

Announcing the
ELEVENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE
League of Evangelical Students

AT

CHICAGO—February 20th Through 23rd

Students Everywhere Invited

**Foremost Evangelical Leaders of American
Protestantism Will Speak!**

SPEAKERS

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., LITT.D.—Westminster Theological Seminary.
JAMES OLIVER BUSWELL, D.D.—Wheaton College.
HENRY SCHULTZ, TH.D.—Calvin Theological Seminary.
MARTIN C. LEHMAN, PH.D.—Goshen College.
THOMAS E. WELLMERS, M.A.—Hope College.
R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D.—Westminster Theological Seminary.
WALLACE L. EMERSON, PH.D.—Wheaton College.
WILL H. HOUGHTON, D.D.—Moody Bible Institute.
F. D. WHITESELL, TH.D.—Northern Baptist Theological Seminary.
P. B. FITZWATER, D.D.—Moody Bible Institute.
ALBERT B. DODD, D.D.—Missionary to China.
MELVIN A. STUCKEY, TH.M.—Ashland Theological Seminary.

Meetings will be held in the auditoriums of the Moody Bible Institute—830 N. La Salle St., Chicago, Illinois.

Lodging will be provided free to all delegates whether League members or not. Send all registrations and reservations for rooms to Miss Ida McMillen, 830 N. La Salle St., Chicago, Ill., at least ten days before the Convention. Please state whether you plan to attend the Banquet on Saturday evening—price fifty cents.

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS
CALVIN KNOX CUMMINGS, *Editor*

Volume XI Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January, 1936

No. 1

EDITORIAL

EVANGELICALS, ARISE!

A few years ago there could have been no more timely subject for an editorial than "Evangelicals, Awake!" Christians were then unaware of the sweeping conquests that naturalism (unbelief) had made in America's denominational colleges and seminaries. God's people needed to be awakened to the fact that the Christian colleges and seminaries founded by evangelical Christians for the purpose of propagating the Christian Faith had come to be dominated and controlled, but for a few noble exceptions, by forces hostile to supernatural redemptive Christianity.

Today, informed evangelicals are fully aware that the average denominational institution—be it Methodist, Presbyterian, or Baptist—is promulgating theories which strike at the very heart of the Christian religion. The crying need of the hour is not for information; it is for action. Mere *words* will not suffice in the modern crisis. Christians must arise and *do* something and do it expeditiously! The student world is perishing today not because Christians are ignorant of conditions on the denominational campus. The student world is perishing because evangelicals have been content with talking about modernism in colleges and seminaries and have usually done nothing about it. "The Lord is a God of knowledge and by Him *actions* are weighed."

What is the duty of the Christian parent and the Christian student when confronted with the apostate condition of denominational institutions? The first duty of the Christian is to withhold his financial support from those denominational boards and agencies which contribute toward the maintenance of modernistic colleges and seminaries. The various denominational boards or agencies for the promotion of Christian education are pouring funds into denominational institutions and into the work of the student pastors in State Universities dominantly modernistic. To support these boards or agencies, however evangelical they may be in other respects, is to aid in the dissemination of anti-Christian teaching. A second duty is for Christian parents to refuse to send and for Christian students to refuse to attend any institution that does not stand four square for the Word of God. To attend a modernistic or indifferentist institution is to deprive the student of a Christian education, to clutter the mind with ever-changing theories, to have the spiritual life blighted, and to cast our financial support together with our influence on the side of modernism. A third duty is to seek in accordance with the appointed constitutional procedure of the particular denomination to reform these institutions and the agencies that support them, and in the event of probable failure—due to the dominance of modernism in the larger Protestant denominations—to prepare ourselves to found colleges and seminaries unswervingly loyal to the Word of God. Institutions thoroughly evangelical in their teachings are indispensable if we are to have an evangelical ministry and leadership for the Christian Church.

But all of this will never suffice. No matter how many truly Christian colleges there may be, there will always be the responsibility of reaching the lost students on pagan campuses with the Gospel; there will always be the responsibility of strengthening the thousands of Christian students who are constrained to attend State Universities because they are less expensive and are better equipped for many specialized fields of study. Then there is the emergent responsibility of trying to salvage the many students who unwittingly have been thrust forth into colleges which boast the name Christian but which are quite hostile to evangelical Christianity. It is these responsibilities to the student that the League of Evangelical Students seeks to fulfill. The League of Evangelical Students is the only student organization which in a national way is endeavoring to reach the student world with the Gospel. Evangelicals who lament the apostate condition of our institutions of higher learning, there is something you can *do* about the matter—pray for and faithfully support the League of Evangelical Students. Be no longer content with complaining about the modernism in our colleges and seminaries; extend a sustaining hand. Evangelicals, arise! The omnipotent God fill your hearts with a compassion for lost and bewildered students, and then move you to *do* something about it.

THE CERTAINTY OF SALVATION

The true Christian student finds himself in the midst of an increasingly hostile world and Church. An almost unbelievable hatred and intolerance is promptly meted the Christian who aggressively witnesses and contends for his Savior and Lord. If the Christian is to witness a good confession in the face of growing opposition he must possess fullness of peace and depth of conviction. Essential to fullness of peace and depth of conviction is the Christian's certainty or assurance of his eternal salvation. Without the certainty of our personal salvation we lack the full sweetness of peace and the inner depth of conviction to keep us immovable and always abounding in the work of the Lord. It was this sense of the certainty of his salvation that stayed Paul's soul in the midst of conflict and suffering. It was this sense of the assurance of his salvation that enabled Paul to speak with a tremendous conviction that throbbed with life. Writing to Timothy, Paul declared "For the which cause I also suffer these things: nevertheless I am not ashamed: for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." Peter exhorted Christians to "give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure," promising them that "if ye do these things ye shall never stumble." God intended that the assurance of salvation be a part of the Christian's armor in life's warfare against unbelief and sin. The loss of this certainty of our salvation paralyzes individual and corporate testimonies to the Gospel.

God has provided a way of procuring the certainty of our eternal salvation. That way is primarily by looking away from ourselves unto the finished work of Christ on Calvary and the promises of God. Uncertainty or lack of assurance finds its cause in the fact that Christians look within themselves for some emotional feeling or experience upon which to rest. How miserable and hopeless to seek a basis for assurance in our own shifting and sinful emotions. How insecure is any security found there. True security is to be found only in God

who is immutable in His love and has given a covenant of grace that is unchangeable and everlasting. The eternal God has covenanted that if we believe in His Son who died for us we shall never perish but have everlasting life. God Himself in the person of His Son poured out His precious life blood as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God. Our eternal security rests on the perfect work of Christ for our redemption. As we look by faith to that glorious cross and accept His perfect work for us we can rest with full confidence in the sufficiency of the price paid and the unchangeable character of Him who hath promised.

But how may the Christian be assured that he has a true faith or belief in the finished work of Christ and the promises of God? It is through the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the soul of the believer. "His Spirit beareth witness with (or, to) our spirits that we are children of God" writes Paul to the Romans. The Holy Spirit testifies *through* the human spirit when—as we experience the immediate consciousness of God's love and our satisfaction in His blessed communion—we look up into His face and cry "Abba, Father." The Holy Spirit speaks also to the Christian amid all the movements of the new life as in suffering there is comfort, in weakness strength, in temptation victory—testifying that he is a Son of God.

It is a timely commendation by God's Word that Christians "examine themselves, whether ye be in the faith." By a comparison of what God's Word sets forth as the fruits of the Spirit with the fruits in our lives we may receive or lose the assurance that we are the sons of God—depending upon whether the examination reveals that we possess or do not possess the fruits of the Spirit. We receive assurance as we possess the Christian graces, and participate in the reading of the Word, in prayer, and in the sacraments. Sin weakens or destroys this assurance. But as we return to His ways and cooperate with Him in the sanctification of our lives, glorious and unalterable certainty of salvation is restored; our souls are stayed amid conflict; we fight a good fight of faith.

IS KAGAWA EVANGELICAL?

A Christian student and member of the League of Evangelical Students has written a sharp letter challenging a cursory remark made in a previous editorial which classed Toyohiko Kagawa as a modernist. "I challenge you to prove one statement or else retract it. Prove that Toyohiko Kagawa is a modernist or the H——— Chapter of the League will be smaller by at least two members." This defense of Kagawa was made in the interest of the Student Volunteer Movement which engaged Kagawa as one of its main speakers at its recent Quadrennial Convention in Indianapolis.¹ The reaction of this student indicates the widespread delusion that prevails in America concerning Kagawa, and, incidentally, concerning the Student Volunteer Movement. When we consider the large number of speaking engagements before American student-bodies that have been arranged for Dr. Kagawa, it becomes important for students to be informed whether Kagawa is an evangelical or a modernist.

The philosophy of Toyohiko Kagawa has been set forth in two of his popular books—*The Religion of Jesus* and *Love the Law of Life*. The whole approach of

¹ The student has since become convinced of his error.

these books is a thoroughly naturalistic one. Jesus is treated as a mere human creature. Man is not felt to be in need of a supernatural salvation either objectively in the death of Christ or subjectively in the regeneration of his sinful heart. The teaching of Kagawa on certain cardinal points of the Christian Faith bears this out clearly. What is Kagawa's conception of the Person of Christ? "Jesus experienced God as the forgiver of sins."² Speaking of "redemption" Kagawa says "Jesus Christ actually experienced it."³ This makes Christ a sinner. Historic Christianity says Christ "knew no sin." What is Kagawa's view of the atonement? "Some people think that the death of Jesus was a bribe . . . for reconciliation with God. But I take the meaning of Jesus' death humanistically and personally. The true deep meaning of redemption is that Jesus apologized to God for all the failures and sins of mankind, taking responsibility for them upon himself."⁴ Christ said He was to die "for the remission (pardon) of sins." Paul taught "we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son." Kagawa discredits the bodily resurrection of Jesus. "We do not know in what form the resurrection did come. Whether it was in the flesh as the Gospels teach, or in the spiritual body as Paul tells us, it makes no difference."⁵ After His resurrection Christ said, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Kagawa's teaching on the nature of man is just as anti-Christian as his teachings on the Person and work of Christ. Man is not at all in need of regeneration. He is inherently good and simply needs to believe in the evolutionary development of himself into divinity. "Belief in evolution is a bolder faith than Abraham's belief in the Promised Land. His land was the lean country of Palestine; the Promised Land of evolution is growth from electron to Divinity."⁶ God's Word says "all have sinned and come far short of the glory of God." Christ said "Ye must be born again." It is the privilege of Dr. Kagawa to prefer his naturalistic philosophy to that of supernatural Christianity. But Dr. Kagawa does not have any rightful claim to the name "evangelical." And the fact of his being invited to speak to the one time evangelical Student Volunteer Movement, far from assuring us of the orthodoxy of Dr. Kagawa, convinces us of the unorthodoxy of any organization that welcomes his message.

CHRISTIANITY—A WORLD AND LIFE VIEW

Evangelical Christians frequently come honestly by the criticism that they are not concerned about moral, social, or political reform. Several factors have caused Christian people to fall heir to this narrow conception of the nature of the Christian religion. The whole modern educational system has been so completely segregated from Christianity that young Christians cannot but receive the impression that Christianity has no relation to the subjects they study and the duties of every day life. The modernist with his social gospel has caused Christians to react against not only his perverted form of the social gospel but

² Toyohiko Kagawa—*The Religion of Jesus*, p. 35.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁶ Toyohiko Kagawa—*Love the Law of Life*, p. 299.

unfortunately against any kind of a social gospel. But the most basic cause for this indifference on the part of Christians to the full implications of the gospel is probably due to a failure to understand that Christianity comprises a system of thought which includes every phase of life. Christianity has something to say about every department of life be it moral, social, or political. Christianity presents a world and life view—a complete philosophy of life.

When we accept Christ as our personal Saviour and Lord we implicate or weave ourselves, however unconsciously, into a whole philosophy of life. Every phase of our thought and life will eventually become affected by that decision. We will earnestly strive after the mind of Christ and seek to bring every thought and act into captivity to Him. Just as Hitler's "Weltanschauung" (world and life view) affects every sphere of life in Germany so the Christian world and life view should affect every department of life.

There is a great need today for evangelicals to discover what God's Holy Word has to say about the burning questions of the day which concern man's relationship with man. Let us not surrender any sphere of human activity to the false philosophies of the day. Let us preach man's relationship to God as basic to all other relationships, but let us urge the application of God's revealed will to all these relationships. Within recent months there has appeared a thoroughly Christian magazine which deals in a Biblical way with the social and moral questions that *The Christian Century* deals with in an anti-Biblical way. The name of the magazine is *The Calvin Forum*. It is edited by a Trustee of the League of Evangelical Students—Dr. Clarence Bouma. Every Christian should greatly rejoice in this able effort to capture every field of life for our Saviour and King. Every Christian who seeks a Christian solution to the social problems of the day will find this splendid magazine indispensable.

ANOTHER NEW FEATURE FOR THE EVANGELICAL STUDENT

Beginning with this issue there will appear regularly in *The Evangelical Student* a series of Scriptural Meditations by Mr. John Murray, M.A., Th.M., teacher of Systematic Theology at Westminster Theological Seminary. Mr. Murray is steeped in the Scriptures in a manner that few men in the world are. His sharp exegetical mind gives a precision of thought which will refresh the soul of the Christian student.

WRITERS IN THIS ISSUE

OSWALD T. ALLIS, Ph.D., D.D., is Professor of Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary.

ANDREW K. RULE, Ph.D., is Professor of Apologetics at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary.

BISHOP ROBERT W. PEACH, Ph.B., D.D., is the presiding Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church, and a Professor of the Reformed Episcopal Seminary.

REV. EDWIN H. RIAN, M.A., Th.B., studied at the University of Berlin under the Gelston Winthrop Fellowship in Church History given by Princeton Seminary and is now Field Secretary of Westminster Theological Seminary.

JOHN MURRAY, M.A., Th.M., Teacher of Systematic Theology at Westminster Theological Seminary.

LIGHT ON THE HIGHER CRITICISM FROM RAS SHAMRA¹

BY REV. OSWALD T. ALLIS, PH.D., D.D.

It is a well-known fact that the theory that the Pentateuch is not Mosiac but a composite of several documents all of which are later than the time of Moses, had its origin in the claim that differences in diction implied diversity of authorship. The first feature to be recognized was the variation in the Divine Names. Thus Gen. 1, which uses the name God (*Elohim*), is assigned to an Elohist document now called P (priestly). Most of Chapters 2-4 are assigned to the Jehovist (J) document because there the Deity is called Jehovah (A. V., LORD). Following this method or clue, long lists of words have been made which are claimed to be characteristic or distinctive of this or that document; and the Pentateuch has been divided up into documents partly, or wholly, on the basis of the occurrence in them of such distinctive words.

Because of its cosmic nature, which makes it almost comparable to Creation, the account of the Flood in Gen. 6-9, naturally uses the word God (*Elohim*) and also much of the phraseology of Gen. 1. But it also frequently uses the name Jehovah. Consequently the higher critics from the very start tried to divide it between two documents (the Jehovist and the Elohist), alleging that two accounts had been blended into one. Years ago Professor Sayce of Oxford challenged this view on the ground that elements of both accounts, both of the one alleged to be early and of the one claimed to be late, are found in the Babylonian account discovered by George Smith some sixty years ago. But the critics have continued to point to the Flood as a clear example of the occurrence of doublets, or composite accounts of the same event, in the Pentateuch.

Within the last seven years certain tablets have been discovered at Ras Shamra (near the northeast corner of the Mediterranean) which are written in an alphabet form of cuneiform script. They are regarded as dating from not later than about 1400 B. C. or about the time of the conquest under Joshua. Semitic scholars regard them as one of the most important archæological finds of recent years. The larger tablets are religious and mythological in character. One of them has much to say about the temples and shrines of which the people of Ugarit had very many. In speaking of the erecting or restoring of these temples, two words are used which apparently refer to windows or some such openings in buildings. One of the words is *'rbt*, the other *chlnt* (only the consonants are written as in Hebrew).² The occurrence of these two words side by side in the same document on a tablet dating from approximately the time of Moses is interesting to the Bible students for the following reason. Both of these words are used in the account of the Flood in the Book of Genesis. The former word (pronounced *'arubboth*) occurs in 7¹¹ and 8^{2a}, which are both assigned to the *late* account (P). The latter word (pronounced *challon*) occurs in 8⁶ and that verse is assigned to the *early* account (J). Now it is true that these words do not occur sufficiently frequently in the Book of Genesis to be treated as prominent and distinguishing features of these alleged documents. Nevertheless, it is an arresting fact that two different words of similar meaning which according to the critics appear in

¹ Reprinted by permission of "Christianity Today."

² Cf. *Syria*, Vol. XIII, p. 144f. For a popular account of these remarkable discoveries see the articles by Schaeffer in the *National Geographical Magazine* for October, 1930, and July, 1933.

Genesis in two different accounts, one early, the other late, but both post-Mosaic, should be found side by side in a cuneiform tablet dating from practically the Mosaic age. If both of these words were known in the time of Moses, he may well have used both, because each in its content conveyed a shade of meaning which he desired to bring out.

The attempt to account for the use of words, the style and diction of a document, is a very precarious matter, especially when this is made the basis for the denial of its genuineness and integrity, and the recent discovery to which we have called attention is a good illustration of this fact. If the critics knew as much Hebrew as Moses probably did, they might be less certain than they claim to be that he did not write the Pentateuch.

CHRISTIAN SUPERNATURALISM AND MODERN THOUGHT

ANDREW K. RULE, PH.D.

(Summary of an address delivered at the tenth annual convention of the League of Evangelical Students, in Philadelphia, February 22, 1935.)

The subject to which we are inviting your attention is clearly quite timely and of basic importance; but it is also tremendously comprehensive. All we can hope to do is to survey the field in order to get a broad conception of the issues involved, and of the materials available for their solution.

It may be assumed that it is not necessary for me to argue, in this presence, that historic Christianity is essentially and pervasively supernaturalistic; but it is also well known that other interpretations of Christianity have been advocated which greatly minimize its supernaturalistic features. Prominent among these less supernaturalistic, or anti-supernaturalistic, interpretations of Christianity are Deism, Modernism, and the views of certain Social Scientists, Anthropologists, Psychologists, and Darwinian Evolutionists.

A careful examination of these views seems to show quite clearly that one influence is at work in them all which is responsible for their anti-supernaturalism. It is an essentially philosophic conception of the complete, inner continuity of Nature; and this conception derives its power from the conviction that it is essential to the very possibility of Science. The issue that is before us today, therefore, may be stated in its baldest terms as one between the principle of the complete, inner continuity of Nature, on the one hand, and Christian supernaturalism, on the other. What can we make of such an issue?

Before discussing it in detail, let me mention certain principles of procedure that seem good to me. First; I personally have a very high regard for both the contending parties, and I would like to see both historic Christianity and science get their full rights. More generally, I am convinced that most of the "either . . . or" situations that are presented for our choice, are really "both . . . and" situations. It is at least worth our while to enquire whether the issue that is now before us may not be a case in point.

Second; I am as certain as I can be, as an act of faith, that the historic interpretation of Christianity is, in all essential respects, the truth, and that all truth will ultimately be found to be harmonious with it.

Third; if the very possibility of science actually is dependent on the principle of the complete, inner continuity of nature, then we are faced with a warfare

between science and Christianity in which no compromise is possible, and which must end only with the complete destruction of one or the other. But instead of this, I should expect to find that science does not really need such a thorough-going principle as this; and that there is room, within historic Christianity, for all the continuity of nature that science really needs. And this is exactly what one does find. I propose to show, therefore, first, that contemporary science is moving in the direction of recognising fundamental discontinuities in nature; second, that science can well afford to claim only a limited continuity for nature; third, that Christianity does provide for such a limited continuity of nature; and, fourth, that the kind of continuity which Christianity attributes to nature better serves the interests of science than do its own sweeping claims.

Let us approach our argument from the standpoint of the Darwinian evolution, and raise the question of fact. How has their effort after a complete, inner continuity of Nature fared at the hands of subsequent investigators? *The answer is that its continuity has had to yield to the recognition of apparently irreducible discontinuities, all along the line.*

To begin at the bottom, they sought to tie up an apparently continuous, inorganic world with their biological world. Well, fundamental discontinuities have now been revealed within the inorganic world. Whatever the future may reveal, that is certainly the case up to the present. For example; the accepted theory of Light in the past century was the wave-theory of Huyghens, according to which light was thought to move in a continuous series of waves. But now it appears to be definitely established that the wave property of light is attached to discrete, unbreakable particles, called photons. Again; it used to be assumed that energy was continuous in the sense that it could be increased or diminished by infinitely small amounts. But now it is discovered that there is an ultimate atom of energy called an erg. When you remember that the tendency of contemporary physics is to express all physical reality in terms of energy, you will see that the two changes which we have mentioned amount to an introduction of an irreducible discontinuity into the very foundation of the inorganic world. It is now universally admitted, also, that the casual law, which was the basic expression of continuity in nineteenth century physics, cannot be applied, in any known form, within the sub-atomic world. So much, at least, of the continuity of the Darwinian scheme has had to be abandoned.

In the second place, the genetic connection which the Darwinians asserted between the inorganic and the organic worlds has not been able to establish itself. Pasteur has definitely shown that, as far as observable phenomena go, every living thing originates from a living parent, and spontaneous generation does not occur. In spite of the most earnest effort, no success has attended the attempts to generate living tissue from non-living matter in the laboratory. In view of these facts, the Darwinians can only indulge in vague suggestions that spontaneous generation may be going on now somewhere in the universe, and that it must have taken place on the earth's surface at a time when its much higher temperature caused conditions of great instability. But the former suggestion is contrary to evidence, and is made at all only to suit the requirements of this theory. (cf. Graebner, *God and the Cosmos*, p. 127.) The latter looks more plausible; but it involves the suggestion that we cannot infer the past from observable conditions in the present. That suggestion however is directly opposed to the assumption upon which rests the geology which is fundamental for their theory. Their geology assumes that the past can and must be inferred

from observable conditions in the present. In the name of science, therefore, they are assuring us both that you cannot and that you must infer the past from processes now going on.

We have drawn your attention, thus far, to the appearance of discontinuities in the inorganic world, and of a rigid discontinuity between the inorganic and the organic worlds. We have now to observe that discontinuities have broken out within the organic world. Mendel showed, prior to the time of Darwin, that inheritance takes place through irreducible "unit characters," transmitted from the parents to the reproductive cells of the offspring. All subsequent work in this field has confirmed Mendel's discovery. Here is an atomism, a discontinuity, that is quite fatal to Darwin's scheme. Hugo de Vries may have claimed too much when he insisted that all new species arise through the discontinuities which are called "mutations"; but it seems to be generally admitted by those biologists who believe that species have arisen out of other species that some of them have arisen through mutations. A radically discontinuous scheme of animal history is presented in the recent volume of Austin H. Clarke, *The New Evolution: Zoogenesis* (1930). Clarke, who is an eminent authority, and who writes in constant consultation with a number of other eminent authorities, insists that not a single major animal group evolved from any other animal group. All of them arose directly from single-celled life, at about the same era, and their subsequent development has been along roughly parallel lines. This process he calls "zoogenesis." Within the separate animal groups there has been gradual evolution, but there have been mutations also. Since each step in the process is a selection from among rich possibilities, with the consequent rejection, at each step, of vast possibilities, mutations were much greater in the remote past than is possible today. Clarke insists that he is not teaching any doctrine of "special creation"; but the fact that he felt this denial to be necessary is quite significant. And his picture as a whole sounds remarkably like the familiar passage, "God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the ground after its kind."

Among the speculative biologists, another departure from the Darwinian continuity appears in the theory of Emergent Evolution. This one is all the more impressive because it seeks to insist strenuously on continuity. These men picture reality as existing in levels, which are so related that the higher emerge out of the lower without any break in the continuity of natural development. Thus, the organic has emerged continuously out of the inorganic; the sentient has emerged continuously out of the merely organic; the self-conscious out of the merely sentient; and so forth. But they also insist—and this is the contention which distinguishes them from other evolutionists—that each emergence is a real novelty. They tell us, further, what they mean by "novelty." They mean that the emergent has characteristics which could not have been predicted even on the basis of a perfect knowledge of the lower stages, as they were before the emergence took place. We shall presently show that this recognition of real novelty is a recognition of a radical discontinuity. Here we will merely assert the fact, and claim this theory as a support of our contention that the Darwinian continuity has had to yield to the recognition of fundamental discontinuities.

And finally, the Darwinian claim of a continuity of development between the organic and the value realms has had to give way before the facts. Balfour showed, in his *Theism and Humanism* (1915), that morality simply cannot be explained in terms of the Darwinian scheme. Ward showed that Spencer's

attempt to prove the connection was a complete failure; and you may see this for yourself if you will read critically Fiske's *The Idea of God*. The earlier anthropologists tried to explain the whole social development of man in terms of the Darwinian scheme, and their effort had much to do with the effect of the destructive Higher Critics to desupernaturalize the Old Testament. Well, the failure of this ambitious effort has also become increasingly obvious in our day. It would take too long for me to demonstrate this fact here; but if you are acquainted with contemporary movements in theology and in anthropology you will not need me to demonstrate it for you.

We have thus shown that, when the question of fact is raised, the movement of scientific theory is away from the continuity of the Darwinians, and toward the recognition that Nature is not completely continuous. *We are now ready to assert that science can get along quite well without any such complete continuity of Nature*. It can do so, and is doing so, in two ways. First, while it is equipped to deal only with continuities, and must recognise a limit to its abilities wherever a discontinuity has to be admitted, it can go round a discontinuity, as a mathematician treats a surd.

But, secondly, and more fundamentally, does science need to claim that all Nature is amenable to its methods? It neither needs to make such a claim, except for one special purpose, nor is it, in the case of certain eminent contemporary scientists, making such a claim. We and the scientists rightly insist on as complete thoroughness as is attainable. We therefore desire the scientists to try out their methods to the limit on every problem, and only to admit that any problem eludes them when the admission is finally forced on them by the facts. We want to have them proceed on the working hypothesis of the complete applicability of their methods to Nature, and this involves the assumption that Nature is perfectly continuous. But that is merely a principle of procedure in the interests of thoroughness. When the facts show that a discontinuity has to be recognized—as the facts are doing—we expect the scientists to make that recognition. And certain of them, at least, are doing that very thing today. Eddington, for one, is arguing that physical methods yield only mathematical equations, involving symbols which must have some reference to reality but whose interpretation in terms of reality the physicist is essentially incapable of discovering. Joseph Needham, the Cambridge bio-chemist, proclaims as the central thesis of his article on "Mechanistic Biology and the Religious Consciousness" (see *Science, Religion and Reality*, Macmillan, 1925; p. 219ff) that scientific and philosophic methods together are incapable of dealing completely with the problem of life. Professor H. Levy, the London mathematician, contends that science is merely an "isolate" from the social process, and is to be tested by it and supplemented by it.

A COMPLETE CONTINUITY IN REALITY DEMANDED BY THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND BY RELIGIOUS FAITH

We have argued, thus far, that science can get along very well without insisting that all nature is amenable to scientific treatment; and she can therefore afford to surrender the claim that nature is completely continuous. We have seen, also, that she has been discovering some irreducible discontinuities in Nature. It follows that any claim for a complete continuity of Nature must be disallowed. But now a somewhat different question arises. Is there any reason to claim a complete continuity, not in Nature, but anywhere in Reality? I am convinced

that this claim is demanded both by the nature of human knowledge and by the nature of religious faith. Let us enlarge on this only a little.

Thinking is a process of discovering relational continuities between objects. For example, when, according to the famous story, Newton perceived that whatever causes an apple to fall to the earth is one element in the explanation of the revolution of the moon around the earth; when his explanation of the latter phenomenon was extended to the planetary revolution around the sun; when, further, it was observed that all this threw light on the rise and fall of the tides—this great process of thinking involved the discovery of relational continuities between phenomena which had previously appeared to be discontinuous. All thinking is of this nature. But, further, as Kant discovered, there is involved in all thinking, however rudimentary, an ideal of perfection, a demand that it shall not stop until an all-comprehensive and complete continuity be achieved; and you cannot believe in the validity of human thinking without accepting the ideal that is inherent in it. And, once more, thinking essentially claims objective validity. The simplest precepts are related to real objects, unless they be hallucinations—and hallucinations are dangerous symptoms. The discovery of wider relational continuities, such as the laws of science, is a discovery of the real nature of an objective world. If it is not that, then thinking is discredited. Surely it is discredited, also, if there is not, somewhere in Reality, an object corresponding to its essential ideal of perfect continuity. It was the vague awareness of this fact which led the scientists to insist that Nature, the object of their investigation, is this perfect continuity. They were mistaken in that claim; but the demand for a perfect, objective continuity is not a mistake. Where, then, can we find it; and what is its nature?

Religious faith not only makes the same claim; when it is clearly thought through, it indicates the answer to our questions. Implicit in all religious faith is the conviction that every part of the world-process, its continuities and its discontinuities, all are parts of one self-consistent, rational, loving plan that is eternally present to the Mind of a transcendent God, and moving victoriously forward in and through and into Time under the hand of One Who is the same yesterday, today, and for ever. Religious faith, therefore, joins with a sound theory of knowledge in claiming that the scientists are not mistaken in their affirmation of a perfectly continuous object; they are mistaken only when they identify this perfect continuity with Nature. But religious faith goes further and finds this perfect continuity in the eternal purpose of God. Nature manifests this continuity to the extent to which the plan of God has matured itself in Nature; it manifests discontinuities to the extent to which God's plan in Nature is incomplete and to the extent to which God's plan essentially transcends Nature.

THIS POINT OF VIEW SATISFIES REQUIREMENTS OF CHRISTIAN SUPERNATURALISM, OF SCIENCE, AND OF PHILOSOPHY

We are now ready to bring our discussion to a close by asking, Does this affirmation of religious faith satisfy all the demands of historic Christian supernaturalism and all the discoveries and needs of science and philosophy? I am convinced that it does; that it fits the discoveries and the needs of science much better than the conception of a perfect continuity of Nature ever can do; and that those Christian thinkers who advocate a weakened supernaturalism in the

supposed interests of science are, therefore, doing a serious disservice both to Christianity and to science. Let us convince ourselves that this is so.

The eternal, perfectly continuous plan of God partially expressed itself in a real act of Creation, by which there came into being a Natural World that is ontologically separate from God and has a relative self-existence. We have not taken time, in this discussion, to examine the scientific attitude to the doctrine of Creation; nor can we do so at any length now. But we ought to point out that, though creation is not primarily a doctrine for science at all, modern science does indicate such a doctrine. When you recall that science now tends to express all physical reality in terms of energy; that it seems to show that the amount of energy in the universe is not infinite; and that it seems to have discovered that the energy of the universe is being universally dissipated at an amazing rate; you will see that science does indicate a point of absolute origin for the physical universe. This at least is true unless science can discover somewhere a process of upbuilding in the universe, large enough in amount to balance the dissipating process. If such a process can be found, that would merely show that the physical universe is now a self-maintaining system; but it would not prove that it was not once created as a self-maintaining system. If there is any other reason for believing in a doctrine of creation. Has science discovered such an upbuilding process? The answer will depend on the issue now being debated, between Dr. Robert Millikan and his opponents, as to the cause of the Cosmic Rays. Millikan's theory is that they are thrown out in the process of building up heavier out of lighter matter, somewhere in space; and he therefore takes them as evidence that "the Creator is still on the job." The rival theory, which also seems to be the increasingly successful rival, is that they are produced through the transformation of matter into energy in the bodies of the stars, and are, therefore, another evidence of the dissipation process. In either case, science has no case against Creation, except in so far as it is committed against discontinuities; and in the latter case, science definitely indicates Creation.

In the temporal realization of God's eternal plan, therefore, a real beginning was made when a natural world was created, having a relative self-existence of its own, and operating with a large measure of inner continuity under its own laws. These laws are its own, and may be profitably studied as such, as science is doing; but they are also God's laws and cannot be completely understood until they are related to God's eternal purpose. But this act of creation was only a beginning, while the plan of God is, in its temporal manifestation, progressive. If the scientist discovers in those laws a tendency toward progress, the Christian need not be at all surprised; and the scientist may be permitted to employ the term evolution to express the developmental tendency so long as he keeps loyal to all the relevant facts.

But the Christian will insist that God's plan for development in time was not completely expressed in the first creation. When the temporal unfolding of His eternally continuous plan reached an appropriate stage, God again acted creatively into it to produce a result which Nature could not have brought about. From the standpoint of natural law, this result was a discontinuity or an emergence; it was not entirely contradictory of what had previously been going on, but it was a real novelty. But, from the standpoint of the eternal plan, there was no discontinuity whatever.

Such a general point of view is perfectly harmonious with Christian supernaturalism. It involves creation, special creation, and all the miracles contained

in the supernatural revelation. It does not clash with the discoveries and necessities of science, as we have previously discussed them, for it leaves room for all the inner continuity of Nature that the scientists can reasonably desire. But I have also claimed that it serves the ends of science better than does the assertion of a perfect, inner continuity of Nature. Let me illustrate and support this contention by again considering the theory of emergent evolution.

This theory has won some very enthusiastic adherents, among scientists, philosophers and theologians; and I feel sure that we may attribute this fact to some very real merits in the theory. But it is also calling forth some hostile criticism. The most careful examination of it, involving hostile criticisms, that I know may be found in some lectures originally delivered in the Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, by Professor William McDougall, and later published in a little book entitled *Modern Materialism and Emergent Evolution*. It seems to me that the adverse criticism is also justified. What, then, is its strength; and what its weakness?

Its strength springs from its successful adherence to its purpose of accepting facts "with natural piety." In particular, it recognizes that there is in each level of existence—the organic, the psychic, and the others—something which is not wholly explicable in terms of the lower levels. That is to say, if some doctrine of cosmic evolution is to be accepted, the strength of emergent evolution is its recognition of real novelties in the evolving process. Further, its insistence that the emergent is not wholly new is a virtue. It recognizes both that the higher level is based on the lower and that the emergence of the higher has made some difference to the lower levels. These virtues however, could be retained, and will have to be retained, even if the evolutionary background of them is entirely surrendered.

The basic weakness of the theory lies in its inability to reconcile two principles, for which it contends, and for which any sound theory of reality will have to contend. The principles are continuity and novelty. We have already argued that science needs continuity, and that the success of science shows that there is a large measure of continuity in Nature. The facts compel the recognition of novelty as well. Somehow it must be possible to reconcile these two principles; but the theory of emergent evolution, we contend, is unable to do so. For notice; the very essence of continuity is predictability, and science needs continuity because prediction is the goal of its endeavour. The laws of science are essentially predictions. They take the general form; if a certain, specified situation arises a certain specified result will follow. The test of a scientific hypothesis is also its ability to predict conclusions which observation confirms. It is because discontinuities would prevent prediction, or it is to the extent to which they do so, that science insists on continuity. The emergent evolutionists are insisting on predictability in that sense. But they are defining novelty in terms of unpredictability; and they are insisting that the same emergent is both predictable and unpredictable. They claim that it is predictable in respect to its quantitative aspects, and unpredictable qualitatively; and in general I think they are about right. But observe that this is a reconciliation of the principles by a mere division of their application; and it does not enable us to see how totally new qualities can emerge out of circumstances which contain no hint of them. The real pressure of this problem seems to be hidden from the emergent evolutionists and their followers because they use the one term, emergence, to cover two radically different kinds of fact. For them the new properties that appear when two parts of hydro-

gen gas are mixed with one part of oxygen gas to form water are designated as emergent; but the same conception or term is also employed to characterize the very different result when sentience appears, or self-consciousness. But in the one case of emergence, the novelty is still in the same class as the combining elements: in the other, a totally new order of being has appeared. It may be possible to reconcile the continuity with the novelty in the case of the emergence of water; though I am inclined to think that it is not even possible there. But how explain the radical novelty of the emergence of sentience as a perfectly continuous development from the purely organic?

I am convinced that there is a continuity there, and that there is also a very great novelty; and that the continuity and the novelty cannot be reconciled merely by separating their spheres. But our transcendent point of view reconciles them quite easily. From the standpoint of the temporal process, emergences, in so far as they are novelties, are real discontinuities, and quite unpredictable; but seen in the light of the eternal plan there is no discontinuity whatever. In this case, therefore, science has forced to our attention a real situation which, from the purely immanent standpoint of science is a contradiction. The contradiction can be solved only by abandoning the purely immanent point of view, and substituting for it our Christian supernaturalism. The latter conception, that is to say, better serves the interests of science than does its own immanent viewpoint.

It is worth while that our conclusion is in fundamental agreement with, and most consistently expresses, an insight that has appeared, all along, among philosophers who otherwise differ profoundly. All the greatest of the philosophers, from Plato, through Descartes, Spinoza, and Hegel, to our own day have realized, and in one way or another have sought to show, that the Reality which fitfully and partially expresses itself in the temporal process finds its complete expression only in, or from the viewpoint of, eternity. It is the same conception which the Barthians are perhaps exaggerating in their theory of "the crisis." To all of these, the temporal process which alone is studied by science, appears as unreal, or as not fully real, or as philosophically unimportant; while it gets what measure of reality and importance it does possess from the fact that, somehow and to some extent, an eternally-complete and perfect Reality is expressed in and through it. This eternally complete Reality is the perfect purpose of God, working itself out in and through and into the temporal process.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Our contentions, therefore, are as follows: First, that the rejection of the full supernaturalism of historic Christianity was due to the influence of a scientific theory of the complete, inner continuity of Nature. Second, that, while the success of science shows that there is a great deal of inner continuity in Nature, science has also revealed some fundamental and irreducible discontinuities in Nature, and has not destroyed itself in doing so. Science does not need to claim such a wholesale continuity as this, and is not able to maintain such a claim. Third, the supernaturalism of historic Christianity affords to science all the continuity in Nature which it needs and has found; and enables us also to deal with the discontinuities without self-contradiction. It is, therefore, the most comprehensive and the most self-consistent point of view that has ever come to the mind of man; and, since comprehensiveness and self-consistency are the ultimate tests of truth, our Christian supernaturalism is the truth.

VISIBLE—TEMPORAL; INVISIBLE—ETERNAL

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

“The things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal” (II Cor. 4:18).

Preachers and students of God’s Inspired Word commonly pass over many of the most startling revelations therein with scarcely a thought as to their profound meaning. Here, for example, is a passage which, interpreted by the Bible itself and illustrated by the recent findings of science, will be found to contain within its sixteen words the foundation of Theology and the capstone of philosophy. But we must throw off mental laziness or spiritual timidity and search and interpret the Scriptures with a thoroughness comparable to that of the men of science who search God’s whole creation.

These men, whether they be devout Christians or agnostics, whether they realize the Theistic implications of their researches or not, are engaged in reading and interpreting the inspired works of God,—studying God’s handwriting in earth and sun and stars,—and they furnish us a commentary on David’s exclamation, “The heavens declare the glory of God.” and on St. Paul’s teaching, “the things that are made” enable us to see, or perceive, God’s “everlasting power and divinity.”

Let us then not hesitate to offer and ponder an interpretation of one of the most challenging sentences in the Book of God: “The things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.” Visible—temporal: invisible—eternal; so may be expressed the equation of the universe.

A.—THINGS VISIBLE ARE TEMPORAL

‘THINGS’ is the first word in our text to demand attention. ‘Things’ is a word not confined to objects physical, ponderable, tangible, either in common usage or in the Scriptures. For example, St. Paul writes of “the things of the flesh” and “the things of the Spirit,” “the things of a man,” and “the things of God.” ‘Things’ means existences and their predicates—existences noumenal and phenomenal, real, and apparent. By ‘the things of God’ we must understand His consciousness, volition, sensibility; His omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence; His invisibility; His invisible creatures—spirits of angels and men; His visible creation—the universe; in short, all that we may know about God Himself and His works.

‘THINGS WHICH ARE SEEN’ are our next consideration—the grain of sand and the sweeping beach; the drop of water and the mighty ocean; the object so minute that only the most powerful microscope will magnify it into visibility and the milky way in the far-off sky. Nor may we confine this phrase to things actually seen, but must extend it to things out of which the microscopically small are compounded. Think we, if we can, of an electron revolving at a frightful speed about a proton—the core of an atom; think then of fifty atoms, more or less, massed into a molecule; think of a number of molecules massed into a particle so minute that the point of a cambric needle would be gross in comparison—a particle still invisible until magnified into our range of vision by a powerful microscope: all of these ‘invisibles’ logically belong to the order of ‘things seen.’ Now turning about, let us try to think of super-galaxies (often mis-called “island universes”) beyond the range of the mightiest telescope, containing hosts

of stars great and small—unseen, but also logically belonging to the order of 'things seen.' Now we are prepared to study that which is predicated of visible things.

"THINGS WHICH ARE SEEN ARE TEMPORAL;"—by 'temporal' we understand to be meant that which begins and ends in time. At once two questions spring up unbidden: Did anything ever begin? If so, What caused it? Let us divest our minds of materialism by reasoning with the avowed materialists. Most materialists profess to believe in an endless regression of effect and cause, effect and cause—in a physical universe which had no beginning. No believer in God's Word can hold this; and no thinker can hold it except by the process of calling a halt to thought. Try it: think backward for as long as the mind can stand the strain, then say to yourself, "the visible universe, if not in form at least in substance, was then as it is now." Then ask yourself, "When did it begin?" The materialist, hearing your soliloquy, will interject, "Never!" Then ask him, "What caused it?" He will reply, "Nothing."

But there are various degrees of materialism. Some materialists go so far as to deny that there is a cause for every apparent thing; but not only does common sense indignantly reject such a negation, science implicitly joins in the rejection: science in every branch is incessantly striving to find causes for everything, strengthened for the quest by the fact of myriads of successes. The bacteriologist isolating filterable germs, magnifying and photographing them, comparing and analyzing them, discovers the cause of some hitherto baffling disease. The astronomer questioning the meaning of a formerly unnoticed faint line in the sun's spectrum discovers an unknown gas, deduces its atomic structure, names it after the sun "helium;" and years afterwards that gas is isolated from the gaseous stream flowing from a well, and lately the great dirigible "Akron"—of tragic memory—and its sister the "Macon" on its trial voyage were filled and levitated by that gas. Another sky-searcher notes the slight deflection of a planet from its orbit, deduces that the cause is an undiscovered planet, plots its position, estimates its size; and again years afterwards that planet is located on a photograph precisely at the point predicted. Practically all of us believe, and live out our earthly lives according to the belief, that for every 'effect' there is a 'cause.'

Now ask again the more rational materialist, "What caused the universe to begin?" He will reply, "It was uncaused, of course, for it always existed; and nothing can be called a cause of anything which did not precede that thing, and nothing could precede that which had no beginning." Then say to him, "This infinite universe, according to you, was not even self-caused, for it always existed; yet the law of causation is written on its every part: by that law the tides flow and ebb, the seasons come and go, sound-waves are transmitted around the globe with the speed of light and are reproduced from radio sets in every land. Because of this law of causation man plants and reaps, constructs his machinery, develops his marvellous sciences," Say to him, "Only the Thinker can produce thought and the power to think; only the First Cause can have originated and sustained the law of causation." Not only believers in the inspired Word of God but all people of intelligence ought long ago to have thrown the whole materialistic theory upon the scrap-heap of outgrown notions.

A variant of this theory needs only to be stated to be rejected: that an eternal and infinite First Cause and a co-eternal visible universe infinite in extent have subsisted from everlasting. Two infinities are impossible. A First Cause co-eternal with an uncaused universe means no cause, and the theory would land us back in materialism.

Even the thought of an aways subsisting infinite space—an unbounded void—which God had to occupy in part or leave empty is crude and indefensible. 'To fill or leave empty' would condition the Unconditioned. To be 'in' or 'out of' such never-beginning space would make relative the Absolute. Space is not a great emptiness independent of objects; it is the measure of distance between objects, or between non-consecutive points of the orbit of an object in motion. Time is the measure of motion, and began when objective movement began. 'Began' 'began': untutored thought conceives, advanced science confirms (Sir James Jeans and other astronomers estimate the age of the earth at two billion years), God's Word reveals that the visible universe began.

Turn we to the first words of the inspired Book: "In the beginning, God"—it will not do to stop there; if the sentence were limited to four words they would have to be 'Before the beginning, God;' if extended to five words, 'In the beginning, God was.' So St. John's Gospel opens: "In the beginning was the Word." Now let us consider the whole first of verses: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." By 'heaven and earth' we understand the visible universe. It began in time; or rather, time began with it. It began. Again and again is this taught in the Holy Scriptures: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made that was made." "By Him (God's dear Son) were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in the earth, visible and invisible, all things were created by Him and for Him: And He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." "Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone; Thou hast made the heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, with all things that are within, the seas, and all that is therein." "Thou, Lord, in the beginning has laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of Thine hands." St. John, St. Paul, St. Peter, all use the inspired phrase, "before the foundation of the world." To say that we believe these Scriptures is not enough; we must try to understand them:

HOW GOD CREATED THE VISIBLE, TEMPORAL UNIVERSE now becomes our study—a subject which has confronted Theists, including the disciples of the Lord Jesus, in every generation. It is impossible, so we have argued, to believe that things visible never had a beginning—were uncaused. Such a guess is both unthinkable and unbelievable; even a rational rationalist ought to reject it in order to save his reason from abdication or dethronement. But there are things unthinkable, because they are beyond our finite capacity, which are not unbelievable. They do not insult the intellect. When presented to our consciousness by God's Word we may travel along with them a little way by reason, then fare forward along the endless road by faith. To St. Paul was revealed such a thought: "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead"; that is, God's everlasting power and deity are exhibited by the visible universe, which He created. Long before, a similar conception was vouchsafed to David: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork"; that is, God's glory is manifested in His creation. How did God create? To the prophet Jeremiah was given the answer: "He hath made the earth by His power, He hath established the world by His wisdom, and by His understanding hath He stretched out the heavens"; that is, the creative process consists of the thoughts of God projected, made objective, by His will. Says Professor Sir Arthur S. Eddington—in "The Nature of the Physical world," page 276—"The

stuff of the world is mind-stuff. As is often the way with crude statements, I shall have to explain that by 'mind' I do not here exactly mean mind and by 'stuff' I do not at all mean stuff." This is not "stuff and nonsense;" it is the profound utterance of a great physicist and astronomer who, in writing a non-theological scientific treatise, proceeds with circumspection to announce a dynamic deduction. One may go on to interpret, also crudely, proceeding from one phase of the atomic theory,—that 'mass' and 'energy' are convertible terms, and that the energy of an atom is as to the proton positive, as to the electrons negative,—and announce the deduction that the whole visible universe is compounded of positive and negative charges of electricity—of nothing else. Electricity cannot be defined, but it may not be too bold to exclaim that these charges of electricity are the thoughts of God, projected and massed by His will!

While the miracle of the loaves and fishes is not an exact parallel of the creative work in the beginning (And we have already seen that the actual Agent in the creation was the Son), because in the miracle there were five loaves and two fishes with which to start, their expansion to two or three hundred times their volume was not inflation but creation. Every added crumb or flake was composed of thoughts of Christ Jesus, made objective by His will. The people ate to satiety; strength was restored; and a great bulk of fragments remained. The mass of food was massed energy—energy which proceeded from Him who in the beginning made all things: God's Son, "through whom also He made the worlds."

We have defined the temporal as that which begins and ends in time, and thus far have been looking back to the beginnings. Now—looking forward—if 'things which are seen are temporal,'

THE VISIBLE UNIVERSE WILL COME TO AN END! Astronomers tell us that the suns which we call stars are wasting away. The vast inter-stellar spaces are being shot through by inconceivable myriads of cosmic rays—each blazing star incessantly bombarding the universe in all directions, using for ammunition its own substance. Our own sun, not content with throwing off incandescent masses which, cooling became its planets, is radiating, we are told, four million tons of its mass every second. In the course of a few million (or billion) years, if this goes on, the present universe will have vanished. This is predicted by some eminent astronomers. On the other hand, that eminent American physicist, Professor Robert A. Millikan, holds that probably electrons, positrons, atoms, re-assemble in the vast areas of space and form the nuclei of new worlds, in process of becoming. Both may be right, as we shall see.

God's Holy Book tells us that the universe will end in time. Isaiah was first to prophesy this: "All the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll"; and, "The heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment." Our Saviour said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away." To St. Peter it was revealed that "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up." And St. John in vision beheld "the heaven . . . removed as a scroll when it is rolled up," and saw that "the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." All things now visible, having begun in time, will end in time—the present physical universe will vanish. He who called it into being can recall His thoughts, or re-group them at His will. He is still the Absolute.

THE SUCCEEDING VISIBLE UNIVERSE WILL NOT BE TEMPORAL: St. John in his vision "saw a new heaven and a new earth," and St. Peter testified, "According

to His promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." Isaiah wrote, "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered or come into mind," and added, "The new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, SHALL REMAIN BEFORE ME, saith the Lord." Amen!

B.—THINGS INVISIBLE ARE ETERNAL

'THINGS WHICH ARE NOT SEEN'—things invisible—now become our theme, and we begin with the Beginner. "The things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God." The Holy Spirit has instructed us that

I. GOD THE FATHER IS INVISIBLE.

To St. John He revealed that "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." St. Paul was inspired to write: "The Son of His love who is the image of the invisible God"; and again, "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of Lords; whom no man hath seen, nor can see." To the writer to the Hebrews was communicated: "He (Moses) endured, as seeing Him who is invisible."

Why God is invisible was taught to St. John: "God is Spirit," Spirit is formless, spaceless. God is formless, spaceless, timeless. There was no space until He projected His thoughts by the exercise of His will, and these energized thoughts—infinesimal particles of energy—made space as they made distance on the journey on which He dispatched them. There was no time until these energized thoughts, by their motion, made time as a measure of that motion.

God is not in space now. That which has no form, whether overwhelmingly great or inconceivably minute in size, can be nowhere in space. God is not, as to location, in the proton, or the electron, or the positron, or the neutron, or the atom, or the earth, or the sun, or the uncircumscribed universe. If David says, "The Lord is in His holy temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven," he also says, "His glory is above the earth and the heaven." If the Spirit moved Isaiah to write, "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool," the same Inspirer taught Solomon to pray, "Heaven, and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee." If our blessed Saviour taught us to pray, "Our Father, who art in heaven," His Spirit gave to St. John the vision: "I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away," 'Temple,' 'throne,' 'footstool,' 'sat,' 'face,' are all metaphors (as are elsewhere in the Bible mentions of God's eyes, or ears, or hands, or feathers, and wings)—helpful, necessary metaphors, depicting to our imaginations Him who is unpicturable, because formless, spaceless, invisible.

Here naive, untutored thought will cry out, "You are reducing God to nothingness!" Not so: save that charge to use against the Pantheist, whose god is a blind impersonal force. We are rather learning to think large thoughts of God—to grow up to the stature of St. Paul, whose concept of God was that of personal *allness*: "in Him we live, and move, and have our being," "of Him, and through Him, and unto Him, are all things."

True it is that we cannot conceive of formless, spaceless existence, but we can believe. True it is that the existence of placeless, timeless, invisible Spirit baffles the imagination, and stops the reason at the barrier of finite limitation. It is the ultimate mystery; nay, it is one of the inseparable trinity of final mysteries—the

other two being the Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, and the duality of natures in the unity of the Person of Christ Jesus. We accept all three 'unthinkables' by faith, because they are all explicitly taught in the Holy Scriptures, and because their alternatives are unbelievable. Theistic philosophy has long propounded and defended its thesis that the Infinite Spirit is the only reality—the only thing possessing self-existence—and that all which we commonly think of as real is only apparent—phenomenal; now science is rapidly coming into agreement. God, omnipresent in power, nowhere in space, can, of necessity, only be spiritually discerned, and so it ever shall be world without end.

(To be Continued in April Issue)

THE CHURCH'S STATUS TODAY

REV. EDWIN H. RIAN, M.A., TH.B.

A few years ago the resignation of the Rev. A. L. Feinberg, associate rabbi of the Temple Israel in New York City, created a sensation. His resignation was not significant, but the announcement that came with it shocked the congregation. In his farewell address he gave his reasons for leaving the priesthood. His accusations against the synagogue are not only applicable to Judaism but they reflect the opinions and prejudices of many thinking people against Christianity. Never perhaps was this young rabbi more persuasive and eloquent than when he stood before the people claiming to voice the spiritual travail of modern youth.

Two failures of the modern Church find expression in this young rabbi's accusations; the Church's loss of authority and the lack of spiritual life. He says that in former times the church, cathedral, and synagogue were the centers of the community. Here the people gathered in sorrow and in joy. The minister molded the opinion of the people and the Church was the supreme source of idealism. "What now!", he asks. Huge buildings, fine architecture but like the tomb of Tutankhamen loaded with riches and bereft of life. He states that the education of the children is far more effected by the movies than by the Church. A seat in the stock exchange is worth much more to the vast majority than a portion in paradise. The collapse in security value gave voice to more heartfelt prayer than the liturgy. The Church has lost its authority and leadership.

I

As far as this indictment goes it is true. We would certainly be blind to the facts if we did not see the pitiful condition of the Church as it vacillates to please the world. With the shifting of the Christian Church from one position to another has come the contempt and ridicule of world opinion.

Russia today, with its official condemnation of religion and Christianity, stands out as the epitomization of that utter disregard for the claims of Christianity. William C. White in his book, *Three Russians*, gives the attitude of many young Russians toward the Church. He quotes one young man as saying, "A generation without religion will be happier and healthier. A generation without a parasite like the Church to support will be wealthier and freer from the superstition that is Christianity." A verse from one of the Russian revolution-

ary songs read, "No other one shall free us, neither God nor Tsar. We gain our independence by the work of our own hands."

On the other hand, Germany is not trying to eliminate religion and the Christian Church as in Russia, nor compartmentalize it as in Italy, but it is attempting to prostitute Christianity in its organization and theology. The Nazis want to de-Judaize and humanize Christianity and the Bible. They actually allege that Jesus was an Aryan. Christianity must fit the German "Kultur." Alfred Rosenberg, the cultural Director and official party philosopher, has written a book entitled, *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*. He states, "The Christian Churches are a prodigious conscious and unconscious falsification; a product of the Jewish-Syrian apostolic efforts. . . . The prerequisite of all German education is the acknowledgement that it is not Christendom which has brought us civilization but that Christianity owes its lasting value to the German character." Here it is not National Socialism which is on trial but the Bible and the Church. National Socialism, in other words, embodies the totality of God.

They have not only humanized Christianity but now the Nazis are about to control the Church's organization. A movement is on foot to commit all Church officials in an oath to Hitler. No greater prostitution of religion could be imagined.

But we are thrilled to read the statement by the Provisional Synod of Westphalia. Listen to its ringing adherence to the truth. "The Gospel itself imposes a divine opposition to a sinful world. If the state desires to remove that opposition it removes the Gospel. The Gospel will not suffer itself to be removed. The Church has to announce the whole of the Gospel and we shall not depart from it even if hell and heaven be destroyed."

We thank God for this faithful remnant in Germany but we see too well the heavy hand of the state as it strikes blows at the heart of the gospel and attempts to dethrone God as the only Head of the Church.

In Italy we are witnessing the strong phenomenon of the Church being shunted off to a state of its own. The Roman Catholic Church has been granted a separate territory. The Pope has an earthly kingdom of his own. Evidently Mussolini has made the Pope to understand that as long as he tends strictly to the business of religion everything will be all right. It is as though one attempted to separate his mind into logic tight compartments which have no relationship one to the other.

America is somewhat different in its attitude toward the Church. Here the people have acquired an indifference, a contempt than which there is no greater. In 1929 when the financial panic began, it was loudly prophesied that material adversity would lead to spiritual revival. After six years the revival has not come, nor is there much evidence that it is on the way. Stocks and bonds have disappeared but the people have not crowded the churches to find God. Men have not repented of their wicked ways. The six lean years have not compelled men to seek spiritual riches. Men still look on the material as though it were the eternal.

Instead of realizing that the wild twenties emphasized too much the things that are seen and so brought on the depression, people in this country are blaming bad economics entirely. The Christian Churches are empty even though rich. God is not there! A pope in the Middle Ages said to Duns Scotus the theologian as he allowed the coins to slip through his gold-ringed fingers, "No

longer can the Church say 'Gold have I none.' " And Duns Scotus replied, "Yes and no longer can the Church say, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee.' "

We have come to another such period in Church history. As we look about we find that the Christian Church is faced with a contempt which is not tolerant. The opposition is aggressive, determined and relentless in its endeavor to destroy the Church. Can the visible Church withstand that onslaught?

II

What of the Christian Church today? What is its condition? Are its critics right?

At least two characteristics distinguish the Church of today from the Church of yesterday. It has a changed ministry and a changed message.

The world's cry to the Christian minister is, "Adjust yourself to the twentieth century!" And adjust himself the minister has done. When we speak of the ministry we are thinking of it as whole for surely there are groups here and there to which this cannot apply.

Ministers have adjusted their theology in two ways. Some have attempted to avoid the hard path of intellectual struggle and have escaped to the haven of mysticism. Others have frankly thrown overboard the doctrines of historic Christianity and have adopted modern science as their high priest.

Mysticism today is not obviously that as it was in the middle ages, it has taken on the subtler form of experience. But it is false mysticism just the same. The most prevalent one is so-called, "Buchmanism," "The First Century Fellowship," or "The Oxford Movement." The main emphasis in this ism is experience. What you believe is not important. Men must have a "changed life." And when they do undergo this change they are sent forth to win others. Sin and salvation through the vicarious death of Christ are not stressed. The objective truths of the gospel receive scant attention. The struggle to maintain intellectual honesty does not occur because the doctrines of Christianity as opposed to modern unbelief are never really approached and studied. Experience of a certain relief and inner co-ordination along with immediate communion with God apart from the Bible characterize this form of mysticism. It is the old fallacy of the experience of religion regardless of creed. This is not Christianity.

On the other hand, the vast majority of Protestant clergymen have pursued the other course of accepting the theories of Baur, Bousset, Schleiermacher and others concerning the Bible as most agreeable to the findings of modern science. No proof texts are necessary to show how prevalent this is. Attend the average church, read most any church paper or listen to the Federal Council of Churches broadcast on Sundays and you will hear and read German liberalism in its Americanized form. You will hear and read stark unbelief parading as Christianity. This is only another way of saying, "I am modern!" "I have adjusted myself!" As a friend of mine remarked to me five years ago, "You maybe right in your theology, but I want to be up-to-date in my Christianity." Incidentally, today he is a radio announcer and has left the ministry.

The minister of today is not a prophet with a burning message from the Word of God. He does not speak with the assurance and finality of, "Thus saith the Lord!" He has adjusted himself to the twentieth century and has forgotten the truth.

In the second place, the Church of today has a changed message. The *focus* of that message is not the individual but society. The relationships between members of the family, labor, and capital and one nation to another are the all

important concern. A well-known Presbyterian believer in the social gospel, Dr. Ray Freeman Jenney, emphasizes this fact when he states in his book, *Speaking Boldly*, "the more forward-looking sections of the various denominations have gradually shifted their emphasis from a strictly 'spiritual' to a more realistic interpretation of religion in terms of basic human needs."

Even the Roman Catholic Church is becoming very politically and socially minded. Father Coughlin, the radio priest, is the best illustration of this swing to the left. And we can feel certain that if Father Coughlin was broadcasting doctrines and emphasis contrary to the Pope's dictates, he would be silenced immediately.

The modern Church feels that the individual is too insignificant, it is society as a whole which needs attention. The Christian Century magazine is perhaps the finest promoter of this gospel. It would be possible, I believe, to read every issue of that religious journal for a year and not find a single article on individual salvation. The theory behind this philosophy seems to be, "We are sure of this world so let's make the most of it!"

In contrast to this consider the words of Our Lord about the individual. "What does it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul!" "But the very hairs of your head are all numbered." Jesus Christ dealt with individuals not society. He made no attempt to reform society. It was never society first and then the individual, but personal salvation first and then social redemption.

The modern Church's message is not only social in focus but also in *content*. The common virtues of morality which are found in many religions are the plea. A perusal of Modernism's latest religious quarterly, *Christendom*, will convince anyone that the content of the gospel for the Church according to Modernism should be ethical and social. To a large extent the present Church has heeded that demand.

The book, *Re-Thinking Missions*, has rendered great service not only in attracting attention to foreign missions but in revealing the true state of the Christian Church today. According to this book missionaries are not to go out possessed with the idea of a spiritually lost people who can be saved by a supernatural Christ, but rather to unite with Mohammedanism, Hinduism, and Buddhism to fight the common foes of materialism, secularism and naturalism. The message for the world is ethical and social and not salvation from sin. For decades this process of disintegration has continued, first in undermining the authenticity and veracity of Christianity's source book, the Bible, and then in changing the message from one of faith in Christ only to a way of life. But it required such a popular book as *Re-Thinking Missions* to awaken Church people.

In contrast to this we read the messages of Peter, John, and Paul in the *New Testament*. Here we find that these apostles believed that individuals are lost and undone, separated from God by sin, and need individual redemption through the death and resurrection of Christ.

What after all has made Christianity the greatest missionary religion in the world? Simply the idea that men outside of Christ are lost. This is the conviction which gripped Paul and fired all the apostles. It alone produced the great spiritual awakenings under Jonathan Edwards and Wesley, and it alone will give the Church today the power to change, purify and make men sons of God. Let us not be deceived, the Christianity which some would preach today is not the Christianity which Christ made possible but an emasculation of the gospel made over to suit the pride of man

Thirdly the message of the modern Church is not *theocentric* but man-centered. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, the leading Modernist preacher today, has admitted that fact in one of his recent sermons.

When we listen to the preaching in many places today with no uncertain sound comes the note of glory in men. Once the creed which begins, "I believe in God" was the only doctrine of the Church. But the increasing motto of modernity is, "I believe in man." It has become a commonplace to enumerate the achievements of man especially in the realm of science. Skepticism about the impossible seems to be waning. Many have implicit faith in the powers of man to solve every problem and to fathom every mystery provided that sufficient time is allowed. Years ago the Psalmist inquired, "What is man?" Modernity's answer is, "He is great!"

The spirit of self-confidence and human sufficiency has found its epitome in a new religion called "Humanism." Francis Potter of New York City, along with some Unitarians have disclaimed all belief in and help from a personal God. They stand squarely on the foundation of man's sufficiency and divinity.

During the French Revolution men planned and staged a service in the worship of the goddess "Reason." Today that bravado has taken on a larger aspect by a worship of man himself. Such outbursts of unbelief as "Humanism" could not have come unless there had been a preparation and a process which had paved the way.

Walter Lippmann's, *Preface to Morals* and Joseph Wood Krutch's *The Modern Temper* are examples of the modern man's utter abandonment of a supernatural religion and the frank acceptance of a solution of the universe's mystery at the hands of man. Both of these authors admit that man has failed as yet, but they opine that the case rests with man and not in any supernatural power outside of humanity. This philosophy is the logical conclusion to modernist preaching today.

In contrast to this, we view the wonders of God's creation. We look at ourselves in the mirror of God's law revealed in the Bible. Then our weakness becomes manifest. Our insufficiency looms large. Our sin becomes exceedingly sinful. And we cry unto the Lord, "O wretched man that I am who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

III

This is a strong indictment of the visible Church today and a pessimistic one. But I cannot end on that note. The Christian Church was founded by God. It has the loftiest mission on earth, to bring men to know God as their heavenly father. That mission must be fulfilled.

The unrest, anxiety, and doubt which exist in the world and in the minds of men present the Church's greatest opportunity. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel" were the words of Christ. And with these words Our Lord gave the Church its divine commission

To carry out that commission the Church must give a message of authority and certainty. When a minister ascends the pulpit or stands behind the sacred desk, he must speak with the assurance and finality of, "Thus saith the Lord!" There can be no apology, no surmise or no mere opinion, it must be with the positive persuasion that his message is from God. Men of the world are not interested in hearing doubts, they want and need to hear convictions born of God. Strike the note of certainty because it is soundeth forth from the anvil of the Word of God.

Paul, the apostle, is almost the supreme example of a preacher who had the abiding belief that his message came from God. His gospel was always the same. When he visited the wicked city of Corinth, or stood on Mars Hill or faced the leaders of the Christian Church at the Council in Jerusalem, he spoke with the same authority because he knew that his gospel was divine. Wherever Paul preached, those who listened knew that Paul was sure that he spoke no fine spun theories or philosophy but the simple, certain gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The same is true for this generation. Let the people of this day be convinced once more that the minister of the gospel is a "true son of thunder" and a man of God. Let the herald of the gospel say, "which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."

The minister must not only speak with authority but his message must be one of judgment and salvation from sin. When we turn to the Old Testament, we read the messages of the prophets to the wayward nation of Israel. Jeremiah cried, "Return thou backsliding Israel, saith the Lord, . . . Only acknowledge thine iniquity that thou hast transgressed against the Lord thy God."

That call can be sounded today. We are in the midst of a perverse generation and an apostate Church. Let the people know that as surely as judgment came upon the nation of Israel, so God shall visit His wrath upon a wicked and sinful people today who heed not His call. Let men know that when they forget God, destruction is upon them. Let the minister of the gospel declare the awfulness of sin and man's righteousness as filthy rags.

But with judgment must come the mercy of the Lord and the love of God through Jesus Christ. There is a way of escape. John was a true disciple, he not only cried, "Repent ye!" but he pointed to Jesus Christ, "Behold the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

Even as the prophets of old cried unto the House of Israel to return unto the Lord God, so we can pray that God will lead His people back to the cross of Calvary and there find forgiveness. We can pray and work for the return of the Christian Church to a true faith in God. But if that be not His will, may He lead us out into a true, living Church where His name is above every name.

A NEW CONTRIBUTOR

REV. R. LAIRD HARRIS, B.S.—a minister well trained in the sciences—will contribute regularly book reviews on evangelical books of a scientific character. Mr. Harris is a member of Tau Beta Pi and an associate member of Sigma XI. Mr. Harris is now acting Librarian at Westminster Seminary.

WANTED—NAMES OF CHRISTIAN STUDENTS IN SOUTHERN COLLEGES

In the Spring the Field Secretary of the League will be making an extensive tour of the Southern Colleges. It is important that he have the names of strong Christian students attending Colleges in the South. Please send the names to Headquarters. Thank you.

YOUR FATHER WHO IS IN HEAVEN—A SCRIPTURAL MEDITATION

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

Our Lord taught His disciples to recognize and address God as Heavenly Father. He Himself also speaks of God the Father as His own Father. A very important distinction is to be observed, however, between the Fatherhood of God as it respects the disciples and the Fatherhood of God the Father as it respects Jesus Himself. "In this manner therefore pray we, Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name." (Matt. 6:9). Jesus does not include Himself in that first person plural pronoun; He does not pray with His disciples and address God as common Father. It would even be blasphemous to think that He did. There is at least one petition in that prayer it would be impossible for Jesus to offer. He had no sins that needed to be forgiven.

The distinction is vital. The relation in both cases is that of Fatherhood and sonship but the distinction as to character must be jealously guarded. Jesus as the Son of God sustains to God the Father a unique and exclusive relation as the only begotten Son. There is a divine and eternal Fatherhood that is the distinguishing and exclusive property of God the Father and a divine and eternal Sonship that is the distinguishing and exclusive property of God the Son. In this intradivine sphere it is the first person of the Trinity above who is Father and the second person alone who is Son.

There is much here that transcends our understanding. It is high and one cannot comprehend it. But our reception of it with believing apprehension and adoration belongs to the essence of our faith in the one living and true God.

This Fatherhood of the Father in relation to the Son is unique and exclusive. But it is not the only kind of Fatherhood. Jesus does teach his disciples to say, "Our Father who art in heaven."

There are many who regard this relation as embracing all men. They find the essence of Jesus' teaching to be the gospel of the universal Fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man.

It must be allowed indeed that there is a sense in which men as men may be called the sons of God. Paul quotes with manifest approval the pagan poets who said "We are also His offspring" and draws from the truth of this saying the inference, "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art and man's device." (Acts 17:29). There is a sense in which by virtue of creation in the divine image all men may be reckoned sons of God.

But when our Lord tells His disciples to pray to God as Father, it should be very apparent that it is not in this general indiscriminate sense that He meant it. For when we examine the New Testament we find that the Fatherhood of God that is all but universally taught is a very restricted and particularistic one. It is the Fatherhood God sustains not to all, but to those who have been redeemed, regenerated, and adopted. To be very specific it is the result of an adopting act of God. But a relation that is native and natural does not require a specific act of adoption to constitute it.

The Apostle John gives expression to all the elements of this doctrine when he says in his gospel, "But as many as received Him to them gave He authority to become sons of God, to those who believe on his name, who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man but of God." (John 1:12, 13).

In this pregnant statement sonship is represented as something that comes to be; it is not taken for granted as something that naturally exists. It comes to be with reference to a particular class, the class described as those who believe on Jesus' name and who are the subjects of a supernatural birth—"born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man but of God. Sonship then has as its presupposition regeneration and faith, and it is constituted by the bestowment of a certain right; authority to become sons of God.

This line of teaching in John is exactly parallel to that of Paul. He says, "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba Father." (Gal. 4:4-6). The adoption of sons is something received; it is not something that inevitably issues from our natural relation to God. The adoption is mediated through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; it is something that required the redemptive work of Christ in order to its realization. And finally it is a privilege that has always concomitant with it the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and a disposition in us of filial love and fear. All of these considerations combine to show that the Fatherhood spoken of is not a natural, all-embracing, Fatherhood.

Though not universal it is, nevertheless, real and precious. Its preciousness consists in the fact that it is the very acme of privilege. Those who believe in Jesus' name know God not simply as Regenerator, or Justifier, or King, but also as Father with all the intimacy and security that such a relation imparts.

(To be Continued)

WHAT TIME DO WE GIVE TO THE BIBLE?

"As we drift along the swift, relentless current of time toward the end of life; as days and weeks and months and years follow each other in breathless haste, and we reflect now and then for a moment that, at any rate for us, much of this earthly career has passed irrevocably; what are the interests, thoughts, aye, the books, which really command our attention? What do we read and leave unread? WHAT TIME DO WE GIVE TO THE BIBLE? No other book, let us be sure of it, can equally avail to prepare us for that which lies before us; for the unknown anxieties and sorrows which are sooner or later the portion of most men and women; for the gradual approach of death; for the period, be it long or short, of waiting and preparations for the throne and the face of the Eternal Judge. Looking back from that world, how shall we desire to have made the most of our best guide to it! How shall we grudge the hours we have wasted on any—be they thoughts or books or teachers—which belong only to the things of time!"—(Canon Liddon.)

RADIO BROADCAST FOR STUDENTS

Each Sunday afternoon from 4:00 to 4:30 one of the Trustees of the League of Evangelical Students—Dr. J. Gresham Machen—broadcasts doctrinal messages over station WIP in Philadelphia. League students in the East will surely want to tune in on this splendid series of broadcasts on "The Christian Faith in the Modern World."

CURRENT EVANGELICAL BOOKS—REVIEWED

THE NEW GEOLOGY

George McReady Price. Pacific Press Publishing Association, Mountain View, California. 1923. Pp. 726. \$3.50.

A scientific theory is good only when it explains all the facts. One stubborn fact which the theory cannot explain will finally disprove the theory. The old phlogiston theory of combustion failed at last because it only explained some of the facts. Professor Price gives not one, but many well-certified facts which the old theory of geology cannot explain without assuming the gigantic catastrophe which it desires to avoid.

The old geology is summed up by Price as teaching that although sedimentary rocks are never found in more than a comparatively few strata in any place yet, the theory goes, they can be distinguished wherever they appear, each stratum being characteristic of an age in which it was deposited. These strata can then be assembled in proper order on a schematic diagram which thus pictures geological history. Now the age of strata, all admit, cannot be determined by their hardness or appearance, but only by the fossils they contain. "If lithologic texture and stratigraphic position disagree with the fossil evidence so much the worse for the texture of the rock and its apparent position" (p. 17). The basic assumptions are (1) that these strata were laid down slowly through many years and (2) that each successive period was characterized by life at different stages of evolution and therefore each stratum can be recognized by the life forms it exhibits.

But there are many facts to contradict the current theory. That the strata were slowly laid down is disproved (1) by many examples of tree trunks found extending clear through several layers of coal and intervening sediment (p. 462) and (2) by the universal testimony of the fossils to violent death and immediate burial. No fossils are being made now because the remains decay and are scattered before burial. But great shoals of fossil fish are found in Scotland "all buried alive" or at least very soon after death (p. 419). Likewise in Siberia thousands of fossil mammoths were so quickly interred and rapidly frozen that "a party of scientists even had a meal off this ancient meat" (p. 581).

The old geology, Price shows, leads to other contradictions too numerous to mention. It does not explain the former "non-zonal" climate (p. 450) and the tropical climate which existed even at the poles (p. 485). It posits glaciers such as the laws of physics call impossible (p. 163). And it declares that all the great mountain chains were formed without catastrophe and in fact since man appeared on the earth (p. 658)!

Much more could be said; the book is quite readable, well illustrated, and the statements made in it are carefully documented. But of course to the Christian student the most gratifying feature is the conclusive argument that there was a great flood which destroyed all in its path, at which the climate was changed, and which heaped up and eroded the mountains leaving all to harden into the deposits we find today.

R. LAIRD HARRIS.

THE CERTAINTIES OF THE GOSPEL

By William Childs Robinson, Th.D., M.A., D.D., Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1935. \$1.00.

Few books have been more timely than this one. The note of certainty has become a lost Chord in current Protestantism. Faith has come to be characterized simply as "a venture," "a betting one's life that there is a God."

What has caused this loss of certainty? The author of this book has rightly discerned that the cause of this loss of certainty is the progressive transference of the Gospel emphasis from God to man. It is the firm conviction of the author that this lost chord of certainty can be restored to Protestantism only by a new recognition of God's relationship to the Gospel and the Gospel way of salvation. Man is ephemeral, ever changing, transient, unreliable. God is eternal, changeless, true, and certain. There must be a return to God before certainty can be regained. Divine authority must supplant human authority.

The burden of the book is to present six stepping stones which the Apostle Paul has placed for us in the Scriptures. These stepping stones mark the way Protestantism must travel if she is to recover her lost sense of certainty. The six stones to certainty comprise six of the seven chapters of the book. Chapter I—"The Certainty That God Is the Author of the Gospel" based upon Galatians 1:11, 12 and I Thess. 2:13. Chapter II—"The Certainty of Jesus Christ the Substance of the Gospel" as derived from Galatians 1:16 and II Timothy 1:12. Chapter III—"The Certainty of the ABC's of the Gospel" by which is meant the death and resurrection of Christ for our salvation. Chapter IV—"The Certainty of Grace, the Fundamental Characteristic of the Gospel," Acts 20:24. Chapter V—"The Certainty of Justification by Faith, the Gospel Way of Salvation," Galatians 2:14-17. Chapter VI—"The Certainty of God's Love and Care," Romans 8:28, 38-9. The concluding Chapter ends in a glorious outburst of conviction and eloquence on "For the Gospel and Unashamed."

These Chapters—although presenting deep and rich thoughts—read like sermons preached from the pulpit with a fiery eloquence. The author's style and selection of words moves the reader along with most refreshing and invigorating delight. The deep conviction and unbounded fervor of the author moves the heart of the Christian greatly.

CALVIN K. CUMMINGS.

* * * * *

STUDY YOUR BIBLE¹

By Edward J. Young, William Erdman Publishing Co. Grand Rapids, Michigan. Price \$.75.

"There is no need for me to say anything about the qualifications of Mr. Young. That the work is written in a scholarly and able manner must be apparent to any one who looks into it.

"Any individual or any group of individuals studying the Bible with the help of Mr. Young's work will naturally become convinced of the absolute truth of the Word of God. Underlying and permeating the book is the Reformed conception of Apologetics, which holds that we can without fear even in our day hold to an

¹ Acknowledgment is due to the "Forword" of this book for the total substance of the review herewith set forth.

absolute God, an absolute Christ, and an absolute Bible. There is no compromise or crouching fear. With full acquaintance with the work of negative criticism and modern philosophy, Mr. Young holds that unless we may take the Bible as true, human life is meaningless. Surely young people of Christian homes need the help of such a study.

"With a true conception of Apologetics goes a true conception of history, especially of sacred history. The truth of the creation story is maintained in opposition to the dogma of evolution. The fall of man not merely as "psychologically true," but as an historical event, is shown to be at the root of all the sin in this world. The far-reaching significance of the doctrine of total depravity as well as its Scriptural foundation is made clear.

"I wish I could give something like an adequate expression to the conception of sacred history that the book of Mr. Young leaves with us. It is, in short, the Reformed conception. Out of the race of sinful men the sovereign God forms for Himself a people. He speaks to them as to no other nation; the revelation to Israel is unique. The similarity of form of this revelation to other "revelations" does not detract from its uniqueness. Nowhere but in Scripture does an absolute God speak. Nowhere but in Scripture is redemption by pure grace alone. Nowhere but in Scripture is there a program of the destruction of all sin in evil. Nowhere but in Scripture is there the picture of absolute victory at last.

"Thus sacred history becomes terrible and beautiful. It grips one in the inmost depths of his existence. There is no epic so sweeping, no drama so dramatic as the story of sacred history when told after the Reformed conception of it as has been done by Mr. Young.

"Naturally Mr. Young does not tell the whole story. His books covers Genesis only. But the story of sacred history has its beginning in Genesis. To tell the story of Genesis well is to help us on the right track. In American history the revolutionary period is of basic importance. In sacred history the period of Genesis is of basic importance.

"The principle of God's sovereign grace is the constitutional principle of the people of God. Mr. Young has brought this out in admirable fashion. He helps us to read our Bibles aright. We see one people of God, with one constitution, governed by one King, namely Jesus Christ.

"There is careful attention to detail but never at the expense of insight into plan of the whole story. The division of the book into convenient lessons, with suggestions for further study in the Bible and the Catechism, with references to the best literature on each topic under discussion, make the book eminently useful for class-work as well as for private study.

"If Sunday School teachers and other teachers of the Bible would master the method of Bible study and the principle of sacred history as these appear in the short book of Mr. Young, I am persuaded that they would be better fitted to study and teach the Bible than they would be if they should read hundreds of pages of the ordinary material now available to them.

CORNELIUS VAN TIL, PH.D."

Errata

There was reference in the October issue to the *thirteenth* Convention of the Student Volunteers. It should have been the *twelfth* Convention.

NEWS OF THE LEAGUE

FIVE NEW CHAPTERS SEEK LEAGUE MEMBERSHIP. Since the October issue of *The Evangelical Student*, five new Chapters have sought membership in the League making the total of new Chapters for the present academic year seven. The five Chapters are: Allegheny College, Pennsylvania; Hastings College, Nebraska; Oberlin College, Ohio; University of Tennessee, and Puget Sound College, Washington State. The faculty at Oberlin College has given official recognition to the League group there after considerable delay. It is hoped that the other new Chapters will also soon seek the official recognition of their respective college faculties. Official recognition frequently enhances the prestige and permanency of the League's testimony.

* * * * *

EASTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE MARVELOUSLY BLESSED. On Thanksgiving week end while many students were vacationing, the Eastern Region of the League sponsored a most successful Regional Conference in Philadelphia. Eighteen colleges and seminaries were represented and the attendance increased to such an extent that it was necessary to bring extra chairs for the aisles. The institutions represented were: Reformed Presbyterian Seminary, (Pittsburgh), Eastern Baptist Seminary, Lafayette College, Princeton University, Westminster Seminary, Temple University, University of Pennsylvania, Haverford College, Beaver College, Wilson College, University of Delaware, Bucknell University, Women's Medical College, Westminster College, Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Bible Institute of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia School of the Bible. The quality of messages was of more than usual quality. Some of the speakers were: Ralph Duncan, Ph.D., Professor of Physics, University of Pennsylvania. Everett Griffiths, B.S., Th.M., Professor of Theology, Eastern Baptist Seminary. Gordon H. Clark, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, University of Pennsylvania. Barnard C. Taylor, M.A., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Interpretation, Eastern Baptist Seminary. Rev. Edwin H. Rian, Field Secretary of Westminster Seminary. Dr. Jonathan Goforth, Missionary in China since 1888; Survivors of the Boxer Rebellion. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D. R. B. Kuiper, A.M., B.D., President of the Board of Trustees of the League of Evangelical Students; Professor of Practical Theology, Westminster Seminary.

* * * * *

FIELD SECRETARY MAKES EXTENSIVE TOUR OF MID-WESTERN COLLEGES. During the months of October and November the Field Secretary of the League visited 49 colleges, covered 5,000 miles and at the very nominal cost of only sixty-two dollars. Colleges as far West as Nebraska were reached. The trip as a whole was more profitable than the one taken over an adjacent territory last year. The reason for this was in the fact that the Field Secretary had more and better contacts this year than he did last year. In fact the Secretary had the names of more Christian college students than he had the funds to visit them. Already new Chapters have applied for membership in the League as a result of God's blessing on this trip. A goodly number of League Chapters were visited with appreciable profit. Headquarters has sufficient contacts to keep a missionary on the field during the entire academic year. Let us trust and pray that funds for the employment of a man who can spend all of his time working among the college students may be supplied.

NEW ENGLAND REGION SPONSORS REGIONAL CONFERENCE. On Monday, November 11th, Eastern Nazarene College sponsored a Regional Conference for the New England States—the first attempt for Eastern Nazarene College. The speakers were Dr. H. F. Reynolds, Eastern Nazarene College; Rev. John H. Skilton, Presbyterian Church of Portland; Dr. Raphael Thomas, missionary from the Phillipines; Professor Weyer of Harvard, and Miss Celia H. Mooshian of Eastern Nazarene College. This is a real step for the New England Region. May God send great hosts to the New England Regional in years to come. The New England States are probably in greater need of the League's testimony than any other region in which the League labors. Eastern Nazarene College has a Chapter of 130 members.

* * * * *

EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE HOLDS REGIONAL CONFERENCE. From Dallas, Texas, comes the good news that on December 16-17 the Second Regional Conference of the South-Western Section was held. Fifteen visiting delegates were present from four colleges. Speakers at the Conference were: Professor E. F. Harrison, Mr. James M. DeFriend (Vice-President of National Organization), Dr. Herbert Mackenzie (Trustee of the League), Pastor Manford Gutz, Mr. Norton Sterrett, and Mr. William Walker. Professor Harrison as a member of the League in the days of its inception at Princeton Seminary was well qualified to speak on the origin and purposes of the League and how to accomplish the League's purposes. Mr. Gutz and Dr. Mackenzie gave the concluding messages of the Conference. The delegates were definitely strengthened through this Regional Conference. God richly blessed.

* * * * *

QUEENS-CHICORA LEAGUE CHAPTER PLANS REGIONAL CONFERENCE. "I am glad to report that the League Chapter of Queens Chicora College is planning for a regional conference to be held at the college sometime in the early spring. We plan to invite delegates from colleges from Virginia to Georgia, and wish that all League members everywhere would pray that this conference will be instrumental in establishing chapters of the League on college and university campuses where they are most needed. Miss Frances Y. Query, President."

* * * * *

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE CHAPTER PLANS BIBLE CONFERENCE. "On October 17 the University of Tennessee Chapter was organized. We started with five members and later added another. Dr. McWhorter, Professor of Classics, is our faculty adviser.

We are planning a student Bible conference for the spring with Charles Woodbridge as our speaker. We hope the other chapters will remember in prayer this undertaking of the 'baby' chapter."

* * * * *

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY CHAPTER RECEIVES OFFICIAL RECOGNITION. "The group at Temple University is in its third year and is composed of twenty members at present. We have now received official recognition and are trying to give a definite testimony on this unfriendly campus. At our regular meetings the members take turns in leading the discussion. Among our speakers at open meetings have been Prof. R. B. Kuiper and Dr. J. Gresham Machen. We request your prayers for the work in this institution."

The League of Evangelical Students

HEADQUARTERS

Philadelphia — Pennsylvania

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

The League of Evangelical Students of China—Affiliated.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President, JACOB DEVRIES, Westminster Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Vice-President, JAMES M. DEFRIEND, Evangelical Theological College
Dallas, Texas

Secretary, E. LLOYD REES, Lafayette College
Easton, Pennsylvania

Secretary for Alumni, JOSEPH R. WOODY, Hampden-Sydney College
Hampden-Sydney, Virginia

C. HELEN MOOSHIAN, Eastern Nazarene College
Wollaston, Massachusetts

Field Secretary, CALVIN KNOX CUMMINGS

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. H. LINTON, B.A., LL.B.,
Washington, D. C.

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

HERBERT MACKENZIE, D.D.
Cleveland, Ohio.

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

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D.
Haddonfield, New Jersey.

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

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

MARJORIE ERDMAN
Wooster, Ohio.

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

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

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

Printed in the United States of America.

CHAPTER DIRECTORY of the LEAGUE of EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

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

Affiliated—The League of Evangelical Students of China—Twenty Chapters.