy with which the manuscripts were copied. And, finally, a large number of versions from the third century B. C. down to the present time show that the same original text lay back of all of them. The New Testament and the Targums also show that their writers had substantially the same text of the Old Testament that we now possess.

But can we go back of the time of Christ and of the Septuagint? Yes. We can even do that. For scores of proper names in the Old Testament are to be found also in the contemporary documents of the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians, carrying us back to the times of Shishak and Solomon and even to that preceding the Exodus. Shishak, Tiglath-Pileser III, Sennacherib, and Cyrus also mention events, more or less at length, which correspond to events recorded in the Scriptures. And the very ruins of Palestine are now giving their testimony to the general accuracy of the Old Testament history.

And lastly, the languages in which the books of the Old Testament are written, are now rising up from the sleep of millenniums to testify to the trustworthiness of the documents which were written in them. For more than a century the objectors to the veracity of the Old Testament Scriptures have been appealing to the evidence of the languages in which the books are written to prove that they are not historical. And many Christians, even professors in our seminaries, and almost the whole Protestant church at home and abroad, have accepted these dicta of the critics instead of the Bible; so the whole church has been shaking in its shoes. The Pentateuch, Daniel, in short the whole Bible has been reconstructed and largely rewritten, and largely on the basis of the forms and the meanings of words found in the documents.

Now it is my claim that the *prima facie* evidence of the languages of the books themselves is in the light of our present knowledge correct. First, because the critics themselves assume that text to be correct whenever it suits them. Secondly, because an examination of the proper names of kings and countries shows that the present text of the Scriptures spells these names exactly as they are spelled in the contemporary documents of the kings of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon and Persia. And, thirdly, because a scientific examination of all the foreign words to be found in the Old Testament shows that the foreign words occur just where we would expect to find them *if the documents in which they occur were written near the time when the events mentioned in the documents are said in the documents themselves to have occurred.* Thus, in the records of Abraham and his predecessors, we find the foreign words embedded in the documents to be Sumerian and Babylonian, the languages of Ur of the Chaldees; in the history of Joseph and Moses we find Egyptian words; in the records from the times of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius we find Persian words. As you determine the age of the rocks by the foreign substances embedded in them, so you can determine the age of the documents by the foreign words embedded in them. And my contention is that these foreign words demonstrate that the history of God's chosen people follows the chronological lines laid down in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. No scientific philologist will deny the facts in evidence. They are to be found in every Hebrew Bible. They can be investigated and tested scientifically by all who have sufficient knowledge or who trust the most modern of scientific grammars and dictionaries. It is scientific work. Its statements can be tested just like the rocks in mineralogy.

And so, strong in an enlightened faith, we lead our students on to defy the allegations of the objectors to the infallible rule of Holy Scripture. We thoroughly believe that the Scriptures are right and the objectors wrong. We fervently hope that Westminster Seminary may be a place where an intelligent defense of the fundamentals of the Christian religion (which is grounded upon a belief in the historical character of the divine records) may be taught to the future Ministers of the church. It is our firm belief that a revival of the old-time religion for which we hope and pray, will only come when faith in the trustworthiness of the simple record shall have been restored. We can not expect an educated people to believe a book which they think to be untrustworthy. Let us waken up. Let us begin our scientific defense of the historical character of the Scriptures by gathering together a library of books containing all the published documents from Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, and elsewhere that contain any evidence whatsoever bearing upon the Bible and its times. These books are what we now need most. For without them we cannot thoroughly investigate the objections of the critics of our times. And then let us secure young men of faith who love the Lord, and train them till they are able to use all the evidence of all the documents, so that the doubts of God's people, and especially of Christ's Ministers, may be removed and their faith confirmed.

But enough for the present. We defenders of the faith—professors and students in Westminster Seminary, Ministers and laymen who are supporting us—are in this fight for God's Word to a finish. We want to confound infidelity by laying the foundation of belief on a scientific basis of fact and knowledge. This basis lies in books and documents. We must have them or we are bound in the long run to fail. We cannot make bricks without straw. Who will supply the straw? We depend on believing laymen to supply what will enable us to train and strengthen the faith of God's Ministers in this world-wide war for God and the Word. Let us all do our best for Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.

# The Concentrated Life

## A SERMON

**by the Rev. Harmon H. McQuilkin, D.D.**
**Minister, First Presbyterian Church of Orange, N. J.**

*"Strive to enter in by the narrow door; for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able."*—Luke 13:24.

THROUGH the query of this unnamed questioner there echoes a curious interest in the destination of human existence. "Are they few that are saved?" It is the ultimate self, the culmination of the career, the abounding and the abiding environment in the world to come, that kindle his imagination and provoke his inquiry. In his mind the problem is most likely speculative, remote and detached from actual life. He is moving with an academic frame of mind through the shadowy fields of eschatology and asks his question mainly in order to satisfy a curiosity that has no issue in moral earnestness.

Nor are many of us in a position with impunity to bring any railing accusation against this unmoral interrogator, for fear the Master might once more "stoop down and with his finger write on the ground" and lifting himself up say to us, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at him." For the temptation is strong to separate between the future and the present and to divorce religion from life.

But, as He so often did, our Lord answers more than the man asked, replying to the inner need rather than to the formulated question. In doing this, He transposes the whole problem from the future to the man's present; rivets the end to the means; relates the termination to the way; and shows him that direction spells destination and destination destiny. Speculation is

suddenly exchanged for exhortation when "Are they few" turns sharply into "Strive to enter." How practical and how pungent the whole matter is on the lips of Jesus Christ!

The principle which Christ poured into the verbal mold in this text is that concentration is the secret of efficiency. Effort is the mother of excellence. He who would triumph must toil. The narrow door demands the narrowed purpose, from which promiscuousness has been expelled and in which throbs the condensed passion of the soul. The antithesis is not between the two words "strive" and "seek," except as our Lord may have imposed a different emphasis on them; but it is rather between "the narrow door" and the wide door which is implied in the whole contrast. He is Himself the "narrow door" primarily, and whosoever tries to climb up some other way is a thief and a robber. So that the direction of our life, as well as its concentered intensity, is included. We must enter into eternal life through Him as our Saviour and we must bend every energy to accomplish our entering in, and striving will be seeking, when we seek "with all our heart."

It is the impeachment of diluted devotion, the arraignment of lax loyalty, the indictment of miscellaneous motives. Jesus is proclaiming again, only in direct and hortatory form, the parable of the sower. We see once more the wayside hearers and the thin-soil hearers and the care-choked, world-seduced hearers passing in melancholy procession, while the dirge that never dies away wails itself on and on. "They shall seek to enter in and shall not be able." Here belong those, who, in the words of a recent writer, devote to religion "only their relaxed and marginal hours." And all such will at the last "seek to enter," that is they will attempt to wrest with unprepared hands the fruits of moral completeness and to enter into the inheritance without having desired or claimed sonship. And they will discover for themselves that the tree of life is still guarded with a flaming sword against the invasion of the spiritually unfit.

But if this principle sounds the death knell of the religiously careless and lukewarm and unsubstantial, it puts the crown of everlasting life on the brow of the religiously intense, the morally earnest, the innumerable multitude who, "faithful unto death," shout back from the opening portals of glory, "The time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day; and not only to me, but also to all them that have loved his appearing." In his letter to the Romans, St. Paul declares that God, in the day of judgment, "will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life." So that the final reward will be only the final recompense: the "patient well-doing" ripens into the "eternal life." Not that men can ever earn salvation for themselves. God forbid! Salvation is "not of works, lest any man should boast." It is all of grace. Only the infinite sacrifice of Christ, the Lamb of God, can ever effect the salvation of a sinner. But we must put forth zealous effort to enter into possession of the blessed fruits of the Redeemer's reconciling death. "Work out your own salvation" cries the apostle, as if we alone could bring it about: "For, it is God that worketh in you, both to will and to work," he rushes on to say, and that gives balance and power and promise to the whole redemptive process as it unfolds itself in our experience. And so God's mighty working, waits upon our human working. "Work . . . for it is God that worketh." It is a stupendous thought that our feeble, commonplace operation should mean nothing less than divine cooperation. Nevertheless such is the case. Our every effort, in His name, releases God's effectual power. We open our mouth, He fills it: we stretch forth our hand, He heals it, fills it: we call, He answers us: we "strive to enter in by the narrow door" and He leads us across the threshold and behold! we are in "the Father's house." And so concentration becomes coronation.

The Scriptures reiterate the outworking of this principle. "If we suffer, we shall reign" . . . "He that overcometh shall sit with me on my throne, even as I overcame and am set down with my Father on His throne." . . . "Thou hast been faithful—I will make thee ruler." And from this law there is no departure. Look at the picture again in the words that follow our text. Crowding about the closed door of spiritual life are the multitudes who dreamed and drifted with the world's current but who now desire to enjoy the results of Christian living. And they are pleading for admission on the grounds that they had eaten and drunk in Christ's presence and that he had taught in their streets. They trusted that their privileges would furnish them a passport into heaven. But juxtaposition is not fellowship, and so, although these people had moved in His vicinity, their hearts had been far from Him. Without doubt there are multitudes today, in the churches and outside the churches, who will at last come to the same deplorable situation.

Nor is Christianity isolated from the great currents of human life in the unfailing operation of this selective, judicial principle. The application of the principle is universal. In every department of our life we must bore our way into success. Every door is narrow that leads into fuller life. And the higher the life, the narrower the door. But as sainthood is assuredly the highest form of experience, the door leading into it must necessarily be the narrowest of all. The concentration and elimination move in the highest ranges of the soul and include all lower levels in their movement. There the temptations are most subtle and terrible. There the struggles fill the heart with sorest travail. There the whole life must be yielded, the whole heart presented "a living sacrifice." In business, in politics, in literature, men may "enter in by the narrow door" to eminent success, while whole areas in their soul are veritable jungles of darkness and iniquity. But in sainthood the whole continent must be subjugated and brought under spiritual cultivation. And so at last it comes about that the narrowness of the door, really lies in the reluctance and resistance of our own selves. And while our moral reluctance and resistance are the most stubborn and persistent, there are no spaces in our experience where they do not manifest themselves.

The business man concentrates his time, attention, energy, on his business. He narrows his life down that he may succeed, and counts the sacrifice well worth while. With an eye to the issue he toils assiduously on without complaining, in order that his ledger may show a heavy balance on the credit side in the day of reckoning.

The farmer strives to enter into his harvest. He plows and sows and cultivates and reaps. Day after day, week after week, month after month, he labors on, and all the while he is thinking of his granaries and expending his thought and muscle and money that they may overflow when the autumn days come round.

The musician spends years at his instrument or practicing his scales, that through the narrow door he may enter into the performance that will bring a sure reward in satisfaction or fame or recompense. Some Paderewski, some Kreisler, some Schumann-Heink, moves the people as a magician with his wand; but back of it all lay weary years of painstaking labor. Through a narrower door than others could squeeze their way through, they, by terrific condensation of their powers, have passed, while the world cheers them and hangs upon the exhibitions of their talents.

Watch the children and youth of your community go trooping away to the school or the college morning after morning. What are they doing? They are striving to enter in by the narrow door of mental proficiency into the educated life. They are laboring patiently day after day to enter into spelling or arithmetic, or biology, or Latin, or engineering. To me there is something pathetic, almost tragical, I might say, about the dog-eared, dirty pages of a boy's school book, for they are the footprints of his travail of soul over the lessons he had to master. But there is no escape. The wild, free life of boyhood must be curbed and cramped into intellectual concentration or the boy will grow up to curse those who left him to wander like the wild goat of the mountain in ignorance and inefficiency.

Who does not know the story of Demosthenes, how with pebbles in his mouth to overcome his stammering, or declaiming beside the roaring waves of the sea and speaking while running uphill, in order to strengthen his weak voice, he overcame apparently insurmountable obstacles and became the most illustrious orator of all history. Through the narrow door by grim determination he gained oratorical fame.

So also does the doctor, the teacher, the lawyer, the preacher, compress his way through

the narrow door of endeavor to the place of power in his calling. Sir W. Robertson Nicol speaks of the late Alexander McLaren's "fierce concentration" on the work of the preacher and declares his motto was, "This one thing I do—preach." But he passed through a door so narrow that at last all Christendom accorded him the solitary distinction of being the world's greatest extempore preacher.

All these have striven and have succeeded. Millions have idly wished to succeed in business, agriculture, music, art, oratory, the learned professions; but they were not able and were excluded and passed their days on the flat lowlands of mediocrity or worse. It is the law of God. And it has always been in operation, is now, and ever shall be.

So that religion is no different from any other aspect of our lives in this regard. But that religion is also subject to the working of this law needs no verification. The manifestations of that working are all about us, as well as in our own experience. And yet is it not sadly true that vast multitudes of the people, and many of them in our churches, never seem to realize this keen-edged principle that goes cutting its way right down through men's souls? At least they do not act as if they realized it. I really wonder if it would not be a healing ministry to the church to have a special day in the calendar of preaching when sermons should be preached enforcing the ceaseless working of the law by which concentration must precede spiritual efficiency.

And it would not be difficult to find ample material either in the Word of God or in human life to furnish the preacher with illustrations. Go back and see how our Lord was always dwelling on it in some form or other. The Rich Young Ruler comes running to Him and asking what he should do in order to inherit eternal life. He is "seeking to enter in." The Master narrows his moral life down to the dimensions of the commandments, and he believes he can get through. "What lack I yet?" "Are there any narrower doors?" Yes, there is one. "Go sell all that thou hast, and come, follow me." Ah! that was different. The uprooting of the affections set on riches; the plans, the prospects that would have to be reconstructed—it was too painful, too impossible. And "he went away sorrowful." And his sorrow only intensified the tragedy and the guilt of his going. "He went away"—that is the part that counts. He sought to enter in, but was not able.

It is instructive also to turn to Christ's discourse to the multitude that crowded around Him as it is given to us in the fourteenth chapter of Luke's gospel. Drawn to Him by various motives, He proceeded to weed out the crowd by placing before them the stern demands of discipleship. He would show them how narrow the door is that opens into true allegiance to Him. What consternation that first word would create among this heterogenous throng! "If any man cometh unto me, and hatest not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he *cannot* be my disciple." This is nothing short of a self-crucifixion and into the vernacular of the cross he puts it. "Whosoever doth not bear his own cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple." Every conflicting relationship must be sacrificed for the sake of Christ. Every selfish ambition must be put away. The center and goal of the life must be found in Him, so that it will be an accurate statement of the facts to say, "For to me to live is Christ." And we must enter into Him through the narrow door of repentance, confidence, affection, obedience. That means the narrow door of holiness of character at last, and it will probably mean the narrow door of persecution at the hands of an ungodly world, according to the last beatitude. How very narrow the door is! The emblem on the gravestones of the Covenanters with its cross and crown interlaced inseparably is a true representation of the demand for the concentrated life in Christ. Self-immolation is the true path to perfection of character and fulness of joy in Christ Jesus, and He would frankly inform the inconsiderate of that fact at the very outset.

Again and again I come back to the marvellously penetrative and illuminating words of St. Paul in the second chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians in which he discloses the law of spiritual cognition and I find there the amplification of the principle Jesus Christ lays down in the words of our text. Only Spirit-filled men can know the things of God, Paul says. The Holy Spirit alone can make men spiritual. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged." The narrow door excludes him, because he will not strive to enter in at it. He will not yield his proud, selfish, wicked heart to the Spirit's control, and so he is shut out in outer darkness already. And as one reads on through Paul's solemn analysis of the spiritual deadness of the "once-born," one can hear the challenge of the Lord Jesus Christ flinging itself out across the centuries to the men and women of every race and nation, "He that hath ears to hear!" "He that hath ears to hear!" And it sounds like the creaking of the bar that fastens the door against unlawful intrusion, against those who "shall seek to enter in and shall not be able." The bar is already up for many a one, and when the Master has risen up and closed the door at last, the exclusion will only assume finality. It is dreadful to think of how many there are all about us upon whom this awful doom is slowly settling. Their fearful state ought to drive us to our knees in agonizing prayer for them that they might be roused before it is forever too late.

To every one of us the conclusion comes with overwhelming force that we should concentrate our every energy on the cultivation of spiritual susceptibility, that we may have "the eyes of our heart enlightened" so that we may behold the holy God in Christ as Isaiah saw Him and was led through the vision into fellowship with Him and service on His behalf. This we should seek through close applicatoin to the mastery of the intellectual content of our holy religion first of all. We should concentrate on the study of the Bible as we do on the study of mathematics or language or the sciences. Christianity will not yield up its truth to the intellectually lazy and careless. Through earnest, importunate prayer, we shall also find admittance to "the secret of the Lord." Prayer is a teacher, an energizer, a guide. A prayerless life is a powerless life. And then in the worship of God's house we shall find the narrow door opening for us to pass into God's presence, if we join in it with mind and heart. It is a tragedy that to so many the ordinary church service seems to bring no real help and that just because they wrap themselves about with indifference until neither sermon nor prayer nor hymn can penetrate to where they live.

Our inertia and indolence and disinclination to holy things must be overcome by a stout determination of the will. Obstacles must be brushed aside. And we must "run with patience the race set before us." Our hand once put to the plow, we must not stop to look back, for the desire to look back may unfit us for entering in at the narrow door.

Let us concentrate our attentions, energies, volitions, thus upon upon the things of Christ's kingdom, and for us in the spiritual firmament, "day unto day" will "utter speech" and "night unto night" will "bring knowledge." That is, there will be the gradual accumulation and augmentation of our experiences, satisfactions, and achievements as time progresses. We will obey the apostle and "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ," until He will truly give us "grace for grace" and we shall pass up "from faith unto faith" as upon alabaster steps into the holy of holies. It has been written, and it will never be annulled, that "Unto him that hath shall be given and he shall have abundance." God is saying it to every creature in His sovereign dealings with them daily and hourly. By a vital, immutable, self-registering law, He is saying it.

Science foreshadows the principle of the narrow door in its emphasis on the "struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest," indeed it only translates it into a different phraseology. Observation writes it with a pen of iron. The ageless Word of God declares it, illustrates it, pleads with us to obey it. The door of opportunity keeps closing against the unfit. Let us "strive," let us "agonize," as the Greek puts it, to enter in at the door, which, while it may be narrow, is still open. Seize the tide in our own affairs at its flood; recognize the hour of our visitation: lest the door be shut never to open, the tide go out and leave us stranded on the rocks, the hour pass by and leave our house desolate forever.

# If One Resorts to Ordinary Logic

## A PROTEST FROM A LAY MEMBER

### By Gertrude Smith

IN the Cincinnati Enquirer of Wednesday, June 4, 1930, Dr. Franklin C. Ward of New York, Executive Secretary of the promotional department of the General Council is quoted as saying, regarding our church membership, "The showing is not good. The church is losing ground in membership as compared with the gain in population." He asks, "Why is it that so many thousands of church members fail each year, when they move from community to community, to call for their church letters? That is a question which should be pondered deeply. Is it because the church has a loose hold on its people? Is it because the churches, for the most part, lack a program equal to the needs of their members? Are we losing ground because some of our pastors have lost some of their enthusiasm for their real job?"

As a passionately religious woman who fought present day conditions in another denomination till I arrived at the heartbreaking realization that when I put my money into my church envelopes I had no assurance whatever whether it was to be used to preach for or against the Divinity of Christ, and who, *as a direct consequence of that realization,* came out of that church and joined the Presbyterian Church,—I wish to answer Dr. Ward's question from the point of view of what I believe to be a considerable number of thinking men and women of today. The answer is this. We are tired of impossible logical contradictions and nauseated with insincerity and lies.

The primary rule of logic today, as always, would seem to be "A thing cannot both *be,*—and *not be,*—at one and the same time." This is not a dogma of religion but an axiom of sane thinking and an inviolable rule of common sense! And we, the laity, do not share the intellectual adjustability of the present day "enlightened" clergy.

It seems that it might be well for the clergy of all the churches to remember that in this day many of their hearers have a fairly good education. Some of us have been interested enough to study religion rather extensively on our own account,—and are better informed than some of the clergy as to the actual facts and the authorities from whom these facts are obtained. The church leaders are no longer dealing with the ignorant peasants of medieval times. We have been trained to use the brains God gave us,—and we look at ministers,—and we do not admire our "spiritual advisers and overlords." We have studied logic and psychology. We are *able* to reason,—and a vast number of us *do*. Not many weeks ago I had a letter from a friend in the north in which she told me, "As a child I took religion to heart. But when I grew older *and saw what ministers were doing to religion I got out of the church and I haven't been inside one for years. That doesn't mean that I haven't any religion. It means that I have.* You can't tell me anything about ministers. Three of my best friends are reverends!" As it happened, it pleased me to make mention in my letters to her of a certain young and very sincere minister who had been a great help to me in my own living. In due time she commented in a later letter, "How I wish I could hear your young minister preach! After all, some ministers are worthy of their pulpits." It seems to me this woman is representative of a large number of the "falling off membership." She took religion to heart,—grew so disgusted with the insincerity of the modern church that she left it altogether,—but, confronted with the facts about a young clergyman who is both preaching and living a consistent and beautiful religion,—my friend, who "has not been inside a church for years," said frankly, "How I wish I could hear him preach!"

To you tolerant, loving, peace adoring, amity seeking ministers, I answer Dr. Ward's question as to what is the matter with some of us. We *are* "holding loosely" something we are considering discarding altogether,—as not worth keeping.

A thing cannot both be and not be at one and the same time. That is the first law of logic. Christ either *is* God,—or He is not. No person, no matter what his or her individual view on the subject, can deny this perfectly obvious statement. Every atheist, every Jew, every heathen,—whether Buddhist, Mohammedan or what not,—as well as the most passionate Christian,—can and must assent to this declaration. Really sincere persons hold decided views, one way or the other, on important topics,—or seek to ascertain the truth on them. Unitarians, orthodox Jews, atheists and heathen think He was *not* God. I do not agree, but I yield them the respect due to an *honestly* held conviction. I do not agree with their views, but I do not feel any impulse to scorn, derision or contumely as to the person who sincerely holds this belief.

But—hear our honored clergy! The question is raised in the General Assembly in Cincinnati whether a signer of the Auburn Affirmation is a fit editor for the official magazine of our church,—and it refuses to discuss the matter, confirms such Affirmationist in his position and votes to supply a deficiency in the expenses of the paper. In other words, the Assembly goes on record by an all but unanimous vote that it holds it of no moment whether: 1. The Bible is or is not trustworthy. 2. Christ was or was not Virgin-born,—which involves the question as to whether He is God Eternal or mere mortal man. 3. The doctrine of the death of Christ as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice is true or false. 4. Christ rose or not. 5. Whether or not the accounts of His miracles are true.

As a member of the laity, I rise to remark that it appears to me that the General Assembly has thereby gone on record as proclaiming that it makes no earthly difference what anybody believes or doesn't believe,—and "What the Dickens does religion matter, anyhow?" To a dispassionate person, it looks —peculiar. We, the laity,—draw conclusions.

There are those of us among the laity who have been honest enough to ask ourselves what life is all about,—what God is and what He wants of us. We are not infected with the happy irresponsibility of many of the clergy,—or with the eager willingness to sell out all our verities and sanctities for the joy of crowded churches and large contributions,—(one is interested to note, by the way, that the contributions are falling off! In my own case, the reason is not far to seek!) We look at many of our ministers thoughtfully,—and without the old, and no longer appropriate, reverence and deference which we had once for the genuine "men of God" who through prayer and consistent efforts to lead helpful and saintly lives really had come into such relations with God that we were justified in looking up to them and regarding them as men who had been taught of God.

We cannot take seriously a minister who says, "There should be no ill feeling between those who think that Christ was God and those who think that He was a noble man, but both parties in our church should not feel other than Christ-like each to the other." I quote from the remarks of a Cincinnati minister last December at a gathering of the clergy of a certain denomination (not Presbyterian), of that city. I am not a Minister but God gave me a certain amount of brains which I have been pleased to *use*. He also gave brains in generous measure to other members of the laity. I do not find a great deal of this twisted think-

ing among the ordinary members. It seems to be confined almost entirely to the clergy.

You ask why we lose interest in church,—why contributions fall off,—why ministers lose their leadership? Well, look at the facts! You stand as a whole, (regardless of those who may be preaching sane doctrine in their individual churches,) and you tell us, "It doesn't matter whether or not you believe the main doctrines of Christianity." We, the laity, apply reason and logic to that statement,—and consequently we apply cold judgment to our analysis of you ministers and as to whether we consider you worth listening to and supporting with our money, our service and the full weight of our lives.

"It doesn't matter whether a man believes Christ is God or not." Suppose we follow out the two positions.

If Christ *is* God,—from this premise comes the inevitable conclusions that He is our Master; that He has a right to issue orders as to all we say and do; that subject to His will is every thought and action of our lives; that our welfare in this world and in the next depend on our relation to Him; and we kneel and pray to Him in all sincerity for forgiveness, for strength to meet temptation, guidance to direct the course of our lives,—and some of us —simply go into His presence and stay there in sincere love and adoration, without even asking anything at all back,—just to be with Him and absorb His loveliness and truth and beauty and strength.

If Christ is *not* God,—after nineteen hundred years His very body is long since dissipated into gasses and vapors and dust,—and is so disintegrated that one bit is probably part of a wall,—one particle a component of a flower,—one puff of vapor part of the breath of some living man. If He is not God,—He ranks only with Buddha, Confucius and Moses as one of the sages and teachers of mankind,—and it is no more sensible to pray to Him than it would be to pray to the brass bed in my room. Yet—ministers say the Creed and pray "for Jesus' sake" and then get up in the pulpit and say He was not God. What do you suppose we think as we watch all this?

Cannot *even a minister* perceive that it requires no *religion* whatever to make one revolt against such a manifest and hopeless absurdity as the position taken by many Protestant ministers today? It is not necessary to resort to spiritual arguments,—though heaven knows there are enough of them we could put forward! But such a contradiction is just a hopeless offense against mere commonsense, reason and logic. That a man may believe that Christ *was* a man,—one can understand,—and his convictions one may respect, while one wishes to convert him to one's own view that Christ is God Eternal. That a man may believe that Christ *is God* one can believe,—and the most confirmed atheist, Jew or heathen *must* respect our honesty of conviction on the point. But to take the ministerial position,—that it doesn't matter whether He is God or not—! What *can* you ministers expect us to think of you? Theoretically, at least, you stand for the Christian religion. Are we to think that you are too ignorant to know what it is,—or too inferior mentally to be capable of coherent reasoning,—or merely too lazy to lift a finger to maintain the faith entrusted to your care?

If you yourselves proclaim that it doesn't matter whether we have any consistent religion or not,—why should we rush to connect ourselves with churches and eagerly offer our money for your schemes of social service and, incidentally, your own support and honor and influence? Why? If Christ is not your Master, what claim have you on us at all? Why on earth *should* we give you our time, our money, our influence, and our work? What are you to us? If Christ's claim on you and us is not valid,—for what earthly reason should we pay a man to run around and make personal calls and talk a couple of hours on Sunday and make himself generally agreeable? Why should we build churches or support them? What *is* the good of religion? To be honest, if the individual churches didn't stand for something better than the consensus of opinion expressed officially at church councils—it is my own opinion and that of a lot of other thinking individuals—that the church is *not* any good, and the sooner we get rid of it the better!

*But* individual churches,—a lot of them,—*do* stand for something definite and worth while. Why do not the ministers of these churches rise up in the councils of our official bodies and express themselves? "Whosoever shall deny Me on earth I will deny before the angels of God." Loyal Christians look at ministers in conclave assembled with wonder which merges into scorn, contemptuous, understanding and tolerant acceptance of them, rebellious discontent, or utter repudiation.

Why in the name of logic and reason and commonsense, don't you split the churches into sane divisions? If those who believe that Christ is *not* God go together,—it makes a coherent and sensible operative entity. And if those who believe He *is* God go together, then we would feel like giving ourselves, our substance, our prayers, our service and our love as we *used* to give it.

But it does seem as if, whether you ministers are aware of it or not, that the great mass of the church laity are still loyal at heart to Christ Himself. You harm us, turning our church loyalty to disgust and our sacred things into light sacrilege. But—it is not to *you* that we took our vows,—it is not to *you* that we hold ourselves responsible,—and there is an increasing disposition on our part to look at you and judge you and reject you. We do not like your levity, your insincerity, and your lack of ordinary logical consistency. I am not a Roman Catholic, but I happened to be present a short time ago at a Roman Catholic service. The priest, in the course of his remarks, made the following statement,—not with any rancor but with the calmness of one making a plain and obvious statement of fact. He said, "Today the Protestant clergy do not know *what* they believe. They are merely playing with religion, and the churches are going to pieces." It is true. There is no strength in insincerity; and the final issue of adherence to the present ministerial policy of compromise, illogical promulgations and unwise conciliation will merely be that the sincere and thoughtful and devoted Christians will either be driven out of the churches altogether or else will band together, procure them sincere and spiritually minded Ministers and start a new church or churches altogether. For—Jesus of Nazareth can *still* call out His own. There are *still* those of us who will follow Him "both into prison and to death." It is the Ministers who have fallen below grade. There is nothing wrong with God or Christ or real religion.

God gave us, the laity, minds and consciences and wills. We will not prostitute our minds to absurdity in our thinking. We will not violate our consciences by disloyalty to our Lord. We will not yield our wills to the vagaries and the exceedingly inconsistent and wabbly leadership of our present day ministerial incumbents. I do not believe in Ministers in general any more. Every individual one must *prove* himself against the undesirable presumption of insincerity they as a class have chosen to establish against themselves. To those who *are* standing fast I yield an extravagant admiration and loyalty and an utter thankfulness that God has not left us entirely without leaders.

From a considerable and passionately interested observation of two Churches—one of them the Presbyterian—I *believe* it to be true that the vast majority of the laity are still, in all sincerity and truth, ready to say, "I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, *our Lord.*" And though I have less data to support my opinion as to the other denominations, I am perfectly willing to believe that the mass of their members are just as loyal to Christ and His Gospel,—and no less able to use their reasoning powers.

We, the laity, can exist in perfect sufficiency, peace and comfort without this modern variety of Minister. But without Jesus of Nazareth we and all civilization will eventually simply smash. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." "I am not ashamed of Christ Jesus, my Lord." "My sheep follow Me, and they know My voice, and a stranger's voice will they not follow." Lead on, oh King Eternal,—and rid us of such ministerial obstacles! For Thine is the Kingdom and the power and the glory, and we would have it so!

# Books of Religious Significance

*WHAT IS HELL? By Dean W. R. Inge, Sir Oliver Lodge, Abbot Butler, Warwick Deeping, J. E. C. Welldon, James Moffatt, Annie Besant, Sheila Kaye-Smith, W. E. Orchard, F. W. Norwood, G. Hay Morgan, and Irwin Edman. Harper and Brothers, New York and London,* 1930. 186 *pp.* $2.00.

HERE we have a book written by British celebrities. One is a Spiritualist, another a Theosophist, another a Pagan. Two are novelists whose religious affiliation is not clear. A Roman Catholic writes a chapter and so does an Anglican bishop. Dean Inge, Fred W. Norwood and W. E. Orchard present the English Protestant point of view, and perhaps represent that view-point fairly.

The impressive thing about the book is the solemn seriousness of the discussion. The usual jibes at Jonathan Edward's sermon on "A Sinner in the Hands of an Angry God" are there; but the reader is spared the customary caricature. Every writer subscribes to the idea of retribution for sin, awful to contemplate, and in substance echoes Browning's famous line: "There may be a Heaven; there must be a Hell."

Articles by Inge, Norwood and Orchard are interesting to Americans as forecasting what our own church leaders may be saying. British culture weighs heavily with the Liberal church party in America. Probably most of our present day heresy arrived via Driver, Cheyne, Sanday, Marcus Dods, George Adam Smith, and the last writings of the once stalwart Bruce and Denney. The influence of our cousins across the sea is never so potent as when they discuss religion.

For years Dean Inge has attracted attention by his writings, and his gifts in this field have been remarkable. As a preacher, his success has been far short of the attainment one expects in a man of his talent. He preaches to small congregations in the vast spaces of St. Paul's Cathedral in London, probably because few people are capable of deriving spiritual help from the beauty of the fine, Hellenic prose which too richly adorns his thought. The Dean is innocent of any loyalty to the prevailing schools of opinion. He is a scornful patrician in theology, looking upon the orthodox in derision and holding himself aloof from the learned Anglo-Catholics in his own communion,—for example, Dr. Charles Gore. Nor has he enthusiasm for Modernists. In his orthodox moments he preaches sermons of power. They have power because they are attended, not by the persuasions of Plato, but by the authority of God's Word. Several sentences from his article on Hell are memorable. They are quoted herewith apart from their context, a method justified only by a lack of space sufficient to carry his argument.

Dean Inge explains the elements of space and time in his consideration of the future life and says: "We think of Heaven as the atmosphere which those breathe who are the children of God. a state to which we need not be strangers even now. How almost ridiculous it is to believe in Heaven without also believing in its terrible opposite. If Heaven is, or may be, a matter of experience to us while we live here, so unquestionably is Hell. We know there is a Hell, for we have been there, or very near it. It is hardly too much to say that Heaven and Hell stand and fall together." Then he cites the Scriptures.

"The doom of the rejected is explicitly stated to be eternal punishment. No sound Greek scholar can pretend that *aeonios* means anything less than eternal. Our Lord's words about the *nature* of future punishment need not be taken literally, but we have no right to ignore or twist His perfectly plain language about its duration. Modernist Protestantism, though it may be reluctant to admit it, believes in Purgatory, but not in Hell. The assumption behind this belief is that there is a process in the universe tending toward perfection. And yet this is certainly not the Christianity of the New Testament. In the New Testament, as von Hugel says, 'there is everywhere an affirmation of man's life here below as a choice between immense alternatives with corresponding abiding consequences.' If there is any future probation, it is absolutely unknown to us, and we have no right to assume any such thing.

"Hell, which is where God is not, and the Devil is; is not at all like the Modernist purgatory, where one trains for the next examination; a place really bracing to the constitution. Such thoughts are cheap and frivolous; the reality is much more tragic and terrible. We face a dread alternative, the choice of which, so far as we know, is for us endless in its results. I have no wish to revive the use of language, which, as I have said already, is dishonouring to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. But if the superior smile with which the mention of Hell is received by our modern guides is part of a plan to banish fear from religion, and to paint God as a good-natured and easy-going ruler, it is necessary to protest that this is not the Christian religion.

"We wrestle not only against flesh and blood, but against more spiritual and intangible and malignant forces of evil. We dare not forget those words of Christ Himself: 'Fear not them that kill the body, and after that have no more they can do. But fear him who after he hath killed, hath power to cast into Hell. Yea, I say unto you, fear him.'"

The Rev. Dr. Fred W. Norwood is an Australian. For ten years he has occupied the pulpit of the City Temple Congregationalist Church in London. The eloquent and earnest Gospel preacher, Joseph Parker; and the brilliant and erratic Reginald Campbell were among his predecessors there. As we read his article on Hell, we discover that whereas Dean Inge depends more or less upon the authority of the Bible, Dr. Norwood's convictions come from experience, first, last, and always. His experience happens to coincide with Scriptural teaching on occasions, and consequently he writes as follows.

"I am not foolish enough to suggest that men can decide the operations of the Divine Will by a mere popular vote. I disagree with those who vote Hell out of existence. Men have always had Hell in their feelings. That is why they keep stating it in their doctrines. The man who repudiates it absolutely has either had a shallow experience, or is not true to the experience he has had. He will find it before he dies, and when he has crossed the river of death he will discover that by no trick of legerdemain has it disappeared. For Hell is as permanent as the mind of man.

"I believe in Hell as I believe in man. I know that he does not escape the consequences of his wrong-doing until he has paid 'the very last mite.'"

The Rev. Dr. W. E. Orchard, minister of the King's Weigh House Church, on Duke Street, in London, preaches well and writes well. Of the so-called "intellectual" preachers in England, he seems to be among the most popular. It is difficult to resist quoting him at length. The following excerpts, chosen from a twenty-one page essay, will have to do.

"Purgatory, so completely repudiated at the Reformation, has been adopted by Liberal theology. Indeed the idea has returned with a vengeance, for now the idea of purgatory threatens to blot out Hell. The New Testament however contains such clear predictions and such solemn warnings about the fate of the wicked as we can hardly reconcile with a process of *remedial* punishment. Further, it must be remembered that changing our destiny in the other world might have to work in two directions, and while introducing hope into Hell, might introduce uncertainty into Heaven. For this type of thought often feels constrained to picture a Heaven of continuous progress which would surely involve some degree of dissatisfaction and struggle, and therefore of pain. This whole doctrine is rightly suspected by many, because if the life we now live does not decide the life to come, then either its purpose is not clear, or it is not properly designed for its purpose, and might as well have been altogether omitted.

"When we consider all the facts, we are bound to admit the reality there is in the idea of Hell, as well as the sanity of Christ's teaching and of the orthodox theology in maintaining the actuality of Hell. Warning therefore should be uttered by all true and serious evangelism. Moreover the warnings need to be addressed to those who have seen the light, for it requires disobedience and rebellion to constitute Hell.

"The New Testament symbol of fire has been retained by Roman Catholic theologians, and understood as if it were material fire. They

concede that material fire cannot have the same effect in the other world as in this, but the affirmation of the notion conveys to the imagination the sense of intolerable pain. Those who demand that fire is only symbolical of torment of mind, must recognize that this makes things even worse. For there is torment of mind far worse than anything fire can inflict on the body. The idea of the materiality of fire seems, therefore, rather to offer some relief.

"There is no need to assume that the vast majority of mankind is bound for such a Hell of suffering as it is impossible for us to think of. It is not required of us to hold that any single soul is at this moment in Hell; we must not dare to judge. All the New Testament tells us about individual destiny is that there will be many surprises when the Day reveals it. Moreover we must not multiply conscious suffering by endlessly protracted time. Eternity cannot be simply identified with the everlasting sequence of time. Eternity is a condition which time cannot measure; but it may be measured by intensity of consciousness. Hell, therefore, may simply mean an intense sense of the deprivation of God, combined with an equally intense determination to deprive oneself of Him; both together and all at once.

"It is possible to hold that there is a solution of this painful problem which has not been revealed to us. But if we are to retain even a hope, it must depend upon a perfect revelation of God's Love made to all souls when they reach the other world, far surpassing in efficacy the revelation of the Cross in this world. Some have found hints in the New Testament of something lying beyond even its farthest horizons; a restoration of all things, when all shall be reconciled, and Hell itself shall be destroyed. But there is nothing sufficient to contradict what is elsewhere clearly set forth. We can only stand by what has been revealed. No natural or spiritual considerations overthrow, and nothing in modern psychology disproves the orthodox doctrine of Hell; nor do they diminish the gravity of Christ's teaching on the subject. Every soul must be warned."

Dean Inge, and Drs. Norwood and Orchard write opportunely even when they write inadequately. Hell is a neglected truth in the Christian religion and its omission from the counsel of God in our preaching is an act of malfeasance and treachery. No revival of religion can come without it. Christ's shed blood cannot be understood without it.

If the black pit against which the Cross of the Son of God was raised is ever so imperfectly described by the preacher, that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom begins to work mightily in the sinner's heart. From the gate of Hell it is but a short step to the Cross, and when a man is constrained to turn to the Cross on which his guilt has been expiated, for the first time he knows what it means to "pass from death unto life," and "being justified by faith" to "have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

FRANK H. STEVENSON.

*HUMANISM: A New Religion. By Charles Francis Potter. Simon and Schuster, New York. 132 pp. $1.50.*

THE purpose of this book is to set forth "the main outline and principal points of the new religion called Humanism." Its author is the founder of "The First Humanist Society of New York," an organization that since its formation last September, has received widespread newspaper publicity.

It should not be supposed that Humanism is of recent origin inasmuch as there were Greek Humanists as far back as the fifth century before Christ. The early rise of Humanism finds its explanation in the fact that God, the world and man are the three realities with which human thinking has ever concerned itself with the result that in the history of human thinking there are but three types of world-view that are distinguishable in principle—the theistic, the naturalistic and the humanistic according as the emphasis has been placed on one or the other of these realities. But while there is little that is new in connection with present-day Humanism, the movement probably has a vogue today never previously enjoyed and there are not lacking indications that in its various manifestations it constitutes the chief modern rival of Christianity, inasmuch as materialistic naturalism is held by few thinkers of repute.

It would be no less a mistake to suppose that Dr. Potter's Humanist Society is the only organization devoted to furthering the creed of Humanism. As a matter of fact it is being preached in all essentials in thousands of pulpits including many classed as evangelical. They are not far wrong, if they are wrong at all, who speak of "Modernism as only as unacknowledged Humanism." Dr. Potter is never more convincing than when he is engaged in twitting the Modernists for their inconsistency in trying to hold fast to Christianity while disavowing supernaturalism. Surely he is right in maintaining that Christianity is through and through supernatural to such an extent that no naturalistic scheme of thought has any right to call itself Christian. In our judgment it would be great gain if this distinction between acknowledged and unacknowledged Humanism was done away with. Dr. Potter may not be particularly learned or particularly gifted as a thinker but it is at least to his credit that the organization he has launched does not sail under a false and misleading banner.

Dr. Potter, we suppose, will for the most part agree with what we have said thus far on the ground that the adjective "new" as used by him qualifies the word "religion" rather than the word "humanism." In harmony with this he claims that Humanism as understood by him is a religious movement whereas as understood by his predecessors it was a literary or philosophical movement. What, then, are we to think of his claim that Humanism is "a new type of religion?" Obviously the question whether Humanism is a religion turns on the answer that should be given to the question, What is religion? No doubt if we say with E. S. Ames that "Religion is the consciousness of the highest social values," or with A. Eustice Haydon that "Religion is the shared quest of the good life," or with Dr. Potter himself that "Religion is the attempt to unify one's personality and relate it to the world without," Humanism (defined as "faith in the supreme value and self-perfectibility of human personality") is rightly spoken of as a religion. But if with B. B. Warfield, we say that "Religion is, shortly, the reaction of the human soul in the presence of God"—surely the only correct type of definition of religion—it is obvious that it is a misnomer to call Humanism as understood by Dr. Potter a religion at all. In a word, the God-idea which Dr. Potter relates to the Santa Claus idea is indispensable to religion: hence whatever else his Humanism may be it is not a religion, true as it may be that it is a substitute for religion for many today. It is true that Dr. Potter defends his associates against the charge of atheism but only to the extent of claiming that they are not dogmatic atheists. For all practical purposes, however, he aligns them with the atheists when he writes that if by God "one means a supernatural personal deity, most, if not all, Humanists would deny such." Elsewhere he correctly maintains that a non-supernatural, impersonal God is virtually no God at all. We concur when he writes: "The salvation of God by identifying him with the cosmic energy is a vain compromise of last-ditch theists. When they sacrifice the personality of God in order to assure his mere existence, they might as well admit defeat."

The fundamental question at issue between Humanism and Christianity, as Dr. Potter perceives, is the question of the reality of the supernatural as a factor in human life. Humanists, he affirms, are unanimous in rejecting belief in the supernatural while supernaturalism "is woven into the very fabric of Christianity." Dr. Potter thinks that this spells the doom of Christianity but in our judgment it spells the doom of Humanism; and that because any thinker who leaves God out of consideration deals with only a part of reality, and that not the most significant part. The Humanist ignores the Lord God Almighty whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, to whom the earth is less than the small dust in the balance. Dr. Potter's allegation that even if there is a God we have no knowledge of Him is purely gratuitous. As a matter of fact we possess a knowledge of God that is just as dependable, even more dependable than we possess of any other reality inasmuch as God himself has revealed himself not only in nature and in human hearts but through prophets and apostles and above all in Jesus Christ, His Son and our Lord. Dr. Potter is perfectly right, however, in holding that Christianity stands or falls with the reality of the supernatural. If, as he alleges, "the so-called supernatural is only the not-yet-understood natural" it is high time that Christianity be relegated to the museum of dead religions as nothing is more cer-

tain than that Christianity de-supernaturalized is Christianity extinct. Dr. Potter, however, is quite mistaken in thinking that the supernatural is the not-yet-understood natural: hence whatever part Humanism may play in the thinking of the immediate future we are confident that its vogue will be short-lived. Genuine Christianity—based as it is on "the supernatural fact, which is God; the supernatural act, which is miracle; the supernatural book, which is the revealed will of God; the supernatural redemption, which is the divine deed of the divine Christ; the supernatural salvation, which is the divine work of the divine Spirit"—is too firmly grounded to fear any contention of man. Real Christianity, in distinction from its modern substitutes, can no more perish from the earth than the sense of sin can disappear from the hearts of men, than the knowledge of God can fade from the minds of dependent creatures, than God Himself can cease to exist. The Christ of the New Testament is not only a fact of the past, He is a fact of the present; and though hand join in hand, His plans and purposes will not fail of realization.

Dr. Potter enumerates ten points of difference between Humanism understood by himself and the religion known as Christianity. In this instance these ten points appear on the jacket of the book, not in the body of the book itself, but it is clear that they were formulated by Dr. Potter himself. For our own purpose, as will be seen below, we arrange these alleged differences between the "old" religion (Christianity) and the "new" religion (Humanism) in the following order:

1. *Old*—God created the world and man: *New*—The world and man evolved.
2. *Old*—Man is inherently evil and a worm of the dust: *New*—Man is inherently good and has infinite possibilities.
3. *Old*—Man should submit to the will of God: *New*—Man should not submit to injustice or suffering without protest and should endeavor to remove its causes.
4. *Old*—Hell is a place of eternal torment for the wicked: *New*—Suffering is the natural result of breaking the laws of right living.
5. *Old*—Heaven is the place where good people go when they die: *New*—Doing right brings its own satisfaction.
6. *Old*—The truth is to be found in one religion only: *New*—There are truths in all religions and outside of religion.
7. *Old*—The chief end of man is to glorify God: *New*—The chief end of man is to improve himself, both as an individual and as a race.
8. *Old*—Religion has to do with the supernatural: *New*—Religion has to do with the natural. The so-called supernatural is only the not-yet-understood natural.
9. *Old*—Salvation comes from outside man: *New*—Improvement comes from within. No man or god can save another man.
10. *Old*—The ideas of sin, salvation, redemption, prayer, and worship are important: *New*—These ideas are unimportant in religion.

We have arranged these ten alleged differences in the above order in order to call attention to the fact that only as regards the last three points is there anything like an absolute difference between Christianity and Humanism as understood by Dr. Potter—a fact fitted to direct attention to the superficiality and inconsequential nature of Dr. Potter's thinking. Dr. Potter would have us believe that Christianity is affirming the ten articles of belief ascribed to it necessarily denies the ten articles of belief ascribed to Humanism and *vice versa*. That is not necessarily the case except as regards the last three articles of belief mentioned, as a moments consideration of each will make clear.

To affirm that "the world and man evolved" is not necessarily to deny that "God created the world and man." Evolution of itself offers no solution of the question of origins. There must be something to evolve before there can be any evolution. Evolution cannot act as a substitute for creation, but at the most can only supply a theory of the method of Divine providence. We believe indeed that it is inadequate even as a theory of Divine providence, because we believe that history exhibits the supernatural in the form of the miraculous, notably in the case of the God-man, but at any rate to say that "the world and man evolved" affords no answer to the question: "In the beginning"—what?

The second alleged difference contains a misstatement of fact. Christianity does not teach that man is "inherently" evil but rather that he became evil and as such is capable of redemption. Humanism regards fallen man as glorious: Christianty says that as compared with what he ought to be, and what by the grace of God he may become, he is worthless. We reject Humanism's conception of man not because it makes *too much* of man but because it makes *too little*, asserting as it does that man is glorious even in his fallen state.

To say that man should submit to the will of God is not of course to say that he should submit to wrong and injustice without protest and with no effort to remove its causes. Only as the will of God is done will wrong or injustice disappear.

Again to say that hell is a place of eternal torment for the wicked is not to deny that suffering is the natural result of breaking the laws of right living. Both statements may be true, in fact are true. Equally true is it that to say that heaven is the place where good people go when they die is not to deny that doing right brings its own satisfaction. Here too both statements may be true, in fact are true .

Again to say that "the truth" is to be found in one religion only is not to deny that there is truth in all religions and outside of religion. Christianity does not claim to teach all truth or deny that other religions teach truth. What it claims is that it alone teaches that knowledge that is necessary to salvation.

Yet again to say that the chief end of man is to glorify God is not to deny that it is man's duty to improve himself both as an individual and as a race. As a matter of fact Christianity stresses both duties, maintaining however that only as we make the former our chief end will we succeed, in any desirable way, in improving ourselves either as individuals or as a race.

But while as far as the first seven points of difference are mentioned the contrast between Christianity and Humanism is by no means as absolute as Dr. Potter would have us believe yet in as far as Humanism denies the existence of God, or his saving activity in the world, or man's obligation to worship and glorify Him, it would be difficult to exaggerate the absoluteness of the contrast between the two. Not only does Christianity live and move and have its being in God, it owes its existence to the fact that God not only can but does save sinners. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life"; "Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptation that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners"; "I am what I am by the grace of God"—it is these passages and passages such as these that express the very essence of Christianity, that apart from which there is just no Christianity at all.

There are of course Humanists and Humanists. All Humanists would not subscribe to the Humanism of Dr. Potter. Many of them would react rather violently to many of his contentions. If we were to become a Humanist we hardly suppose we would be a Humanist of the Potter type. But while Humanism in all its forms is, in our judgment, inadequate as a life and world view yet the attitude of the Christian toward it ought to be one of appreciation as well as criticism. In as far as Humanism ignores God, or makes man his own saviour, or places exclusive emphasis on the life that now is, the attitude of the Christian should be one of unrelieved opposition. But in as far as the Humanist merely pleads for a proper valuation of the life that now is as over against asceticism, or stresses man's duty to improve himself both as an individual and as a race, the Christian finds his teaching in harmony with his own. Christianity yields to none in the value it attaches to human personality; moreover it believes in the perfectibility of human personality, not indeed in its self-perfectibility—man can no more perfect himself than the Ethiopian can change his skin or the leopard his spots—but in its perfectibility in and through Jesus Christ. Humanism knows of no dynamic, no source of energy, save that which inheres in man as man; but it is a glory of Christianity that it proclaims a living Redeemer and so makes available a dynamic power, an energizing force other than that which belongs to man as man. The tree of humanity must be made good before it can bear good fruit: Jesus Christ alone is capable of doing this: hence He alone makes possible the perfectibility either of the individual or of the race.

S. G. C.

# Voices from Many Quarters

## (Second Series)

(In our first issue we published a selection from the hundreds of letters received by Dr. Craig after his retirement as Editor of "The Presbyterian." Those letters showed the demand of a great constituency for such a paper as CHRISTIANITY TODAY. In this "second series" we print a similar selection of letters from among the great flood of communications that has come to us. They show the reaction to the first announcement and then to the first issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. We regret that our space is so limited.)

From "three loyal laymen" in Oklahoma:

Joy, joy, joy is in our hearts this day. For last night my brother brought home your letter of April 29th. Words cannot express our deep satisfaction and gratitude, first, for answered prayer, then for the rest of spirit. After reading the letter-headings and the first paragraph we had to stop several minutes—the boys couldn't think of anything to say, for we just could not realize that our prayer had been answered *so soon*. It seems little short of miraculous, truly! We are indeed "wholeheartedly" with you "in this effort to rally and strengthen the cause of the Gospel at this critical time." Thank you for using the word. And *well* we know *the truth* of your argument, for the people here are certainly *more than five to three* for Modernism. We wish to assure you that you can always depend upon us three as "loyal laymen"—and how we do need CHRISTIANITY TODAY—pun or no pun. *Not* subject to domination and dictation of others? *Herein* we will rest from *all fears* for the future. For the paper, led of the Holy Spirit, will be sufficient for all needs. This is indeed God's work, and we are entirely in sympathy with CHRISTIANITY TODAY in all its aims. By all means send us the subscription blanks, and anything else you think we can do for you.

* * *

From Massachusetts:

My heart just sang for joy when your letter awaited me last night. I knew you would have to do this thing eventually but to think it has come about so quickly—yet *that* is what we can expect from your group of men in Philadelphia. Thank God He has pressed His live coal from off the altar right to the hearts of every one of you and you are glowing forth His worth to a hungry *longing* people. Oh, I'm so glad—now we'll know of Westminster regularly and its glorious stand for our Lord. I simply can't tell you my joy over this publication. I *love* the *name*—straightforward and true.

* * *

From New York:

After such a delightful and heartening experience as I have had in reading the first issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, it is only fair that in some small measure I should make known to the Editor my sense of indebtedness to him and the contributors to this inspiring new magazine. Not for a long time have I thrilled so concordantly with the message of any publication, and I am sure that many another reader will derive new courage from its tone of color and conscious possession of truth that must be heralded. God be thanked that once more we have a Christian magazine that *is* Christian, whose Editor and contributors are unafraid, and unhampered by the domination of any influence save that of their own devotion to Divine truth. Those of us who have been pained by all that befell faithful men in the Presbyterian Church—the chief seminary and its sole believing publication—are now rejoicing over the advent of Westminster Seminary and of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. For the men who sacrificed personally that these two institutions might live as a true witness in the midst of apostate "brethren" for these and the great work they have undertaken in His name and for His glory alone, we make humble petition to Him in their behalf that He may grant great grace to each one and bless the oblation which their service offers. With abounding good wishes, I bid you Godspeed in this new enterprise.

* * *

From a Retired Minister:

Yesterday a friend handed me a copy of the first issue of your new paper, CHRISTIANITY TODAY. That was the first time I had ever seen or heard of it. Within the first half hour I had read quite a little of it, reading it aloud to my wife, and I then and there determined to send you my subscription at the first opportunity. Yesterday being the Lord's day, my first opportunity is today, and I enclose herewith my dollar. (You are charging one dollar for a paper well worth two dollars.) I am now a retired Congregational minister, having been in the active service for fifty years, graduating from Andover, the Andover that was. But since the rise of this heart-breaking modernistic apostasy, I have been ashamed to be known as a Congregationalist. My son is a Congregationalist minister, as indeed were my father and one of my grandfathers; but my son and I have wished that we were Presbyterians. I rejoice in the new Westminster Seminary, and a grandson of mine is to enter there this next Fall. I donated to their library a number of valuable books a few months ago. And now I do thank God that you have been led by the Spirit to launch this new paper. I want to tell you that I read practically the whole of the twenty-four pages yesterday, and would like to see it oftener than once a month.

* * *

Another voice from New York:

Enclosed please find my check for a two years' subscription to CHRISTIANITY TODAY. At the beginning of your great undertaking I wish to say in Tennyson's words: "Hold thou the truth; define it well." I have come to believe that the first part of this admonition depends for its success for a good deal on the second part. Now in the sample copy of your new paper I discover that clearness of definition for which I have been longing. To be able to *state the problem* and at the same time *point the way out* as you did is fulfilling the function of true leadership and should inspire your readers, as it did me, with confidence for the future. May God's blessing rest on your endeavors.

* * *

Two letters from Ohio:

I was delighted yesterday to receive sample copies of your splendid paper CHRISTIANITY TODAY, and thank God with all my heart that He is sending forth this new champion of His glorious truth in these tragic days when our dread adversary is wielding the subtle and deadly weapon of Modernism with such devastating effect in many hearts and lives. As we contemplate the heart-breaking situation in the Christian Church today, when men who have been ordained as "ambassadors for Christ" are found false witnesses of Christ, proclaiming "another gospel, which is not another," and leading souls into the mazes of unbelief and down to eternal ruin, how we are challenged to bear constant, fervent, faithful witness for our beloved Lord and to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints," and how joyously and steadfastly we ought to meet that challenge! In all "your work and labor of love" during the coming days may our precious Lord ever be to you, as He was to Abraham your "shield and exceeding great reward."

* * *

I am sending a dollar bill for which send me a copy of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I have read it from first to last, the first issue; and, as I have followed you for years in a noble, devoted, unbeatable fight, I want to tell you the great help and ministry you have been to me. Thank God for the stand you take and the place you fill—hold it at *any* cost, which I know you will—and I predict the paper and Westminster Seminary will both be a great success. They cannot be otherwise, since God and the faith are behind them. And while I shall soon be "retired," I only wish I could begin again, and get behind them and you. But others will rise and see you through. May there be many years granted you to head the host that *will* win!

* * *

A few welcome words from Wisconsin:

The first number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY is not only a journalistic triumph but a precious jewel as well so far as contents are concerned. My subscription dollar is enclosed.

* * *

A minister of the Presbyterian Church in Canada writes from distant British Columbia:

The church of Christ has waited long for just such a paper as CHRISTIANITY TODAY appears to be. I'm sure it will be very welcome in our Presbyterian Church in Canada and I will do my part in its extension. We need a paper like yours. Your statement of preface is very fine and gives a man courage for the struggle that lies before every minister that

loves Jesus Christ in truth. I predict a great future for your paper and I'm sure our Presbyterian Church in Canada will welcome it with much heart.

* * *

Illinois has a good word:

I received, a few days ago, the first issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. It was a surprise to me, and it is the simple truth that I read the paper from beginning to end with rare delight. For myself I wish to say that—whatever the mind of the world may finally decide as to ultimate truth: whatever may be the present or future course of the Presbyterian Church or of the different religious journals published in its name—(and I have charity for them all, and approve of many excellent things which they contain)—yet souls like mine, born, nourished and sustained in faith, hope, and life in historic and evangelical Christianity, must still be fed upon these truths stated *fully, clearly,* earnestly, and even *militantly*—for only thus are they adequate to our need. Hence it is with malice toward no one, but only for my own good and the good of what I conceive to be a great cause, that I have decided immediately to become a subscriber to the new paper.

* * *

From a Middle-Western banker:

A ministerial friend once wrote me saying "controversy is of the pit." Well, if that is so, our Lord certainly has much to repent of, for the waves of controversy never towered higher than when He was meeting the unbelief of His day. And what a treasure of divine truth we should have missed had He avoided meeting error with His overwhelming truth. Every time a minister, professor or editor puts up the white flag against Modernism and Humanism my heart aches for him. He has joined the ranks of "the fearful and the unbelieving" and he has become a shorn Samson. Now that Modernism is so completely in the Presbyterian saddle, those who still sing with heart and soul

"How firm a foundation ye saints in the Lord
Is laid for your faith in His excellent word,"

need as never before to stand together with uncamouflaged fellowship and tell their faith and give their testimony with aggressive frankness.

* * *

From Kentucky:

We received the first copy of CHRISTIANITY TODAY and the four in our family read it with much interest, profit and thanksgiving. We have long seen the need of just this kind of Christian religious paper, and our prayers go up to Him for you and those who assist you in this good work.

* * *

Indiana presents a matter that ought to be faced:

Enclosed please find my check for which please send me CHRISTIANITY TODAY for one year. I am delighted with the prospect of having a reliable sound Fundamental Church paper since the "Directors" decided that we needed a change in the editorship of the Presbyterian. That was a great shock to me. And when we can have such an article published in our so-called "Official Church Organ" as was written by Dr. Abbott in the March issue of the Presbyterian Magazine, go unchallenged we pray for some one to come to the rescue. The article referred to would have done credit to Tom Paine or Bob Ingersoll. In fact, instead of being an evidence of progressive religious thought, it was identically the same belief that was taught by these men years ago. And the fact that it could pass without a challenge from our church papers that are not the "official" organs shows the great need of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

* * *

Some encouraging words from Iowa:

I am so glad to receive the first copy of your excellent paper with the familiar true Holy Spirit ring and I pray God's blessing and approval and assistance in making the paper a clarion call of God's people under the banner of the cross of Christ. And I hope to see the same published weekly very soon. Rest assured that our God has many true ones who have not bowed the knee to the Modern Baal. I enclose my check for three subscriptions and a few names for sample copies.

* * *

Texas sends assurance of support:

Enclosed you will find my subscription to CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I was delighted with the sample copy of the first issue. I am wtih you to the last ditch. I am a direct descendant of the first and second Presidents of Princeton University, but I deplore the present situation there. I rejoice with you in your success in the establishment of an organ which will speak in behalf of the truth and the Gospel. My best wishes go to you and also to the cause as represented in Westminster Seminary. You will find that your friends and supporters will be counted by the thousands.

* * *

A word from Pennsylvania:

I have enjoyed CHRISTIANITY TODAY to the fullest. It is instructive and inspirational throughout. How good it was to hear again the true devotion, clear expression, concise statements, and deep spirituality that we used to hear every week in the Presbyterian. So far as I am concerned, the new magazine is a complete success. It has a great mission to perform in the church today. Allow me to express my appreciation for your noble endeavor and to promise my full support in prayer always, in circulation now, and financially as soon as I am able. My copy is being passed around the house where I am boarding and I have one elder very much interested in it. I hope to arouse more interest as time goes on.

* * *

Illinois again:

Will you please enter my name on your mailing list for a year's subscription to CHRISTIANITY TODAY. It seems to me that you should have great success with CHRISTIANITY TODAY, as the need of such a paper is so great and widespread. It is high time that able defenders of the faith should challenge militantly and uncompromisingly the thoroughly false and pernicious philosophy which underlies the whole fabric of Modernism.

* * *

An elder from Missouri makes a pertinent observation:

Through some unknown source I am in receipt of Vol. I, No. 1, of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. When I read the third paragraph of "By Way of Preface" I was convinced that I wanted your paper—here is my dollar. As a Sunday School Superintendent and worker for many years I have watched and wept over the spineless literature which is put into the hands of and is available to Presbyterians, for the homes and for Bible study, by our Board and our so called "Church Papers." In all my years of experience I have been loyal to our Board and its publications but it is certainly little short of a crime to have the Board beg for support BECAUSE IT IS PRESBYTERIAN and then put out the stuff they do which has no marks of Presbyterianism except the advertisements. I defy anyone to pick up *any paper* or *lesson help* issued by our Board for the past 25 years and find one (just one) doctrinal suggestion or one item which could not be accepted in toto by Methodist, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Campbellite or Baptist; and yet, in the face of this they wonder why our Schools are not loyal to them and why so few people know what the Presbyterian Church stands for and believes. Yours for the Bible and the Presbyterian Church.

* * *

A voice from the Southern Church—in the person of one of its most outstanding leaders:

I like the motive leading to the publishing of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, and I like the policy as announced in the May No., Vol. 1, No. 1. Personally I am not in favor of Organic Union with any Presbyterian Church in America, for the reason that the terms of union would have to be so broad that it will forever be impossible to silence any minister or ruling elder who may be loud-mouthed in blattering the rottenest misinterpretations of the eternal word of God. I wish we could segregate the conservatives in the U. S. A. Church and persuade them to come in with us so that we could form a bulwark against the risen wave of ancient heresies that has assumed to itself the name of "Modernism." It looks to me that the U. S. A. Church, or rather the conservatives in that Church, waked up too late to stem the tide. The one consolation is that THE CHURCH is GOD'S CHURCH, and He is immensely MORE interested in its welfare that we can possibly be, and He has the power to roll back the tide of the destructive enemies of His Church. He is pleased to use His own true followers in this work, and may be standing out of the way until His true followers at least begin to work together to carry forward the BANNER OF THE CROSS. The condition may not be quite so bad in the U. S. A. Church as it sometimes seems. I know the disposition of all opposers of the word of God, their noisiness and their claims. I'm hoping

that the tide will soon turn, and the truth of God be like a great tidal wave that shall carry very far over the realm of His Kingdom.

* * *

From a noted Minister of the United Presbyterian Church:

I received from an unknown source a copy of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. It came at a time when I was much distressed and burdened about things in the church today. Our own United Presbyterian Church has been sitting back complacently boasting about all absence of modern unbelief in her midst. And all the while Satan has been making his inroads and we are entirely too complacent to even make a good protest. Your good paper certainly warmed my heart and I feel confident it will fill a much needed place. It will not be long until the matter of organic union of all Presbyterian bodies will be accomplished. Can oil and water be made to mix? A great majority of our churches will be for the union. Some will not be. Not because we have anything against our brethren in the Presbyterian Church nor yet because of denominational pride or prejudice. Things have gone too far for trifling about denominational pride especially when the leaders of one's own church have ceased to bear any testimony for the living Lord. Is not the day rapidly coming when there must be a new alignment, not along denominational lines, but rather a "coming out" of those individuals and churches who still believe in historical Christianity? I hope your good paper may be the means of blazing the light of that new day.

* * *

From a well-known Minister of the Reformed Church in America:

You say there is need of a "militant presentation of the truth." Yes, indeed. Life is a stuggle. Education is a struggle. Politics is a struggle. And when we are after THE TRUTH why must struggling cease? Is not error militant? And were not the new masters of Princeton militant to drive through their desires—seemingly "nice" and "reasonable" and "broad-minded" as they were in going about it; but relentlessly thorough and persistent? May we not be militant when error in every form is so brazen and hoodwinks even the children of light? I have no sympathy with "middle-of-the-roaders": they are constructive traitors. Error does not believe in a middle-of-the-road. The great reformers never got anywhere except through their positive stand. Lincoln did not believe in it. Kuyper gained his great ecclesiastical and political victories in Holland by being uncompromising. He believed in the motto: "In our isolation lies our strength." We live in a time which is as a stream which has its quiet drift in the direction of terrible rapids.

God bless you in your undertaking! May He raise up strong friends to support you. I wish I were financially able to help subsidize. Worldly ventures of all kinds get their millions, and even shady ecclesiastical ventures do not lack for cash and endowment. This seems to be a pretty good criterion for knowing what is the truth: *there* where a hard struggle is.

* * *

From two Ministers of the Reformed Church in the U. S.:

Kindly accept my congratulations upon the publication of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. You have a splendid policy and I highly appreciate your endeavor to maintain the heritage of the fathers.

* * *

This is to acknowledge receipt of your paper CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I read with keen interest and consent. The struggle is to abide with the word as the fathers of our Church have explained it.

* * *

Two more letters from the East, the second letter being written by a well-known member of the Pennsylvania bar:

Please put me down as a charter subscriber, and send me ten copies of this initial number to distribute among my people and my friends. This first number is a classic. It is valuable as a statement of the church situation today, and of the remedy. Back to the BOOK and back to the Christ of the BOOK. CHRISTIANITY TODAY will be welcome to the "seven thousands," to the millions, who have not fallen for Baal. It ought to have a million subscribers in a short time. Long live CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Best wishes—showers of blessing!

* * *

The first copy of your paper has been placed in my hands and I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations and to wish you strength to battle for the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity. As a member of this church since my twenty-first birthday, some fifteen years ago, I can truly say that it is my deliberate opinion that the signers of the Auburn Affirmation and their followers have definitely proclaimed themselves followers of a doctrine which is neither Presbyterian nor Christian. I give them credit for stating their convictions, but I feel they are not acting in accordance with ethics when they deliberately use the pulpit of the church to preach doctrines hostile to its very existence. I gladly grant to every man the right to believe as he wishes, and to preach those beliefs; but I deny to him the right to advocate those doctrines from a pulpit in the Presbyterian Church, a church brought into existence by the faith and labor of our fathers. Let those who hold to the principles of the Auburn Affirmation at least have the dignity and common decency to take themselves out from under the shelter of our church and set up their own church and advocate therein their doctrines; but NOT to continue to clothe themselves with the name Presbyterian, the doctrines covered by that name having been deliberately forsaken by them. If they fail to do so, I trust that faithful and courageous churches will at once take steps to expel them from their midst. No one wishes a fight, much less a church worker; but a fight has been forced upon us. Let us rally behind our leaders, put our trust in God, and purify our churches. As the body is often saved by the cutting out of a cancer, so let us hope that the Presbyterian Church will be saved by cutting out this cancer of unbelief, painful as such operation may prove.

### An Explanatory Statement

*(Continued from Page 4)*

yond our control. We plan to go to press about the middle of each month.

This issue, like the preceding one, has been sent to many from whom, or in behalf of whom, no request for a copy had been received. We have been much encouraged by the response, in the way of subscriptions, we have received from those to whom copies of the first issue were sent; and hope, it is needless to say, that we will receive like encouragement from the recipients of this our second issue. We could wish that our financial resources permitted us to look forward to making an equally wide broadcast of our third issue; but, our financial resources being what they are, we will be able to send our next issue only to subscribers and to those from whom, or in behalf of whom, we receive a request.

We therefore urge those who have not subscribed, but who intend to subscribe, to do so at once, so as not to miss the next issue. We also urge our friends to send us the names of non-subscribers who they think would be interested in receiving a copy of our next issue. In this connection we would again appeal to our friends and sympathizers to become sustaining subscribers, as they may be financially able. There is no truth in the rumor that has come to us that one or more wealthy individuals have underwritten the expense of this enterprise. Only as the paper has the help of a large number of individuals of moderate means can it hope to succeed, financially speaking. We repeat that CHRISTIANITY TODAY is not operated for profit—and never will be—but wholly in the interest of what its founders believe to be a great cause.

Expressions of opinion by our readers for publication under their own signatures are welcomed. "Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice," as announced in our first issue, will receive consideration in our next issue. Those having questions to submit are urged to send them in without delay. We expect to add other features soon. In the meantime we welcome suggestions and criticisms from our readers.

# The 142nd General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

THE 142nd General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. formally convened on Thursday morning, May 29, 1930, in the Taft Auditorium, Cincinnati, Ohio. The sermon was, as usual, preached by the Moderator of the last Assembly (Dr. C. B. McAfee), following which the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered to the commissioners.

### Pre-Assembly Conference on Evangelism

But while the Assembly was officially opened in this traditional way, the real beginning was on the Tuesday before, when the Pre-Assembly Conferences commenced. They were held in the Church of the Covenant, the largest downtown Presbyterian Church in Cincinnati, of which Dr. Frank R. Elder, is Minister. Most of the commissioners to the Assembly arrived in the city of meeting for most, if not all, of these Pre-Assembly gatherings. Surely the object for which these conferences are designed is above all praise. The most important is the "Pre-Assembly Conference on Evangelism," to which Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning are allotted. The winning of men to saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as Redeemer and Lord is the great task of the church. Any services that will bring men to a new consecration and faithfulness in the proclamation of the blood-bought gospel ought to be sacred. But the difficulty is, that in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. there runs the same line of cleavage so apparent in all the Protestant communions today. Historic Christianity offers one Gospel, Modernism offers "another,—which is not another." Which Gospel are we to preach, the Gospel of redemption through the Cross of Christ alone, or the Gospel of salvation through human improvement and effort? Those speaking for both views make use of much of the same vocabulary—but when they speak of evangelism, each means a process of salvation exactly opposite to the other. Yet to many of those who love the old faith the fact is often never suspected that Modernism's new wine is, sometimes, for policy's sake, poured into old bottles. True evangelism is absent, nor will we be blessed with a revival, until we are agreed upon what message we are to proclaim, until we are willing to insist lovingly but immovably, that the Church preach only the Gospel set forth in the Word of God and our great doctrinal standards. Conferences on "evangelism" that ignore the question of the substance of the evangel, relegating discussion of it to the forbidden realm of "controversy," are a shining example of the confusion of so much that is called modern thought.

It is well known to all those familiar with the working of the machinery of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. that a relatively small clique, composed mostly of officials connected with some of the boards, really dictates the policies of the Church and the Assembly. This group—doubtless well-meaning according to its lights—usually picks the Moderator for the ensuing year some months in advance, so that much preparatory political work may be done long before the Assembly opens. And then, to insure that its candidate has an opportunity to impress those commissioners not already pledged, it is often arranged that he deliver one of the principal addresses to the Pre-Assembly Conference on Evangelism. The address of Dr. Kerr to the Conference this year was of a very high order. He said nothing disloyal to the standards of the Church. He was reverent, persuasive and winning. Whether he so intended it, or calculated it no man may say or even surmise, but it is certain that when he ended his address, hundreds of commissioners were deeply impressed with the idea that Dr. Kerr was a conservative, and his election was thenceforth assured.

It seems a great pity to many that the Pre-Assembly Conference on Evangelism—the most sacred work of the Church—cannot be kept entirely free from even the remotest suspicion of ecclesiastical politics. The fact that the political use of these conferences is quiet, reverent and unobtrusive, makes such use, in the judgment of many, even more unethical. One Commissioner expressed it by the simple word: "Blasphemy." While this may be perhaps too strong, it is surely high time that these conferences be divorced from anything that seems to smack of Church politics.

### Election of Moderator

On Thursday afternoon Dr. Kerr was elected Moderator of the Assembly. The only other candidate was the Rev. Henry B. Master, D.D., Secretary of the Board of Ministerial Relief and Sustentation. It had been expected that two other names would be presented,—those of the Rev. Howard Agnew Johnston, D.D., of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and the Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D., of Princeton, N. J. But neither Dr. Johnston nor Dr. Craig would permit his name to be presented, for reasons which seemed best to each. Dr. Kerr was nominated by the Rev. H. C. Swearingen, D.D., of St. Paul, Minn. This nomination was seconded by the Rev. C. W. Kerr, of Tulsa, Oklahoma. Dr. Master was nominated by the Rev. Henry Marcott, D.D., of Evansville, Indiana. His nomination was seconded by the Rev. Ralph D. Hall, of New Mexico, a home missionary. Dr. Kerr was nominated on the ground of his pastoral success, his distinguished career as President of the Board of Christian Education, and his fame as a radio preacher. Both those who nominated Dr. Kerr stressed what they described as his "loyalty to the standards of the Church" and the Assembly was assured that Dr. Kerr "had never sounded a false note" in his preaching.

Those who nominated Dr. Master did so on the ground of his great service to the Church in conceiving and bringing to pass the pension system for its Ministers. While Dr. Master is known to be conservative in his theology, that fact was not mentioned by his sponsors. The result was, that many who came uninformed as to candidates, but desiring to vote for the conservative candidate, whoever he might be, gained the impression that Dr. Kerr and not Dr. Master was the conservative. Dr. Kerr was elected by a majority far exceeding anything that his supporters had expected, and in the opinion of experienced observers this confusion in regard to the identity of the conservative candidate gained him between one hundred and fifty and two hundred votes. The result of the balloting was: Dr. Kerr, 605, Dr. Master, 303. Rather strangely there was no motion that the election be made unanimous. Dr. Kerr was escorted to the platform and assumed the Moderatorship with a short and graceful speech.

### Chairmen of Standing Committees

On Friday morning, appointments of chairmen of standing committees were announced. They were as follows:

Bills and Overtures, Dr. C. W. Kerr.
Pensions, Dr. Mark A. Matthews.
Theological Seminaries, Dr. Arnold H. Lowe.
National Missions, Rev. C. Waldo Cherry, D.D.
Foreign Missions, Rev. Howard A. Johnston, D.D.
Christian Education, Rev. Henry B. Master, D.D.
Polity, Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, D.D.
Finance, Elder Charles E. Benedict.
Mileage, Elder George E. Cryer.
Leave of Absence, Rev. E. Floyd Rippey, D.D.
Synodical Records, Rev. Glenn L. Sneed, D.D.
Nomination of Members of General Council, Rev. Hugh T. Kerr, D.D.
Nomination of Members of Permanent Judicial Committee, Rev. R. M. Kistler, D.D.
Resolutions, Rev. Stanley Hunter, D.D.
Canvass on Overtures, Rev. George W. Benn, D.D.

Dean J. D. Hoskins, of Knoxville, Tenn., was announced as Vice-Moderator.

Three of these chairmen,—Doctors Coffin,

Rippey and Hunter, were signers of the Auburn Affirmation.

### Memorial Service

Considerable miscellaneous business was transacted on Friday. The work of the Assembly was suspended for a time while the Rev. W. H. Foulkes, D.D., led the Assembly in a Memorial Day Service. Three veterans of the Civil War were given places of honor upon the platform and the Stated Clerk read the names of 189 Ministers of the Church who had died since the last Assembly.

### "National Loyalty Commission"

The report of the "National Loyalty Commission" came on Friday afternoon. The Commission was appointed by the last Assembly. First Dr. C. B. McAfee was heard. He was followed by Dr. Wm. H. Foulkes, who introduced four of the winners in the National Loyalty Oratorical Contest. Dr. Mark A. Matthews spoke at some length upon the deliverance proposed by the Commission, which was enthusiastically adopted by the Assembly. It pledges the Assembly to support Constitutional government, recognzies the right of the people to change the constitution if they so desire, and endorses Prohibition.

### Princeton Seminary Report

On Friday afternoon came the report of the new Board at Princeton Seminary. It was presented by Dr. W. L. McEwan, President. With evident sincerity, Dr. McEwan read his report stressing particularly the sentence "Every action has been adopted, every deliberation has been estimated, every detail of administration has been undertaken, with the avowed purpose of viewing distinctly and regarding sacredly the traditional and recognized position of the seminary for conservative theology and strict evangelical teaching." This strong declaration naturally made considerable impression upon many, but if the uninformed could have noted, as the writer did, the hearty chuckles and winks exchanged between two Modernists of great fame in the Church as this sentence was read, they might have wondered. This is not said to discredit the sincerity of Dr. McEwan in making his declaration. His sincerity is granted. But one wonders how long it is going to take Dr. McEwan and others to wake up to the fact that all the power of Modernism in the Church was *not* expended for the purpose of keeping Princeton conservative. How can anyone really believe anything so incredible as that? And although Princeton may be outwardly orthodox, yet all will agree that she has ceased her militant witness. If she speaks the same words, she whispers them, when once her voice rose clear and strong around the world. Nor did Dr. McEwan make any reference to the fact that two members of the Board are actually signers of the Auburn "Affirmation," that no protest at receiving them as fellow directors of Princeton's policies was made by those on the Board who emphasize their own orthodoxy; that the Board has actually commended itself, including these affirmationists, to the confidence of the church. How any Auburn Affirmationist can be expected honestly to support the historic Princeton position is a profound mystery. If he *did* support that position he would be repudiating the "Affirmation," for the two are mutually exclusive. Neither of them have, however, so far as our knowledge extends, withdrawn their signatures from the "Affirmation."

### Dr. Craig's Amendment

At the conclusion of Dr. McEwan's amiable assurances that all was well, and after the report had been seconded by the ubiquitous Dr. M. A. Matthews, the Assembly was surprised to see Dr. Craig take the floor to offer an amendment to the report. His amendment was as follows:

"1. That the approval or disapproval of the portion of the report of the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton in the State of New Jersey, which deals with the amendments to its Charter, be withheld until the General Assembly may be informed by Court decision as to the validity of these amendments.

2. That the Moderator be authorized and directed to appoint a Committee of five, none of whom shall be Trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary, or otherwise officially connected with Princeton Seminary, who are hereby authorized, empowered and directed in the name of and on behalf of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, to take such action as may be proper and appropriate to obtain a decision from the Court of last resort in the State of New Jersey, as to the legality of said amendments."

The resolution having been immediately seconded from several parts of the house, Dr. Craig spoke in its behalf. In opening his remarks, he said: "My purpose in presenting this resolution is not to reopen the question of the wisdom or the unwisdom of the reorganization of Princeton Seminary—that is a question that was settled by the last Assembly. In presenting this resolution, I am not opposing the action of the last Assembly; rather I am seeking to bring it about, that this General Assembly see to it that certain instructions given by the last General Assembly in connection with its approval of the reorganization of Princeton Seminary be carried out."

Dr. Craig then proceeded to explain to the Assembly the legal tangle into which the reorganization of Princeton Seminary had involved the Church.

On the one hand, he showed that "eminent New Jersey lawyers" (a phrase that the prevailing party found so distasteful that it tried to laugh it down) particularly the Honorable E. L. Katzenbach, formerly Attorney General of New Jersey and the great law firm of Lindabury, Depue and Faulks of Newark held positively that the Act of New Jersey of 1918-20 under which the Trustees purported to make their charter changes in Princeton, did not apply to Princeton Seminary, that any so-called changes would be illegal and everything done under them null and void. The last Assembly instructed the new Board at Princeton to "take all steps necessary to ensure the validity of the amendments." This the board had failed to do, and thus had disobeyed the instructions of the 1929 Assembly. All the board had done was to secure the opinion of its own lawyers that it could legally proceed, and had thereupon purported to make the charter changes, and deposit a copy of the changes, as required by law, with the Secretary of State of New Jersey. The Board had, to be sure, received a document from the Secretary of State of New Jersey certifying that the "changes" had been deposited with him, but this was no proof that the changes were legal. The Secretary of State was not empowered by law to decide upon the legality of the amendments—his document was simply a receipt which he was required by law to give. That receipt had no bearing on the legality or non-legality of the changes, and could not be relied upon as being the approval of the State of New Jersey. Since counsel of the highest reputation and standing declare flatly that the amendments are illegal, while the board's attorney's say they *are* legal, there is only one way to settle the matter; to have it adjudicated by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. For this purpose Dr. Craig advocated that the Assembly institute a "friendly suit" to determine the matter. As long as it was left in doubt, the trust funds of Princeton were endangered. The Assembly ought to take every precaution to see that the changes were lawful. "Law observance" held good for the church as well as the nation.

Then Dr. Craig turned to the other horn of the dilemma into which the Assembly had been maneuvered by the advocates of reorganization. Suppose the amendments *were* legal? What then? Why, worse!

### Assembly Control Lost?

The reorganizationists had for several years almost made a slogan of "Assembly Control." They had led the Church to believe that the trouble at Princeton was that control by the Assembly was too remote. The new plan, it had been assured, would bring effective legal control over the Seminary by the Assembly. Had it done this? No. Instead of *assuring* Assembly control, it had, if the amendments are legal, *destroyed* it.

"The question of the validity of these amendments is important, because if the Trustees of Princeton Seminary have acted legally in making these amendments to their Charter under the Act of 1918-1920, they can also under the authority of the same Act, rescind them at any future meeting and substitute such other Amendments as the Act authorizes as suits their pleasure—and that without consulting anybody, except themselves. The Certificate of Amendment which the Board of Trustees filed with the Secretary of State of New Jersey, last December, under its Corporate seal and signed by its President and verified by the Oath of its Secretary, states that 'There being no membership of this Corporation to which a Resolution of the Trustees may be referred for

approval . . . . the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton . . . . do hereby determine that the Charter . . . . granted to it by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey by Act passed November 15, 1822, with the supplements thereto and the amendments thereof, be further amended and changed to provide as follows . . . .' What does this mean? It means that according to the Trustees themselves there is no superior body to which they must submit their actions in amending their Charter. If this be the case, any instruction which the General Assembly may give them relative to amending their Charter is purely advisory, not at all mandatory. It is no doubt true that these particular amendments were submitted to the last General Assembly for its approval, but that was not at all necessary. If the Board of Trustees can amend their Charter under the Acts of 1918-1920 these Amendments could have been made just as well if the General Assembly had withheld approval."

All that had been said related to the powers of the trustees as a property holding and managing body. Some lawyers thought that it might be possible for the Assembly to preserve control over the Trustees so far as their educational functions alone were concerned even if it lost financial control over them. This was doubtful, however. The ground on which this view is based is disputed by eminent counsel, including the Honorable Robert H. McCarter, former Attorney General of New Jersey and legal advisor of the Committee of Eleven. He holds that all the power the General Assembly possesses over the institution is such as is reserved to it in the Charter. "If this be the case, and the Trustees can at any time that suits their pleasure, make amendments to their Charter of the sort they have attempted to make, there need be no longer any talk at all of Assembly Control as far as Princeton Seminary is concerned. Then at most, the General Assembly can humbly petition the Board of Trustees to conduct Princeton Seminary, according to its desires, but it can issue no binding instructions," said Dr. Craig.

The dilemma was now before the Assembly. If illegal, the charter changes imperiled the vast Princeton properties; if legal, the Assembly had lost its control over the Trustees. Neither prospect was pleasing.

Dr. Craig further pointed out that the purported changes in the charter of the Seminary regarding (1) the manner of election of the Trustees, and (2) the change in the beneficiary from Princeton Seminary to the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were both regarded as illegal by eminent counsel. In conclusion, he urged that this mater of great importance be not ignored, and that the Assembly test it in a friendly way, lest it should be brought into the courts in the future, under less pleasant circumstances.

After Dr. Craig had concluded, Paul Martin, Esq. of Springfield, Ohio, a member of the new Board, took the floor. Introducing himself as "an Ohio Lawyer" he attempted no answer to Dr. Craig. He merely asserted that all was well, that instructions had all been carried out to the letter, and that there was nothing to fear.

At this moment someone made a point that Dr. Craig's motion was out of order, and that it should be presented when the Committee on Theological Seminaries reported. After some hesitation the Moderator ruled the discussion out of order at that time, (after having allowed the discussion for a considerable period) and Dr. Craig was allowed to withdraw his resolution with the understanding that he would present it when the standing Committee on Theological Seminaries reported.

### Dr. Coffin Applauded

On Saturday morning one of the most significant events of the Assembly took place,—the address by Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, of New York, who told of his experiences in Scotland at the time of the recent Church union. It was a brilliant address packed full of valuable information but replete with the Modernism for which Dr. Coffin is known to be unashamed. He told of the now reunited Church of Scotland, the ceremony of re-union, and prospects for the future. With great pride he pointed out its new latitudinarian creed-subscription, which is extremely acceptable to Modernists. He told of the "spiritual independence" which that Church sought to reserve for itself. This, when examined, proves to be no more than the old Modernist scheme of changing the teachings and doctrine of the Church, while retaining all its assets (even in defiance of sacred trusts, as the United Church of Canada has done) on the plea that the old faith has not been discarded, but merely "reinterpreted for this generation." At the conclusion of Dr. Coffin's remarks, which might well be entitled "Dr. Coffin's dream of a perfect Modernist Church," the Assembly applauded him again and again. It was quite apparent that many of those applauding did not grasp the real significance of Dr. Coffin's address. Yet it is more than significant that in a Presbyterian Assembly an acknowledged Modernist, an Affirmationist, preaching Modernism pure and undefiled, should receive such an ovation.

### "Church Cooperation and Union"

On Saturday morning the Department of Church Cooperation and Union, of which Dr. J. Ross Stevenson is Chairman, had the floor. Dr. Coffin's address was in connection with this report. Fraternal greetings were received from Dr. A. W. MacKinnon, of the United Church of Canada, and from Dr. W. M. Rochester, representing the Presbyterian Church in Canada. In a moving address, Dr. Rochester told of the progress of the "Auld Kirk" in Canada—a progress that promises great things for the future in that extensive and growing Dominion.

Dr. Stevenson presented the report of the Department regarding Union with other churches. He told of a report having come from the United Presbyterian Assembly of a move favorable to union with other Presbyterian and Reformed bodies. The response of the Southern Assembly had been more cautious.

### The Assembly as a Deliberative Body

The Assembly, following Dr. Stevenson's remarks adopted the resolution proposed without debate or much consideration. In a few moments the Assembly had definitely committed itself to Union by instructing the Department to "cooperate with the Committees in the preparation of a complete plan for organic union to be submitted to the next Assembly." If there were any pressing reasons for this action, they did not appear in the discussion. But everyone seemed to be under the impression that what the Church needs most of all is to be *bigger*,—that *size* will guarantee *quality*. No one pointed out that a much larger Church will mean either a much larger Assembly or that the basis of representation from the Presbyteries will have to be radically reduced. The action of the Assembly on this and other matters emphasizes anew the fact that the Assembly has become so large that it is no longer a truly deliberative body. It is absurd to imagine that a body composed of nearly one thousand commissioners, over half of whom are at an Assembly for the first time, will be a true deliberative body. Such size makes a perfect setting for manipulation on a large scale. It opens the door to let real efficiency *out* and machine domination *in*. Many of the commissioners found that the most they had to do as representatives of their presbyteries was to join in with an "aye" or a "nay" as the case might be, as the committee then reporting happened to request. It will sound like heresy to those who are committed to getting a bigger and bigger church by repeated mergers, but what the church needs is to get away from the fascination of the idea of "bigness." If anything the church needs, like Gideon's army, to be made smaller, not larger. It is too unwieldy already. The same is true of the Assembly. The Presbyterian form of government in the form in which we possess it was fashioned in ages when (1) Ruling Elders possessed a background of rigid theological instruction; (2) the Church was small enough so that the representatives were really familiar with the needs and conditions of the whole church, and (3) the Assembly was small enough to be a real deliberative body, one acting in its own wisdom, and not merely as a rubber stamp for countless mysterious committees. For a great portion of the time, the unwieldly Assembly in Cincinnati did not possess the atmosphere of an ecclesiastical body at all. If it were not that one knew it to be an Assembly, there were times when one might have imagined himself present at an Elks' convention—not at a great court of Christ's Church. While never deliberately irreverent, yet the huge body lacked the dignity and sense of solemn responsibility which were fitting in its approach to great problems of faith and life. The most serious and sacred questions were treated with levity or passed with a "hurrah and a bang." What real dignity the Assembly possessed practically all came from the balance and inherent sense of fitness possesesd by Dr. Kerr. Always graceful, felicitous and sympathetic, the Moderator did his best to keep the Assembly in the rev-

erence due to the great Presbyterian tradition, and if he failed at times it is only because one man cannot always control a few members of a large group who are on a vacation and act like a crowd of college boys at a party. This sederunt also considered the report of the standing committee on Pensions, which was favorably received, and a much deserved resolution of tribute to Dr. Master was unanimously passed.

### Report on Overtures

After the Pension report the Assembly listened to an able address by the Honorable Meyers R. Cooper, Governor of Ohio. Following the Governor's remarks, and after he had been escorted out by his officer in uniform, the official canvass of the overtures was announced as follows:

A. (On the Election and Ordination of Women as Bishops or Pastors, and as Ruling Elders.)
- For .....109
- Against .....171
- No action ..... 3

B. (On the Election and Ordination of Women as Ruling Elders.)
- For .....160
- Against .....120
- No action ..... 7

C. (On the Licensure of Local Evangelists.)
- For .....145
- Against .....130
- No action ..... 8

D. (On the Incorporation of Particular Churches.)
- For .....140
- Against .....133
- No action ..... 13

E. (On the Call to the Pastoral Office.)
- For .....242
- Against ..... 28
- No action ..... 7

F. (On Directors of Religious Education.)
- For .....140
- Against .....121
- No action ..... 14

Since an overture must receive 147 affirmative votes to be adopted, only overtures B and E were declared part of the law of the Church by the Moderator.

### Sabbath Services

Saturday afternoon was devoted to sight-seeing. On Sunday most of the pulpits in and near Cincinnati were supplied by Assembly Commissioners. Dr. Kerr preached in the First Presbyterian Church, official host of the Assembly, of which the Rev. John Garretson is Minister. His sermon dealt with Christian unity and organic cooperative effort.

In the Church of the Covenant the morning sermon was delivered by the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., D.Litt., on "the Gospel and Modern Substitutes." A great congregation, composed largely of commissioners to the Assembly, heard a brilliant, moving and passionately earnest plea for the old Gospel and the old Book. After the vaugeness and incoherence of so much that was said at the Assembly and in its incidental meetings, Dr. Machen's fearless and heartfelt testimony to the Gospel was a refreshment to the souls of many. In the evening Dr. Craig preached on "The Christ of Today," his text being Hebrews 13:8. Again a large number of commissioners were present, listening closely while Dr. Craig expounded the Word regarding the everlasting Christ of the Gospel, who is the living Christ of today. In the First Church of Walnut Hills, the Rev. C. E. Macartney, D.D., preached in the morning, while the Rev. Mark A. Matthews, D.D., occupied the pulpit in the evening. Both spoke to large congregations.

Among other noted visitors to Cincinnati who occupied prominent local pulpits were, the Rev. W. E. Jordon of Philadelphia, Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin of New York, Dr. Howard Agnew Johnston of Milwaukee, Dr. Minot C. Morgan of New York, Dr. Charles R. Erdman of Princeton, Rev. C. W. Kerr of Tulsa, Dr. Wm. H. Foulkes of Newark, and Dr. Wm. C. Covert of Philadelphia.

### Budget for 1930-1931

Monday morning the Assembly adopted the budget for the coming year, which is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Board of National Missions... | $3,903,500.00 |
| Board of Foreign Missions.... | 3,024,750.00 |
| Board of Christian Education.. | 1,581,750.00 |
| Board of Pensions..... | 647,500.00 |
| American Bible Society..... | 74,000.00 |
| Federal Council of Churches.. | 18,500.00 |
| | $9,250,000.00 |
| Women's National Missions. | 1,375.000.00 |
| Women's Foreign Missions.... | 1,375,000.00 |
| | $12,000,000.00 |

In addition to this, the budget of the office of the General Assembly (including the $87,000 expenses of this meeting) was fixed at $212,341.

### Miscellaneous Reports

The standing Committee on Christian Education gave its report, which was presented by Dr. Master, the Chairman. Addresses were made by the Rev. W. C. Covert, D.D., General Secretary of the Board, and the Rev. H. L. Bowlby, D.D., General Secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance.

Other matters discussed at this sederunt were, the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, the Waldensian Church and the Western Section of the "Pan-Presbyterian Alliance."

Monday afternoon the Assembly devoted considerable time to hearing of the project for a National Church building in Washington. The Assembly approved the project, which calls for the Union of the Church of the Covenant in Washington and the First Church, and the erection of a new building at a cost of about two millions of dollars.

When the report of the Committee on Marriage was called up, the Assembly seemed more like an Assembly than at any time during its sessions. The portion of the report that met with disfavor was as follows:

"We recommend as consonant with the religious temper of our day that there be stricken from our Confession of Faith Chapter 24, Section 2, the following words:

"'And, therefore, such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, papists or other idolaters; neither should such as are goldly be unequally yoked by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life or maintain damnable heresies.'"

The assault upon the recommendation was led by the venerable but vigorous Dr. Geo. B. Bell of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. Others rallied to his support, and when the vote was put, the amendment to strike out the recommendation was overwhelmingly carried.

### Final Action on Princeton Report

The report of the standing Committee on Theological Seminaries was made, and its recommendations approved. When the items concerning Princeton Seminary came up, Dr. Craig took the floor and offered his resolution, which was seconded. It was moved and seconded that the resolution be laid on the table. On the question being put, the motion was decisively lost. Then Dr. Craig spoke briefly in favor of his resolution, warning the Assembly that its rejection was tantamount to a declaration that the Assembly did not care whether the Princeton funds were in jeopardy or whether the Assembly possessed any control. Following Dr. Craig, Dr. C. B. McAfee took the floor, and gently assured the Assembly that "this was but an echo of last year, the matter had been settled by the last Assembly, there was no need to prolong it further," etc., etc. Like Mr. Paul Martin, Dr. McAfee did not attempt, for very good reasons, to answer Dr. Craig's contentions. He simply relied upon the desire of the commissioners not to quarrel, and upon the natural lack of information with regard to the subject that was so noticable among those who were present for the first time. Upon the question being put the motion was decisively lost, although the sentiment in favor of the amendment had noticeably increased since the Friday before. Dr. Craig had his dissent recorded and on Tuesday's sederunt he filed the following protest, which will appear in the minutes of Assembly, and reads as follows:

### Dr. Craig's Protest

"The undersigned, a Commissioner to the 142nd General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, hereby respectfully records his deliberate and solemn protest against the action of the Assembly on Monday, June 2nd, 1930, in approving the Report of the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, at Princeton, in the State of New Jersey, inasfar as said report has to do with the changes which said Trustees purport to have made in their Charter under the authority of an Act of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, entitled 'An Act to Authorize Charitable and Educational Corporations to make Changes in their Charters, or Acts or Certificates, of Incorporation and their Organization,' approved

in 1918 and amended in 1920. He does so for the following reasons:

(1) The Board of Trustees did not obey the instructions given it by the last Assembly to take all the steps required to insure the validity of these amendments, inasmuch as (a) eminent New Jersey Counsel hold that the Act of 1918-1920 is not available for amending the Charter of said Trustees, and (b) eminent New Jersey Counsel hold that even if the Act of 1918-1920 is available for making certain changes in the Charter of said Trustees, it is not available for making the change in the manner of selecting the Trustees, or for making the change in the beneficiary of the Trust funds held and managed by the Trustees, which is attempted by these Amendments. The circumstances being what they are, he holds that there is no way of insuring the validity of these Amendments short of a judicial decision by the Court of last resort in the State of New Jersey. Moreover he holds that the only evidence advanced before the Assembly in support of the validity of these amendments, namely the reference to a certified copy of the 'Certificate of Amendment to the Charter of the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton in the State of New Jersey' has no bearing whatever on the question of the legality or illegality of these amendments, inasmuch as the Act of 1918-1920 merely provides that when a Charter is amended under this Act, 'A certificate of such Action under the Corporate seal of such Corporation, signed by the presiding officer and Secretary of such meeting, verified by the oath of said Secretary, shall be forthwith filed in the office of the Secretary of State.'

(2) If these Amendments have been made illegally, Trust Funds of Princeton Seminary have been placed in jeopardy. If these Amendments are valid, the General Assembly does not possess an effective legal control over the Trustees of Princeton Seminary as the corporation which holds and manages the property of the Seminary and may not possess an effective legal control over them as the governing body of the Seminary as an Educational Institution. He holds, therefore, that the Assembly in approving the report of said Trustees, manifested indifference, not only as regards what happens to the Trust funds of Princeton Seminary, but as regards the measure of effective legal control, which the General Assembly has over Princeton Seminary.

(3) The approval of the report of said Trustees by the General Assembly, together with the refusal of the General Assembly to take such action as may be proper and appropriate to obtain a decision from the Court of last resort in the State of New Jersey, as to the legality of said Amendments, makes it possible, even probable, in view of the large Interests involved, that some other party or parties will take such action, and thus that the matter come before the courts under circumstances that may be attended by considerable bitterness, and bad feeling, whereas, if the General Assembly had itself instituted suit, it would have been certain that the action taken would have been of the nature of a 'friendly suit.'"

After Dr. Craig had read his protest on Tuesday, it was voted that no reply be made. This is rather unusual, for as far as our information extends, this is the first time in many years that no answer to such an important protest has been attempted. It is hardly to be wondered at, however,—for no effort was made to deny anything Dr. Craig contended. Since he was standing on solid legal and factual ground, a reply would have forced upon the Assembly the unpleasant task of facing the facts.

### Honorary Degrees

On Tuesday morning the Assembly spent a great deal of time over the weighty question as to whether all honorary degrees should be omitted from the minutes. An amendment that would have made the motion include *all* degrees was lost when the votes for and against it were found to be equal, 331 voting each way. After this the recommendation eliminating degrees (to begin in 1931) was adopted 423 to 224.

### Membership of Boards

The next item was "overture 13" from the Presbytery of Westchester, "Asking the Assembly to rescind the present rule that no member of any of the boards of the Church should be eligible for re-election after having served for two full terms until one year has elapsed, and to enact again the rule which was the law of the church for the years preceding 1926." The boards are divided into three-year classes, and the rule as it was from 1926 to 1930 would provide that not more than one-third of the membership of the boards could be changed in one year. Therefore, there would always be a board of at least two-thirds "veteran" members. The object of the rule was to draw more from the church at large for members of the boards, and was based upon the idea that there is abundant good material throughout the country for the boards. Those controlling the church, however, like to keep the same members of the boards in office indefinitely, as is most natural. So the organization's desire that the rule be changed back was complied with. But this was not done until the Rev. H. C. Welker, of Sidney, Nebraska, had presented some pertinent and eloquent facts. Pointing out that these members of the boards, who were always exhorting the Church to raise apportionments in full, were supposed to be so indispensable to the boards, he gave the following facts:

That only 13 out of 40 pastors who are members of the boards and the general council had led their churches in raising their full apportionment: of six in the General Council, only one; of fourteen on the Board of National Missions, only four; of ten on the Board of Foreign Missions, only four; of six on the Board of Christian Education, only two; of five on the Board of Pensions, only two. Amid, applause, Mr. Welker remarked that these were the men who were supposed to be so indispensable to the boards that a rule must be changed to keep them in office. However the recommendation prevailed, although a large negative vote was heard.

All the retiring members of the Board of Foreign Missions were nominated and re-elected to the Board.

### The State of the Church

The report of the Standing Committee on National Missions was presented by Dr. Cherry. The Assembly indulged in a season of self-examination upon the general topic of "What is wrong with the Church?" Outstanding among addresses from the floor were the remarks of the Rev. Walter E. Jordon, of Philadelphia, who said in part:

"We are losing faith in our message. There is the crux of the matter, and now we have come to the place where the public is finding it out. People realize that the church doesn't believe the Gospel. Machinery will never save the world, no matter how well oiled the machinery is. It is all very well to preach about the boards, but it is more fundamentally necessary to preach the Gospel."

One elder took the floor to say that "what we of the pews are asking is not theology. We are asking the deeper questions and meanings of life." Any comment upon this profound statement is superfluous. And the Assembly responded with hearty applause.

### The Presbyterian Magazine

The report of the Presbyterian Magazine was presented by Dr. Wm. Hiram Foulkes, Chairman of General Council's Committee, who paid a glowing tribute to Dr. Wm. T. Hanzsche, Editor. Dr. Hanzsche and Mr. Horace P. Camden, publisher of the magazine for 27 years, were heard. Before the recommendations were adopted, Dr. Craig arose to ask a question. He wished to inquire whether, in view of the fact that the "five points" of the 1923 Assembly were still the Law of the Church, and since Dr. Hanzsche had signed the "Auburn Affirmation," which denied the necessity of belief in those facts, Dr. Hanzsche was a proper editor for the official magazine of the Church? For some strange reason Auburn Affirmationists do not like that fact cited, and so the Rev. James Clement Reid, D.D., of San Francisco, another Affirmationist, jumped to his feet declaring that Dr. Craig was out of order and that so far as the Affirmation was concerned, "that matter had all been settled." (When, he did not say.) Dr. Kerr then ruled that Dr. Craig was out of order, and that the matter should come up in the Presbytery of New Brunswick, of which both men are members. Dr. Craig did not attempt to appeal from the decision of the Chair, which was obviously an error, but contented himself with asking that his negative vote be recorded. Dr. Kerr's ruling was manifestly an error in that Dr. Craig was bringing no formal charges against Dr. Hanzsche, but was simply discussing his theological qualifications for that particular post, a matter clearly within the jurisdiction of the Assembly and the Assembly alone.

#### Permanent Judicial Commission

The following were elected as members of the Permanent Judicial Commission:

Dr. George A. Frantz, Indianapolis, Ind.; Dr. Andrew Magill, Jamaica, N. Y.; Rev. Rasmus Thomsen, Amarillo, Texas; Mr. Paul Martin, Springfield, Ohio; Mr. A. G. Studer, Detroit, Michigan.

Of the three Ministers thus elected, two, Dr. Frantz and Mr. Thomsen, are signers of the "Auburn Affirmation."

#### Foreign Missions

On Wednesday morning, the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions made its report through Dr. Howard Agnew Johnston, Chairman. Miss Mary E. Moore, Young People's Secretary of the Foreign Board, gave an excellent address, and quite captured all her hearers. Dr. Francis Shunk Downs, a Secretary of the Board gave what was, in the judgment of the writer, the clearest and best presentation of any of the boards to the Assembly. Speaking with great fervor and evangelical zeal it was an inspiration to hear his clear-cut message. A number of foreign missionaries were also heard.

After having completed its docket, and finished its business, the Assembly adjourned to meet in 1931 in Pittsburgh, Pa., as the guest of the Shadyside Church of which Dr. Kerr is Minister. Thus concluded an Assembly of some diverse characteristics. The most outstanding fact about it was that the ecclesiastical machine worked so smoothly that many commissioners were unaware of its existence. This made of it an Assembly conforming in every way to the desires of those now in power in the Church. The machine is working smoothly, taking the Church along. But—whither?

—H. McA. G.

## Presbyterian Church in Canada

THE fifty-sixth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada began its sessions on Wednesday evening, June 4th, in Knox Church, Hamilton, Ontario. One hundred and fourteen Ministers and an equal number of elders sat down to listen to the opening sermon by the Rev. John Buchanan, M.D., D.D., Moderator in 1928. The Rev. David Perrie, D.D., of Wingham, Ontario, Moderator of the fifty-fifth Assembly, died suddenly some months ago, and Dr. Buchanan, a Foreign Missionary, presided as nearest predecessor.

Dr. Buchanan had been injured in an automobile accident the day preceding the fifty-fifth Assembly, and had not been able to deliver his sermon personally at that time. At this sederunt he still showed the effect of the accident, having to make use of two canes. His text was in John 17:19.—"And for their sakes I sanctify myself." His discourse was devoted to an appeal to the commissioners to be willing to sacrifice any pleasures or habits which would lessen their effectiveness in leading men to Christ. Concluding, he said, "The very nature of the disruption called upon us to sanctify ourselves as to the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church. There was and is a drift towards unitarianism. We were forced to think of the foundation of our belief.

"The different religious sects springing up today are probably occasioned by the starving to death for strong evangelical food in many Churches, so that people wander away. The people want to be fed. Sheep will come where there is pasture. Let us not be afraid of our great responsibilities as though they were afflictions. They are divinely granted opportunities.

"As a Church we have been greatly affected. We have been chastened, sanctified in the loss of churches, manses, ministers and people. Many minority groups in lonely and small places were cast adrift. Some of these are still very needy. We that are strong should seriously help them.

"Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see God, looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God."

After the sermon, the Rev. A. J. McGillivray, a former Moderator, presided at the request of Dr. Buchanan. Two men were nominated for Moderator: the Rev. S. Banks Nelson, D.D., of the host Church, and the Rev. Frank Baird, D.D., of the First Church of Pictou, Nova Scotia. Dr. Nelson was nominated by the Rev. Robert Johnston, D.D., of St. Catherine's, Ontario. He was seconded by Dr. A. S. Grant, of Toronto. Dr. Baird was nominated by the Rev. D. G. MacQueen, of Edmonton, Alberta, a former Moderator, who pleaded that the Maritime Synod, in the extreme East, be recognized in choosing a Moderator. Dr. J. Keir Fraser, of Renfrew, Ontario, seconded Dr. Baird's nomination. The election, which was close, resulted in the naming of Dr. Baird. Dr. Nelson personally moved that the election be made unanimous.

Dr. Baird is a native of New Brunswick, and has spent his entire Ministry in the Maritime Provinces. During the disruption of 1925 he was a tower of strength to those who fought to maintain the Presbyterian Church in Canada. He is known as an accomplished scholar, a preacher of dignity and power, an author of note, and as a conservative in his theology.

On Thursday and Friday the Assembly spent considerable time in discussion of a letter from the United Church of Canada in which the United Church expressed a desire for a conference with regard to "overlapping." Dr. A. S. Grant, who brought up the matter, stated that the United Church had sent an invitation to the Anglicans and to the Baptists. The latter had declined. He could not see why the United Church talked about "overlapping" when they had built churches and forced the Presbyterian Church to build churches all over the Dominion, the most extensive kind of overlapping ever known in Canada, dividing many communities that had formerly known only one Church, the Presbyterian. "We have to apologize to no one for our existence or continuance," said Dr. Grant. "We propose to promote Presbyterianism in Canada to the full extent of our ability and resources."

It was moved by the Rev. M. A. Campbell, of Montreal, and carried, that "We continue our part of the policy of Ministering to all people in Canada to the best of our ability." In the course of discussion upon this point, Dr. Nelson remarked that "we believe the United Church will be a Christian organization when they drop their insane objections to our name, stop padlocking the doors of our churches, and cease going to the courts of the law for tainted money."

Judge John MacKay, Port Arthur, considered that overlapping in a new country was largely imaginative. "Cooperation," he said, "leads eventually to organic union and Church history has shown us that the natural consequence is disruption. Let us keep clear of cooperation. Look over the last five years. Results were never better and you can't improve on the program. I heartily approve of Dr. Campbell's motion."

Rev. G. C. Taylor, of Montreal, drew a parallel between the United and Presbyterian Churches and a situation which arose between Russia and Great Britain some years ago. The Russians had been anxious to confer on points and the British had expressed their complete willingness so long as the other side abandoned their vicious propaganda, which was doing harm, and act with sincerity.

"There is no use putting our head into the mouth of a lion just because he happens to look good-natured," Rev. Mr. Taylor said. "I would move that a letter be written to the United Church informing them that conditions being such as they are we cannot entertain any thoughts of meeting in conference."

At a later sederunt, the following motion was passed, after considerable discussion:

"That the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, consistent with its practice in the past and with the spirit of Presbyterianism through all its history, records its readiness to meet in conference with representatives of other evangelical bodies upon matters of common interest in their prosecution of the work of the kingdom of Jesus Christ."

It was evident, however, that the Assembly felt that since the United Church still was prosecuting legal cases against the Presbyterian Church, attacking basic Presbyterian principles and spreading a propaganda abroad that the Presbyterian Church in Canada did not exist, no close relations could be expected until the United Church changed its aggressive attitude.

Consideration of the budget and the financial state of the Church occupied a large part of the Assembly's time. The synods had fallen short of their allocations. While the condition was a general one, yet the Church faced an emergency. It was resolved to urge upon all the membership of the Church true sacrificial giving, that there might be advancement, and not discouragement. In other respects than financial, the statistics were encouraging.

The membership of the Church now stands at 179,530. The net increase since December

31, 1925, is 25,287. During last year, 7,387 were received into the Church upon profession of faith, and 7,050 by certificate, while 10,913 are reported as removed by death, transfer or otherwise. The number of families is reported at 90,698. This shows a gain of 13,510 families since 1925. Congregations and preaching stations now number 1,325, an increase of 185 since 1925. All the eight synods report an increase in membership. All synods but one report an increase in the number of families. Six synods report an increase in the number of preaching stations.

#### Greetings from Presbyterian Church in China

Dr. J. G. Inkster presented a letter from Allan Reoch, bringing greetings from the Presbyterian Church in China:

"In this report I will give briefly the main facts in connection with the Presbyterian Church in China. I was the fraternal delegate from our mission to their general assembly, just held at Tenghsien, Shantung, China.

"The situation existing in China is much the same as in our own Church after the disruption of 1925. Here, in China, until the assembly of 1929, the last legal assembly of the Presbyterian Church in China, was held in 1918, for at the 1922 assembly which voted to unite with the English Baptist Congregationalists and London Missionary society, to form the 'Church of Christ in China,' eight presbyteries already in the 'Church of Christ in China' sent representatives to the Presbyterian assembly and voted unionist. At the 1927 assembly, which voted to consumate the union, more than one-half the delegates were from presbyteries already in the Church of Christ in China.

"As in Canada, so in China, the unionists declare that the Presbyterian Church is in the union. This view was opposed by the Presbyterians of North China synod, which refused to enter the union and carries on the continuity of the Presbyterian Church in China and will carry on under the old name and constitution.

"Opposition to the union was almost entirely on doctrinal grounds because the leaders among the unionists refused to acknowledge the doctrine of the Trinity, the plenary inspiration of the Bible, and the vicarious atonement. The general assembly, meeting in 1929, reaffirmed its belief in the Bible, and declared its credal statement to be the Westminster Confession of Faith together with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms.

"The Presbyterian Church in China now consists of large presbyteries containing 17,776 Christians, cared for by 88 ministers, of whom 21 are Westerners. A well-trained and consecrated ministry is assured through the North China Theological Seminary at Tenghsien.

"The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in China voted unanimously to enter the League of Christian churches.

"The Assembly appointed Dr. J. G. Inkster, of Knox Church, Toronto, to represent that body and carry the greetings from it to our general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada."

Prior to dissolution the Assembly, according to custom, rose and sang together the last portion of the stately 122nd Psalm as rendered in the Scottish Psalter, words made doubly dear in the testing-time of the last few years:

Pray that Jerusalem may have
  Peace and felicity.
Let them that love thee and thy peace
  Have still prosperity.

Therefore I wish that peace may still
  Within thy walls remain,
And ever may thy palaces
  Prosperity retain.

Now for my friends' and Brethren's sakes
  Peace be in thee, I'll say,
And for the house of God the LORD,
  I'll wish Thy good alway.

The Assembly was dissolved by the Moderator and another Assembly ordered to meet in 1931 in Knox Church, Toronto.

## The Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

THE Seventieth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. met May 22nd, in Charlottesville, Va. About 300 commissioners listened to the strong sermon of the Moderator of the last Assembly, Rev. Wm. Ray Dobyns, D.D., of Birmingham.

The Rev. Thos. W. Currie, D.D., President of Austin Theological Seminary, in Texas, was elected Moderator.

The most pressing matter before the Assembly was the question of organic union with the Presbyterian and Reformed bodies of the United States. The Committee on Closer Relations with the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church recommended continued cooperation, amity and negotiations for Union. This recommendation was unanimously approved. The Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church lies wholly within the Southern Church.

The Interim Committee on union with the United Presbyterian Church of North America reported that negotiations had been eclipsed by talk of the larger union. The Interim Committee on union with all Presbyterian and Reformed bodies reported hearty and favorable action and recommended that negotiations be continued in order to find a possible basis of union agreeable to all.

Overtures were received from various presbyteries, some opposing, some favoring union.

The committee to which these reports and overtures were referred came to the Assembly with two reports. The majority report opposed all union. The minority report favored union. After extensive debate, the minority report was substituted by the Assembly for the majority report, by the close vote of 159 to 148. Thereupon a substitute was offered, to the purport that, without committing itself to union, the Assembly was not willing to close the door on all future negotiations, and would continue a union committee consisting of the Moderator and one representative from each of the seventeen synods. Upon the motion being put, the Assembly adopted the substitute by a vote of 164 to 119. This is accepted as being, in effect, a victory for those who wish the Church to "go slow."

A complaint against the action of the Presbytery of Little Rock in the case of the Rev. Hay Watson Smith, D.D., came before the Assembly. The Presbytery had recognized that he was not in full harmony with the doctrinal standards of the Church, but decided that his views were not of such a serious nature as to warrant action. The complaint was referred to the Synod of Arkansas, the Assembly taking the ground that it lacked jurisdiction until the matter had been passed upon by the Synod.

The Assembly was dissolved to meet in 1931 at the School of the Ozarks, in Hollister, Missouri.

## United Presbyterian Assembly

THE Seventy-second General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, convened in the Beaver Avenue United Presbyterian Church of Des Moines, on May 28th. The Moderator of the Seventy-first Assembly, the Rev. John MacNaugher, D.D., LL.D., of Pittsburgh, opened the Assembly with a scholarly and impressive sermon. Following the sermon, Dr. MacNaugher read the Nicene creed, while the Assembly, standing, gave silent assent. He then constituted the Assembly with prayer.

The Rev. T. C. Atchison, D.D., of Lawrence, Mass., was nominated by Dr. W. I. Wishart for Moderator. This was seconded by the Rev. Johnston Calhoun of the Presbytery of Los Angeles, and by the Rev. John H. Griggs, of Cambridge, Mass. There being no other nomination, Dr. Atchison was unanimously elected.

On Thursday morning the Moderator nominated and the Assembly approved, the standing committees. The business coming before the Assembly was largely referred to the appropriate committees. A telegram was sent to President Hoover pledging support to Prohibition enforcement. Action was taken looking to the changing of the Conference on Evangelism from the days preceding the Assembly to "the afternoon and evening of the Assembly Sabbath, to be preceded by Communion."

An appropriate memorial service was held for the thirteen Ministers of the Church who had died during the year. Fraternal delegates were heard, among them, the Rev. J. A. MacKeigan, from the United Church of Canada; the Rev. W. D. Vandwerp, from the Christian Reformed Church; the Rev. Watson Boyce, from the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church; and the Rev. W. M. Rochester, D.D., from the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

On Friday morning, Memorial Day Services were held in charge of Dr. A. C. Douglass. The Honorable J. M. Lashley, of St. Louis, made the Memorial address.

Statistical reports showed that the increase on the year was, by Profession of Faith, 7,320 —less by 3,406 than the year before. The net loss in membership was 2,005. Total members received by profession and certificate, 12,989, or 4,415 less than in 1929. This decrease is explained by the fact that no Easter accessions are reported in these figures. Contributions for budget and special work were $1,423,213, an increase of $199,576 over 1929; and to Minister's stipends $1,511,194—a decrease of $40,573. The number of Licenciate students of theology decreased from 25 in 1929 to 15 this year. The number of young peoples societies is 1,118, an increase of 26, with the total membership of 31,542.

On Saturday morning the discussion centered around the matter of organic Church Union. Dr. MacNaugher sharply criticized an anonyous pamphlet being circulated at the Assembly as being false. [This pamphlet contained a partial reprint of Dr. Machen's article entitled "The Present Situation in the Presbyterian Church." The Editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY had no part in the issuing of this pamphlet, and do not know who issued it. They did not see a copy of it until after the Assembly, which was their first knowledge of its existence. So far as statements quoted verbatim from CHRISTIANITY TODAY are concerned, the Editors assure our readers of all churches that every statement made is true. If any proof to the contrary is forthcoming we will be glad to confess error publicly.] Dr. MacNaugher said that from his own knowledge of the splendid character of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., fully 95% of the Ministry of that Church are sound doctrinally. [Editor's note —since this is evidently an attempted denial of conditions as described by Dr. Machen in his article, we feel bound to point out two facts: (1) there are 9556 Ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. If Dr. MacNaugher knew the doctrinal soundness of 95% *from personal knowledge,* he would have to know and speak with 9077 men personally, finding them *all* to be sound. (2) The percentage of "unsound" Ministers Dr. MacNaugher places at five—or about 478. How does he account for the fact that about 1300 Ministers signed the Modernist Auburn Affirmation?]

Following remarks by Drs. R. W. Thompson and C. J. Williamson, favoring the report and its recommendations for Union, Mr. David P. Linduff, of the Presbytery of Allegheny, moved that the whole matter be laid on the table for one year. This motion was decisively defeated, and the recommendations adopted as follows:

"1. That we approve organic union with other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches on the basis of the existing standards of the uniting Churches.

"2. That our representatives be instructed to cooperate with committees of other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches to prepare a complete plan to make this organic union effective, to be submitted for adoption to the properly constituted authorities of these Churches.

"3. That the committee on Presbyterian Unity be given authority to request assistance from members of our Church, who may be regarded as experts in such matters, when details of a plan of union are being considered."

It will be noted, however, that this action and the action of the next Assembly, if any, will have to be sent down to the Presbyteries by way of overture, before the proposed union can be effective.

Resolutions were adopted regarding the Christian Sabbath, Prohibition and World Peace. Regarding marriage and divorce, the Assembly adopted the following:

"In view of certain proposed activities, in ecclesiastical circles, looking toward the sanctioning of marriage of all kinds and the legalizing of divorce, and in view of the fact that the Church has ever stood as the guardian of the home, and without such guardianship the home will disintegrate, and in view of the fact that our criminals are coming largely from broken homes, we recommend:

"1. That the Assembly go on record as reaffirming our position on the sanctity of the home and as opposed to divorce save on Scriptural grounds.

"2. That we urge our ministers to exercise care in solemnizing marriages where the divorce question is involved.

"3. That the Assembly recommend to pastors the necessity of a sermon at least once a year, on the home—stressing the evils of divorce."

Recommendations were adopted looking forward to close cooperation and union with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. (Southern Church) alone if the larger movement should fail.

After dealing with many other routine, but important matters, the Assembly was dissolved to meet next year in the South Church of Youngstown, Ohio, on Wednesday, May 27.

**Reports of other Assemblies will appear in the July issue.**

## University of Dubuque

In our last issue we published an item on "Seminary enrollments" from figures furnished from the office of Rev. Frederick E. Stockwell, D.D., General Director of the Department of Colleges, Theological Seminaries, and Training Schools of the Presbyterian Church. That item included the enrollment at Dubuque at 16. The Rev. David I. Berger, D.D., Dean of the Seminary, writes us as follows and we are glad to publish his statement:

"During the past year we have had 16 resident students, 2 graduate students, 17 students in our summer school of Theology, 3 Ministers taking work by correspondence, 10 college students taking Seminary courses."

## Westminster Seminary

### An Important Appeal

MAY I be given space in CHRISTIANITY TODAY to ask friends of Westminster Theological Seminary to consider its needs?

The Seminary is not in debt. Every bill is paid. God raised up contributors to the funds required for the first year from all parts of America and from points as distant as North Ireland, France, Brazil, West Africa; India, Siam and China. We think they will repeat their gifts. But we shall have far more than fifty students in the autumn according to every indication, and while our present contributors provided amply for fifty, what shall we do if seventy or eighty students knock at our doors? It is hardly fair to demand of pioneer sustainers that they carry the increased expense alone. They should be reinforced by hundreds of additional contributors. We have no doubt these can be found among the subscribers to CHRISTIANITY TODAY, and we ask their help.

Perhaps it is God's will that for the moment Westminster Seminary shall be utterly dependent. A great purpose certainly is served just in demonstrating to a modern world the willingness of faithful Christian people to deny themselves to the extent of real sacrifice that the Seminary's banner may be kept flying. Modernism has wealth in abundance, is increased in goods, and has need of nothing. Here is an institution maintained by the prayers and sacrifices of a comparatively small company whose gifts are precious because they are all they have. If something of the glory of early Christianity returns in our lives through heroic endeavor, who can say the lesson will be altogether unheeded, even by those who view us with derision.

The Seminary office will be glad to furnish information about any type of contribution, general or specific. Some who will want to give might like to provide the entire expense of a student for a year; some might be able to take care of a student's room rent. Individuals or churches might be interested in providing the salary for a professor, and the value and far-reaching results of such a contribution, is, of course, immeasurable.

Already Westminster Theological Seminary has taken its place among prominent institutions of higher learning. As a home of sound scholarship, conducted by distinguished teachers, with a student body representing a proportion of college and university equipped men unequalled in the seminaries of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., Westminster ranks with the foremost schools of the world.

Will you give what you can, whether five dollars or five thousand dollars, that Westminster Seminary may supply the demand for ministers who believe Christ's gospel; who will preach it; be able to defend it, and never be ashamed of it, in these dark days?

*The Board of Trustees of Westminster Theological Seminary,*

FRANK H. STEVENSON, President.

*1528 Pine Street, Philadelphia*