

October 15, 1954

VOL. 23, NO. 10

The Presbyterian
G U A R D I A N

As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, both to deter all men from sin; and for the greater consolation of the godly in their adversity: so will He have that day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come; and may be ever prepared to say, Come Lord Jesus, come quickly, Amen.

Westminster Confession XXXIII.111

J. Gresham Machen
Editor 1936 - 1937

Published Monthly
\$2.50 per year

Meditation

Time to Invest

"He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. And he called ten servants of his, and gave them ten pounds . . ."

—LUKE 19:12-13.

Many who saw and heard Jesus of Nazareth thought he looked very much like the promised Messiah who should bring them freedom, consolation, and glory. At least on one occasion, his talk in the vicinity of the city of Jerusalem even stirred up the hope that the time had come at last when the Kingdom of God would appear.

The Kingdom was in fact already with them. It was the explanation of the wonderful things men saw and heard. But it was appearing then only in a sort of token. God was working and asserting the power of the world to come to a great extent in secret. He kept a veil over his operations. And though the people sensed correctly that the King was about to assert his authority and to press his claims, they did not really understand his program. He would ride in triumph into the city and would even clean out the temple. But it would all be a token gesture. He would ride upon an ass, and he would fall into the hands of his enemies. They would see him caught up in a wave of reproaches and carried away as with a tide of disgrace. The final triumph of this Kingdom was not yet. They must think of other matters.

He was really just about to leave them. And it would be some time before he would come in the power and glory of his Kingdom, for he was going "into a far country." The coming of the Kingdom should indeed be on their minds. But not the thought of its immediate revelation. Their thought must not be as to when the Kingdom should appear, but how ready they were to enjoy it the most when it came.

No better indication of readiness could they hope to produce than the fruits of a life devoted to promoting his glory during the time of his absence. Those who cherished the hope of the Kingdom ought to show

that it was their hope by demonstrating their love and their allegiance. And they must be ready to give an account of how they used all their resources of time, abilities, strength, and material goods in the light of their professed hope.

At the appearance of the King visibly clothed with the authority of his Kingdom, some of his servants will come with a record worthy of praise. Their affections were set on the things above. And they ran their race as men concerned with the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Like shrewd men of business, they took every opportunity to make a few "dollars" for their Lord—to exalt Christ and to bring him honor. Great will be their reward! Others less successful will fare less well. But every man will receive the just reward of his labor. Yet the rewards are so far out of proportion to their earnings that it is plain that their stewardship was given merely as a test of faithfulness, to bring out the character and the capacities of every man.

But some will have no gain to show. They would not trade. Afraid to lose it, they would not invest their capital. They froze their assets because they were afraid of their Master. So afraid were they of him that they wanted to make sure of at least what he had given them. And they refused to obey his order to go and trade.

By this they showed themselves unfaithful servants, quite ignorant of their Master and his ways, and unfitted for his Kingdom. Had there been the will to invest, there would have been a return. Labor in the Lord cannot be in vain. Certainly it will bring no loss. Christ is already honored in the very try of the servant who sincerely tries.

And though the gains may be small because the assets are handled poorly, the Master is pleased because there was the effort made to trade. The servant tried to honor his Master.

But the "careful" servant will not trade. And he refuses to trade because he knows nothing of his Master's grace and compassion. He does not breathe the air of the heavenly dominion, and has never learned its anthem. He knows about justice, but has never heard of grace. He does not know

that the Master by his redeeming grace sanctifies the faltering efforts of his people to honor his name. He does not know that he will receive the reward of a city for a pound of gain. He does not see that his Master does not need the profits, but looks for the heart of his servants. He adopts a foolish policy. His very capital is taken away!

As for open rebels, utter ruin is before them. To their everlasting shame and frustration the truth will be forced upon them that the Kingdom cannot be overthrown.

HENRY P. TAVARES.

Two New Books By Dr. Young

THE Rev. Edward J. Young, Professor of Old Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary and author of numerous books in the Old Testament field, has just had two more books published. They are *Studies in Isaiah*, a reprint in book form of a series of articles which appeared originally in the Westminster Theological Journal, and *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*, a small work (86 pages) in exposition of these portions of Daniel's book. Both books are published by Eerdmans of Grand Rapids, the Isaiah volume at \$2.50 and the Daniel book at \$1.50. They may be ordered through THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN.

Seven Southern Presbyteries Vote Against Union

THE seventh presbytery of the Southern Presbyterian Church to vote on the question of union with the Northern Presbyterian denomination followed the steps of its six predecessors and voted overwhelmingly against the merger. The total of the votes cast in all these seven presbyteries shows 363 against union, and 50 in favor.

The seven presbyteries which have voted thus far are Pee Dee Presbytery, S. C.; Florida Presbytery; Central Mississippi Presbytery; East Alabama Presbytery; Tuscaloosa, Ala., Presbytery; and Congaree, S. C., Presbytery. Should fifteen more presbyteries vote against, the plan of union will have been defeated.

The Presbyterian Guardian is published monthly by the Presbyterian Guardian Publishing Corporation, 728 Schaff Building, 1505 Race Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa., at the following rates, payable in advance for either old or new subscribers in any part of the world, postage prepaid: \$2.50 per year; \$1.00 for four months; 25c per single copy. Entered as second class matter March 4, 1937, at the Post Office at Philadelphia, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN

OCTOBER 15, 1954

Speaking To Our Own Time

ON another page we publish a letter from one of our readers commenting on certain material in the September GUARDIAN, and more specifically on the responsibility of those who hold the Reformed faith in the present generation.

Though the letter may seem rather critical at points, we prefer to interpret it as a considered effort at constructive comment on the current ecclesiastical situation.

And with the basic argument of the writer we sincerely agree. His basic point is that the true Church must speak its Christian message intelligently to its own generation, including contemporary Christendom. We cannot withdraw into our little corner and contemplate, merely as observers, the struggles of those who have forsaken the Rock, to find solid ground to stand on. Thus every agency devoted to the cause of Christ must engage actively in the current situation.

This does not mean that we throw away our history books. From the past we learn both of success and of failure. We learn the nature of the problem, what has been done to meet it, and the effectiveness of the efforts in this direction. We do not recall the fight in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., for example, simply to rekindle the fires of a conflict of twenty years past, but to understand the nature of the problem that existed then, in its bearing on the nature of the problem as it exists now.

Also to engage actively in the current situation does not mean that we must become a part of the modern "ecumenical movement," so that what we have to say to our generation becomes merged with what others are saying, with the result of a confused babel of voices and a generally "uncertain sound" from the trumpet. He who would move the world must have a place to stand. And he who would speak to a confused Christendom must speak *to* it, not with it or through it.

Finally if one's message to one's own generation or church is to be worth speaking, it must be a redemp-

tive message. And the redemptive message must start with, center in, and end with the Person and Work of Christ in history. The message of redemption has social, political, and cultural implications. These too must have their place. But they must not *replace* the specifically redemptive core of the Christian message. And that redemptive core is personal, individual, particular.

It is right here that the problem of making the Christian message a message to the contemporary world seems so difficult. The social errors of our time loom large. We have wars, racial strife, economic inequalities, political theories, international uncertainties. And the ecumenical church views these as of such importance it cannot believe that there is significance in the problem of the individual soul standing before God. And so when the Christian message directs its attention to this problem of the individual, and insists that redemption starts here, the speaker is accused of withdrawing from the world and occupying a corner apart. Yet this is where the redemptive message must start—this is where the church must speak first. And if the church does not speak truth here, its speaking is in vain.

In speaking the message of redemption through the shed blood of Christ to individual burdened souls, the Church is speaking to its own generation, to contemporary Christendom and contemporary pagandom. There is no such thing as community repentance, community faith, community obedience. There is only repentance, faith and new obedience for the individuals who make up the community. The law of God is set forth in the singular, not the plural. It is, "THOU shalt love the Lord thy God . . . and thy neighbor as thyself." It is failure on this level that causes the problems on the social level, and it is an effective message on this level that will bring solutions to the problems on the other levels. Here above all the Church must speak in clear, unmistakable tones, to its own generation.

L. W. S.

Machen Biography

READERS of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN have noticed that we carry on the cover the name of J. Gresham Machen, and the fact that he was editor of this paper 1936-1937. They will also have noticed frequent reference in our pages to Dr. Machen in connection with the beginnings of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, and the early story of Westminster Seminary.

Because of the close association which Dr. Machen had with this entire movement, we are exceedingly glad that there has now appeared a biography of him. There have been other briefer volumes giving some information about his life and thought, but they have been woefully inadequate for anyone who really wished to know some of the life story of this man.

The author of the new book, which was released for sale at the time of the Seminary's 25th Anniversary, September 20, is Dr. Ned B. Stonehouse, Dr. Machen's associate and successor in the chair of New Testament at Westminster. Dr. Stonehouse not only has personal memories, but he has had free access to a great mass of letters and documents, preserved by Machen himself and by members of the Machen family.

We expect to carry a review of the book in due course, but meanwhile we are very happy to bring it to the attention of our readers, with warm commendation. Its title is *J. Gresham Machen, a Biographical Memoir*. The list price is \$5.95.

L. W. S.

In Appreciation

WE wish publicly to thank the Rev. Lawrence R. Eyres, pastor of Westminster Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Westchester, Illinois, for representing us as a reporter at the World Council Assembly in Evanston.

Elsewhere in this issue we have a further report on the Assembly. It is evident that, in addition to his attendance at numerous sessions, Mr. Eyres has spent a great deal of time and labor in writing his report. Obviously not every one will agree with all he has to say about it. News reporting is a science of its own. And this was a tough assignment for a cub reporter.

Mr. Eyres might have gone to Evanston, as some reporters doubtless went, convinced beforehand that there was nothing good to be seen or heard there, and prepared simply to denounce everything that was said or done. He might have gone not as a reporter but as a preacher, unconcerned with events taking place and seeking only to impart his own views to the few individuals he might get to listen.

Actually he did neither. He went with eyes open, to see and in so far as he could to evaluate one of the largest and most complicated ecclesiastical gatherings ever to be held in this country. And we are all wiser and better informed on this movement than we would have been without his help.

Thank you, Mr. Eyres.

Your Help is Needed

SOME effort has been made, during the past year, to encourage congregations of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church to give to the missionary work of the church on a fairly regular, year round basis, instead of having contributions concentrated largely in one or two periods during the year.

We believe this is a proper procedure. The expenses of the Committees are on a year-round basis. Salaries must be paid each month, and other costs likewise are spread over the year. Also the income of those who contribute is usually on a regular basis over the year. Giving to the work of the church should be related to our income, the first fruits of that we receive.

This does not mean, however, that there is not a place also for additional giving at special seasons. One of these seasons is Thanksgiving, and the church continues the practice of inviting a special Thank Offering, sacrificial in character, and beyond regular giving, to help meet the missions budget of the church.

The Committee on Foreign Missions is especially in need of your help at the present time. In addition to salaries of men in the field, there has been necessary additional expense for the travel of missionaries—of the Mahaffys who came home on furlough after five years in Eritrea, and of Mrs. Gaffin and her two sons who are on their way to Formosa. These expenditures are neces-

sary and proper, but they have helped deplete the resources of the Foreign Missions Committee.

The statistics as reported in the General Assembly *Minutes* indicate an average of about \$111. per communicant member as the rate of giving in the churches. If contributions averaged ten per cent of income, this would mean that communicant members of the church averaged an annual income of about \$1,110. each. We seriously doubt that the average income of the communicant member group in the church is this low.

In other words, there is room for improvement. We are not at any sort of limit. Keeping strictly within the ten per cent required in the Old Testament period and certainly proper, whether required or not, at the present time, the church should be able to carry on and expand its missionary program. And we do not have to stop at ten per cent.

If we desire the gospel to be preached to the ends of the earth, if we believe missionaries of the church are preaching that gospel in accordance with God's Word, and if we would be obedient to our Saviour who commanded the church to go into all the world and make disciples of all nations, then there will be a very substantial support of the missionary program of the church in the days ahead.

God loveth a cheerful giver.

The Presbyterian
GUARDIAN

1505 Race Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa.

Leslie W. Sloat
Editor and Manager

John P. Clelland
Arthur W. Kuschke, Jr.
Robert S. Marsden
Contributing Editors

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Robert L. Atwell
Leslie A. Dunn
John Patton Galbraith
Edward L. Kellogg

The Unknown Christ

*Address of Welcome to
Entering Students at Westminster*

By C. VANTIL

I HAVE now to address a few words of welcome, in the name of the faculty, and of the older students, to those who have come to us for the first time and in this connection I would like to say a few words about Christ, the Hope of the World.

As you know, that was the theme of the second Assembly of the World Council of Churches which met in Evanston near Chicago last month. There had been an advisory council of thirty-three theologians that had formulated a statement about the church—its task, its unity, its plan. And this advisory committee came in with a report which report was accepted with some modifications, and a statement by the Assembly appears currently in *The Christian Century*.

Quoting from that statement, I read as follows: "We are profoundly grateful for the work of the advisory committee. The report exhibits a substantial ecumenical consensus. It indicates the direction in which we all must move—away from our selves toward Christ, our only hope. Away from human desires, doctrines, ideologies, toward the Word of God which alone has eternal authority and power. Away from the godless, self-centeredness of this world toward the kingdom of Christ."

Those who were privileged to be present at that conference, as I was for a couple of days, noted, as you may also learn from the many addresses and the press releases, that there was great unanimity present in this council about the fact that Christ is the hope of the world. I read you this statement which indicates that fact, and there are many similar statements in many of the addresses given at Evanston. And the Council even spoke of the *message* and of the *witness* that should go forth from Evanston. There is in *The Christian Century* an article entitled, "The Message, or the Voice of Evanston."

The Unknown Christ

But if you should ask now, what was the Christ, who is the Christ, of

which Evanston spoke at this great Assembly of the World Council of Churches, you would seek in vain for an answer. It just cannot be found. To be sure, the reason for this is given in one or more of these addresses themselves. Says one of the members who spoke, that every speaker at Evanston at least implicitly and usually explicitly appealed to the Bible, each with a different conception of its authority, and a different principle of its interpretation. How then could they tell us who the Christ is? The Christ they spoke of is the Christ nobody knows anything about, of which nothing can be said in the world. To be sure, they appealed to the Holy Scriptures. We all read the Holy Scriptures and proclaim the general gospel from them. The Word speaking through them draws us to himself and into the apostolic faith.

IT is customary at the opening exercises of Westminster Seminary for an address of welcome to be delivered, directed to the entering students. Dr. VanTil, Chairman of the Faculty of the Seminary, delivered the accompanying address this year.

But there were many among them, for instance the Greek Orthodox Church, that put tradition on a par with Scripture. And the many Modernists and New Modernists present assumed that Scripture must in any case be interpreted in terms of human experience. The voice of those few who spoke of the Christ of the Scriptures could scarcely be heard. They spoke of the Christ nobody knows.

The Unknown Hope

And speaking of the Christ nobody knows, they also naturally spoke of the hope nobody knows. Much has been made in the press of the distinction between the American optimists and the European pessimists. The American optimists are said to be people who not having suffered so much as their European brethren from the ravages of recent war have still much hope of

progress of the human race in this world, hope for the removal of inter-racial and international tensions, and they have a program in this respect. But their European brethren, more sophisticated, more mature, less youthful and enthusiastic, having individually suffered from both the recent wars, expect hope only from some catastrophic, sudden, supernatural event. But even this difference between the so-called European pessimists and the American optimists does not go to the bottom of the matter. For both of them agreed among themselves that we must not start from the Scriptures as from the infallible Word of God, directly given unto the church of Jesus Christ for her instruction, but that we must start from the fact of evident manifest unity such as was here present at Evanston, and that any division that does not start from that fact, any form of confession or ideology as they love to speak of it, that would be disruptive ultimately of this fact of union which has now taken place here in this land is subversive, and there must be as they speak of it a holy impatience to remove such issues and to affect greater harmony.

The Unknown God

And if they spoke of the unknown Christ and the unknown hope of the Christ with respect to this world, they also spoke of the unknown God. Who is this Christ, and what? Was He God? And if He was God, was He that one who is infinite eternal unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth? No one could presume, certainly, to know of such a God. It was taken for granted that the historic Christian position that God has clearly manifested himself in nature and in Scripture—that no one can today reasonably believe in such a position as that.

There were a few voices, scattered and feeble, who seemed still to speak of such a God. But they were scarcely heard. It was taken for granted that God, the God we speak of, is the God nobody knows.

The Unknown Kingdom

And then of course much was said in this Evanston conference on the kingdom of God, and the kingdom of heaven. For it is in this kingdom that there lies the hope of the world. So it was said. But who shall tell us the

nature of that kingdom? Are there those in this world who know that they are now in that kingdom, that their sins are forgiven, washed in the blood of the Lamb, that there is now no condemnation for them because they are in Christ Jesus and walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. Oh no, for if there were, such people would have to pretend to know the nature of that kingdom. They would have to make believe that their ideas of the kingdom are absolutely true. They are the creed makers, those that are back of such confessions as the Westminster Confession of Faith, and they are the ones that are instituting these divisions against the fact of this manifest unity, and those that believe in it must go forth in holy zeal to destroy these dissidents. And so then of course they could not speak intelligently of this kingdom being at hand. Who knows what it means to be "at hand?" Is that kingdom to be in this world? Is it to be at the end of this world? At the end of this age? Nobody knows. Nobody can pretend to know. It is of the Christ that nobody knows, of the kingdom of Christ of which nobody knows, that Evanston had so much to say.

Repentance

And then finally, of course, something was said about repentance. How much is there not in the New Testament about repentance for those that would enter into that kingdom. But the only repentance Evanston knows of is to confess to one another that we have not recognized this manifest fact of unity, that we have separated one from another because of our creeds, our ideologies, our stubbornness in thinking that in them we have the truth, and that there are any who are not in the church of Jesus Christ potentially, if not actually. And that is the only repentance that one could hear of at Evanston. The idea of repentance as the Scripture speaks of it—it was faintly spoken of, suggested now and then, but it was scarcely heard at all.

The Christ of the Scriptures

But surely the Christ nobody knows, is after all the Christ that is known all too well. The Pharisees stood before Jesus of Nazareth, and they disputed His claim to be the Messiah. They asked Him for a sign from heaven. He had done many signs and wonders to prove that He was that Messiah. But

they said—who knows? Can any good come out of Nazareth? How do you people know that this is Jesus of Nazareth. They relativized the Absolute One that stood in their midst. It is in similar fashion that today in the so-called church of Jesus Christ those that are in this church relativize the Christ. The Pharisees put Him to shame, nailed Him to the cross. They looked for another one. It was not He. They said there was no hope in Him. Their hope was in some other one. And so they despised this Christ. The unknown Christ is the well-known Christ despised by His church.

Now it is in such a time as this, my friends, that you have come to prepare yourselves for the gospel ministry. And I welcome you in the name of the faculty. We rejoice that you have come to us, for we know the Christ, we know where He is to be found. We have not discovered Him. We have turned to the Scriptures, with other

faithful institutions of learning. By the grace of God this institution was raised up by Dr. Machen and others, to go back to the Scriptures, there to find the Christ. And so I welcome you to a reading of that Scripture, to a careful reading of it, an exact reading of it, to find Him who is clearly to be found, and then our hope and prayer for you is that with others thus preparing themselves to preach this Christ of the Scriptures as the hope of the world, you may go forth with joy and with peace of mind eventually proclaiming this Christ who is the hope of the world to a world that knows Him not and to a church that pretends to know Him but has set Him aside. May God grant that you with us may grow in the grace and knowledge of that Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and that together by His grace and benediction we may understand His Word, love Him, and serve Him to His glory, and to our rejoicing in the faith.

Westminster Seminary Observes Twenty-Fifth Anniversary

WEDNESDAY, September 22, 1954 dawned clear and cool, but with the forecasters promising cloudy and windy in the afternoon, with possible showers. The weather was of some importance, for this was the day on which Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia was observing its twenty-fifth anniversary, with the opening convocation in the afternoon, and an anniversary banquet in the evening.

In view of the slight uncertainty in the weather, the opening convocation was held in Calvary Orthodox Presbyterian Church, adjoining the campus. Over two hundred persons managed to find seats in the auditorium, which normally seats about 150. A number of others heard the service over the loud speaker in the social hall of the church.

Opening Convocation

Professor C. Van Til, Chairman of the Seminary faculty, presided. The Scripture lesson was read by the Rev. Yune Sun Park, President of Korea Theological Seminary, and prayer was offered by the Rev. Robley J. Johnston, pastor of Calvary Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Middletown, Pa.

Dr. VanTil gave a brief address of welcome to the incoming students. Referring to the World Council Assembly held in Evanston in August, he said that that organization was proclaiming a Christ nobody knows, a God nobody knows, and a hope nobody knows. He declared that, by the grace of God, Westminster Seminary believed in and taught the living God who is known through His revelation of Himself to men. He welcomed the students to a fellowship of study and increasing knowledge of the true God and His gracious works of redemption.

The convocation address was delivered by the Rev. John P. Clelland, pastor of Westminster Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Valdosta, Georgia, on the subject, "Presbyterian Dissent." Mr. Clelland pointed out that Westminster Seminary and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church with which it is closely related stand in the line of "dissent" which has characterized those in the history of the church and of Protestantism who were concerned with maintaining purity of doctrine through close adherence to the Scriptures. He criticized what he described as a

"Catholicizing" tendency according to which the church in some particular organizational form is viewed as the body of Christ, so that separation from that organization becomes the cardinal sin, regardless of the character that organization assumes over the years. He noted that such a catholicizing tendency existed not only in Romanism, but in much of Anglicanism, and also in the modern ecumenical movement.

Mr. Clelland was also critical of the opposite tendency, which makes of the organized church a matter of little concern. The church in its organizational form is important, but important in that the truth is there maintained and proclaimed. Westminster, he said, was concerned with holding the truth of Scripture, and with the true doctrine of the church.

The speaker also warned against dangers which face any movement of "dissent." He reminded his hearers that in the past many movements which had started out nobly had in a few generations departed from their early zeal and concern for the truth. We must avoid the tendency to become traditionalists, holding what our fathers held simply because they held it. We must avoid becoming isolationist, separating from the world and living in smug self-complacency. We must maintain a high degree of spirituality in our Christian life.

In view of the banquet scheduled for the evening, the customary tea and reception following an opening convocation was not held this year. Instead those present made their way to the Casa Conti restaurant in Glenside, where the evening gathering was held.

Anniversary Banquet

The banquet room was beautifully arranged, with members of the faculty, their wives, and the guest speakers at the head table, and the guests at six tables extending the length of the room from the speakers' table. There were 332 seats, and every seat was taken.

The banquet, as it turned out, was arranged by the Board of Trustees and designed to give recognition to the members of the faculty. The wives of faculty members each wore a beautiful orchid corsage, and the other ladies at the head table had also been given a suitable corsage. The table itself was decorated with three sprays of white flowers. On the front of the table a

simple white cloth was draped, bearing in silver letters the numerals 1929-1954.

The Rev. Robert Marsden, Executive Secretary of the Seminary, presided for the occasion. Following a delicious turkey dinner, a brief devotional period was conducted by the Rev. John P. Galbraith. Two solos, "Come unto Him" by Dunn, and "How Lovely Are Thy Dwellings," by Liddle, were sung by Mrs. Klaudius Kuiper.

Mr. Marsden then introduced a number of those present who played a significant part in the life of the Seminary, other than the faculty. At one point he requested all who were present who had attended the first opening of Westminster in 1929 to stand. There were about twelve or fifteen of these "old guard." Brief remarks were made by the Rev. Everett C. DeVelde, Pastor of Covenant Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Vineland, N. J., and first president of the Westminster student body, and by the Rev. Robert L. Vining, pastor of Bethany Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Nottingham, Pa., a member of the first graduating class.

There were two short addresses. The Rev. Calvin K. Cummings, pastor of Covenant Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., and a member of the Board of Trustees, spoke with gratitude to God of the way in which, in times of crisis for the Seminary, God had raised up men to carry on the work. This had been true in the executive oversight of the Seminary, but especially in the faculty. Always, when men either left the institution, or were no longer able to serve, God in His gracious providence had provided other able men to carry on. He paid tribute to the faculty for the way in which they had set forth the Scriptures as the infallible Word of God, and the manner in which they had set forth the great doctrines of the faith. They had, said the speaker, presented a vision of the glory of God, that the students might be enamored of the system of truth given in His Word. They have taught us, he said, that unless we live the truth we live in vain in the modern ecclesiastical world.

The Rev. Eugene Bradford, pastor of the Third Christian Reformed Church of Paterson, N. J., spoke on the influence of the Seminary in the larger scene. He noted that the Seminary had made an impact far beyond the Orthodox Presbyterian church. In Korea, China, and many other places the effect

of the Seminary's teaching had been felt. And in the church of which he was now a member, Westminster's influence was very considerable, and, he thought, for the good of the church. He expressed confidence that the Seminary would continue to be a strong force for good in ecclesiastical circles around the world.

Following these brief addresses, the Rev. Kenneth J. Meilahn of Middletown, Penna., sang two solos, "God is our Refuge," by Ward-Stephens, and "The Publican," by Van de Water.

Dr. Stonehouse's Address

The main address of the evening was delivered by the Rev. Ned B. Stonehouse, Th.D., Professor of New Testament in Westminster. His theme was "Why Westminster — A Reappraisal after Twenty-five Years." Due to the lateness of the hour, Dr. Stonehouse substantially shortened the address he had prepared to give. Taking a clause from Galatians 2:5, "that the truth of the gospel might abide or continue with you," he said that expressed basically the reason why Westminster came into existence, and the reason it should still be supported. There was at Westminster a fundamental concern for the truth of the gospel. In the course of his remarks, some of which dealt with the history of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and of Princeton Seminary, Dr. Stonehouse took sharp issue with a recent book by Professor Lefferts Loetscher, in which Loetscher had reported and endorsed the rise of inclusivism in the Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Stonehouse emphasized that in the whole movement associated with Westminster there had been a concern for a basic personal integrity on the part of all, Trustees and faculty. Though there had not always been agreement on every point among members of the faculty, for example, there was a profound conviction that each man was acting out of a sincere personal conviction as to the nature and application of the truth to the immediate problem. There had never been any "cliques" in the faculty, and no one could ever be sure how any member of the faculty would vote on a given question.

The gathering came to a close at about 11 p.m. with the singing of the hymn, "When I survey the wondrous cross," and prayer by Dr. W. Stanford Reid of Montreal, Canada.

Report on the World Council

By LAWRENCE R. EYRES

*"The tumult and the shouting dies;
The Captains and the Kings depart; . . ."*

THESE lines by Kipling might well be written over the gates of Northwestern University in the beautiful, north-shore Chicago suburb of Evanston, Illinois. For it was there that the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches came to an official close Tuesday, August 31. More than a month has passed since then and in that time Evanston has returned to being just the home of Northwestern University, McGaw Hall is again just a huge fieldhouse. The bishops, archbishops, patriarchs and just plain delegates have returned to their places on both sides of the iron curtain. So the time comes to evaluate that piece of history known as the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches.

This is no easy task, and this reporter has no illusions as to his ability to say the first word, let alone the last on the subject. The last word, should it ever be said, will be said in deeds rather than in words. It might be well, nevertheless, to give some insight as to the way things were done at Evanston before discussing what was accomplished.

World Council Procedure

At the First Assembly of the World Council (Amsterdam, 1948) a permanent Central Committee of one hundred was set up. The Central Committee very early selected the main theme of the Second Assembly, "Christ—the Hope of the World." Studies were carried on before Evanston by this special committee as by six other subcommittees assigned six areas of study and activity. When the Second Assembly convened (August 15) delegates and consultants were divided into seven committees: one to deal with the Main Theme, one each to treat of the relation of the Churches to the following areas: I—*Faith and Order*, II—*Evangelism*, III—*Social Questions*, IV—*International Affairs*, V—*Intergroup Relations*, VI—*The Laity*. Each of these groups was divided into many sub-committees, and their time was largely spent, during the earlier days

of the Assembly, in group meetings working out, on the basis of the material assigned to them by the Central Committee, their reports which would later be submitted to the whole Assembly. In those early days plenary sessions (of all delegates and open to the public) were few, and speeches from delegates around the world were their substance. Accredited visitors and the press and observers were engaged, during these days, with meetings for such, and daily press conferences where notable personages were brought out of Committee to report and speak on the various crucial subjects of debate. By the middle of the second week, however, the sectional groups began to report, and these reports were discussed at plenary sessions (sometimes three two-hour sessions in a day), sent back for amendment and re-drafting again and again, till some sort of finished product, acceptable to the delegates as a whole, was at last approved.

These provisional reports were available to us as soon as they came from committee. Some few (mostly of the "secular press") were permitted to observe in the committee meetings. But most of us had to be satisfied with the reports themselves plus press conferences and press releases from the Assembly's own reporting service as to what actually went on in these sectional and subcommittee meetings. Only recently has the finished product been made public in its final form, and this has engaged me for laborious hours and days in preparation for this article. In my preliminary article I dealt with the report on the Main Theme. Now I wish to deal first with the knotty theological problem, then with sections III, IV, and V.

The Theological Conundrum

It was something akin to courage that such a diverse body as the World Council of Churches (having nothing in common doctrinally but a brief, uninterpreted statement concerning Jesus Christ as God and Savior) chose the theme, "Christ—the Hope of the World." Common activity is always easier than common belief, for united action on the part of natural enemies is

possible, even though participants later discover that they were joined to the wrong cause. So, common action on the part of evangelicals and modernists (both new and old) is *possible*, though it partakes of the nature of an ox and an ass plowing together!

But when those who worship wholly different Christs attempt a common, elaborated pronouncement on the Christian Hope, they have tackled no mean task. A liberal journal has predicted editorially that, if the world has not already been blown up by then, given four more such theological themes, treated in the Evanston manner, the whole ecumenical movement will blow up by 1978. Personally, I think it would be worth the effort! A unity which has no foundation in truth is never so absurd as when an effort is made to find a theological basis for it.

The finest of creedal language was employed in the theological parts of the Assembly reports. What Reformed Christian could possibly question such a statement as this, taken from the concluding "Message" of the Assembly:

Here we stand. Jesus Christ stood with us. He came to us, true God and true man, to seek and to save. Though we were the enemies of God, Christ died for us. We crucified Him, but God raised Him from the dead. He is risen. He has overcome the powers of sin and death. A new life has begun. And in His risen and ascended power, He has sent forth into the world a new community, bound together by His Spirit, sharing His divine life, and commissioned to make Him known throughout the world. He will come again as Judge and King to bring all things to their consummation. Then shall we see Him as He is, and know as we are known. Together with the whole creation we wait for this with eager hope, knowing that God is faithful and that even now He holds all things in His hand.

What can be wrong with the faith of Christians who can join in such a pronouncement? In answer, Nothing, *provided* the foundation of such a confession is the Bible as the infallible Word of God; *provided* the Christ here spoken of is the second Person of the trinity of Persons in the Godhead, become truly man in the incarnation; *provided* the atonement be that of a sovereign redemption, by substitution, of those whom God has chosen to be His people; *provided* that the church here spoken of is exclusively made up

of those sovereignly chosen, effectually called, graciously renewed and indwelt by the Holy Spirit; *provided* that the coming of Christ as Judge and King is what the Scriptures say it is in all its implications for the whole race, both elect and reprobate . . . It is safe to say that none of these provisos can be certainly affirmed on the basis of the Assembly reports themselves.

Scripture

(1) The Assembly simply fails to affirm that the Scriptures are the Word of God. Phrases such as this, "We speak together with one mind and in accordance with the witness of the New Testament. . ." (from the Introduction to "Faith and Order"). "We all read the Holy Scriptures and proclaim the Gospel from them in the faith that the Word speaking through them draws us to himself and into the apostolic faith." (Faith and Order" par. 12). This sort of language is far from clear. Could it be that those who choose to believe that the Scriptures are the Word of God may so read these and like expressions, while those who merely believe that the Scriptures are a *witness to the Word* may also so understand them? Then there is another almost-but-not-quite statement (par. 24 "Faith and Order"), "We must all listen together in the midst of our disunity to our one Lord speaking to us through Holy Scripture. This is a hard thing to do. We still struggle to comprehend the meaning and authority of Holy Scripture. Yet whenever we are prepared to undertake together the study of the Word of God and are resolved to be obedient to what we are told, we are on our way toward realizing the oneness of the church in Christ . . ." True, the last sentence is very close to an orthodox view of Scripture. But if that is the intended meaning of the drafters, why is it said, "We still struggle to comprehend the meaning and authority of Holy Scripture?" If Scripture is simply the Word of God, there may still be difficulty with its meaning, but its authority is as clear as day. It is surpassing strange that such full dependence upon a sort of authority of Scripture, as a source of the knowledge of what the church is, what its message and task must be, is repeatedly manifest, yet in the report the divinity it unquestionably claims for itself is never once acknowledged. This is not so strange, though, when

in the same paragraph these words appear: "In this connection we need also to study together the significance of Christian tradition and our various traditions, as reflected in liturgy, preaching and teaching." If I am not mistaken this sentence serves as a sop for the Eastern Orthodox churches which are never loth to insist upon the equal ultimacy of inspired tradition with an inspired Bible. Whatever the meanings one might draw from this sort of statement on the Scripture, it is evident that on the subject of Biblical authority the Evanston trumpet has given an uncertain sound.

Christ

(2) As to the Person of Christ, our task becomes easy by default. Little positively is said, and nothing clearly. True, He is called the Son of God, but the old liberalism never found that hard, while robbing Him of every mark of His deity. The disciples of Barth are even less embarrassed, since they make His godhood a necessary corollary of His manhood. Statements such as these: ". . . God who is revealed in Jesus Christ," and "Jesus Christ is the Gospel we proclaim," or, "It is Jesus Christ, who revealed God

as Father," fail to pierce the fog. There was not one Christ in Evanston, but at least three—the Christ of the historic creeds, the human Jesus and the Christ of the dialectical theologians who is his own negation.

Atonement

(3) We fare no better when we come to enquire about the atonement. To be sure, it is said that Christ died for us. It is also repeatedly asserted that He died for the *world*. Whatever is meant, one thing is clear: particularism in the atonement (that Christ died for the purpose of saving only His elect) found no loyal defenders in the inner workings of the World Council. And as to the nature of the atonement, historic Christian doctrine fared no better. "No man is fully regenerate until he has brought every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." (Section I, par. 10). Does not this statement accord to man's own effort some part in his regeneration? There is no clear cut distinction between the redemptive work of Christ and the task of the church in the world. In the report on *International Affairs*, paragraph 51, this sentence (See "World Council," p. 196)

Orthodox Presbyterian Church News

Brief Church Items

Portland, Me.: The pastor of Second Parish Church, the Rev. Calvin A. Busch, is president of the Board of Trustees of the Portland Christian School, which opened its third year on September 13 with about 15 pupils. While the Rev. and Mrs. Arthur Kuschke were vacationing in Maine in August, Mrs. Kuschke assisted as soloist at the services of the church.

Baltimore, Md.: The new building of St. Andrews Church was used for the first time on the first Sabbath in September. A full schedule of services, including Sunday school and mid-week meetings, has been inaugurated.

Glenside, Penna.: The Rev. Yune Sun Park, President of Korea Theological Seminary, was guest speaker at a special missionary meeting on Tues-

day evening, September 28. The Rev. Francis Mahaffy, missionary to Eritrea now home on furlough, spoke at a missionary meeting on October 14.

West Collingswood, N. J.: The annual missionary conference of Immanuel Church is scheduled for October 22-24. Among speakers invited to the Conference are the Rev. Francis Mahaffy and Donald and Dorothy Duff, all from Eritrea.

Middletown, Penna.: Thirty young people from Calvary Church attended the French Creek Conferences in August. The Rev. Kenneth Meilahn, Principal of the Middletown Christian School, supplied the pulpit during the pastor's absence on vacation. The Sunday evening service has been advanced to 7 p. m., and the Senior Machen League holds its meetings following the evening service.



View of the auditorium of First Church, Manhattan Beach, on the occasion of the dedication of the completed building. The Rev. Edward L. Kellogg is standing at the pulpit desk.

San Francisco, Calif.: The Rev. Edwards E. Elliott, pastor of First Church, is sort of a greeter for west coast arrivals and departures. He saw Mrs. Richard B. Gaffin and sons Harold and John off on the freighter, Nicoline Maersk, on their way to Formosa, September 16. He and his family entertained "Connie" Hunt, daughter of the Rev. and Mrs. Bruce Hunt, missionaries in Korea, when she arrived on her way to Wheaton College. He met Mr. Suwa, a Japanese student coming to study at Westminster Seminary, when he arrived via the President Cleveland from Kobe. On September 26 First Church started a branch work in South San Francisco, under the direction of Mr. Arthur Riffel. A hall has been rented in the Brentwood area, for these services.

Long Beach, Calif.: A new electric organ has been given to First Church by a member of the congregation. The church has arranged a substantial loan to the group at Sun Gardens, for the purpose of enabling that group to erect a chapel building.

Valdosta, Ga.: Two children of the Rev. John P. Clelland, pastor of Westminster Church, are attending Calvin College. Daughter Ann is a senior, while son Donald entered this year in the freshman class. Mr. Clelland and Elder Hartman Eager attended the

meeting of the Philadelphia Presbytery on September 21, as well as the Westminster Seminary convocation and banquet on September 22.

Manhattan Beach Completes Building

A TOTAL attendance of over one thousand was registered on Sunday, September 19, at First Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Manhattan Beach, California, when the new sanctuary was used for the first time. Some three hundred members and friends of the church from the community and from sister churches in the Los Angeles area gathered for the dedication service at 3 p.m., besides the attendance at morning and evening services.

Ministers from the area participated in the dedication. The sermon was delivered by the Rev. Edward L. Kellogg, recently come to National City. Also taking part were Dr. David Calderwood and the Rev. Dwight Poundstone of Los Angeles, the Rev. Henry Coray of Long Beach, and the pastor, the Rev. H. Wilson Albright. The choir, directed by Mrs. Dorothy Bushell, sang the anthem, "Bless This House," by Brahe.

The occasion was the culmination of years of prayerful effort by the people

of the church, and brought great joy to them. Twenty five years ago the zeal of two young men to preach the gospel led to the start of this work. At first there was only a Sunday school class on the beach. The class grew, and moved into a rented store building. Later, preaching services were started and a pastor was called.

Eighteen years ago a frame building was purchased. It was twice enlarged, and finally outgrown. In the summer of 1949 ground was broken for the present structure. Meanwhile, under the pastorate of the Rev. Clifford Smith, the congregation had affiliated with the Orthodox Presbyterian denomination.

The men of the congregation did much of the work on the lower floor, which was the first unit of the present building. This was completed and occupied in the spring of 1951. Continued growth of the work, especially of the Sunday school, made it necessary to add the second floor and complete the building. The building as completed provides space for the Sunday school, a study for the pastor, and an auditorium seating 300. Men of the church have done the painting inside and out. The interior woodwork and open beam roof are finished in natural wood and the walls are painted a wheat tone.

Mr. John E. Weaver, father of one of the Sunday school pupils, drew up the plans for the building without cost to the church. The contractor was Mr. Charles R. Laraway, and the construction superintendent was Mr. H. C. Foster. Mr. Robert Jones of First Church, Long Beach, put in the flooring. The chancel window was given by Mrs. William H. Davies, a charter member of the church, in memory of her husband. The high school and college Christian Endeavor societies gave a baby grand piano.

The value of the entire property, including lot, buildings, and furnishings, is now estimated at \$100,000. But a policy of limited indebtedness has been in effect, and less than \$18,000 is unpaid. Some furnishings and improvements are yet to be provided.

The people of First Church have labored hard, given sacrificially, and prayed earnestly, but all praise and glory is to our covenant God who has so graciously and abundantly rewarded these efforts.

H. WILSON ALBRIGHT

Excitement in Eritrea

THE providential care of God for the Orthodox Presbyterian missionaries in Eritrea had been shown wonderfully in two recent incidents.

In a letter from the Rev. Clarence Duff dated September 18, he tells of an auto accident in which Mrs. Herbert Bird was injured, fortunately not seriously. She was in town in Senafe with the car—the Fargo. She had gone to Mr. Mahaffy's house to get a native to come and help Mr. Bird in some work on the Tigrinya Bible. For some reason the car would not start. Finally a local District Officer told Mrs. Bird to move over, and he got in and managed to get the car started. But then he apparently didn't know how to drive it well, with the result that he drove it at considerable speed into a bank by the side of the road. The car was damaged, though Mr. Bird managed to get it to a garage in Asmara. Mrs. Bird suffered a cut in the forehead, while the officer who had been driving was unconscious for several hours, but apparently not seriously hurt. The Birds two children, David and Steven, were also in the car, but their chief damage seemed to have been that they were quite frightened.

The other incident has been at Ghinda, where on several occasions snakes have been found in or near the Duff house. In each case they have been discovered before any harm was done, and destroyed. Recently a "spitting cobra" was found under the dog house in the back yard.

In the absence of the Rev. and Mrs. Francis Mahaffy, who are home on furlough, Mr. Duff and Mr. Bird have been continuing services in the Adi Caieh, Senafe, Asmara and Ghinda areas.

G. A. Minutes Available

THE *Minutes* of the Twenty First General Assembly of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, held this year in Rochester, have been published, and may be secured from the office of the Committee on Home Missions, 728 Schaff Building, Philadelphia 2, Pa. The price is \$1.50 a copy.

Our attention has been called to an error in the statistics as given on page 60, where the communicant member-

ship of Calvary Church of Cedar Grove, Wisconsin, should be 386, instead of the 204 given.

The statistics show the total membership of the church, including baptized children, as 8,435. Total receipts for all causes amounted to about \$650,000, and the average contribution per communicant member was about \$111.00, continuing the steady increase of recent years.

Carnell to Head Fuller Seminary

THE Rev. Edward J. Carnell, Ph.D., has been appointed president of Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California. Dr. Carnell has been professor of apologetics at the Seminary since 1948. He succeeds Dr. Harold J. Ockenga, pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, who has been president in absentia of the institution since it was started. Dr. Ockenga had been expected to leave Boston and devote his full time to the Seminary, but the

Park Street congregation refused to accept his resignation, and the new appointment followed. Dr. Ockenga will continue to serve as the president of the board of trustees.

Professor Carnell graduated from Wheaton College in 1941, and in 1944 received his Bachelor and Master of Theology degrees from Westminster Seminary. He took the William Brenton Green prize in Apologetics while at Westminster, for a thesis on "The Influence of the Philosophy of Immanuel Kant on the Theology of Friedrich Schleiermacher." He also has a Th.D. degree from Harvard Divinity School, and a Ph.D. from Boston University.

Before going to Fuller in 1948, Professor Carnell taught at Gordon College of Theology and Missions in Boston. He is the author of several books, including *An Introduction to Christian Apologetics*, which received the Eerdmans award of \$5,000 in 1948; *A Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, and *The Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr*. He is 35 years of age, and a Baptist.

The Revision of the Form of Government

Second in a series of articles by members of the Revision Committee

By NED B. STONEHOUSE

IN undertaking further comments on the proposed revision of the Form of Government, I am happy to presuppose several points made last month by Professor John Murray. His article reflects many general considerations that have determined the approach of the Committee, and some of these will be re-emphasized here.

In the first place, his article reflects the fact that the Committee has understood that it was authorized to undertake a thorough and pervasive revision. When the present Committee was erected in 1948, it was recalled that in the early years of the life of the denomination only a very superficial revision was adopted whereas the Book of Discipline and the Directory for Public Worship were substantially rewritten from beginning to end. One of the main reasons, if not the sole reason, for this difference of approach to the three standards was the urgency of the need

for a Form of Government adapted to the new situation in which the Church found itself. Nevertheless, there was considerable dissatisfaction with the Form of Government and this has not abated, but has rather increased, with the passing of time.

Secondly, the previous article provides some substantial evidence that the Committee has taken careful account of Reformed traditions in the area of church government. It has not sought to be original or novel. Formulations of principle and the practices of the Reformed Churches have been examined and weighed. The inclusion of the *Preface* formulated by the Westminster Assembly may be cited as evidence of this approach.

In the third place, the Committee has been occupied basically with a study of the Scriptures in the interest of arriving at conclusions in accordance with the Word of God. This is far

and away the most significant factor in accounting for the changes that are proposed. Unless this is grasped, the report will hardly receive the sympathetic consideration that we hope it will have. And unless those responsible for ultimate decisions will judge our proposals in the light of Scripture, much unhappy confusion and misunderstanding are sure to result. It is well to remind ourselves also that such study of Scripture becomes more urgent when one considers the extraordinary attention that has been given to the Biblical teaching concerning the church and the ministry in modern times. In this connection my fervent prayer is that the Church will demonstrate that it has risen above the sheer traditionalism and expediency which have so often sapped the vitality of denominations.

Membership of Ministers

One of the most far-reaching proposals of the Report is that ministers shall be members of particular congregations and not merely of presbyteries (Chapter IV, Sec. 4). Let no one suppose that this modification is presented because the committee considers this a matter of practical expediency, and has been moved by the consideration that it thinks that certain practical benefits will result if its recommendation is adopted. Solid practical benefits might indeed result. But the basic thinking of the Committee is that this conception of membership is required by the pervasive teaching of the New Testament regarding the Church.

The evidence that the designation "church" is applied to the local unit is so frequent that no particular proof need be given. But the same designation is used for the church in its totality, as, for example, in Matt. 16:18; Acts 8:3; and Gal. 1:13. It is clear from such passages as I Cor. 1:2 and II Cor. 1:1 ("the church of God which is in Corinth") that the church in its totality is not made up by way of addition of local churches, nor is the local church originated by being divided off from the church in general. Thus, as against independency, the unity of the church as a whole is maintained, and yet the right of the local church to the name "church of God" is not derived from other churches or from the church in its totality. The salutary observations of Murray at the close of his article also bear upon this point, and are deserving of special attention.

But if the church of God manifests itself in local churches, one's relationship to the visible church cannot be conceived of apart from one's place within a particular congregation. And this necessarily applies to ministers as well as to other members. For ministers, when ordained to the sacred office, do not cease being members of the church.

That membership in the presbytery cannot displace basic church membership will be confirmed if one considers that two, quite different, kinds of membership are in view in these relationships. The minister's relationships are essentially like those of the ruling elder at this point. The ruling elder retains his basic relationship to the church in the local congregation, but he may also be a member of a session, presbytery or general assembly to discharge certain responsibilities that devolve upon him. His right to rule in such assemblies is a quite different matter from his membership in the body of Christ in its visible manifestation. Thus also the consideration that a minister exercises rule in a presbytery or other assembly should not be viewed as annulling his most basic relationship to the church.

That the minister's relation to the local church should not be severed by his becoming a minister is supported by another basic observation. In becoming a minister one is not discharged from one's responsibilities as a Christian, and in particular from the responsibilities that one as a Christian has towards the local church. Nor may a Christian be deprived of his basic rights as a member of the church because he has become a minister. As he has the right to assemble with the people of God for public worship, so he has the right to participate fully in the other rights of believers.

Any regulation which prevents a minister from such participation in all the rights of church members is doubly objectionable if he is head of a family. The Presbyterian conception of church membership is not severely individualistic; rather it gives expression to the central Biblical doctrine of covenantal fellowship. Hence the head of a family, especially if he is a father, has to fulfill most important duties on behalf of his family also in the sphere of the church. But if he is denied membership in the local church, and therefore the right to take part in the functions which other husbands and fathers enjoy, he is made the victim of inexcus-

able discrimination and prevented from carrying out fully one of his most basic and sacred responsibilities.

Elders and Elders

Another feature of the committee's revision, as Professor Murray also has observed, is that certain changes have been introduced with a view to guarding the parity of all elders, both teaching and ruling, "in respect of ruling in the Church of God." It is important to emphasize, however, that the committee by no means wipes out the distinction between the two kinds of elders (compare Chapter III, Sec. 3 and Chapter IV), as certain alternate proposed revisions virtually do. In evaluating this subject, several matters should be kept in view.

In the first place, if the position of the alternate proposal were to be adopted, a far more thoroughgoing revision of the Form of Government would have to be undertaken. To eliminate the separate office of the ministry of the Word—for nothing short of this would be involved—the regulations with regard to an educated and proved ministry would have to be abandoned. Chapters XIII and XIV at least would have to go.

Moreover, if we followed this course, we would have to abandon what appears to be the universal practice of the Reformed Churches. If indeed this tradition is unscriptural, it ought to be forthrightly set aside. Universal tradition has at least this weight, however, that it constrains us to search the Scriptures most diligently before we find the boldness to abandon it.

And when the teaching of Scripture is evaluated, it is requisite, as all will admit, that great pains be taken neither to go beyond its teaching nor to fall short of what it has to say. One must take care not to build too much on an isolated passage lest the broader implications of Scripture be slighted. But one must also take serious account of the silences of Scripture. And the latter point clearly applies in the case of the government of the church.

We learn a great deal concerning the origin and nature of the temporary office of the apostolate. Acts 6 apparently has to do with the origins of the diaconate, though it is certainly not explicit, and we lack any clear definition of the powers of the deacon. But neither Acts nor the rest of the New Testament informs us concerning the

origin of the office of the elder. Acts 11:30 simply presupposes their presence in the church. References to elders and bishops in other passages such as Acts 20:28 and I Tim: 5:17 are informative as to the nature of the office, and support the principle of parity in respect of ruling. But it does not follow that there is not significant diversity within the eldership in other respects, and that the distinction between teaching and ruling elders is without Scriptural support.

In particular it is important, if one is to gauge the full sweep of the Scriptural evidence, to observe the diversity and variety of gifts and functions to which attention is drawn (cf. Rom. 12:6 ff.; Eph. 4:11 f.). And can any one doubt but that the New Testament singles out the ministry of the Word as a function of the most fundamental importance for the life of the church? This was so basic in the early church that provision was made whereby the apostles, though possessing comprehensive authority, would be able to

concentrate upon "prayer and the ministry of the Word" (Acts 6:2, 4). Thus I Tim. 5:17, while using the term "elder" comprehensively, sets apart a special class of "those who labor in the word and teaching." Although the apostolic office has ceased, the all-important function of proclaiming and teaching the Word remains. And it is essential that the Church take the utmost care to entrust this function only to those who give evidence of possessing the special qualifications for it. The office of the teaching elder is distinguished, therefore, not with a view to exalting certain persons but only because of the distinctive place assigned to the Word and its proclamation and the necessity of insuring that this ministry be committed only to qualified and proven men. In setting up high standards for licensure and ordination of ministers of the Word, accordingly, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church gives expression to its zeal to accord the Word and its exposition the unique place assigned in the Scriptures.

is not bound in heaven, depend upon it we will not possess heaven's sanctions and our usurped sanctions become a stench in the nostrils of God and man. A church cannot discipline for anything but sin, and sin is a breaking of the law of God.

The law which sin violates is not the law of man, not the law of the universe, not the law of the church, but the law of God. We can't manufacture sin. That is sin only which violates the Word of God.

This is the profound and relevant theology which came out of the crucible of the Protestant Reformation. Here is the main spring of all genuine freedom among men. Let us never forget that these principles, simple though they may be, have not come to us without much misery and sore trial; on them is the musty smell of dungeons, the mark of persecuting fires; they have come to us literally through seas of blood.

It was with this in mind that the Reformers were careful to reiterate a fact which all history abundantly proves, namely that all church councils may err, and have erred. The corollary to this is that the motions and deliverances of church assemblies and synods are advisory and administrative. Disobedience to these decisions may not constitute sin, in fact it may be necessary in rare occasions to disobey the mandates of councils and assemblies in order to obey the laws of God. It was against the decision of such church councils that the Apostles had to stand when they said: "we ought to obey God rather than man."

Inherent in this whole viewpoint of the theology of the Reformation is of course, the absolute authority of God over all other constituted authority. No earthly authority may command a man to set aside that which is put upon him by his Creator. There came a time in Prussia when the Union was introduced, that is to say the State President ordered the divine services of the United Church to be the rule in all churches. It is significant that Krummacher of the Reformed Church replied that as His Majesty's most humble servant he was ready at all times to lay his head on the block—but that when His Imperial Majesty made himself lord of the Gospel, then he despised His Imperial Majesty. In the coronation of a British Sovereign there are many symbols which teach

Fire on the Earth

"Here I Stand"

By ROBERT K. CHURCHILL

THE principles of liberty are nowhere more deeply laid than in the constitution of true Presbyterianism. Not in any bill of rights or in any human constitution, but in the Holy Scriptures is the dignity of man and the human conscience adequately enshrined.

The genius of Presbyterianism lies not so much in itself but rather in the place which the Word of God occupies therein. Let us make no mistake about discipline in ecclesiastical affairs. Dr. Machen was a firm believer in discipline. So much so that he humbly appeared for trial in a Presbytery which really had no jurisdiction over him. Discipline is the hall mark of the true church. The modern church stands condemned if for no other reason than that it has totally neglected discipline. If an organization will not attempt to curb lawlessness it cannot be a representative of God. Every church member vows that he will be subject to discipline if he should be found delinquent in doctrine or life. It should

also be said here that Dr. Machen, like the Reformation leaders, hated church schism. This one thing alone sets him apart from the mass of fundamentalists and sects of the day. Who has not been disgusted with the divisions in the church; divisions over the most trivial and personal issues? Such things are far from the true crusading spirit. In a true Presbyterian body, a man cannot be tried or condemned for any other reason than that he has disobeyed the Word of God or broken the commands of God. *We may not condemn a man whom God does not condemn.* All earthly authority is set up to guarantee this fundamental freedom of a man under God. When any court or law on earth violates this sacred trust it becomes the engine of tyranny and must proceed to destroy all true freedom. Church courts and also state courts were created to enforce not their own laws but the laws of God. We are to bind or loose on earth only that which is bound or loosed in heaven. If we attempt to bind on earth that which

precious Reformed principles. At a certain time in the ceremony the one to be crowned is presented with an orb, representing the world. This orb is surmounted by a cross. In this act the ruler is to understand that all authority in this world is subject to God and Christian truth. The rule of Britain may be world wide and hold sway over many peoples but such government must proceed under a higher law; no human law may order a man to break the supreme laws of God.

Every tribunal of man must sit with restrictive powers; restricted to its own constitution of course, but especially and forever restricted by the Word of God. It was in Calvinism where this principle was most clearly formulated and boldly set forth. The stones which built the temple of freedom came from the quarry of Calvinism: there is no other quarry. In this chapter we will go on to the General Assembly of 1936 where the appeals from the lower courts were decided. In 1935 the Assembly met in Cincinnati, Ohio. This was the Assembly which 'unseated' three minister delegates who were members of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. The instigator of this move was Dr. George E. Barnes, a signer of the Auburn Affirmation. The reason given was that these men had not obeyed the decisions of the '34 Assembly by resigning from the Independent Board. These men were duly elected delegates in good and regular standing in their Presbyteries. Nevertheless they were unseated as delegates and forbidden the right to vote in the Assembly. These men were given three minutes to defend themselves and the Moderator applied the three minute rule assiduously—even breaking off sentences in the middle thereof. It should be noted in passing that this move was instigated by a man who had flouted the decision of an earlier Assembly when it set forth certain fundamental doctrines of the Bible as essential. Significant also was the fact that the members of the Assembly had so degenerated by that time that they could no longer distinguish between administrative and judicial actions. Assembly and Presbytery had become little more than a political caucus. The motion of the '34 Assembly had been purely administrative, it came from the top down, whereas all judicial acts must proceed from the bottom upward. Ministers in good

standing in the church were suddenly disenfranchized by an Assembly without due process of law, men were denied their constitutional right by a decidedly unconstitutional act. Here was tyranny indeed. What a furor such a thing would create if it took place in American civil government. A man under God has certain rights which we call inalienable; these rights cannot be turned off and on at the whims of a group of men, be they large or small. Guilt cannot be established by fiat, even murderers are given a trial before they are pronounced guilty or disenfranchized. There is nothing more terrible than ignorance in action. Here were the untrained rank and file of the church doing the bidding of an Auburn Affirmationist who having set aside the authority of the Scriptures had to put in its place the voice of the Church. The church had all but ceased to be Presbyterian.

The all important General Assembly of 1936 met in Syracuse, N. Y. in a large high school building. I sat up in the balcony, the place reserved for visitors. The things which I saw and heard there will live in my memory forever. That balcony was well filled, since many had come to see the climax

of the years of struggle in the Presbyterian Church. To an increasing number there had come the conviction that two fundamentally different religions were involved. The men who had been tried in the church because they refused to obey the mandate of the '34 Assembly, or because they had criticized the boards of the church by exposing unbelief, had appealed their case to the various synods and finally to the General Assembly. This then was to be the court of final appeal. The cases had been given to the permanent judicial commission for review and final decision. The time came on the docket, the permanent judicial commission of seven men filed on to the platform from a side wing of the stage, while the Assembly reverently stood. The Moderator announced that the Assembly was about to sit in Judicial Session, and as a Court of Jesus Christ. This was good Presbyterian procedure, and important to remember. The decisions at that time were not the decisions of ordinary assemblies such as the previous decisions had been when the assembly was in administrative session. The acts and decisions at that time were the acts and decisions of the supreme
(See "Churchill," p. 197)

The Bible and Archaeology (III)

By LAWRENCE N. MANROSS

EARLIER we spoke of the scale by which the Old Testament was weighed and found wanting. This scale was the reconstructed history of Israel resting upon a naturalistic conception of that history. With this reconstruction the Bible was found to be at variance and judged to be in error. It is true that the scale did register the Old Testament to be untrue. The scale pointed out that the Old Testament erred in ascribing monotheism to Moses' day, in positing the system of Levitical sacrifices as Mosaic, in crediting Moses with the recording of the Ten Commandments, in supposing high ideals of morality to have existed in the days of the patriarchs, in speaking of the use of iron in early time, in making armies travel from Mesopotamia to Palestine in Abraham's time, etc. These readings of the scale were accepted and the Old Testament judged to be unworthy as an historical record. It shall be our

purpose in this article to test the scale which gave these pronouncements against the Scriptures.

We have probably all had the experience of getting weighed on a scale only to find the reading to be ridiculously low or high. We have pronounced the scale out of order and refused to accept the reading. The reading was plain but false because the scale was false. The Scriptures condemn the false weight and refer to it as an abomination to God. We have a Bureau of Weights and Measures to test measuring equipment used by merchants to assure the customers an honest measure. A false scale cannot give a correct reading. The false scale must be abandoned and a true scale accepted to get accurate readings. In like manner a false presupposition precludes the possibility of arriving at the truth. As in the case with the false scale, the false presupposition must be forsaken in order to truth.

As negative Old Testament criticism progressed in the late nineteenth century it moved farther and farther away from the true Christian theistic position and adopted more and more of a naturalistic position. This scale, this presupposition, could not weigh otherwise than to pronounce supernaturalism false. Negative critics gave a "reason" for their rejection of the truthfulness of Scripture, that "reason" being simply that Scripture did not agree with the "facts" of history. In the providence of God as negative criticism moved forward with great strides, careful archaeological research was developed. The mounds of northern and southern Mesopotamia yielded up thousand of written documents from 3000 B. C. down to the time of Christ while the tombs of Egypt furnished their abundance of ancient inscriptions. Under God men were enabled to decipher the cuneiform writings of Mesopotamia and the hieroglyphics of Egypt giving us an insight into Biblical times through the accounts of eyewitnesses rather than through the conceptions of men of the nineteenth century A. D., thousands of years removed from the history they sought to reconstruct.

What is the testimony of the ancient, original, contemporary documents? What do they have to say about the scale of the negative critic? Do they support the reconstructed history of Israel? What do the records tell us?

From Egypt about the time of Moses we read of a Pharaoh who sought to put an end to polytheism and establish a kind of monotheism with the sun disc representing the god. This witness runs counter to the contention of the negative critic that the very idea of monotheism came to man first in the eighth century B. C. This individual weight of the scale of the negative critic must be declared false.

From Ras Shamra (ancient Ugarit) located on the coast of Syria come tablets dating from about the time of Moses. Many of these tablets have to do with the well-known god of the Bible called Baal. In some of the tablets sacrifices and offerings are enumerated revealing a *system of sacrifices* with a nomenclature that often parallels the names of the Levitical offerings. It is not the place here to point out the relationship of these offerings, if any, to those of the Scrip-

ture. Such a consideration would be an interesting subject in itself. Suffice it to say for the point of this article that the Ras Shamra material bears record of the actual existence of a complex system of offerings and sacrifices in Mosaic time. The contention of the negative critic that the Levitical system of sacrifices must be of post-exilic times simply because they did constitute a system must be rejected. Another weight of the scale is found to be untrue.

There are now in our possession many early law codes. We have law codes from the Hittites, Assyrians, Akkadians and from the Sumerians. Most of these are pre-Mosaic and yet they are often complex and reveal highly developed societies. Unmistakably these codes evidence that another weight of the critic's scale is false. Complex society with developed laws need not be late in history as contended by the negative critic. Furthermore these codes reveal an ideal of right and wrong that the negative critic did not allow the Old Testament culture to possess until very late in time. This weight also must be disallowed.

Excavations in Mesopotamia at Tell Asmar and elsewhere have shown the use of iron in the third millennium B. C. That scale weight which pronounced the Old Testament false for referring to the early use of iron must be itself condemned.

The ancient records surprised all by revealing the extent of travel engaged in by the people of early Biblical times. Whole peoples did move to other places. The armies of Mesopotamia were often in conflict with the peoples of Asia Minor and Palestine. Literary remains give us detailed accounts of conflicts between the Hittites of Asia Minor and the Egyptians, even recording the stratagems of each side. Diplomatic embassies and international treaties were not unknown to them. Another weight of the negative critic's scale must be abandoned in the light of the records contemporary with Biblical events. Travel and military campaigns were extensive, the critic's contention to the contrary not withstanding.

Many other weights used in the scale of the negative critic could be mentioned which failed to stand up under the impact of the documentary evidence brought forth by archaeology. Among these were the assertion of the

non-historical character of the Horites and the Hittites, the supposed Biblical exaggeration of the extent of Solomon's kingdom, the supposed incorrectness of the Pentateuch in its portrayal of patriarchal customs. It must be stated with all the emphasis at our command that the original documents removed from the earth and copied from the temples, tombs and cliffs of ancient times do not support the contentions of the negative critic but rather pronounce his scale to be false.

Most present day negative critics readily agree that the individual weights of the scale enumerated above are false and that they gave false witness to the Scripture. Do they then accept the Scripture as true, as the Word of God? One might think on first thought that they would now accept the Scripture as true since their weights which they held forth as the very "pillars" of their argument to the contrary must now be abandoned. The "pillars" of the argument have fallen but the superstructure, unbelief of the integrity of the Old Testament, erected upon it still stands. Why? The modern negative critic readily admits the truthfulness of Scripture at many points which were once pointed to as unbelievable items necessitating the rejection of the Holy Writ, yet he still rejects the integrity of Scripture. Why? As one traces the development of the negative higher criticism of the Old Testament one must conclude that the real *reason* underlying the rejection of the Old Testament was usually not the weights or "pillars" so boldly proclaimed as such but rather the real *reason* was the denial of the supernatural and the weights or "pillars" were merely surface arguments set forth to support that denial, a presupposition often hidden from the unwary. Thus when the "pillars" fell the superstructure remained with minor changes since the superstructure did not actually rest upon the "pillars" as some supposed. Thus archaeology has not proved the Bible to be the Word of God to the negative critic. Archaeology cannot do that for him. It has convinced him that some of his weights were false and it has in some instances forced him to reveal his real weight by which he judges all things, that weight being a denial of the supernatural, a false weight which can never render a true reading because it is a false presupposition. Meanwhile archae-

ology has afforded much comfort to the Christian since it has enabled him to better understand the Scriptures and has closed the mouth of the negative critic at many points.

World Council

(Continued from p. 189)

appears: "By virtue of its calling, it (the church) must act as a redemptive, suffering fellowship in the form and manner of its Lord Jesus Christ." This makes sense in the light of a view currently held by some of the European delegates that the Church is a sort of extension of the incarnation of Christ. However that might be, we begin to see the ghost of Pelagius hovering over the council tables. Lest some accuse me of building a case against the orthodoxy of these reports on mere fragments, let it be clear that, except for these fragments, these basic theological questions remain unanswered. We look in vain for any definite hint of an affirmation of the biblical doctrine of sovereign grace.

Church

(4) As to the nature of the Church itself, I have already spoken (September GUARDIAN) of the unchallenged assumption that the churches of the Council are truly one in Christ. It follows from that assumption that all churches which profess Christ as God and Savior are what they claim to be—churches of Jesus Christ in very truth. Granting that there are many congregations and denominations represented in the World Council who rightly bear the Christian name, it is plainly unchristian to call everyone who wears sheep's clothing a member of Christ's flock, despite the big ears and the long teeth so slightly concealed. Churches of the World Council officially and unofficially preach "another Gospel" thus calling down upon their own heads the frightful anathema mentioned in Scripture. And so long as the theory of the church is held (silently confessed by the World Council) that all professing and baptized Christians are true Christians it is hard to see how faithful Christian communions can make common cause with the Council.

Hope

(5) My earlier report dealt with the Council's pronouncements on the re-

turn of Christ as the consummation of the Christian hope. This appears in the "Statement on the Main Theme" as well as in the "Message," which concludes, "We do not know what is coming to us. But we know who is coming. It is he who meets us every day and who will meet us in the end—Jesus Christ our Lord." There was some opposition in the section meetings to any pronouncement which tied the Christian hope to something in the future, but it prevailed none the less. It is somewhat softened by the phrase, "It is he who meets us every day." This sounds suspiciously like the older liberal explanation of the coming of Christ—through greater tolerance, improved human relations, the advance of brotherhood, etc. At any rate, nothing official (or unofficial so far as I was able to discover) was said in elaboration of the meaning of the coming of Christ at the end of history. Certainly neither the modernists nor the Barthians have had any difficulty in repeating the Apostles' Creed right up to the end! It is encouraging that emphasis has been shifted to eschatology, but how can the eschatology of Evanston be a Christian one when we are not sure what Christ is to return, or just who He will return to save.

Reports of Section III, IV and V

The World Council, like its forebear and its progenitor, the Federal Council and the National Council, seems unafraid to enter any field in the name of the churches. Very sensitive of the reproach that the church has lost its influence in the world because it has not entered into the world in which the great masses live, the Council tackled the whole range of subjects from race relations on up to international affairs, including the control of nuclear weapons. The Council has not apparently seen or sought to draw the distinction between the task of the Church as such and that of the Christian citizen. It must be admitted that what is said in these reports often makes the best of sense. Nevertheless one wonders just how the Church is to *be* the Church if it must at the same time be an institute of social and political science! Here is being repeated the primary error of the social gospel churches of a previous generation. They saw the evils of society, allied themselves with great social and political reform movements and got into

the fight only to discover that in the end they lost their social victories and their religion too. True, it is encouraging to observe that the Council is aware of the need of its member churches for a positive spiritual message, which many of them have lost, but they are still unwilling to return to just being churches.

The term, "Responsible Society" (originating in the Amsterdam Assembly) is embraced in the title of the report of Section II. And it is interesting to see how seriously the report seeks to give it a theological setting. But it still falls far short of the grand concept embraced in the Christian world and life view of the historic Reformed churches. While we get the notion that society and its leaders are responsible to God and are really the servants of its people, rather than their masters, still there is something lacking. "Christians should work for the embodiment of the responsible society in political institutions by emphasizing the following: . . ." Here follows a list of four human rights which are to be insured. But these are *human* objectives. An agnostic could also subscribe to this. The *Christian* treatment of a responsible society cannot stop short of enunciating the right of Christ to rule as Lord and King over all the affairs of men and nations. It is not to some *principles* of Jesus that society and government ought to bow, but to *Christ Himself*. I could not help saying to myself as I read these long reports on government and race relations and the United Nations that this is the Social Gospel at its best, but the Social Gospel nonetheless.

The Communist issue was very much in the Assembly. This was not less so as a result of jibes at the World Council in the press which criticized it for receiving delegates from the iron curtain countries who were accused of collaboration with the communist governments under whose sufferance they were permitted to carry on the work of the churches. The hottest point of the Assembly on this question came on August 27th when Prof. Joseph Hromadka of Czechoslovakia (formerly guest professor at Princeton Seminary) appeared at a press conference dealing with the question of "coexistence." He was asked how he, a Christian professor, was able to get along with the communist regime. In answer he pointed out that the Czechoslovakian

state is not a communist state since there are other parties besides the dominant communist party. The state has a constitution which aims at a "classless society." Now, since the communists are not professedly advancing a *philosophy*, but just a *method of action*, he as a theologian was quite willing to talk with them. "I have nothing to say against the classless society: but my ultimate hope is not in a classless society but in Jesus Christ . . . Anti-communism is so cheap I would be ashamed to be an anti-communist! What I say is, 'Jesus Christ is an eternal Yes.' If we are really as Christians committed to our Lord, that is not ideology, not metaphysics, it is reality." At this point Charles P. Taft (Protestant Episcopal delegate who presided over all the press conferences) took about five minutes to repudiate that view of Christian "coexistence" with atheistic communist governments. This press conference continued more than a half hour beyond its closing time.

Nevertheless it was all peace and sweetness when the report of Section III was completed—especially the fourth main section which is headed "The Church in Relation to Communist—Non-communist Tension." The Assembly was walking a tight wire, and delicate balance was a necessity. Capitalism, as a system, did not come in for a separate critique, as it had at Amsterdam, hence there could be no separate critique of communism either, though the Amsterdam statement on Communism was affirmed and added as a footnote. But the dangers of communism come in for mention (especially as they come to expression in its utopian promises in backward areas); and the dangers of anti-communism are also mentioned: threat to civil liberties, danger of overemphasizing militarization and the danger of anti-communist hysteria.

Two other items merit more attention than the mention I can give to them. In the report of Section IV a fairly long evaluation of the United Nations is given, favoring less unilateral action among nations and greater use of the facilities of the U. N. It suggests that the U. N. could become more useful by giving to it international police powers. There was a strong separate resolution passed against racial segregation. A rather

healthy view of the problem is to be found in the report of Section V.

Conclusions

It will be disputed by some just how significant the movement called the World Council of Churches has become after two Assemblies. Whether its vaunted ecumenical star is on the ascendency or descendency is a question I'm glad I don't have to answer. Just the same I believe we who are on the outside looking in may not shrug the whole thing off, and that for the following reasons:

(1) Evanston is a straw in the wind of world religious thought. It indicates a decided drift toward a more vigorous theology (even if it is not more Christian for all that). The forces of evangelical, but especially Reformed, theology must marshal their resources to meet this latest reconstruction of the Christian Gospel.

(2) It indicates that historic Christianity in all its branches must throw off the last vestiges of a cloistered life. Here is a force which is carrying its "gospel" to the world and seeking to show its relevance to every aspect of life on this planet. Can we to whom has been committed the "everlasting Gospel" do less? Are we going to bring Christ to the world, or are we going to stand by our church doors and call to the masses as they stream by, "If you want it, come and get it."

(3) False ecumenicalism has but one answer—*true* ecumenicalism. Like it or not, we are one with all blood-bought sinners in all parts of the world. Like it or not, there are divisions among us which are due to our own sins, which *ought* not to be and *need* not be! Like it or not, the principles of true ecumenicity are to be found in the Word of God! It is high time that these be converted into our own words, and those words translated into deeds.

Churchill

(Continued from p. 174)

court of the church and could not be altered or withdrawn except the church repented of them. The situation of course should have been full of dramatic tension but such was not the case. The reason for this lay in the fact that the Judicial Commission gave the exact decision which everyone expected. That

the assembly would support these decisions was also a foregone conclusion. Three members of that commission were Auburn Affirmationists who had already set aside the Scriptures as supreme in truth and authority. Of course if we had eyes to see it, this very lack of tension may have constituted a drama far greater than that which was immediately present. At any rate, it pin-pointed the fact of the hopelessness of any reform movement within the church. I won't burden the reader with a detailed description of every decision except to say that in each case the decision of the lower courts was upheld.

A Dr. Adams came forward to render the decision regarding Dr. Machen. Being an able man, he brought much laughter from the assembly and no little ridicule to Dr. Machen in the way he told of the frustrated aspirations of Dr. Machen to a coveted chair in Princeton Seminary, a frustration which apparently lay back of his subsequent attitudes and attacks. Have you ever wished that the Devil were a brave warrior who would come out into the open and exchange thrust for thrust? It is often the cowardliness, the slimy-ness of his attack that is so effective, so maddening. It was to be hoped, of course, that an adequate review of the case would be given; a review such as is given by the Supreme Court of the United States. We had the right to expect a rather comprehensive and incisive review of each step in the litigation. Especially did I look for some explanation as to why Dr. Machen was tried by the Presbytery of New Brunswick instead of the Presbytery of Philadelphia of which he was a member. Also the fact that Dr. Machen was forbidden to bring whole areas of material into court, evidence calculated to establish his innocence, should have had most careful review. Surely a Supreme Court would give substantial and adequate reasons for upholding the decisions of a lower court, else why would any appeal be made?

I suppose that by that time we had become hardened to the ordeal by liberalism and did not expect too much. But when nothing was spared to give this one case all the aspects of a comic opera, it was indeed hard to take.

Up in the balcony, two young couples were seated just in front of me. The men were either ministers or stu-

dents for the ministry. As each adverse decision was given and sustained by the assembly these men in great excitement would perform some act and utter phrases which said in effect—great stuff, what a church! Imagine a church demonstrating such fearlessness, such moral strength and fortitude, it's almost unbelievable. I mention this because I think it was quite typical of the general reaction.

After that day's fateful meetings, I stood by as several liberal leaders in the fight came up to some of the ministers who had just been deposed. One of these liberals was a beautiful man whom we called "Queen Elizabeth." There was a demonstration of good sportsmanship; the liberals smiled on the 'ultrafundamentalists' and shook hands. They told the defeated ones that they were respected and that they had put up a good fight—it was a good show, etc. They also told of their disgust with other fundamentalists in the church who were afraid to take a similar stand for fear they might lose their jobs. Well, it was not a bad attitude on the part of the liberals, especially the latter expression. And yet it had its tragic aspect. Had Elijah been present, he might have cried, "hast thou deposed and hast thou also taken possession?" The robbers could well afford to feel expansive and generous. They had just secured a vast and goodly heritage. The fact that this heritage had been painfully built up by the blood, sweat and prayers of a more scripturally sound race of men meant nothing to them. The church had been 'rescued' from men who held the old impossible view that the scriptures were the infallible Word of God.

I was glad to see at that Assembly several members of the Olympia Presbytery of which I was under care. These men came to me with interest and solicitation; they came to help me, to see that I did not leave the church. How deeply I appreciated that approach. None but a student coming up for ordination as I expected to do that summer knows my state of mind at that time. I knew that I would be asked that inevitable question—"will you vow before God to support the boards and agencies of the church?" I asked these men if such questions would be asked. Yes, they said, no doubt they would be. What did they think of such a question? Well, it was probably all right. Should a min-

ister make a blanket promise to support any human, and therefore erring agency, no matter how perfect its present status? Well, perhaps not. Could a minister promise before God that he would support boards when he had in his hand the unbelief and errors which these boards were either teaching, or supporting? *Could a man vow to Almighty God that he would support evil?* There is of course no real answer to this predicament which faced ministerial students at that time, and I'm sorry to say still faces ministerial candidates in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Thus it is that a minister who comes into that church must become un-presbyterian at the point of entry.

It should be abundantly clear that a man's refusal to take such a vow is not an indication of any lack of love for the church. In fact the very reverse is true.

The twin issues at stake in this whole struggle were the truth of God's Word and the authority of God's Word. Men have always tried to separate these twins. People would like to believe in and preach the *truths* of the Scriptures without the sacrifice and contention which is often entailed in standing for the *authority* of the Word. Men would enjoy the promises and forget the precepts. Martin Luther faced the same twin issues in his day. He had to go to Worms though there were as many Devils there as there were tiles on the roof tops. In believing the truths of the Gospel, he found that he had to deny the authority of a decadent and corrupt church. He said once that though he were a small man, yet he could stand for something big in the world. One thing at least may be said of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, small and despised though it may be. It DOES stand for something big in the world. Nothing trivial or inconsequential brought it into being. It was not the question of how much water should be used in baptism, nor any of the thousand and one like differences which have in the past brought into being the denominations and sects. One cannot imagine a larger or more important contention than the one which called the new orthodox movement into life. The Sovereignty of God was involved, and what is it which does not come under the wide rays of that sun?

Sometimes when ministerial candi-

dates would hesitate in answering the inevitable question about loyalty to the church boards, the questioners would put it another way. Don't you think you should promise to leave the church if the time came when you should find yourself in disagreement with the church? The answer would always be 'yes.' The modernists were always clever enough to hide their poison in a bouquet of sweet reasonableness. The question of truth was handily disposed of and the possibility of a man contending for the faith was eliminated. Imagine a Prophet today holding such a view of his work. When the Lord's prophets found themselves out of agreement with the life of the church and nation they did not fold their tents like the Arabs and silently steal away.

The General Assembly of Syracuse was perhaps too recent for us to set it in proper perspective. But by way of conclusion certain summaries may be stated. That Assembly, sitting as a Court of Jesus Christ, finally and resolutely set the word of man, or the voice of the church, above the Word of God. This in turn did not take place in a vacuum. It took place against the darkening background of a resurgent paganism and total godlessness of our age. The assembly also marked a decisive victory for a bland type of modernism, invincibly ignorant of the principles which had forged the sinews of church and nation. This in turn occurred in the context of the cheerful, optimistic, almost inconsequential American mind. The victory would scarcely have been possible otherwise.

There was also displayed a liberalism totally unable to justify itself on the intellectual or spiritual plane, resorting to the force of majorities, ridicule, misrepresentations, hush-hush policies, and closed trials.

From the balcony at Syracuse I looked down on that assembly, and heard its judicial decisions. I think I saw the death of something true, good and pure in life. It was not a death which came with a flash and roar. No, it was rather an evil smelling emptiness which came floating up. Many reports were given of that assembly. Some were favorable; others unfavorable. I wonder what a Jeremiah or an Ezekiel would have seen? I think that one who was a 'seer of God' would have seen a form not yet formed, raw and sinister, staggering toward some Mecca to be born.

LETTER

Speak Redemptively . . .

TO THE EDITOR:

The September 15 issue of the *GUARDIAN* arrived yesterday and had in it, it seems to me, the positioning of factors which make for Westminster Seminary's impasse. I refer to the articles of Marsden, Woolley, and Eyres. Marsden speaks of how the ideas of the classic Reformed theology are to be generated in the school. Woolley speaks of how critically important in every respect it is that these ideas be communicated understandably to men. Then Eyres follows with a narrowing down of ecclesiastical responsibility so as to provide the dead-end.

But no one bothered Eyres at Evanston. The Church is free. The classic Reformed theology is not condemned. But of course it must be communicated to men, and the visible, ecumenical church is men. So then to speak of "these people" and "they" and "I believe there is good reason to wonder at what THEY mean"—the while saying, "I have no difficulty in understanding this theme for myself"—is to pick one's teeth in idle contemplation in one's own little parlor while the battle of the church is in progress in the world at large.

Certainly ideas cannot be communicated to the past. Nor is there any point in putting one's face to the wall

in the present. But how long will Westminster Seminary toll the Machen bell as though it were a tocsin to the present and to the future? Please don't go over it all to prove the point as of twenty years ago. The Rev. Robert Churchill surfeited himself with that in your back pages. The point to be determined now is whether Westminster Seminary will involve itself responsibly with the ecumenical, visible church, so as to be able to speak redemptively to the Church. To turn from that responsibility is to approach the impasse, and, as Torrance of Edinburgh said to Eyres at Evanston, it is also to seek the condemnation of God. For it does seem that God must judge every Christian community in regard to its redemptive involvement with its generation. And the responsibility is not to be fulfilled by picking and choosing those who will go to the dead-end with you. The responsibility is to meet the whole problem of the church by sympathetic involvement with it and to speak to its salvation.

For indeed the Church cannot go to Westminster. Perhaps its name is not even known. So then Westminster must go to the Church. Not in hostility and fear, but with salvation and peace.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM D. GRAY

Middlesborough, Ky.

The "Message" of Evanston

FOLLOWING is the text of the "Message" adopted by the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston on August 31. As a message adopted by representatives of churches claiming a total membership of over 170 million individuals, it is an important declaration, regardless of how one views its theological ambiguity.

TO all our fellow Christians, and to our fellow men everywhere, we send greetings in the name of Jesus Christ. We affirm our faith in Jesus Christ as the hope of the world, and desire to share that faith with all men. May God forgive us that by our sin we have often hidden this hope from the world.

In the ferment of our time there are both hopes and fears. It is indeed good to hope for freedom, justice and peace, and it is God's will that we should have these things. But he has made us for a higher end. He has made us for himself, that we might know and love him, worship and serve him. Nothing other than God can ever satisfy the heart of man. Forgetting this, man becomes his own enemy. He seeks justice but creates oppression. He wants peace but drifts toward war. His very mastery of nature threatens him with ruin. Whether he acknowledges it or not, he stands under the judgment of God and in the shadow of death.

Here where we stand, Jesus Christ

stood with us. He came to us, true God and true Man, to seek and to save. Though we were the enemies of God, Christ died for us. We crucified Him, but God raised him from the dead. He is risen. He has overcome the powers of sin and death. A new life has begun. And in his risen and ascended power he has sent forth into the world a new community, bound together by his Spirit, sharing his divine life, and commissioned to make him known throughout the world. He will come again as Judge and King to bring all things to their consummation. Then we shall see him as he is and know as we are known. Together with the whole creation we wait for this with eager hope, knowing that God is faithful and that even now he holds all things in his hand.

This is the hope of God's people in every age, and we commend it afresh today to all who will listen. To accept it is to turn from our ways to God's way. It is to live as forgiven sinners, as children growing in his love. It is to have our citizenship in that Kingdom which all man's sin is impotent to destroy, that realm of love and joy and peace which lies about all men, though unseen. It is to enter with Christ into the suffering and despair of men, sharing with them the great secret of that Kingdom which they do not expect. It is to know that whatever men may do, Jesus reigns and will reign.

With this assurance we can face the powers of evil and the threat of death with a good courage. Delivered from fear we are made free to love. For beyond the judgment of men and the judgment of history lies the judgment of the King who died for all men, and who will judge us at the last according to what we have done to the least of his brethren. Thus our Christian hope directs us toward our neighbor. It constrains us to pray daily, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," and to act as we pray in every area of life. It begets a life of believing prayer and expectant action, looking to Jesus and pressing forward to the day of his return in glory.

Now we would speak through our member churches to each congregation. Six years ago our churches entered into a covenant to form this council, and affirmed their intention to stay together. We thank God for his blessing on our

work and fellowship during these six years. We enter now upon a second stage. To stay together is not enough. We must go forward. As we learn more of our unity in Christ, it becomes more intolerable that we should be divided. We therefore ask you: Is your church seriously considering its relation to other churches in the light of our Lord's prayer that we may be sanctified in the truth and that we may all be one? Is your congregation, in fellowship with sister congregations around you, doing all it can do to ensure that your neighbors shall hear the voice of the one Shepherd calling all men into the one flock?

The forces that separate men from one another are strong. At our meeting here we have missed the presence of Chinese churches which were with us at Amsterdam. There are other lands and churches unrepresented in our council, and we long ardently for their fellowship. But we are thankful that, separated as we are by the deepest political divisions of our time, here at Evanston we are united in Christ. And we rejoice also that, in the bond of prayer and a common hope, we maintain communion with our Christian brethren everywhere.

It is from within this communion that we have to speak about the fear and distrust which at present divide our world. Only at the cross of Christ, where men know themselves as forgiven sinners, can they be made one. It is there that Christians must pray daily for their enemies. It is there that we must seek deliverance from self-righteousness, impatience and fear. And those who know that Christ is risen should have the courage to expect new power to break through every human barrier.

It is not enough that Christians should seek peace for themselves. They must seek justice for others. Great masses of people in many parts of the world are hungry for bread, and are compelled to live in conditions which mock their human worth. Does your church speak and act against such injustice? Millions of men and women are suffering segregation and discrimination on the ground of race. Is your church willing to declare, as this assembly has declared, that this is contrary to the will of God and to act on that declaration? Do you pray regularly for those who suffer unjust discrimina-

tion on grounds of race, religion or political conviction?

The Church of Christ is today a worldwide fellowship, yet there are countless people to whom he is unknown. How much do you care about this? Does your congregation live for itself, or for the world around it and beyond it? Does its common life, and does the daily work of its members in the world, affirm the lordship of Christ or deny it?

God does not leave any of us to stand alone. In every place he has gathered us together to be his family, in which his gifts and forgiveness are received. Do you forgive one another as Christ forgave you? Is your congregation a true family of God, where every man can find a home and know that God loves him without limit?

We are not sufficient for these things. But Christ is sufficient. We do now know what is coming to us. But we know who is coming. It is he who meets us every day and who will meet us at the end—Jesus Christ our Lord.

Therefore we say to you: Rejoice in hope.

RSV Sales Three Million

ACCORDING to a recent report, the Revised Standard Version of the Bible has sold over 2,926,000 copies since its publication two years ago. Fifteen U. S. and Canadian denominations use this version for their Sunday

school materials. And some 350 colleges and universities reportedly use it in literature and other non-religious courses.

PINKING SHEARS

Only \$1.95 postpaid. Chromium plated, precision made. Manufacturer's Christmas overstock. Guaranteed \$7.95 value or money refunded. Order by mail. Lincoln Surplus Sales, 529 Main St., Evanston 41, Illinois.

G O W N S

• Pulpit and Choir •
Headquarters for
RELIGIOUS SUPPLIES









National

CHURCH GOODS
SUPPLY COMPANY
821 - 23 ARCH STREET, PHILADELPHIA 7, PA.

CATALOG ON REQUEST

SUNDAY SCHOOL PAPERS

Edited by Orthodox Bible Teachers

**Flannelgraph Pictures
and Helps**

CHRISTIAN REFORMED PUBLISHING HOUSE
Grand Rapids, Mich.

ORDER FORM

THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN
1505 Race Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa.

Dear sirs:

Enclosed find \$2.50 for which please send *The Presbyterian Guardian* for one year to:

Name

Address

The Presbyterian Guardian is a monthly magazine committed to stating, defending, and promoting orthodox Presbyterianism as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith.