

The Presbyterian Guardian

October 24, 1936

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2

One Dollar a Year

J. GRESHAM MACHEN *Editors*
NED B. STONEHOUSE

Published semi-monthly by
THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
1212 Commonwealth Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

THOMAS R. BIRCH,
Managing Editor

PREMILLENNIALISM

THE Premillennial view of the return of Christ is that our Lord will return before a thousand-year period held to be mentioned in the Book of Revelation, that during that period He will reign upon this earth, and that after that period will come the final judgment.

Many Christian people, believing in the full truthfulness of the Bible, hold that Premillennial view.

Other Christian people, believing with equal firmness in the full truthfulness of the Bible, reject the Premillennial view and hold that our Lord's return will be followed immediately by the last judgment.

Both these groups of Christian people accept with equal clearness and firmness the great doctrine of the personal and bodily return of Christ and reject with equal abhorrence the Modernist "spiritualizing" or explaining away of that doctrine.

Both these groups of Christian people are represented in the ministry and eldership of The Presbyterian Church of America. Have they both a right to be so represented?

The answer to that question can be found only in the doctrinal declaration made by those who took part in our first General Assembly and prescribed for all those who may subsequently become ministers or elders or deacons.

The first clause in the declaration declares that "the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice." There is obviously no difficulty about that. That clause obviously can be subscribed to both by Premillennialists and by those who are opposed to the Premillennial view.

The second clause declares that "the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms contain the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." Can both Premillennialists and those who are opposed to the Premillennial view subscribe to that second clause?

We think the question should be answered in the affirmative. We think that both Premillennialists and those who are opposed to the Premillennial view may subscribe to that clause.

It is true, the Westminster Confession of Faith and

Catechisms teach not the Premillennial view but a view that is opposed to the Premillennial view. That is particularly plain in the Larger Catechism (Q. 87 and 88).

But subscription to the Westminster Standards in The Presbyterian Church of America is not to every word in those Standards, but only to the *system* of doctrine which the Standards contain.

The real question, then, is whether a person who holds the Premillennial view can hold that system. Can a person who holds the Premillennial view be a true Calvinist; can he, in other words, hold truly to the Calvinistic or Reformed system of doctrine which is set forth in the Westminster Standards? We think that he can; and for that reason we think that Premillennialists as well as those who hold the opposing view may become ministers or elders or deacons in The Presbyterian Church of America.

We think that a man who holds that the return of Christ and the final judgment take place not in one act, as the Westminster Standards contemplate them as doing, but in two acts with a thousand-year reign of Christ upon the earth in between, yet may honestly say that he holds the system of doctrine that the Standards contain.

It is no new thing to take this position regarding creed-subscription. It is the position which has long been taken by orthodox Calvinistic theologians. I think any fears which Premillennialists in The Presbyterian Church of America may have lest their view may suddenly be regarded by anyone in the Church as a heresy unfitting them for ordination are quite groundless.

Of course, that does not mean that a man may subscribe to our ordination pledge no matter how many errors he holds, provided only he is a Premillennialist. Undoubtedly there are many errors held by many Premillennialists, as also there are many errors held by many who are not Premillennialists, which ought to prevent a man from being received into the ministry or eldership of The Presbyterian Church of America. But the point is that such persons are to be excluded from the ministry or eldership not because they are Premillennialists, but for other reasons.

FOR unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake."

For the sake of loyalty to the Son of God and the gospel of His grace men are suffering today.

Please read the following words carefully.

A Critical Situation

On October 8th, the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension of The Presbyterian Church of America met and took stock of its assets and needs.

This is the state of affairs.

The Committee is assisting more than a score of ministers financially. It is expending about \$2,000 per month in this worthy cause.

Its bank balance is about \$800.

A Worthy Cause

We have called this "a worthy cause." Why? An example or two will show what we mean.

Here was a young minister laboring in the state of X. He had been receiving \$400 per year, in addition to what his struggling congregations could give him, from the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

A tidal wave of "blind allegiance to the boards and agencies of the denomination" swept across the church.

This young minister, along with many others, felt that the boards and agencies of the church were doctrinally unsound. He could not in good conscience support them.

He was coaxed, cajoled, threatened. But he remained true to his Lord. Then he was punished: he lost his \$400 per year.

The church went a step further. The 148th General Assembly, in an attempt ruthlessly to get rid of all those in the church who would not fall into line with its modernist program, sought judicially to bind the consciences of men, and elevated the word of man to a position of equality with the Word of God.

Out in the state of X our friend heard what happened. Rather than yield to the dictates of Modernism he had already suffered the loss of his much needed \$400 per year. Now he took the next logical step.

He severed his connections with a church which he believed had denied

A Frank Appeal

By the REV. CHARLES J. WOODBRIDGE

On Behalf of The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension of The Presbyterian Church of America

his blessed Lord. He was "counting all things but loss for Christ."

He had to give up his regular salary. All hopes of a pension were gone. He moved out of the manse. A loyal handful of believers took its stand with him. An uncompromising standard was set up. The minister continued to preach.

But now he is receiving only \$25.00 per month. His health is impaired by the months of nervous strain through which he has passed. A few loyal friends recently met, and took up an offering of \$4.00 with which to buy his wife a dress. And winter is approaching.

Why is this young servant of God suffering? *Because like Daniel of old he "purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself" with Modernism.*

That is an actual case. We learned all these details, not from the minister—he would not complain—but from those who know him well.

The Committee on Home Missions heard the story. It acted promptly. It voted financial aid to the minister, *even though the money for the purpose was not in the bank.* Now the members of the Committee are praying that God will stir the hearts of donors that this need and similar needs may be supplied.

Another case.

Here was a brilliant and able young minister of the gospel. He had just been called to a well-established church in a large metropolis. His new congregation was enthusiastic. Prospects were bright. The pastor was about to take up his duties and to take unto himself a wife.

Then the Syracuse denouement. Loyalty to the gospel demanded action, as it does of every minister and member of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Our friend severed his connections with the church, gave up his salary, postponed his marriage, and established a new work in the city—a work which would not be fettered with the heavy chains of Modernism.

Two families went out with him. That was about three months ago.

God was certainly going to bless his testimony. But financial aid was needed at once. He had no source of income. The Committee rallied to his aid.

On October 4, sixty persons attended his morning service. Is not such work worth while?

The Goal of Self-support

Our ideal, of course, is that the newly organized churches shall be self-supporting as soon as possible. But this is a period of transition.

The goal of self-support has already been realized in at least one case in which the Committee was called upon for aid. Some weeks ago a congregation of The Presbyterian Church of America was formed in Baltimore. The Committee was able to help the pastor financially at the outset of his work. The congregation grew rapidly. They have now returned to the Committee every penny which was advanced to him.

Other churches too are giving sacrificially to the Committee for the sake of the brethren who are in need. Many churches are including the Committee in their benevolence budgets. The Calvary Presbyterian Church of Germantown, Penna., took up a special offering for the work of the Committee at its regular morning service on October 18th.

All such gifts are very welcome indeed. But they are not adequate for the needs of the men on the field.

The If, As, and When Basis

Accordingly the Committee has been compelled to write to all those whom it is assisting, explaining to them that our funds are very limited, and that we can continue helping them only in proportion as God's people send in gifts for this purpose.

Reader, if the Lord lays it on your heart to do so, will you not help these men? They are prepared to undergo any amount of hardship rather than yield to Modernism. But we must rally to their support in this their hour of need. "Come over and help us."

The situation, frankly stated, is that the Committee does not have sufficient funds on hand to meet its obligations which are due on October 31st.

Checks should be made out to Paul Woolley, Treasurer, and mailed to the Committee, at 1212 Commonwealth Building, Philadelphia.

What Shall We Feed Our Children?

A Plea for Christian Education

By the REV. CORNELIUS VAN TIL, Ph.D.

Professor of Apologetics in Westminster Theological Seminary



Dr. Van Til

THERE may be said to be a two-fold aspect to the work that is before us as people of The Presbyterian Church of America. In the first place we shall have to continue to expose modern unbelief wherever it appears within or without the visible church. On the other hand there is the constructive work of building up our own people in an understanding of and love for a full-orbed Christianity.

In the work of education that is before us, for instance, we shall have to continue to point out the false policies and programs that are being adopted elsewhere but we shall also have to build an educational program of our own. It is to the need of such a constructive program that we wish to call attention now.

We know that the literature of the old Board of Christian Education was permeated with Modernism. But even if we are able to find literature that is sound, do we then have all that we need? Can we really believe that the only thing wrong with the old program was its Modernism? Our fathers had a far more comprehensive program of Christian education than we have now. Time was when the public school system of the country was virtually a Christian school system. That time is past and yet are we sure that there is no need for a real system of Christian education?

Perhaps we can best seek an answer to such questions as these by asking whether the educational influences that are Christian are stronger than the educational influences that are not Christian. Imagine with me, if you will, a child now six years old. Then think of this child some twenty years from now. Is it likely, considering the education this child will receive, that it will be an intelligent member of the church at that time? Is it likely that this child will be full of enthusiasm and zeal for the truth when it comes to manhood or womanhood?

In answering these questions we shall assume that the child we think of has the benefit of a truly Christian home. We shall also assume that the child's Sunday school teachers were fully equipped for their task. We shall assume that the child has actually attended preaching services that were truly Reformed in nature. Still further we shall assume that the child is taught the catechism. These are huge assumptions but we must make them now, and ask whether all these Christian influences can counteract the non-Christian influences to which our child will be subjected in the next twenty years.

College Education

Suppose then that our child goes to college. Many children eventually do. Will he go to a Christian college? This is not at all certain. There are not enough Christian colleges. A considerable percentage of our young people will continue to attend the public university or college. Besides, colleges that are not only Christian but truly Reformed are few in number. We think of our child, then, as eventually attending a modern university. Will he, upon graduation "join" or remain in the church? Will he be able to do either if he is honest with himself?

It was not difficult for young people to "join" or remain in a church when that church largely failed to bring out the contrast between the teaching of Scripture and the teaching of the modern university. Under those circumstances young people were not compelled to make an intelligent choice. They could continue in the church because of "hallowed associations" and "noble traditions" connected with fine old buildings. But if the full implication of Scripture teaching for doctrine and life is set forth clearly and forcibly, educated young people will have to choose between this teaching and what they have learned in the university. An intelligent choice for or against the truth will naturally replace decisions made

on the basis of sentiment alone. We ask our young people to believe in Christ as their personal Saviour. Can they honestly say that they do, if they also believe what they have heard in the courses on science and philosophy?

The answer to this question ought not to be difficult. What does it mean to believe in Christ as my personal Saviour? Among other things it means that I am a creature of God who has sinned against God by "want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God." As a sinner I am under the wrath of God forever. No mere man can do anything for me. Only God can save me. Therefore Jesus must be God. Therefore He must, in His human nature, die in my room and stead. Therefore the Holy Spirit must regenerate me. But does university teaching agree with this? We trust that no one will argue that it does. That teaching denies, to begin with, the foundation fact of Christianity, the fact of creation. Modern philosophy and modern science are in perfect accord in rejecting the Scriptural notion of creation. If the word "creation" is employed by some philosophers it is not taken in the Biblical sense. Then, too, the Biblical idea of sin as defined by the Shorter Catechism is set aside by modern science in general and by psychology in particular. Freudianism, for example, may say many ugly things about human nature but it has no use for the idea of an originally perfect creation and for the idea that man is, since the fall, guilty before God. Thus, according to this point of view, man does not need to be saved in the Bible sense of the term; why then should he confess Christ as his personal Saviour? To do so would be to prevaricate.

But if it were granted that man needed to be saved there would be no Saviour to save him: Christ is, according to the "modern" teacher, like ourselves, the product of evolution. The virgin birth is "a biological miracle that the modern mind cannot accept." But if Jesus is called divine,

then we are all said to be divine; if He is called God, God then becomes no more than an aspect of Reality as a whole; we cannot be responsible to Him.

There is no need to go on. If our graduate thinks straight he must choose between two mutually exclusive views of life. In this choice the odds are, humanly speaking, overwhelmingly against the church. The university influence has been far more comprehensive and impressive than that of the church. We have no moral right to expect that our child will stay with the church. If we jump off the Empire State building our prayers for a safe landing are but mockery in the sight of God. "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

High School Education

But suppose our child does not go to college. Suppose he goes to high school only. This does not obviate the difficulty. The high school teachers have for the greater part been trained in the public universities and normal schools. We are, it would seem, quite safe in saying that the general influence on the high school pupils is largely the same as that brought to bear upon college students. Even if there are a number of high school teachers who are Christians they are not prepared, because of their lack of Christian training, to counteract the general non-Christian influences. Besides, they are forbidden by law to give anything but neutral instruction. Still further it should be remembered that boys and girls of high school age are less mature than those of college age. Then if we recall that though not all young people go to college practically all go to high school, and that though there are several Christian colleges there are practically no Christian high schools, we may well shudder at the results that are bound to follow. If we are unwilling to make use of the natural means of instruction that God has placed within our reach we cannot expect our children to become Christians—useful Christians—through sporadic efforts of our own. "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

Grade School Education

Finally comes the grade school. Our child will certainly attend the grade school for several years and that for five days a week. In Sunday school

our child has learned the nineteenth psalm. As he goes to school those beautiful words, "The heavens declare the glory of God," still reverberate through his mind. But when he enters the school room all this has suddenly changed. There the "starry universe above" somehow operates quite independently of God. And what is true of "the heavens above" is true of everything else. At home the child is taught that "whether we eat or drink or do anything else" we must do all to the glory of God because everything has been created by God and everything is sustained by God. In school the child is taught that everything has come of itself and sustains itself. This much is involved in the idea of "neutrality" itself. At best this means that

God need not be brought into the picture when we are teaching anything to our children. But is it not a great sin for Christian parents to have their children taught for five days a week by competent teachers that nature and history have nothing to do with God? We have no moral right to expect anything but that our children will accept that in which they have been most thoroughly instructed and will ignore that about which they hear only intermittently. And are not our children "born and conceived in sin"? Will they not naturally accept that which is false rather than that which is true? Nor is the instruction by any means always "neutral." The influence of John Dewey on American primary education is proverbial; and John Dewey is a murderer of Christianity.

If we Christian parents think of all this is it not really amazing that we have so sadly neglected the Christian training of our children? We take excellent care of the bodies of our children. We are becoming "vitamin minded." We do not buy cabbages and potatoes but we buy calories and vitamins. We ask how much of the valuable vitamin D content is in this food or in that. But the strange thing is that in the field of spiritual nurture we do not count the number of vitamin D's our children get. No sensible parent will give his child food not of the best if the best is within his reach. No mother will allow her child to pick up what it may anywhere in the way of food and then when sickness comes suddenly feed that child nothing but cod-liver oil. Why then do we allow our children to have daily meals of spiritual food which has no vitamin D? Do we not care if they develop spiritual rickets? Do we not worry if they are spiritually underfed? "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

Humanly speaking, then, one cannot honestly be enthusiastic about the future of The Presbyterian Church of America unless its people will realize that a new and far more intense policy will have to be adopted in the field of Christian education. The existing agencies, even when purged of all the non-Reformed elements, are woefully insufficient for the work that must be done. In obedience to our covenant God we shall have to bring up our children "in the fear and admonition of the Lord."

The National Union of Christian Schools

MR. MARK FAKKEMA, General Secretary of the National Union of Christian Schools, has offered the services of his office in connection with any endeavor to meet the challenge which is presented in Dr. Van Til's article. The organization which he represents held its seventeenth annual convention recently. It has rendered very effective service in solidifying and promoting a system of schools which is under parental, as opposed to parochial, control.

Any who wish to learn more about the history, principles, and program of the Christian School movement in this country may address him at:

1019 Lafayette Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

Is There Any Hope of Reform?

An Analysis of Conditions in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

By the REV. WILLIAM T. STRONG

THE issues of the controversy between the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and The Presbyterian Church of America are beclouded by the fact that there are many ministers who claim to be as orthodox as the seceding group but refuse to leave the old denomination, insisting that their duty is to fight for reform which, they say, obviously can best be done from within the church.

It appears that the whole situation, as it now stands, boils down to this question: "Is there any hope of reform for the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.?" If there is, then it would seem every man's duty to stay in, in order to battle for reform. But if not, then he who would be true to Christ and the Bible should withdraw from an organization so manifestly untrue to Him and to His Word. In the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., every minister is an organic part of the whole denomination, and is therefore party to the corporate witness of the whole. The scriptural injunctions, "Be not partaker in another man's sins," and "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers," would seem clearly to demand separation.

It is the writer's conviction, based upon reasons indicated below, that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is beyond the hope of reform. Were it not for this conviction he would not only have preferred, but would have considered it his duty, to have remained within that church. The considerations that appear, to him at least, to make this decision inescapable, should be carefully weighed by all who are still perplexed as to the right stand to take:

Reform might be possible if men of solid orthodoxy, with courage and determination to wage war against the modernist party now in power, should come into the ministry in such numbers as to gain a majority in the councils of the church.

Reform might be possible if all of those now in the ministry, who claim to be orthodox, would initiate a strenuous campaign of protest and criti-

cism, in their own churches, and in their presbyteries, against the unbelief now so firmly entrenched in the seats of power. Such a campaign might well involve both verbal attacks, and the withholding of financial support until housecleaning might begin.

Again, reform might be possible if overtures and other protests, looking to reform, would be given a fair hearing and due consideration by the presbyteries and the General Assembly and its Boards.

But on the other hand there are several deplorable facts and influences that stand in the way of such a reform movement:

(1) Men cannot now be ordained unless they promise wholehearted support to the official program of the church; in some cases, even, men are required to promise obedience to whatever future General Assemblies may command! A man who is truly orthodox *will not*, because he *could not*, make such a promise. On the other hand, any man who *would* make such a promise, would be bound to refrain from criticizing the official program. Hence, this first avenue to reform is closed.

(2) Men, now in the church, who dare to criticize the official machine, alleging Modernism, and refusing financial support, are in peril of being disciplined. The highest court of the church, last June, handed down a judicial decision which empowers and has emboldened presbyteries to *require* a minister to urge his church to support the official Boards. This is contrary both to the Constitution, and to the Word of God. Hence, it is apparent that it is in vain that the godly remnant still in the church might look to orthodox men, now ministers of the

denomination, for a businesslike reform movement. Many, alas, *too* many, of the ministers who call themselves "orthodox," are not really so, and they will not make sacrifices for something which is but to them a half-hearted profession. Then it is true that many who in reality *are* orthodox, will lack courage when the showdown comes, and they have to line up for, or against, the machine in power. It may be—and God grant it!—that some men of God will be really aroused over conditions, and will lift their voices bravely against the serious abuses that have come into existence. One wonders, however, how long it will take the machine to discipline such "rebels" into silence, or out of the church.

(3) It has been painfully apparent that overtures and other protests, looking toward reform are foredoomed to failure. The machine which needs reform has such complete control of things that in numerous ways it pulls the sting out of reform measures, either by white-washing actual conditions, or by wrapping the protest neatly in red tape and then pigeon-holing it.

Under such circumstances what prospect of reform is there? Meanwhile, the denomination pursues its policy of regimentation. Westminster Seminary men are now forever barred from the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. But Union Seminary, a well-known hot-bed of Modernism and heresy, will continue to pour its poison into the life of the church. This is but one symptom of the deadly disease that is destroying, slowly but surely, the spiritual life and testimony of the once-great Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

It behooves earnest Bible-loving Christians, who want to know and to do the will of their Lord, to give serious and due consideration to these things, as they shall one day answer to God for their stand in this hour of crisis.

"Ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3).

REMEMBER

The Second General Assembly
in Philadelphia

November 12th to 15th

For Details See Page 36

Calvinism in Europe

By Professor G. D. HENDERSON

Reprinted from *The British Weekly* of September 17, 1936

A REVIVAL of Calvinism is one of the most interesting features of the ecclesiastical life of Europe in our day. This sturdy faith seemed to have lost the field to modernist forces, and its supporters were latterly timid, self-conscious, and apologetic. The most serious matter was the way in which it lost ground in Scotland, so that the Scottish Church, the most Presbyterian in the world and revered to an embarrassing extent by all the Reformed Churches of the Continent and the Colonies, was, under English and German influences, fast becoming the least Calvinistic of the group.

But Calvinism everywhere has recovered its confidence. It is actually aggressive now. It is even worth a journalist's while to attack it—witness Edwin Muir and Eric Linklater and Agnes Mure Mackenzie—and to be attacked is to be more important than to be ignored.

Barthianism

One side of the revival is represented by Barthianism in its various forms—the stages successively reached by Barth himself, Brunner's modifications, Haitjema's conservatism. Not all Barthians are Calvinists, but sympathisers within Lutheranism have had their attention turned to Calvin in a new way. The strict thinkers within the Gereformeerde Kerk in Holland have no use for Barth, but his work has stirred them to new activity. The Modernist thinks Barthianism a desperate remedy, tremendous courage born of fear, and feels one might as well go into the Roman Church when one is about it; but the Modernist may not ignore Barth and so is brought back to Calvin. No theological student today but is intensely aware of him.

Barthianism in some quarters seems to be producing a new intolerance, but it certainly has provided for the younger generation a living issue. And not only is the leader himself a born pioneer and a completely disinterested explorer, but he has produced other men with missions. And not only did students go in crowds to Bonn and Zurich, but books on the subject found a ready market amongst ministers, and the general public was made aware of

the movement, so that today, for example, Maury in the fashionable Paris suburb of Passy is one of the most sought after of preachers. Scottish honorary degrees have been conferred on Barth and Brunner and Thurneysen, and the only foreigners to have such degrees in Divinity bestowed at Utrecht this summer in connection with the tercentenary were Barth and Brunner. Barth's name has become so well known outside of divinity faculties and ecclesiastical circles that he has even been appointed to a Gifford lectureship.

There is further the distinctive place which this school has taken with regard to political matters in Germany. Barthians are wholeheartedly on the side of the Confessional Church in its desire for that independence for which Calvin so strenuously worked at Geneva and for which the Scottish Covenanters suffered.

Other Influences

It would, however, be a great mistake to think that the Calvinistic revival to-day consists only of Barthian influences, direct or indirect. Indeed, it might be truer to say that Barthianism itself is simply one part of such a movement. There is at present much more reading of Calvin himself than formerly. The Hungarians have published and widely circulated a translation of the 1536 "Institutio." In France a new translation has also appeared, and other volumes are to follow. The first volume of a German "Institutio" has also been issued, while Peter Barth is again busy with his six-volume edition of the more important Calvin works. Only in Britain is it apparently impossible to make an attempt of this sort. Beveridge's translation is now difficult to obtain, and there is nothing else.

Some strengthening of interest in Calvin in Britain may be indicated by the success which has attended the work of Professor Donald Maclean and the *Evangelical Quarterly*. The Sovereign Grace Union includes Baptists and Anglicans as well as Presbyterians. And new books, such as Carew Hunt's "Calvin," are of real value.

Abroad, there is great activity. The Gereformeerde Kerk in Holland is

issuing a series of Bible handbooks, and also commentaries for popular use, as well as others of more ambitious learning. Excellent historical work is also being done. Bohatec, at Vienna, continues to write on the legal aspect of Calvin's teaching, and from Germany comes Mühlaupt's "Die Predigt Calvins." In Switzerland young men, such as de Saussure and Dominicé, are finding a public for books intended to educate in Calvinism, and Madame Bienz steadily produces her *Almanach Calvin*, and Stickelberger's popular study of Calvin has been translated into both Dutch and French. There has also been a translation into French of Walker's classic. Recently the University of Strassburg invited Professor Lecerf, of Paris, to lecture upon the revival of Calvinism in France, and Professor Clavier discussed the same subject at the Presbyterian Alliance Conference of 1935 in Czechoslovakia. The situation is certainly very different from what it was when Doumergue upheld the cause in solitary grandeur, and when Pannier laid the foundation for his extensive researches.

Not that all Calvinists see alike. Wilfred Monod distinguishes between "Calvinistes" and "Calviniens." There are the Neo-Calvinists who follow Lecerf. There are disciples of Kohlbrügge, such as Dr. Orthuys. The veteran Professor Lang, of Halle, is alarmed at Lutheran tendencies in the teaching of some professing Calvinists. At a Calvinistic Congress this summer there was even quite a long debate between Infralapsarians and Supralapsarians! But such differences are only additional proof of interest and active thought in the matter.

The interest is not merely academic. The huge congregation, including so many young men and women, who filed up to the table in St. Peter's at Geneva when Communion was celebrated at the quarter-centenary in June, and the thousands who with uplifted hands renewed their Covenant before the Reformation monument a few days later, offer abundant proof of this. And in Scotland we find a new interest in many quarters in dogmatic preaching.

It is clear that our times long for authority and security. They want to know where they stand, or at least, that they do stand somewhere. And so they retreat from Humanism and Relativism and Modernism, which sat

so loose to conviction, in love with search but wary of dogma, impressed by the truth rather than the falsehood of every point of view, stressing what we have in common, but certainly not offering rest to mind or

spirit. The causes of the revival are not far to seek in the post-war world. The tendency to which they witness is no new phenomenon in history, but it is interesting to notice its presence, and to watch developments.

case of Kuyper the cause of orthodoxy in the state church down to the present day has been served by none better than by Dr. Kuyper and his followers who have gone out. And judging from the organization of ministers who have met at Pittsburgh, you are already beginning to influence the older institution you have left behind.

But far and away the greatest success lies in the movement itself which was inaugurated by those who left the old organization. This becomes especially clear if we contrast with it the lack of any great success by those who attempted reform from within. Those who remained behind in each case failed in their objective of leading the church back to its pristine purity. They could only muster weak strength in comparison with the power developed by those who, for conscience' sake, felt constrained to leave the old to start a new denomination. What has become of the efforts at reform of those disciples of Le Febre, many of whom were Calvin's erstwhile friends, who chided him for leaving the church and for organizing what they styled a separatistic movement? What permanent influence of reform has been exerted by Erasmus and the religious humanists of his type? To be sure, Erasmus, the genius, could compose his "Praise of Folly," that stinging satire upon the corrupt practices of the Roman clergy. And he could write his scholarly Greek text of the New Testament. But he could not launch a religious crusade of reform. Erasmus said in defense of his lack of reformatory zeal, that he was not made of the stuff that martyrs are made of. Would to God that he had been made of the same stuff! With his marvelous mental ability he might have been able to leave as his legacy to posterity something of the vast influence which Calvin, the Reformer, has had upon the world after him. And many a modern Erasmus may profit by his example.

Again let me refer to the fortunes of those orthodox leaders who at the time of Dr. Kuyper remained behind in the state church, hoping to bring about its reformation. Down to the present day they have failed in unseating the objectionable Synod. If we may believe Dr. Herman Bavinck, they have been weakened by all sorts of factional strifes among each other. They are today divided into a confessional group, an ethical group, an

Thank God and Take Courage

By the REV. H. HENRY MEETER, Th.D.
Professor of Bible in Calvin College

The following article is the second part of the address delivered at the opening of Westminster Theological Seminary on September 30th. The first part of the address appeared in "The Presbyterian Guardian" of October 10th.

PART II

"And from thence, when the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us as far as Appii forum, and the three taverns: whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage" (Acts 28: 15).

FURTHER reasons for gratitude and encouragement present themselves when you contemplate the opportunities of success which are yours in the future. There is, of course, reason for gratitude whenever you enlist in a great and good cause, irrespective of the measure of success which may attend it. Paul had that feeling of gratification when, at the close of his life, he reflected upon the very fact that he had engaged in the Christian warfare, and declared: "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course" (II Tim. 4:7). A good Christian cannot engage in the warfare of the Christian gospel against modern religious liberalism or any prominent heresy, without entertaining that same feeling of a gratified conscience which will necessarily attend it. But you may be grateful when you contemplate that, besides engaging in a good cause, there are alluring opportunities of success in the chosen path ahead of you. I speak of opportunities of success, for while they are, I believe, great, your actual success will, under the blessing of God, be dependent upon the extent to which you prove equal to your opportunities.

What are these opportunities? Perhaps it is best, in determining what these will be, to judge the future by the past. History is apt to repeat itself. The historic movements which we

have found to be akin to your own may therefore serve as examples of what the future may have in store for you. Let us therefore refer once more to the cases of Calvin and Kuyper.

In the cases of Calvin and of Kuyper, as well as in the present instance, we have presented to us a religious reform movement, conducted by men who saw the evils in the church and who finally emerged into independent organizations after vain attempts at reform from within. In each case a separate school, as well as a distinct church, was organized: the school of Calvin at Geneva, of Kuyper at the Free University of Amsterdam, and the Westminster School at Philadelphia. In each case there were large numbers of reform-minded men who remained behind in the established church, hoping to bring to pass the much-needed reform from within. In the case of Calvin you have several of the school of Le Febre in France and many religious humanists of Erasmus' type throughout Europe. In Kuyper's day it was the large group of confessionals in the Dutch Reformed Church. And today we are witnessing the same phenomenon, several hoping to reform the older Presbyterian church itself.

It will be interesting and instructive to tabulate what successes have attended each of these groups. In every instance those who emerged from the older organization have wielded a wholesome influence of reform upon the mother church. In Calvin's day the counter-reformation in the Roman Catholic Church can be attributed in no small degree to the Protestant Reformers who left the church. In the

evangelical group, and those again into several minor groups. But the honors for having exerted the great power of reform must be conceded to those who, after vain attempts at reform from within, have had the fortitude to carry on their reformation in independent organizations where they had the liberty to develop the principles which they held dear, unhampered by the fetters of an adverse ecclesiastical institution.

Dr. Herman Bavinck was once invited to deliver the principal address at a celebration commemorating the secession movement of the Christian Reformed Church of the Netherlands in 1834. Everyone wondered what the learned Dr. Bavinck would have to say about the rise and development of that movement. Everyone knew that this church in its early history had lacked scholarly leaders, and had made many ecclesiastical blunders. The church had nevertheless been blessed with marked success. When Dr. Bavinck came to deliver his address, he summed up his impressions of the movement in the topic which he chose, selecting the very words of St. Paul: "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth" (II Cor. 13:8). May the gigantic progress and the widespread influence which will attend your movement of reform likewise be a verification of that sacred word: "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."

In gauging the success of your mission, however, there is a factor of vital significance which must be taken into consideration. It is a factor over which you have no direct control, and yet it may be serious enough to defeat all efforts at reform. I have reference to the conditions of the time in which your movement is launched. No matter how great and good the cause, no matter how ably defended, if in God's grace there is no religious awakening to the truth of your mission, you might be compelled to labor on for years without apparent success. Even such thoughts ought not to deter you from defending the cause of Calvinism. Conceivably you might for conscience' sake be called upon, like Athanasius, to stand alone against the whole world, only to find that you would win out in the end. Or like Ezekiel, you might be required to preach for years to a valley of dry bones, and discover that in God's own time those dry bones would live.

Nevertheless, the feeling of gratitude and encouragement will be greater in days when the opportunities of success are more immediate, when, to quote the words of our Lord, we look over the fields and they are already white with harvest. Such was the day when Christianity itself was ushered into the world. Christianity came "in the fullness of time," and despite much determined opposition it swept like a forest fire across the empire. Such also was the day of the Protestant Reformation. Everywhere there was a religious awakening, and the cause of Calvin met with unprecedented success. Such was the day when Dr. Kuyper launched his movement. It was a time of religious revival. This in no small measure accounts for the great success which the cause of Calvinism experienced in his day.

But how about the conditions of today? Is this not a wrong time to begin a movement such as yours? Dr. Kuyper himself declared in 1898, when he delivered his famous lectures on Calvinism, that the spirit of the day was not at all favorable to the Calvinistic cause but rather to the opposing views of modern religious liberalism. That prophecy has, sad to say, come true. Again in the year 1909 the great Dr. Warfield has told us that Modernism would rout everything before it except consistent supernaturalism. You have learned by bitter experience how this prophecy has come true. Dare we then expect, in a day when Modernism is admittedly in control of many Protestant denominations, that your movement, however good it may be, may hope for any marked success?

It is my belief that the tide is turning in your favor. The current thought of today is not as it was when Dr. Kuyper delivered his Stone Lectures on Calvinism, nor like the day when Dr. Warfield gave us his splendid memorial addresses on Calvin's birth. To be sure, Modernism is still today the religion of great masses of people. But just as was the condition of the civilization of Greece and Rome—its popularity was highest when its dissolution was closest—so when Modernism's flower is in bloom its blighting is nearest. Several among the orthodox may still believe that to Modernism belongs the future. The Modernists themselves are not so confident. Dr. H. E. Fosdick, who would perhaps be the last to forsake Modernism, was voicing the opinion of a growing num-

ber when he intimated the disappointments which Modernism yielded in his article of last December in *The Christian Century* entitled: "Beyond Modernism." And Edwin Lewis in his "A Christian Manifesto" is directing our minds to the same disappointment. And Niebuhr, Pauck, and Miller in "The Church Against the World" are doing the same thing. The consciousness that Modernism cannot satisfy the religious needs of man is being acknowledged in a widening circle today.

Dr. Warfield, in his memorial address on the birth of the great Reformer, delivered before the General Assembly in 1909, cited as the three great characteristics of Calvinism: (1) Theism come to its rights; (2) Religion at the height of its conception; (3) and Evangelicalism in its purest and most stable expression. (Cf. Calvin as a Theologian and Calvinism Today, p. 31.) Testing out the spirit of the age in which he lived with regard to each of these three characteristics, he found it decidedly antagonistic to Calvinism. If we examine current thought in the year 1936 it is my belief that it is not as adverse to the views of Calvinism as it was when Dr. Warfield made these utterances.

Take the attitude to Theism. In his day, a day of unusual prosperity, a theistic God, a supernatural, personal, spiritual Being, Creator, Governor of this universe, who directs all things according to His divine purpose and upon whom all depends, was hardly the kind of a God that was popular. If a God was to be believed in at all, it was rather an immanent God, of whom vain man was the highest expression. Some went even further and proclaimed out-and-out humanism, or even atheism. In many quarters all interest in metaphysics was dead.

Today there is a growing consciousness of the need of the supernatural. As I think of the ever expanding belief in a spirit-world, both good and bad, as I think of the so-called religious realists who are seeking to introduce objective supernatural elements into their religion, as I think especially of the reception Barthianism is receiving in Europe and also in a measure in America, it seems to me it all voices a return to a belief in the supernatural. Barth's conception of God, however much we may disagree with it, is not the low pantheistic conception with which we have grown familiar in recent years, but *Der ganz*

Andere, the Wholly Other, a God who cannot be known except through a supernatural Bible, and is not to be received except by a supernatural faith inspired by a supernatural Spirit. In all these movements the fact that is worthy of note is a growing consciousness of the need of the supernatural. Modernism with its anti-supernaturalism cannot satisfy this craving. Modernism has no supernatural Deity. It has no message from a supernatural God. It is Calvinism with its theistic view of God and its supernatural Bible and Spirit-inspired faith, that here can and must supply the need. This is your day of opportunity. Remember that if God is going to bless your message to men He first prepares the hearts of men for your message, and He may be using conditions of the present day to lead men to this realization of their need.

Let us look for a moment at the second characteristic of Calvinism, "religion at the height of its conception," or as Dr. Warfield circumscribes it, "the sense of absolute dependence upon God." At the time when Dr. Warfield delivered that address there was great material prosperity. It was also an age in which science gave great promise of solving the riddles of the universe. In such an age dependence upon God was with many reduced to a minimum. God was unpopular! Man did not need God. Man himself, by his own scientific achievements, could solve his own problems and work out his own salvation without help from a higher hand.

But times have begun to change. The World War with its after-effects and the depression have driven home the lesson of man's helplessness. They have demonstrated to us that man with all his scientific achievements has not been able to solve the really big problems in his life. He has not by wisdom searched out God or framed a satisfactory religion. He has not been able to control his happiness. He has not been able to stop war or greed or crime or vice or selfishness. Nor has he been able to guarantee his economic security.

As a result man is not that self-reliant creature today which we knew him to be yesterday. On all sides impotent man is reaching out for someone, something outside of himself, that will guarantee for him his happiness. With some the search is for some able dictator as the embodiment of

power, a Hitler or a Mussolini. With others it is some ideal that can sway men's minds, be it even a myth, as a religion for Germans only, or a worldwide labor strike, anything that can serve as a rallying point around which the enthusiasms can centre and thus drive the masses to accomplish, by united action, the desired goals which man alone finds himself unable to achieve.

Of course these ideals are destined to be as disappointing as the ones they were intended to displace. But they illustrate this point: Man's consciousness of his own inability to solve his problems in his own power. This, of course, does not mean that men today have by natural causes become Calvinists overnight. But it will make fallow ground in which to sow the seed of Calvinism. It is not the self-reliant man that will listen to your message. In a day when men discover their helplessness and are looking, blindly no doubt, but looking for some force that can solve their problems and guarantee their security, there is the grandest opportunity for just such a message of absolute dependence upon almighty God as you in your Calvinistic program can bring. Today, if ever, there is a mighty appeal to you to acquaint men, not with a modernist deity of whom helpless man is the highest expression, but with the supernatural God upon whom all must depend and who alone can solve man's problems and secure his happiness for him.

The third characteristic of Calvinism was "evangelicalism in its pure and stable expression." It comes with a gospel of grace to the lost. Calvinism is not, like Modernism, a religion that calls the self-righteous; it calls sinners to repentance. It is, to use another of Dr. Warfield's phrases, the "miserable sinner Christianity." Calvinism is the religion of the agonized conscience, of the man that needs to be helped by God's grace. But how could this religion thrive in these palmy days of prosperity, when man felt sufficient unto himself, and needed no one to help him? Grace grows best in winter. That winter has come. With our recent disappointments in men and in institutions of men we are learning the Calvinistic lesson that man is inherently not good but bad. We are not like our fathers who believed that man can do all things. We are more like our grandfathers who believed that all men

are evil, if not like the old Puritans who believed in total depravity. Today is a growing day of opportunity for the Calvinistic message and program.

The faculty and students of Westminster Seminary, together with the leaders in The Presbyterian Church of America, have become known by the American public as the outstanding champions of Calvinism. To you, therefore, more than to any others, comes the mighty challenge to supply the Calvinistic leadership which America of today is needing. May the way in which you meet this challenge reveal that you have come into the kingdom for just such a time as this. Thank God and take courage!

Reformed Presbyterian Missionary Welcomes New Independent Board Project

THE Rev. J. G. Vos, missionary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, speaks with the heartiest approbation of the work begun in Manchuria by missionaries under The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Writing in *The Covenanter Witness* for September 30th, Mr. Vos says, in part:

It is with the greatest satisfaction that I report to the Board an important new development in the Manchurian missionary situation. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, representing the thoroughly conservative and at present much persecuted remnant in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., is considering opening missionary work in Manchuria, in an unoccupied field east of Harbin. Their proposed field will be some distance from ours, but the presence of a Mission of this type and with such a testimony for the truth, will be a very wholesome influence in Christian circles throughout Manchuria. Recently two missionaries of the Independent Board visited us and spent three days in our home. These were Mr. Henry Coray and Mr. H. McIlwaine. Mr. Coray was dropped by his presbytery because he became a missionary under the Independent Board. It was a great joy to find that these brethren are staunch believers in the Reformed or Calvinistic Faith, and not merely hold it as an intellectual conception, but propose to preach it actively and defend it against all opponents. In these days of loose thinking and false doctrine, a fresh emphasis on the old truths of the Reformation, backed up by modern scholarship, would be a most salutary thing throughout China and Manchuria.

When the Children of God Are Hard Pressed

A Meditation on the Third Psalm

By the REV. DAVID FREEMAN



Mr. Freeman

MORE than once the children of God in this world have been hard pressed on every hand. In fact, their history has been one of trial and tribulation. This is promised them in God's Word: "In the world ye shall have tribulation" (John 16: 33).

The odds were overwhelmingly against David. He was fleeing from his son, Absalom, and the nation was in open rebellion against him. Humanly speaking there was no hope for him. He must inevitably be overcome by his ever-increasing number of enemies. David was fully aware of his hopeless position. He cried, "How many are mine enemies," "Many rise up against me," "Ten thousands of the people have set themselves against me."

It was a bitter sorrow that came to this man of God. Many whom he had favored and trusted had joined the conspiracy of his own household, which arose through the treason of his own son.

The enemies of God's kingdom, as established then by God through David, were very happy to see him in distress. They looked upon his troubles as evidence that God had rejected him. They even said that he deserved no help from God. This is the way of God's enemies. They speak of that about which they know nothing at all. Ignorant, they pry into the counsels of the Almighty and insolently take the reigns of His government into their own hands. To this they add impious lies, hoping that by them they may the more distress His servants.

Have we not seen similar things in this our day? Have we not heard men say of the Lord's own works that the Lord is not in them and has not falsehood been resorted to in order to accomplish the destruction of God's saints?

But all that man might do is only to the body. Our Lord said, "My

friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do." Our striving cannot be losing because God is on our side. Suffering for Him can only mean victory because it will tell for the furtherance of the gospel. The apostle Paul wanted men to know that the things that happened to him were for the greater advance of the kingdom of God. Should we not rejoice that God uses even His enemies to bring glory to His name?

Believers Are Not Forsaken

God is not one to withhold help from His needy. He is the covenant God. "The Lord is faithful, who shall establish you, and keep you from evil." He cannot deny His word or go back on His promises. No matter how men may deride, yet God will not forsake His own. When they are afflicted, He draws even nearer as a shield strong and mighty.

What was David's plea in seeking help from God? It was a rare faith which he manifested when stricken with great fear; he dared to lay his complaint in the bosom of God. He came boldly to the throne of grace. True, he had not deserved the ill usage which he received from even his friends, but at the same time he did not bring before God his own innocence as a ground or cause for God to bestow favor upon him. It was rather the righteousness of God that he adored and to which he submitted. He looked to God for the conferring of that righteousness upon him as a sinner. On the basis of free grace and mercy he hoped in God (Rom. 4: 6).

Absalom promised himself the favor of God. Trampling under foot the decrees of God he set out to make a way for himself in the nation. He would make God bow to his desires. He was self-appointed and self-directed. But no man can make himself favorable in God's sight, because there is nothing in man in himself that is worthy of merit (Jer. 17: 9). Acceptance of man is wholly God's right, for He owes no man anything. Out of His great love and grace He delights

to show mercy upon whom He will have mercy.

Did not God choose David according to His own wise counsels from all eternity? He was not made king of his own volition, but he was set apart to that high office according to the decree of God. How can God's help be withheld from those whom He has called? He "hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began" (II Tim. 1: 9). God has pledged Himself to us, having given His Son to die for us. This electing love of God is the basis of our confidence that He will not forsake us, as it was of David's and all the people of God. We rejoice in tribulation not because we have chosen God to be our portion, but because He has chosen us and ordained us to life everlasting (John 15: 16).

Confidence in God Is Reasonable

God is the Light, Teacher, Guide, Comforter of His people. His salvation is from temporal dangers and eternal misery. With such a God on his side David determined that he would not yield to fear; even if a whole army should march in battle array to wage war against him.

David was often delivered out of trouble and danger. When he called for help God answered. As in former times we have committed ourselves by faith and prayer to the divine protection, what should hinder us from betaking ourselves to God in the present emergency?

Every temporal deliverance should be received as an earnest of eternal salvation. It is God's way of showing Himself mighty to save.

What of our light afflictions if we look unto Jesus and contrast His glory and His grace with the contempt and cruelty with which He was treated? "For consider him that endureth such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin" (Heb. 12: 3, 4).

Studies in the Shorter Catechism

By the REV. JOHN H. SKILTON

LESSON 3

The Word of God

QUESTION 2. *What rule hath God given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him?*

ANSWER. *The Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him.*

How God Makes Himself Known to Men

WE have seen in Lesson 2 that God is the only source of certainty for us. Only one who knows all things can give us assurance concerning anything.

But the question now arises, how does God give us the knowledge that we need to deliver us from confusion and chaos? God makes Himself known, reveals Himself, in various ways. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork" (Psalm 19:1). "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" (Romans 1:20). The Westminster Confession of Faith rightly holds that "the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable" (Chapter 1:1).

However, before men enslaved by sin could see even the true light of nature and before men could learn the way of salvation, a further revelation was necessary. "Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his church" (Confession of Faith 1:1). In such ways as by manifestations or appearances, by dreams, by the lot, by visions, by direct communication, and by miracles, God has revealed Himself. But "afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world [it pleased God] to commit the

same wholly unto writing: which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased" (Confession of Faith 1:1).

The Bible—the Word of God

In the Holy Scripture, then, we have the revelation of God that we need for our instruction as to how we may attain our chief end in glorifying and enjoying Him.

The answer to the second question of the Shorter Catechism declares that the Scriptures or writings of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God. The word "contained" that is used in the answer does not imply that anything besides the Word of God is to be found in the Scriptures. The answer to the third question of the Larger Catechism should be considered in this connection: "The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience." (See also the Confession of Faith 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and the Larger Catechism question 4.)

Those who framed the Shorter and Larger Catechisms and the Westminster Confession of Faith regarded the Bible as being given by inspiration of God. They considered it in its every part and in its every word as it came from the hand of its inspired authors to be the Word of God.

This view is the same that the writers of the Bible themselves had and the view on which our Lord Jesus Christ has placed His approval. We find in the Bible expressions like "Thus saith the Lord" more than 3,800 times. The Biblical view of the inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament Scriptures is clearly stated by Paul and Peter: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (II Tim. 3:16). "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (II Peter 1:21).

For views held by New Testament writers of their own or other New Testament books see II Peter 3:15-16 and I Cor. 14:37: "If any man think

himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."

Jesus Christ revealed His view of the Old Testament as the Word of God and promised the Holy Spirit to His apostles to bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever He had said unto them, and to guide them into all the truth. See Mark 7:13; Luke 24:27 ff.; John 10:35; Matthew 5:17 ff.; Matthew 4:4, 7, and 10; Matthew 7:40; Luke 18:31; John 14:26; and John 16:12-13.

The indication of the Bible is that its very words are inspired. Moses, Joshua, and the others who received the Word of the Lord in the Old Testament times received not mere ideas but the words necessary to express ideas. The Lord spoke to them—and, of course, used words. See, for example, Ezekiel 3:4. Paul regards his words as the words of God (I Cor. 2:13). Much importance is attached to words: John 10:35; Matt. 22:43-45; Gal. 3:16. Words of the Old Testament are quoted in the New Testament as the utterances of God: Hebrews 1:5 ff.; 2:11-13.

From the fact that the words of Scripture are the words of God it is not to be inferred that the writers of Scripture were mere machines. The personalities of the various human authors of the Bible were not effaced, no one style or type of composition was prescribed, and other liberties were granted; but God did keep the human authors from error as they wrote and did see that their words expressed the ideas He willed them to express.

SUGGESTIONS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

1. *Could Genesis be of any authority for us if it were inaccurate in any respect?*
2. *If the Bible is the revelation of God, who is truth, could it contain any errors?*
3. *Can ideas be separated from words? Could the ideas of Biblical writers be inspired and the words not?*
4. *Select some hymns giving glory to the Word of God.*
5. *If the Bible is the Word of God*

how should it influence our thinking? Our living? Is it indispensable as a guide in every sphere of human activity?

6. Does the doctrine of inspiration of the Scriptures, i.e., inspiration of the very words used, mean that the writers of Scripture were infallible when not writing Scripture or were perfect in their lives?

7. To whom do the heavens declare the glory of God?

8. Is it reasonable to accept the testimony of the writers of Scripture as to their own inspiration?

9. If we reject one word of the Bible how much are we logically compelled to reject?

10. Can we speak of a poet like Milton or Shakespeare as inspired in the way in which David was inspired?

LESSON 4

Is it Reasonable to Regard the Bible as the Word of God?

The Bible in many ways justifies the claims its writers make to inspiration and the approval placed upon it by our Lord Jesus Christ. It is the only book that reveals the living and the true God—the God who must exist if life is to have any meaning. It is the only book that relates the universe and sinful man to God in the way in which the nature of the living and the true God requires. Other sacred books would minimize God and elevate man beyond his due: but the Bible observes the proper relationship, refusing to subject its teaching to the proud will of man.

Despite the fact that the Bible was composed by many men of varied culture, in many styles and modes of writing, in more than one language, over a period of 1500 years, it is nevertheless one book, dealing with one theme, portraying one matchless Person. The unity that we find in it indicates that it is the work of one author: God.

The harmony of all the parts of the Bible and the accuracy of every statement are likewise signs of divine authorship. Although for centuries subjected to the scrutiny of brilliant unbelievers, the Scriptures have never been proved contradictory or erroneous in any respect.

"Thy law is the truth" Psalm 119: 142.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" Matthew 24: 35.

The phenomenon of the fulfillment of prophecy is a further sign of the inspiration of the Bible. The Old Testament, for instance, foretells the life of Christ. Moses wrote of God's promise of One, the seed of the woman, who would bruise the serpent's head. David sang of One who would be both his son and his Lord, who would be crucified, rise from the dead, and bring great blessings to the world. Other prophets foretold the coming of One who would be called the mighty God and the everlasting Father; but who would be born of a virgin in Bethlehem, would be wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities. Truly those who search the Old Testament Scriptures, as our Lord Jesus commanded, should conclude that they testify of Him. Dr. Arthur T. Pierson, in his book, "Many Infallible Proofs," well inquires, "How is it that, with such overwhelming proof that Jesus is in the Old Testament, any candid mind can escape the conclusion that a divine pen traced the prophecy and a divine person fulfilled the prophetic portrait?"

Other considerations such as the witness of the church to the Scripture, the fact that the Holy Spirit has led the children of God to recognize the unique inspiration of the Bible, the effect the Bible has had on men, the majesty of the style of the Scriptures should confirm our belief in the Bible as the Word of God.

But regardless of how much evidence of the divine authorship of the Bible we ourselves amass, "our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts" (Confession of Faith 1: 5). Only the Spirit of Truth can cause those who are in bondage to Satan, the father of lies, to embrace the truth, to see the cogency of the evidences of the inspiration of the Scriptures that God has provided.

SUGGESTIONS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

1. How do we arrive at the conclusion that the Bible is the Word of God?

2. Are evidences of the accuracy of the Bible increasing today?

3. Why have some brilliant men not believed that the Bible is the Word of God? Do our salvation and our understanding of the truth of God depend

upon our brilliance? Consider Matthew 11: 25-27.

4. Develop the life of Christ from the Old Testament.

5. If you did not believe the Bible to be the Word of God what difference would there be in your attitude toward life, in your conduct, in your relationships with your relatives and friends? What would be your hope for the future? Could you be sure of anything?

6. Are the Bible and science in conflict?

7. In what respects is the Bible different from other books?

LESSON 5

The Bible: The Only Infallible Rule

QUESTION 2. What rule hath God given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him?

ANSWER. The Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him.

The Westminster Confession of Faith, being true to the Bible itself, calls attention to the clarity and the completeness of the Holy Scripture.

"All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them" (1: 7).

The Bible speaks directly to the people, and calls on them, through its statements alone to form their attitudes toward God and life. Moses, David, the prophets, the apostles, and the other figures in sacred history and the writing of the Bible speak to the people and expect to be understood. The faithful themselves are required to teach the Scriptures to others (see Deuteronomy 6: 6 ff). Believers are, on our Lord's command, to search the Scriptures for themselves, and through the illumination of the Holy Spirit expected to be able to discern truths overlooked or misinterpreted by the scribes, Pharisees, and the whole Sanhedrin. Timothy is advised by Paul, when conditions are adverse, "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of,

knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (II Tim. 3:14-15).

As to the completeness of Scripture the Confession says: "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing is at any time to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or by traditions of men." Compare II Tim. 3:15-17. Of course the "inward illumination of the Spirit of God" is considered necessary "for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word" (1:6).

Any attempts to establish rules to rival the Bible are to be condemned at the beginning and all the erroneous teachings of rival rules fall before the test that the Bible itself proposes: "To the law and to the testimony: if they do not speak according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isaiah 8:20).

Roman Catholicism by elevating its confusing traditions which clash with the Bible on important points to a position of extreme importance in effect subordinates the Scriptures to them. The claim that the Church of Rome is a perfect interpreter of the Bible is hardly borne out by the manifestly unbiblical doctrines that separate that body from the evangelical and the apostolic churches: doctrines such as the identification of the church universal with the church of Rome, papal infallibility, the indirect relationship of the believer to God through priests, the tenet one may do more than God requires and give the super virtue to the church, purgatory, prayer to saints, and belief that Christ is actually present, "Body, Soul and Divinity," in the Lord's Supper and that He is offered again for sin.

The mystics, who have claimed direct revelations of truth from God, are guilty of adding a subjective "authority" to the completed direct revelation of God—the Bible—and in effect of compromising its uniqueness and finality. Their special teachings can ill bear the tests that the Bible establishes.

The same condemnation must fall upon those who regard the reason of unregenerate man as the final authority in all matters of faith and practice.

SUGGESTIONS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

1. *If the Bible is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy God are we diligent enough in studying it and in telling others about it?*
2. *How does the Bible direct us as to how we may glorify and enjoy God?*
3. *Name some heretical religions of our times which do not recognize the clarity and completeness of the Scriptures. How would you reason with their followers?*
4. *Who alone can give us a saving*

understanding of such things as are revealed in the Bible?

5. *What impression do the things of the Spirit of God make upon the natural man? See I Cor. 2:14.*

6. *Is it safe to trust the Bible to the unscholarly?*

7. *In what way may light be thrown on the more difficult passages of Scripture?*

8. *Is it true that there has been an agreement among the children of God of all times as to "the meaning of Scripture in all things necessary either in faith or practice?"*

The Sunday School Lessons

By the REV. R. LAIRD HARRIS

November 1st, Law, Love and Temperance. Romans 13.



Mr. Harris

SO MUCH has been written and said on the subject for this week that in six hundred words we can only lay down a few principles to guide our actions. Our only virtue in discussing this, a mooted question, must be in staying close to the Bible and bending all our ideas and prejudices and opinions to its demands.

Our first observation is of great significance. We read plainly in the Bible that Jesus, the apostles, and the early Christians did drink wine. We must insist on this point because of its importance. Two words are used in the New Testament for wine: *gleukos* which occurs only in Acts 2:13 and *oinos* which is used twenty-eight times. It is certain from Eph. 5:18 (be not drunk with wine), I Tim. 3:8 (deacons . . . not given to much wine), and other passages that *oinos* referred to an intoxicating drink. John the Baptist was to avoid "both wine and strong drink." Jesus, taking the opposite course from that of John, was called a winebibber (*oinopotes*), (Luke 7:34). The Corinthian Christians who actually became drunk on wine were *not* told to change to unfermented wine, but were told to be more circumspect (I Cor. 11:21, 22). So much for the indisputable facts. Christ, the apostles, and the early Christians did drink wine.

We have so far proved that to drink alcoholic beverages in moderation under otherwise lawful circumstances is not sinful, for the Lord Jesus Himself did it. The question is not one of morality. However, if this country should prohibit all alcoholic beverages, we have no choice but to obey. We even retain laws against drunken driving, and Christians are morally bound to observe such prohibitions as the state erects. Is it not the point of the famous thirteenth chapter of Romans that the state is to be obeyed unless indeed it forces us to sin? The positive demands of the state, such as taxation and the bearing of arms in war, we may find inconvenient and even quite upsetting, but that we are to obey them is Paul's teaching. Likewise the state's negative commands—even such an humble one as a Japanese beetle quarantine—are to be obeyed. The question is not on a moral plane. But if the state decides that the use of alcoholic liquors is injurious the prohibition of their use must be respected.

Our knotty problem, however, is still to be answered. Must we, knowing that drunkenness is sin and moderation is not, abstain from the use of liquor because it might (and so often does) lead weaker ones astray? Naturally, if there is any doubt in the matter we should steer on the side of safety. But I sometimes wonder if we have paid sufficient attention to other factors involved. What is it that causes our weaker brother to sin? Is it not often bad company rather than

the drink? Is not the liquor *business* with its bars and dives and inducements to sin, worse than the liquor itself? In Christ's time, I believe, it was different. Then quite likely the "brewer's big horses" were not so bold and certainly what we call strong drink was unknown (for the Arabs later invented distillation). Is it not possible that a business could get so intertwined with evil that a wise Christian should avoid it altogether? I think it could. Early Christians banned the stage as not legitimate for a child of God. I do not know much of the plays of that period, but I rather suppose that the early church was right. Certainly, few industries of recent times have been so notoriously interconnected with evil in all its forms of graft, excess, immorality, murder, and general vice as has the liquor business. And therefore, although moderate drinking in decent circumstances cannot be denominated sin, still the part of wisdom and expedience for the Christian may well be to stand off from a hellish trade. Whatever rights a Christian may possess, his exercise of his liberties must always be controlled by love for his brother.

November 8th, The Christian Warfare. Acts 19; Eph. 6:10-20.

The end of the second missionary journey and the beginning of the third is told in few words in Acts 18:18 to 19:1. Paul made the circuit from Corinth to Asia Minor, then Palestine and up to Antioch, then over to Ephesus and stayed for about three years. It was from there that he wrote to the Corinthians as we have already seen. He had great success in Ephesus and the church there flourished. The apostle John, according to tradition, spent most of his old age in Ephesus and was buried there. The Epistle to the Ephesians was written after the end of Paul's third journey and the voyage to Rome, and reflects the good condition of the church to which he writes. Paul had good reason to be thankful to God for the Ephesians whose prayers he now had to comfort his imprisonment.

Paul was nearing the end of a Christian warfare. He was in bonds. For him the warfare had been intensive indeed, for he had resisted unto blood. He had felt the active bombardment of the powers of wick-

edness and had also known the protecting barrage of the grace of God. He knew it was a warfare. Less active souls do not realize either the deadly combat or the great issue involved. Because the battle is noiseless they do not know war has been declared. But since there is evil in the universe, God does fight and He calls upon Christians to "follow in His train."

We, therefore, are to fight against sin. We should notice that the Ephesians' passage follows upon the fourth, fifth, and early part of the sixth chapters which deal with the conduct of the Christian. Paul has said "walk in love," "avoid fornication," "be not drunk with wine," "children, obey your parents in the Lord," "finally . . . put on the whole armor of God." In this last chapter Paul is exhorting us to walk as Christians should, fighting against evil and trusting in God. It is keeping ourselves from sin which Paul says is a struggle. He is not commanding us to go on a grand crusade for an eight-hour day denouncing employers as greedy ogres and expecting by social legislation to usher in the Kingdom. In fact, he is telling us to avoid such warfare because our warfare is not against flesh and blood. In short, it is not our business as witnesses to the gospel to "make America Christian," as we are urged by the promoters of the movement, "Christian Youth Building a New World." We are to defend ourselves against the world's attack as those who are in this "present evil world" yet not of it. We are to fight, of course. But shall we not re-emphasize the fact that our first duty is not what is generally known as social reform, but a hardy resisting of the

solicitation to evil which the world presents on every hand?

We have mentioned only defense so far, but the Christian has a mission of offense to carry out also. Here we are to strike out with the Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God. The preaching and teaching of the Word will advance God's kingdom of grace when legislation will inevitably fail. For the truth of the Word gains converts from the ranks of Satan. By correct application of the written Word our Lord vanquished Satan in the wilderness and by it we too can conquer the power of Satan in our lives and in the lives of those whom God shall call. If we would be true men for God this must be our warfare: We will be faithful and patient students of the Word. We will read it daily in our homes and talk of it to our friends. We will see to it that it is fairly preached from our pulpits and carefully taught to our children. Then armed with the salvation, the righteousness, the faith, the truth that God supplies by His Gospel we shall indeed be soldiers of the Cross and by this sign we shall conquer.

November 15th, The Heroism of Christian Faith. Acts 21:12 to 23:30; Rom. 9:1-5.

From Paul's residence at Ephesus we follow him in a tour of Greece continuing his third missionary journey. Then he planned to return to Jerusalem by the feast of Pentecost. At Jerusalem his third journey ended in the two-year imprisonment which led to the journey to Rome, the shipwreck and the Roman imprisonment, after which he was apparently freed for a little while. We shall study Paul's last journey to Jerusalem rather than the topic assigned, which appears in a way to be secondary. Paul did not go to Jerusalem as a hero, but as one on a mission. For a necessity was laid upon him, as he said, "yea, woe is me if I preach not the gospel" (I Cor. 9:16). It may be making a false distinction to say that Paul was not exhibiting courage when he went to Jerusalem, but I like to think of it as far different from ordinary bravery. Certainly Paul faced danger—certain danger and possible death—without flinching. Paul, however, faced that certain trouble calmly, not as a hero who dares but as one who relies upon a preserving God. Not manly courage, but Godly faith is the basis of

**Free Literature for
the Sunday School**

FROM a reliable source The Presbyterian Guardian has learned of an offer of lesson helps for the period from October to December. Those who are interested may address their inquiries to the Instructor Publishing Co., Zeeland, Michigan.

that Christian fortitude which has been characteristic of the great saints of God.

The Scripture reading from Romans gives, I think, the real reason for Paul's return to Jerusalem. True, he had an offering for the church there, and he doubtless longed to be with the leaders of that important church for a while again. But chiefly he wanted to speak to the crowds of his own people who thronged Jerusalem at this season. Paul wanted to reach the Jews. Although he magnified his office as apostle to the Gentiles he never forgot the Jews, his "kinsmen according to the flesh." Thousands of Christians today who live in homes divided can understand the apostle's feeling. He always turned to the Jews first, and now he saw an opportunity to reach many Jews from distant lands all at once. In passing let us notice that it is these unsaved Jews, these kinsmen of Paul according to the flesh, to whom pertains the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law and the service of God, and the promises. And these blessings appear from Romans 11:29 not to have been taken back. Certainly we should share with Paul his solicitude for the unsaved Jews from whom as a nation came our Saviour.

There are two questions connected with Paul's visit which should be mentioned, but they call for serious study and I have neither space nor ability to give a complete answer. Was Paul right in going to Jerusalem and was his conduct in keeping at least a portion of the law justified? Some conclude from Acts 21:4 that Paul disobeyed a direct revelation. We cannot be so certain as to say that. It is possible. But the warning of Agabus was conditional and this revelation may well have implied a condition that if he did go he should suffer. And of course Paul was ready to suffer. Why may not Acts 20:22 refer to a revelation of the Holy Spirit constraining him to go (so Calvin) and yet warning him, even before Agabus' prophecy, of the tribulations awaiting him there? At least, as a result of the visit Paul did bear witness both at Jerusalem and at Rome, and God was with him.

More serious is the other question. Did Paul do right in observing certain ceremonies in the temple? The feeling of the church seemed to be that Gentiles need not keep the cere-

monial law, but that Jews, at least, must. But the Epistle to the Hebrews declares that the whole ceremonial law is done away since Christ fulfilled its types and shadows. Peter also had been shown that unclean meats could now be eaten. To be short it appears either that Paul dissembled as Peter had done at Antioch (Gal. 2:11) or else that Paul in an indifferent thing became as a Jew in this case also, in order that he might win the Jews. At least again God triumphed either through him or in spite of him and the name of Jesus was preached from the prison steps as well as in the Sanhedrim. And here is the end of the

heroism of Paul as it is the end of the heroism, or better the faithfulness, of the Christian—Christ must be preached in all his fullness. That goal of sounding out the Gospel is worthy of our suffering or even death. It is worthy of our attention too and our support. It was the last and great commission of Jesus and is, in part, the business of the Christian church. We are not to shrink from hardship or difficulty or danger in the prosecution of that work, "for we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" (II Cor. 5:20).

PHILADELPHIA PRESBYTERY PASSES RESOLUTION ON MILLENNIAL QUESTION; RECEIVES SEVEN MINISTERS, THREE CHURCHES

Recent Westminster Graduate Licensed and Called to West Pittston Church

AT ITS meeting on October 13th, the Presbytery of Philadelphia passed a resolution which expresses its position with reference to matters that had come before it from the Duryea Church. The prevailing opinion was that the resolution would help clear away many misconceptions of the doctrinal position of the church. While voicing the liberty which has prevailed in most Reformed churches on the matter of the Millennium, the resolution at many points guards the fidelity of officers and churches to the Reformed system of doctrine. The entire resolution follows:

"I. The question whether or not our Lord's bodily return is held to precede the "thousand years" referred to in Revelation 20 is, in our opinion, despite its importance, not to be regarded as a test whether a man does or does not adhere to the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms. A man may, we think, answer this question in the affirmative or answer it in the negative and still, if his convictions otherwise are satisfactory, be ordained and received as a minister or elder or deacon of The Presbyterian Church of America.

"II. A congregation that desires as its pastor a man who holds the view of our Lord's bodily return described above should not be prevented from

having such a pastor; neither should a congregation that desires as its pastor a man who rejects this view be prevented from having him, provided that in each case the pastor has subscribed *ex animo* to the system of doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

"III. It should, however, in our judgment, be regarded as improper for congregations to erect into a position of constitutional fixity (by inclusion in their charters or otherwise) any doctrinal requirements or standards other than those of the church at large."

At this meeting there were several additions to the rolls of the presbytery. Ministers received were J. Edward Blair, A. Franklin Faucette, Floyd E. Hamilton, Oscar Holkeboer, J. Mellema, Glenn Coie and Robert Strong. Churches: Calvary Church, of Willow Grove, Pa.; St. Andrews, of Baltimore, and Christ Church, of Philadelphia.

Mr. Reginald Voorhees was licensed and a call to the West Pittston Church was placed in his hands. Arrangements were made for his ordination and installation as pastor of that church at an early date.

Twelve students of Westminster Seminary were taken under the care of presbytery as candidates for the gospel ministry.

PROGRAM ANNOUNCED FOR SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 12TH TO 15TH

Prominent Speakers Planned for Important Meetings in Philadelphia

THE Second General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America will convene in Philadelphia from Thursday, November 12th, to Sunday, November 15th. All sessions will be held in the large auditorium of the Manufacturers' and Bankers' Club, Northwest Corner of Broad and Walnut Streets.

The tentative program of the Assembly is as follows:

- Thursday, November 12th*
- 10.00 A.M.—Sermon by Moderator of First General Assembly
THE REV. J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D.
The Lord's Supper
- 2.00 P.M.—Constituting Assembly with prayer
Roll call
Adoption of the docket
Presentation of minutes of last Assembly
Election of Stated Clerk for duration of Assembly
Nominations for Moderator
Election of Moderator
Installation of Moderator
- 3.00 P.M.—Report of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension
Reports from Home Missionaries
- 7.45 P.M.—Public mass meeting
Addresses:
THE REV. J. J. DEWAARD, Cedar Grove, Wisconsin
THE REV. EVERETT C. DEVELDE, Cincinnati, Ohio
- Friday, November 13th*
- 9.00 A.M.—Devotional Exercises
- 9.15 A.M.—Assembly constituted with prayer
Reading of minutes of previous day
- 9.30 A.M.—Report of Committee on the Constitution
- 12.15 P.M.—General Assembly picture
- 2.00 P.M.—(a) Report of the Committee on Christian Education
(b) Special Meeting for Women—New Century Club, 124 South 12th Street
Presiding—Mrs. J. B. GRIGGS, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Speaker—Mrs. A. L. BERRY, Tryon, North Carolina
- 3.00 P.M.—Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions

Reports from foreign missionaries

4.00 P.M.—Report of the Committee on Comity Relations with Other Churches

7.45 P.M.—Public mass meeting
THE REV. JOHN P. CLELAND, Wilmington, Delaware
THE REV. SAMUEL J. ALLEN, Carson, North Dakota

Saturday, November 14th

9.00 A.M.—Devotional Exercises

9.15 A.M.—Assembly constituted with prayer

Reading of minutes of previous day

9.30 A.M.—Second report of Committee on the Constitution

11.30 A.M.—Miscellaneous business
Setting date and place of next Assembly

Approval of the minutes

2.00 P.M.—Afternoon session if needed

Sunday, November 15th

11.00 A.M.—Services in various churches addressed by visiting ministers

7.45 P.M.—Public mass meeting

Address:

THE REV. J. OLIVER BUSWELL, JR., D.D., President of Wheaton College

METHODISTS VOTE ON QUESTION OF CHURCH MERGER

THE New Jersey Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, North, in its 100th annual session held recently in Ocean City, voted unanimously in favor of a merger with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church. This was hailed by many as a great forward step toward healing the schism that developed in Methodism in 1824 over administrative differences and in 1844 over the slavery issue.

Bishop Ernest G. Richardson, of Philadelphia, presiding over the conference, announced that approval of the consolidation was being expressed throughout the northern churches. However, on October 9th, the Eastern Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church voted 69 to 32 against the proposed union. Observers came away from the balloting convinced that one of the chief issues motivating the vote was that of Modernism versus orthodoxy.

Thus far ten regional conferences of the Methodist Protestant Church have voted for the union, and four against. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has not yet voted.

PHILADELPHIA PRESBYTERY REPORTS UNUSUAL PROGRESS

THE Presbytery of Philadelphia of The Presbyterian Church of America has had a rapid growth. Beginning with a meeting of a scant dozen ministers and elders on June 13th in an anteroom of the New Century Club, Philadelphia, at which the first congregation, Knox of Philadelphia, was admitted and the first licensure, that of Frank Fiol, Independent Board appointee, performed, this first of the presbyteries has held fourteen meetings, now numbers nineteen churches, fifty-six ministers, over sixty elders, and nineteen students under care, with numbers constantly increasing. Several other presbyteries have been formed largely from its membership. Its ministers reside in many states, literally from Maine to California. Ten are missionaries. Of the twenty-eight ministers residing within its boundaries or nearby seventeen are pastors, eight educators, and two board secretaries. Seventeen of its nineteen churches have been self-supporting from the beginning, and thirteen have regular pastors who withdrew with them. There are no deficits, and its rapidly-growing congregations meet in halls, remodeled dwellings and church edifices, six of them in Philadelphia.

For the convenience of visitors a list of church locations is appended:

- St. Andrew's Church, Baltimore, Md.
Pencader Church, Glasgow, Del.
Kirkwood Church, Kirkwood, Pa.
Calvary Church, Middletown, Pa.
Head of Christiana Church, Newark, Del.
Valley Forge Church, Norristown, Pa.
Bethany Church, Nottingham, Pa.
Calvary Church of Germantown, 66 W. Chelten Ave., Phila.
Christ Church, Columbia Ave., Phila.
Gethsemane Church, 2803 S. 63rd St., Phila.
Knox Church, 2216 E. Cumberland St., Phila.
New Covenant Church, 5039 Baltimore Ave., Phila.
Northeast Church (Frankford), 4955 Frankford Ave., Phila.
Redeemer Church, 3944 Walnut St., Phila.
Faith Church, Quarryville, Pa.
Knox Church, Washington, D. C.
West Pittston Church, West Pittston, Pa.
Calvary Church of Willow Grove, Pa.
Eastlake Church, Wilmington, Del.

PHILADELPHIA PRESBYTERY OF OLD BODY RELICENSES THE REV. JOHN W. FULTON

THE Comedy of Errors in the case of the Rev. John W. Fulton, Westminster Seminary graduate, reached Act III at the meeting of Philadelphia Presbytery of the old organization on October 5th. Mr. Fulton was first licensed by the presbytery on March 4, 1934. He was licensed in spite of his refusal to promise obedience to the future acts of church councils. A complaint against the licensure was filed by the minority which, on two separate counts, was held by the majority to be invalid as a "stay" on the licensure. On April 3, 1935, the presbytery ordained Mr. Fulton.

Pennsylvania Synod's Judicial Commission on October 22, 1935 ruled in favor of the complainants and declared Mr. Fulton's licensure *and ordination* invalid. Complaint against this action of Synod was carried to the 148th General Assembly, where it was summarily dismissed, Synod's decision sustained, and "the attempted licensure and ordination" once more declared invalid.

Apparently reversing his previous stand on the subject of loyalty to the Boards and agencies, Mr. Fulton appeared at the October meeting of presbytery and allowed himself to be recommended for examination and licensure. Two questions were asked him by presbytery's always vocal Auburn Affirmationist, Joseph B. C. Mackie. The first question was: "When you state in your vows that you will be obedient to your brethren in the Lord what do you mean?" Cryptically Mr. Fulton replied, "I have not the power to discriminate between the brethren." Dr. Mackie's second question was, "If you are installed is it your intention to support the Boards and agencies of our church and would you refuse to give comfort and assistance to the captious critics of the Boards and agencies?" Mr. Fulton replied, "Yes." He will probably be ordained sometime during November.

Several innovations in the method of conducting the affairs of presbytery have been noted. It is evident that all the really important matters are decided by hand-picked committees so that no details are allowed to reach

the floor of presbytery. That body simply votes to approve, or occasionally in a mood of reckless caprice to disapprove, the committees' reports.

Newspaper men are now given a table under the protecting shadow of the stated clerk. Every effort is being made to avoid even the beginning of a controversy on any point. The leaders appear determined to demonstrate that, since the "troublemakers" are now out of the church, the meetings of presbytery will in the future be one long dulcet symphony.

SPEECHES BY OPPOSITION BACKFIRE AT IOWA RALLY

A WELL-ATTENDED meeting was held on October first at the Princeton (Iowa) Church of The Presbyterian Church of America. The occasion was the presence of three members of the faculty of Wheaton College—Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Dr. Gordon H. Clark, and Mr. Peter Stam—who spoke on the present Presbyterian conflict.

Representatives of Iowa City Presbytery of the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. were offered equal time to speak if they so desired, but the invitation was refused. However, after the meeting had started, two members of that body entered. They were the Rev. Louis P. Penningroth and the Rev. John H. Gabriel, both graduates of Union Seminary. At the close of the addresses of the Wheaton men they were again invited to speak.

Neither of them faced the issue in any way, but both produced a remarkable exhibition of hedging, smoke-screening, circumlocution and general befuddlement. Said the pastor of the host church, the Rev. V. V. Wortman, "They did us a great deal of good. They really proved that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. cannot meet the issue in the open and present a case that in any way, shape or form proves that we are wrong in our stand against the apostasy of their organization. This meeting was successful in every way. If you really want to help your people to see the issue more clearly and help them to stand more firmly against the evils of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. have them invite the opposition to present 'its side.'"

NEW CASTLE BODY MOVES TOWARD CIVIL ACTION TO RETAIN CHURCH PROPERTIES

Old Organization Pledged to Support "Loyal" Congregations

WHEREAS, you have been convicted by sufficient proof, and by your sin and unfaithfulness have brought reproach on the cause of your Master, we therefore, acting under the authority of Jesus Christ, do hereby depose and exclude you from the office of minister of the gospel, and do prohibit you from exercising henceforth any of the powers and duties of that office."

With these searing and, to many listeners, blasphemous words, the Rev. J. Herrick Darling, Moderator of New Castle Presbytery, attempted to pronounce final sentence of deposition on four former members at the meeting of presbytery on October 6th at Snow Hill, Maryland.

The four were: The Rev. John P. Clelland, Wilmington; the Rev. Henry G. Welbon, Newark; the Rev. Robert H. Graham, Middletown; and the Rev. Colin C. Weir, Elsmere.

With characteristic steam-roller tactics presbytery's ring-leaders ruled that there could be no discussion of the report of the special judicial commission. Said the Rev. John W. Christie, in an abortive attempt to do presbytery's thinking for it, "Gentlemen, I don't think you want to hear all of these charges and specifications repeated. It is all water over the dam now."

On motion of Mr. Christie the presbytery unanimously voted to pledge as its first duty complete support of congregations that decline to follow their ministers from the apostate organization. Obviously cheered on by the law suit of the old organization now pending against The Presbyterian Church of America, the Presbytery of New Castle elected moderators for seven "affected" churches. Pulpits of six of these are now occupied by "suspended" or "deposed" ministers. Presbytery instructed the new moderators to move into the churches. Since it is inevitable that the authority of these moderators will be challenged by the congregations,

the next step is seen as the filing of suit in the civil courts. The Rev. J. S. Venable of Pocomoke City, who made public the proposed legal action, asserted that only the Delaware Church buildings are to be included in the initial legal move.

Meanwhile the churches and ministers under fire were busily engaged in promoting the cause of the gospel of Christ. None have given more than passing heed to the tumult and the shouting of their former presbytery.

CHICAGO PRESBYTERY HOLDS FIRST MEETING; RECEIVES SIX MEMBERS, TWO CHURCHES

Dr. Buswell Chosen Moderator

MEETING in the office of Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, President of Wheaton College, the Presbytery of Chicago of The Presbyterian Church of America was formally erected on September 26th. This presbytery will include churches throughout the entire state of Illinois.

Dr. Buswell was unanimously chosen as Moderator and the Rev. R. Jackson Vaughn as Stated Clerk. The following six members were enrolled by the presbytery: J. Oliver Buswell, Wheaton; R. Jackson Vaughn, Chicago; Frank H. Heydenburk, Chicago (transferred from Philadelphia Presbytery); Benjamin M. Brown, Chicago; and Louis R. Patmont, Berkeley, California.

The two churches enrolled are both under the pastorate of the Rev. R. J. Vaughn. They are the First Chicago Presbyterian Church of America and the Glenwood Presbyterian Church of America.

The resolution adopted by the first General Assembly regarding the status of allegedly deposed ministers was reaffirmed by the new presbytery.

The Moderator read in full the Act of Association adopted at the first General Assembly, and it was resolved by unanimous vote that each minister applying for membership in the presbytery must subscribe to Section III of that act.

After a time of real spiritual refreshment the presbytery adjourned to meet again on November 5th at the Gospel League Home, Chicago.

BUCHMANISM LINKED WITH HITLER'S PHILOSOPHY

Shoemaker Calls for State Supervision of Religion

ACCORDING to the press, Dr. Samuel M. Shoemaker, first lieutenant to Fuehrer Frank Buchman of the Oxford Group Movement, has come out with a plea for the right of the State to control religion which is not "genuinely beneficial to the people":

It seems to me that any government which has the people's interests at heart has the right and the duty to ask whether religion, as the churches preach and practice it, is genuinely beneficial to the people. We liberal-minded Americans see the danger which inheres in any interference by the State in religion. We do not see the danger in allowing to go on unchecked and unchallenged almost any church, however corrupt it may be in morals and however meddlesome in politics. We really want the State to take the responsibility for keeping things in order, so that we may continue our religious practice as we wish.

Commenting in *The Boston Evening Transcript*, the brilliant religious editor, Dr. A. C. Dieffenbach, pointedly shows the implications of Dr. Shoemaker's statement:

What does this mean? Only one thing, if it is logically carried out, namely, the rule of the churches and of religion by the State, and that is precisely what is being attempted in Germany, in Spain, Mexico and Russia. To give the State authority to decide what is good religion and what constitutes a true church is to throw civilization back into benighted monarchism, which is what we have as a matter of fact in present-day dictatorships.

And it would follow in the United States, as in any other dictatorship over religion, that godlessness with an unspiritual ideology would destroy the soul of the people.

Following hard upon Buchman's own praise of Hitler as the Saviour of Europe and his apparent admiration of dictators in general, Dr. Shoemaker's statement takes on greater significance as being apparently a studied espousal of some form of state control of religion. Commenting upon Buchman's statement that through such a man as Hitler "God could control a nation overnight and solve every last bewildering problem", Reinhold Niebuhr, writing in *The Christian Century*, declared that Buchmanism involved a fascist philosophy, and as such was "not only socially vicious but religiously vapid."

THE REV. A. F. FAUCETTE LEAVES OLD BODY

THE Rev. A. Franklin Faucette, former pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Watsontown, Pa., on September 23rd read to his congregation a letter of resignation to take effect on October 15th.

"I am compelled to sever my connection with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.," said Mr. Faucette, "and to bring to an end my labors among you in order that I may be true to my convictions as a minister of Jesus Christ."

Mr. Faucette has now joined The Presbyterian Church of America.

WILLOW GROVE PASTOR LEADS OUT CONGREGATION BY VOTE OF 200 TO 25

ON Wednesday, September 30th, two hundred members of the Willow Grove (Pa.) Church met with their pastor, the Rev. Robert Strong, to take appropriate action in view of the official apostasy of the organization known as the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Mr. Strong submitted his resignation to the congregation, and summarized his reasons for withdrawal. He said, "I feel that no course is left to me but withdrawal from a communion that, in my judgment, has set at naught tremendously important teachings of God's holy Word and the requirements of its own constitution."

It was at once moved and seconded that the resignation be not accepted. The resignation was then rejected by a vote of 197 to 28.

The congregation, having thus shown its sympathy with the pastor's stand, was asked if it would take the same stand officially. A resolution of withdrawal from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. was read. There was practically no debate, the opposition pleading only for delay that an argument might be presented by the presbytery in its behalf. It was strongly felt that more than enough time had elapsed for everyone to become informed on these matters and that action should be taken at once. The resolution of withdrawal prevailed by a vote of 200 to 25.

The next item of business was the reorganization of the church. Twenty-one out of twenty-six officers were found to be in full sympathy with the action taken, and they were elected to continue in official position.

The pastor closed the meeting, which had been characterized throughout by enthusiasm, with a brief address in which he warned of difficulties and even persecutions that would come. He called upon all for complete cooperation and faithfulness in the great task ahead of making the Calvary Presbyterian Church of Willow Grove a challenging and effective testimony to the true Gospel of Christ. In the past three years the congregation has tripled its membership, and with the blessing of God it may hope to go on from strength to strength.

Both Mr. Strong and the church were received by the Presbytery of Philadelphia of The Presbyterian Church of America on October 13th.

OREGON PASTOR LEAVES OLD ORGANIZATION

CCLIMAXING a year of constant application to the duty of warning his congregation of Modernism in the Boards and agencies, the Rev. Glenn R. Coie renounced the jurisdiction of the body called the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. on Sunday, October 18th. Mr. Coie was formerly pastor of the church at Bend, Oregon. Immediately after his installation last November Mr. Coie launched a program designed to acquaint his people with the facts in the Presbyterian crisis. A series of studies on the church situation, hour-and-a-half talks to the missionary society, and wide distribution of copies of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN resulted in gratifying response.

Delaying his resignation as pastor until the arrival of the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, Chairman of the Home Missions Committee, Mr. Coie, on September 22nd, held a well-advertised mass meeting at which Mr. Woodbridge answered the great question: Why The Presbyterian Church of America?

On Sunday, October 18th, Mr. Coie preached his farewell sermon, closing with his renunciation of the jurisdiction of the old organization.

It is expected that a large percent-

age of the church membership, particularly among the young people, will take a similar action. Mr. Coie has already joined The Presbyterian Church of America.

PRESBYTERY OF THE DAKOTAS HOLDS INITIAL MEETING, ADOPTS RESOLUTIONS

The Rev. S. J. Allen Chosen
Moderator of New Body

MEETING in Bismarck, N. D., on Wednesday, September 30th, five ministers and eight elders formally erected the Presbytery of the Dakotas of The Presbyterian Church of America. The Rev. Samuel J. Allen, of Carson, N. D., conservative candidate for Moderator of the Syracuse General Assembly, was elected Moderator of the new presbytery. The Rev. E. E. Matteson, of Wilton, N. D., was chosen Stated Clerk.

Resolutions read by the Rev. David K. Myers, of Thunderhawk, S. D., declared "the Presbytery of the Dakotas to be the true and spiritual successor of the following presbyteries of that body known as the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as it existed prior to the apostate actions of the 148th General Assembly of that body: Bismarck, Fargo, Minnewaukan, Minot, Oakes and Pembina of North Dakota, and Aberdeen, Black Hills, Dakota Indian, Huron and Sioux Falls of South Dakota."

The resolutions "renounced the authority of all other ecclesiastical bodies, declaring that its members are subject to the jurisdiction of The Presbyterian Church of America alone and that any purported acts of discipline against any or all of them by any other ecclesiastical body whatsoever are unlawful and void."

Ministerial members, in addition to Mr. Allen, Mr. Matteson and Mr. Myers, were the Rev. C. A. Balcom, Wilton, and the Rev. Walter Magee, Hamill, S. D.

Also listed as associate members were the Rev. Jack Zandstra, Alexandria, S. D.; the Rev. Charles Shook, Volga, S. D.; the Rev. George Heaton, Bancroft, S. D.; George Cotton, Volga, and H. D. Thayden, Bancroft.

CANADIAN CONGREGATION GREETS THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AMERICA

Cites "Signal Service to Cause
of Evangelical Christianity"

MEETING in Toronto's Bloor Street East Presbyterian Church (unaffiliated) on September 28th, a large group of Presbyterians unanimously adopted a resolution of greeting, sympathy and encouragement to The Presbyterian Church of America. The meeting was addressed by Mr. John Murray, of Westminster Seminary, on the subject of "Recent Developments in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A."

The text of the resolution follows:

It is felt that the opportunity presented to us tonight should not be allowed to pass without permitting those present to give formal expression to their appreciation of the signal service rendered to the cause of evangelical Christianity, the historic Reformed Faith, and true Presbyterianism by the recent formation of The Presbyterian Church of America.

This meeting of Presbyterians in the Bloor St. East Presbyterian Church (unaffiliated), Toronto, Canada, called to hear an address on "Recent Developments in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A." hereby sends greetings to their brethren in The Presbyterian Church of America with a profound sense of admiration for the sacrificial loyalty exhibited by those brethren in the United States of America who have voluntarily separated from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. because of the extreme defections from the faith which are rampant in that once orthodox body and countenanced by its highest court. And especially do they express their admiration of those whose resistance to the unscriptural and tyrannical usurpation of authority of that church has resulted in their being expelled from the church of which they had hitherto been loyal and devoted servants.

This meeting also expresses the hope that at an early date a strong party of Presbyterians in Canada will be organized to cooperate with The Presbyterian Church of America, failing appropriate action by the authorized courts of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

Mr. Murray is hereby authorized personally to convey this resolution to the Moderator of the first General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America, the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., of Philadelphia.

Moved by Mr. R. Campbell, seconded by Mr. R. D. Ross and unanimously adopted.

(Signed) A. MACKENZIE.
September 28, 1936.

INDEPENDENT BOARD ACCEPTS MISSIONARY FORMERLY UNDER BOARD OF OLD ORGANIZATION

The Rev. Floyd E. Hamilton of Korea Received as Member of Presbytery of Philadelphia

THE Rev. Floyd E. Hamilton of Pyengyang, Korea, on September 5th, renounced the jurisdiction of the body known as the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., and requested the Stated Clerk of Mahoning Presbytery to erase his name from the roll of that body.

At the same time he addressed a letter of resignation to the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. under whose direction he has labored in Korea since 1919. This letter set forth in great detail and with calm, unhurried and incontrovertible logic the reasons why he could no longer remain a missionary of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Mrs. Hamilton also expressed her complete agreement with the letter.

Mr. Hamilton then sent his application for admission to the Philadelphia Presbytery of The Presbyterian Church of America. He was received by that body at its regular meeting on October 13th.

Completing his ecclesiastical housecleaning he promptly applied for appointment under The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. On the afternoon of Thursday, October 15th, he was enthusiastically appointed by the Executive Committee of that Board.

Mr. Hamilton graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1919. He was ordained by the Presbytery of Wooster, and for the past seventeen years has labored as a missionary and Professor of Bible in Union Christian College, Pyengyang, Korea. He is the author of several well-known books, among them "The Basis of Evolutionary Faith," and "The Basis of Christian Faith."

It's Easy to Start a

Presbyterian Guardian Club

In Your Church or Community

The Plan is Simple

Five or more subscriptions at the rate of only 80c each per year are all you need to begin your "Presbyterian Guardian Club." This represents an immediate cash saving of 20% of the single subscription price. The five or more copies may be sent either to separate addresses, or in a package to one address.

How to Add New Members

All subscriptions in a club are renewable at the same time. However, additions to an existing club may be made at any time by charging the new member at the rate of 7c per month for the unexpired term of the club. Clubs may be formed entirely of gift subscriptions if so desired, or composed of subscriptions paid by individuals.

Why Not Form Your Church Club Now?

Many churches have already begun to organize clubs among their members. In other cases individuals have formed clubs among their personal friends, each sharing in the substantial saving. If your church and Christian friends have not yet started a club, why delay longer? We offer this almost unbelievably low rate in order that "The Presbyterian Guardian" may now be available to everyone. Will you do your part in helping us accomplish the mighty task to which we are committed? We know of no better way than by starting your "Presbyterian Guardian Club" now.

For further information about the Club Plan address

The Presbyterian Guardian

1212 Commonwealth Building

Philadelphia, Penna.