# 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.

MAY, 1930 Vol. 1 No. 1

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# By Way of Preface

CHRISTIANITY TODAY will be edited from the viewpoint of those who hold that Christianity as it exists throughout the world, in as far as it is not Christianity falsely so-called, is essentially one with Christianity as it is authoritatively set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and as it has been confessed through all the Christian centuries.

This means, in the judgment of its editors, that what is known as evangelical Christianity is a purer and more adequate expression of Christianity than what is known as "Catholic" Christianity. It means, also, according to the same judgment, that what arrogates to itself the name of Modernism, in all its consistent forms of expression, is not Christianity at all.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY has been established to state, defend and further the system of thought and life taught in the Bible—a system of thought and life which in the judgment of its editors has found its most complete and most carefully guarded as well as its most vital expression in the standards of the Presbyterian Church.

It seems to us that there is an imperative need of such a paper, most of all within the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. inasmuch as the recent change of policy on the part of *The Presbyterian* means that there is now no paper within this great church that is committed to a militant defense of its faith against its enemies—whether within or without its borders. But while the more immediate occasion for starting this paper is the recent change of policy on the part of *The Presbyterian,* it is the situation throughout the Church-at-large that calls most insistently for its establishment. We refer to that wide-spread defection from Christianity which is so obvious a phenomenon in the age in which we live—a defection rooted in the so-called "Enlightenment" of the 18th century with its thorough-going naturalism of thought and sentiment but which within the last fifty years has assumed such proportions throughout Europe and America that the enemies of Christianity have gathered courage to contest the right of historic Christianity (which is supernatural to the core) to dominate the culture and civilization of the future. Wholly apart from what has happened in connection with *The Presbyterian* and wholly apart from what may be the future of *The Presbyterian* we believe there is an imperative need for such a paper as CHRISTIANITY TODAY aspires to be. This paper will fail of its purpose if it does not prove helpful not only to Presbyterians but to Christians everywhere in maintaining their heritage in the face of encroaching Modernism and in transmitting it undiminished to those who shall come after them.

But while the viewpoint of its editors will be that of the Calvinistic rather than that of the Lutheran or Arminian Churches there will be the full recognition of the fact that what they hold in common with other evangelical Christians is much more important than what they hold in distinction from them. In fact while they will be as unflinchingly opposed to Rome as were their fathers they will not be blind to the fact that as the lines are drawn today — theism over against atheism; Christ the God-man over against the man Jesus; the cross as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice over against the cross as a symbol of self-sacrifice; salvation as a divine gift over against salvation as a human achievement; the Bible as the revealed Word of God over against the Bible as a purely human product; the moral law as a divinely imposed rule of life over against the moral law as an ever-changing resultant of human insight and experience—Rome, at the points at which the battle rages most fiercely today, is our ally rather than our opponent.

An additional reason for establishing this paper is the fact that Westminster Theological Seminary has been founded in Philadelphia to carry on and perpetuate the policies and traditions of Princeton Theological Seminary as it existed prior to its reorganization by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. We rejoice in this event as we look upon it as the most hopeful and encouraging event for the future of the Presbyterian Church and evangelical Christianity that has happened for many a day. As matters now stand, however, this institution lacks the support of any paper, in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. at least, that has a really sympathetic understanding of the things for which it stands. While CHRISTIANITY TODAY is not connected in any official way with Westminster Seminary it hopes to be of use in furthering its interests—along with those of other institutions that stand four-square for the Bible and the gospel it contains.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY will not only be free of all ecclesiastical control but its editors will be free to determine its char-

acter and policy according to their convictions. These convictions include:

(1) The conviction that the Bible is the Word of God and as such completely trustworthy whether as regards its factual, doctrinal or ethical representations;

(2) the conviction that the system of thought and life taught in the Bible is valid and capable of convincing intellectual defense in the forum of the world's thought;

(3) the conviction that Christian doctrines are the root rather than the fruit of the Christian life and hence that the Standards of the Presbyterian Church correctly assert that "truth is in order to goodness" and that "no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are";

(4) the conviction that it is the duty of Christians to bear clearcut witness to the Christian faith against all who oppose it, whether within or without the church.

The editors of this paper believe in all heartiness and sincerity that the Bible is the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. They hold that the Bible is true both in the sense of "truth of idea" and of "truth of fact." So far are they from supposing that we can be indifferent to the question of the historical truthfulness of the Bible that they hold that its supreme value lies in the fact that it records those great acts of redemption that God has wrought for the salvation of His people—acts that have their culmination in the birth, atoning death and triumphant resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. Those who feel no consciousness of the guilt and power of sin may be content with a Bible from which they derive only moral and religious instruction and inspiration, but those who see themselves as they really are will not be able to find rest for their souls in anything short of an authentic record of the wonders that God has wrought for their salvation. Apart from the recognition of the facts recorded in the Bible as actual historical occurrences there is, indeed, no such thing as Christianity as we understand it. But while we stress the importance of the facts we do not fall into the error of supposing that the facts of themselves are constitutive of Christianity. Give the facts no interpretation and they are meaningless. Give them an interpretation other than that of the Bible and they will yield us something other than Christianity. It takes both the facts recorded in the Bible and the interpretation of those facts given us in the Bible (i.e. the Biblical doctrines) to yield us Christianity. In a word we hold with the Church of all ages that the Bible gives us both a trustworthy record of the facts that lie at the basis of the Christian religion and an authoritative explanation of those facts.

If the Bible contains not only a trustworthy record of that great series of redemptive acts that God has wrought for the salvation of the world but the meaning of those acts as understood by God himself, it follows as a matter of course that the system of thought and life taught in the Bible is valid and worthy of all acceptation. Not only that but we hold this system of thought and life is capable of defense in the forum of the world's thought and that it is the duty of Christian scholars and thinkers to organize not only its defense but its attack as over against that energy of thought and fertility of assault which characterizes the world in its anti-Christian manifestations. The editors of this paper have no sympathy with those who decry controversy as useless or even as wrong and un-Christian. It passes our comprehension how any intelligent Christian can decry controversy in view of the fact that Christ and His apostles were controversialists, that practically every book of the New Testament was born out of controversy, and that through all the Christian ages, in every period of crisis, it has been not theological pacifists but sturdy contenders for the faith who in the providence of God have saved the day. To controversy for its own sake we are wholly averse but in days like these when Christianity is everywhere spoken against, both as a system of thought and as a way of life, it seems to us little short of sheer unfaithfulness to Christ Himself for the Christian scholar and thinker to decline to enter the lists in defense of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. While then the primary purpose of this paper will be to state and expound the Christian religion as a system of thought and a way of life yet it will not neglect the task of defending what it regards as genuine Christianity against all who oppose it whether within or without the church.

But while we hope to be of service in promoting a better understanding of what Christianity really is, and in defending it against attack whether by open enemies or alleged friends, yet we will fail of our main objective if we do not prove instrumental in furthering its interests at home and abroad. Our exposition and defense of Christianity will never be an end in itself but always for the sake of strengthening and confirming the faith of Christian believers and of leading others to a like faith. We expect to exhibit a zeal for the facts and doctrines of Christianity but this will be done not in the interests of a sterile intellectualism but in the interests of the Christian life itself. The contrast expressed in the widely current saying, "Christianity is life not doctrine," we regard for instance as false and misleading. We believe as fully as any that Christianity is a life and that a knowledge of the doctrines of Christianity, no matter how correct, profits only those in whom it issues in a Christian life. Doctrines are not life. Certainly not. It does not follow, however, that they are not indispensable to life. Doctrines are not the cause of life. Nobody ever said they were. It does not follow, however, that they are not an essential condition of life. As a matter of fact Christianity is both life and doctrine—but the life is the expression of the doctrine, not the doctrine the expression of the life.

With this preliminary statement of our aim and purpose we begin the publication of this paper. We are acutely conscious of our insufficiency for the task and not without fears lest the inadequacy of our statement and defense of Christianity—whether as a system of thought or a way of life—may conceal rather than reveal to our readers the real strength and beauty of the Christian religion and its ability to satisfy both the minds and the hearts of men. However it seems to us that there is a real need of the kind of paper that CHRISTIANITY TODAY would fain be and so we have undertaken the task in dependence on God and with the prayer that our efforts may be blessed of Him.

## Christianity as It Was and Is

THE religion we profess is a religion of the present as well as of the past. This finds its explanation most of all in the fact that the object of our faith as Christians is JESUS CHRIST as He exists today. Suppose it were true that JESUS is merely one of those "dead but sceptred sovereigns who still rule our spirits from their urns"—one who lived and worked in the past but not one who also lives and works in the present. Then Christianity would be little more than an exaggerated form of hero worship. Then we might know of a JESUS of history but we could know nothing of a JESUS of experience. How cold, how lifeless the Christian religion would be were it not for the fact that CHRIST is one who can say: "I am He that liveth, and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore." The secret of Christianity's progress in the world, of the hold it has on the hearts of men, of our assurance for its future, lies in the fact that it points men to a living LORD and SAVIOUR, to whom they can pray, in whom they can put their trust, from whom they can obtain power, upon whom they can build their confidence not only for time but for eternity.

The fact that the object of our faith is CHRIST as He exists today does not lead us to underestimate the value of the Biblical record of His earthly, historical life. In fact it is only in the Scriptures that we can obtain dependable knowledge of the living CHRIST. Apart from that source of knowledge we have no assurance that the CHRIST with whom we hold communion is the CHRIST of reality. What is more, apart from His earthly, historical life the CHRIST as He exists today would have little or no significance for us. The life He lived on earth, more especially the death that He died, were prerequisites to the functions He now performs. That He is qualified to bestow upon us the forgiveness of our sins, and grant unto us an inheritance among those who are sanctified through faith in Him, is due to what He experienced on earth. It should never be forgotten that the object of Christian faith is CHRIST "in the garments of Sacred Scriptures" or as the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Standards puts it, CHRIST "as He is offered to us in the gospel."

That we can have knowledge of CHRIST as He exists today by reading a book whose final pages were written nearly nineteen centuries ago finds its explanation in the fact that "JESUS CHRIST is the same yesterday and today, yea and for ever." We are conscious of ourselves as changing with the passing years. These changes are not merely physical. They are moral and intellectual and spiritual as well. We think differently and we act differently than we once did. Our loves and our hates and our admirations are other than they once were. Suppose that JESUS CHRIST though alive were subject to change like the rest of us. Then that ancient book might tell us of what He was like some nineteen hundred years ago, but it would give us no assured knowledge of what He is like today. What we want to know, however, and must know, if CHRIST is to have any large significance for us, is what He is like today, most of all whether He is still the same strong SON OF GOD who can save sinners, that One upon whom we can safely venture our all—whether for this life or the life to come.

Other biographies tell us of what men were once like but they give us no assured knowledge of what they are like today. The Gospels however—and here we touch on that which separates them from all other biographies—tell us not only of what JESUS CHRIST was like some nineteen hundred years ago, they tell us of what He is like today. This makes the Gospels the most up to date of all books. They have to do not merely with a great historical figure in the past; they have to do with the person of the hour, with Him who is today exerting a greater and more direct influence over the thoughts and lives of men than any other. In fact not only the Gospels but all the books of the NEW TESTAMENT were written by those who were firmly convinced of the continued existence of JESUS CHRIST as an ever-present reality who would abide the same through every change and chance of time. They never represent JESUS CHRIST merely as a great and noble man who lived and died and left behind Him the aroma of a useful and beautiful life and who set in motion influences whose energies had not yet been exhausted. For them even more fully than preceding His death CHRIST was not an inert but an active being. The value of the NEW TESTAMENT can be appreciated aright only as it is recognized that it tells us not only of what JESUS was but of what He is, not only of how He thought and felt nineteen hundred years ago but of how He thinks and feels today, not only of the power He wielded in the first century but of the power He wields in the twentieth century and which He will continue to wield until the end of time.

If the object of our faith as Christians is JESUS CHRIST as He exists today, and if JESUS CHRIST as He exists today is in all essentials the same JESUS CHRIST of whom we learn in the NEW TESTAMENT, the conclusion is inescapable that genuine Christianity is essentially one with the Christianity of the NEW TESTAMENT. It is true that much of what is called Christianity today exhibits no real resemblance to the Christianity of the NEW TESTAMENT but that merely advertises the fact that much of what is called Christianity today is falsely so called. Few things are more needed at the present time than the making clear of just what Christianity is in a way that will enable the man in the street to distinguish the genuine from the counterfeit article. Just now we are merely concerned to point out that because JESUS CHRIST, who stands at the center of Christianity and makes it what it is, abides the same as age succeeds age the Christianity of today, in as far as it is genuine, is essentially one with the Christianity of the NEW TESTAMENT.

To perceive that CHRIST as He exists today is an active not an inert CHRIST is to perceive that Christianity is more than a system of thought and life, that it is also a divine dynamic that is destined to turn and overturn until the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord. At a time when Christianity is being everywhere spoken against both as a system of thought and a way of life, especially in academic circles, we need to realize for our heartening and encouragement that the conflict for and against Christianity is not merely an intellectual struggle between two life and world views. If that were the whole of it we would have no confidence in the ultimate triumph of Christianity. This is not to admit that intellectually the Christian occupies the less defensible position. Far from it. It is merely to recognize that

Christianity must make its appeal to sinners, to those who are prejudiced against it both as a system of thought and a way of life, and that here in a marked degree the proverb holds good that "men convinced against their will remain of the same opinion still." We need to keep clearly in mind, therefore, that while Christianity is, or at least involves, a specific way of thinking and living yet that it is at the same time infinitely more than this. Those who think of Christianity as merely one life and world view among others do not reckon with the risen and glorified and ever-present CHRIST. They think of Him merely as one who was, not of Him as one who also is and who through all the world's changes continued to work as only GOD can work. JESUS CHRIST being what He is, we are persuaded that Christianity will yet, despite all opposition, make its way to victory. We do not pretend to say what the immediate future has in store for Christians. It may be that the love of more and more will wax cold. It may be that the Church is facing persecutions worse than those of the early centuries. But of this we are sure that JESUS CHRIST being what He is His cause will ultimately triumph. In CHRIST Himself lies our final assurance that the future belongs to Christianity. Under His leadership we face a certain though by no means easy victory.

## A Statement and an Appeal

CHRISTIANITY TODAY will not be operated for profit but wholly in the interest of a great cause. Its origin has been made possible by the contributions of a small number of individuals. If, however, the paper is to continue to exist, and more especially if it is to realize its aims and purposes in any large way, it must have the aid and cooperation of a large number of like-minded persons. We begin with no list of subscribers and can hope to secure any considerable number of subscribers only as those who sympathize with this venture of faith interest themselves in its behalf.

This they can do: (1) by subscribing themselves; (2) by subscribing for or inducing others to subscribe; (3) by sending us the names of those who they believe would be interested; and (4) by contributing, as the Lord has prospered them and as He leads them, to the financial needs of the paper. We can offer no financial or other inducements to secure this service save the sake of the cause we seek to further. We have fixed the price of the paper at one dollar a year so as to bring it within reach of all. As soon as the size of our subscription list, or the amount of the contributions received, justifies it, we will either increase the size of the paper or issue it as a fortnightly. If every one to whom we are privileged to send this first issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY would send his own and two other subscriptions—many we are sure will send a much larger number—this paper would at once become second to no other paper in the world as an available instrument for expounding and defending the Gospel of the grace of God. We earnestly solicit the help of all who approve its aim and purpose in bringing it to the attention of men everywhere. If we may do so without being suspected of cant, we ask the prayers of all those who love the LORD JESUS CHRIST in sincerity and in truth, in behalf of CHRISTIANITY TODAY and the cause for which it stands.

## A Word of Explanation

WHILE this first issue fairly indicates the sort of paper CHRISTIANITY TODAY expects to be, yet because of certain practical considerations we have been compelled to curtail certain features and to omit altogether at least one feature that we anticipate will prove especially valuable to our readers.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY to a larger extent than this number might indicate expects to be a news journal. It does not indeed expect to concern itself with news of purely local interest, but as far as matters of interest to the church at large is concerned it hopes to keep its readers fully informed in a fresh and unbiased manner. With the help of all available sources of information, including its own correspondents at home and abroad, it plans to report all events and movements throughout the world that have any significant bearing upon the fortunes of Christianity in the modern world.

The feature which in the nature of the case could not be included in this issue may be tentatively designated as "Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice." In answering any questions that may be submitted to them by readers, the editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY will have the assistance of a number of leading experts, including some of the members of the faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary, and so hope to be able to give more or less authoritative answers to the questions that may be asked them. The editors will necessarily have to be the judges as to the relevancy and importance of the questions submitted but at any rate they will not pronounce them irrelevant and unimportant merely because they are difficult or divisive.

It will be noted that this issue contains no advertisements. While we recognize that advertisments are often valuable to the reader, we believe that the advantages to be derived from them are more than offset by their disadvantages. A non-advertising policy not only leaves all possible space available for advancing the purpose for which the paper exists, it saves its editors from the embarrassing entanglements which are more or less inevitable in dealing with modern advertising. We hope to continue this policy but our ability to do this will depend largely upon the willingness of friends to supply the needed additional support.

## The Managing Editor

THE Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths is a native of San Francisco, California. He received his secondary education in the schools of Berkeley, California, and is a graduate of the University of California, where he majored in Law and Military Science. He studied Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, and Philosophy in the Graduate School of Princeton University. For a year we was an assistant editor of *The Sunday School Times*. In 1925 he was ordained to the ministry by the Presbytery of Cape Breton of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. He was Minister of the historic congregation of Scotsburn, Pictou County, Nova Scotia, from 1926 to 1930. He has become well-known in the United States and Canada as a preacher and writer. He is now a member of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

# The Present Situation in the Presbyterian Church

By the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.,
Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

THE present situation in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is only one phase of a situation that prevails in the Protestant churches throughout the world. Everywhere—in the countries of Europe and in mission lands—Christianity finds itself in a mighty conflict with an alien type of religious belief and life. This alien type of religious belief and life appears in many different forms, and expresses itself in many different ways; but at bottom it is everywhere the same. Disparagement of doctrine, decrying of controversy, sinking of doctrinal differences in a program of peace and work, the craze for organizational unions, the "interpretation" of the Bible and of the great Christian creeds to make them mean almost their exact opposite, the substitution of vague swelling words for a clear-cut proclamation of the Cross of Christ, exaltation of "experience" at the expense of God's written Word—these are everywhere the marks of one great and deadly enemy to the Christian faith.

The enemy is made the more dangerous because it is found within, rather than without, the Church. Definite opponents of the Christian religion could have been more easily met; but now as in ancient times Satan has preferred to labor for the most part in the dark. The change has come very quietly and very gradually. There have been few open breaks; there have been comparatively few open denials; good men, in their ignorance, have often become emissaries of unbelief. The Gospel has not been openly contradicted, but it has been quietly pushed aside. It has quietly faded away, as one picture fades away before another on the screen; and another gospel has assumed its place. Many men are quite unconscious of the change; they are made very angry by being told the truth. Others are not so completely blind; they know in their heart of hearts that all is not well. But they will do nothing unpleasant to preserve the purity of the Church; they preach the true Gospel themselves, they say, but let others in the same church preach what they will. God will ultimately honor the struth, they tell us; God will ultimately destroy error; but meanwhile let us above all have peace. Thus is Gamaliel cited as though he were a Christian saint; thus does a worldly urbanity masquerade under the name of love; thus has a polite optimism been substituted for the dread solemnity and exclusiveness of the Gospel of Christ.

### The World-Wide Conflict

Upon this policy of palliation and compromise God has placed the signal marks of His disfavor in the modern world. Nowhere has that policy resulted in the advancement of the truth; everywhere it has led to more and more radical departure from the Word of God. Almost all the larger Protestant churches of the world today are dominated by men who are either hostile or indifferent to the great verities of the Faith.

We do not mean that the situation is one of unrelieved gloom. Nowhere in the world has God left Himself altogether without a witness. In Germany, in France, in England, in China, and in many other lands there are heroic groups of people who have not bowed the knee to Baal, who have not been afraid to witness for the Lord Jesus Christ. In Scotland, the heroic Free Church still raises its voice amid the sad defection of the larger bodies; in the North of Ireland, a courageous group, chiefly composed of laymen, is in revolt against the Modernist tyranny that there prevails. But these heroic efforts of individual men and women, and of smaller bodies, should not cause us to close our eyes to the general state of the Church. It is a fact, whether we like it or not, that the larger and older Protestant bodies have in their corporate capacity for the most part ceased to witness in any clear-cut way to the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.

To that assertion one, and perhaps only one, notable exception must be made. In one place only in the modern world have we a large church that is maintaining faithfully the full deposit of faith. The church to which we refer is the great free church of Holland, the "Gereformeerde Kerken." There at least we have a truly Calvinistic church—a church that is proclaiming the Christian religion, not in some feeble, inconsistent form, but as it is set forth on the basis of Holy Scripture in the Reformed Faith.

What is the reason for this resistance of the free church of Holland to the general drift? How has that church succeeded where other churches have failed? The answer is perfectly plain. It is simply that in Holland the issue was clearly faced, and faced in time. In the eighties of the last century, the Calvinists or evangelicals in Holland, under the leadership of a great Christian statesman, Dr. Abraham Kuyper, separated from the state church, and formed a truly Calvinistic church. They had the courage of their convictions; they set up and maintained a true church discipline; they were perfectly ready to do unpleasant things that Christ's little ones might not be led astray; they demanded that the ministry of the church should proclaim no message save the message for the proclamation of which the church had its being. They maintained a great Christian system of education—Christian schools in grades high and low, and a great Christian university. Thus was established by the help of God a well-rounded ecclesiastical life, an educated ministry, a laity instructed in the Word of God, true worship and true service. Against such a church the forces of modern unbelief have proved to be powerless. The free church of Holland and its daughter, the noble Christian Reformed Church in America, still stand firm in the midst of a hostile world.

The example of those churches shows, if indeed it needed to be shown, that modern unbelief is not invincible, but that even in these days a church as well as an individual may be a true witness to the Lord Jesus Christ. Only, if it is to do that, it must be willing to pay the price. It must be willing to be called intolerant and narrow and unkind; it must be willing to do unpleasant things; it must be willing to practice exclusion for the sake of those for whom Christ died. But do we require modern examples to establish the need of separateness for the Church? Did not our Lord say that salt that has lost its savor is good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men; did not Paul say: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed"? Is not the whole of the First Epistle to the Corinthians devoted to a mighty contention of the Apostle against a paganism, both in life and in thought, that was seeking in subtle ways to establish itself in the Church? Really the Word of God here supports the lesson of all Christian history. A church that tolerates within its borders the polite paganism of the world, a church that cries "Peace, peace, when there is no peace," is a church that is ready to die.

Such is the deadly peace that has captured most of the larger Protestant bodies in the world today. Very lamentable is the condition of the Protestant Church. But need that condition be wondered at? Is it due to any weakness in the Gospel itself? Is it not rather the inevitable consequence of one fundamental error—of this disastrous notion that an individual or a church may avoid doing unpleasant things and yet maintain its power, may be

at peace with God without being in conflict with the world, may simply drift with the current and still be faithful to the Lord Jesus Christ. A strange error that is, indeed. As a matter of fact, the Gospel now as always runs directly counter to the natural man, and can be maintained only through constant struggle. Let a church relinquish the struggle, let it cease to practice exclusion, let it decry controversy within its borders, let it assume that all is well, and soon the all-engulfing paganism will creep in and take control. Such is the lamentable state of the ecclesiastical world at the present time.

In view of this world-wide condition, we need not wonder that America too has drifted away from the Gospel of Christ. We are in little agreement with those who think that in American churches all is essentially well, that Modernism is just a foolish little aberration, and that the heart of the churches may be assumed to be perfectly sound. Those who speak so are really quite blind to that which is going on in the world today; they are living in the situation of fifty or seventy-five years ago, and have not the slightest inkling of the real state of the case. As a matter of fact, in this battle against Modernism in America we are engaging merely in one division of a world-wide conflict; here as elsewhere Christianity is battling against a mighty current of the age.

In this American phase of the conflict, the enemy is not yet in such complete ascendancy as in most other countries of the world; but certainly the situation even here is bad enough. Of the larger Protestant bodies very few are resisting with any vigor the general drift; very few are delivering any ringing testimony to the Gospel of Christ. Most lamentable of all, perhaps, is the condition of those churches that boast of their freedom from Modernism, and of the absence of controversy within their bounds; for that boast usually means merely that the churches that make it are relinquishing without even a struggle the great heritage of the Christian Faith. A deadly vagueness besets the teaching of such Churches. It is a feeble message which in these days arouses no opposition and causes no controversy; now as always the true Gospel would turn the world upside down.

### The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. belongs in a slightly higher category; for the evangelicals in that church, though so far they have been defeated in their contention, have at least had faith enough to contend; and that is some gain. They have at least not treated the witness of the church as though it were an utterly contemptible and valueless thing, but have endeavored—unsuccessfully so far, it is true—to restore it before it is utterly destroyed.

Certainly the condition of this church, as of other American churches, is bad enough. The creed of the church remains, indeed, truly Christian; for every candidate for ordination is required to subscribe solemnly to the Westminster Confession of Faith. But this creed-subscription is constantly being "interpreted" so loosely as to mean scarcely anything at all.

It would be instructive to trace the steps that have brought a church that was formerly so great into its present lamentable condition; but that can only very imperfectly be done. Here as elsewhere the destructive forces have been content to labor for the most part in the dark. Only now and then has some overt act served to reveal the extent to which the undermining of the church had progressed.

Such an overt act was the union with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in 1906—a church that was Presbyterian in name but certainly not Calvinistic in doctrine. The basis of union was simply the Westminster Confession of Faith; but since the adherents of the very different creed of the Cumberland Church were to be received without any change in their beliefs, it is evident that the ordination pledge in the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. was to be interpreted with a looseness to which scarcely any limits could be set.

After the Cumberland union, the destructive forces labored for a time in the dark. But they came to the surface again in the so-called "Plan of Organic Union," which was sent down to the presbyteries by the General Assembly of 1920. According to that Plan, the constituent churches in the proposed union were, indeed, graciously to be allowed to retain each its own creed; but what was really stamped as essential was contained in a Preamble couched in the vague language so dear to modern naturalism. Evidently something more than Calvinism was here at stake. In the Cumberland union the attack was upon the distinctive features of the Reformed or Calvinistic Faith; but here it was also upon those verities of the Christian religion about which even the Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic Churches agree with us.

The Plan of Organic Union was defeated in the presbyteries: but it received an enormous vote; and when one observes that it was presented to the Assembly by Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, the president of the most conservative seminary in the Church, and was advocated by Dr. Charles R. Erdman, another professor in that same conservative institution, one can readily see how very far the doctrinal consciousness of the church had been undermined.

### The Auburn Affirmation

In 1923, the General Assembly at Indianapolis, in opposition to the propaganda of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick in the First Presbyterian Church of New York—a propaganda that was hostile to the very roots of the Christian religion—issued an evangelical pronouncement to the effect that the Virgin Birth of Christ and four other verities of the Faith were essential doctrines of the Word of God and of our Standards. This evangelical pronouncement contained nothing distinctive of the Reformed Faith, and certainly it did not err on the side of too great detail. It merely enunciated certain great facts and doctrines about which all the great branches of the historic Church are agreed. Yet it was attacked by about one thousand three hundred ministers in the Presbyterian Church in a document commonly called the "Auburn Affirmation," which declared that acceptance of not one single one of the five points mentioned in the General Assembly's pronouncement was essential for ordination in the Presbyterian Church. Thus according to the Auburn Affirmation a man may be a Presbyterian minister without believing in the Virgin Birth or in any other one of these great verities of the Faith.

In the ensuing ecclesiastical battle between the General Assembly's pronouncement and the Auburn Affirmation, between the evangelical and the anti-evangelical forces in the Presbyterian Church, the anti-evangelical forces have in the main won the victory. They encountered, indeed, some temporary setbacks in their triumphal march. In 1924, at Grand Rapids, Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, representing the evangelical forces, was elected Moderator of the General Assembly in a close contest with Dr. Charles R. Erdman, who, despite orthodox declarations made by him and for him, had the support of the Modernist-indifferentist party in the Church. But in the following year Dr. Erdman was elected over the candidate of the evangelical party in that year, and the Modernists and indifferentists resumed control. A Commission of Fifteen, appointed by Dr. Erdman in 1925, really gave the Modernists and indifferentists all that they desired—namely, the glossing over of the real conditions and time to tighten their control of the machinery of the church.

That control is at present practically complete. Four out of fifteen ministerial members of the Board of Foreign Missions and seven out of sixteen ministerial members of the Board of National Missions are actually signers of the Modernist "Auburn Affirmation," and those who have taken any clear and effective and prominent stand against what that anti-evangelical document represents are scarcely represented in these boards at all. Typical, too, of the prevailing conditions is the fact that the "Candidate Secretary" of the Board of Foreign Missions is a signer of the Affirmation. Thus this gentleman whose function is to interview candidates for the mission field, and who has it within his power to encourage them or discourage them in their plans for missionary service, is a signer of a formal document that is derogatory to the very roots of that Gospel for the proclamation of which, at home and abroad, the Presbyterian Church exists.

Side by side with this undermining of the doctrinal position of the Church, and with this weakening of its testimony, has gone an attack upon its form of government. In the interests of this latter attack the most effective step, perhaps, was the establishment of the "General Council," which has proved to be a powerful agency of centralization and a more and more serious menace to our ancient liberties. Year by year the General Council,

through the General Assembly, which acts altogether without debate, sends down overtures whose effect is to tighten the control of the central ecclesiastical machine. Some of them, as was the case with the overture of 1928 regarding the Permanent Judicial Commission, have been defeated. The fate of others, as of the amazing Overtures D and F of last year, are at the present time of writing still in doubt. But the menace is ever with us, and of the ancient Presbyterian liberties, if the process goes on unchecked, little will remain.

### Destruction of the Old Princeton Seminary

The drift of the Church has been seen not only in the ecclesiastical machinery but also in the educational agencies. One and only one of the theological seminaries, that at Princeton, was until recently engaging in a really vigorous and effective battle against the destructive forces that were so mightily at work. That seminary, indeed, up to the spring of 1929, stood at the very height of its influence; its student body had increased greatly within recent years,[1] and it was honored by all those throughout the world who in the face of the prevailing Modernist tyranny cherished Presbyterian liberty and the glories of the Reformed Faith. Evidently, from the Modernist-indifferentist point of view, such an institution constituted a serious menace, and had to be destroyed. So destroyed it was in 1929, after a three-years' fight. Princeton Theological Seminary now stands under a board of control that has two Auburn Affirmationists in its membership and is quite out of accord with the doctrinal position that the institution has hitherto maintained.

This destruction of the old Princeton was furthered by representatives of the ecclesiastical machinery who were within the councils of the seminary itself. President J. Ross Stevenson and Dr. Charles R. Erdman, the two advocates of the reorganization who were members of the faculty of the seminary, are both of them members of the Board of Foreign Missions, Dr. Erdman being its president. Dr. Robert E. Speer and Dr. John McDowell, the former being a secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions and the latter of the Board of National Missions, took a particularly vigorous part in the reorganization movement; and Dr. George Alexander and Mr. W. P. Stevenson, members of the Board of Foreign Missions, also were concerned in it, the former being a member of the board of directors of the Seminary and the latter a member of the board of trustees. What we have essentially in the change at Princeton is the crushing out of the distinctive features of the seminary by the general administrative machinery of the church. Princeton Seminary has simply been made to conform to the general doctrinal drift.

That doctrinal drift is also practically in complete control of the agencies of public discussion. The official organ of the church, *The Presbyterian Magazine,* is actually under the editorship of a signer of the Modernist "Auburn Affirmation" itself; and of the older inofficial organs not one is supporting a clear-cut evangelicalism. The only one which was formerly doing so, *The Presbyterian,* has removed its former editor, Dr. S. G. Craig, because of the courageous, though always courteous, way in which he presented the real issue in the Church; and now it is an organ of the conventional "middle-of-the-road" or pacifist kind. From February 1, 1930, up to the appearance of this first issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY the evangelical party was without any real organ of publicity in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

### The Present Duty of Evangelicals

Under these discouraging circumstances, what ought to be done by the sound elements in that church? About the answer to this question there may be differences of opinion in detail; but some things, we think, can hardly be in doubt. There are some things at least which we certainly ought to do.

1. We ought to face the facts. Nothing is more enervating today than a foolish optimism about the state of the church. Let us get rid of this ecclesiastical Couéism which seeks comfort from a parrot-like repetition of the assertion that the church is "essentially sound." Rather let us spread the real facts unreservedly before God in prayer, and seek our help from Him.

2. We ought to avoid paring down our ecclesiastical program to suit undecided or timorous persons on the outskirts of our camp. Nothing has been more effective in preventing any brave or generous action on the part of evangelicals in the church than this continual fear of "losing support" for our movement if we speak out bravely for the Lord Jesus Christ. As a matter of fact, our movement will greatly profit by losing some kinds of support. When our army is reduced to Gideon's three hundred men, then God may be pleased to give us the victory in the fight.

3. Let us support our new evangelical organ with all our might and main. It certainly deserves our support. Dr. S. G. Craig, the Editor, needs no introduction to men of evangelical conviction wherever they may be. His noble voice in *The Presbyterian* brought comfort and guidance to thousands who were seeking the truth. His very opponents do him credit. Never was there a man who could say more justly to those who opposed him: "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" In CHRISTIANITY TODAY, he will speak with even greater power; and he will have associated with him, as Managing Editor, the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, whose splendid talent for journalism will be put to the very highest use. Such a paper can be relied on never to be dull. And never will it fall into the fault of so many church papers of keeping silent about the really great issues and emitting a smoke-screen instead of light.

4. We ought to support Westminster Theological Seminary, which has been born in prayer and has been supported by the devotion and self-sacrifice of those who love the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Certainly we who are serving in this work in the faculty are far from perfect; and certainly we are the first to recognize that fact. But there can be no doubt but that the work itself is of God. Sweet water cannot be obtained from a bitter fountain; and if the preaching of the Gospel is to go on at all in the Presbyterian Church we must have a truly evangelical and truly Presbyterian source of ministerial supply.

5. We ought to keep the banner flying in the councils of the church. About our immediate duty in detail there may be some doubt. But one thing at least is clear—there can be no peace, save a shameful peace, between the Christian religion and that which the Auburn Affirmation, for example, represents. If the latter is really in permanent control of our church, then a new church should be formed to be a true witness to Jesus Christ. Meanwhile the banner of the Gospel cause should be kept flying at the General Assembly and in all the councils of the Presbyterian Church. Dr. S. G. Craig has been mentioned in the daily press as a possible Moderator of the General Assembly of this year. We do not know whence this suggestion originally came. But certainly we commend it with all our heart. He may not like our doing so in the columns of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. But we beg him not to mutilate our article at this point. There could be no finer standard-bearer than this one who has done so much and suffered so much for the cause of Christ. And to have no standard-bearer at all—to elect by acclamation some candidate of the Modernist-indifferentist party in the church—this we think would be simply to be unfaithful to a great trust.

6. We ought not to despair. The world may look dark to him who loves the Gospel today. But let us reflect that this is not the first gloomy time in the history of the Christian Church; and sometimes the darkest hour has just preceded the dawn. Even now God has by no means left Himself without a witness. We who have been at Westminster Seminary, for example, have learned through contact with our splendid company of students, as never before, how truly blessed a thing is Christian fellowship in the midst of a hostile world. No, there are still many today who love the Lord Jesus Christ as He is presented to us in God's Word. But the true ground of our confidence is found in the great and precious promises of God. Who can say? Perhaps God has brought us into these troubles in order that we may cease to have confidence in men and may rely more completely upon Him.

[1] The attendance in successive years at Princeton Seminary from 1918-1919 to 1929-1930 inclusive has been 114, 156, 163, 195, 215, 215, 224, 238, 222, 253, 255, 177. In the first few of these years, the effect of the war was felt. The drop of 78 (30 per cent) from 1928-1929 to 1929-1930 was of course due to the reorganization. The student body during the last year of conservative control numbered 255; it numbered 177 during this first year under the new Board. Not improbably it may begin to increase again as a different type of students is attracted to take the place of the devotedly evangelical students who have been repelled by the change in control.

# Protestantism's Tomorrow

By Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D.

[Below appears the complete text of the address delivered at the first commencement of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, in Witherspoon Hall, on the evening of May sixth. Dr. Macartney is an ex-Moderator of the General Assembly, Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, and a member of the Seminary's Board of Trustees. An account of the commencement exercises appears in our news pages.]

WERE I to consult my own preference, I should avail myself of this opportunity to speak some words of counsel, warning, and encouragement to the young men who are going out from this Seminary to preach the Gospel. But I am aware, as you are, that this is no ordinary occasion, and that the exercises of this evening have back of them a deeper significance than the sending out of these young men into the work of the ministry. Tonight we fling out to every wind that blows a new banner, to be displayed not because of any new discovery, or any new faith, but because of the Everlasting Gospel. With this commencement, and the going out of these young men into the ministry, the real history of Westminster Seminary begins.

One hundred and fifty-four years ago, the Continental Congress, assembled in the old State House on Chestnut Street, declared to the world the independence of the United States. It was fitting that the Declaration should commence with the now familiar words: "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitles them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to separation."

A decent respect to the opinions of Presbyterians, and evangelical Christians in the United States and throughout the world, requires that we should declare the causes which impelled us to separate from Princeton Theological Seminary. A statement of these causes must, of necessity, embrace a brief survey of the present condition of the Protestant Church.

On an August day one summer, I was sitting on a bench in the park at Geneva. In front of me, and built against the ancient ramparts of the city, rose the great stone wall of the International Monument of the Reformation. In the center, cut out of the rock, stood the figures of the four Reformers who had to do with Geneva—Calvin, Farell, Beza, and Knox. Along the wall to the left stood the great Elector Frederick, William the Silent, and Admiral Coligny. On the right, Roger Williams and Cromwell. Between the different figures, were sculptured scenes representing memorable incidents of Reformation and post-Reformation times: Henry the IV, signing the Edict of Nantes; John Knox, preaching before Mary Stuart; the Elector Frederick receiving the French refugees, and the signing of the compact in the cabin of the Mayflower. Over all, cut in great letters was the familiar motto of the Reformation, "Post Tenebras Lux." It is a noble memorial, and the stern faces of the Reformers, and the stirring scenes of Reformation history sum up the tremendous religious and political revolution which created a new world and a new Church.

Four centuries have passed since Luther nailed his Theses to the door of the Cathedral at Wittenberg and since John Calvin came to Geneva and inaugurated the great work which made Geneva the cradle of the reformed theology and the "fertile seed-plot of democracy." But what of Protestantism today? As I gazed earnestly and reminiscently upon the memorial to our spiritual forefathers, the vagrant August wind was blowing the yellow leaves about the gardens, telling me that the end of the summer was at hand. Has the Protestant Church, which we and our fathers before us took to be a Tree of Life, whose leaf could never wither, come to its sere and yellow leaf? Is its grandeur and glory only in the past, and in those mighty forces which it loosed upon the world to sweep away hoary iniquities and superstitions in Church, in State, and in human society? Must we liken Protestantism to a vast scaffolding upon which have stood the workers and toilers and dreamers, as the temple of religious and political liberty rose towards the sky through their labors, but which, now that the building is finished, is to be taken down and carried away? Has the inexorable hand which has spelled the passing of so many of the kingdoms and societies of mankind now appeared to write upon the wall of Protestant Christianity, "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting?"

At first, these questions may startle and sadden earnest evangelical Protestants. But, upon sober second thought, it must be evident to all that a great change has come over the Protestant Church, and that a still greater change is in process. One of our university presidents said recently, "I do not know where Protestantism is going. Nobody knows." Everyone, however, seems to have the impression that Protestantism is on the tide of change, and is going—somewhere. In the first book of his Commentaries, Caesar describes a river of Switzerland called the Saone, which, he says, "flows through the territories of the Aedui and Sequani into the Rhone with such incredible slowness that it cannot be determined by the eye in which direction it flows." Sometimes, the process of transition is so slow that it escapes observation. Again, there are other times when the stream of change flows with tremendous rapidity, so rapid, indeed, that although one knows the river is going in some direction, one cannot tell what that direction is. There may be those who stand in honest doubt as to the present drift and current in the Protestant Church. But there are a great number who are convinced that Protestant Christianity is rapidly being carried away towards what Newman called, "a bottomless liberalism of thought."

What are some of the characteristics of the present Protestant drift? How can we describe the change which has come over so many of our Protestant Churches? Perhaps we can best commence by saying that Protestantism is losing its faith in the Bible, and as it loses its faith in the Bible, it is losing its religion.

The ultimate question of all religion is this,—Has God come out of the darkness and silence and spoken to man? The answer of the Protestant Church, indeed, of the whole Church catholic, has been that God has so spoken, and that in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament we have an infallible record of that revelation. In the Protestant Church we have emphasized the divine origin, and therefore the complete authority of the Scriptures, their sufficient clarity, and their finality.

But who today would claim that those principles represent the popular Protestant thought of the Bible. Certainly they do not, if we can pay any regard to the utterances in Protestant pulpits, seminaries, colleges, and publications. Instead of that Word of God, we have a strange substitute, a book which is a conglomerate of fact and fable, of Stone Age morality and divine precepts. For the authority of the Scriptures, there has been substituted man's own unaided reason; and "man's reason is a flickering torch on a starless night fanned by the winds of passion and ignorance." Instead of a religion based upon the revealed truths of the Bible, we now have a Christianity which every man is to evolve out of his own mind and experience, much as the spider weaves his attenuated web.

A deleted Bible has resulted naturally, inevitably in a diluted Gospel. How shall we describe this diluted Gospel? Protestantism commenced its career by furnishing a great answer to a great question, "What shall I do to be saved?" Side by side with the Protestant principle of the supremacy of the Scriptures, stood its article of the standing or falling Church, Salvation by faith alone. But now, in the strange whirligig of time, that Protestant doctrine has been stood on its head, until it reads, not salvation by faith alone, nor salvation by faith *and* works, but salvation *without any faith at all,* so long as you do what you think is right.

Slowly, but surely, multitudes of people in the Protestant Church have awakened to the fact that another Gospel "which is not another" is now being widely proclaimed in Protestant Churches. It is another Gospel because it gives us another Christ. We have Christ in the four Gospels, and outside of that silence and darkness. But the Christ of this neo-Christianity is one who did not come into the world by the stupendous miracle of the Virgin Birth, who wrought no miracles, who did not rise again from the dead in the same body with which He suffered, and whose second and glorious Advent is nothing more than the "phrasing of hope." Whoever this Jesus is, whatever power He may possess, He certainly is not the Christ of the Gospels.

The Gospel of this new Christianity is another Gospel because it gives us another Cross and another way of salvation. The Atonement, to quote the words of Turretin, is "the chief part of our salvation, the anchor of Faith, the refuge of Hope, the rule of Charity, the true foundation of the Christian religion, and the richest treasure of the Christian Church. So long as this doctrine is maintained in its integrity, Christianity itself, and the peace and happiness of all who believe in Christ, are beyond the reach of danger. But if it is rejected, or in any way impaired, the whole structure of the Christian faith must sink into decay and ruin." But the new Gospel of Protestantism has no Atonement in it. The death of Christ on the Cross was but the last incident, though touching and pathetic, in the life and ministry of Jesus. The main thing about Christ was not His death, but His life. If His death meant anything, it was a beautiful instance of submission to the will of God, the highwater mark of sacrifice, or a last appeal to man to repent and turn to God. It is true, and fortunately true, that the Atonement still survives in the great hymns of the Church, in the liturgies and rubrics of its services, and in the two great sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. But beyond this, one would hardly dare to say that the Atonement, the central fact of Christianity, is widely taught or proclaimed. In a perusal of forty-four sermons preached recently in metropolitan pulpits, there was but one mention of sin, and that was in a sermon in St. Patrick's Cathedral. The pastor of the Waldensian Church in Rome, on a visit to this country last spring, read in the newspapers on the Monday following Easter excerpts of the sermons preached on Easter Sunday. He said to me that the thing which surprised him and amazed him was the almost total disregard for distinctive Christian doctrine, especially the great doctrine of the Resurrection. The one exception, he said, was a sermon preached by a Roman Catholic.

It is vain to hide from ourselves the range and sweep of this neo-Christianity, which is a totally different religion than the Christianity of the New Testament and of the historic creeds. This new religion has captured many seminaries and colleges, a great number of our pulpits and thousands of our people. The Phaeton of sentimentality and scorn for definite religious belief has taken his place in the chariot of the Protestant Church and now drives down the steep of Heaven to the applause of the great multitude.

Although written a century ago, one of the best accounts of the grotesque caricature of Christianity which has pushed the wedge of its invasion so deep into the Protestant Church is found in the famous sermon preached by Cardinal Newman on "The Religion of the Day." In this sermon he said, "In every age of Christianity since it was first preached, there has been what may be called a Religion of the World, which so far imitates the one true religion as to deceive the unstable and unwary. It has taken the brighter side of the Gospel, its tidings of comfort, its precepts of love; all darker, deeper views of man's condition and prospects being comparatively forgotten. This is the religion natural to a civilized age, and well has Satan dressed and completed it unto an idol of the truth." Instead of those great words, Repentance, Faith, Regeneration, Heaven and Hell, words which pierce like stars the fog and darkness of the night of sin, we have these curious substitutes, Unity, Eugenics, Birth Control, Internationalism, Communityism and all that vast hokum which now is widely received as an equivalent for the Gospel. Those who desire such dilutions can drink decaffeined coffee and smoke denicotined tobacco, and now we have de-Christianized Christianity. So far has this process of de-Christianization advanced, that those who founded the Protestant Church, and the first Apostles themselves would never recognize the Gospel now offered to the world as that in which they put their trust and for which they jeopardized their lives. Even the devils themselves might well express amazement, and say, as did the evil spirit whom the seven sons of Sceva sought to exorcise, "Jesus, I know, and Paul, I know, but who are ye?"

Although the seal of it had long been here, this change has come over Protestantism within a generation. How complete and rapid the change has been may be illustrated by the fact that over thirty years ago, Union Theological Seminary, New York, broke from its connection with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church because it found that that connection hampered the seminary in its liberty to teach Liberalism and Modernism. But today we have something quite the reverse. A group of renowned scholars, enthusiastic students, and faithful directors have withdrawn from Princeton Theological Seminary and established a new seminary, which, while devoted to the doctrine and polity of the Presbyterian Church, is to be free of all control by the General Assembly because it was discovered, to our sorrow and amazement, that such connection was a menace to our liberty to be loyal as we understood loyalty, to the doctrines of evangelical Christianity.

In September, 1891, Dr. Francis L. Patton delivered the funeral sermon over his colleague in the Seminary at Princeton, Dr. Wistar Hodge. The whole address shows Dr. Patton in one of his most tender moods, and as it is one of the few literary remains of Dr. Patton, it is all the more precious. In his address, Dr. Patton foresaw the struggle in which we are engaged today. He said:

"Dr. Hodge knew that the attack upon Calvinism through the new theology was made by bringing Paul's teaching to the test of human feeling. He saw that the attack consisted not so much in denying Paul said what is alleged, but that his opinions are not necessarily binding upon us. Minimizing the authority of Paul, however, leads to minimizing the Gospel story,—ends in reducing Christianity to the religion of the individual conscience—ends in naturalism. He saw this: and because he saw, or thought he saw, that the Church was blind, and her leaders blind he was depressed and saddened.

"I cannot think of him today without feeling that by his death he has been spared a great sorrow. I may be wrong, but it seems to me that American Christianity is about to pass through a severe ordeal. It may be a ten years' conflict. It may be a thirty years' war; but it is a conflict in which all Christian churches are concerned. The war will come, the Presbyterian Church must take part in it, and Princeton, unless her glory is departed, must lead the van in the great fight for fundamental Christianity. It is no amendment; it is not revision; it is not a restatement, it is a revolution that we shall have to face. The issue will be joined by and by on the essential truth of a miraculous and God-given revelation, and then we must be ready to fight, and, if need be, to die, in defence of the blood-bought truths of the common salvation."

In such a day as this, Westminster Theological Seminary is founded. At such an hour her flag goes up and her first class goes out Speaking forty years ago, President Patton described with wonderful foresight what has taken place in our own day in the Protestant Church, and the religious revolution which is upon us. As to Princeton he said, "Princeton, *unless her glory is departed,* must lead the van in the great fight for fundamental Chris-

tianity." Unhappily, when we were marching into the forefront of the hottest battle for the faith, a dispute arose among the directors, the faculty and the trustees of Princeton as to the part she ought to play in the great fight for fundamental Christianity. The Presbyterian Church, through its highest court by the dissolution of the loyal board of Directors decided that Princeton, for the present, shall not, as Dr. Patton hoped she would, "lead the van in the great fight for fundamental Christianity." I am sure that I speak, not only for myself, but for my friends and colleagues on the Faculty and Board of Directors of Westminster Seminary, when I say, that we would have preferred to remain at Princeton, and there fought in the van in this great battle for evangelical Christianity. But the Presbyterian Church, by the action of its last General Assembly, made it difficult, if not impossible, for us to do so. We bear no grudge against Princeton, the seminary which nurtured us, and whose grand traditions are precious unto us. If God shall still use Princeton as a witness to the truth, we shall rejoice in it.

If the cloud which now rests upon Princeton shall lift, and again, as in the days of her glory, she shall be as one that looketh out of the window, fair as the sun, bright as the moon and terrible as an army with banners, none will rejoice more than we shall rejoice.

The founding of Westminster Seminary, therefore, has a peculiar and definite meaning at this critical day in the history of Christianity. In the first place its establishment is a protest against the action of the Church in dissolving the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary, and practically ejecting them for loyalty to the truth.

In the second place, the establishment of Westminster Seminary is a warning to the Presbyterian Church against the danger of being completely submerged in the tide of the neo-Christianity which threatens to engulf the whole Protestant Church. This Seminary is a watchman on the wall, proclaiming with no uncertain trumpet that an enemy is in our midst.

In the third place the establishment of this Seminary is a witness to the Bible as the Word of God, a notification to the world that we believe in the Bible, both as to its facts and its doctrines, and are confident that both facts and doctrines are capable of reasoned, thoughtful and scholarly defense.

In the fourth place, this Seminary is founded as a witness to the saving power of the glorious Gospel of the blessed God and of our Lord Jesus Christ. This Seminary shall stand as a token of our earnest conviction that the Gospel of Christ is the alone hope of a lost and fallen race.

In the fifth place, Westminster Seminary is founded as a token of our faith in the reverescence of evangelical Christianity, and that as the tops of the mountains were seen after the deluge, so after the deluge and invasion of unbelief in the Protestant Church, when the angry waters shall have subsided, those sacred heights, the mountain tops of Sinai and Calvary, shall again be revealed, and the Church shall again bow in gratitude, adoration and love before the Cross of the Eternal Christ.

## TO THE MEMBERS OF THIS GRADUATING CLASS:

One of the greatest references to the Gospel and to a minister's relationship with it is that word of Paul to Timothy. The glorious Gospel of the blessed God, *which I was trusted with!* The Gospel in the hands of you who go out from this Seminary to preach it is a sacred trust. Trust is a beautful thing; the trust of a child in its parent, and of a mother in her son, of a friend in a friend, a lover for a lover. But that trust, beautiful though it is, cannot compare with the sacred trust which Christ reposes in those who stand before the world as His ministers. You go out as the first representatives of this Seminary in the world and in the Church. In your own life and conduct be worthy of the trust which is reposed in you.

> "Though to wax fierce
> In the cause of the Lord,
> To threat and to pierce with the heavenly sword,
> Thou warrest and smitest,
> Yet Christ must atone for a soul which thou slightest—
> Thine own!"

Remember those searching lines of Newman, and in the "war of the Lord" take heed to thyself and see to it that your life is not a hindrance to your message.

Entrusted with the Gospel of the blessed God, be sure that you proclaim it. This will not be easy, for the truths which are at the base of the faith of the Church are contrary and odious to the natural man. One day you will find yourself at the parting of the ways, when you must all alone, by yourself, and for yourself, make the decision whether or not you will preach the gospel, whether you will stand as the retailer of the world's fancies and wisdom, or the proclaimer of the unsearchable riches in Christ. Whether your lot be cast in the midst of the great city where footsteps beat the sidewalks like drops of rain, and always in your ears the hoarse din of commerce and industry, or whether it be in some quiet, white-towered village Church with the dead generations who have accomplished their warfare clustering close about the Holy House, as if yearning in their dark graves to hear again the Word of Life, or whether it be your high honor to preach Christ where His name has never been heard,—wherever your lot is cast of God, let it be your solemn vow that your preaching shall be the kind which shall help to hand down to the generations unborn the grand and peculiar traditions of the Christian's faith. On the northwest tower of St. Paul's in London hangs the great bell known as "Great Paul." The bell bears this inscription, from the vulgate: "Vae mihi si non evangelisavero!"—"Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel!"

As you go, be strong in the enthusiasm of your faith. The future is with you, and with those who believe the Gospel. Unbelief, humanism, paganism, modernism, rationalism, and all forms of the false gospel which in so many places has supplanted the true, has no message for the heart of a world that is sick. With all its marvelous inventions and discoveries, and underneath the glitter and glamour of all its worship of the world, the heart of man is sick and sad. You alone have the message of Him Who said, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor, to heal the brokenhearted, and to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, and to preach the acceptable year of the Lord."

When Gideon, with his diminished army still had misgivings as to the results of the forthcoming battle, as he gazed from the slopes of Gilead upon the hosts of the Midianites encamped in the valley below, God told him to go down in the camp of the enemy and "Thou shalt hear what they say." With his ear close to the tent of the Midianites, Gideon heard one tell to his fellow his dream of the barley loaf which tumbled down the hill and knocked over the tent; and his interpretation of the dream. "God hath delivered Midian and all his host into the hand of Gideon." When Gideon heard that, he worshipped and returned to his army and said, "Arise, for the Lord hath delivered into your hand the host of Midian!"

Thou shalt hear what they say! We hear what they say to us, what they say in criticism of the Church, in hostility or derision or bitterness, but not what they say among themselves, in their own camp. Would that we might lie quietly by the tents of this world and hear what they think and say! Could we but hear what they think and say of some noble and guileless Christian character; could we but hear their anxious misgivings for the tomorrow of a life without God; could we but see their blank despair as they stand by the grave of one they have loved; could we but hear the restless tossing of their remorse; could we but hear their secret verdict about the ultimate victory of the Kingdom of God,—like Gideon we should worship and return to our posts full of joy and confidence, for we should then know how true it is that the sword of the Lord is also the sword of the Church.

As ye go, preach! As ye go, preach! As ye go, preach! And may the blessing of the Triune God be upon you.

> "God of the Prophets! bless the prophets' sons!
> Elijah's mantle o'er Elisha cast."

# The Saving Christ

## A SERMON

### by the late Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D.

B. B. Warfield at the time of his death was the leading Calvinistic theologian in the English speaking world, ranking in this respect with the great Dutch theologians, Abraham Kuyper and Hermann Bavinck. In him a mind of rare power, extraordinary erudition and a remarkable facility for accurate and concise expression was united with a deeply Christian heart and an earnest evangelical zeal. It is a matter of much moment to all serious students of theology that the Oxford University Press is now in process of publishing ten volumes of his selected writings. Three volumes have already appeared, "Revelation and Inspiration" ($3.00), "Biblical Doctrines" ($4.00), and "Christology and Criticism" ($3.00). Others will follow shortly. Dr. Warfield's sermons have been spoken of as "models of the better sort of University preaching" and it seems fitting that the first sermon printed in "Christianity Today" should be from one who for so many years was a standing illustration of the fact that the most searching critical and historical investigation strengthens rather than weakens belief in the Bible as the Word of God and in Christ as the alone and all-sufficient Saviour. This sermon is taken by permission from a volume of Dr. Warfield's sermons recently published by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., under the title, "The Power of God unto Salvation" ($2.00). It here appears somewhat abridged.

*"Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."*—I TIM. i. 15. (R. V.)

IN these words we have the first of a short series of five "faithful sayings," or current Christian commonplaces, incidentally adduced by the apostle Paul in what we commonly call his Pastoral Epistles. They are a remarkable series and their appearance on the face of these New Testament writings is almost as remarkable as their contents.

Consider what the phenomenon is that is brought before us in these "faithful sayings." Here is the apostle writing to his assistants in the proclamation of the gospel, little more than a third of a century, say, after the crucifixion of his Lord—scarcely thirty-three years after he had himself entered upon the great ministry that had been committed to him of preaching to the Gentiles the words of this life. Yet he is already able to remind them of the blessed contents of the gospel message in words that are the product of Christian experience in the hearts of the community. For just what these "faithful sayings" are, is a body of utterances in which the essence of the gospel as been crystallized by those who have tasted and seen its preciousness.

Obviously the days when this gospel was brought as a novelty to their attention are past. The Church has been founded, and in it throbs the pulses of a vigorous life. The gospel has been embraced and lived; it has been trusted and not found wanting; and the souls that have found its blessedness have had time to frame its precious truths into formulas. Formulas, I do not say, merely, that have passed from mouth to mouth, and been enshrined in memory after memory until they have become proverbs in the Christian community. Formulas rather, which have embedded themselves in the hearts of the whole congregation, have been beaten there into shape, as the deeper emotions of redeemed souls have played round them, and have emerged again suffused with the feelings which they have awakened and satisfied, and molded into that balanced and rythmic form which is the hallmark of utterances that come really out of the living and throbbing hearts of the people. Formulas, moreover, which have come to us not merely as valuable fragments of the Christian thinking of the first period—of absorbing interest as they would be even from that point of view—but with the imprimatur of the apostle upon them as consonant with the mind of the Holy Spirit. They are dug from the mine of the Christian heart indeed, but they come to us stamped in the mintage of apostolic authority. The primitive Christian community it may have been that gave them form and substance, but it is the apostle who assures us that they are "faithful sayings, and worthy of all acceptation."

And surely, when we come to look narrowly at the particular one of these "sayings" which we have chosen as our text, it is a great assertion that it brings us—an assertion which, if it be truly a "faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation," is well adapted to become even in this late and, it would fain believe itself, more instructed age, the watchword of the Christian Church and of every Christian heart.

It would naturally be impossible for us to dip out all the fullness of such a great declaration in a half-hour's meditation. It will be profitable for us, accordingly, to confine ourselves to bringing as clearly before us as may prove to be practicable two or three of its main implications. And may God the Holy Spirit help us to read it aright and to apply its lessons to our souls' welfare!

First of all, then, let us observe that this "faithful saying" takes us back into the counsels of eternity and reveals to us the ground, in the decree of God, for the gift of His Son to the world, and the end sought to be obtained by His entrance into the likeness of sinful flesh. "Faithful is the saying," says the apostle, "and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world *in order to save sinners.*" That is to say, the occasion of the incarnation is rooted in sin, and the end of it is found in salvation from sin. And that is to say again, translating these facts into the terms of the decree, that the determination of God to send His Son and the determination of the Son to come into the world are grounded, in the counsel of God, on the contemplated fact of sin, and have as their design to provide a remedy for sin.

This, it need hardly be said, is in accordance with the uniform representation of Scripture. Scripture always speaks of the incarnation as the hinge of a great remedial scheme. Our Lord Himself, in language closely parallel to that before us, says, "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." And everywhere in Scripture the incarnation is conceived distinctly, if we may be permitted the use of these technical terms, soteriologically rather than ontologically, or even cosmologically. Under the guidance of Scripture, and preëminently of our present passage, therefore, we must needs deny that the proximate account of the incarnation is to be sought either ontologically or ethically in God, or in the nature of the Logos, or in the idea of creation, or in the character of man as created; and affirm that it is to be found only in the needy condition of man as a sinner before the face of a holy and loving God.

But this great declaration not only takes us back into the counsels of the eternal God that we may learn what from the ages of ages He purposed for sinful man, but it also throws an intense emphasis on the nature of the work which the incarnate Son of God came to perform.

What, after all, are we looking for in Christ? Perhaps very divergent replies might be returned to this query did we but probe our hearts deeply enough and question our hopes resolutely enough. At all events, from the very earliest ages of Christianity, men have approached Him with very varied needs prominent in their minds, and have sought in Him satisfaction for very diverse necessities. They have felt the need of a teacher, an example, a revealer of God, a manifestation of the Divine love, an unveiling of the mysteries of the spiritual world, or of the life that lies beyond the grave. Or they have felt the need of a protector, a strong governor on whose arm they could rest, a bulwark against the evils of this life, and a tower of strength for their support and safety, whether in this life or in that to come. Or they have felt the need of a ransom from sin, of a redeemer, an expiation, a reconciler with God, a sanctifier. In the opulent provision for all that man can require made in the work of the Son of man, we can find all this, and more, in Him. But it makes every difference where, amid the rich profusion of His mercies, we discover the center of gravity of the benefits conferred on us, and what we ascribe more to the periphery.

In particular, in the first age of the gospel declaration it appealed to men more especially along three lines of deeply felt needs. Some, oppressed chiefly by their sense of the ignorance of God and of spiritual realities in which they had languished in the days of their heathendom, and dazzled by the light of the glorious

gospel He brought to them, looked to Christ most eagerly as the Logos, the great Revealer, who had brought the knowledge of God to them, and with the knowledge of God the knowledge of themselves also as the Sons of God. Others, oppressed rather by the miseries of life, turned from the dreadful physical and social conditions in which humanity itself had nearly been ground out of them, to hail in Christ the founder of a new social order; and permitted their quickened hopes to play almost exclusively round the promises of the kingdom He had come to establish and the joys it would bring. We call the one class "Gnostics" and the other "Chiliasts;" and by the very attribution to them of these party names indicate our clear perception that in neither of these channels did the great stream of Christian faith run. For from the beginning it has been true of Christians at large that the evils they have looked to Christ primarily to be relieved from have been neither intellectual nor social, but rather distinctly moral and spiritual. There have arisen from time to time one-sided and insufficient modes of expressing even this deeper longing and truer trust in Christ. Early Christians were apt, for example, to speak of themselves too exclusively as under bondage to Satan, and to look to Christ as a ransom to Satan for their release. But, however strangely they may now and again have expressed themselves, the essence of the matter lay clearly revealed in their thought—this, namely, in the words of the text, that Christ Jesus had come into the world to *save sinners;* that sin is the evil from which we need delieverance, and that it was to redeem from sin that the Son of God left His throne and companied with wicked men for a season.

The two thousand years of Christian life that have been lived since the gospel of salvation was brought into the world have not availed to eliminate from His Church these insufficient conceptions of our Lord's work. Even in this twentieth century of ours there still exist Christian intellectualists as extreme as any Gnostic of old: men who look to Christ for nothing but instruction, manifestation, revelation, teaching, example; and who still discover the essence of Christianity in the higher and better knowledge it brings of what is true and good and beautiful. And by their side there still exist today Christian socialists as extreme as any Chiliast of old: men whose whole talk is of the amelioration of life brought about by Christ, of the salvation of society, of the establishment on Christian principles of a new social order and the upbuilding of a new social structure; and whose prime hope in Christ is for the relief of the distresses of life and the building up of a kingdom of well-being in the world.

We shall be in no danger, of course, of neglecting the truth that is embodied in the intellectualistic and the socialistic gospels. Christ is our Prophet and our King. He did come to make us know what God is, and what His purposes of mercy are to men; and where the light of that knowledge is shut out from men's sight how great is the darkness and how great is the misery of that darkness! He is our wisdom, our teacher beyond compare. So far from minimizing either the extent or the value of His revelations, we must rather acknowledge that we cannot magnify them enough. And Christ did come to implant in human society a new principle of social health and organization, and the leaven which He has thus imbedded in the mass is working, and is destined to continue to work, every conceivable improvement in the structure of society until the whole is leavened. In a word, Christ did come to found a kingdom, and in that kingdom men shall dwell together in amity and peace, and love shall be its law, and happiness its universal condition. It is with no desire to minimize the intellectual and social blessings that Christ has brought the world, therefore, that we would insist that the center of His work lies elsewhere. We all the more heartily hail Him as our Prophet and our King, that we must insist that He is also, and above all, our Priest. He has saved us from ignorance; He has saved us from pain; but these are not the evils on which the hinge of His saving work turns. Above all and before all He has saved us from sin. "Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save *sinners.*"

And it is only by saving us from sin, we must further remark, that He saves us from ignorance and from misery. There is a high and true sense, valid here too, in the saying that faith precedes reason: that it is only he that is in Christ Jesus who can know God and acquire any effective insight into spiritual truth. And equally in that other maxim that the regeneration of the individual is the condition of the regeneration of society: that it is only he that is in Christ Jesus who can have added to him even these lesser benefits. Apart from the central salvation from sin, knowledge can but puff up, and society at best is a whited sepulchre, full of dead men's bones. And it is only by His prime work of saving from sin—that sin which is the root of all our ignorance and of all our bitterness alike—that He makes the tree good that its fruit may be good also. In the penetrating declaration of our text, therefore, we perceive the heart of Christianity uncovered for us. The saying that it was to save sinners that Christ Jesus came into the world is a faithful one, and worthy of all acceptation. And that means that it is not the primary function of Christianity in the world to educate men, though we shall not get along without teaching; or to ameliorate their physical and social condition, though we shall not get along without charity; but to proclaim salvation from sin. It exists in the world not for making men wise, nor for making them comfortable, but for saving them from sin. That done and all is done—each result following in its due course. That not done, and nothing is done. All the wisdom of the ages, all the delights of life, are of no avail so long as we are oppressed with sin. The core of the gospel is assuredly that Christ Jesus came to save *sinners.*

We need, however, once more to adjust the emphasis in order to gain the whole message of our passage. What Paul declares to be a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, is that Christ Jesus came to *save* sinners. Put the emphasis now on the one word *"save"*—Christ Jesus came to *save* sinners.

Not, then, merely to prepare salvation for them; to open to them a pathway to salvation; to remove the obstacles in the way of their salvation; to proclaim as a teacher a way of salvation; to introduce as a ruler conditions of life in which clean living becomes for the first time possible; to bring motives to holy action to bear upon us; to break down our enmity to God by an exhibition of His seeking love; to manifest to us what sin is in the sight of God, and how He will visit it with His displeasure. All these things He undoubtedly does. But all these things together touch but the circumference of His work for man. Under no interpretation of the nature or reach of His work can it be truly said that Christ Jesus *came* to do these things. For that we must penetrate deeper, and say with the primitive Church, in this faithful saying commended to us by the apostle, that Christ Jesus came to *save* sinners.

We must take the great declaration in the height and depth of its tremendous meaning. Jesus did all that is included in the great word *"save."* He did not come to induce us to save ourselves, or to help us to save ourselves, or to enable us to save ourselves. He came to *save* us. And it is therefore that His name was called Jesus—because He should save His people from their sins. The glory of our Lord, surpassing all His other glories to usward, is just that He is our actual and complete Saviour; our Saviour to the uttermost. Our knowledge, even though it be His gift to us as our Phophet, is not our saviour, be it as wide and as deep and as high as it is possible to conceive. The Church, though it be His gift to us as our King, is not our saviour, be it as holy and true as it becomes the Church, the bride of the Lamb, to be. The reorganized society in which He has placed us, though it be the product of His holy rule over the redeemed earth, is not our saviour, be it the new Jerusalem itself, clothed in its beauty and descended from heaven. Nay, let us cut more deeply still. Our faith itself, though it be the bond of our union with Christ through which we receive all His blessings, is not our saviour. We have but one Saviour; and that one Saviour is Jesus Christ our Lord. Nothing that we are and nothing that we can do enters in the slightest measure into the ground of our acceptance with God. Jesus did it all. And by doing it all He has become in the fullest and widest and deepest sense the word can bear—our *Saviour.* For this end did He come into the world—to *save* sinners; and nothing short of the actual and complete *saving* of sinners will satisfy the account of His work given by His own lips and repeated from them by all His apostles.

It is in this great fact, indeed, that there lies the whole essence of the gospel. For let us never forget that the gospel is not *good advice,* but *good news.* It does not come to us to make known to us what we must do to earn salvation for ourselves, but proclaiming to us what Jesus has done to save us. It is salvation, a completed salvation, that it announces to us;

*(Concluded on Page 19)*

# Books of Religious Significance

*THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST by J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. Harper & Brothers, New York and London.* 1930. 415 *pp.* $5.00.

THIS volume sustains, and more than sustains, Dr. Machen's reputation as not only one of the world's foremost New Testament scholars but as one of the ablest defenders of historic Christianity. His former books, *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (1921), *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923) and *What is Faith?* (1925), have so whetted the appetites of their thousands of readers that the announcement of a new book by Dr. Machen fills them with eager expectancy—whatever may be their theological position. It will be recalled that Mr. Walter Lippmann, whose theological position is about as far removed as possible from that of Dr. Machen's, in his widely read book, *A Preface to Morals,* not only speaks of Dr. Machen as "both a scholar and a gentleman" but says of his book, *Christianity and Liberalism:* "It is an admirable book. For its acumen, for its saliency, and for its wit, this cool and stringent defense of orthodox Protestantism is, I think, the best popular argument produced by either side in the current controversy. We shall do well to listen to Dr. Machen."

Dr. Machen's latest book, it is true, like *The Origin of Paul's Religion,* moves throughout in the field of exact scholarship. It would be difficult to point to a book anywhere that is more thorough-going in its recital and examination of all that bears upon the subject with which it deals. But while this is the case, Dr. Machen writes so simply and lucidly that men and women of intelligence everywhere, whatever their standing as technical scholars, will be able to read it with understanding and profit. Certainly no minister or Bible teacher of adults can afford to ignore this book. To the reviewer at least it is a source of much satisfaction to know that what is confessedly the most exhaustive and most scholarly book on the problem of the Virgin Birth of Christ ever published, at least in English, has been written by a man who after having acquainted himself with everything of importance that has been written on the subject since the first century, no matter in what language, holds to the historic belief of the Christian Church that its founder was born without human father, being conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary.

It is impossible in the space at our disposal to do more than indicate the contents of this book—a book that is all but certain to remain the standard book on the subject for many years to come.

Dr. Machen begins by pointing out that whatever we may think of the virgin birth as a historic fact we cannot deny that the historic Christian Church has all but universally held to the belief that Christ was virgin born. How shall we account for this belief? The simplest and most adequate explanation would be to say that the Church was led to so believe because Christ was actually so born. Such an explanation, however, involves recourse to the supernatural in the form of the miraculous and unquestionably there is an enormous presumption against any human being having ever been born without human father. If an adequate explanation of this belief were available that did not involve the miraculous it is quite certain that it would quickly supplant the explanation just mentioned. Not the least valuable part of Dr. Machen's book (Chapters XII-XIV) is his discussion of the theories that have been advanced to give a naturalistic explanation of the origin of the Church's belief in the virgin birth. In this connection he shows, quite successfully we think, that all such efforts including the vulgar rationalistic and the dominant mythical whether on the basis of Jewish or pagan ideas —have been failures and that "if the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ did not originate in fact, modern critical investigation has at any rate not yet succeeded in showing how it did originate." The mere fact, however, that no adequate naturalistic explanation of the origin of the Church's belief in the virgin birth has been advanced notwithstanding the fact that the best efforts of modern scholarship have been devoted to the question, does not of itself warrant our holding that the belief originated in fact. At this point Dr. Machen steers midway between the position of Vincent Taylor according to which the failure of the "alternative theories" weighs but little in favor of the historic explanation and that of H. R. Mackintosh according to which the strongest argument in favor of the historicity of the virgin birth is the difficulty of accounting for it on any other assumption. He holds that the failure of modern scholarship to offer an adequate naturalistic explanation of the origin of this belief to be exceedingly significant and yet that our own acceptance of the virgin birth as a fact must rest on positive evidence if it is to be at all well-grounded, inasmuch as it is at least conceivable that this belief originated in some manner beyond the reach of modern research. In harmony with this position the major portion of Dr. Machen's books has to do with the direct evidence in favor of the notion that the early Church was led to believe in the virgin birth for the simple reason that Jesus was actually born of a virgin.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the thoroughness of Dr. Machen's examination of the positive testimony to the virgin birth as an historic fact together with the objections that have been raised against this testimony. He begins by showing that even if the New Testament were silent in regard to the matter the second-century testimony makes clear that in the early years of that century all parts of the Christian Church regarded the virgin birth as an essential Christian belief, and that while there were denials of the virgin birth even within that century yet, without exception, they were based on philosophical or dogmatic rather than historical considerations. As a matter of fact, of course, the New Testament does contain accounts of the virgin birth that were written well before the close of the first century and which constitute our earliest testimony to the virgin birth. As they have come down to us there can be no doubt that the birth narratives of Luke and Matthew represent the Church's belief in the virgin birth as based on fact. Hence the many and determined efforts that have been made to break the force of their testimony by attempting to show that these birth narratives did not belong to these gospels in their original forms or that the verses in these narratives that bear direct witness to the virgin birth are later interpolations. Dr. Machen examines these attempts in all their ramifications and shows (1) that the infancy narratives both in Matthew and Luke are not later additions but original parts of those Gospels (2) that in their original forms they both really contain accounts of the virgin birth as something that actually happened and (3) that they are strikingly Jewish, Christian and Palestinian in both form and contents (a consideration that weighs heavily against those who seek a pagan origin for the Church's belief in the virgin birth). Dr. Machen next deals with the effort to weaken the testimony of both Matthew and Luke by alleging that they contradict each other, his conclusion being that in Matthew and Luke we have two completely independent but not contradictory accounts of the birth and infancy of Jesus. This is followed by an examination of the efforts made to discredit the trustworthiness of these narratives (1) on the ground that they are inherently incredible because of their supernaturalism (2) on the ground that they contain representations, like the reference to the census of Quirinius, which do not accord with what we learn from secular history and (3) that they are contradicted by what is either implied or stated in other parts of the New Testament. He has little difficulty in disposing of the second and third of the objections to the virgin birth just mentioned. But what about the first of the objections just mentioned?

In dealing with the objection to the virgin birth based upon the fact that it would involve the actuality of a miraculous event Dr. Machen does not avail himself of a reduced definition of "miracle" or of the distinction between the

virgin birth as a matter of "faith" and a matter of "history." He says flatly: "If the virgin birth is a fact at all, by whatever means it may be established, it is a fact of history." Moreover the virgin birth represents for him "the beginning of a new era in the course of the universe, a true entrance of the creative power of God, in sharp distinction from the order of nature." He freely admits, therefore, that if miracles (as thus defined) have never happened and never can happen, then, in the nature of the case, the virgin birth as reported in the Gospels cannot be historical. What he maintains is that enormous as is the presumption against supposing that at a designated point in history there has been an intrusion, into the order of nature, of the creative power of God, this presumption has been gloriously overcome in the case of Jesus Christ. He maintains indeed that even as an isolated event the evidence for the virgin birth is so strong that the story of the virgin birth is an aid rather than an obstacle to Christian faith, but at the same time he holds the evidence in its favor is sufficient to overcome the presumption against the occurrence of such an event only when it is taken in connection with the entire phenomenon of Jesus' life and particularly with the evidence of his resurrection, and so seen to be an organic part of God's mighty work of redemption. "The real question," he writes, "is whether Jesus Christ was just a man like the rest of men, or a heavenly being, the eternal Son of God, come voluntarily to earth for our redemption. Once admit the absolute uniqueness of Jesus, admit not merely that he was one who has not as a matter of fact been surpassed, but that He was one who can never by any possibility be surpassed, and you have taken the really decisive step. But if you take that step, you should have no difficulty in accepting the exultant supernaturalism of the New Testament narratives as they stand." This means in effect that modern denials of the virgin birth like those of the second century are based on philosophical or dogmatic rather than historical considerations.

The volume concludes with a chapter of singular power dealing with the question of the importance of belief in the virgin birth to the Christian man. He points out that the denial of the virgin birth involves a rejection of the authority of the Bible as ordinarily understood; and as over against those who hold that the Bible is an authority in the sphere of ideals but not in the sphere of external facts, he points out that this distinction can be carried out only by representing Christianity as a very different sort of religion than it as a matter of fact is. "What is this modern religion," he asks, "that is founded upon a Bible whose authority is altogether in the sphere of inspiration and not at all in the sphere of external fact? Is it not a religion whose fundamental tenet is the ability of man to save himself?" He further points out the importance of the virgin birth as a test to apply to ourselves and others to determine whether we really hold a naturalistic or a supernaturalistic view of the person of Christ; also how incomplete our knowledge of our Saviour would be if the New Testament had not told us of the virgin birth; also how important it is because of its bearing upon the question of the solidiarity of the race in the guilt and power of sin. His conclusion in this connection is that even if belief in the virgin birth is not necessary in order to constitute one a Christian it is necessary to Christianity and to the corporate witness which the Church should bear to Christianity.

We have sought to indicate the range and scope of this important volume, but nothing short of an examination of the volume itself will apprise the reader of the cogency of its defense of the virgin birth as an historic fact. It is customary in many circles today to allege that only those destitute of real scholarship believe that Jesus was virgin born but here is a volume produced by a workman that needeth not to be ashamed in any scholastic gathering who holds that it is indeed true that Jesus was born without a human father, being conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. An excellent index adds much to the value of the volume. When it is considered that the volume contains more than 200,000 words, with paper, print and binding leaving nothing to be desired, its price cannot be considered large. S. G. C.

*THE THEOLOGY OF CRISIS by H. Emil Brunner, Professor of Theology, University of Zurich. Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 113. Price $1.75.*

THIS is a small but significant book. For some time we have been hearing of a new theological movement in Europe under the leadership of Karl Barth, H. Emil Brunner, Friedrich Gogarten, Eduard Thurneysen and others—a movement which was said to be "fundamental without being fundamenalist" and even a "resurgence of Calvinism" and to have captured the attention of the ministers and Churches of the Continent to a large degree. The first direct knowledge of this movement that was afforded the English reader was provided in a translation by Douglas Horton of a series of addresses by Karl Barth and published under the title of *The Word of God and the Word of Man.* That book, however, proved to be somewhat difficult reading and not readily understandable with the result that probably few of its readers derived from it any very clear conception of just what the nature of *The Theology of Crisis* is. In this respect Dr. Brunner's book is a decided improvement over Dr. Barth's. It has the advantage of having been prepared for an American audience as it consists of a series of five lectures that were first delivered at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Pa., and repeated in part at Princeton, Harvard, Hartford, Union and other seminaries. Moreover as Dr. Brunner had enjoyed the advantage of study as a Fellow in Union Theological Seminary in 1919-1920 he has a better understanding of the mind and speech of the religious thinkers of America than if he had spent his whole life in Germany. The result is a book which while it bears the stamp of German rather than of American thinking does really serve to introduce *The Theology of Crisis* to its American audience. The brevity of the book is such that many questions that arise remain unanswered but at the same time those who desire some intelligible information concerning the Barthian School of Theology will not consult this little book in vain. We can do little more than indicate some of the characteristics of the Barthian movement as this book reveals them.

An outstanding characteristic of the Barthian movement is its critical attitude toward the Modernists. Dr. Brunner says roundly: "A fundamentalist, possessed of a reasonably correct knowledge of Christianity, will have little difficulty in proving that the modernist teaches, under the label of Christianity, a religion which has nothing in common with Christianity except a few words, and that these words cover concepts which are irreconcilable with the content of Christian faith" (p. 9); also, "Fundamentalist criticism has justified its thesis, negatively and positively, that modernism can no longer be called Christianity" (p. 13). Such satisfaction as the fundamentalists derive from Dr. Brunner's criticism of the modernists is greatly lessened, however, by the fact that he is only less critical of the fundamentalists themselves. He speaks of fundamentalism as "an imposing mediaeval form of orthodoxy" and says that "fundamentalism and orthodoxy in general are a petrification of Christianity" (p. 14). At the same time he does not indulge in that cheap criticism of fundamentalism so common among so many who have but a fraction of his knowledge. Speaking of Fundamentalism he says:

"Among the leaders of this movement, both in Europe and America, there are so many scholarly and devout men that it is a sheer snap-judgment to explain their theology as due to mere traditionalism or conservation. In this way neither the essence of their movement nor the mental forces behind it are truly valued. These men, notwithstanding their one-sidedness and certain traits of close-mindedness, leave the impression that they stand for a great dynamic truth, by which they live and which they must not lose if they are not to lose their best" (p. 9).

The significance of Dr. Brunner's relatively favorable critique of Fundamentalism as compared with Modernism can be adequately appreciated only as it is remembered that he began his theological career as a Ritschlian and hence that he represents a movement away from Modernism and toward Fundamentalism. While from the viewpoint of what he calls "fundamentalism or orthodoxy" he has not yet arrived, it is a satisfaction to know that, broadly speaking, he has been moving in the right direction.

What ever may be thought of the adequacy or inadequacy of the Barthian movement it represents a plea for serious theological thinking. It is really a theological movement. It does not exhaust itself in the study of the history of religion or the psychology or philosophy of religion. It properly defines theology as the

science which has God as its object of study and has no sympathy with the theologians, so-called, of today who are "busy confirming the prejudice that theology is something unimportant and secondary or even harmful to religion." Dr. Brunner rightly says: "The science which is taught in most of our leading theological schools under the name of Christian theology ought rather to be called the science of religion. For the subject matter is not the word of God, the revelation in Christ, but something totally different—religion, and perhaps revelation in general." The modern slogan, "Not doctrine but life, not dogma but practice" is, he declares "itself a doctrine, even a dogma, but it is not a Christian doctrine nor a Christian dogma. It is a dictum either of an ethical pragmatism or of mysticism."

An examination of the substance or content of *The Theology of Crisis* discovers much that is commendable from the standpoint of the Bible and the faith of the Reformers. It stresses the transcendence of God; revelation as God's gracious approach to man, not as man's quest of God; sin as guilt and power so that man is utterly unable to accomplish his own salvation; salvation as being wholly of God and not at all from man himself; faith as real faith only when man gives himself up and rests on God alone for salvation; faith also as the only solid foundation for ethics and as supplying the only adequate ethical impulse; the kingdom of God as a eschatological concept. We think he is often one-sided in his treatment of these themes—for instance his too exclusive emphasis on the transcendence of God—but as over against the denial or scorn of them by Modernism he writes much that will rejoice every Christian heart. Throughout the book there is a running criticism of evolution and immanency as affording anything like an adequate life and world view. We believe the kingdom of God to be a present as well as a future reality but we agree with Dr. Brunner in holding that "one of the most fatal errors in the history of theology is the identification of the Biblical idea of the Kingdom with the rationalistic evolution and the optimistic theory of progress of the eighteenth century."

That Dr. Brunner's theology contains so much that is good and yet falls so far short finds its root explanation, it seems to us, to his doctrine of the Scriptures. It is true that he says that "the Scriptures, and the Scriptures alone, are God's word" and yet how little he holds to a sound view of Scripture is obvious from the fact that he writes: "Lest we open the door to misunderstanding let me say that I myself am an adherent of a rather radical school of Biblical criticism, which, for example, does not accept the Gospel of John as an historical source and which finds legends in many parts of the synoptic gospels." More revealing as to his actual doctrine of Scripture is the following: "The word of God in the Scriptures is as little to be identified with the words of the Scriptures as the Christ according to the flesh is to be identified with the Christ according to the spirit. [Dr. Brunner's doctrine of the Incarnation is not the orthodox doctrine.] The words of the Scriptures are human; that is, God makes use of human and, therefore, frail and fallible words of men who are liable to err. But men and their words are not the means through which God speaks to men and in men. Only through a serious misunderstanding will genuine faith find satisfaction in the theory of the verbal inspiration of the Bible. In fact, this misrepresents what true faith conceives the Bible to be. He who identifies the letters and the words of the Scriptures with the word of God has never truly understood the word of God; he does not know what constitutes revelation" (p. 19). Such a view of Scriptures seems to us not only confused and confusing but to open up the way for a boundless subjectivity that makes it possible for one to hold to most any theological view and yet maintain that it has the sanction of Scripture. Any and every attempt to distinguish between what is "revealed" in Scripture and what the words of Scripture as used by their writers express seems to us an attempt at the impossible. The Bible not only contains but is the Word of God and only as this fact is recognized can we really know what we should believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man—so at least it seems to the writer.

While as over against Modernism the Barthian movement seems to be a wholesome one yet we think it unwarranted to speak of it as "a resurgence of the faith of the Reformation in thoroughly modern form but in all its amazing power." As an antidote to Modernism it has great value and significance; but as a substitute for orthodox Protestantism it has little to commend it S. G. C.

*THE MESSAGE OF THE AMERICAN PULPIT. By Lewis H. Chrisman, A. M., Litt. D. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc.* $2.00.

THE Professor of English in West Virginia Wesleyan College has written this important book and into it he has put what he concludes is the consensus of opinion of the conspicuous preachers of America. The book is the result of two years of preparation during which the author read more than six thousand sermons. Portions of some two hundred of these sermons are fitted into a unified narrative under headings such as God, Jesus, The Bible, Evolution, Social Betterment, Hope, and Spiritual Values.

In the process of selecting preachers whose views he would publish, Professor Chrisman seems to have limited himself almost exclusively to what is known as the left wing and center of the theological divisions of today and he has paid only the slightest attention to ministers on the conservative right. One notices the discrimination in his choice of representatives from the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. He quotes from thirteen ministers: George A. Buttrick, William P. Merrill, Albert P. Fitch, Charles R. Erdman, Henry Sloan Coffin, J. A. MacCallum, Andrew Mutch, Frederick F. Shannon, Hugh T. Kerr, Charles F. Wishart, Henry Howard, George Stewart, and John Timothy Stone. Dr. Chrisman's taste is not for men who have borne the label "Fundamentalist." In the Congregational Church his bucket is several times lowered into the overflowing well of Dean Charles Reynolds Brown; while A. Z. Conrad is not considered. Bishop Francis J. MacConnell supplies draughts from Methodist springs, not once only, but three times; Harold Paul Sloan is ignored. That singular Baptist, Harry Emerson Fosdick, is given attention on page after page; whereas far more representative Baptists are not mentioned.

Not every man whose sermons are quoted can be imagined as supporting the views of all the others, and yet in this book the stream of thought flows steadily on with scarcely an eddy of opposition. A clash of ideas occurs when Mr. William Jennings Bryan is permitted a paragraph, at once contradicted, in the chapter on Evolution. Elsewhere the excerpts from sermons are selected carefully to bring out various phases of the subjects treated, and to produce harmonious accord.

In the chapter devoted to Jesus, Professor Chrisman says: "It is affirmed with a high degree of emphasis that Christ bore the burden of the sins of the race and that through Him we may obtain forgiveness of sins." Just one minister, President Akers of Asbury College, confirms this conclusion in two brief paragraphs when he cites Joseph Cook's telling reference to Lady Macbeth's stained hands which the perfumes of Arabia "could not sweeten," and then quotes the Scripture promise of salvation through the cleansing blood of the Son of God. But the chapter hastily proceeds to long passages of ethical platitudes from Dr. Fosdick, George A. Gordon and Joseph Fort Newton which have a totally different connotation, and one feels that as far as these distinguished preachers are concerned, indeed, as for all advanced thinkers in the Protestant Churches, the orthodox tenet is about done for, and the essential truth that Christ offered Himself a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and to reconcile us to God, is quite outmoded. Dr. Chrisman says: "There seems to be a practical unanimity in the opinion that the pulpit should not defend the pedantic, mechanical interpretations which make the cross a matter of sordid bargaining. The enlightened preacher does not explain Christ's death by means of unethical dogma." A startling consignment of the doctrine of substitutionary atonement to the limbo of outgrown convictions; but justified from the point of view of Dr. Chrisman's symposium.

As to sermons on the Bible, the best preachers are apparently echoing sentiments like these from Dr. R. H. Stafford of the Old South Church in Boston: "Though the Bible is more often right than not in its statements of fact, it is not by any means always so. Many Bible statements cannot be verified, while some are irreconcilably contradicted by the conclusions of dispassionate and exact investigation. A Christian who holds as an indispensable element of faith that the Scriptures are inerrant in all

statements of fact, must if he would keep his faith, deliberately reject the verdict of his senses. I have known Christians of this sort whose minds were so twisted by accommodation to their irrational position that they were guilty of actual dishonesty and falsehoods in arguments, wilfully misstating known truths." A strong indictment, this, from a pulpit of unusual influence.

Is Professor Chrisman right in thinking beliefs like the above are held by the American pulpit generally? It this the message of cultured preachers throughout the country? Who, after perusing the Monday morning newspapers of the larger cities, can doubt it? Of course thousands of ministers preach the old faith, (a few of them do it in Dr. Chrisman's book) and in every city the worshipper may find them, sometimes in great churches; but we are discussing sermons that reach the printed page in books and papers. Nine out of ten of these, published by prominent houses, are just what Dr. Chrisman makes them out to be. Moreover he says of them what none will dispute: "The student of contemporary sermons does not have to read many volumes without becoming firmly convinced that the pulpit of the twentieth century is making an *honest effort* to interpret God to man."

Granting they are honest, is the Protestant Church safe in their hands? It is doubtful if Dr. Fosdick, Dr. Merrill, Dr. Stafford and Bishop MacConnell themselves know where their leadership is taking them and the thousands of ministers who follow their guidance. What these brilliant clergymen think and say and write is always interesting, even the vast interrogation points that mark their conclusions. But only with the "thus saith the Lord" of Holy Scripture does a Protestant preacher have any authority whatever to stand before his people. The "thus saith Dr. Fosdick" will not do. And gradually emptying churches everywhere prove Mr. Walter Lippmann's observation: "Many reasons have been adduced to explain why people do not go to church as much as they once did. Surely the most important reason is that they are not so certain they are going to meet God when they go to Church. If they had that certainty they would go." The outside world has no reason for entering any Protestant Church, when so many eminent Protestant preachers are widely advertising their waning confidence in the Bible without remonstrance from the governing bodies of their churches. The lack of protest against unbelief looks like tacit approval from the whole Protestant constituency.

All of which brings us to the trustworthiness of the Bible. Is the Bible discredited by the best scholars? Certainly not. But whether or not it will more and more be preached as discredited depends upon the education the Church's future ministers are receiving in the theological seminaries. This is either good or bad, and there is no intermediate state half way between.

—Frank H. Stevenson

# Letters to the Editor

*To the Editor of* Christianity Today:

Sir: As an elder permit me to congratulate you upon the publication of Christianity Today. What a wealth of meaning in that name. Christianity today, the religion that was founded by Jesus Christ nearly two thousand years ago and yet a living faith today; the religion that is what it is because of what took place so long ago and yet that meets the needs of men today and will meet them tomorrow because Jesus Christ himself is the same yesterday, today and forever.

As an elder permit me in the first issue of Christianity Today to make an appeal to the eldership of the country to give their support to what is going to be, I dare say, the best exponent in the Presbyterian Church of living Christianity.

Living Christianity is being supplanted by social service, and attendance at the Court of the King, the highest honor within the bounds of earth, is voluntarily waived for the trifling trumperies of a superficial and supercilious society.

Much Christianity, so-called, is largely a matter of doubts, whereas the Christian religion was founded upon and functions only in connection with a living faith. A religion whose foundation is doubt is only a religion so-called. A religion is not worth anything when its Bible trademark is a question mark, instead of living faith.

Let me hold up before you, the great army of Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., the immeasurable importance of such living faith. Living faith cannot be bought, sold or otherwise obtained, like goods, wares and merchandise. It is a firm conviction of the truth in regard to God and Jesus Christ, which truth is found within the pages of Holy Writ, and is accepted without quibble or question whatsoever, by and through the influence of the Holy Spirit. Faith, other than living faith is meaningless and worthless. Faith which we may put our own construction upon is merely faith so-called. Faith that has been merged into worldliness never was alive, which is the trouble with the Church today, namely, a superabundance of *dead faith.* The domain of Christianity today may be vast, but the realm of living Christianity is all too small. For today we find terms like "eternal life," "immortality," "hope of heaven," "the pilgrim's progress," in such disuse as to warrant marking them as obsolete in the modern and modernist dictionary.

Why does not the eldership in the Presbyterian Church awake and arise? Why is it that we do not organize and function? We elders have it in our hands to further living Christianity, to restore the worship and the spiritual sincerity of other days. It only needs the fervor of a pure and simple living faith, with only one chart and compass—the Holy Bible, the one and only guide in life and to life eternal.

Living faith is not something to be proven by puny finites—"YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN," "for by grace are ye saved through faith." What is the matter with the Church and the country today? The Bible and Church alike are being trifled with, and we are not witnessing in our actions, our looks, our words, our steps, all along the way today, in Church and out, and in our Church government, to the statement of Jesus Christ, "YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN!"

Living faith: "When we open the New Testament we find ourselves in a world where faith has become king among all human acts and experiences." O, for a restoration of this living faith throughout the Church! Will we not return to this living faith of our fathers, doing everything we possibly can as Ruling Elders to bring about and enforce a policy in and upon the Church as will be favorable to its growth and progress? What is your answer?

Kendrick C. Hill.

Trenton, N. J.

*To the Editor of* Christianity Today:

Sir: *The Presbyterian Standard,* a paper in the Southern Church, recently contained an article subsequently reprinted in *The Presbyterian,* in the Northern Church, in which this sentence occurs: "Princeton factions seem to hate each other." It is not supposed either paper intended to damage the reputation of men by this reckless statement, or to encourage the spread of a persistent myth. Probably the editors liked the assertion because it afforded an excellent contrast in the argument they had in mind, which, as I remember, was against church union. But the charge has been made so often, without contradiction, during the past year, that someone ought to file a bill of exceptions. I hope you will grant enough space in your new paper to permit a fairly complete denial, at least insofar as the charge has been applied to the thousands of men who tried to save Princeton from its present plight.

The fact is, not one man who signed the huge Princeton petition, not one member of the former controlling board, not one professor or student who departed from Princeton to found a new institution, has been, or is, a hater of the men who now direct the destiny of Princeton Seminary. Why should they be? If they endeavored to make one point clear in four successive General Assemblies, amid an uproar from their opponents, it was that the issues in the controversy were not personal but wholly impersonal. As much as could be, they referred to men on the other side of the question with the courtesy due the advocates of a policy which must have its day in court. It was never man against man. As they saw it, and constantly said, the struggle was between Liberalism and Orthodox Christianity. When Liberalism won the victory and moved in to take the

prize, all who could simply walked away. There was no alternative for men of honest convictions. They believed peace between the two contending principles was neither possible nor desirable, and said so emphatically. There is a wide difference between hating a man and hating a principle.

When the Thompson Plan was put into operation at Princeton; when a new board of control made up of representatives of many shades of belief in the church had been duly chosen; when the President of the Seminary, inclusive policy and all, was vindicated by the General Assembly, the old Princeton, if not dead and buried, was so evidently stricken with mortal wounds that men who honored her former traditions could not do otherwise than at least try to set up an institution that would be free from the pressure of certain Board Secretaries and other church statesmen to whom Princeton had become exceedingly offensive in the last ten years. Somewhere and somehow the witness of Princeton to the pure evangelical faith would have to be continued, and continued openly and fearlessly.

Hundreds of ministers and laymen in America and many missionaries directly contributed to the beginning of Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. They hated nobody. But they did love the Bible and every truth it contains, and they understood what the two disciples on the way to Emmaus meant when they said their hearts burned within them as Jesus opened to them the Scriptures. Where the Bible takes such men, there they want to go. Where Scriptural declarations fail them, there they stop short. The new enterprise could not have survived a single month had its motive been based on petty human antagonism. Hate is a destroyer; not a builder. One cannot gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles.

Westminster Seminary occupies plain buildings in Philadelphia with none of Keats' "magic casements" and without a suggestion of wooded campus. The marks of a pioneer venture are all over it. But it is stimulating to see the students in its crowded rooms and to know they are willing to forego lawns and trees in their determination to learn from great teachers. To see the Faculty, capable, enthusiastic, tireless; men who have not counted their lives dear unto themselves, is not to be reminded of anything discreditable. On the contrary their self-sacrifice and earnest ambition reveal something of the real glory of the Christian religion.

Certainly Presbyterians, of all people, can be depended upon for sympathy and help in the movement, and more and more as they learn the truth about it, for the Presbyterian Church itself was formed by men of very like spirit and under similar circumstances; and the Presbyterians who are the real strength of the Church are aware that neither their Church nor any Church can live by breathing the prevailing atmosphere of good natured tolerance toward propaganda squarely aimed at the Church's faith.

The Board of Trustees of Westminster have plans for a great future; and evangelical forces in America will support the plans just as far as the plans are true to God's Word. The main business of the Churches is bound to be the preaching of the Word; the declaring of the whole counsel of God, and especially that part of His counsel which tells plainly of the salvation offered a guilty and helpless world. Already there are signs of weariness with the little one-page gospel whose good news is nothing more than the urging of people to build more ecclesiastical machines and better ones, that through these human agencies they may attempt to improve the social order. There is a dreary falsetto in the music of the new theology; it is anemic and futile. To supply a demand for ministers who believe Christ's gospel; who will preach it, be able to defend it, and never be ashamed of it; is Westminster's mission. Misrepresentation may hinder, but it will not stop the progress of the task. Let us pray that Westminster will make enough stir in the modern world to call Christ's blood-bought Church back to Calvary's cross, to the whole Bible, and to the work originally committed to the Church's hands.

FRANK H. STEVENSON.

*Princeton, N. J.*

# Voices from Many Quarters

[We are publishing herewith only a small fraction of the letters received by Dr. Craig since his retirement from the Editorship of "The Presbyterian." All are necessarily abridged, and since they were not written for publication, names have been omitted. They serve to show the widespread desire of a great company of people that a new paper be established. We are unable to find space for hundreds of similar excellent letters. The Conservatives in the Church have clearly evidenced their urgent wish for a new periodical. "Christianity Today" is the response to their call.]

From a Reader in Kansas:

I was shocked more deeply than I can express, when I read of your statement of your resignation as Editor of *The Presbyterian* and particularly because of the reason given for its asking. I had been pleased to think that the entire Board was like-minded with yourself. I cannot conceive of a Conservative being in harmony with the Assembly's decisions of late, particularly last year's Assembly. I cannot think either that the Lord will leave "the militant group without a voice."

* * *

From Illinois:

It was with deep regret that my husband and I read in the January 16th issue of *The Presbyterian* that you had been asked to resign. If at any time you and others like-minded would start a paper we would like to subscribe for we approve of all you have written on the subject of the Seminaries as well as many other subjects. We have been taking this paper first as the *Herald and Presbyter* and now as *The Presbyterian* since 1876, at that time for our mother and since her death, ourselves and we will miss it very much; but if it is to be governed by men of the other type we do not want it.

* * *

From a Minister in New York State:

So you must go because you dared to tell the truth about Princeton. While more than sorry to have your connection with *The Presbyterian* terminated, I am not concerned as to what the future holds for you. Our faithful God does not fail those who are faithful to Him. I am concerned for *The Presbyterian.* Princeton must have fallen far when it is so afraid of the light and of the facts in the case that it has to strangle the testimony of the only publication that dared to give those facts. I am not alone in seeing in this treatment of you, an involuntary confession, on the part of the Princeton men involved, that you have given the Truth as to the Seminary situation. Westminster Seminary—not Princeton—will be helped by this new attack on the conservative life of our Church. I thank you for the help I have received from the pages of *The Presbyterian* since you became its Editor. May our Lord give you many years of service for Him.

* * *

From Ohio:

I have read in *The Presbyterian,* January 16th, that "you were requested to resign as Editor of the paper because you refused to alter your policy about Princeton and Westminster Seminaries." Then the Dayton *Herald,* Monday, January 20th, says the "militant" Conservatives of the Presbyterian Church would found a new paper to continue the battle against the liberal factions of the Church. We do want to know when you get the new paper started and please let me know all about it and we will be ready to subscribe for it. I am the grand-daughter and great grand-daughter of Presbyterian ministers, the daughter, niece and sister of men who were elders. We believe every word of the Bible, and glory in the valor of the men that stand for the right and we have been so interested in Westminster Seminary. May God bless you all in that you are trying to do in His name and for His sake.

* * *

A voice from California:

As I opened my *Presbyterian* received today, what was my astonishment and righteous indignation to see that you had been asked to resign simply because you hold to the truth, and give the common people the information they want about what is going on in the Church, underneath the apparently *smooth* surface. The situation has been bad enough and is rapidly growing worse all the time, as it was in the days of Israel when the leaders closed their ears and persecuted their prophets and went on to their doom with a good many years to think about it afterward and repent as they wept by the rivers of Babylon. The Lord will always have His true witnesses in every age,

and so He will still give you a place where your voice will be heard in living testimony. When the Modernists get their way about all the Seminaries, and now all the papers, it may be they think they'll go on to sweeping victories, but only to their sad disappointment. The Lord has His own unchangeable purpose ever in view. We have greatly enjoyed *The Presbyterian* and hope and pray for something equally good and true to take its place.

* * *

A Minister in Iowa speaks his mind:

I have just finished reading the announcement of your enforced resignation as Editor of *The Presbyterian.* I was not wholly unprepared for this event, but it has brought a distinct shock, notwithstanding. I regret it very much. Has the last stronghold of the historic faith of our Church been stormed and taken? Where are we to turn for such a defense of the faith as you have been so courageously maintaining? The action of the Board of Directors of the Presbyterian Publishing Company will doubtless receive the hearty approval of practically every modernist in the country. If there is no organ of Fundamentalism in the Church, some one should start such an one.

* * *

Two Ministers write from Minnesota:

I cannot tell you how grieved I was to read your announcement in *The Presbyterian* of the 16th. I cannot say that I was surprised, for this is the time when men may expect to suffer for their stand for the truth. I have so enjoyed your articles and your defence of the Gospel, and have rejoiced in your logical presentation of the facts concerning the defection in our beloved Church. I am sure the work has not been lost but will still speak to those who are willing to hear. Surely this is a time when those who love our Lord should be much before Him in prayer and intercession and supplication for His help at the time when all help of man is vain. I have been so glad for your stand for Westminster Seminary, and for your keen judgment as to conditions in Princeton. I do pray that the Lord will open other avenues for you to wield your pen in the defence of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

* * *

I notice with regret that your connection with *The Presbyterian* is being severed. It grieves me more than I can express that, one by one, those who uncompromisingly stand for the Truth of God are finding it impossible to trim and light their lamps in the old lighthouses. Wilson, Machen, etc., could not hold forth the Word of Life any longer at Princeton. *You* cannot continue without compromise, with the one paper of our Church we thought immovable, and many another Luther is having to break with his Pope. While I hate to see the necessity of your leaving *The Presbyterian,* I rejoice that you "are willing, not only to believe on HIM, but to suffer for His sake."

From a retired General of the Army:

I regret exceedingly, that you are to leave the editorship of *The Presbyterian* especially for the cause you give, in part. Is this paper to be Modernized also? What other paper in the Presbyterian Church is thoroughly orthodox? Where shall I go to find the Spiritual food I have *always* found in *The Presbyterian* under your editorship? I think your position was right with regard to Princeton Theological Seminary and Westminster Seminary. I wish I had millions to give the latter. I will not live long enough (I am 92-7/12 years old) to see these things righted, but God reigns, and in His own good time, will triumph over all.

* * *

Another expression from California:

I wish to express my regret that you are no longer to be in Editorial charge of *The Presbyterian.* I am dumbfounded and indignant that you should be so summarily dealt with, and pained beyond my ability to tell, for the reason announced as the cause of your retirement. That *The Presbyterian* should recede from its *militant* defense of the faith never entered my mind as even the remotest possibility. I am too surprised and stunned for adequate expression—I wanted to write you this much, however, and assure you that this is one old pilgrim who has spent nearly 40 years in Home Mission activities, who has seconded your every effort for the old Faith's defense and propagation, and feels a distinct loss in your retirement and great appreciation of your editorial management of *The Presbyterian.* I have been wondering, "what next?" I have hoped there would be a new paper launched—with you at the helm. I do not know what the "old guard" will do without a weekly journal to champion their cause and encourage them to stand by the ship. The situation is serious and for some of us growing tense. It calls for steady nerves, almost infinite patience, and much prayer.

* * *

An Ohio Minister says a great deal in a few words:

I am indeed very sorry to read of your resignation as Editor of *The Presbyterian* and *Herald and Presbyter.* I honor and admire your Christian courage. I know that some of the Ministers of my Presbytery are rejoicing, for it was too straight for their Modernism.

* * *

A voice from Illinois:

I am profoundly disturbed and distressed to learn of your forced resignation. Is it possible that orthodox men themselves wish to silence the only remaining testimony which conservative Presbyterians have for warning them of impending deadly danger? Dear Brother, I do hope *Time* is correct in indicating that you will start a new periodical. It was sad indeed to have to witness the disappearance of historic Princeton Seminary. And now there seems to be a second tragedy unavoidable in the cessation of this honored and faithful voice in the wilderness of modern unbelief. Somewhere, somehow, the Two Witnesses will be revived, for God—the God of Truth—still rules.

* * *

Pennsylvania voices an opinion:

Though I do not know you personally, yet I admired your stand in regard to the Editorship of *The Presbyterian,* and I feel that I should express it to you. I have known *The Presbyterian* for many years, yet I have never seen it so ably and interestingly edited as under you. But what I prized it the most for was its stand for the truth and against Modernism. Then that is so much needed at this time. The Congregational Church is ruined already by Modernists, and the Methodist greatly weakened; and it is fast injuring our church, as was shown at the last General Assembly. Princeton had been the only large Seminary that stood true to the faith, and under the new management with so many Trustees weak and giving way, I cannot see, as you believe, that it can be maintained safe. So we are in a critical condition as a church. Now that we have no journal standing for truth and against error, we are in extreme danger of going the way of the churches mentioned above. They say that you made *The Presbyterian* "too dominantly controversial." I did not see that you did so unduly. Then it is the way we are taught in Scripture, to "contend for the faith." I cannot see what the Directors of *The Presbyterian* think of. Do they wish the paper to be colorless, and have it say nothing against the trend? It rather seems to me, since they believe in the old doctrines, and have them maintained, they would be glad to stand up for them. If they love the church, I cannot see how they would have you do otherwise. Then it seemed to me that you were always courteous in it and not harsh toward those who did not agree with you. Besides the paper under your management had a due proportion of articles that were Evangelical and Spiritual. As for your standing up for Westminster Seminary, I thoroughly sympathize with you. Its professors consist of the ablest men in our church, certainly some of them, and as able as any in the world, going off to start that Seminary with no assurance of support or equipment, or at least very little, doing so for training men in the doctrines our church stands for. All men who love the church ought to have been glad to encourage that institution. But you did not do so unpleasantly, nor did you neglect news in regard to other seminaries. It seems to me that you edited the paper in a way to be admired, and I feel ashamed of the directors in asking you to resign; and not only ashamed, but saddened, because of the policy the new Editor is expected to pursue. Again, I would say that I greatly honor you for the course you pursued, and especially as it must have been done at considerable sacrifice. I hope the good Lord will open a position for you to continue using your ability and gifts for doing something against the downward trend of the church.

A letter from Indiana:

I was most sorry to read in the January 16 issue of *The Presbyterian* that you were terminating your editorship with that paper, and I gather from reading the item that your attitude toward Princeton Seminary has been too fundamental for the Board of Directors. Personally I have been pleased at what you have published in regard to recent happenings relative to Princeton and I am greatly disappointed that the Board of Directors of *The Presbyterian* have chosen to object to this. I cannot remember a time when *The Herald and Presbyter,* and later on *The Presbyterian,* was not in our home weekly, first in the home of my parents and for thirty years in my own. Could you suggest a periodical I may take which will be acceptable to me to read?

* * *

From a Middle Western Minister:

It was with great regret that I read in the last issue of *The Presbyterian* of your forced resignation. You have stood for all the things for which the Presbyterian Church should stand. I have admired your courage and efficiency. To some of us older Princeton men the future for our church is not bright. Modernism seems determined to put our Church on the rocks. The loss of Princeton to evangelical Christianity, for that is what it will eventually mean, was a disastrous blow to our beloved Church. But now to have the only conservative paper weaken its opposition to the modernists is about the last straw. Many ministers in the middle west feel as do I. Unless I am very much mistaken, the boards of our church and other agencies which seem to be more or less in sympathy with the modernistic movement may expect a falling off in receipts and lessening of interest on the part of many churches. The laity of the Presbyterian Church is loyal to its fundamental principles but not informed. We are surely drifting and only God knows where we will end. I assure you of my sympathy, not only for myself but for the entire conservative element of the Presbyterian Church.

* * *

A few pertinent words from New York:

As a subscriber and occasional contributor to *The Presbyterian,* I wish to say that I was amazed at the news given in your announcement of the last issue. This is "the last and most unkindest cut." There could be no better proof of the need of just such a paper as *The Presbyterian* has been under your skillful and faithful editorship.

* * *

From Pennsylvania:

The item in the papers and the brief note of announcement in *The Presbyterian* grieved me deeply. It seemed to be symptomatic of the movement in the church at large, which I deplore. I earnestly hope that the friends of our historic church will establish an organ which will be what *The Presbyterian* has been and even more acceptable to our membership. I hope moreover that the Head of the church will show you His favor and support you in your loyalty to Him.

* * *

From Minnesota:

I see by the current issue of *Time* that you have been removed from the Editorship of *The Presbyterian.* In showing the article to some of my elders Sunday, we pledged our support to a fundamentalist Church paper should one be founded to take the place of *The Presbyterian* which will undoubtedly lose its influence among strictly evangelicals after you relinquish its Editorship.

* * *

Philadelphia speaks out through one of its prominent Ministers:

I note by the daily papers and the last issue of *The Presbyterian,* that your resignation has been called for. We are confronted, at once, with the fact that the Presbyterian Church has lost its real conservative paper and we are without voice in the Church. I feel that we must have such a paper. Of course, I have no idea how much financial backing you could get for such a paper. I wish that I had a million dollars to put into it and Westminster Seminary. The time has come for a definite break and I am with any group that will back you and the new Seminary. I do hope that you will find sufficient financial encouragement to undertake such a task. Humanly speaking, we *must* have it. I shall await some step with great anxiety and prayer. Surely something can and will be done to continue this leadership among the truly conservative men and women of the Church.

---

## THE SAVING CHRIST—Cont.

and the burden of its message is just the words of our text—that Christ Jesus came into the world to *save* sinners.

Now Paul could never write of this tremendously moving truth in a cold and dry spirit. There was nothing that so burned in his soul as his profound sense of his indebtedness to his Redeemer for his entire salvation. We cannot be surprised, therefore, to note that as he repeats these great words, "Christ Jesus came into the world to *save* sinners," his thought reverts at once to his own part in this great salvation; and he cries aloud with swelling heart, "Of whom I am chief." Says an old Anglican writer: "The apostle applies the worst word in the text to himself." But we must punctually note, Paul is not, therefore, boasting of his sin. He is, on the contrary, glorying in his salvation. If Christ came just to save sinners, he says, in effect, Why that means me; for that is what I am. There is a sense, then, no doubt, in which he can be said to be glad that he can claim to be a sinner. Not because he delights in wickedness, but because that places him within the reach of the mission of Him who Himself declared that He came not to call the righteous, but sinners. Paul knows there is deep-seated evil within him; he knows his own inability to remedy it—for does not that long life of legalistic struggle, when after the straitest sect of his religion he lived a Pharisee, witness to his agonizing efforts to heal his deadly hurt? In Christ Jesus, who came to save sinners, he sees the one hope of sinners like himself; and with deep revulsion of feeling he takes his willing place among sinners that he may take his place also among saved sinners. His only comfort in life and death is found in the fact that Christ Jesus came just to save sinners.

Brethren, it is there only also that our comfort can be found, whether for life or for death. Perhaps even yet we hardly know, as we should know, our need of a saviour. Perhaps we may acknowledge ourselves to be sinners only in languid acquiescence in a current formula. Such a state of self-ignorance cannot, however, last for ever. And some day—probably it has already come to most of us—some day the scales will fall from our eyes, and we shall see ourselves as we really are. Ah, then, we shall have no difficulty in placing ourselves by the apostle's side, and pronouncing ourselves, in the accents of the deepest conviction, the chief of sinners. And, then, *our* only comfort for life and death, too, will be in the discovery that Christ Jesus came into the world just to save sinners. We may have long admired Him as a teacher sent from God, and have long sought to serve Him as a King re-ordering the world; but we shall find in that great day of self-discovery that we have never known Him at all till He has risen upon our soul's vision as our Priest, making His own body a sacrifice for our sin. For such as we shall then know ourselves to be, it is only as a Saviour from sin that Christ will suffice; and we will passionately make our own such words as these that a Christian singer has put into our mouths:—

"I sought thee, weeping, high and low,
I found Thee not; I did not know
I was a sinner—even so,
I missed Thee for my Saviour.

"I saw Thee sweetly condescend
Of humble men to be the friend,
I chose Thee for my way, my end,
But found Thee not my Saviour.

"Until upon the cross I saw
My God, who died to meet the law
That man had broken; then I saw
My sin, and then my Saviour.

"What seek I longer? let me be
A sinner all my days to Thee,
Yet more and more, and Thee to me
Yet more and more my Saviour.

* * * * * * * *

"Be Thou to me my Lord, my Guide,
My Friend, yea, everything beside;
But first, last, best, whate'er betide
Be Thou to me my Saviour!"

# News of the Church

## Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

THE OVERTURES-VOTES BY PRESBYTERIES.

(Up to Noon of May 15)

A. (On the Election and Ordination of Women as Bishops or Pastors, and as Ruling Elders.)
For ..... 107
Against ..... 165
No action ..... 7

B. (On the Election and Ordination of Women as Ruling Elders.)
For ..... 157
Against ..... 115
No action ..... 7

C. (On the Licensure of Local Evangelists.)
For ..... 143
Against ..... 125
No action ..... 8

D. (On the Incorporation of Particular Churches.)
For ..... 135
Against ..... 129
No action ..... 13

E. (On the Call to the Pastoral Office.)
For ..... 238
Against ..... 26
No action ..... 7

F. (On Directors of Religious Education.)
For ..... 136
Against ..... 120
No action ..... 13

For any overture to be adopted, a majority of Presbyteries (147) must vote in its favor. A like number of votes will serve to reject an overture sent down by Assembly. But any overture not receiving the approval of at least 147 Presbyteries, is defeated even if the negative vote is smaller than the affirmative. It will thus be observed that at the time when CHRISTIANITY TODAY goes to press, overture "A" has been defeated, overtures "B" and "E" have been adopted, and the others are in doubt.

### Mentioned for Moderator

Four names are being prominently mentioned for Moderator of the Assembly this year. They are: the Rev. Henry B. Master, D.D., of Philadelphia, General Secretary of the Board of Ministerial Relief and Sustentation; the Rev. Hugh T. Kerr, D.D., of Pittsburgh, President of the Board of Christian Education; the Rev. Howard Agnew Johnston, D.D., of Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and the Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D., of Princeton, N. J., Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Dr. Master is a native of Elizabeth, N. J., a graduate of Princeton University and of Princeton Theological Seminary in the class of 1898. During the War, he served as a Y. M. C. A. Secretary at the front. He has been secretary of the Board of Ministerial Relief since November, 1929, and is credited with having conceived and fashioned the Pension Plan recently adopted by the Church, as well as with having brought the work of the board to a high state of efficiency. Dr. Master is American Secretary of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance. He is a member of the Presbytery of Fort Wayne, Ind.

Dr. Kerr is a graduate of the University of Toronto and of the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, in the class of 1897. He has been Minister of the Shadyside Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh since 1913. He is President of the Board of Christian Education, and is a member of the Board of Directors of the Western Seminary.

Dr. Johnston, who is Minister of Immanuel Church, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is widely known throughout the church as a preacher and author. He has been suggested for Moderator by the Presbytery of Milwaukee. Dr. Johnston is chairman of a subcommittee of the Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage, whose interesting report will be presented to the coming Assembly.

Dr. Craig has been widely suggested as the standard-bearer of the Evangelicals or Conservatives in the Church. He was born in De Kalb County, Illinois. Most of his early life was spent in Missouri. He is a graduate of Princeton University, where he played guard on the famous championship football team of 1899. He graduated from Princeton Seminary in 1900. His first charge was the First Presbyterian Church of Ebensburg, Pa., and later he was minister of the North Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh. From 1912 to 1929 he was an editor of *The Presbyterian*. He was a Director of Princeton Theological Seminary until the loyal board was removed by the last Assembly, and took a prominent part in the effort to maintain Princeton on its old basis. Upon the establishment of Westminster Seminary, he became a member of its Board of Directors. As Editor of *The Presbyterian*, he refused to support Princeton Seminary as reorganized, and supported Westminster Seminary as carrying on the work of the old Princeton. For this policy he was requested to alter his editorial policy or resign, as Editor, by a majority of his Board of Directors. He refused to change his stand with regard to the seminaries, and resigned as requested.

### Assemblies—1930

**Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., Cincinnati, Ohio, May 29th.**

**Presbyterian Church in the U. S., Charlottesville, Va., May 22nd.**

**United Presbyterian Church, Des Moines, Iowa, May 28th.**

**Christian Reformed Church, Grand Rapids, Mich., June 11th.**

**Reformed Church in America, Asbury Park, N. J., June 5th.**

**Presbyterian Church in Canada, Hamilton, Ontario, June 4th.**

### The "Barnhouse Case"

The Presbytery of Philadelphia, at its meeting on May 5th, rescinded the action which it took in April, restraining the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse, pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, from conducting Sunday evening services in the Tower Theatre, Upper Darby.

At the end of a long debate, a resolution instructing the stated clerk to expunge from the records all reference to the controversy concerning the theatre services was adopted.

Opponents of Mr. Barnhouse announced immediately that a complaint would be filed with the Synod of Pennsylvania on the ground that a misunderstanding had existed concerning whether a two-thirds or a majority vote was required to make the resolution effective.

The action of the Presbytery in prohibiting Mr. Barnhouse from preaching at the Tower Theatre was prompted by complaints from pastors of churches in the vicinity that the attendance at their evening services was impaired.

A storm of protest arose over the action of the Presbytery. Several church sessions took action petitioning the Presbytery to remove its injunction, and hundreds of letters were received by the Presbytery urging that Mr. Barnhouse be permitted to return to the theatre. The case has attracted wide attention, and it has been said that Mr. Barnhouse has been opposed largely because of the militantly conservative type of his preaching. The resolution adopted by Presbytery after a long and heated debate was offered by the Rev. W. P. Fulton, D.D., and is as follows:

"WHEREAS, the Presbytery of Philadelphia, at its stated meeting April 7th, 1930, took the following action, viz.:

"In view of conditions subversive of the best interests of the Kingdom of Christ, which have been brought to the attention of many of this Presbytery and clearly stated in a letter from a ministerial group in the 69th Street Section, read by the Stated Clerk of this Presbytery, at this morning's session, and which is as follows: (letter in Minutes) this Presbytery hereby directs the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse immediately to cease conducting these meetings in the Tower Theatre, or in any other place in the neighborhood, without the approval of the ministry of the community.

"And, WHEREAS, this action of Presbytery was taken hastily and without due consideration or deliberation,

"And, WHEREAS, the said action of Presbytery was based on inference rather than on facts ascertained through investigation by Presbytery, as to whether the services conducted in the Tower Theatre by Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse are 'subversive of the best interests of the Kingdom of Christ,' (the numerous communications received by the Stated Clerk from Sessions, Presbyterian Church

members and others do not warrant the conclusion that the said services are 'subversive of the best interests of the Kingdom of Christ'),

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

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

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

## Church Union

The complete organic union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. with the Reformed Church in America (Dutch Reformed) and with the United Presbyterian Church is advocated by the report of the Department of Church Cooperation and Union.

Regarding the Reformed Church in America, the report says:

"It was the consensus of opinion regardless of any larger merging of the Presbyterian family, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the Reformed Church in America should keep clearly in view the union of these two denominations. Your Department recommends that it be authorized to take up with the Committee of the Reformed Church the preparation of a plan of organic Union to be presented to the next Assembly, provided the Synod of the Reformed Church votes affirmatively for union."

Concerning a report of a meeting with representatives of the United Presbyterian Church and other reformed churches, the report says:

"The last Assembly took action requesting the Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church to appoint a Committee or Commission with which the Department may confer with a view to closer cooperation and, if possible, organic union, and that the Rev. Henry C. Swearingen, D.D., be appointed a fraternal delegate to convey to the Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church our Assembly's action. In accordance with the authority conferred upon him Dr. Swearingen visited the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America and invited the appointment of a committee by said General Assembly to confer with reference to organic Union with a committee of our church. The General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, however, appointed a committee to confer with any or all of the bodies belonging to the Presbyterian and Reformed group. On January 29th, 1930, a conference of the churches of the Presbyterian and Reformed group was arranged by the committee of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church. On the evening of January 28, 1930, a dinner was given by the committee of the United Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh at which the Chairman of the committee on church union of the United Presbyterian Church, Dr. William J. Reid, presided. The Moderator of the United Presbyterian Church, Dr. John McNaugher, greeted the guests of the evening and addresses were delivered by Dr. Robert E. Speer, representing the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., the Rev. F. Raymond Clee, representing the Reformed Church of America and Dr. James I. Vance, representing the Presbyterian Church, U. S. On Wednesday, January 29th, an open conference was held in the First United Presbyterian Church at Pittsburgh, at which the following subjects were discussed:

(1) Is a union of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches desirable?

(2) On what basis can union be accomplished?

(3) What are the obstacles in the way of union?

"After the general conference it was decided by the official delegates present to hold an executive session. At this executive session the following was adopted:

(1) The committees of the conferring Churches express themselves as approving the organic Union of these Churches at the earliest moment;

(i) That we approve organic Union with other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches on the basis of their existing standards.

(ii) That our representatives be instructed in cooperation with committees from 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.

"This action was approved by a unanimous vote of the representatives from the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., the Presbyterian Church, U. S., and the United Presbyterian Church of North America. The Reformed Church in America refrained from voting on Paragraph (2) item (ii) feeling that they were not authorized to vote on this item. Representatives of the Reformed Church in the U. S. sat in conference but refrained from taking any official part because of the negotiations in which they were engaged with other bodies.

"In line with the above resolution we recommend that the General Assembly authorize its department to cooperate with the committees of other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches or with any (single) one of these committees in the preparation of a complete plan for organic union to be submitted to the next Assembly.

Regarding the Methodist Episcopal Church, a meeting was held with a portion of their union committee in February. A joint statement has been formulated, which has received the unanimous approval of the Department on Church Cooperation and Union. [The Commission of the Methodist Church has not yet reported its reaction to this joint statement, and, at the time of going to press, its text cannot be secured.]

A conference concerning possible union with the Protestant Episcopal Church was held last October, at which time representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church was present. As to this conference, the report notes:

"At this conference attention was called to the fact that the Protestant Episcopal committee is not making an approach on the basis of either doctrine or polity, such as has already been provided for in the World Conference on Faith and Order, but is seeking conference and a hope for agreement with reference to sociological questions, particularly those dealing with the family, temperance and racial questions, as well as a clearer understanding as to what is the wisest relationship of Church and State."

## Marriage, Divorce and Re-Marriage

Much interest has been aroused throughout the Church regarding the report of the Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Re-Marriage, which was appointed by the last Assembly in answer to an overture from the Presbytery of Dubuque, requesting the General Assembly "to study and give to the whole Church a clear deliverance on Divorce and Remarriage."

The Chairman of the Commission is the Rev. Ralph Marshall Davis, of Erie, Pa. A "Subcommittee on the true significance of the teachings of Scripture and a definition of marriage in the light of these teachings" was headed by Dr. Howard Agnew Johnston.

High lights of the report are:

Approval of Birth Control under proper conditions, but within certain limits.

Opposition to liberalizing the grounds for divorce.

A Recommendation that the prohibition of marriages between Presbyterians and "infidels, papists and other idolators" be stricken from the Confession of Faith.

A Recommendation that the General Assembly urge the Board of Christian Education to cooperate with the Federal Council's Committee on "Religion and the Home;" that the General Assembly appropriate a sum sufficient to pay its share of a full time research worker "provided that certain other denominations do likewise" and "that the Commission consider carefully the feasibility of joining with other denominations through the Federal Council in a request to a Foundation for a thorough-going research study into this problem."

Interesting excerpts from the report are as follows:

"Beyond the fact that the marriage relation is terminated by death is the further fact that it may be destroyed by either party to the agreement proving unfaithful to the vows taken. That unfaithfulness may be found in the act of

infidelity or irremediable desertion. Anything that kills love and deals with the spirit of the union is infidelity.

"Our standards now allow two grounds for divorce, namely, adultery and irremediable desertion. Your committee would recommend that this position should remain as it is."

In its conclusion, in reference to marriages between Presbyterians and others, the report says:

"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 godly be unequally yoked by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life or maintain damnable heresies.'"

"In First Corinthians, 7:39, the Apostle Paul urges that believers should only be married 'in the Lord.' Experience justifies this teaching as wise and right.

"Many Roman Catholics are sincere and intelligent believers in our Lord Jesus Christ, and marriages with them may be 'in the Lord,' even though such marriage may be beset with dangers.

"The commission feels that caution enough is given candidates for matrimony in the first sentence of the section:

"'It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry who are able with judgment to give their consent; yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord,' without adding the second sentence which we recommend for elision and which we believe adds no weight to the caution but does add a means of offense."

Continuing, the report says:

"We recommend for consideration by the Church at large the following definition of marriage:

"Marriage is an institution ordained of God for the honor and happiness of mankind, in which one man and one woman enter into a bodily and spiritual union, pledging each to the other mutual love, honor, fidelity, forbearance and comradeship such as should assure an unbroken continuance of their wedlock so long as both shall live.

"This institution finds its primary justification in the establishment and maintenance of the Christian home, in which children shall be born and nurtured in the Christian faith. On the side of civil government, the Church recognizes marriage as a legal contract, involving the moral obligations of Christian citizenship."

"In discussing divorce and remarriage," says a subcommittee report, "it is incumbent upon the Church to deplore most earnestly the laxity of divorce which prevails today, and especially to condemn the deliberate steps taken by married people to secure divorces in order to remarry, especially when such plans betray the fact that unholy relations between those who are married have occasioned the destruction of the existing relations between husbands and wives who were happy together before such seductions were exercised in sinful desires."

"The widespread use of contraceptives for the total prevention rather than for the reduction of the number of children certainly produces distinct losses of personality.

"Easy divorce proceedings and easy means of preventing conception have an intimate connection. That there may be a place for the contraceptive under medical advice, there is no doubt. But it still remains that a baby in the home now and then is a splendid diversion for those suffering from an uneventful married life."

"Perhaps at some future time some recommendation may come in favoring two ceremonies, one a civil and the other a religious ceremony," says the report. "The latter will be purely optional but it will represent the positive convictions of the couple seeking marriage. We do commend for consideration the possible severing of a relation with the State which is anything but a happy one."

Touching on companionate marriage, the report continues:

"The Christian religion holds that the basis of marriage is the mutual love of a man and a woman. Faith in God would seemingly be the first and most immediate ground for the wise foundation of a home.

"Companionate marriage arrangements that assume less than this are fraught with peril. To base it on the insecure foundation proposed by certain of our sophisticates—namely, that of sex desire, and subsidized at that, condemns the whole enterprise to speculation. For, with the coming of children, larger and different responsibilities develop."

The Committee requests in its report to be reappointed for one year.

## Philadelphia Disapproves

At its stated meeting, held on May 5th, the Presbytery of Philadelphia voted to protest to the General Assembly against making any change in the Confession of Faith that would permit marriages with "Infidels, Papists and other Idolaters."

## First Commencement of Westminster Seminary

Before a great throng which began gathering long before the doors were thrown open, Westminster Theological Seminary held its first commencement exercises in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia, on the evening of Tuesday, May 6th.

At eight o'clock, the hour set for the beginning of the exercises, the piano took up the strains of "Come, Thou Almighty King." Soon the audience was lifting the song in mighty volume as in processional the trustees, faculty and graduating class entered the room and took their places. The long metre doxology was sung by all. The Rev. Charles Schall, D.D., of Wayne, Pa., then led in prayer, reverently invoking the Divine presence and blessing. After the invocation came the hymn, "All hail the power of Jesus' Name," followed by the reading of the Scripture lesson (Matt. 16: 13-28) by the Rev. Frank R. Elder, D.D., of Cincinnati. The prayer was offered by the Rev. John T. Reeve, D.D., of Syracuse, N. Y., who led the company to the foot of the Throne of Grace in a moving and appropriate manner.

After the prayer had been offered, the President of the Board of Trustees, the Rev. Frank H. Stevenson, D.D., of Princeton, N. J., made the announcement that, the charter of the Seminary having been secured from the State of Pennsylvania, the decision had been taken to have the members of the faculty take the doctrinal pledge required by the charter, and to have them affix their signatures thereto, in the presence of the whole gathering. The Pledge was then read by the Rev. Harold S. Laird, of Collingswood, New Jersey, the Secretary of the Board, and is as follows:

"In the presence of God, and of the Trustees and Faculty of this Seminary, I do solemnly and *ex animo* adopt, receive, and subscribe to the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in the form which they possessed in the year of our Lord 1929, as the confession of my faith, or as a summary and just exhibition of that system of doctrine and religious belief, which is contained in Holy Scripture, and therein revealed by God to man for his salvation; and I do solemnly, *ex animo,* profess to receive the fundamental principles of the Presbyterian form of church government, as agreeable to the inspired oracles. And I do solemnly promise and engage not to inculcate, teach, or insinuate anything which shall appear to me to contradict or contravene, either directly or impliedly, any element in that system of doctrine, nor to oppose any of the fundamental principles of that form of church government, while I continue a member of the Faculty in this Seminary."

After the reading of the pledge, the Chairman of the Board called the members of the faculty one by one to come to the platform, assent to the Pledge, sign it, and take their places as fully inducted members of the faculty. The first name to be called was "The Reverend Robert Dick Wilson, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Divinity, Doctor of Laws, Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism." As the venerable and well loved figure ascended the stairs to the platform a thunder of applause arose from the audience, which hardly seemed able to contain itself. And then hushed, the multitude watched him sign the historic document.

Dr. Wilson was followed by Dr. Machen, who in turn received a great ovation.

As each member of the faculty came forward the applause arose spontaneously again and again.

After the induction ceremony and the formal announcement by the President of the Board that "the faculty was now constituted according to the charter," the address of the evening was delivered by the Rev. Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, and a Trustee of the Seminary. Dr. Macartney's address, which is printed in full in this issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, was a great utterance upon a great

theme: "Protestantism's Tomorrow." As he spoke, to many in the audience the spirit of the Reformation lived again as unconquerable as of old. Almost at the beginning came the words, "I am aware, as you are, that this is no ordinary occasion, and that the exercises of this evening have back of them a deeper significance than the sending out of these young men into the work of the ministry. Tonight we fling out to every wind that blows a new banner, to be displayed, not because of any new discovery or any new faith, but because of the Everlasting Gospel." And with these words, and as the address proceeded, the first commencement of Westminster seemed in its spirit to take its place in history with other great assemblies and gatherings; with the signing of the Covenant in Greyfriars Kirkyard, the Glasgow Assembly of 1638, the Free Church Assembly of 1843.

Following Dr. Macartney's eloquent and momentous address, the certificates were awarded to the graduating class by Dr. Wilson, as senior member of the faculty. Again the applause arose as the first graduates—thirteen in number—received their certificates. Their names are as follows:

Samuel James Allen, William Treman Blackstone, Harold Tabor Commons, Everett Clarke DeVelde, Chester Arthur Diehl, Herbert Vinton Hotchkiss, Jacob Marcellus Kik, Robert Samuel Marsden, Harold John Ockenga, Arend Roskamp, Ralph Wesley Todd, Robert Lucius Vining, Ernest William Zentgraf, Jr.

It was announced that the Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield Prize in Semitic philology had been awarded to Chester A. Diehl, of Grundy Centre, Iowa, and the William Brenton Greene, Jr., prize in systematic theology to Robert S. Marsden, of Philadelphia.

The address to the graduating class was given by Dr. Wilson, who in impressive and tender words, exhorted the students so to live and preach the gospel that at the end they might say with Paul, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day."

After Dr. Wilson had concluded, the whole company rose and sang, "When I survey the wondrous cross," and as the audience lifted up the words of Watts' great hymn, it was evidently releasing much pent-up and restrained emotion. The benediction was pronounced by the Rev. John Dolfin, Minister of the Bethany Christian Reformed Church of Muskegon, Michigan, a Member of the Board of Trustees. Thus came to an end a service which it is hardly possible that any witnesses could ever forget.

The members of the faculty, in the order of signing the Pledge, are:

Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Semitic Philology and
Old Testament Criticism

J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.,
Professor of New Testament

Oswald Thompson Allis, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Old Testament History
and Exegesis

Cornelius Van Til, Th.M., Ph.D.,
Professor of Apologetics

R. B. Kuiper, A.M., B.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology

Ned Bernard Stonehouse, Th.D.,
Assistant Professor of New Testament

Paul Woolley, Th.M.,
Assistant Professor of Church History

Allan Alexander MacRae, M.A.,
Assistant Professor of Semitic Philology

The Board of Trustees met in the morning at the Seminary, 1528 Pine Street, and was constituted under the charter. All subscribed to the following pledge:

"I hereby solemnly declare in the presence of God and of this Board (1) that I believe the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, (2) that I sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, in the form which it possessed in 1929, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, (3) that, approving the Charter of Westminster Theological Seminary, I will faithfully endeavor to carry into effect the articles and provisions of said Charter and to promote the great design of the Seminary."

The trustees elected the following officers:

The Rev. Dr. Frank H. Stevenson of Princeton, president; F. M. Paist of Philadelphia, vice-president; the Rev. Harold S. Laird of Collingswood, N. J., secretary, and Morgan H. Thomas of 18 So. 6th St., Philadelphia, treasurer.

### Princeton Commencement

The 118th commencement of Princeton Theological Seminary, the first commencement under the new plan of control, was held May 6th, and degrees were presented by Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, President, at services in the First Presbyterian Church. Announcement of new appointments was made by the board of trustees, and an alumni luncheon and meeting was held. The Rev. Henry Howard, D.D., of the Fifth Ave. Presbyterian Church of New York, spoke at the commencement exercises.

The Rev. John E. Kuizenga, D.D., President of the Western Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America at Holland, Michigan, was elected Stuart Professor of Apologetics and Christian Ethics. The trustees also announced the appointment of the Rev. Harold Irvin Donnelly, now general director of the department of educational research of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., to the newly established Professorship of Religious Education. Mr. Donnelly is a graduate of Wooster College, and has taught there.

The Rev. Harold McAfee Robinson, D.D., executive secretary of the Board of Christian Education was elected a member of the board of trustees in place of the Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D., who had declined to serve. The Rev. W. L. McEwan, D.D., of Pittsburgh, was elected president of the board of trustees for the coming year; Thomas W. Synnott of Wenonah, N. J., was elected vice-president, and the Rev. W. B. Pugh of Chester, Pa., secretary.

## CANADA

### "The Tatamagouche Case"

Great interest has been manifested in the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada in the so-called "Tatamagouche Case." ("McLellan v. Fraser," "Eliza Patriquin Estate.")

Eliza Patriquin, a member of the Presbyterian Church in the village of Tatamagouche, made a will in 1924, leaving to the "Tatamagouche Presbyterian Church" the residue of her estate. In the next year the Tatamagouche Church voted to enter the United Church of Canada. A minority of the congregation voted to remain Presbyterian, and after the voting, withdrew and established a new Presbyterian congregation. The original congregation became a part of the United Church on June 10, 1925, when the Dominion Act went into effect.

Eliza Patriquin "voted Presbyterian," left the church which had "voted Union" and joined the new congregation. She did not change her will. Later she died, and to the surprise of many the local United Church, in 1928, claimed the money, though knowing that she was firm in her opposition to the United Church. The original hearing resulted in victory for the United Church. On an appeal to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, however, it was unanimously adjudged by that body, that the United Church in Tatamagouche could not claim the money because it had ceased to be a Presbyterian Church, and no longer came within the description of the will.

Realizing that this was a heavy and damaging legal blow to their claims to be regarded legally as the only Presbyterian Church in Canada, the United Church appealed the case to the Supreme Court of Canada. That high court, on April 10th, delivered a unanimous judgment affirming the position taken by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. The judgment of the court was delivered by Justice Smith, and a partial quotation follows:

"There was, at the date of the will of the testatrix, a religious body named the Presbyterian Church in Canada, having a congregation of that church at Tatamagouche, to which the testatrix belonged. That congregation, or at least the majority of those who composed it, have now become a congregation of the United Church of Canada, an incorporated body that came into existence, as stated, subsequently to the date of the will. I think that the Supreme Court in banco of Nova Scotia has correctly held that the present congregation of the United Church of Canada at Tatamagouche is not the same entity as The Tatamagouche Presbyterian Church to which the testatrix made this bequest, and therefore cannot take it. We have, incorporated by the Act, an entirely new and distinct legal entity, and what we have to consider is whether or not that

## Seminary Enrollments

A problem confronting the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and probably other denominations which historically demand a highly educated ministry, is presented by the number of students in theological seminaries who are admitted without having previously received college training.

Facts dealing with this situation are revealed in a statement issued recently by Rev. Frederick E. Stockwell, D.D., General Director of the Department of Colleges, Theological Seminaries and Training Schools of the Presbyterian Church. According to this statement, 195 out of 810, or 24 per cent., of the students enrolled in Presbyterian theological seminaries, have not obtained college diplomas. This includes special and graduate students.

A committee of the General Council, recently considering the problem of ministerial employment, directed attention to the considerable number of men already in the ministry who have not a complete higher education, and raised the question whether this did not affect pastoral tenures.

Total enrollment at the 12 theological seminaries affiliated with the Presbyterian Church is reported at 810, as compared with 957 in 1929, a decrease of about 15 per cent. However, the aggregate has fluctuated greatly from year to year, dropping below 600 immediately after the war.

Princeton Seminary, which suffered the secession of a group of professors and students who were dissatisfied with action of General Assembly, reports 177, as against 255 in 1929. Presbyterian Seminary, Chicago, also reports 177, as against 168 in 1929.

Other institutions report as follows:

San Francisco, 99, decrease 7.
Louisville, 88, increase 2.
Western, 95, decrease 3.
*Westminster, 50 (first year).
Omaha, 47, increase 3.
Auburn, 44, decrease 8.
Lane, 16, decrease 9.
Bloomfield, 20, decrease 2.
J. C. Smith, 18, increase 4.
Dubuque, 16, same as in 1929.

The number of percentage of non-college graduates among the regular students preparing for the ministry at the 12 Presbyterian seminaries are as follows (graduate and special students not included):

| Institution | Students in Preparation | College Prepared | Non-College | Per cent. Non-College |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Presbyterian, Chicago | 153 | 138 | 15 | 10 |
| Princeton | 136 | 126 | 10 | 7 |
| Kentucky, Louisville | 64 | 55 | 9 | 14 |
| Western, Pittsburgh | 62 | 50 | 12 | 19 |
| San Francisco | 50 | 41 | 9 | 18 |
| Auburn | 34 | 17 | 17 | 50 |
| Omaha | 33 | 15 | 18 | 54 |
| J. S. Smith (colored) | 18 | 10 | 8 | 44 |
| Bloomfield (foreign speaking) | 16 | 2 | 14 | 87 |
| Lane | 15 | 10 | 5 | 33 |
| Dubuque (foreign speaking) | 14 | 11 | 3 | 21 |
| Lincoln (colored) | 11 | 4 | 7 | 63 |
| Totals | 606 | 479 | 127 | 21 |
| *Westminster, Philadelphia | 45 | 44 | 1 | 2 |

* Not under ecclesiastical control.

## Sample Copies Available

**Arrangements have been made whereby copies of this issue of "Christianity Today" may be obtained without cost provided an order for them is received on or before May 31st. Orders received after that date will be filled if copies are available but cannot be promised. Any effort that our readers may make in bringing this issue to the attention of others will be greatly appreciated. Ministers and Church workers are urged to send for copies for distribution in their congregations and among their friends. We would also greatly appreciate lists of names and addresses to which to send copies of our second number. Please send them on or before June 10th.**

## CANADA—Continued

entity is the same organization as that which she had in contemplation as her beneficiary. There can be no doubt that it was not present to her mind that there was to be any such change as subequently took place, and it seems clear that the beneficiary that she had in mind was 'The Tatamagouche Presbyterian Church,' as a congregation of the Presbyterian Church as it then existed, and it cannot be said that a congregation of the United Church at Tatamagouche is the same religious organization as was within the contemplation of the testatrix in making this bequest to the Tatamagouche Presbyterian Church."

This means, in effect, that the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia is affirmed in its stand that the United Church congregation at Tatamagouche is no longer Presbyterian, no matter what the "United Church of Canada Act" may say. It is without doubt the most far-reaching legal question regarding the disruption yet decided in the Canadian courts, for it is generally conceded that if the local congregations of the United Church of Canada are declared by the courts not to be Presbyterian, that it will be very difficult for the denomination composed of these same congregations, to make good its claim to be a Presbyterian Church at all, much less "The Presbyterian Church in Canada."

### Church Union and the Census

Coincidentally with the judgment on the "Tatamagouche Case," great interest has been aroused in Canada regarding the action of the United Church in seeking to have all those who declare their religious denomination "Presbyterian Church in Canada" enrolled in the Dominion census as connected with the United Church.

The United Church Committee on the census had adopted the following report:

"That the Census Commissioner be informed that according to the United Church of Canada Act, The Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Methodist Church and the Congregational Churches of Canada, entered the United Church of Canada on June 10th, 1925, and therefore all persons who describe themselves as belonging to, or adherents of The Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Methodist Church, or the Congregational Churches of Canada, should be registered as connected with the United Church of Canada. . . ."

Typical of protests being made against this action of the United Church is the following resolution adopted by the Presbytery of Pictou, of the Presbyterian Church in Canada:

"Whereas it has come to the knowledge of the Presbytery of Pictou that the United Church of Canada has approached the census commissioner and the political leaders of the dominion-wide campaign with a view to having all who declare themselves as connected with the Presbyterian Church in Canada counted as members of the United Church on the ground that the United Church of Canada Act of Parliament says that the Presbyterian Church in Canada entered the so-called United Church, and, to quote the language of the United Church as appearing in their Year Book for 1929, on page 46, Section D, 'should be registered as connected with the United Church of Canada'; and,

"Whereas the presbytery views this proposal as improper and misleading, and, if finally approved as destined to place the more than twelve thousand loyal members and adherents of the Presbyterian Church in Canada within the bounds of the presbytery in a false light before the world, by counting them as members of a church to which they do not belong, and whose doctrine and polity they never accepted but protested against;

"Therefore resolved that the presbytery of Pictou in session assembled in St. Andrew's Church, Pictou, on Wednesday the second day of April, 1930, do solemnly and strongly protest against the recently disclosed purpose of the United Church, and express the hope that the responsible minister of the government, and the census commissioner, will see, that as in the past, the schedules for the census of 1931 are drawn so as to disclose clearly and honestly the exact number of all faiths throughout the Dominion."