

November 15, 1954

VOL. 23, NO. 11

The Presbyterian
GUARDIAN



NEW SEMINARY PROFESSORS SIGN DOCTRINAL STATEMENT

The Rev. Meredith C. Kline puts his signature to the statement required of Westminster Seminary professors, while the Rev. Edmund P. Clowney, Jr., standing, center, waits his turn. Both were elected assistant professors by the Board of Trustees October 26. Looking on are Professor C. VanTil, Chairman of the Faculty, and the Rev. John P. Clelland, President of the Board.

J. Gresham Machen
Editor 1936 - 1937

Published Monthly
\$2.50 per year

Meditation

Acceptable Service

"... and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, who also sat at the Lord's feet, and heard his word . . ."—LUKE 10:38-42.

Martha was in a dither. She had invited Jesus to her home. She was very anxious to be at her best as hostess, but she was having trouble. With all the things there were to do, her sister was not doing a thing to help. Instead of giving a hand, Mary had decided to sit and listen to Jesus.

Martha stood it as long as she could. But the fever of anxiety and the vexation of her troubles wore on her nerves. Finally she had to say something.

Trying to be polite, she spoke to Jesus. By appealing to his sympathy she would not seem discourteous toward him in taking Mary away. "Carest thou not that my sister did leave me to serve alone?" bid her therefore that she help me." But her words were not polite toward Mary.

Perhaps Martha felt sure Jesus would side with her, once he knew her worries. But if so, she did not understand Jesus very well. He would have her know him better.

What was he doing at her home? Was it primarily to eat a meal? Was he there to take of hers as if dependent on her favor? He was not there just to receive. He wanted first to give. Before he ate, he would feed. He was not just a guest. He was the host. And what to him was uppermost, Martha did not seem even to notice. She was too busy with her own affairs.

"The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Martha's home was a corner in that world. He would serve there too. What he would take from her was little indeed, beside the things he had to give. And were there but the welcome of an open and an understanding heart to take him as he would give himself, very little was needed of what Martha might provide.

Martha meant well. But she was not doing well. Because she did not know "the time of her visitation," she

wanted to offer an anxious heart, a troubled brow, a distracted mind for a sacrifice. And she could not see it was unwelcome service. She was even ready to rebuke her sister, though Mary knew better the mind of her Lord.

Mary made a better choice in the kind of reception she gave her Lord. She was prepared to give all he saw fit to accept. But she knew it was necessary first that she receive from him. And her service must not be as an endowment, of which he had no need. It must be only as a token gesture that expressed the feelings of a grateful heart. From this conviction she would not be distracted by her sister's good intentions. And the thing she had chosen so wisely to the enrichment of her soul and the honor of her Savior, our Lord would not allow to be taken away. "Mary has chosen the good part, which shall not be taken away from her."

With all her good intentions, Martha was foolish. But don't be too hard on her. Jesus was not. It was not malice, but ignorance that he would correct. There are many cooks, anxious to entertain the Master, who yet do not know him as their Lord and Savior. They are very busy with their own menu. But they have never eaten of the heavenly bread. They treat our Lord as a tired father come home to rest at the end of a hard day. They want him to sit and take it easy, while they manage things. He has had his day on the stage of history. But this is their hour. Though they appear to give him quite a reception after the fashion that men call good taste, they despise his cross and will not eat his fare. And who can convince them that their service is the sacrifice of fools!

Neither is our service acceptable if we try to go off to work before we sit down to eat. It is easy for the servants of the Lord to be long on activity and short on preparation. They want to get up to do before they get down to learn. They think they can stand to preach without kneeling to pray. They plan big undertakings. But the Lord is not in them. They make a lot of fuss. But there is no acceptable service. Therefore they must share the embarrassment of Martha.

HENRY P. TAVARES

Westminster Seminary Trustees Meet

THE Board of Trustees of Westminster Seminary met for its regular fall session on Tuesday, October 26, at the Seminary. Ten members of the Board were present.

The Board after satisfying itself of their qualifications elected the Rev. Meredith G. Kline and the Rev. Edmund P. Clowney, Jr., as Assistant Professors in the departments of Old Testament and Practical Theology respectively. They had previously held the rank of Instructor. Both men accepted their new positions and signed the doctrinal pledge which is required of professors at the Seminary.

The Rev. William Vander Haak, Christian Reformed Church minister of Kalamazoo, Michigan, who was previously elected to the Board, signed the doctrinal statement required of Board members and was formally seated on the Board. The Rev. Peter H. Eldersveld and the Rev. G. Van Pernis indicated their inability to attend meetings of the Board, and their membership was not continued.

The Rev. Robert Marsden, Executive Secretary of the Seminary, reported that contributions were slightly above those of a year ago, but that there had been no legacies and in consequence the Seminary entered October with a deficit of about six thousand dollars. Nearly twelve thousand dollars have been contributed toward the projected apartment building. Certain administrative changes have been made during the past year, which have relieved the Registrar, Professor Paul Woolley, of some burdensome responsibilities in that area.

There are eighty-one students regularly enrolled for the present term.

Philip Hughes Lectures At Westminster

THE Rev. Philip E. Hughes, of Bristol, England, an Anglican Calvinist, Secretary for England of the International Society for Reformed Faith and Action, was scheduled to deliver two addresses at Westminster Seminary November 15 and 16, on the subject, "Evolutionary Dogma and Christian Faith."

THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN

NOVEMBER 15, 1954

Thanksgiving

O Give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy endureth forever.

PSALM 107:1.

SCRIPTURE abounds with expressions of thanksgiving to God. From the Psalmist whose songs of praise feature every page of his inspired litany, to the apostle whose letters to his sons in the faith begin with prayers of thanksgiving, the thought of man's dependence on God and of God's faithfulness to His people never fails to find frequent and adequate expression in the Bible.

The significant element in the words quoted above, however, is the thought that it is for the "mercy" of God that the Psalmist is giving thanks. We give thanks for those things which we receive in normal course. We give thanks for food and clothing and shelter and friends and homes and loved ones. We should. All things, these included, come from God. At every moment we are dependent on Him. But the point is that we do not deserve these things. We do not merit them. We have not earned them. Giving thanks for them is not in the same sphere as the politeness we show when we say "thank you" to the clerk at the store who hands us the parcel and our change.

It is of the mercy of God that we are not consumed. That which we deserve is far less than that which we receive. In fact that which we deserve is nothing of good, but only judgment and rejection. We have gone in our own ways. Even in our efforts to serve God we have been self-willed, arrogant, proud. Our very worship is tainted with our sins. Yet judgment does not come. Instead, there is mercy.

There is the mercy of God toward the fool who in his folly gets into trouble, and in his extremity asks for the divine intervention. There is the mercy of God toward the unbelieving, who would walk in his own worldly wisdom, until the road comes to the inevitable dead end, and he cries out for the help of One he has neither known nor served. There is the mercy of God toward the rebellious, who will not let the Word of God be the lamp to their feet, but con-

tern the most high God, until He in mercy brings them down in sickness to the edge of the grave, and they cry in despair. There is the mercy of God toward the helpless, those who are caught in circumstances not of their own making but beyond their powers to conquer, as sailors in a storm tossed sea who are at their wit's end, until the voice speaks, "Peace, be still."

There is the mercy of God toward all men, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. All of God's goodness is mercy. He is good, for His mercy endureth forever.

We need to recover the humility which is proper to giving thanks to God. We are a proud people. We never hesitate to describe how much better our land is than other lands, and we give thanks for it. Our homes are better than other homes, and we give thanks. In some way our very giving of thanks is a declaration of our pride at our own accomplishments, for which it seems polite to tip our hats to God.

But with all our labour, all our wisdom, all our sacrificial strivings, we are yet unprofitable servants. When we have done everything commanded of us—and who has—we have but done that which was our duty to do. In the church too, if we have stood for the truth, if we have resisted compromise, if we have born the heat of the day, if we have been persecuted for Christ's sake, we have yet done all that we have done only with the help of God. It is He, not we, who builds His church, His Kingdom on the earth, and it is of His mercy that He is willing to build it through the efforts of such unwilling and incompetent servants as we have proven time and again to be. O Give thanks unto the Lord for He is good, for His mercy endureth forever.

The Son of God gave thanks that, according to the will of the Father, He the Son was known by babes, but was rejected by "wise and prudent" men.

May God give us the grace to thank Him for His mercies, and to recognize that everything for which we do thank Him is a gift of His mercy. For there is nothing we deserve.

L. W. S.

Publicising the Church

ONE of the main businesses in our modern world is advertising. And the purpose of advertising is simple—it is to sell a product through informing people of its nature, qualities and advantages. Magazines, newspapers, radio, TV, all are financed through the medium of advertising.

Yet the one institution that has more to offer the public than any other is woefully deficient when it comes to advertising or publicity. That institution is the church—the denomination in a sense, but chiefly the local congregation.

What has your local church done to attract the attention of the public generally in your community? Perhaps there is a half inch notice in the local newspaper on Saturday, buried in the midst of a few hundred other similar notices. If any one finds it—and the only reason they would is that they were looking for it—they learn that services will be held at a certain hour and maybe who will speak and on what topic. The topic is usually couched in such general terms as to lack all distinction, or in terms obviously designed to be unusual.

Perhaps members of the church have visited some homes in the community and have left a church bulletin or some sort of a leaflet. Church bulletins, on the average, are not calculated to attract much attention on the part of persons not ordinarily associated with the church. And often the leaflets, in order to avoid offense, present their material in such general terms that they do little to promote the work of your church.

We make no claim to be experts in the field of church advertising. But there seem to us to be certain points that could well be emphasized.

In the first place, no one can do a very good job of selling something in which he is not interested or in which he does not believe. One must believe in the product one has to sell—believe it is the best on the market, believe that everyone in the community ought to have that particular product above all other brands. We cannot be ashamed of our product, and still sell it.

We are not interested in selling one church as being as good as another in

these days. The value of the church is related to the correctness of its message. In the Reformed Faith we believe that we have that message which most closely approximates in human formulations the truth of God. There is no reason to be ashamed of that message, or of the church where it is preached, be that church a massive structure or a community hall.

One of the great efforts of commercial advertising is to get people to change brands. And the church should never be afraid of trying to get people to “change brands.” If we believe that the Reformed Faith is true, but that Methodism, Lutheranism, Anglicanism and Catholicism fall short of the truth, we should have no hesitation in urging people to listen to the Reformed message. In church matters, of course, this is called proselytizing, and it is criticized and condemned as “unChristian.” There is no reason why it should be. In religion, as in other fields, there is truth and there is error. And if we love the truth, we want people to know and believe and follow the truth. Our church promotional work should not be limited to people who have no church connections, but should be directed to all people, including those who have anything less than the best church connections.

A second feature of commercial advertising is that it seeks to blanket an area—that is, to reach everybody, but everybody. Church advertising and promotion cannot pick and choose. Too often we have said that certain areas are not suitable for our work. It is undoubtedly true that we cannot contemplate setting up churches in every block all at once, but that is not an excuse for refusing to get the message we have to offer into every block. We must work to reach people with the message we believe to be the truth.

In the third place, commercial advertising proclaims the story of the product so the reader will learn about it right where he is. *Life* magazine in its radio advertising describes some of the contents of each issue of the magazine, so people will want to go to the stands and buy. In comparison the church usually says—we have an interesting magazine down here in our church. If you will come down we will tell you what is in it. General Motors doesn't say, if you want to

know about our new cars, come around to our showroom and we'll tell you. They give the message in the advertising, to as great an extent as they can.

Likewise the church, through direct mail advertising perhaps, or in other ways, must get the message of the church into the homes of people, to places where men and women will hear it and read it and learn of it. It must put that message in terms that are intelligible to every reader.

And this must be done through a planned program. The individual church member has his part in promotional work. But the church can no more rely on him for a general promotional program, than Chrysler Corporation can rely on people who once owned a Plymouth to tell what is good about Chrysler products.

And this promotional work must be directed to one specific end. That end in the commercial world is to get the people first to the place where the product is actually for sale, and then to get the people to buy the product. In church affairs this means the first aim of promotion is to get people into the church building where and when the message is being preached. From that point, the message must sell itself.

Have you reviewed your church's promotional program recently?

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 Grace of Giving

Scripture pictures the Christian as steward, not owner, of God's creation

By GLENN R. COIE

I WANT to talk to you, reader, about a joy of which many Christians know nothing, about a grace all too few of God's people possess—the grace of giving. Paul speaks of it in II Corinthians, chapter 8. Writing from one of the churches in Macedonia in northern Greece to the young church at Corinth, he urges the Corinthian Christians to liberal giving, citing the very generous and sacrificial giving of the Macedonian believers in spite of their deep poverty as an inducement to the Corinthians to prove by a similar liberality the “sincerity of their love” to Christ. He says to the Corinthian Christians (vs. 7), “Therefore, as ye abound in every thing, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in *this grace* also,” that is, the grace of giving. Giving, he teaches, is just as much a grace as faith or love or knowledge of the Word of God.

High as the Orthodox Presbyterian Church stands in its per capita contributions as compared with other denominations, it is still my deep conviction that we have only begun to do what we really *could* do if our hearts were kindled with a flame of holy love for God and for the souls of men so that all of us would first give our “own selves to the Lord.” May God use these words to stir all of us to “abound in this grace also.” Let us go to the Bible and see what it has to say on this important subject of giving: first, about the guide for our giving, then the motivation for our giving, and, finally, the blessing of giving.

The Guide for Our Giving

In considering the guide for our giving we must recognize the basic, underlying principle of divine ownership. Many Bible passages assert that God is the owner of all things. “For every beast of the forest is mine and the cattle on a thousand hills. I know all the birds of the mountains, and the wild beasts of the field are mine” (Ps. 50:10-11); “The silver is mine and the

gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts” (Hag. 2:8); “The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof” (Ps. 24:10); “The land is mine” (Lev. 25:23).

GOD'S OWNERSHIP

By creation God not only owns the earth, but He also declares, “All *souls* are mine” (Ezek. 18:4), to say nothing of our talents, our time, and our strength. And it is God who gives us the power to make money: “And (lest) thou say in thine heart, My power and the might of mine hand hath gotten me this wealth . . . thou shalt remember the Lord thy God, for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth” (Dt. 8:17-18). Absolute ownership is vested in God. He never made any deed; He never transferred ownership to any one else. Man is rather God's steward or trustee to be the administrator of his possessions which are his Partner's property.

The Rev. Glenn R. Coie is pastor of Knox Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Silver Spring, Md.

Let us raise this matter of tithing and stewardship to the high and lofty plane which the Bible gives it. It is an acknowledgement of God's absolute and complete ownership. God owns all—my body, house, and the earthly things I call “my possessions.” God has merely loaned them to me. As the tenant of a house is vividly reminded on the first of the month of his landlord's ownership of the house in which he lives, so God would remind us continually on every pay day when we set aside His consecrated portion of our tithes and offerings, that He is our Maker, Owner, Preserver, and Redeemer. This is just one way in which we can say all too feebly, “Thank you, Lord, for saving my soul.”

MAN'S STEWARDSHIP

This truth of man's stewardship and accountability is emphasized in the first two chapters of Genesis and runs through the whole Bible. Why did

God put Adam and Eve in the garden? Does man own it? No. Five times God tells what He expects of man—he is to “have dominion,” he is to “replenish” the earth, he is to “subdue” the earth, he is to “dress” the garden, and he is to “keep” the garden.

We are God's by creation. We are His because of His sustaining providence—He “giveth to all things life and breath” and “upholdeth all things by the word of His power.” And we who by God's grace trust in the precious blood of Christ are His by redemption—“ye are not your own; ye are bought with a price.” So we are thrice God's—by Creation, Providence, and Redemption.

But has God's Word been any more specific to provide a guide for our giving than to establish the principles of God's absolute ownership and our stewardship and accountability? As Christians we profess to take the Bible as our only infallible rule of faith and practice. So we properly ask, Has the Bible spoken on this subject? Does God leave us simply to the spirit of gratitude and generosity, or has He definitely indicated what portion of His gifts to us are due to Him in return?

THE TITHE

There is no clear command, but we believe that even before the law was given, God indicated that a definite proportion of the believer's income should be devoted to Him. It is not recorded that God *commanded*, before Sinai, the offering of sacrifices, but in the light of the offerings of Abel, Noah, and Abraham, and the comment recorded, for example in Genesis 26:5 that Abraham kept “my commandments, my statutes, and my laws,” we are compelled to assume that there must have been such a commandment given. Similarly with the Sabbath: although no express command is recorded, there are clear indications that such must have been the case, for when God gave the Ten Commandments at Sinai, He did not tell Israel in the fourth commandment to *keep* the Sabbath, but to *remember* it, implying previous instruction regarding its observance.

So is it with the tithe. Although we have no specific “Thus saith the Lord” that God's people before the time of Moses were to give God a tenth of all their increase, yet we find that

Abraham gave tithes to Melchizedek, priest of the Most High God (Gen. 14:20). So also Jacob vowed that in return for the Lord's temporal blessings upon him, he would render a tenth in return unto the Lord (Gen. 28:19-22). We are not told why they selected that percentage—why they gave a tenth—but the fact that they did, as in the case of the sacrifices and the Sabbath, intimates God may have previously revealed to His people that one-tenth of their income should be devoted to Himself.

When we come to the Mosaic law, we find that the tithe was definitely incorporated. "And all the tithe of the land whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's: it is holy unto the Lord . . . And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock . . . the tenth shall be holy unto the Lord" (Lev. 27:30-32). Note the twice-repeated expression concerning the tithe, that it was "holy unto the Lord," that is to say, the tenth is exclusively God's own, His "holy," consecrated portion.

It is significant that in each great revival of godliness in the history of Israel, tithing is one of the things that is mentioned as being renewed and restored among them. It was true in the revival of Hezekiah's day after fearful declension (II Chron. 30-31). It was true in the revival in Nehemiah's day (Neh. 10:34-37). And it was no wonder at all that during the apostasy of the dark days before Christ's birth, God frankly charged His people with having "robbed" Him in withholding the tithe. Then the Lord does a remarkable thing—the only place in the Bible He does such a thing. He actually challenges His people to put Him on trial, to put Him to the proof, to test Him out and see whether He will let them be losers or not. His challenge is: "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it" (Mal. 3:8-10). God has appointed tithing as a test of faith and for the development of faith—if we would only prove His faithfulness!

It is a mistake to regard the tithe as a Levitical tax and to dismiss it as a mere civic law. It was both before and after Moses a distinct religious

duty, everywhere spoken of as an obligation to God. It was enforced not by legal punishments but by appeals of love to God. It was based not upon threats of prosecution or punishment, but upon tender entreaty and promises of God's loving approval. The purpose or end which the tithe was designed to accomplish was explicitly stated: "Thou shalt surely tithe all the increase of thy seed . . . the tithe of thy grain . . . and the firstlings of thy herd . . . that thou mayest learn to fear the Lord thy God always" (De. 14:22-23). The giving of the tenth would keep constantly before their minds the fear of God, reminding them of the Giver of all good.

But what about the tithe in the New Testament? Has it been abrogated or abolished? No more than the Sabbath was abolished. There is nothing in the New Testament that sets aside the teaching of the Old Testament on this important subject. Although incorporated into the Mosaic law, it is not binding as a *legal* requirement. But the *principle* which it emphasized and taught—God's ownership—is still operative. The New Testament only deepens and enlarges this principle.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

Our Lord clearly endorsed the principle of the tithe and placed His approval on it. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone" (Matt. 22:23). Here, while Christ condemned the scribes and Pharisees for neglecting the weightier matters such as judgment, mercy and faith, He significantly reminds them that they ought not to leave the other—the tithe—undone.

But the New Testament does not stop there. If the tithe is still an acknowledgement of God's ownership, approved by our Lord, the Apostle Paul goes on to extend and enlarge this principle. He says, ostensibly referring to Malachi 3:10 ("Bring ye all the tithes into the *storehouse*"), "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the church of Galatia, even so do ye, Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him" (I Cor. 16:1-2).

(See "Giving," p. 215)

Why Westminster?

A Reappraisal after 25 years

By NED B. STONEHOUSE

IN view of all the splendid addresses that we have already heard today, it is not wise or necessary for us to hear or be concerned with another—very long—address. We have tonight, as we are here together, a mingling of moods. There is very prominent in our minds, I am sure, a profound sense of gratitude to Almighty God for His wonderful blessings upon the Seminary, and at the same time a sense of deep humility and unworthiness that to us should have been entrusted this glorious privilege of witnessing to the truth of His Word.

I am tempted to reminisce tonight concerning the history of the Seminary. There are so many things that we might recall with profound gratitude that I hardly know where to begin. Certainly we have many rich reasons to thank our God as we contemplate the

preservation of the Seminary, the way in which men have come to us and have gone forth as ambassadors of Christ, the way in which our needs have been supplied, in which the campus came into our possession to be a rich blessing to us, the way in which the instruction has expanded, the library has grown and many other things. Among all these mercies of God there is probably nothing that compares with the thanksgiving in our hearts as we think of the wonderful fellowship we have had over these many years. We rejoice at the precious memories we have of faithful servants and children of God who have gone on, of the many who remain with us and this goodly company who are here tonight to cheer us and to fill us with renewed thanksgiving. It has been a glorious experience of fellowship.

Most precious of all has been the experience of the intimate fellowship possible only to a member of the faculty of Westminster Seminary. Certainly that privilege is as great a privilege as a person could ever think of having. And how I rejoice tonight that I may be associated with that company of men, my noble colleagues who are about me here. We have had a fellowship of labor that is quite unique, probably, in all the world. We have not been able always to agree on every point. But we have always been able to face and deal with our problems on the basis of the truth and with the assurance in our hearts that there was a basic integrity in every man that made us sure that we would arrive at a true solution of our problems. And one of the aspects of that situation that seems to me to be exceedingly happy is this—I think my colleagues would bear me out—that there has never been anything resembling a clique in the faculty. No one I think has ever been able to predict how its members would line up on any issue or how they would vote. Lines have not formed, but as each issue has risen we have given earnest and prayerful consideration to it and our votes have been taken and decisions have been made. I believe that there has never been a fellowship that is grander than that which has characterized our Seminary, and that particularly is in my mind tonight as I think with gratitude upon God's blessing to us.

The experience indeed is also a very humbling one, in view of some of the words have been spoken to us tonight. And I am also humbled as I think of the privilege that is mine on behalf of my colleagues, to try to say some of the things that we would probably all want to say.

The Issue of Truth

What I have in mind in asking again the question, Why Westminster?, is summed up pretty largely in certain words of the Apostle Paul. They are recorded in the epistle to the Galatians, 2:5, in a clause—*That the truth of the Gospel might abide with you.* I take it that the reason why Westminster came into existence, why it may still be worthwhile to support Westminster, why there may be a real future for Westminster Seminary is that there is bound up with the history, the life and the testimony of Westminster this

very great concern that the truth of the gospel might abide with you. We are concerned profoundly, first of all, with the question of truth, the truth of the Gospel, and that it should abide. When we speak of our commitment to the Reformed Faith we have that commitment in mind because we believe that the gospel in its purity will abide as the Reformed Faith in its purity is maintained and taught. We exist, as all the history of the Seminary has reminded you, that the Reformed Faith might be maintained and proclaimed. And that is not saying anything very different than that the truth of the gospel might abide with you.

Westminster was not formed simply that *another* Seminary might proclaim the Reformed Faith and the truth of the Gospel. There were perhaps enough seminaries in 1929. But it was formed because there came the conviction that at long last, after great

DR. Ned B. Stonehouse is Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary. This is the address he delivered on the occasion of the Anniversary banquet held the day the Seminary opened in September.

struggle and heartache, if the truth of the Gospel was to abide with men, it was simply imperative that the Seminary be formed. There was no other course of action that could possibly be taken. There was that sense of urgency about it.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

I had in mind tracing the history of events prior to that time in which, especially in the Presbyterian Church U.S.A., of which Princeton was a part, there was a gradual development of the situation which led to the reorganization of Princeton Seminary. There was the union in 1869 which spelled a certain relaxing of commitment to the Reformed Faith. There was also the movement of revision in the nineties which was consummated at the beginning of this century. It did not change many articles of the Westminster Standards but again sealed a relaxing of commitments and the entrance of mediating and compromising points of view into the church. And all of that was inspired by a spirit of liberalism and unbelief, to which men in Union Seminary especially were giving expression and aid in the nineties

and on into the present century. There is a new book on the history of Union Theological Seminary, recently prepared by the retired president, Henry Sloane Coffin. And among many interesting things he speaks of certain points of view that had no relevance to Christian life and work, so far as the founders of Union Theological Seminary were concerned. And among these was this point of view—a certain man taught that unregenerate men can keep the commandments of God and convert themselves!

THE AUBURN AFFIRMATION

Then there came the climactic development, especially in the publication of the Auburn *Affirmation*, which represented, I think, an open revolt against the Standards. Here was not merely a relaxing, or tearing down, but an open revolt against the infallible Word of God which had ruled in the life of that church, certainly until about 1900. It also broke down the gospel of the grace of God to claim, for example, that the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ was only a theory, so that it might be a fact and not a fact. Dr. Machen was one of those who saw the tremendous skepticism and anti-Christian character of that point of view, which says to men basically that it doesn't matter what you believe. Thus a man might affirm all the articles of the Christian faith, but if he said that in the last analysis it doesn't matter whether you believe them or not, he would be guilty of the most profound heresy of which a man could be guilty. For he would be ultimately and completely indifferent to truth, to the question of the truth of the gospel.

INCLUSIVISM AT PRINCETON

Well, in that situation, with pragmatism and inclusivism in the church, it is no wonder that Princeton Seminary ultimately became the victim. There was a grand and glorious struggle to preserve it. But Princeton Seminary was, as it appears now, certainly doomed in that situation, for this church had developed into what a recent spokesman for Princeton Seminary calls "the broadening church." Professor Lefferts Loetscher, son of the older Professor Loetscher, has written an exceedingly interesting book called "The Broadening Church," a very instructive book, but also a very (See "Stonehouse," p. 216)

Child Evangelism (I)

A Plea on Behalf of the Children

By LAWRENCE R. EYRES

IN a few of our states are settlements of Amish people who cling to the life of a bygone day. One of the most interesting peculiarities of these people is the way they dress their children—just like their grown-ups. These children are dressed to appear like little men and women. I like our modern ways better—wherein children are dressed like children, not as miniature adults.

But treating children as little adults is hardly limited to such isolated practices. Psychologically and religiously this error is manifest far and wide. And this error comes to expression in no area more generally, and with more damage to the children themselves, than in the field of child evangelism. In the modern child evangelism movement the Gospel appeal is laid upon the children in the same way it is laid upon their elders—with all the pressures available. And the obvious goal of this type of “gospel appeal” is to “get decisions” with the sincere, though erroneous, assumption that such decisions for Christ are for the most part true conversions, just as they are so counted in adult evangelism.

At the very beginning I wish to make it clear that this series is not intended to be a critique of modern child evangelism methods and nothing more. On the contrary, if modern child evangelism is largely wrong in its methods and goals, we are faced with the alternatives of repudiating child evangelism altogether or presenting a program which is in accord with the Christian's only infallible rule of faith and practice—the Scriptures which are the Word of God. And let it be said most vehemently that the former alternative must be disavowed and the latter affirmed by all who take seriously the Great Commission of our Lord to His Church. And to underscore this avowal I wish to present *a plea on behalf of the children*.

But before I deal with this subject I'd like to say a little as to just who I hope will be interested in these articles. Parents of growing children, pastors, Sunday school teachers and officers,

workers in junior young people's societies, vacation Bible school teachers, teachers in private and public day schools—in a word, all Christians who have an interest in the growth and development of boys and girls at every stage, should be interested in this subject. And it is my earnest prayer that this series will serve to stimulate prayerful and earnest study of ways and means to the end that their efforts of evangelizing the children may have blessing and fruition from Him who was once Himself a little Child and is the Children's Savior.

Children's Rights

Children have their rights! And inasmuch as they are spiritually defenseless against superior cunning and discernment of their elders, our Lord has defined these rights in what might well be called *the Magna Charta of Childhood*. This is found in Mark 10:13-16 and its shorter parallels in Matthew and Luke. It was during a busy day of our Lord's Perea ministry of teaching and healing that certain parents began to bring their little children to Jesus,

This is the first in a series of brief articles on child evangelism, a subject of timely interest and great importance. Mr. Eyres is pastor of Westminster Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Westchester, Ill.

hoping for no more than that He might touch them with His hand and speak a word of blessing. The disciples officiously rebuked these parents for bothering their Master when the thousands of grown men and women pressed upon Him for His teaching and healing: what a profitless waste of His precious time!

Now when Jesus took in the whole situation He was filled with indignation at those who would prevent the children from coming to Him. He rebuked His disciples with words which have rung down through the ages, “Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.” Then He

took these little ones into His loving arms and, laying His hands upon them, blessed them. There is a wealth of truth in this incident, but we must be content in drawing from it three obvious conclusions:

(1) *The children were brought to Jesus*. In this whole transaction the children themselves were passive. Our Lord made no direct appeal to them as He blessed them; rather He made His appeal *for* them. He was defending their *right* to be brought to Him! The same is to be observed in Paul's words in Ephesians 6:4 where fathers are enjoined to “bring them (their children) up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” It is quite true that in a previous verse Paul had said, “Children, obey your parents in the Lord,” but the only duty laid on these young hearts and minds was *obedience*. Our conclusion is further bolstered by the silence of Scripture relative to any direct appeal made to children as such for a once-for-all decision for and commitment to Christ as Savior and Lord. It follows, then, that we parents and teachers must *bring* our children to Jesus, for without our bringing them, they cannot come to Him. Just how we are to do this will become clear in later articles.

(2) *Children, by their very nature, are most susceptible to being brought to Christ*. This, in part, is the point of the words, “for of such is the kingdom of God.” When a child believes in any thing or anybody, he believes with all his heart. He is not critical of what he is taught, but trusts the word of his teacher implicitly. For this very reason it is easy to warp and destroy the souls of little children. It is done by substituting a lie for the truth, or by holding before them a false Christ in place of the true. It is in ways like these that children from time immemorial have been forbidden to come to Jesus. As parents, teachers, pastors, have we permitted our prejudices, indolence and worldliness to come between a child and his rightful Savior? Have we caused one of these little ones to stumble? If we have (for so says the Lord Himself) it were better that a millstone were hanged about our necks, and that we were drowned in the depths of the sea. It is just because little children are, by the simplicity of their nature, so undiscerning and helpless against soul-destroying influences that our responsibility to insure their

right to come to Jesus is so fearful and compelling.

(3) *This right belongs to all children.* We do not know much about these children who were brought to Jesus. We don't even know whether their parents were true believers. And for our purpose we do not need to know, for it is the right of *all* children to be brought to Jesus. If Paul was debtor to all men to preach the Gospel to them, surely we are debtor to all children, by all proper means, to bring them to the Savior. It is not unperformed to sing,

"Jesus loves the little children,
All the children of the world,"

for He created them, gave them hearts

Orthodox Presbyterian Church News

Brief Church Notes

East Orange, N. J.: Covenant Church, which has sold its property on South Munn Avenue, has leased a house at 997 Broad Street, Bloomfield, N. J., for the use of the pastor and his family. Efforts are being intensified to determine the best location for the erection of a new church building. The congregation held its anniversary fellowship dinner on October 19, under the leadership of Mrs. Robert Freytag.

Schenectady, N. Y.: The Junior and Senior choirs of Calvary church have resumed their rehearsals, with about 30 in the older group and 20 in the younger group. The Rev. Harry Meiners, brother of the pastor of Calvary Church, has suffered an attack of poliomyelitis, and at last reports was still in an iron lung.

Berkeley, Calif.: Annual visitation of members of Covenant Church by the Session is being carried out in November. Mrs. Richard Miller who had just returned from Japan was guest speaker at the Women's Missionary Society meeting, and showed slides she had taken of Orthodox Presbyterian missionary work in Japan.

Nottingham, Pa.: The Rev. George Christian, pastor of Faith Church, unaffiliated, conducted a series of evangelistic services at Bethany Church

which in their tenderest years are susceptible to His saving truth. And if we are to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them, teaching them, as the risen Savior commanded, is there any child of whom it can be said, "he ought not to be brought to Jesus?"

Conclusion

Yes, children have their rights, regardless of their race, color, station or the religion of their ancestors. Everyone of them *ought* to be brought to Jesus. But he must be brought to Jesus *as we find him and in terms of what he is.* This last sentence will bear much enlargement in succeeding articles. Next month we shall consider *the nature of the child to be evangelized.*

October 18-24. The Rev. Francis Mahaffy was guest speaker at the church early in October. The church has suffered loss in the death of Elder Clarence Davison, who passed away recently, just three weeks after his wife died.

French Creek Plans Family Conference

THE Directors of the French Creek Bible Conference Association have announced plans for their Conference season next summer.

There are to be two Young People's Conferences at French Creek Park, the Junior Conference date being August 23-30, and the Senior Conference date August 30-September 5.

Also there will again be a Family Conference, to be held at New Preston, Connecticut, August 6-13. In case a better location for the family conference is found, the site may be moved, but the dates are set. It is suggested that families interested in the Conference make vacation dates accordingly.

St. Andrews Dedicates New Building

AFTER many years spent in a variety of locations, including a hall in the center city, and the home of

the resident pastor, St. Andrews Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, Md., on November 7 formally dedicated to the glory of God its newly completed house of worship. The structure is located at 3451 Erdman Avenue, in the northeastern section of the city.

The dedication service was held on Sunday afternoon at 4 p. m. with the Rev. George J. Willis, pastor, in charge.

Westfield Church Self-supporting

GRACE Orthodox Presbyterian Church has voted to become entirely self-supporting. The congregation has been receiving aid from the Home Missions Committee for the past seventeen months, though the aid was actually used for only five months, the other assistance checks being returned to the Committee. At a recent anniversary service it was reported that attendance at the Sunday school has increased over one hundred percent, and at the worship services of the church over fifty percent, in the year since services were started in the new church building.

Church Seeks Used Pulpit Furniture

GETHSEMANE Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia is interested in securing pulpit furniture for its church auditorium. The Pastor, the Rev. Lester R. Bachman, writes that the immediate need is for a pulpit desk, but that a set of desk and chairs, or desk, chairs and communion table, would be most acceptable. Anyone with information about such used furniture should write to the Rev. Lester R. Bachman, 7004 Reedland St., Philadelphia 42, Pa.

Church in Bangor, Maine, Organized

PILGRIM Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Bangor, Maine, is now a regularly organized congregation of the Orthodox Presbyterian denomination. Mr. Dale M. Snyder, who has been serving as missionary pastor in Bangor for over a year, was ordained

to the ministry and installed as pastor of Pilgrim Church on August 20. Assisting in this service were the Rev. Calvin Busch of Portland, Maine, the Rev. Arthur W. Kuschke of Philadelphia, the Rev. Charles E. Stanton of Cornville, Maine, and Mr. C. Herbert Oliver of Ludlow, Maine.

Women's Presbyterials Hold Fall Meetings

REPORTS of the fall meetings of three Women's Presbyterials have been received.

New Jersey Presbyterial

Seventy-nine delegates attended the fall meeting of the New Jersey Presbyterial, held October 12 at Covenant Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Vineland, New Jersey. Mrs. LeRoy B. Oliver of Fair Lawn, New Jersey, is President of the organization. Other officers are Mrs. Hopwood Mullen of Wildwood, vice-president; Mrs. Theodore Georgian of Trenton, secretary; Mrs. Frank Youngman of Crescent Park, treasurer; and Mrs. James Stryker of Ringoes, assistant secretary-treasurer.

The topic of the morning discussion was "A Well-rounded Missionary Program." In the afternoon the Rev. Francis E. Mahaffy spoke of the work in Eritrea, and showed colored slides of the mission.

The spring meeting is to be held May 5 at Immanuel Church, West Collingswood, New Jersey.

MRS. THEODORE J. GEORGIAN

Ohio Presbyterial

The Rev. G. H. Morling in his book, "The Quest for Serenity," refers to the man who "sprang into the saddle and rode rapidly in all directions." With the fall work of the churches and Christian school under way there has necessarily been a great deal of activity as we carry out a vigorous program of instruction, evangelism and mercy. Some of us have felt like Morling's rider. Consequently the ladies of the Ohio Presbyterial welcomed their fall meeting, held at New Hope Church, October 30, with the opportunity to "come apart and rest awhile."

The New Hope church is located in a beautiful setting of russet oaks, flaming maples and the evergreen pine. About 45 women (and men) from the four churches of the Presbytery at-

tended. Mrs. T. F. Armour of Grove City presided.

The morning devotions were led by Mrs. Henry Kiester of Faith Church, Harrisville. Special music throughout the day was provided by a trio from Covenant Church, Pittsburgh.

Mr. Wendell Rockey of Wayside Church, Grove City, gave an address on the subject, "Whose Children are they?" His thesis was that home and school must reinforce the work of the church if we are to protect our children against the threat of secularism. This must be done because our children belong to God.

In the afternoon there were reports from the work of the Rev. Henry Phillips, missionary in Gresham, Wisconsin, and Mrs. Bruce Hunt, missionary in Korea. Mr. Phillips reported increased attendance at the services, and some extension work started. Mrs. Hunt expressed appreciation for relief goods which had been sent to Korea. The native people there are very discouraged, and feel that there is hope for them only in heaven. The help of other Christian people is a source of great comfort to them. Miss Sara Speer of Covenant Church led in a period of intercessory prayer.

Guest speaker in the afternoon was the Rev. Francis Mahaffy, who spoke on the work in Eritrea.

MRS. C. K. CUMMINGS

Philadelphia Presbyterial

The fall meeting of this group was held October 28 at Calvary Church, Middletown, Pennsylvania, with 62 delegates present. Mrs. Leonard Brown of St. Andrew's Church, Baltimore, presided in the absence of Mrs. Robert L. Atwell, the president, who is recovering from a case of hepatitis.

The devotional service was conducted by Mrs. Ralph Clouser of Middletown. At the business session a letter of news and greeting from the Missionary Society of Westminster Church, Valdosta, Georgia, was read. The society also sent a check to be included in the day's offering. A committee consisting of Mrs. William Ferguson of Kirkwood, Mrs. Eugene Hayman of Wilmington, and Mrs. Robert Marsden of Middletown, Pennsylvania was appointed to propose nominations for officers of the presbyterial.

The morning session featured reviews of four books suitable for missionary study. The books were "J.

Gresham Machen" by Dr. Stonehouse; the Compilation of the Reports of the Committee on Local Evangelism submitted to the General Assembly and now published by the Committee on Christian Education; "The Life of Dr. Lee Huizenga," by E. J. Lamberts; and "An Outline of World Wide Missions," by R. H. Glover. The reviewers were Mrs. Murray Forst Thompson of the Glenside Church, Mrs. Robert Vining of Nottingham, Mrs. Hope Jebb of Kirkwood, and Mrs. W. C. Patterson of Wilmington.

In the afternoon Mrs. John P. Galbraith conducted a missionary quiz program, giving as clues facts about home and foreign missionaries of the church to be used in identifying the missionaries. Mrs. Glenn Coie of Silver Spring led the period of prayer for the missionary program of the church. Featured speaker of the afternoon was the Rev. Mr. Mahaffy, who was at this time visiting the churches on the east coast.

MRS. ETHEL R. YAW

Lucas in Miami Area

THE Rev. Robert Lucas has moved to Florida in order to carry on missionary work in the Miami area.

Mr. Lucas, a member of Calvary Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Bridgeton, New Jersey, was ordained to the ministry by the Presbytery of New Jersey on October 24. He accepted a call from the Presbytery to serve it as a home missionary. He plans to support himself by secular work for the time being. He was ordained as an evangelist.

The Rev. John C. Hills, and the Rev. John P. Galbraith spent some time surveying the Miami section. In the Hialeah area they found many new homes being erected, and what seemed to be good prospects for church work. It is here that Mr. Lucas will be engaged for the present.

Daughter to Herbert Birds

A DAUGHTER, Ruth Elizabeth, was born on October 22 in Asmara, Eritrea, to the Rev. and Mrs. Herbert Bird, Orthodox Presbyterian missionaries in that country. Mr. and Mrs. Bird have two other children, David and Stephen.

Hazel Hits Seminary

HURRICANE Hazel, which left a wake of destruction in the east coast area, did not miss the campus of Westminster Seminary. The storm hit the Philadelphia area on Friday evening, October 15. Trees were uprooted, branches broken off, and signs and roofs distributed over the country-side.

Though damage to buildings at the seminary was fortunately very slight—a few shingles being blown off the roofs, the beautiful maple trees suffered severe damage. Branches large and small were strewn over the campus. Several large evergreen trees were also broken. Electricity was off for a day and a half.

Letter from Mrs. Gaffin

MRS. Richard B. Gaffin and sons Harold and John arrived in Formosa October 10, where they joined the Rev. Richard Gaffin, Orthodox Presbyterian missionary there. The following extracts are from a letter dated October 26.

"When we arrived at Keelung on October 10, I was too sick to come on deck at first (the whole night and day before we were in the wake of a typhoon) but the boys reported that they saw Dick waving far ahead on the pier, and as soon as I could get on my feet I heard Dick and Harold yelling like two country cousins at each other. I was on deck long before Dick was allowed to come on board.

"The elderly Mr. Kuo, who was at Westminster several years ago, was at the boat, and Mrs. Bien's son who teaches school in Taipei—you remember I told you about her at Missionary society. Mrs. Wu was there too. She is a beautiful girl and very friendly.

"We had a grand time in Taipei. Everyone was glad to see us—the police on his beat, the ricksha coolies on the stand by the O.M.E.A. Everywhere we went we met people Dick knew. We were invited into some interesting homes and had some delicious meals. The Chinese all stand in amazement as Harold passes by. They think he is huge, and stand and gaze at him.

"We rode down to Taichung in a truck which brought our baggage and Dick's things from O.M.E.A., on Mon-

day, October 18. We had by process of elimination selected a house in two days, on the basis of cost . . . The house we took has two bedrooms and a living room, a bath and small kitchen. We eat in one end of the living room. The rooms are large and are fairly well

furnished with huge Chinese pieces made in Canton. They are part of our landlord's mother's dowry. We have to have a dining table and chairs made. The floors are rough cement. There is grass matting on the kitchen and living room floor . . ."

What About This Ecumenism?

By PAUL WOOLLEY

LAST summer the American air vibrated with ecumenism. As everyone knows the World Council of Churches was holding its second Assembly in Evanston. In the immediately preceding weeks the Third Plenary Congress of the International Council of Christian Churches was held in Elkins Park, Philadelphia. As a result nearly every Christian in America must have done some "thinking" about the subject of ecumenical relationships.

Both of the bodies mentioned are organizations made up primarily of Churches. There are, perhaps, three broad levels at which Churches can find a common usefulness in activity in a jointly supported organization. The first is the level of common approach to formal and technical relationships. Such are the approach to government concerning the allocation of radio and television frequencies; the teaching of religion in schools; the relation of the clergy to the armed forces, the police, legislative bodies and the like; proposed legislation and regulation; the taxation of religious bodies, church property, clerical persons and the like; and other matters in similar formal and technical relationships.

A second level of joint action is where the Churches are united with reference to their teaching on some important doctrinal matters but not in all. There are, of course, various degrees of unity at this broad level. At one extreme, there can be unity concerning the triune personality of God and little else. At the other the difference may concern, say, only the work of the Holy Spirit.

Finally, the third level is where there is unity of teaching in all important matters. In each case, we are talking about the common basis of *activity*.

For, in practice, that is the most useful primary classification.

The World Council contains some Churches apparently, and some individuals certainly, which believe that it belongs to the third of my categories. Most of its members would place it in the second category. The members of the International Council would certainly classify their organization in the second category.

At the present time there do not appear to be any organizations of the first category.

We have thus far presented our classification on the basis of *activity*, for there do not seem to be any world organizations of Churches or, in this country at least, any national organizations of Church which do not engage in active teaching which has at least a broad doctrinal basis. Both the World Council and the International Council express their opinions formally as to the *Christian* position concerning this or that subject of general interest. So do the World Evangelical Alliance, and the world confessional or denominational organizations like the Alliance of Reformed Churches throughout the World Holding the Presbyterian Order. So does the National Association of Evangelicals. Its international counterpart, the World Evangelical Fellowship, is perhaps too young to have set its course yet, but it is to be presumed that it will follow the lead of its American sister.

In brief, then, all the world organizations of Christian Churches which we have mentioned are engaged to a greater or lesser degree in teaching. But in the interests of comity, they put a limit on their teaching. They teach only what they believe a majority, usually an overwhelming majority, of their members believe. This is true

of the World Council, the International Council and all the rest.

I have a great deal of difficulty with this procedure. There is bound to be some teaching by these organizations with which I disagree. But, in fact, so does everyone else who has convictions have difficulty, only some are less ready to admit it. Most of the World Council people want the Roman Catholic Church to join. Some do not. Why? Because they think it would bring in expressions (teaching) that would be misleading. Some want the Unitarians to be admitted. Some do not. The reason is similar.

There are like difficulties facing organizations that are limited to "evangelicals." The National Association of Evangelicals admits "pentecostals." The American Council of Christian Churches does not. Presumably their world counterparts take, or would take, corresponding positions.

The present writer has considerable hesitation about all of the teaching organizations mentioned. As soon as one starts to do any teaching at all, it is difficult to stop short of the whole truth. How can you ever be sure you are only teaching the part of the truth in which you agree with the majority in the organization? Do you really want to be teaching only *part* of the truth? *Can* you teach only part of the truth without misleading people?

There are other difficulties connected with these organizations. They are seen especially in the International Council. There is often what appears to me to be a terrific violence to its polemic which is unchristian. Charity and courtesy are among the most needed virtues today, particularly because they are so sadly neglected among both Christians and non-Christians in the present age. Many people have been repelled by the failure of what they consider the International Council's chief organ of propaganda to print communications correcting or amplifying statements made in its pages.

The political and economic statements issued by the Council, or in its name, do not always seem to be in keeping with either its purpose or its character. They presuppose a unity of political and economic outlook which hardly exists. Certainly such unity has not been prepared by any adequate consideration of the subjects on the part of the membership.

Is there, then, no organization of Christian Churches throughout the world which is free from objectionable characteristics — characteristics which are not only minor annoyances but actual hindrances to Christian testimony? Should we just forget ecumenism? Hardly. That is rarely the way to make progress. For the present, since there is no organization which is willing to restrict itself to formal and technical relationships, the best objective of our ecumenical energies is the Reformed Ecumenical Synod. Here is a body which properly belongs to our third class as described above. So far, at least, it does not appear that a convinced member of a Reformed Church would be embarrassed by its conduct or have to restrict his teaching improperly. The Reformed Ecumenical Synod

has made a slow and careful start. Perhaps it can gradually become a vigorous and effective ecumenical organization.

There ought also to be an organization of the first category, one confined to technical and formal matters. Probably such would be best at the national level. The National Council of the Churches of Christ tries to usurp this function along with its teaching activities. It is important to prevent it from securing a monopoly in the matter. In that respect, the National Association of Evangelicals, the American Council of Christian Churches, and the independent denominations serve a useful function. Ultimately enough people may see the need for a unitary organization to supply one.

Fire on the Earth

Recapitulation

By ROBERT K. CHURCHILL

IT was autumn, with a hint of eternity in the air. A purple haze curtailed the quiescent hills in prayer. Through the waning sunlight came a profound and brooding peace, the end of earth's feverish strivings.

The sermon had been simple that morning, just a phrase by phrase description of the last judgment as recorded in Matthew Twenty-Five. We walked home, down the Philadelphia Parkway, much in thought. We were disturbed at the thought of standing before the Great White Throne on the day of Judgment, to be judged according to our works—who could remain calm at such a thought?

But there was something else that disturbed us. We had just had a certain popular interpretation of Scripture utterly demolished. The interpretation which modern fundamentalism has given to this passage is probably well known to my readers. It is to the effect that the judgment spoken of here is not a judgment of individuals, but of nations. Here the nations of earth are to be judged, not as to how they had kept or failed to keep the law of God, no, the sole standard of judgment was how the various nations had treated the Jewish nation (some say, the Jewish

remnant). Furthermore, works are prominent here, and the Christian who is under grace will never appear before any such judgment. Back in my mind I always felt that this interpretation was unnatural. Neither the Scriptures, nor any other great literature, should suffer such forced and stunted exegesis. But not all the rationalism or liberalism to which I had been subjected at University had dislodged this notion. It took a Methodist preacher, sticking to the Scriptures in a forceful and truly dramatic sermon to fully open my eyes. The preacher was not aware of this interpretation: at least he did not try to answer it. He simply set forth the Scriptures in their naked grandeur—thus does the Word break down, destroy, and build.

Let me say a word about that minister, Dr. Nichols, and the old Arch Street Methodist Church. We often attended that church; it was good to get away at times from the contention (necessary) which was so much a part of the Seminary atmosphere. That church had character and spirit. The well-trained quartet and organ, being in the rear balcony did not perform before the people; this aided the sense of worship. At every service there was

a welcome given the strangers. Dr. Nichols loved people genuinely, and this made his preaching attractive. The power of his sermons, which by the way did not follow the Methodist line, or should I say lack of lines, lay in the preacher's genius in the dramatic art. This had no manifestation in outward or bodily movement—it was a more sterling quality. There was a reserved motion of hands, but mostly by word pictures which struck the common chord did he set forth the Word of God. We often found inspiration and refreshment there for Dr. Nichols was a preacher who could touch the stars with one hand, and the common clay of earth with the other. There in the center of that old and teeming city he performed a blessed ministry.

On that Sabbath referred to, we walked home to our room-and-a-half apartment, where all our worldly possessions were stored under the bed. On that day in November, still warmed by the dying embers of the year, we made a momentous decision, a decision which by months of study at Westminster Seminary was to be greatly strengthened. We decided that we and all men would one day stand before that Judgment Seat, the Great White Throne, and give an account of the deeds done in the body. That this decision was momentous will be revealed as this story unfolds. Briefly, it meant that we had suddenly started to go against the main current of American Christendom, especially the current of fundamentalism. It also meant that we had rejected not one error, but many, which were partially revealed in this very popular view.

Succinctly we had rejected the false antithesis between law and grace inherent in modern fundamentalism. Personally, it meant years of disappointment, ostracism, and heart break. But of course, we did not see all this. I accepted the view which Dr. Nichols had set forth, first because I knew that it was the simple teaching of the Bible. I think there was another reason, and that was its preaching value. There is a wondrous power in preaching the Bible just as it is, without long and involved interpretations. We should always view the multitudes when we preach; there is something even in the popular mind which can respond to truth. That popular mind to which God must speak, has one virtue at least—it hates being balked and cheated by

a confused appeal. We are talking about that last Great Day. All men fear it. All men know it is coming. Surely it is inexcusable, if not criminal, to confuse the general mind on such an important subject. Modernism stands condemned because it has robbed a man of what he needs in order to stand before that last great assize: there can be no greater crime against the human spirit than this. But what shall we say of fundamentalism, with its partial truths and devious teachings? It belongs to the righteousness of God and the fact that the moral law is written on the hearts of all, that when the world's case is finally tried, it will not be judged by a code unknown to the defendant. The world instinctively knows this and men will listen to a preacher who can speak the truth plainly. That is what I mean by the preaching value of this doctrine.

To fill out the present ecclesiastical picture, I should say that the interpretation to which I have just referred has become pretty much a part of modern premillennialism, though I do not believe that it need be so. Unfortunately when a man today says he is a Premillennialist, he usually means that he is a Dispensationalist, or one who has generally embraced the doctrines of Plymouth Brethrenism, rather than the Reformed Faith. I could not proceed with this little survey of contemporary church history without pointing out this very strong current of thought. It may seem unimportant to the reader but I feel assured that as the drama unfolds it will prove to be most significant. Under the ever forward moving banner of the Cross we were given a gargantuan task; it was none other than the rebuilding of the church of God. This in itself would be quite enough to relate, but there is more. That church had to be rebuilt, not only in the presence of an indifferent and godless world grown calloused to every appeal, but also in the presence of Modernism and Fundamentalism, each of which in its own way was to block the new rearing of the walls of Zion. From the human standpoint it was the one movement which could not succeed.

In the months which preceded the '36 Assembly, an uneasiness appeared in the ranks of those who were standing with Dr. Machen. More than once, I talked to ministers who were either on the Independent Board, or else

standing in the fight against liberalism. These men became more and more outspoken in their assertions that they did not see 'eye to eye' with "Das," meaning of course that "Das" Machen was not a "pre-mill." So important was this in their eyes that they doubted if they could stand with him in his contending for the faith. This always saddened me, it seemed like straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel. Here where historical Christianity itself was at stake, men would make one doctrine, or rather an interpretation, into an all important issue. But such were the times, such they are still. My own pastor, the Rev. Dr. Roy T. Brumbaugh, who was on the Seminary Board, justified his position as a "Pre-Mill" on the Board by the expressed notion that in time Westminster Seminary would be put to trial or reshuffled in such a way that it would become a premillennial seminary. If we think this strange, we should remember the context. There was constant and mounting pressure put on such men by the leaders and elders of the church. Any view except the "pre-mill" view was unscriptural, why should the 'pre-mills' act as a smoke screen to hide this evil—why not clean house?

Soon after the new church was formed, there came a split. Faith Seminary and The Bible Presbyterian Church were formed. There were many trumped up charges for this split, such as 'drunkenness' at Westminster, etc., but the real reason was the incompatibility of a fundamentalism grown quite narrow, and the Reformed spirit which has always trembled at the thought of adding even the best of human interpretations to the Word of God. Historic Presbyterianism has always allowed for at least three views concerning the millenium—simply because the Scriptures were not absolutely clear on the subject. We dare not be more clear on an interpretation than the Word itself. If the grand line of orthodoxy were to be continued, men would have to have freedom in such matters. To maintain such a high principle was very costly: we lost some fine men and churches, and you may be sure the enemy made the most of it. Nevertheless, it was a stand which all lovers of God's Word were forced to take. But more of this later. I mention this type of Premillennialism now, only to show that this was pretty much the temper of the

Presbyterian Church before the '36 Assembly, at least in the large conservative sector.

Dr. Machen, and those who marched with him against the modern apostasy, had to draw their supporters from this conservative sector of the church. But this conservative sector had been pulled away from true Presbyterian doctrines into fundamentalism. We must get the true picture. In the years that liberalism, mostly from Germany, was rising and making its way into the church and general thinking of the age, there was also another tide rising, the tide of modern fundamentalism, largely influenced by Bible Institute learning and Dispensationalism. Dr. Machen was well aware of the first of these tides, and saw that every believer in the Scriptures must rise in defense of the historic Christian faith. But he knew nothing, or at least very little, of the other influence until he met it within the ranks of his own friends and supporters. This, I believe, was somewhat of a surprise to him and most assuredly a deep heartache, but when this attack on the truth was made, this time behind his own lines, he met it forthrightly. This of course, meant that many withdrew their support and many other conservatives began to attack the new movement.

The new church would be small, not large, and this was terrible. The American mind was used to religion with one eye on the box office. If a thing was good, it had to register on the applause meter. Here was a movement, and the crowd was not present—it was doomed. To this may be added the general defection of conservatives who were not of the fundamentalistic temper of mind. These men saw clearly the drift of ecclesiastical affairs. When men were tried in Presbytery and Synod for their membership on The Independent Board, or for their speaking of the doctrinal defection in the church, they saw that things were far more serious than they had at first supposed. This meant great loss; they would be put out of the church, lose their positions, they could no longer do good. We may not judge the motives of these men; no doubt their actions were well justified in their own minds. But at least they did not say with Luther:

“Let goods and kindred go;
This mortal life also.”

One of these men, Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney, came about that time to the Seminary, looking for an assistant. I was one of those whom he tried out and talked with. Finally he said, I think you may do, but there is one more question—do you agree with this group in Philadelphia, *are you a seceder?* I was utterly surprised at the use of this term. I assured him that I was no ‘seceder’ but that if I were asked in my ordination vows to promise before God to support modernism I would not take such a vow. He waved this lightly aside and later told the registrar that there was nothing here for him. The fact that Dr. Macartney left our ranks was a great blow, as well as a personal loss. We loved the man as a father, and had come to depend on him as a Moses, or a Joshua. There were other men, of equally high calibre, such as Dr. O. T. Allis, Professor of Old Testament at Westminster, who were to stay in the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A. I like to think that such men are still with us in spirit. The cords of love and respect, though they may be stretched, are by no means broken.

The 1936 General Assembly culminated the long struggle in the church between the conservatives and modernists. The word of man was officially placed above the Word of God and men had to leave the church or else support false doctrines. It would be hard to conceive of an issue which was more clear cut and commanding to all honest men. In some ways the issues were larger or clearer cut than in Luther's day. Who, for instance, in the Roman Church, would deny the Virgin Birth or the truth of the Scriptures? What Roman theologian ever doubted the miracles of Christ, His penal death, or His resurrection? The modern Reformers stood for all that Luther stood for regarding the absolute authority of the Scriptures, plus a great deal more. If the situation in the 16th century demanded a new church, the situation in the 20th century demanded one also—perhaps more so.

Soon after this decisive assembly in Syracuse, the put-outers and the come-outers met in downtown Philadelphia, and formed a new church called The Presbyterian Church of America. (Later this name was taken away in a court action by The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.). I resist the temptation of lingering on these signif-

icant meetings. I was one of the Seminary graduates ordained at that first General Assembly of June 1936, and was soon sent out by the newly formed mission board to be a missionary to the Northwest Territory, a tiny area consisting of the States of Oregon and Washington. Thus after many an adventure in the tumultuous religious life of our day, I arrived at the place from whence this historical account began. I took up work in Tacoma and Seattle, there we take up the saga again.

California Presbytery Holds Fall Meeting

THE Presbytery of California held its fall meeting September 22-23 at Westminster Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Bend, Oregon, with ten ministers and two ruling elders present.

Among matters confronting the Presbytery was the question of promoting the church on the Island of Guam, where Chaplain Lynne Wade is now stationed. Chaplain Wade had requested advice of Presbytery concerning persons who might wish to become members of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Presbytery adopted a report recommending that such individuals apply to a particular church of Presbytery to be received, being examined either through correspondence or by Chaplain Wade acting for the Session. The report further recommended that fellowship with such individuals be developed and maintained through correspondence and the interchange of literature, and that whenever possible, where a group could be gathered together, a separate church be set up in fellowship with the Presbytery.

The Presbytery also took steps looking to the placing of a home missionary on the California peninsula beginning in April, 1955.

In another action, Presbytery erected a visitation committee to supervise the program of visiting sessions of local churches.

The Rev. Edward L. Kellogg was received into the Presbytery and plans were made for his installation as pastor of First Church of National City, which took place on October 15.

Giving

(Continued from p. 206)

"Laying by" signifies a definite, pre-determined act rather than a spontaneous impulse, and it is a *definite proportion* of our income, set aside in a proportionate way. If my income is double what it was a year ago, and I am not giving any more to the Lord's cause than I gave then, then I am *not* giving "as the Lord hath prospered." It is to be cheerful and joyous liberality toward God. "Every man as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver" (II Cor. 9:7).

So the New Testament believer, when he comes to church on the first day of the week, the Lord's Day, is to bring his offering, previously set apart and now presented as a part of his worship. And how much should he bring? Certainly no less than the tithe which God required in the Old Testament. The tithe is really only the place to *begin*. Old Testament believers brought tithes *and* free-will offerings. We do not really begin to give until after we have paid the tithe. Let us remember this when we think of our November Thank Offering. With the fuller light of God's completed revelation and the greater privileges under which we today live, tithing as a place to begin giving, is even *more* obligatory on saints of the New Testament period. It is so on the principle of "unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required" (Luke 12:48). The Christian should bring his tithes and offerings for the very same reason he keeps all the other commandments of God—not because he *must* do so, but because he loves God and *wants* to do so. Our giving should be of that which really costs us something. David said he would not give unto the Lord that which cost him nothing. We should *feel* it; else it is not really giving of ourselves.

The Motivation for Giving

But not only has God left us a guide for our giving. He has also indicated the motivation for our giving. The example of the Macedonian Christians should move us. They were exceedingly poor; they were in deep affliction; yet they contributed with great

sacrifice, cheerfulness, and liberality. Paul says that the real secret of their giving lay in the fact that they "first gave their own selves to the Lord" (II Cor. 8:5). That is what takes the "burden" out of giving—when we truly recognize that we are not our own, but have been "bought with a price." Our wills are to become one with His will; our aim, the glory of His name. We have become "workers together with God." That means precisely that. We are not idlers, drones, standing idle in the market place. We are those who have heard the words of the Lord Jesus, "Son, go *work* today in my vineyard."

Paul goes on to appeal to the highest possible motive in our giving. The example of Christ should move us: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor that ye through his poverty might be rich" (II Cor. 8:9). He was rich, yet He became poor, and O! how poor! He gave Himself for us. If we really love Him, we will "prove the sincerity of our love" by consecrated giving to alleviate men's woes and save their souls. And only God can give us who are by nature selfish, this disposition toward liberality. It is a grace which must be traced to Him. It was "bestowed" by God on these early Christians (8:1). God grant us this grace and this "willing mind" (vs. 12).

The desperate need of the unsaved about us should move us. The poor must be provided for, the cause of missions and Christian education must be sustained and *advanced*, Bibles must be distributed, and men must be trained for the ministry.

Blessings from Giving

Finally, God's Word assures us of the great blessing of giving the separated portion. To those who put God to the test and "prove" Him, He promises to "open the windows of heaven and pour out a blessing such that there shall not be room enough to receive it" (Mal. 3:10). This blessing may be material or spiritual, or both, but it will surely follow. God will never be a debtor to any man, but will repay him far more than he has bestowed in giving to Him.

It may come in the form of health or of blessing on our families. Liberal,

consecrated giving will teach our children relative values as few other means will do. When children grow up in a Christian home that is poor and learn that God's portion is always laid by "in store" first by Dad and Mother, never to be appropriated by the family any more than the neighbor's purse, those children will learn that the faith of their parents is no idle lip profession, but a true, living faith which is manifest in a consecration that often involves real personal sacrifice. What blessing will accrue to children with such a heritage. Some of us were taught from childhood to *begin* with the tithe, and can testify to the rich, personal satisfaction and joy it has been all through life. Whether we have had little or much, when God's portion was faithfully set aside first as inviolable, the Lord has never let us lack, but has in one way or another "supplied all our need according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus."

The phrase "this grace *also*" suggests pointedly that no Christian character is complete and well-rounded unless there is a spirit of large and liberal beneficence toward the work of God's kingdom. It is indispensable to the proper symmetry of the Christian graces and will give beauty and completeness to the whole.

This blessing, too, will be in proportion to the liberality of our giving. "He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully" (II Cor. 9:6). Paul says it is in giving as it is in farming. A man that sows little must expect to reap little. If a man sows only a small piece of land, he will reap only a small harvest. If he is niggardly in sowing, trying to save his seed, he *must* expect to reap little. So it is with our giving. "The liberal soul shall be made fat: and he that watereth shall be watered also himself" (Pro. 11:25).

May God so enlarge the hearts of all of us in The Orthodox Presbyterian Church with such a spirit of loving, liberal, and sacrificial giving for the work of His kingdom as we have never known before. And then we shall *abound* also in this crowning Christian grace—the grace of giving! "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive!"

Stonehouse

(Continued from p. 207)

sad book from many points of view. As the title itself suggests, that church was a broadening church. In spite of bad things in the book, there comes to expression this feature, that Loetscher recognizes that pragmatism entered in time and again into the life of the church. By this he means an interest in just the practical everyday working of the church, so that it was run like a business corporation rather than with a concern for issues of truth. He admits that at several points. It is sad therefore that he doesn't draw the obvious conclusions from it.

And in that situation it was a very great misfortune that in 1913 the Directors of Princeton Seminary appointed as president J. Ross Stevenson who, as it appeared before very long, was committed to the proposition that that seminary should represent the whole church. The Seminary had been committed to the Westminster Confession of Faith, to the infallibility of Scripture. Now the Auburn *Affirmation* was present in the church, and it was not being resisted. But Stevenson was calling on the Seminary to represent the whole church. In appealing to that broadening church, to that inclusive church, he of course won the day. Inclusivism when it becomes a kind of dogma, must give way to tyranny. If it becomes a basic article of the Christian faith, then it must be maintained. Then the power of the church must support that particular article and guarantee liberty for it. So of course those who protested vigorously and resisted that current were bound to be expendable. We know what happened in the rest of that particular story.

THE INFALLIBLE SCRIPTURES

Westminster Seminary has stood, as Princeton Seminary stood in its history, for the infallible Scriptures and for the whole counsel of God. It is also distressing that Lefferts Loetscher has taken up the cry which I think is a puerile kind of thing, that those who appeal to the infallible Scriptures and who say that they hold to the original autographs as inspired, are appealing to a lost and imaginary Bible. We will not be swayed by that kind of ridicule or criticism. For we indeed have not

taken that position out of desperation, or because we have been faced with any kind of practical situation which inspired it. We have taken that position because we are convinced that the Scriptures themselves bear testimony to that truth and compel us to adopt that view with regard to them, as also testimony is borne by the Spirit in our hearts. And of course we are unwilling to allow that errors which have been handed down as the Scriptures have been transmitted are a part of the Scripture, because we as Protestants separate Scripture and tradition. On the basis of our basic principle we insist upon a proper exercise of textual criticism. And taking account of the true situation so far as the preservation of the Scriptures is concerned, we may indeed thank God that He has wonderfully preserved the Scriptures. So we do not for one moment admit that the Bible is lost, that the Bible is imaginary, but rather we insist that the Bible has been gloriously preserved. And the more that one learns about the history of the transmission of the Bible, the more one should be ready to acknowledge that particular truth.

As we have stood for the whole counsel of God, as we are concerned to do so, we have taken our stand against Modernism, in the older forms or the more recent forms. I do not dwell upon that.

THE WHOLE COUNSEL OF GOD

We also, of course, have been quite unwilling to have our position identified with hyper-Calvinism, of whatever kind. Mr. Clelland was referring to the hard-shelled Baptists. Much the same kind of Baptists was one particular group called Two-Seed-In-The-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists. I think the latest statistics are that there are two hundred such people left. In our resistance to irrationalism we are unwilling to allow that we should rationalize the Scriptures. We want to stand upon the whole counsel of God.

Also for that reason—and I rejoice that the President of the Board of Trustees emphasized that point today—we are concerned to oppose traditionalism and provincialism. We will not allow that the truth of the Scriptures, that our faith, that our theology may be characterized, let us say, as an American theology, or anything of that

kind. It is the truth of the Scriptures, truth as that has been formulated in the historic confessions of faith. Dr. Hodge used to say that not a single original idea had ever been developed in Princeton Seminary. I read not so long ago that Dr. Patton said that that was Dr. Hodge's very modest way of saying that the professors of Princeton were fighting valiantly for the maintenance of the orthodoxy of the Westminster Confession of Faith. Regardless of what criticism one might make of them, certainly they were valiant in that regard, and certainly they were not guilty of provincialism in the way, for example, in which the New England theology was after all somewhat provincial in character.

But in opposing such tendencies, we are not really negative. In opposing traditionalism, for example, and provincialism in theology, we are being positive. And I believe that there has been a very wholesome development at Westminster Seminary in the exposition of the Scriptures, so that we are relating the fresh teaching of the Scriptures to the problems of the day.

The Issue of Honesty

There is the issue of truth that is very much at stake in the life of Westminster Seminary. But there is also an ethical issue, or a practical issue, on which I want to touch very briefly in conclusion. The issue at stake is also one of honor, of honesty, of fidelity to solemn vows, of doing the truth in love, of walking uprightly according to the truth of the gospel. And this concern not merely for the truth but for honor and fidelity in our life is something that is not merely personal and individual. It is something that applies to the church. It is suggested I think also by this portion of Scripture to which I referred—that the truth of the gospel might abide with *you*. We're concerned with this thing not merely for ourselves but also for the church of Jesus Christ. Though the Seminary has been a free and independent seminary, yet in all its life and teaching it is profoundly concerned with the life of the church, the advancement of the church of Jesus Christ.

This concern with honesty, this concern with the issues of the church, should be very much at the center of our thought tonight, as that issue of

honesty and integrity was very much at the foundation of Westminster Seminary back in 1929. How men struggled with the problem with which they were concerned in those particular days—the question of their attitude toward Princeton Seminary. And when there was the resignation on the part of men from Princeton Seminary, it was because there was this profound conviction that God's little ones should not be led astray. That was the deepest aspect of that conviction on their part. They might have stayed at Princeton. It would have been attractive to remain. There wasn't any great eagerness to leave Princeton Seminary. But there were God's little ones that would be led astray if men like Machen and the others remained there, when they knew very well that there had been such a radical transformation in the life of the Seminary.

Now this issue of honesty remains before us in the church. And it was a position that Dr. Machen stressed very greatly—that it was necessary for ministers and the church to take the straightforward and upright course with regard to the truth of the gospel. Dr. Machen was most sympathetic with men who were doubters. He spoke of a fellow feeling even for men who doubted the Christian faith. But he had a profound concern that men should be honest in regard to the truth of the gospel. And this was the point that was made so clearly and emphatically in *Christianity and Liberalism*, for example, and in many other books.

It is rather amusing in a way, though also very distressing, that Dr. Loetscher in his book on the "broadening church" accuses Dr. Machen of unorthodoxy with regard to the doctrine of the church, because he stressed the element of liberty. Machen's plea was that liberals should leave a church that was so inclusive, since the church was committed in the most solemn way to the Reformed Faith. He said the strong honest course was to leave the church. And in that connection he spoke of the liberty that men have to make their own decisions with regard to their relationship to such a body. Because there were those who charged that it was intolerant to make such a demand, he stressed this fact of their liberty—that they were not compelled to remain in such a church. But because in that context he stressed the element of liberty and responsibility and especially

this issue of honesty—Loetscher singles out a sentence which I think is taken out of its context, as if Dr. Machen held to a completely unpresbyterian conception of the church. No, the whole of Dr. Machen's work and his life certainly, and the history of Westminster Seminary indicate that there is a very high view indeed of the Christian Church.

HIGH REGARD FOR THE CHURCH

Dr. Machen said that "schism is a very heinous sin." That was a profound conviction of his life. And the whole course of his heroic struggle for Princeton Seminary and the rest of the struggle of his life have no meaning except on the basis of the highest conception of what the Christian church is—as the church of Jesus Christ, which belongs to Him, which must acknowledge Him, which is not worthy of being called a church of Christ unless it is faithful to Him. He insisted that the broad, inclusive conception which simply names as church everything that claims the name of church must be repudiated in order that the church may be brought into conformity with the Word of Christ. That was the strong principle that guided him through all these struggles, through all the history also of Westminster Seminary. For it also he paid the great price that he did by being consistent and faithful to his vows as a minister in maintaining the truths of the gospel regardless of the opposition that might arise unto him on that account.

And so our position is that Westminster does not exist for its own sake in isolation from and without regard to the Christian church, but for the sake of the church, that the truth of the gospel might abide *with you*, with the Christian church, here and around the world.

And that accentuates the point which I mentioned at the beginning, and with that I close, that we who labor in the Seminary cannot think of laboring in some isolated way, apart from Christian people and apart from the Christian church. Our cause is your cause. It is not your cause or ours, but Christ's cause, and the cause of His church.

The question is a doctrinal one, it is also an ethical one, but in the last analysis I would say it is a religious one—a question of our faith and our commitment to the Lord Jesus Christ,

in the seminary but also in the larger fellowship of God's people, who unitedly with us pray and labor that the truth of the gospel may abide with you—in the Church of Jesus Christ.

Recent Publications

Lutheran Cyclopedia. Concordia Press. 1160p. \$7.50. A one-volume source of information on all phases of religion, past and present. Would be especially helpful to pastors and church workers. Over 100 writers have contributed material for the more than 7,500 subjects treated.

Story of the Old World, by John de Bie. Eerdmans. 409p. \$4.95. This is a textbook for later elementary and junior high school courses in world history. It was prepared under the direction of the educational committee of the National Union of Christian Schools. The author is teacher of history in the Christian high school of Grand Rapids. The book can serve not only as a textbook for Christian schools, but as supplementary reading for students not in Christian schools.

Israel and the New Covenant, by Roderick Campbell. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. 333p. \$3.75. The author is a layman who is concerned with the apparent failure of the church to make proper progress. He rejects the interpretation which the situation to be resolved by the return of Christ, and instead holds that the church has simply failed to take seriously the Great Commission. The book has an introduction by Dr. Oswald T. Allis, with whom the author consulted while working on the book.

The Soul of the City, by Jacob D. Eppinga. Eerdmans. 93p. \$1.50. A series of brief essays on a pastor's reactions to a city, as he meets its varied character. Mr. Eppinga, a graduate of Westminster Seminary, is pastor of Lagrave Avenue Christian Reformed Church in Grand Rapids.

The Book of Acts, by F. F. Bruce. Eerdmans. 555p. \$6.00. Fourth volume to be published in the New International Commentary. The author is head of the Department of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Sheffield, England. Dr. N. B. Stonehouse is general editor of the series.

GUARDIAN NEWS

The COMMENTATOR

VIEWING THE NEWS FROM THE RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE AND THE RELIGIOUS AND SECULAR PRESS

The Pope takes over

THE Pope of the Roman Catholic "church" has taken possession of the universe.

He did this, the first of November, by crowning Mary as queen of heaven, and by declaring all human consciences subject to him in all things.

This year has been among Romanists a "Marian Year." That means the interest of the Roman communion has been directed especially to honoring and exalting Mary, the mother of Christ. All over the world special masses and processions have been held in honor of the Virgin. And many of these have included the act of giving a statue of Mary a new crown.

Finally in a solemn ceremony at St. Peter's Basilica in Rome the Pope himself climaxed the year by attaching two jewel-laden crowns to an ancient painting of the mother and child. The age-blackened picture is, following Romanist practice, attributed to the hand of St. Luke of apostolic fame. Before the same picture the Pope said his first mass fifty-five years ago when he became a priest. The picture is regularly hung in the church of St. Mary Major in Rome, but was brought out to be crowned by a two mile long procession of priests carrying religious banners.

The Pope also proclaimed May 31 as the universal feast of the queenship of Mary, to be celebrated each year.

In an address the Pope declared: "It was not our intention to introduce anything new, but rather to have shine forth before the world's gaze the truth, which, in the present circumstances, is capable of remedying its ills and of freeing it from its anguish and leading

it toward the way of salvation which it so anxiously seeks.

"In the present hour when world unity and peace, nay more, the very sources of life are endangered, what can Christians do except turn their eyes towards her whom they see vested with royal power . . . Not only must she annihilate the dark plans and the wicked works of those who are enemies of united and Christian mankind, but she has also to communicate to modern man something of her own spirit . . ."

On November 3, two days after he had crowned the queen of heaven, the Pope in an address to theologians and church officials defended the right of the church to "direct the consciences and actions of men" in matters which are not strictly religious. He declared:

"The power of the Church is not bound by limits of 'matters strictly religious' as they say, but by the whole matter of natural law. Its foundation, its interpretation and its application, so far as their moral aspects are concerned, are within the Church's power. For keeping of the natural law, by God's appointment, has reference to the road by which man has to approach his supernatural end. But on this road the Church is man's guide and guardian in what concerns his supreme end . . ."

The Pope claimed authority over many fields. Problems in the social field cannot be declared outside that authority, for they concern man's conscience and salvation. Also problems outside the social field—political problems of concern to individual nations or to all nations—belong to the moral order. Such problems include the "purpose and limits of temporal authority, the relation of the individual to society,

and the so-called totalitarian state whatever be the principle it is based on." They extend further to the rightness of war and the right of one to engage in war.

"Commonsense and truth as well," said the Pope, "are contradicted by whoever asserts these and like problems are outside the field of morals and hence are, or at least can be, beyond the influence of that authority established by God to see to a just order and direct the consciences and actions of men along the path to their true and final destiny."

It is difficult to see that such language does not, by implication at least, cover the whole realm of human conduct. Having crowned the queen of heaven, and having declared that human consciences are subject to his authority also in matters not strictly religious, the Pope has really put himself in possession of the universe.

Sunday School Curriculum for Armed Forces

AN organization known as the Protestant Church-Owned Publishers' Association, is sponsoring the publication of a uniform series of Sunday school lessons for the use of chaplains who have such schools in their charge. It is estimated that there are over 80,000 children of service men whose only access to Sunday school is through the military chapels. It has often happened that as the service men are transferred, the Sunday school program has been duplicated, or confused.

According to the announcement, the new materials will be "drawn from many denominations, and so arranged

as to follow a co-ordinated plan, emphasizing basic Christian teaching, without intrusion of denominational emphasis."

Mackay Warns Against Break with Communists

DR. John A. Mackay, President of Princeton Seminary, in a statement made when he received from The Upper Room, Methodist devotional publication, the annual award for Christian leadership, declared that the United States will abandon its position as a Christian nation if it cuts off diplomatic relations with Communist nations and stops trying to persuade them to ways of peace. We do not betray our Christian faith, he said, if we try to talk to our enemies.

Religious Workers Lost in Typhoon Sinking

WHEN the Japanese ferry was sunk in a typhoon north of Honshu Island late in September, it carried a number of religious leaders to their deaths. A meeting of the Cooperative Evangelism Committee of the United Church in Japan (Kyodan) was scheduled for Honshu Island at just that time, and many of the delegates apparently were on the boat. Among those missing or known dead are the Rev. Harry Leeper, an American Methodist missionary, and the Rev. Alfred Stone, secretary of the C. E. Committee.

Segregation in Cemeteries

THE problem of segregation of the white and colored peoples of the South continues to raise problems. The Supreme Court decision to abolish segregation in public schools has been put into effect in many areas without trouble. In some areas, however, there has been strenuous opposition.

But segregation apparently is not confined to the living. In Chapel Hill, N. C., the Board of Aldermen, directing the construction of a new cemetery, arranged that the races would be segregated also in their last resting places. A group of ministers protested, and urged that there be at least a portion of the cemetery for non-segregated burials. The Board took the matter under advisement.

Graham Continues Evangelistic Crusades

SINCE recovering from the illness he suffered following his London Crusade earlier this year, Evangelist Billy Graham has again engaged in evangelistic work.

Early in the fall he conducted a campaign in Nashville, Tennessee, which saw a total of over 650,000 in attendance at the 26 meetings, and an estimated 60,000 present for the final meeting in Vanderbilt Stadium.

From Nashville Graham went to New Orleans for a month of services. Reports indicate the average attendance at meetings in Pelican Stadium was ten thousand nightly and fifteen thousand Sunday afternoons. The final service was held in the famed "Sugar Bowl" with over sixty thousand persons present.

Meetings are scheduled for several cities on the west coast during November and December. A major crusade is to be held in Edinburgh, Scotland, in March.

No Freedom of the Press in Spain

ACCORDING to a report in The New York Times, the editor of the magazine *Ecclesia*, a religious publication in Spain, has been removed from his post because of an article

critical of the government's censorship of the press, which he published early in the summer.

Ecclesia has often been thought to represent the position of the Catholic Church, and has been the only uncensored publication in Spain. The article on press censorship was widely distributed outside of Spain, and gave the impression that the Catholic church was outspokenly critical of the lack of freedom of the press. It now appears that on this issue the church has submitted to the state. General Franco, head of the Spanish government, has stated that he does not believe in the freedom of the press. The government claims that the press must be oriented to serve what it considers the common good.

American Council Reports on Membership

THE American Council of Christian Churches met in Boston the latter part of October. A list of the council's membership was released at the time. According to the report, there are seventeen church bodies affiliated with the Council, with an individual membership of 263,311. In addition there is local constituent membership of 305,000, individual constituent membership of 175,000 and an auxiliary individual membership, representing persons in the National Council who have

Thanksgiving Proclamation

"EARLY in our history, the Pilgrim Fathers inaugurated the custom of dedicating one day at harvest time to rendering thanks to Almighty God for the bounties of the soil and for His mercies throughout the year. At this autumnal season, tradition suggests and our hearts require that we follow that hallowed custom and bow in reverent thanks for the blessings bestowed upon us individually and as a nation.

"We are grateful that our beloved country, settled by those forebears in their quest for religious freedom, remains free and strong and that each of us can worship God in his own way according to the dictates of his conscience.

"We are grateful for the innumerable daily manifestations of divine goodness in affairs both public and

private, for equal opportunities for all to labor and to serve, and for the continuance of those homely joys and satisfactions which enrich our lives.

"With gratitude in our hearts for all our blessings, may we ever be mindful of the obligations inherent in our strength and may we rededicate ourselves to unselfish strivings for the common betterment of mankind.

"Now therefore I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America . . . do hereby proclaim Thursday, November 25, 1954, as a day of national Thanksgiving, and I call upon all our citizens to observe the day with prayer. Let us demonstrate in our lives our humble thanks to God for His beneficence in the year which is past and let us ask His guidance in the year to come."

asked that the American Council be their representative in certain matters, of some 440,000. The Council thus claims to represent somewhat over a million individuals.

The largest member denomination is the General Association of Regular Baptists, claiming 93,000 members. The World Baptist Fellowship with 49,000 members, and the National Fellowship of Brethren Churches (Radio) with 40,000, are the other two largest constituent members. None of the other bodies has more than 16,000 members.

In resolutions adopted at the annual Convention, the Council denounced the World Council for advocating "living together" with Communist regimes; attacked the action of the St. Louis Church Federation in giving a "scroll" to Bishop Oxnham to honor him for his "ten hour ordeal" before the House Committee on Un-American Activities; urged the removal of Dr. Elton Trueblood as Chief of Religious Information in Washington, and asked the abolition of the office; and called on Congress to pass laws prohibiting beer and liquor advertising on television.

Dr. Kenneth R. Kinney, of the General Association of Regular Baptists, was elected President of the Council.

Religious Rights Granted in Italy

ACCORDING to a report in the *New York Times*, the Council of State in Italy has ordered the Ministry of the Interior to give to a Pentecostal sect "juridical recognition," which means that the sect will be allowed to carry on its work without government restriction.

The decision apparently applies or will apply also to other religious groups which have been hampered in various ways.

The decision will relieve the sect of all taxation on its places of worship, will permit it to hold services open to the public, to collect money from congregations for its own purposes, and will allow ministers of the sect to conduct religious services and ceremonies.

The application for such recognition has been pending before the Ministry of the Interior for some time, but that office, having no legitimate reason for

refusing recognition, simply had postponed taking action, and meanwhile the sects were being persecuted by local officials and in some cases their leaders were expelled from the country.

There is no appeal from the decision of the Council of State, which is being hailed as a substantial victory for the cause of religious freedom in Italy. It means in effect that this and other similar minority sects will have the same status as the Roman Catholic Church.

The group directly involved in this decision is affiliated with the Assemblies of God having headquarters in Springfield, Missouri.

Ask Reconsideration of Anti-Segregation

THE Synod of Mississippi of the Presbyterian Church U. S. (Southern) has passed a resolution calling on the General Assembly of that church to reconsider the resolution it passed last spring on segregation. The Assembly had urged that segregation be abolished in all church institutions.

The Synod declared it could not in good conscience comply with the request of the Assembly, either with regard to desegregation in church conferences or in local congregations. It asked that steps be taken to see that the

stand taken last June by the Assembly shall not be repeated.

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, 1704 W. Farwell Ave., Chicago 26, Ill.

GOWNS
 • Pulpit and Choir •
 Headquarters for
RELIGIOUS SUPPLIES
 Church Furniture • Stoles
 Embroideries • Vestments
 Hangings • Communion
 Sets • Altar Brass Goods
 CATALOG ON REQUEST
National CHURCH GOODS
 SUPPLY COMPANY
 821 - 23 ARCH STREET, PHILADELPHIA 7, PA.

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.

The Presbyterian Guardian