

# The Presbyterian Guardian

November 14, 1936

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 3

One Dollar a Year

J. GRESHAM MACHEN *Editors*  
NED B. STONEHOUSE

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

THOMAS R. BIRCH,  
*Managing Editor*

## THE SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AMERICA

**W**E ARE looking forward to the second General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America with profound thankfulness to almighty God. Very wonderful has been His goodness to us during the past months. When we think of the loyal groups of Christian people who are keeping aloft the banner of the Cross in many places throughout the length and breadth of our country, when we think of the loyal pastors who have for the sake of Christ faced the loss of all that the world holds dear, we thank our God for His favor so wonderfully given to His children. He has brought us through many troubles, and has placed before us a door of glorious opportunity. We call upon all that is within us to bless His excellent name.

### A DANGER TO OUR CHURCH

At the same time we are perfectly aware of the fact that a danger faces our Church. That such dangers should arise is only what was to be expected. They have often arisen in similar situations. Ask anyone who is familiar with the early days of the reform movement under the leadership of Abraham Kuyper in the Netherlands, and I think he will tell you that there were violent disputes among those who at first came with the orthodox and truly Reformed church. But God brought that church through all those early troubles. Those who were not really heart and soul with the movement did not finally go with it; the others put petty jealousies aside and were used of God in the building up of a great church. So we trust that it will be with these early troubles in The Presbyterian Church of America.

### THE ROOT OF THE TROUBLE

The root of our present trouble is found in those ancient enemies of Christian fellowship—misrepresentation and consequent suspicion. It is the purpose of the present editorial to correct the misrepresentation and allay the suspicion. We shall not be content with doing that in any partial fashion. This misrepresentation must be eliminated *radically*. The last vestiges of it must be removed if our Church is to go forward with full blessing and joy to the accomplishment of its great task.

What is the misrepresentation of which we speak? We can answer that question very simply. It is the misrepresentation that there are some persons at Westminster Theological Seminary or in The Presbyterian Church of America or on the editorial staff of **THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN** who are unwilling to concede the right of their brethren who hold the Premillennial view of the return of our Lord to a place in the ministry of The Presbyterian Church of America.

This misrepresentation has been spread particularly by an editorial which appeared in the October 1st number of the *Christian Beacon*, a paper edited by the Rev. Carl McIntire, who is a member of the Presbytery of New Jersey in The Presbyterian Church of America. The editorial attacked in very vigorous language the Rev. Professor R. B. Kuiper, Professor of Practical Theology in Westminster Theological Seminary, and asserted that in his article published originally in *The Banner* of the Christian Reformed Church and reprinted in **THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN** of September 12, 1936, he had declared or implied that the Premillennial view of the return of our Lord is contrary to the Reformed Faith.

There was nothing whatever in Professor Kuiper's

article that justified any such interpretation of it. On October 6th Professor Kuiper sent to the *Christian Beacon* a reply to this attack and asked that it be published. Whether it was worthy of publication let every reader of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN determine for himself by turning to pages 54 and 55 of the present issue. We think every unprejudiced reader will hold it to be just what is to be expected from the pen of so distinguished a scholar and preacher.

Yet the editor of the *Christian Beacon*, despite earnest remonstrances from Professor Kuiper himself and from the senior editor of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, has persistently refused to publish it. Finally, after irreparable harm has been done by the long delay, he merely publishes, in his issue of October 29th, which has just come into our hands, a statement by *him* regarding what Professor Kuiper's letter contains. He still does not publish the letter itself, nor does he indicate to his readers even that Professor Kuiper has insisted upon the publication of it.

The result is that which is nearly certain to come when an editor refuses to give to a person whom he has attacked the right to reply—namely, a rising tide of suspicion and injustice. The suspicion and injustice due to the original misrepresentation culminated in the attack which has been made by the Presbytery of California against certain persons in The Presbyterian Church of America and particularly against THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN (see page 55 of the present issue).

We lay no claim to any Stoic apathy in the presence of this attack. On the contrary, we are very deeply grieved. In all these long years of struggle, when many attacks have come from many enemies, we do not remember ever having received a blow that has hurt us much more than this unjust charge which has been brought against us by our California brethren.

But the important thing is that the misrepresentation on the basis of which the Presbytery of California has acted should now be corrected once and for all. Be it said therefore with the utmost plainness and insistence that never have we or to our knowledge has anyone else in The Presbyterian Church of America or in the Faculty of Westminster Seminary asserted or implied in any way, shape or manner that the holding of the Premillennial view of the return of our Lord is incompatible with maintenance of the Reformed system of doctrine or that it prevents a man from subscribing honestly to the doctrinal standards of The Presbyterian Church of America.

In our last issue we stated our position on this point. If anyone should say that that statement was dragged out of us or represents any concession on our part only recently made, that would again be a complete misrep-

resentation. On the contrary we have always held just exactly the position which is stated in that last issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN. If we have not stated it before, that is because we supposed that everyone would take it for granted. We are truly amazed and grieved that it became necessary for us to state a thing which should have been so obvious.

#### THE DISPENSATIONALISM OF THE SCOFIELD BIBLE

In attacking the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible, Professor Kuiper was not attacking in the slightest, as being incompatible with the Reformed system, the Premillennial view of the return of Christ; and we cannot detect the slightest color of justification for such an interpretation of his words. There are surely many persons who, though they hold to the Premillennial view of the return of our Lord, reject the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible. We agree with these Premillennialists and we agree with Professor Kuiper in such rejection. The Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible seems to us to be quite contrary to the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Standards.

We do not mean, of course, that everyone who uses the Scofield Reference Bible is to be excluded or deposed from the ministry or eldership or diaconate of our Church or other truly Reformed or Presbyterian churches. It is quite possible that many persons know and love the Scofield Reference Bible without really agreeing with the false teaching that is in it. By a salutary misunderstanding or ignoring of Dr. Scofield's notes they may be prevented from taking into their souls the errors that those notes contain. Moreover, we certainly do not mean that everything in Dr. Scofield's notes is erroneous. Of course we recognize that many things in them are true. We do not even deny that some of the worst things in the notes are actually contradicted by other passages that the notes themselves contain. By a happy inconsistency Dr. Scofield is prevented from drawing fully the disastrous consequences of his theory as to the history of God's dealings with men. We gladly recognize all that.

But we do mean very definitely that if a man really does accept all the teaching of those notes, according to their real meaning, he is seriously out of accord with the Reformed Faith and has no right to be a minister or elder or deacon in The Presbyterian Church of America.

The Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible is characteristically expressed, for example, in Dr. Scofield's notes on Matt. 5:2 and Matt. 6:12. In the course of these notes it is said:

"For these reasons the Sermon on the Mount in its primary application gives neither the privi-

lege nor the duty of the Church. These are found in the Epistles. Under the law of the kingdom, for example, no one may hope for forgiveness who has not first forgiven (Mt. 6: 12, 14, 15). Under grace the Christian is exhorted to forgive because he is already forgiven (Eph. 4: 30-32)."

Similarly, in the note on Matt. 6: 12 it is said, regarding the petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors":

"This is legal ground. Cf. Eph. 4: 32, which is grace."

Again, in the note on Luke 11: 1, after the strangely inconsistent assertion that "in the so-called Lord's prayer Christ gives an incomparable model for all prayer," Dr. Scofield goes on to say:

"Used as a *form*, the Lord's prayer is, dispensationally, upon legal, not church ground; it is not a prayer in the name of Christ (cf. John 14: 13, 14; 16: 24); and it makes human forgiveness, as under the law it must, the condition of divine forgiveness; an order which grace exactly reverses (cf. Eph. 4: 32)."

These notes, separating between the teaching of our Lord and the teaching of the Epistles of the New Testament, and holding that a petition in that blessed prayer which our Lord taught His disciples is "on legal ground," are at the heart of the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible, and at the same time they are seriously against the Word of God. They are heresy of a very terrible kind. Rather than that The Presbyterian Church of America should knowingly tolerate such heresy in its ministry or eldership or diaconate, it would surely seem better that it should be divided or dissolved.

Certainly The Presbyterian Church of America cannot tolerate such heresy if it is to be true to the Westminster Standards. No less than nine of the one hundred and seven questions in the Westminster Shorter Catechism are devoted to the Lord's Prayer, and the answer to the introductory question among these is as follows:

"The whole Word of God is of use to direct us in prayer; but the special rule of direction is that form of prayer which Christ taught his disciples, commonly called *The Lord's Prayer*."

Then, in six of the other answers, it is said that *we* actually pray the various petitions in the Lord's Prayer. Plainly it is meant that the Lord's Prayer teaches us something *directly*. What becomes here of the notion in the Scofield Bible that the teaching of our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, including the Lord's Prayer, is not, in its primary application, for the guidance of the Church? A man may hold to those notes in the Scofield Bible or he may hold to the Reformed Faith, but he certainly cannot hold to both. He must make his choice.

Here is what the Shorter Catechism says about that fifth petition in the Lord's Prayer, which Dr. Scofield says is "on legal ground":

"In the fifth petition, which is, *And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors, we pray, that God, for Christ's sake, would freely pardon all our sins; which we are the rather encouraged to ask, because by His grace we are enabled from the heart to forgive others.*"

Where is the legalism in that petition, so interpreted? And is not that interpretation plainly the right interpretation? Can any man who has ever prayed that prayer from his heart, as it is interpreted in the Shorter Catechism and as it is plainly meant in the Word of God, ever be content with the dismemberment of the Bible which is involved in Dr. Scofield's Dispensationalism and which finds such distressing expression in that note on the Lord's Prayer?

God grant that The Presbyterian Church of America may get the Shorter Catechism down from the shelf and may again give it its rightful place in the nurture of the children of the covenant! God grant that it may encourage a widespread return to the grand simplicity of that account of God's dealings with His people which is presented in the Word of God and so wonderfully summarized in the Westminster Standards!

## THE MILLENNIAL QUESTION

Having done our best to clear away misconceptions of our position, we shall now endeavor in a word or two to set forth more positively what attitude we think The Presbyterian Church of America ought to take regarding the important matter of the differences of opinion which prevail among us about the time of our Lord's return.

In the first place, we think that any attempt to deal with these matters in the Constitution of the Church would be nothing short of folly. The doctrinal standards of the Church should be simply the historic Westminster Standards. This is not a creed-making age, and we certainly have not the ability to formulate doctrine. There is hardly the remotest chance that we can agree upon anything—any statement of our attitude toward our Lord's return or anything else—except what is hal- lowed for us by its inclusion in our grand historic Confession of Faith and Catechisms. For the reasonable interpretation of these Standards, and in particular for the reasonable interpretation of the meaning of the ordination pledge, so far as the time of our Lord's return is concerned, we must have confidence in our brethren. Unless we have that mutual confidence, it would have been better that we should not have attempted to form a church at all. But it is the opinion

of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN that such mutual confidence will be shown actually to exist.

In the second place, we are not at all certain that even a mere statement of the General Assembly on this matter, as distinguished from any attempt to include something about it in the Constitution—which would certainly be folly—is either necessary or wise. We did not particularly favor originally the issuance of the statement by the Presbytery of Philadelphia which will be quoted below. All that we did was to help the presbytery to formulate and pass the *right* kind of resolution when once it had made evident the fact that it was determined to pass *some* resolution. Of course the resolution so passed had no constitutional or legally binding force whatever. It was simply an expression of the opinion of the presbytery.

In the third place, we are opposed to all unnecessary "counting of noses" on the Premillennial question. We are opposed to the forming of two lists among our ministers—a list of Premillennialist ministers and a list of anti-Premillennialist ministers. We are opposed to any elaborate diplomacy as between these two groups. We are opposed to any notion that the election of a Premillennialist to any office has to be balanced by the election of an anti-Premillennialist, or *vice versa*. Instead of all that we favor being really in earnest about our view that this question, though certainly important, is yet not important enough to divide a church into two opposing camps.

In the fourth place, we favor the same liberty for individuals within congregations regarding this matter as that which we favor for individuals and congregations within the church at large. That is the reason why we favored the third part of the Philadelphia resolution, quoted below, which states that it "should be regarded as improper for congregations to erect into a position of constitutional fixity (by inclusion in their charters or otherwise) any doctrinal requirements or standards other than those of the church at large."

### CONGREGATIONS AND THE MILLENNIAL QUESTION

Suppose the principle in this paragraph were violated. Suppose some congregation had in its charter or in its constitution a provision that only a Premillennialist should be elected as pastor. Suppose then that some layman, a member of The Presbyterian Church of America, should go to live in the community where that congregation was, and suppose that he became a member of the congregation, with the notion that it was a congregation of his own church, The Presbyterian Church of America. Suppose then that the pulpit became vacant and a congregational meeting were held to

call a pastor. Suppose then that the layman whom we are taking as our example arose in that meeting and nominated some minister for the pastorate. Suppose that minister happened to be not a Premillennialist.

What would the Moderator be obliged in that case to say? Why, he would be obliged to say to our layman friend: "You are out of order; you have nominated a man who is not a Premillennialist, and the constitution of this church requires that only a Premillennialist shall be pastor."

"But, Mr. Moderator," our layman friend might then say, "is not the man whom I have nominated perfectly orthodox and a minister in good and regular standing in our church, The Presbyterian Church of America?"

"Yes," the Moderator would be obliged to say; "your candidate is orthodox in The Presbyterian Church of America; but he is not orthodox in this congregation; for this congregation has an additional doctrinal requirement, the requirement of Premillennial belief, which is not in the requirements in the constitution of the church at large."

"But, Mr. Moderator," our layman might then say, "I believe that the great majority of the persons here present in this meeting want to have my candidate as their pastor."

"Never mind," the Moderator would be obliged to say; "even though not only the majority but all of us who are here present at this meeting wanted that man as our pastor we could not have him, because the constitution of this congregation limits the freedom of the majority; we have been appealing for funds with the assurance that this congregation will always remain a Premillennial congregation, so that no matter how much we may desire to have that candidate of yours as our pastor we cannot honestly have him."

That would be the situation that would logically arise if congregations should include in their charters doctrinal requirements that go beyond the requirements in the constitution of the church at large. Would it not be an utterly intolerable situation? Would it not utterly destroy the Presbyterian character of our church government? Would it not also make into a meaningless form of words all our talk about liberty in this matter of our views as to the time of our Lord's return?

No, we must carry out this principle of liberty all the way down if we really mean what we say when we insist on it.

Does that mean then that congregations have not liberty to prefer a Premillennialist pastor to one who is not a Premillennialist? No, it does not mean that at all. Certainly they have that liberty. What it does mean is that a congregation may not give up its liberty in this matter by determining now what it must do in the

future. A present majority of a congregation may act as it pleases in this matter, but it may not attempt to take away the liberty of future majorities.

Perhaps some one may ask then whether we think a congregation ought to have the right under our system of government to label itself a Premillennial congregation or an Amillennial congregation by inclusion of those words in its church calendar or in some other similar way.

We answer that a congregation might conceivably do that; provided it should be made perfectly clear, every time that is done, that the congregation is assuming no responsibility as to what stand it will take on this question in the future. But it is hard to see how that condition can very easily be met. Therefore we think it would be a very serious evil for congregations to label themselves officially either Premillennial congregations or Amillennial congregations. To do so would certainly be very offensive to brethren who might desire to worship in the congregation or to be members of it and yet did not agree with the majority about this point.

We said above that we are opposed to "counting noses" on this question among individuals. We are still more opposed to "counting noses" among congregations. If we are going to have the congregations of our church divided into two rival camps—the Premillennial congregations on the one side and the Amillennial congregations on the other—then we think we ought to be divided into two entirely separate churches at the start. That would certainly be far more conducive to brotherly feeling than any hardening of opinions on this matter practically into the fixity of dogma by the labeling of congregations one way or the other within the limits of what purports to be the same Church.

In short, there is room in The Presbyterian Church of America for Premillennial congregations, but we do not think that there is room for congregations who practically even if not theoretically erect the Premillennial view into one of the essentials of their faith. As for the labeling of congregations as Amillennial congregations we should be opposed to that also, with all our might and main.

To sum up what we have been trying to say about this important matter, we shall now quote in full the resolution of the Presbytery of Philadelphia on the question:

I. The question whether or not our Lord's bodily return is held to precede the "thousand years" referred to in Revelation 20 is, in our opinion, despite its importance, not to be regarded as a test whether a man does or does not adhere to the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Cate-

chisms. A man may, we think, answer this question in the affirmative or answer it in the negative, and still, if his convictions otherwise are satisfactory, be ordained and received as a minister or elder or deacon of The Presbyterian Church of America.

II. A congregation that desires as its pastor a man who holds the view of our Lord's return described above should not be prevented from having such a pastor, neither should a congregation that desires as its pastor a man who rejects this view be prevented from having him, provided that in each case the pastor has subscribed *ex animo* to the system of doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

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

We do not favor the adoption of this resolution by the General Assembly. The best thing, we think, would be the adoption of *no* resolution on the subject at all. But if any resolution is adopted, we think it should be like this one.

#### THE 1903 AMENDMENTS

We desire to say again that we think it to be a matter of central importance that the 1903 Amendments to the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. should be omitted from our Standards. Those amendments are extremely bad in themselves, and they were adopted by the U.S.A. Church in the interests of indifferentist church-unionism.

We are glad to observe that the Presbytery of California, though severely critical of us on another matter, is with us in this matter.

Finally, as our last word of all in these somewhat protracted editorials, we desire to say that we cherish the very lively hope that when our California brethren know all the facts they will agree with us also regarding the matter about which they now seem to differ from us. We do hope and pray that suspicion and distrust may be removed and that we may go forward joyously and unitedly in the great work which God has so wonderfully placed before us.

We should express no such hope if we thought that there were real divergence of principle between those brethren and ourselves. We have always abhorred with all our souls a "peace-and-work" program that covers up real doctrinal divergence. But then, you see, a peace and work program is very different when it is advocated over against Auburn Affirmationists from what it is when it is advocated over against brethren who bear in their bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus and have shown very plainly that they are not ashamed of Him.

# A Premillennialist's View

By the REV. J. OLIVER BUSWELL, Jr., D.D.

President of Wheaton College

[EDITOR'S NOTE: *We are happy to publish this article from the pen of Dr. Buswell. While some of the opinions which are expressed in it, including the general estimate of the Scofield Bible, are not shared by us, we rejoice in its defense of the Reformed Faith against many of the teachings of Modern Dispensationalism.*]



Dr. Buswell

I AM a premillennialist and am happy to have the privilege of saying so in the liberty allowed within the Reformed faith in the columns of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN. I have not always experienced this liberty in other publications. Some years ago I wrote for *The Presbyterian* an article opposing certain extremes in allegorical interpretation. The errors were not confined to the premillennial camp, but I thought it best in writing against what some premillennialists taught, to state that I am a premillennialist. The editor, without my knowledge or consent, cut out my premillennial statement. I protested, but was not allowed to state over my own name that I was a premillennialist. I am glad that THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN has a more truly Presbyterian policy.

## Dangerous Terms

### I. "Eschatological Liberty"

While I am thankful for freedom to be a premillenarian in The Presbyterian Church of America, and to say so in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, yet the term "eschatological liberty" is too inclusive for any of us. This might be construed to include such anti-evangelical doctrines as conditional immortality or universalism, though of course this term has not been so interpreted by any in our movement. In fact, articles in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN of May 4, 1936 (pages 44 and 52) and August 3, 1936 (page 203) limit the term to the millennial question.

I believe that the Bible clearly teaches a Messianic kingdom, a period of time on this earth in which God will vindicate His creative purpose in the

temporal consummation of His redemptive program. Very able scholars have argued to the contrary. I have prepared for my classes a little book on Eschatology. I give a considerable amount of space to the views of Vos and Warfield. This little work, the last of five small volumes in a series entitled "The Lamb of God," will soon be published by the Zondervan Publishing House of Grand Rapids, Michigan. I mention it only because Biblical evidence for the millennium is too extensive for a summary here. (Volume IV of this series deals with the dispensational question.)

## Dangerous Terms

### II. "Dispensationalism"

Another term which is in need of limitation is "dispensationalism." Although articles in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN of February 3 and May 18 limit this term and point out that it has a correct use in the Confession of Faith, chapter VII, and in Professor Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology*, yet the term has unfortunately been construed as including that very doctrine of dispensations which is taught in the Confession of Faith. Furthermore, the attack upon "dispensationalism" has very unfortunately been understood as an attack upon the doctrine of a dispensation or economy of things corresponding to the Messianic age or the thousand years, construed as occurring after the return of Christ. We believe that what THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN and certain writers contributing to it really object to is not the idea that there is to be a future kingdom period in God's economy as taught by premillennialists, in which, in addition to the fact that Christ now reigns supreme as sovereign Lord and King over the church and over all the universe, sitting "on the right hand of the Majesty on high," he will then reign in a visible kingdom over all the earth. Some do and some do not hold to that view. We believe that what is objected to is a denial of the unity of the covenant of grace. I wish to register my testimony emphatically for the teaching of the Westminster Confession upon this point. I do not believe

that there are any in The Presbyterian Church of America or in our true constituency who really deny the unity of God's redemptive plan ("the scarlet thread," as we call it, running through Scripture).

Among those who call themselves premillennialists there are many who also call themselves dispensationalists but among this premillennialist-dispensationalist group there has come to be a very strong reaction against the form of dispensational teaching which denies the unity of the covenant of grace. Bullingerism and hyper-dispensationalism are in thorough disrepute among the great majority of so-called dispensationalist-premillennialists. (See *The Foundations of Dispensational Truth*, 1930, by the Rev. Ethelbert W. Bullinger, D.D., a British theologian of the recent past. This is a posthumous work consisting largely of articles written in the years 1911-1913.)

There being this reaction against wrongfully dismembering the Word of truth, many premillennial-dispensationalists have also reacted against certain notes in the Scofield Reference Edition of the Bible, for example, the note to Matthew 6:12 and all notes which place any part of the Scripture "on legal ground" (legal in the sense of human merit through works of the law). I must not claim, however, that all those who reject Bullingerism are awake to the danger of these particular Scofield notes.

Whereas I am ardently a premillennialist, my own personal views are quite extremely opposed to what is commonly called dispensationalism. I thoroughly agree with Charles Hodge, Volume II, page 122, to the effect that the covenant of works completely terminated with the fall. I cannot agree, however, with Hodge's view that there were "two methods of attaining eternal life" (*ibid.* page 117). It is true that the covenant of works is called a "covenant of life" in the Westminster Shorter Catechism, but I understand that to mean a covenant whereby man could have *retained* such spiritual life as he had, not a covenant whereby man could have *attained* anything beyond

that which he possessed. Hodge interprets the words of the Lord, "This do and thou shalt live," exactly as the Scofield notes interpret them, with the comment, "If any man can present himself before the bar of God and prove that he is free from sin . . . he will not be condemned," but will inherit eternal life (*ibid.* page 122). But upon the basis of the Lord's parable of the unprofitable servant, I insist that there is only one way in any age whereby God has even hypothetically offered to give eternal life to anyone who did not possess it, namely, through the covenant of grace.

It is my personal feeling that the general "system of doctrine" underlying the dispensationalism of the Scofield Reference Edition of the Bible does not deny the unity of the covenant of grace any more than Hodge denies it. The Scofield note on page five indicates that the dispensations are various systems of economy whereby God has demonstrated the human race to be a failure. This failure is said to be just as great in the age of the Gospel as in the age of the Mosaic law. In every age man demonstrates himself to be the failure which he became in Adam, but it is generally understood to be implied in the Scofield notes that those who put their trust in God in any age are saved by grace.

One sentence in the Scofield notes to which I particularly object reads as follows: "The dispensation of promise ended when Israel rashly accepted the law (Exodus 19:8)." But even here in this very same note (the note on Genesis 12:1) we find an important distinction: "The *dispensation* must be distinguished from the *covenant* (of promise). The former is a mode of testing. The latter is everlasting because unconditional."

The Scofield notes do teach that the Mosaic order was fundamentally legalistic. This teaching I reject, but I do not believe that those of my friends who regard the Mosaic system as purely a legal system are necessarily heretical. The great majority of them teach that underlying all the dealings of God there is the covenant of grace and that no one ever was or could be saved except by faith. These moderate dispensationalists (with whom I disagree) regard the Mosaic system as demonstrative of the fact that man could not be saved by the law. The Mosaic system (as Hodge actually teaches), hypothetically offered a way

of eternal life in order to show that man was not able to attain salvation by this hypothetical means. This dispensation of law, the moderate dispensationalists say, is not contrary to but consonant with the underlying principle of grace. It is heretical to teach that the covenant of grace was broken off between Sinai and Calvary. It is not heretical, strongly as we may disagree with the teaching, to hold that between Sinai and Calvary there was superimposed over the covenant of grace a legalistic system of hypothetical but impossible salvation by works.

The quotations from a leading dispensationalist in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for May 18th, 1936, do not in my judgment fairly represent the system of doctrine taught in the notes of the Scofield Reference Edition of the Bible. Ask almost any ordinary pastor, evangelist, or Bible teacher who calls himself a "Scofield Bible-premillennialist-dispensationalist" and he will say very emphatically that the opinion expressed by my good friend, quoted by Professor Murray, is extreme, and inconsistent with the unity of the covenant of grace. I have argued with this friend hours and days at a time on this very point. I admire his evangelical earnestness but I believe there is a deep inconsistency in his teaching. I understand his books and his conversation to imply that the covenant of grace was suspended in its operation at Sinai. If I misunderstand him on this point, I shall be happy to be corrected, but I must confess that Professor Murray's opinion on that particular part of this friend's teaching is my opinion, and the opinion of many of his closest friends and admirers. However, we ought to remember that this man does actually believe both sides of his inconsistency. He does believe that Isaiah was saved and that salvation is by grace alone.

Now, as to the moderate form of dispensationalism which holds that law and grace are supplementary, but which regards the Mosaic system not as a means of grace but as a legalistic economy, it seems to me that that view of things is manifest in many of the arguments of our amillennial friends. I speak only for myself in arguing that in the successive stages of revelation the various elements of spirituality, law, temporality, etc., run on absolutely horizontal lines. I do not mean that the people are always on the same level, but I cannot regard the Old

Testament revelation as in itself one whit lower than the New. The difference between the two is a difference of degree of fullness of revelation. Isaiah being utterly dependent upon the grace of God through the atonement which was to be accomplished, is, I think, upon just as high a plane of spirituality as Paul in his state of dependence upon the atonement which has been accomplished. There is, of course, a difference of economy but no difference in principle. The moral law in Exodus has the same relation to a man of faith which the moral law in Ephesians has to the Christian. Spirituality and temporality are both found in the Old and New Testaments, in different economies, but not on different levels. For most dispensationalists the idea that the Mosaic system was essentially different from the covenant of grace grows out of the very strong statements of the Apostle Paul in regard to the transition from being "under the law" to being "under grace." If being "under the law" means being in the spiritual state of a godly man in the Old Testament, then Paul's teaching as to the violence of the transition implies a fundamental difference.

I personally believe that the transition so vigorously described by Paul does not refer to the change from the condition of a godly man of faith in the Old Testament to the condition of a Christian. It is the change from the condition of a blind self-righteous Pharisee, ignorant of the true meaning of the Old Testament, to the condition of true godly faith. Habakkuk, and Simeon, and Anna "were not under the law" before Christ came but the Christian church as a whole was under the law before the Protestant Reformation.

I feel that to regard the moral law in the Old Testament as in any sense more rigid or more binding upon God's people than it is in the New Testament, opens the way for antinomianism, which view I have found at least as prevalent among amillennialists as among premillennialists.

In insisting that the Mosaic system was an economy of grace, and denying that it was a system of mere legalism, I believe we open the way to the argument for a literal millennium in opposition to that system which over-temporalizes the Old Testament and then etherealizes New Testament eschatology into a final state of abstraction without sequence.



## Some Distinctive Features of the Proposed Form of Government

**T**HE Committee on the Constitution, which was appointed by the First General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America, has placed in the hands of the commissioners to the Second General Assembly a Form of Government which it is recommending for adoption, together with a statement containing certain explanations of its work. The following brief account of some of its most distinctive features is published with the hope that it may answer some of the questions that may arise as one reads the document for the first time.

The proposed Form of Government is not a new creation. To a large extent it is identical with the Form of Government which has been in use in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. for over a hundred years. But it contains no provisions for forms of organization that do not fill the actual needs of The Presbyterian Church of America as it exists today. So it does not provide for synods. Old propositions are sometimes restated and antiquated language is occasionally modified in the interest of a fresh and lucid statement of the fundamental principles. There is little need of discussing the desirability of such modifications. However, where the form of statement has been materially influenced by the desire to return to the basic principles of Presbyterian church government, it may be well to discuss briefly the principles which were kept in view.

### The Principles of Presbyterianism

Charles Hodge, in his *Church Polity*, p. 119, in setting forth the fundamental principles of our Presbyterian system, declares that, in addition to the parity of the clergy, these principles are: (1) "the right of the people to a substantive part in the government of the church," a principle which excludes hierarchical government, and (2) "the unity of the church, in such sense, that a small part is subject to a larger, and a larger to the whole," a principle that distinguishes Presbyterianism from Independentism. The preservation of the proper balance between these two is a real test of fidelity to Presbyterianism. Just as the

Constitution of our national government guarantees the preservation both of a real national union and of the rights of the states and of individuals, so a truly Presbyterian form of government must protect the rights of the people and of minor assemblies without sacrificing the unity of the church as a whole. Few will deny that in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. there has been, in recent decades, a strong tendency towards centralization and government from the top down, government by general councils being a notable example of this un-Presbyterian development. As a matter of course, the committee has sought to guard the liberties of minorities under the Constitution. On the other hand, the committee has not been unmindful that to go to the other extreme would also result in the destruction of true Presbyterianism. A strong reaction against denominationalism in our time has caused many to turn to Independentism in church government. Consequently, we have been on our guard lest our zeal for the preservation of liberty should lead us to annul the authority which the various assemblies, under any truly Presbyterian form of government, possess in view of their representative character.

### The Powers of the Assemblies

The traditional powers granted to the various assemblies have therefore been preserved in the proposed Form of Government, but at many points there has been an express limitation of power. For example, to the statement which describes the powers of the presbytery, including the general power "to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under its care," there is appended the clause: "always respecting the liberties guaranteed to the individual congregations under the Constitution" (Chapter X, Section VI). Another illustration of the application of these principles is found in Chapter XI, which deals with the General Assembly. Section VI of that chapter reads as follows:

Although the deliverances, resolutions, overtures and other actions of the General Assembly are to be accorded the weight

which is proper in view of the character of the body, as representing all of the particular churches, yet, whenever such deliverances, resolutions, overtures and other actions are additional to the specific provisions of the Constitution, they shall not be regarded as binding unless they have been approved by the General Assembly and presbyteries in the manner provided in this Form of Government for the amendment of the Constitution.

The reader will be interested, too, in the formulation of Chapter XXII, entitled "OF ORGANIZATIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH":

The members of the church may associate together, under proper forms of association, for benevolent, missionary, or other religious purposes, provided however, that, when such organizations purport to represent a particular church, or a presbytery, or The Presbyterian Church of America, they must obtain the approval, and be subject to the jurisdiction and oversight, of the session of the particular church, or of the presbytery, or of the General Assembly, respectively.

### Government in the Particular Church

According to the Westminster Confession of Faith, the visible church consists of those who profess the true religion, together with their children; and the only Head of the church is the Lord Jesus Christ. Clearly, there can be no Presbyterianism unless these truths are acknowledged and carried into practice. Yet, in various ways, the implications of these truths have been ignored or slighted in Presbyterian churches. For example, has not the practice of speaking of communicant members of the church as *the* members become nearly universal, with the result that children, in spite of their having received baptism as a sign of their entrance into the visible church (Confession of Faith, Ch. XXVIII, Section I), have rarely been regarded as actual members of the church, being relegated to a "register of baptisms." In the proposed Form of Government, Chapter IX, Section IX, begins: "Every session shall keep registers or rolls of the members of the church, both of believers and of their baptized children."

Furthermore, the character of the church demands that only those who profess Christ and acknowledge Him as Head of the church shall participate in the government of the church. Or, to state the principle from a somewhat different point of view, in the words of Charles Hodge, *Church Polity*, p. 119, "all the attributes and



prerogatives of the church arise from the indwelling of the Spirit, and consequently, where he dwells, there are those attributes and prerogatives"; and "as the Spirit dwells not in the clergy only, but in the people of God, all power is, *in sensu primo*, in the people." My purpose in quoting these passages here is primarily to emphasize the truth that there can be no proper exercise of power in the church except as the Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit rule through those who are Christ's and have received the Holy Spirit. Does it not follow that it is dishonoring to Christ to allow those who have not acknowledged Him as Saviour and Lord to share in the government of His church? In the interest, therefore, of guarding the spiritual character of church government, the proposed Form of Government permits only those who are communicant members to vote in the congregational and corporation meetings.

As a further application of these principles, temporal concerns of the church must be subordinated to the spiritual. The prerogatives of the session are carefully stated. Furthermore, the qualifications for trusteeship are placed on a distinctly higher level than that which has prevailed in the past. Obviously, if only communicant members may properly vote at a meeting of the church corporation, those who are not communicants can hardly be judged eligible for office in the corporation. Moreover, the evils that have often accompanied the sharp separation of the session and the Board of Trustees are overcome by the stipulation that "the Board of Trustees of a particular church shall consist of the acting ruling elders and deacons in that church" (Chapter XXIII, Section III). Accordingly, under the proposed Form of Government, there would be no such thing as a trustee who had not taken the solemn vows which are required of officers of the church.

### Concerning the Officers of the Church

The description of the office of the minister, and of his qualifications are set forth largely in traditional language and without departing from the high standards which the Presbyterian churches have always set for their ministers. The designation "bishop" has been dropped, not because the minister is not charged with "over-

sight," but because the ruling elders also clearly share in this function, and the term itself is no longer used popularly. Chapters XIV and XV state the educational and spiritual qualifications of the ministry. While some things are freshly stated in these chapters, no innovations are introduced except in matters that are peripheral. Perhaps the greatest interest will be attracted by the provision for the ordination of licentiates as "teachers" of the Word, thus overcoming the old anomaly that professors of theology have often been ordained as evangelists (Chapter XV, Section XV). But even this provision is not entirely new, for the ecclesiastical ordinances, drawn up by Calvin for the Genevan church, and the old Scottish Form of Government, recognized the title of teacher, as well as of the pastor.

Other features of the new draft that deserve mention or brief explanation concern the offices of ruling elder and of deacon. The historic Presbyterian position that ruling elders and deacons must be "*male* members in full communion in the church in which they are to exercise office" is expressed in Chapter XIII, Section I. Minor changes have been introduced into Chapter V which describes the nature of the office of ruling elder:

Ruling elders are the particular representatives of the people, chosen by them from their own number, for the purpose of joining with the pastors or ministers in the government or discipline of the church.

That precise formulation has in view the principle that all of the offices, and not that of the ruling elder only, are representative in character. On this point the *Church Polity* of Charles Hodge may be cited with profit again: "Ministers are just as much the representatives of the people as elders are. Both are chosen by the people to their station in the church; neither have any authority over any congregation, not voluntarily subject to their watch and care; and at the same time neither derives his authority from the people, nor is either responsible to them" (p. 303). And from the same authority, "Now there is a sense in which ministers may be said to represent the people, inasmuch as they exercise a function included in the general commission given to the church; but elders are representatives in a very different

sense, as they are chosen to act in the name of the people, and to join with ministers in doing those things which the people themselves, as distinguished from the ministers, have a right to do" (p. 267).

The forms of subscription required of ministers, licentiates, ruling elders and deacons retain their historic formulation. In order to make perfectly clear that the Larger and Shorter Catechisms are included, with the Confession of Faith, in the confessional writings which are received and adopted at the time of subscription, as containing the system of doctrine taught in Holy Scripture, the various forms of subscription refer explicitly to the Catechisms.

Since the forms of subscription, which determine the manner in which the officers of the church receive the Word of God and the subordinate doctrinal standards, are quite as important as the doctrinal standards themselves for the maintenance of the doctrinal position of the church, it is hardly the part of wisdom to make the provisions for the amendment of these forms easier than the provisions for the amendment of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms. Consequently, one of the most important features of the proposed draft is the inclusion of these forms in the section dealing with amendment of the doctrinal standards. Chapter XXIV, Section II, is as follows:

Amendments or alterations of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and of the forms of subscription required of ministers, licentiates, ruling elders and deacons, as these forms are found in the Form of Government, shall not be regarded as having constitutional validity unless sent down to the presbyteries by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly, approved by two-thirds of the presbyteries in writing, and finally adopted by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly next ensuing. Before any of the changes described in this section are proposed to the presbyteries, the General Assembly shall appoint a committee to consider the proposed changes and to report to the next Assembly.

While this discussion of the proposed Form of Government does not claim to be a comprehensive treatment, it is presented with the hope that it may commend the document to the church as a whole, and may help to prepare the way for the adoption of a Form of Government at the coming General Assembly.

—N. B. S.

# Shall We Look to the Preaching Mission for a National Revival?

By the REV. J. F. MINOR SIMPSON

**E**ARNEST Christians everywhere are looking for revival, and are praying for God's blessing upon the preaching of the gospel. They have no sympathy with the position of the rector who recently gained the headlines with the demand for a two-year moratorium on sermons. There has been a widespread concern that missionary effort, at home and abroad, shall be centered in evangelism. Shall we look to the National Preaching Mission as an answer to the prayer of Christians that thousands shall be confronted with the challenge of the gospel? Shall we co-operate with this movement and lend it our support? Questions like these prompt a consideration of the position which has been taken by the leading spokesmen of this Mission in the great battle between Christianity and Modernism.

## Stanley Jones

Stanley Jones, missionary, author and lecturer, has many good points and much can truthfully be said with regard to his character, intellect and sincerity. It is with keen regret that we feel constrained to point out that, from the standpoint of the Bible-believing Christian, he errs at the very outset. He will not accept the Bible alone as the ultimate source of authority, preferring to rest upon the Bible as it is supported by the experience of the individual believer and the authority of the church. To quote from *Christ at the Round Table*:

"We were in a motor on our way from Jerusalem to the ruins of Jerash, a Roman city in Trans-Jordania. At the junction of the roads we came upon a signpost on which was written 'To Jerash, Great Aniquities.' Laughing over the 'Great Aniquities' we continued on our way. But in a little while it dawned upon us that in spite of the missing 't' that sign did point us to the place where we wanted to go, to Jerash. We had to turn around, come back and obey the signpost and it got us there. In our thinking the whole emphasis had been thrown upon the wrong phrase of the signpost. 'To Jerash' was the important thing.

"Suppose scholars should find a 't' missing in the accounts of Jesus. The decisive thing is that he points the way of life. Where does the infallibility of the gospel lie? In this: that if a man will

take the way that Christ points he will infallibly find God."

It is saddening to see the sublime truth contained in the above quotation encrusted in deadly error, for inerrancy of the Scriptures is obviously questioned if not rejected outright. This is not only deadly error in itself, but it opens the door to other errors yet more deadly.

## Ivan Lee Holt

How fares it with Ivan Lee Holt, D.D., pastor of St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, South, St. Louis, Missouri, president of the Federal Council, and author of several religious works? He is a speaker, scholar and writer of ability and one of the more thoughtful of the members of his school of thought; one who is aware of the short-comings of Modernism and who has labored manfully to correct them. (See THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for Sept. 26, 1936.) He has discovered that Liberal Protestantism must seek and emphasize a new consecration to God. This is an important step in the right direction, definite progress toward the truth. Unfortunately Dr. Holt has as yet made no further progress and has not yet found the firm ground of the infallible Word of God.

## Richard Roberts

Another distinguished speaker in the national mission is the Rev. Richard Roberts, D.D., Moderator of the United Church of Canada, justly honored and respected as a gentleman of the first order and looked upon as the soul of honor. But he is in deadly error on the very doctrine of God. As one reads his published essay *Imago Dei*, one is struck with the manner in which he leans upon evolution even in postulating God. To quote several pertinent passages:

"I think that all thought of God . . . must be anthropomorphic. On a higher plane of evolution we may outgrow this necessity, but here and now we can do no other."

"The best thought of our time leads us to the idea of a transcendent-immanent, eternally self-perfecting Absolute; and as, on analysis, this statement is found to

be chock-full of logical contradictions, it is difficult for our minds to get around it. This does not mean that it is not true; it means only that we cannot grasp it. On a higher plane of evolution it may seem quite simple and obvious to us. Now we know only in part."

"If we accept, as we surely must, the logic of evolution, we shall infer most clearly what God intends, and therefore, what He is, from those values which we discover in experience to lead to the highest life."

Dr. Roberts thus seems to be leaning ultimately upon evolution and more directly upon certain values accredited by experience, and not upon the Bible, the very Word of God. We are not, therefore, surprised at the following from the same essay:

"It is immaterial to this argument whether the story of the Crucifixion is even a correct record; it is enough that this story as given in the Christian tradition has gained the currency and acceptance it has had, and that ever since a growing multitude of people have found it saying something which is self-authenticating and ultimate."

## Rufus M. Jones

Rufus M. Jones is Professor of Philosophy at Haverford College, author, editor, lecturer, man of rare gifts, to whom the London *Times* referred some time ago as "the greatest spiritual philosopher living in America since William James died."

In his essay on "The Eternal Goodness" published a few years ago Dr. Jones displays a lack of the materialism so plainly evident in the thesis of Dr. Roberts, but seems to have a God who is misty and unreal and who exists only as an idea. He says:

"I think of God . . . not as a Being who occupies space, seated on a throne in the sky, not as working as an architect or builder, using external tools and building stuff. I think of Him as Spirit—which does not mean something vague, vapory or ghost-like. We know spirit best in our inner selves. It is what we are. It is our intelligence, our aspiration, our ideals, our love of beauty, truth and goodness, our persistent character, our true nature—all we mean when we say, I am, I will, I love. If we hope to find a real God we must discover that we have a real soul, a spiritual nature which directs and animates us."

"When I think of God as Spirit then I

think of Him as the Ground and Source of all that we call mind in the universe." "I think of God as Spirit and as the ideal-making Mind of the universe."

Dr. Jones, in spite of his definite rejection of the pantheism of Spinoza seems plainly infected with that error. For his God does not seem to be separate from and above the universe but a part of it. In fact, Dr. Jones seems in some passages to uphold an idealized and spiritualized form of Christian pantheism. In other passages he definitely denies the doctrine of the sovereignty of God, so dear to the hearts of all Calvinists, and even doubts a future resurrection and life everlasting:

"Self-giving, not sovereignty, is the mark and badge of the Divine Nature." "Even death may well be one of His ways forward into fuller life."

### George A. Buttrick

George A. Buttrick, pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, another of those taking part in the Preaching Mission, while a true gentleman and altogether a likable man personally, is certainly to be looked upon by the Bible-believer as a poor guide in things spiritual. For, even in his apologetic for Christianity, from a modernist point of view, he denies the inerrancy and hence the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. This is shown in the following quotations taken at random from *The Christian Faith and Modern Doubt*.

"It is no use our evading or trying to hide Bible inconsistencies. They have been found; and if they had not been found by the many, the few who knew and hid them would by that evasion be cankered in character. Literal infallibility of Scripture is a fortress impossible to defend: there is treason in the camp. Probably few people who claim to 'believe every word of the Bible' really mean it. That avowal held to its last logic would risk a trip to the insane asylum."

"The Bible writings are obviously . . . the work . . . of men like ourselves. They were sometimes mistaken."

"Its [the Bible's] science passes as does all science. It is not a book of science or history."

"The argument for the Virgin Birth is persuasive but the argument against it is strong. An honest verdict might be: we do not know, and do not need to know."

### Bishop Moore

One good quality will have to be conceded to all the men we have discussed so far. Each one made his position perfectly clear and stood upon the truth as he understood it. Unfortunately as much cannot be fairly said

of another speaker participating in the National Preaching Mission, the Rev. James M. Moore, D.D., a prelate of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, who undoubtedly did much good work as bishop of Brazil, who has aroused interest in mission work especially in Roman Catholic lands and whose writings possess many excellent qualities. Unfortunately he has shown a disposition to obscure the difference between truth and error and often avoids taking a definite stand for the truth revealed in God's holy Word. This is best illustrated by quoting extracts from a published sermon of his on "The Commanding Certitude."

"The untutored have had their suspicions aroused. They fear that the Bible is being destroyed, that their faith is being undermined, and that they are in danger of having their precious heritage taken away from them."

"The scholar is often looked upon as the enemy of religion rather than as a friend, and he is all but an unwelcome guest in the house of faith."

"On the other hand men of scientific mind, method and attainment are dead set against Christianity by the crudities and intolerance of ecclesiastics and exponents of its doctrines."

He then speaks of the "Back to

Christ" movement, and unloads the following as his "solution" of the difficulties of the situation:

"Neither a domineering dogmatism nor illusive liberalism can furnish the remedy. One is as incompetent as the other. They both lack the necessary life emphasis. There must be a new positiveness of faith, but it can be based only upon personality with all the life elements which it involves. Personality is Christianity's solution to the world's problems, personality at its highest and best, and the religion of Christianity has its true meaning and redemptive power in the person of Jesus Christ."

All of this is very vague and unsatisfying. There is nothing in it to guide the man floundering in the morass of doubt to the firm ground set forth as the gospel by the apostle Paul and by all the writers of the Old and New Testaments. There is nothing in it to point the lost sinner to the way of escape from sin. It fails to show that the only hope for man is the gospel of Christ and Him crucified.

If these men are representative of the personnel of the mission as a whole, and certainly they are not the least prominent, can we possibly look upon the mission as truly evangelistic and truly evangelical?

## A Calvinistic Exposition of the Atonement

A Review by Professor JOHN MURRAY

VICARIOUS ATONEMENT THROUGH CHRIST, by Louis Berkhof, B.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 1936. 184 pages. \$1.50.



Mr. Murray

IN THESE days of loose thinking and widespread unbelief it is not often that there issues from the press a book on so central a theme as the substitutionary atonement that one can wholeheartedly recommend to both cultured and uncultured readers. We are happy, however, to be in that position with respect to this volume by Professor Berkhof. In taking up the volume we had every expectation that we would not be disappointed. Within the last few years several books have come

from the pen of the same author, and through them the acquaintance we have formed with him has led us to expect that the same ripe scholarship, Reformed orthodoxy, and wholesome piety would come to expression in the volume now before us.

This book is in the true sense of the word a popular book. The method and style are such as make it suitable for the lay reader. In this respect it admirably supplies a need as no other with which we are acquainted. Particularly may it be placed in the hands of young people and recommended to them with full confidence as setting forth by way of exposition and defense what is cardinal in our holy Faith.

It is a book thus to be commended, however, precisely because it is written by an earnest and accomplished student of holy Scripture and of his-

tory. Only such a student could write a book of this quality. And for that same reason it may without apology be placed in the hands of the learned. Even those who are hostile among such will have to concede, if they are fairminded, that the evidence for the doctrine of penal substitution is marshalled and argued in masterly fashion, and the treatment of all opposing theories accurate in analysis and cogent in rebuttal. It is, therefore, an apologetic that effectively meets the need created by unbelieving attack.

The book is divided into thirteen chapters. The first deals with the eclipse of this central doctrine, the second with historic theories, and the remaining eleven develop the Biblical doctrine according to coherent and logical plan.

Professor Berkhof is thoroughly acquainted with his theme. He brings to bear upon his treatment the combined qualities of historian, exegete, and systematic theologian to a very remarkable degree. Consequently historical perspective, accurate exegesis, and systematic formulation are everywhere apparent. The feature that has made its appeal to the present reviewer, perhaps more than anything else, is the way in which, in a style perspicuous to all, the erroneous theories are ever kept in view, their fallacy ever and anon exposed, and the truth of the Biblical doctrine always presented in contrast with counterfeit. The sympathetic reader rises from the perusal of this volume not only grounded in the truth of the gospel but informed of the futility of every attempt to undermine or overthrow it.

It will have become apparent that the view presented and established in this book is that of penal substitution, that Christ in offering Himself as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God bore vicariously the legal and judicial penalty of the sins of His people. "The penal substitutionary doctrine of the atonement," he says, "proceeds on the assumption that sin is in its very nature a transgression of the law of God and thus renders man guilty. For that very reason the remedy proposed for it must be first of all a *legal* remedy. The point calls for particular attention because of its widespread denial. The forensic nature of the atonement finds no favor with the advocates of the Moral Influence, or of the Mystical Theory, because it does not fit in

with their fundamental thought. . . . When the Bible represents sin as a transgression of the law, as it repeatedly does, the idea is not that it is simply an infraction of some positive enactment of God, which served a merely temporary purpose and could be changed at any time. The law to which it refers is God's moral law, which is as to its essence grounded in the very nature of God and is therefore necessary and immutable. It is a law which God cannot simply ignore or set aside at will, since it is the expression of His very Being. . . . The law is a transcript of the will of God for the regulation of the lives of His moral beings, and the will of God is not an arbitrary will, but a will which is determined by and is in perfect harmony with all the divine perfections. . . . Another point which requires special emphasis is that every law given for moral and responsible beings necessarily carries with it a penal sanction. Such a law calls for obedience and, in case of transgression, for the infliction of a penalty. The justice of God which guarantees rich blessings to those who obey the law, *necessarily* inflicts due punishment on transgressors" (pages 59-62). And so in accord with the dictates of inherent justice and the uniform testimony of Scripture as to this necessity "Christ bore a *full equivalent* in the strictly legal sense for the sins of His people" (page 64).

It is frequently objected to this view that it is purely legal, and therefore entirely removed from the ethical requirements of life. This objection is adequately answered when it is not only stated but demonstrated that, "it is of the utmost importance and indeed quite essential that the doctrine of the atonement be considered in connection with other closely related doctrines. The common objection to the penal substitutionary doctrine of the atonement, that it is purely legal and has no ethical bearings, would hardly be raised, if it were clearly understood and acknowledged that the atonement effects reconciliation, and reconciliation, in turn, carries with it the assurance of complete and perfect redemption" (page 67). This is shown more fully in the chapter entitled "The Subjective Effects of the Atonement" (pages 139-147).

In evangelical circles the aspect of Reformed doctrine that calls forth more protest than any other is that of

the restricted design, or what is more frequently known as Limited Atonement. With that topic Professor Berkhof deals in the last two chapters of the book. In view of the widespread misunderstanding and misrepresentation on this subject within nominally Presbyterian and Reformed circles, not to speak of broader evangelical circles, there is no part of Professor Berkhof's book more worthy of commendation and studied consideration. The real point at issue is well stated and the Calvinistic position succinctly yet adequately argued, and the objections urged against it effectively answered. Two brief quotations will illustrate. "The real point at issue in the controversy that has been carried on for centuries pertains to the design or purpose of the atonement. Did God in sending His Son into the world to be the Saviour of sinners, and did Christ by taking upon Himself the work of redemption, intend to save all men, that is, all the individuals of the human race; or did they intend to save only the elect whose representative Christ became in the Counsel of Redemption? Lutherans and Arminians take the former position, and Calvinists the latter" (pages 151, 152). And after treating of the various theories of universal atonement he proceeds: "All these views have one element in common: they assume that there is a difference in extent between the design of God's atoning work in Christ and the result actually attained, between the objective atonement and its subjective application. In opposition to all such theories the Calvinist holds that the design of the atonement was limited, that is, that God sent His Son into the world for the purpose of atoning for the sins of the elect; and that Christ gave His life only for those who were given Him by the Father. Moreover, they believe that the atonement is effectual in the lives of all those for whom it is made. It necessarily carries with it all that is needed for the application of the work of redemption. Christ not only made salvation possible, but actually saves to the uttermost, everyone for whom He has made atonement. God's designs do not fail through the failure of men to meet the requirements of the gospel" (pages 155, 156).

We accord this volume, then, the highest commendation and plead for it very wide reading and careful study. At a few points we may differ with

the author on minor details of interpretation. For example, it is the judgment of the present writer that John Calvin should be regarded as ascribing an absolute rather than hypothetical necessity for the atonement. In this regard we think Calvin departs from Augustine to whom he usually pays profound deference.

But these are details on which there is room for diversity of interpretation, and any divergence in judgment on our part does not in the least affect our general estimate of the book, nor does it interfere with our wholehearted endorsement of Professor Berkhof's thesis from beginning to end.

### An Inimitable Story Bible

THE CHILD'S STORY BIBLE, by Catherine F. Vos. Three volumes. \$2 each. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.

HERE is a Bible history in story form that you can place in the hands of your children with the confidence that it will stimulate their love for the Bible as the Word of God. Reverent and faithful in its presentation and interpretation of the contents of the Bible, it is marked further by evangelical fervor and wholesome piety. Moreover, it is superior to most books of this class in the comprehensiveness of its treatment: the first volume covers the period from Genesis to the Kings; the second takes up the Kings and covers the rest of the Old Testament period; volume three presents the history of the New Testament period. The publishers inform us that it is designed for children as young as seven years, but the reviewer can testify that even a four-year-old child will follow the stories with great interest, particularly if the one who reads will resort occasionally to a paraphrase or word of explanation. Printed attractively, and illustrated with thirty-two colored pictures in each volume, the work calls for a word of hearty congratulation to the publisher and to the National Union of Christian Schools, which sponsored it.

Mrs. Vos is the wife of Geerhardus Vos who, for so many years, was an outstanding representative of the scholarly and orthodox tradition of Princeton Theological Seminary. These volumes were written in that atmosphere, and bear the impress of the complete devotion to the Reformed Faith for

which the old Princeton stood. Mrs. Vos is the mother of four children, and these stories became crystallized as she instructed them in the truth of the Word. The author is a gifted story teller. When I called on Dr. and Mrs. Vos in their home in Santa Ana, Cali-

fornia, several months ago, Dr. Vos told me that Mrs. Vos' talent had been greatly stimulated by the stories which she had heard and had read in her childhood home—the stories of the inimitable Dickens.

—N. B. S.

## Has The Presbyterian Guardian Attacked Premillennialism?

IN ORDER to present as clearly as possible all of the documents which are pertinent to this issue, we are reprinting first the Editorial on "Premillennialism," which appeared in *The Christian Beacon* for October 1, 1936, and the answer of Professor Kuiper.

### The Editorial in "The Christian Beacon"

One of the truths of Scripture that has increasingly impressed itself for comfort and edification upon many Christians in these days of apostasy has been the premillennial return of Christ. In the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., which has officially departed from the faith, there was no question as to the right of individuals to be premillennialists, a-millennialists, or even post-millennialists. However, in recent months, during the days of the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union, before it dissolved, and now at the formation of The Presbyterian Church of America, there has been considerable discussion among men of what is called "eschatological liberty." Men are free to be, it is said, "pre's," "a's" or "post's."

Why is it necessary even to talk about "eschatological liberty"? Such liberty has been recognized. The answer, we believe, is that men have had to talk about it because a few individuals who are a-millennialists have been attacking more strenuously the premillennialists. The premillennialist position has been quite generally accepted by Christian people, and the a-millennialists have launched their attack upon it. This attack has proceeded in various ways—most frequently in indirect ways—and has reached the stage where it has found itself in print a number of times.

A recent article appearing in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN leads us to feel that the time has come when the *Christian Beacon* should say a word about the matter. We are premillennialists, and believe that the Bible clearly teaches that there will be a millennium on this earth after the return of Christ, and that then Christ will reign here upon the throne of his father David. We believe with the Bible references compiled by Dr. C. I. Scofield that the millennium is a definite dispensation or period of time.

Under the title, "Why Separation Was Necessary," the Rev. Professor R. B. Kuiper, of Westminster Theological Sem-

inary, in an article printed in THE GUARDIAN, which reviews the formation of The Presbyterian Church of America, attacks the premillennial position in this matter. The editor, an a-millennialist, the Rev. Ned B. Stonehouse, comments concerning the article: "In this important article, which is reproduced slightly abridged from *The Banner*, organ of the Christian Reformed Church, Professor Kuiper justifies the formation of The Presbyterian Church of America and indicates certain conditions which he thinks must be fulfilled if the church is to have a future as a truly reformed body."

In all of this article there is only one short paragraph in which Dr. Kuiper refers to the matter of dispensationalism. The full quotation follows: "The General Assembly had the privilege of examining several graduates of Westminster Seminary for licensure and ordination. It would have warmed the cockles of the heart of any Christian Reformed minister to hear how closely they were questioned about the two errors which are so extremely prevalent among American Fundamentalists, Arminianism and the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible. The Assembly wanted to make sure that these prospective ministers were not tainted with such anti-reformed heresies."

In the first place we are quite sure that there has been some serious mistake made by Dr. Kuiper in regard to the facts related by him concerning the licensure of the two Westminster men. We were present, and we have also consulted others who were present at the time, and in the examination of the students relative to their views of eschatology no reference was made to the "Scofield Bible." There was a question asked concerning an alleged and little known form of so-called dispensationalism which violated the covenant of grace. The Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, a premillennialist, editor at that time of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, immediately arose and said that question needed to be stated thus, "Do you believe that the Bible teaches only one way of salvation and that by the blood?" Mr. Griffiths said that if they answered this question in the affirmative it would satisfy him, and ought to be enough for anybody else. This was answered in the affirmative, and the question concerning dispensationalism was dropped. Therefore, we are at a loss to understand why Dr. Kuiper can assert that these two men condemned the "Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible," which was not even under discussion,

Furthermore, in our opinion, the even more significant matter at this point is that, without any effort to distinguish the good from the bad, Dr. Kuiper calls the "Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible" an "anti-reformed heresy." Heresy is not a pleasant word. The remark in regard to the "Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible" is an attack upon the premillennialists, as heretics.

According to Dr. Scofield's references to dispensationalism, the millennium is a dispensation. Of course, Dr. Kuiper does not believe in the millennium, and his generalized condemnation of the Scofield references leaves no room for the premillenarian to join with Scofield in believing that the millennium is a dispensation!

We feel perfectly sure, however, that it was not the mind or the intention of the members of the General Assembly, as indicated by Dr. Kuiper, in examining these young men to make sure that they "were not tainted with such anti-reformed heresies."

We are unable to see in our own thinking how the a-millennialists can say they grant liberty to the premillennialists and then turn in such a manner as this and condemn them as heretics. We firmly believe that by far the majority of the people in The Presbyterian Church of America are premillenarians, and the Church committed to the Westminster Confession of Faith is not committed to the particular view held by any individual.

We do not fear at the present time concerning the future of the right of premillennialists, but we do believe that unless the a-millennialists cease their veiled and continued attacks upon the premillennialist position concerning "dispensationalism" there will be a united expression on behalf of the premillenarians in the Church.

The great battle which has been raging in the Christian world has been over true Protestantism and true Presbyterianism and on that high level it should remain.

### The Reply of Professor Kuiper

Professor Kuiper replied to the Editorial in a letter under date of October 6th, 1936, and requested that his letter be published in the *Christian Beacon*. The letter, not having been published in that paper, is here published for the first time:

October 6, 1936.

"The Rev. Carl McIntire,  
Collingswood, N. J.

"Dear Mr. McIntire:

"I wish to thank you for the courtesy of mailing me a copy of the *Christian Beacon* of October 1 containing your editorial on 'Premillennialism.' While reading this editorial I could not suppress the wish that, before rushing into print, you had done me the previous courtesy of requesting a personal interview. That would have kept you, I am sure, from the wholly unwarranted misrepresentation of my position which constitutes the thrust

of your editorial and, I am frank to confess, deeply grieves me. It would also have spared me the unpleasant task of now calling attention to some serious fallacies in your reasoning.

"In my article in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN I made mention of 'the two errors which are so extremely prevalent among American Fundamentalists, Arminianism and the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible,' and I went on to style these errors 'anti-reformed heresies.' You call this 'an attack upon the premillennialists, as heretics.' Surely, here seems to be a clear instance of jumping at a conclusion.

"You indicate, however, by what process of reasoning you arrive at your conclusion. It runs thus: Kuiper condemns the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible as heresy; Scofield calls the millennium a dispensation; therefore Kuiper calls belief in a coming millennium heresy. But pray, what sort of reasoning is that? One might as well say: McIntire condemns the theology of Modernism as heresy; Modernism teaches that there is a Supreme Being; therefore McIntire brands belief in a Supreme Being heresy. I ask in all seriousness how you would like to have your position thus misrepresented.

"It is a matter of common knowledge that there is ever so much more to the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible than the mere teaching of Premillennialism. Nor do the two stand and fall together. There are premillenarians who have never heard of Scofield's dispensations. More important than that, there are serious students of God's Word who hold to the premillennial return of Christ and emphatically reject Scofield's system of dispensations as fraught with grave error.

"I am frankly an amillenarian. I was that already before the term had come into common usage. I have objections to Premillennialism. But never until now was I charged with intolerance toward my premillenarian brethren. It may interest you to know that when some years ago the Christian Reformed Church, in which I was then and am today a minister, refused to take steps toward putting up the bars against premillenarians, I was in hearty accord with that refusal. Some of my warmest friends and most ardent co-laborers in the gospel ministry are of premillenarian persuasion.

And I may add that I do not know of a single amillenarian minister in The Presbyterian Church of America who would exclude premillenarians from office in that communion. Your charge that 'the amillennialists say they grant liberty to the premillennialists and then turn and condemn them as heretics' is without foundation in fact.

"I have relieved my mind of a heavy burden, the onus of misrepresentation by a Christian brother. Before concluding this letter, however, I must beg leave to make a few additional statements.

"It is impossible in a mere letter to point out every error involved in the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible. Everybody at all interested in the subject should read Dr. Oswald T. Allis's noteworthy articles on this matter in *The Evangelical Quarterly* and Professor John Murray's valuable contributions in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN. Much more needs to be written and, no doubt, will be written in the near future to enlighten God's people on this subject. Suffice it now to say that Scofield's sharp distinction between the dispensation of grace and that of law, if carried through to its logical conclusion, must result in impairment to the exceedingly precious doctrine of salvation by grace and that his placing these dispensations over against each other leads logically to that rejection of God's law which is known as Antinomianism. When saying that, I am well aware that but few, if any, of Scofield's admirers actually go the full length of these conclusions and that Scofield himself frequently takes refuge in happy inconsistencies. But that in no wise alters the fact that the organizing principle of the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible is essentially heretical. And altogether apart from the question whether or not the Scofield Bible was actually named in the examination of candidates for ordination at the First General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America, I am just as positive now as I was last June that certain questions were directed to these candidates in order to make sure that they were not tainted with its errors.

"In the first paragraph of your editorial you plead for the same 'eschatological liberty' which is found in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., where there is 'no question as to the right of individuals to be premillenarians, amillenarians, or even postmil-



lenarians.' I simply cannot believe that you have thought through what you say here. In fact, I am certain that you have not. You know, of course, that there are not only supernaturalistic postmillenarians, who believe that the millennium will be ushered in by the preaching of the gospel, but also naturalistic postmillenarians, who expect it to be ushered in by such human efforts as education and social reform. The latter view, which is obviously modernist, may be freely held in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., but surely should not be tolerated in The Presbyterian Church of America. Then had we not better stop speaking of 'eschatological liberty' without qualification and be content with eschatological liberty within the limits of the system of doctrine of the Westminster Confession?

"Finally I want to express full agreement with the concluding sentence of your editorial. You say: 'The great battle which has been raging in the Christian world has been over true Protestantism and true Presbyterianism and on this high level it should remain.' I say: 'That is the point precisely.' But I take it for granted that no minister or elder in The Presbyterian Church of America will consider Scofield's comment on the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer—to name but one of his characteristic teachings—compatible with either true Protestantism or true Presbyterianism. Scofield describes the words 'as we forgive our debtors' as 'legal ground' and thus actually has the temerity to tell us that Christ taught His disciples to plead for forgiveness on 'legal ground.' He goes on to say: 'Under law forgiveness is conditioned upon a like spirit in us; under grace we are forgiven for Christ's sake and exhorted to forgive because we have been forgiven.' How false an antithesis! Every true Presbyterian, even every true Protestant, knows that forgiveness must ever be a matter of pure grace, that Christ's merits are the one and only ground for forgiveness in every age, and that God has revealed this to man ever since he needed forgiveness.

"Hoping that this letter may help to remove misunderstanding among brethren and above all else may contribute something to the maintenance of the purity of the gospel, I remain

"Your brother in Christ,

(Signed) R. B. KUIPER."

### Actions by the Presbytery of California

Having seen the editorial in the *Christian Beacon* and not having seen Professor Kuiper's reply, the Presbytery of California adopted the following resolution and the following overture at its meeting on October 21st:

#### The Resolution

WHEREAS there appeared in the September 12, 1936, issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN in an article written by Professor R. B. Kuiper the following paragraph:

"The General Assembly had the privilege of examining several graduates of Westminster Seminary for licensure and ordination. It would have warmed the cockles of the heart of any Christian Reformed minister to hear how closely they were questioned about the two errors which are so extremely prevalent among American fundamentalists, Arminianism and the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible. The Assembly wanted to make sure that these prospective ministers were not tainted with such anti-reformed heresies."

AND WHEREAS the above paragraph makes light of a doctrine which many of us in The Presbyterian Church of America hold near and dear to our hearts, namely, the premillennial return of our Lord.

AND WHEREAS we believe that such a statement was contrary to the facts of what actually occurred at the meeting of the General Assembly as attested to in an editorial in the *Christian Beacon* of October 1, 1936, entitled "Premillennialism,"

AND WHEREAS should there continue to be such uncharitable words as would make a Premillennialist in our denomination feel as unwelcome as were he a Modernist or an Arminian, there will be an immediate departure from our membership on the part of many,

AND WHEREAS it is our strong conviction that we Premillennialists (who are just as hostile to any type of hyper-dispensationalism nullifying the atonement as are our Post and A-millennial brethren) are thoroughly welcome in our present parent body.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we strongly protest the above-mentioned paragraph and all other statements of a similar nature which have appeared in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, which is commonly regarded as the authoritative publication of The Presbyterian Church of America.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we recommend to the editors of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN that such statements hereafter be stricken from the manuscripts or that an editorial note be appended immediately following such statements which will make it clear that such a view is the private view of the author of the article and in no wise represents the official position of the Church.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this protest go to THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN together with our request for, and expectation that, it will be

published with a statement from the editors which will afford perfect satisfaction to those Premillennialists among us who feel that a grave misunderstanding has arisen.

Passed by the Presbytery of California on October 21, 1936.

WM. HARLEE BORDEAUX,  
Stated Clerk.

### The Overture

The Presbytery of California

of

The Presbyterian Church of America

October 22, 1936.

The Presbytery of California respectfully overtures the General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America, meeting in Philadelphia in November, 1936, as to eschatological freedom.

Despite the fact that our Presbytery is nearly unanimously premillennial in its personnel, it would be farthest from our desire that The Presbyterian Church of America close her doors against all who disbelieve in the premillennial return of our Lord. To do so we are convinced would displease Christ. We recognize that brethren who are post-millennialists or a-millennialists may, and many of them do, equally love our Lord's appearing.

We regret the occasion necessitating that editorial, namely, "Pre-millennialism" in *The Christian Beacon* of October 1, 1936, but nonetheless, we are in perfect agreement with the sentiments contained therein. With all our souls we are averse to any hyper-dispensationalism which would proclaim salvation as possible in any age apart from God's redemptive work wrought out on Calvary. We think it, therefore, decidedly unfair to confuse the issue and make every pre-millennialist to be a hyper-dispensationalist.

Such strength of language as has lately been hurled against pre-millennialists by some who have been thought to speak in the name of The Presbyterian Church of America is proving hurtful here. Thoroughly evangelical pre-millennialists are singling out such sentences as proof texts to show the anti-pre-millennial disposition of The Presbyterian Church of America.

Therefore, we earnestly and prayerfully appeal to you (and to all other Presbyteries, if God wills it, to join us in our plea) that definite, emphatic, and unambiguous eschatological liberty be written into the constitution of our beloved church.

Yours respectfully,

The Presbytery of California

of

The Presbyterian Church of America

WM. HARLEE BORDEAUX,  
Stated Clerk.

### Reply by The Presbyterian Guardian

In reply to the resolution of the Presbytery of California calling upon us to repudiate the statement of Professor R. B. Kuiper designating as being contrary to the Reformed system of doctrine, "Arminianism and the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible", we desire to outline our position as follows:



1. We must decline to repudiate the statement, but on the contrary we express the warmest agreement with it.

2. We are convinced that the objection of the Presbytery of California to the statement and its demand that we repudiate it are based upon a total misunderstanding of what the statement means and a total misunderstanding of Professor Kuiper's position. Professor Kuiper was not attacking Premillennialism in that article at all.

3. We hereby definitely challenge the Presbytery of California or any of our readers to cite a single instance in which THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN or any writer in it has stated or implied in any way, shape or manner that the holding of the Premillenarian view of the return of our Lord is incompatible with the maintenance of the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Standards or prevents a man from subscribing honestly to the ordination pledge in The Presbyterian Church of America.

4. We cannot agree to shut off discussion as to the correctness or incorrectness of the Premillenarian view of the return of our Lord. That question is, we think, quite within the range of legitimate discussion among those who hold to the Reformed system of doctrine. We certainly cannot promise to allow Premillenarians liberty to oppose the Amillenarian view and at the same time deny Amillenarians liberty to oppose the Premillenarian view. Moreover, we reserve the right, on occasion, to express our own opinion on this important subject.

5. THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN has made no claim to be "the authoritative publication of The Presbyterian Church of America."

In support of paragraphs 1 and 2 above, we call attention to our editorial in the present issue and to the letter by Professor R. B. Kuiper on pages 54 and 55. We call the attention of the Presbytery also to the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia which is presented and discussed in our editorial. That action had the active support of both those members of the editorial staff of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN who are ministers.

## Be Not Afraid

### A Meditation on the Fourth Psalm

By the REV. DAVID FREEMAN



Mr. Freeman

**F**EAR destroys peace and robs the believer of joy. The children of God have no cause to fear. David of all men might have surrendered himself to sorrow and discouragement. The adverse judgments of men, and the slanderous reports of his enemies and one-time friends were sufficient to overwhelm a mightier man than he. Yet he was not cast down.

Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake." These evil reports are not sent without His permission, that the soul might lean the more heavily upon Him who is the God of all righteousness. With such a God as the Lord, who is the friend and advocate of His people, why should one be given to fearfulness?

There have been but few truly godly men that have escaped the slander of the world. The history of God's people abounds with examples of men whose only appeal was to heaven. It is a mark of great grace in the soul when it can look away from the wrongful abuse of men and place itself directly in the presence of God and His holy angels. Paul, the apostle, did this when he said, "He that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God." (I Cor. 4: 4, 5.)

#### The Weapons Against Fear

The Christian's attitude should be one of constant prayer, but especially should he betake himself to this exercise when hemmed in by the malice of men. This is part of the armor of God which enables him to stand against the wiles of the devil. The enemy only throws his missiles in vain with such a protection. Prayer is the vantage ground of the saint.

A clear conscience, one that is void of offence, will give serenity and calm. God will take the side of him who has loved mercy, done justly, and walked humbly with Him, and in this fellowship there is repose.

It is true that a man should not put his own righteousness before God, for the cleanness of man is filthiness before God, yet for God's honor, and not man's, it is proper to present to God what He has Himself wrought—a well-assured conscience. This plea of a good conscience is often made by the servants of God in Holy Scripture. Paul before Felix said, "And herein do I exercise myself, to have always a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men." This even gave him cause for great rejoicing as he says in another place, "For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world." (II Cor. 1: 12.)

A man cannot expect freedom from a troubled mind if his ways have not been according to the commandment of God. On the other hand, the world is no match for him who has called upon God to defend his integrity.

#### The Assurance of God's Calling

Since it was of God's free grace that David had received the kingdom, he could boast against his enemies. He knew that his calling was of God's sovereign mercy and grace. What power on earth can frustrate His purposes? All the attempts at harm to God's saints shall be without success. God is against those who are against His elect. He is a faithful God, never forsaking His own work, but defending those whom He has once embraced.

There is indeed pity for the oppressor and desire for his conversion, but the evil doer should know that his defeat is sure. In God, His saints are victors over their foes, be they many or few, or ever so malicious.

Some would find the source of fearlessness in wealth, some in honor, some in palaces and some in pleasure. The Psalmist found it in the favor

and friendship of God. This comes when the Saviour's love is shed abroad in the heart. It is the Father's love brought home to our hearts by the Holy Spirit. It is more than a notion, it is a felt possession.

What child of God would exchange places with the prosperous man of the world? Such a barter would be selling an enduring joy and an eternal inheritance for a mess of pottage. The true child of God will not do it. In God's favor there is a gladness which no outward circumstance can buy.

When we view the fretful condition of worldly men we should be mindful that we shall never have undisturbed

peace and joy until the favor of God is ours. And when only does God smile upon us? When He sees us in Christ Jesus through whose precious blood He has made peace and reconciled us to Himself.

One has well said: "They slumber sweetly whom faith rocks to sleep. No pillow so soft as a promise; no coverlet so warm as an assured interest in Christ. O Lord, give us this calm repose on Thee, that like David we may lie down in peace, and sleep each night while we live; and joyfully may we lie down in the appointed season, to sleep in death, to rest in God."

(Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter XVI:2.)

Uniformly the Scriptures base life and good works on truth and doctrine. The Ten Commandments are binding on men because they are the law of God, established by Him, who is truth: "I am the Lord thy God, which hath brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." "The preface to the Ten Commandments," according to question 44 of the Catechism, "teaches us, that because God is the Lord, and our God, and Redeemer, therefore we are bound to keep all his commandments."

The experience of the human race instructs us that doctrine and duty cannot be separated. A young man who was persuaded through the influence of a certain university that what the Bible teaches us to believe concerning God is untrue, logically concluded that the Ten Commandments were not binding on him. If they were not the law of God, he reasoned, they could not properly restrain his actions. He broke them. The way of the transgressor was hard for him. Despair gripped his soul. He took his own life.

It has been the experience of the Christian Church that God has used the preaching of the gospel (see I Corinthians 15) in the conversion of a multitude whom no man can number. The early church presented to men facts about Christ and the true interpretation of those facts. As a result men were converted and were enabled, through power from above, more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness. Vain and dangerous are the ways of those who would exhort us to follow a purely human Jesus, concerning whom history has nothing to say, and to entrust our souls to the man-devised principles they attribute to Him. We can trust only One whom we have found to be our Saviour from sin, our Lord, and our God. We dare not presume to say that we can live His perfect life. We can only ask Him for grace and power to obey Him.

#### SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Do you agree with the thought expressed in Pope's lines:  
"For points of faith let senseless bigots fight,  
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."?
2. Did Paul regard doctrinal differ-

## Studies in the Shorter Catechism

By the REV. JOHN H. SKILTON

### LESSON 6

QUESTION 3. *What do the Scriptures principally teach?*

ANSWER. *The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man.*

#### A Voice of Authority

THE answer to the third question of the Catechism admirably conveys to us the authoritative note of the Scriptures. The Bible, in which the living and the true God is revealed, speaks with final authority as to what man is to believe and what man should do.

Many persons today consider a man's beliefs and a man's conduct solely his own business, to be regulated entirely by his own judgment: but the Bible with its "Thus saith the Lord" instructs us that man is to believe certain things concerning God and that God, not man, determines man's duty.

#### Review of Doctrine and Duty

It would be well to read the succeeding answers in the Catechism and to classify them under the headings: (1) What man is to believe concerning God and (2) What duty God requires of man. It would be profitable, also, to consider whether some or all of the answers could be classified under both headings. This exercise should give us a good review of important Scripture teachings and should help us to see how closely what man is to believe, the doctrines of the

Bible, and the duty (or the life) required by God are related.

#### Doctrine and Life

There is a tendency today, in some circles, to deny the importance of Biblical doctrines, and to exalt a false conception of the Christian life. Many think that our views of God are of no vital consequence; all that really matters, they hold, is that we try to live the sort of life that they imagine a purely human Jesus lived. They exhort us to follow the "Jesus way of life."

We cannot agree with such persons that beliefs can properly be divorced from life.

It is helpful for us to note that the answer to the third question of the Catechism mentions doctrine, what man is to believe, first; and duty, or life, second. In so doing the Catechism is in accord with the Scriptural teaching that doctrine logically precedes life and the performance of good works.

Consider what John says with regard to his purpose in writing the fourth gospel: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." Without doctrine there is no possibility of life or of the performance of really good works, which are the fruit of a true and living faith.

ences as unimportant? Consider the Epistle to the Galatians.

3. Is it possible for those who do not believe in Christ to perform works pleasing unto God?

4. What is the relationship between faith and eternal life?

5. What is the relationship between faith and good works?

6. Study the Sermon on the Mount. Do you find any doctrines in it? What view of the person and work of Christ might we properly form from reading it?

7. Why do you suppose the preaching of the gospel, the telling of the story of our Lord Jesus, has been effective in the transformation of countless lives? Why do not the purely ethical discourses of brilliant unbelievers have the same effect in the transformation of lives?

8. Is it possible for Christians to become perfect on this earth? If not, is there any excuse for Christians sinning?

9. What does I Corinthians 15 tell us about the gospel Paul preached?

10. Does the Bible instruct us as to our duty in every circumstance of life?

11. What is the Great Commission? Should a missionary attempt to teach the heathen anything? If so, what? Would it be sufficient for him merely to live a good life in their midst? Is it necessary for us to testify with our words as to the nature and work of Christ? Can we be used by God in winning men to Christ if we merely "live a good life" among them and never tell them about Christ?

12. Is it our duty to believe what the Scriptures teach about God?

### LESSON 7

QUESTION 4. What is God?

ANSWER. God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth.

#### God Is a Spirit

The answer to the third question of the Shorter Catechism informed us that the Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man. The fourth question opens the great section of the Catechism dealing with what man is to believe concerning God.

We are rightly told in answer to the question What is God? that God

is a Spirit. "God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John 4:24). God is, accordingly, of a distinct substance from matter. "A spirit is not a mere attribute, or quality," Dr. James Harper has said, "but a substance, that is, something in which qualities inhere." When the Bible applies to God terms that would ordinarily be applied to the material we must not take them literally.

"Now the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their bones flesh, not spirit. When the Lord shall stretch out his hand, both he that helpeth shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall down . . ." Isaiah 31:3.

As Spirit, God is invisible. (Luke 24:39 and John 1:18) He has life in Himself.

#### Infinite

God is without limit in His Being. He is unbounded in all His qualities. "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised; and his greatness is unsearchable" (Psalm 145:3).

"Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" (Job 11:7).

God is everywhere present. "Undivided," He "is present in every point of space." He is not confined by space or definitely fixed at a given time in some one place: but "He fills all space with the whole of His being."

"Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?"

### THE SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

of The Presbyterian Church of America convenes in Philadelphia from November 12th to 15th. We urge every member to plan to attend if at all possible. All sessions will be held in the auditorium of the Manufacturers' and Bankers' Club, Broad and Walnut Streets.

Attention is especially directed to the important meeting for women to be held on Friday at 2 P. M. in the New Century Club, 124 South 12th Street. It is hoped that many will attend.

If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there.

If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;

Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." (Psalm 139:7-10)

#### Eternal

God is in no way limited by time. With God there has been no beginning. There will be no end. And there is no "succession of moments." He is eternal. His eternity is not merely indefinitely extended time—it is a perfection altogether distinct from time.

#### Unchangeable

The perfect all-glorious, independent, infinite, eternal God, cannot change. "For I am the Lord, I change not." (Malachi 3:6.) With God "there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." (James 1:17) "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever; the thoughts of his heart to all generations." (Psalm 33:11)

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

##### 1. Comparison:

In the light of such Scriptural teaching concerning God as we have just summarized how do the conceptions of their gods formed by non-Christians impress us? What differences are there between the true God revealed in the Bible and the impersonal gods that some theorists today are willing to give a place in their thinking? How do we finite and sinful creatures appear? Can we dare to place our will above God's? Dare we serenely "patronize" God, take His name in vain, and leave Him out of our thinking? Compare Lesson 2.

2. Can we expect to understand everything about God?

3. If we do not understand everything about God, how can we know anything?

4. What is meant by the statements in Scripture that God "repents"? Does this mean that God changes His eternal purposes?

5. Find Scripture verses dealing with the attributes of God mentioned in the answer to question 4 of the Shorter Catechism.

6. Can believers find comfort in the fact that God is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable?

## The Sunday School Lessons

By the REV. R. LAIRD HARRIS

**November 22nd, An Ambassador in Chains. Acts 25:1-12; 28:16-31. Rom. 5:1-11. Phil. 1:12-14; 4:22.**



Mr. Harris

THE last few chapters of the Book of Acts tell what would be to some a tragic story. Paul, the veteran of the cross, who had travelled far and wide to preach the gospel of Christ, is confined to a jail in Jerusalem among the people for whom he labored, and then is kept bound at Rome. Tradition completes the picture with the account of his eventual martyrdom there. Paul, the warrior for Christ, is now himself taken captive. You remember that he was imprisoned after the uproar in Jerusalem when the hated word "Gentile" threw the mob into a frenzy, and that his confinement without the benefit of trial dragged out for two years. Paul at last seems weary of the delay and when Festus, obviously catering to the Jews, asks if he will return to Jerusalem to his court there, Paul in dramatic fashion appeals to Caesar's judgment seat at Rome. Strange it is, but true, that Paul could count on more justice from the heathen Caesar than from the Jewish leaders with all their show of false piety.

The picture at first glance seems pathetic. But Paul himself cuts no pitiful figure. He might be hindered or hampered in his work, but he never forgot what his mission was, and even in confinement acted the part of a true ambassador. He could no longer go to the synagogue, but he could and did invite the Jews to come to him. With indefatigable zeal he overcame the difficulties, although for him to preach now under the nose of a hostile government some would have called suicidal. Many were the arguments that could have been raised in favor of Paul's keeping quiet and those same arguments are still current. He could have done more good later, one would say. He wasn't witnessing in the right way, another would add. But Paul in hardship and in danger of his life thinks only of his duty to preach, first

to the Jews who had imprisoned him and then to the Gentiles to whom was his special calling. Far less hardship than this has sidetracked many a man from the Gospel ministry or silenced the testimony of many a Christian. But let us grasp Paul's idea that we are ambassadors who have a mission not dependent on even the benediction of the state. And that mission we must carry out, if need be unto death. It was not easy, either, for Paul to preach in the face of opposition. He asked for prayer that utterance might be given him, that he might open his mouth and speak boldly as he ought to speak (Eph. 6:19, 20). Do we realize that in the last few years literally hundreds of Christ's ministers have been placed in such a situation? We all know that for several years it has been ecclesiastical suicide to give a complete and effective testimony to the gospel as distinct from error in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., but I am thinking of foreign countries where persecution has again begun and where to preach faithfully is accounted treason and therefore a capital offense. What would we do in Paul's position? Would we fly the flag of expediency or would we be true ambassadors for the Lord Christ, resisting as Paul did even unto the death? Our actions in such a crisis will depend upon our belief. If preaching is to us a profession or Christianity medicine for our feelings we will know when to keep silence. But if we are true men with a mission we will never hoist the flag of truce.

The triumph of Paul's bonds is also apparent. It is often said that you cannot keep a good man down, but of course you can. It is absolutely impossible, however, to restrain the witness of the almighty God. A good salesman can easily have reverses. But opposition cannot bind the gospel any more than Rome could seal the tomb of Christ. Paul was in chains but the Word prevailed even in Caesar's household (Phil. 4:22) and Rome became very early a strong center of the Church. It was easy for God to magnify the words of Paul though he could not have a large audience. God's

amplifiers could and did make the capital ring with the message. It was during this period that the so-called prison epistles were also written, which have preached in the years since to many another soul caught in the darker prison of sin. Let us never be dismayed at opposition. It has often come, but "Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them" (II Kings 6:16). Christ told us that we are to expect nothing but opposition from those that crucified our Master, "but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

Just what was the source of Paul's zeal, comfort, and triumph? He had already told the Romans years before in the words of our Scripture lesson (Rom. 5): We who were sinners have been by the blood of Christ, God's Son, saved from God's wrath and reconciled to Him (vs. 8-10). Being justified we have the fruits of salvation: peace with God, assurance of His love suffusing our hearts, and hope in His glorious appearing (vs. 1-5). These are considerations that outlast the floods of life and conquer the fears of death. These were the credentials of Paul, Christ's ambassador in bonds.

### November 29th, Christian Brotherhood. Philemon.

Two words need to be emphasized in our lesson topic this time, especially in view of present-day conditions in the churches of the world. The first word for emphasis is the word "Christian"; the second is "Brotherhood."

Those who have watched present-day trends know that practically all Modernists agree in this one creed: the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Brotherhood is to them a fetish, not the brotherhood of faith or of a common salvation, however, but just the brotherhood of humanity. Notice, however, that our lesson has no mention of that sort of brotherhood. The common salvation is the basis of the apostle's appeal for the favor of Philemon. The universal brotherhood of man is not so much as hinted at. The reason why Paul expects Philemon's favorable response is that Philemon is a Christian owing all, in fact, to Paul's preaching, humanly speaking, just as did Onesimus also. Paul further groups himself with the runaway slave by calling himself in the first verse a "prisoner" of Jesus Christ, echoing the thought of I Cor. 7:22: "For he that is called in the

Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman, likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant." Petty human distinctions of class and station fade into nothingness under the blaze of the glory of the pre-eminence of the Lord Jesus Christ, whose we are and whom we serve.

But we cannot say of non-Christians that the pre-eminence of the Lord draws us closer together, because it is just there that we differ. Although we can and should have contacts with non-Christians, still the deeper we delve into the realities of life, the wider we find the chasm that separates us. Men who differ about the weather can preserve real friendship, men who differ in politics often do not make such good companions, and people who differ consciously on the fundamentals of religion cannot long walk together. There is a deep and precious brotherhood of Christian friends which cannot exist with outsiders. Friendships with non-believers necessarily have an end. Christian brotherhood lasts forever. It seems therefore that this lesson would teach us not to expect real brotherhood from the unsaved. And the universal brotherhood of man is as false a goal as the universal fatherhood of God is a pernicious doctrine. By the clear teaching of Scripture, which is stated clearest of all by Calvinists, not all men are saved. If therefore there is to be a real world brotherhood it must be a fellowship of the damned which to be mentioned is to be abhorred.

Other Bible passages support this important doctrine. The Old Testament is full of the teaching that God's people are to be a peculiar people separated unto Him and not to intermingle with the heathen nations 'round about. The love of Christian for Christian was what Jesus said should be the distinguishing mark of His disciples (John 13:35). Love for others may be important and is commanded also, but the deep love and abiding friendship of the people of God must be given to fellow servants of Christ and to them alone. Paul gives this express command in II Cor. 6:14, 15, which some believe forbids only intermarriage with unbelievers: "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for . . . what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" It would seem that Paul here forbids not only mixed marriage, however, but also all serious friendships with the unsaved which

have so often chilled the devotion of God's children. It only remains to guard the doctrine in the words of Christ who commands us to love our enemies and do them good (Matt. 5:44, 45) even as our Father in heaven makes His sun to shine on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust. But that love cannot be brotherhood, for God Himself who, by common grace blesses the wicked for a time, even now recognizes the unjust as "children of the wicked one" (Matt. 13:38).

The other lesson of true brotherhood among Christians is likewise easily forgotten. Paul, Onesimus, and Philemon were far apart in many respects. But they were brothers in Christ. One was a slave, one an educated apostle high in learning and of noble genealogy, one a man probably well off in this world's goods. But they were united in the common faith. Christ had died for all three. It was by such teaching that "Le Maréchal" of Salvation Army fame had a French boy black a German's boots in days when national hatred was at a peak. There are many negroes, Jews, and foreigners in our own country whom the world despises, but with us they are one, as Philemon and Onesimus were one, in the Lord Christ. Christian brotherhood transcends distinctions of class, nation, race and culture: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

Another consideration which should make us think is that this brotherhood extends to *all* Christians. The reason for it is that we are saved by Christ and therefore it should extend to all who will be found in heaven. In our zeal for purity let us not forget that there are hosts of Christians who, though they are in serious error on some points, have yet been saved by God's electing grace. These, though we feel them to be misguided, are our Christian brothers and are to be treated as such. There are thousands among intelligent Roman Catholics, or among the small sects which we view as extremely erroneous, who are truly saved and therefore deserving of our real brotherhood. We in The Presbyterian Church of America who have been drawn together by the closest ties should certainly be conscious of the communion of the saints. But our own strong association must not

blind our eyes to the fact that not only we as a special group, but all those for whom Christ died, are precious in His sight and are to be treated with utmost Christian courtesy. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have *love* one to another."

## NEW BIBLE SCHOOL FOUNDED BY WESTMINSTER STUDENTS

ON TUESDAY, October 27th, a Bible School was launched which it is hoped will grow until it fills the need for a true and thorough Presbyterian Bible School in the Philadelphia area. Many have felt the need for such a school definitely committed to Reformed doctrine and thorough in its teaching. The recently-organized Christ Presbyterian Church of The Presbyterian Church of America offered the use of its quarters at 1610 Oxford Street and students from Westminster Theological Seminary agreed to serve as instructors.

At present the Presbyterian Bible School of Philadelphia is starting modestly. Classes are scheduled from 7:30 to 9:30 on Mondays and Tuesdays, with three periods each evening. The curriculum is planned for a three-year cycle which may be begun at any time yet will present the fundamental theological studies to all who take the entire course. A partial course may be taken, however, and credit will be given for the work completed.

The courses are especially designed for young people, yet several adults have already asked to come and have been welcomed. Such basic courses as New and Old Testament, Theology, Church History, Missions, and elementary Greek are being offered this year. In following years the study in New Testament and Old Testament and Theology will be continued and other courses such as Apologetics and Teacher Training will be offered. About nine students have already enrolled, but registrations will be received until the middle of November.

The school asks the prayers and cooperation of others in The Presbyterian Church of America who see the need for more opportunity for education of our lay people in the faith.

**PRESBYTERY OF CALIFORNIA  
APPROVES THREE OVERTURES  
RECEIVES ONE CHURCH**

**Two Additional Churches Present  
Applications for Admission**

**A**T ITS meeting on October 21st, the Presbytery of California of The Presbyterian Church of America adopted three overtures to the Second General Assembly and one resolution addressed to THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN. The full text of the resolution and the overture concerning the same question will be found on page 55 of this issue.

The texts of the other two overtures are as follows:

October 22, 1936.

The Presbytery of California respectfully overtures the General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America, meeting in Philadelphia, in November, 1936, as to the Revision of 1903.

We desire to go on record before our brethren as warmly approving the tenor of discussion of the Revision of 1903, as given in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for September 26, 1936, pages 247-251.

We too see clearly the Arminian and anti-Reformed character of that Revision. To us it represents not a compromise with a body of Christians known as the Cumberland Presbyterians, but a compromise with the infallible and inerrant Word of God, and the sacred truths of its doctrines committed to us.

We have all confidence in the direction of God's Spirit in the coming Assembly, and we are strongly convinced that it will be His pleasure to lead our people to the careful exclusion of the theological error and scriptural unfaithfulness mirrored in the Revision of 1903.

Yours respectfully,

*The Presbytery of California  
of  
The Presbyterian Church of America*  
WM. HARLLEE BORDEAUX,  
Stated Clerk.

October 22, 1936.

Mindful of the property losses which are now being suffered by many Presbyterian congregations because of their fidelity to the Word of God and loyalty to the person of the Lord Jesus Christ and their courageous departure from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. to enter upon a field of ministry, either as Independent Churches or members of The Presbyterian Church of America, it therefore seems wise to the Presbytery of California of The Presbyterian Church of America to urge upon the General Assembly, meeting in Philadelphia in November of this year, the prayerful consideration of the question as to how the property of the individual church

can be safeguarded in such a manner that its control remain permanently in the hands of those members of the congregation who adhere and are loyal to "the faith once delivered to the saints" and the doctrinal standards of our Church.

Yours respectfully,

*The Presbytery of California  
of  
The Presbyterian Church of America*  
WM. HARLLEE BORDEAUX,  
Stated Clerk.

The application of the Grace Church, Independent, of Pasadena, for admission to the presbytery was, upon recommendation of the Credentials Committee, unanimously accepted. It will in the future be known as the Grace Presbyterian Church. The Credentials Committee also received the application of the Covenant Presbyterian Church of Berkeley and the Belvedere Gardens Tabernacle of Los Angeles. The pastor of the latter church is the Rev. Donald K. Blackie, Moderator of the Presbytery of California. It was also reported that the University Presbyterian Church, under the pastorate of the Rev. Milo F. Jamison, had unanimously voted to make immediate application for membership.

The entire presbytery concurred in sending the following message to all other presbyteries:

October 22, 1936.

*To the Presbyteries of The Presbyterian  
Church of America:*

Greetings from the Presbytery of California! We recently received such greetings from the new Presbytery of Ohio, and you may be sure that it was a glad word.

Our organization took place on September 10th. We are all agreed that we have never enjoyed such fellowship in our Lord as we are knowing in these blessed days. Weekly we are meeting for prayer and profitable discussion. Each week beholds an increasing attendance, enthusiasm, and oneness in our precious Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Starting with six ministers and one elder, we now have nine ministers and eleven elders. No one is entering (or being encouraged to do so) except such as have counted the cost, who feel definitely led of God to stand with us for the purity of the Gospel, and who are doctrinally honest in adherence to our beloved Church.

We are urging upon our presbyters the sending of names of persons who might wisely be contacted, and any other information which might be serviceable to you brethren in the other presbyteries. We solicit this same help from you. Above all, we thank you for your ministry of intercession for us: that with the perfect guidance, and in the energy of the Holy Spirit everything shall be said and done. We assure you of our constancy of earnest prayer for you, collectively and individually.

We join you in zeal for the salvation of souls, for the building up of those who are numbered in the household of the Faith, and for withstanding resolutely every device of our great adversary, the Devil, by which he would assail God's Word and bring men to the dishonoring of Jesus Christ. Especially, do we rejoice with you in the consciousness that we are laborers together with God in tasks where His grace alone is sufficient. Precious to His saints is their leaning on the everlasting arms.

Yours in our Great Prophet, Priest, and King,

THE PRESBYTERY OF CALIFORNIA.

*Ministers*

D. K. BLACKIE	SAMUEL SUTHERLAND
L. H. JAMISON	M. L. THOMAS
M. F. JAMISON	LYNN WADE
C. S. KIM	W. H. BORDEAUX
	E. H. OSBORNE

*Elders*

SAM BRAWLEY	J. W. LUDLOW
J. R. BURNS	H. H. MOORE
S. R. EARNEST	J. M. ROBERTSON
I. S. HANNA	R. G. ROHRER
C. W. HOLBROOK	W. H. WILLIAMS
	O. L. JACOBI

**INDEPENDENT BOARD BULLETIN  
ANNOUNCES NEW FEATURE**

**T**HE *Independent Board Bulletin*, well-known and highly valued monthly publication of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, has announced a new regular feature to be introduced in the issue of January, 1937. This will consist of a wealth of mission study material specifically designed for use in missionary societies.

This material will include outline missionary studies in the Book of Acts, by Dr. Floyd E. Hamilton, Independent Board missionary in Korea; a six-months' study of Manchoukuo, by the Rev. Henry W. Coray, including its history, geography, culture, ethnic divisions, religions, and the opportunities and obstacles which it presents to the preaching of the gospel; definite suggestions for prayer and Bible study; and the recommendation of a basic missionary text book and biography for the coming year.

*The Independent Board Bulletin* has announced that it will accept subscriptions for packages of ten or more copies sent to one address at the rate of 30 cents for each yearly subscription. THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN is glad of this opportunity to urge all churches, missionary societies and study groups to take advantage of this remarkable offer.

## PRESBYTERY OF NORTHWEST HOLDS INITIAL MEETING; RECEIVES FOUR MEMBERS

THE Presbytery of the Northwest was convened for its first meeting at Corvallis, Oregon, on Tuesday, October 25th, following a public rally. The Rev. Robert K. Churchill, the Rev. Glenn Coie, the Rev. J. Edward Blair, and elder William R. Sibley were received as members of the new body.

Mr. Churchill was elected moderator and Mr. Coie was chosen stated clerk.

Petitions of entrance into the presbytery were received from the Calvary Presbyterian Church of Seattle, Washington, and the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Bend, Oregon. The church at Seattle has been recently formed and, by unanimous action of its elders and congregation, voted to join the presbytery. The story of the formation of the church at Bend will be found elsewhere in these news pages.

Mr. Blair was elected commissioner to the Second General Assembly. After adopting a resolution warning all other religious bodies against any attempt to discipline any members of the presbytery, the meeting adjourned to be reconvened at the call of the moderator.

## PENNSYLVANIA CHURCH BEGINS WORK ON NEW BUILDING

ON MONDAY, October 19th, the Harrisville (Pa.) Presbyterian Church of America began excavation for a new church building. The members plan to provide the labor themselves as far as possible and, temporarily, to complete only the essential portions of the structure.

Faced with the grim alternative of erecting a building or ceasing to exist as a congregation, this new group under the guidance of the Rev. Robert L. Atwell plans to erect a modest frame structure and expects to have it ready for occupancy before cold weather arrives. Although the congregation is but a few months old and without funds there is every indication that they will be blessed in this venture of faith. Even before the

building plans were made public, a Pittsburgh friend had sent one hundred dollars for the work of the group.

The congregation hopes that used pews can be secured at a reasonable price, and asks that if any reader knows of pews now available he notify them through the office of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN.

## SON OF FORMER PROFESSOR IN PRINCETON SEMINARY LEAVES OLD ORGANIZATION

### Bernardus H. Vos Resigns from First Church, Princeton

ON SEPTEMBER 30th Mr. Bernardus H. Vos, because his conscience would no longer permit him to remain in the body styled the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., tendered his resignation to the session of the First Presbyterian Church of Princeton, New Jersey. Mr. Vos is the son of Geerhardus Vos, Ph.D., D.D., formerly Professor of Biblical Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. His letter of resignation is quoted in full:

TO THE SESSION OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY:

Inasmuch as it appears from the actions of the One Hundred Forty-eighth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., held at Syracuse, New York, in May, 1936, that said Assembly and said Church are at this time controlled by an apostate group not primarily concerned with the spread of the evangelical gospel of "that wonderful redemption, God's remedy for sin"—not primarily concerned with *truth* as revealed in Scripture; and inasmuch, further, as it has become apparent to Bible-believing Christians who accept the accounts of Scripture as truth inspired of God, that the future course of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. under the leadership of the above-mentioned apostate group will be an ever-increasing tendency towards deviation from revealed truth; and inasmuch, further, as the final state of any such deviation from revealed truth must of necessity be that of an institution concerned only with social betterment, and in no wise concerned with the state of the sinner's soul before his righteous Creator:

Therefore, the undersigned member of The First Presbyterian Church of Princeton, New Jersey, has become convinced that, as a Bible-believing Christian, his conscience will no longer allow him to continue as a member of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Pursuant, therefore, to the provisions

of Chapter VII, Section 53 of the Book of Discipline as contained in the 1924 edition of The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, it is requested that the name of the undersigned be erased from the roll of membership of The First Presbyterian Church of Princeton, New Jersey, effective on that date which is given at the head of this letter.

Yours very truly,  
BERNARDUS H. Vos.

Mr. Vos is now a member of the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Grove City, Penna., which is affiliated with The Presbyterian Church of America. In commenting upon a recent accusation that pressure is being brought to bear to secure members for the new organization, Mr. Vos said that no one had so much as suggested that he make this move, but that loyalty to his sovereign Lord had demanded it.

## THE REV. J. LYLE SHAW ASSUMES CHARGE OF WORK IN NEWPORT, KENTUCKY

ON SUNDAY, October 4th, the Rev. J. Lyle Shaw took permanent charge of the Community Presbyterian Chapel of Newport, Kentucky. Mr. Shaw is a charter member of the Presbytery of Ohio of The Presbyterian Church of America.

During the past twelve years he has labored in the ministry in Cleveland. Previous to his work in Cleveland, Mr. Shaw held pastorates in Utica, Pa., Eau Claire, Pa., and Toronto, Ohio. He is a graduate of Franklin College where he also received his Master's Degree, and of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary.

The Community Chapel was founded one year ago by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Druck of Newport. Upon joining The Presbyterian Church of America, Mr. and Mrs. Druck turned the chapel over to the care of that organization. A growing evangelistic work at the chapel is expected with the acquisition of a permanent pastor.

On the opening Sunday Mr. Shaw spoke on the subject: The Resources of God. In the evening many of the Newport congregation joined the Cincinnati group, meeting in the Walnut Hills Baptist Church, to hear the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge. His subject was: Weighed in the Balance, and Found Wanting.



## STANLEY JONES FINDS GOAL OF PREACHING MISSION KINGDOM OF GOD ON EARTH

IN A radio address delivered at the opening of the National Preaching Mission, Stanley Jones, perhaps the most prominent of the preachers, showed clearly that as far as he is concerned, its goal is conceived as on typically modernist lines:

We come then with no cheap nostrum to hand out, offering lightly to heal our country's ills. The physician of the Dalai Lama, the spiritual and temporal ruler of Thibet, gives him pills periodically "to renew his vitality and to make his body shine." We have no such pills in our satchels. We have no ready-made solution to the world's problems. When I asked Harnack, the great German scholar, what the Christian solution of a certain problem was, he replied: "Christianity provides no solutions; it gives a goal and power to move on to that goal." That is our position and outlook. We believe we see the goal and we believe that men can get hold of the power to move on to that goal. That goal is the Kingdom of God on earth. The Kingdom of God is a new order standing at the door of the lower order. This higher order, founded on love, justice, good-will, brotherhood, redemption, stands confronting this lower order founded on selfishness, exploitation, unbrotherliness, with its resultant clash and confusions. This higher order is breaking into, renewing, cleansing, redeeming the lower order, both within the individual and the collective will, wherever we allow it. It will finally replace this lower order, for it is God's order, the ultimate way to live. Everything else breaks itself upon the moral facts of the universe.

His analysis of the need of our times for the "gospel" of the Mission is also illuminating:

That we need both a goal and a power, and need them desperately, is seen from the following diagnosis of our national need by a very acute observer, who says: "We are suffering from a three-fold malady: 1. Lack of direction; 2. Lack of motivation; 3. Poor morale."

First, a lack of direction—we have missed the way, we are confused. Our forefathers spoke of "lost souls." We can speak again of a generation being "lost," perhaps with deeper meaning, for men have lost their hold on God, their moral bases decayed and the future veiled in awful mists. Yes, this generation in large measure is a "lost" generation. For many of the external authorities, the Church, the Bible, the family, the State, have decayed in many minds and it has left them with no sense of direction.

Second, a lack of motivation—many of the old motives in religion and morals are gone or going, the desire for Heaven, the fear of Hell, the burden of evil. These

motivations have become dimmed and nothing has arisen to take their places. Men are needing a new compelling motivation that will gather up all their loyalties and give them direction and meaning and purpose.

Third, poor morale. With the loss of the sense of direction and confused motivation, the moral and spiritual morale is at a low ebb. Men cannot move unless they are sure that they know where they want to go. A fatalism has settled upon the wills of many and has paralyzed them. Men need power to lift them up out of themselves, out of the sense of futility, out of the weary round of sin. In other words, men need desperately to get hold of something that will prove to them to be a Saviour from themselves and their futilities and their sins.

The solution he finds in "the power of Christ" and he declares that there is need of individual and national re-birth—a definite moral and spiritual change. And he speaks of "that greater Cross where a Man's message was Himself speaking in deathless tones through a redemptive death." However, he never gets beyond such typically modernist vagueness. His conception of sin and of the goal of Christ's work being so unbiblical, one can hardly expect his cure—indeed he says Christianity provides no cure—to be true to the Bible.

## NEW CHURCH ORGANIZED BY CALIFORNIA GROUP

ON FRIDAY, October 23rd, thirty persons gathered in a private home in Highland Park, California, to band themselves together as a particular church of The Presbyterian Church of America. The meeting was addressed by the Rev. Samuel Sutherland, of the Presbytery of California.

A statement of renunciation of the jurisdiction of the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. was then circulated among the group, together with an act of association as a church and an application for membership in the Presbytery of California. Sixteen of those present signed immediately, and many more have already signified their intention to join.

Forty-eight hours after the organizational meeting the first services of the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Highland Park were attended by an enthusiastic and profoundly grateful group. The blessing of God has been manifest throughout the brief but happy existence of this church.

## COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION ISSUES RECOMMENDATION ON REVISION OF 1903

THE Committee on the Constitution appointed by the First General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America, on October 24th issued a tentative report of its work. In it was included a recommendation concerning the changes made in the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1903. The committee was unanimous in recommending to the General Assembly the adoption of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms in the form which they possessed before these changes were made, with the following two exceptions:

- A. We recommend the retention of the change which was made in Chapter XXII, Section III by the omission of the sentence: "Yet it is a sin to refuse an oath touching any thing that is good and just, being imposed by lawful authority"; and
- B. We recommend the retention of the change made in Chapter XXV, Section VI *in so far* as it involved the elimination of the words: "but is that anti-christ, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God." If this recommendation is adopted, Section VI will read as follows: "There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof."

This general recommendation involves the adoption of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms without the following changes which were made by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1903:

- A. Chapters XXXIV and XXXV of the Confession of Faith with their Preamble.
- B. The Declaratory Statement of 1903.
- C. The revision of Chapter XVI, Section VII. In the unrevised form, the section reads:

"Works done by unregenerate men, although, for the matter of them, they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; yet, because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to the word; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore sinful, and cannot please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God. And yet their neglect of them is more sinful, and displeasing to God."

In recommending the elimination of

the sections which are enumerated in the preceding paragraph, the committee stated that it did so on the ground that these changes seriously impair the testimony of the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. to the system of doctrine which is taught in Holy Scripture.

## OPPOSITION FACED BY RECENTLY FORMED CHURCH IN BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

**P**ARTIALLY as a result of the recent visit of the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, a sturdy group has banded itself together to form The Covenant Presbyterian Church of Berkeley, California. This same group had previously formed a chapter of The Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union, making a brave stand against the Modernism and exceedingly great indifference of the old San Francisco Presbytery.

Regular meetings are now being held in Vasa Hall, Addison and Grove Streets, Berkeley. At the opening service on October 11th, twenty-seven were present in the morning and sixteen in the evening. It is quite possible that this group may have to struggle on for some time without a pastor. However, it is very fortunate in having as two of its leaders Mr. David Neilands and Mr. Sankey Oren. Although neither of these young men has studied in a theological seminary, both of them have made a very thorough study of the Reformed Faith. Mr. David Neilands, an elder, will probably conduct the services until a regular pastor can be called. He is an excellent preacher, evangelistic in the very best sense of the word, and wholly devoted to the Reformed Faith.

This little group, which has already applied for admission to the Presbytery of California of The Presbyterian Church of America, faces unusual difficulties as it begins its work. The Presbytery of San Francisco has apparently made every effort to hide the issues from the people. Hence the Covenant Presbyterian Church of Berkeley will be subject to much abuse and ridicule from those who oppose it and yet would hide the truth

from the laity. It is to be hoped that Christian people will remember this brave group in prayer. Those in Berkeley who are interested should communicate with Mr. David Neilands, 1046 Stanford Avenue, Oakland, California.

## PROMINENT MEMBERS LEAVE FIRST CHURCH, PITTSBURGH; UNITE WITH NEW BODY

**M**EMBERS of the family of Mr. Jeremiah B. Griggs, longtime members of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 13th addressed to the pastor, Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney, a lengthy, logical, detailed and irrefutable statement of their convictions concerning the apostasy of the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., and requested that their names be therefore stricken from the rolls of the church.

A small portion of the conclusion of this cogent letter is here quoted:

We are not willing to submit to these [illegal] demands nor to place ourselves back in the abominations of the sixteenth century; we therefore renounce all allegiance to the organization known as the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The only constitutional method to effect this is to withdraw our memberships from the particular congregation of our connection.

In pursuance thereof we respectfully request that you remove our names from the rolls, with the notation "Membership voluntarily withdrawn to unite with The Presbyterian Church of America."

We assure you that it is with deep regret we are obliged to sever our connection with the First Church congregation and to thus bring to a close a family membership of 106 years uninterrupted until now. We owe much of our Christian fellowship and culture to a faithful and able ministry, and a helpful and harmonious friendship throughout the entire time, but from henceforth our fellowship and connection will be, where we have every assurance that it is God's will and purpose, in the new organization solemnly pledged by trustworthy leaders and adherents faithfully to carry on the doctrines of true Presbyterianism, free from the weakening additions and amendments since the year 1902, and free from the doctrines and commandments of men—men, who having corrupted at least eight theological seminaries, are so intolerant and vindictive as to have issued orders to the Presbyteries and Churches that no graduates of the Westminster Theological Seminary (the only thoroughly sound and capable seminary) shall be licensed or ordained unless they pledge unquali-

fied allegiance and support to the present and future policies of the official boards and that no member of The Presbyterian Church of America shall be permitted to appear in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. They have dethroned the Lord Jesus Christ as the Head of the Church in order that in all things they themselves might have the pre-eminence.

JEREMIAH B. GRIGGS  
ADELAIDE L. GRIGGS  
MARTHA B. GRIGGS  
ALICE L. DEFFAA

## INDEPENDENT BOARD APPOINTS MISSIONARIES TO ETHIOPIA

**I**N ADDITION to the appointment of Dr. and Mrs. Floyd E. Hamilton, reported in the last issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, the Executive Committee of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions on October 15th appointed the Rev. and Mrs. James L. Rohrbaugh, of Ethiopia.

Mr. Rohrbaugh was formerly a graduate student at Westminster Seminary. He has been engaged in independent missionary work in Addis Ababa and, at the outset of the Italo-Ethiopian war, became a war correspondent of the United Press. By so doing he was able to reach the front-line trenches with the gospel.

In a recent letter addressed to his friends in the United States Mr. Rohrbaugh made application for membership in The Presbyterian Church of America, and commented upon it, in part, as follows:

The new Church grew out of a movement to preach Christ and Him crucified to those who have never heard. It is based upon the Word of God and its purpose is to preach the Word in its purity and defend it against the onslaughts of unbelief. Though persecuted, maligned and reviled, it is impossible to see how such a movement can fail. If one looks upon the human frailty or numerical weakness of its membership one might say, "Let's wait a bit and see." But it is to the weak that the power of the Spirit is given. There were Gideon's three hundred, the eleven Apostles, and Luther, alone braving the rage of Christendom. With the power of the Spirit this may well be the beginning of a great movement and revival. Without it we are merely a part of the decadent Church which modernists and fundamentalists alike deplore. But truly believing and fearlessly proclaiming we can claim the promises of God and know that power will be given. The whole armor of God is as truly given to men today as of yore.

## NEW JERSEY CHURCH VOTES TO ABANDON ITS PROPERTY

ON SUNDAY, October 18th, the members of the West Collingswood (N. J.), Presbyterian Church, whose pastor is the Rev. William T. Strong, voted to withdraw without further delay from their former church building. The name chosen by the group is "Immanuel Presbyterian Church." Services are now being held in the Crescent Theatre in West Collingswood, a few blocks removed from the former property.

The first services in the new church home were well attended. The Sunday School reported 167 present; an enthusiastic congregation of 180 greeted Mr. Strong at the morning service; and 150 were present in the evening.

Hymnals have already been donated and a communion set was offered by one of the members. A sense of relief and freedom was generally enjoyed, since the church has now left behind it the heckling minority of obdurate stand-patters.

## WILLOW GROVE CHURCH HOLDS ENTHUSIASTIC OPENING SERVICES

### Dr. Machen Brings Message of Welcome to New Church

THE Calvary Presbyterian Church of Willow Grove, Pa., most recent but largest of the churches enrolled in the Presbytery of Philadelphia, held its initial services Sunday, October 18th, in Memorial Hall, Willow Grove.

Said the pastor, the Rev. Robert Strong: "We had a great opening day: 201 at Bible School, 193 at the morning service, 154 in the evening, 130 new hymnbooks pledged, a fund for a new communion set raised, new members gained, large giving, and wonderful encouragement."

At the evening service on Sunday, October 25th, the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., Moderator of the First General Assembly, brought the official welcome of the church to

an enthusiastic congregation of more than two hundred. His was a message of encouragement and a call to a renewed and steadfast faith.

During the first three weeks of its existence the Calvary Church has raised over \$500 to care for the special needs attendant upon its removal from the old building. Pulpit furnishings and ninety extra seats have already been provided. On the lips of every member is deep thanksgiving for the Lord's rich blessing.

## TWO SOUTH DAKOTA CHURCHES VOTE TO LEAVE OLD BODY

QUIETLY, with no pronounced opposition, the congregation of the Presbyterian church at Alexandria, South Dakota, whose pastor is the Rev. Jack Zandstra, on October 6th voted 25 to 7 in favor of withdrawing from the organization styled the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. A second resolution was then adopted by a vote of 30 to 2 in favor of retaining the church property.

Although orderly procedure characterized every move there was an attempt made by members of the old presbytery to induce as many as possible to remain "loyal" to the old organization. Four representatives of presbytery were present at the congregational meeting. When given an opportunity to speak they did so with astounding vigor and practically no effect.

The following evening a congregational meeting, planned for Mr. Zandstra's other church at Bridgewater, was temporarily delayed by locked church doors. Undaunted the members secured rooms in the local Commercial Club, discussed presbytery's illegal action, demanded explanations from three members of that body, received none, adjourned. Those favoring prompt withdrawal met at the home of an elder, laid plans for organization and decided to abandon the present property.

Church services are now being held in the Commercial Club rooms. Three of the former four elders and all of the Sunday School teachers have joined the new church. More than 75 persons attended the opening service on October 11th.

## GOSPEL LEAGUE MINISTER LEAVES OLD ORGANIZATION, JOINS NEW PRESBYTERY

THE Rev. Benjamin Mickle Brown, of Chicago, on September 26th, renounced the jurisdiction of the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and, at the first meeting of the Presbytery of Chicago of The Presbyterian Church of America, was admitted to that body. It is interesting to note that Mr. Brown, an officer of Chicago's Gospel League, is a brother of Dr. Henry Seymour Brown, Chairman of the modernist Commission of Nine appointed to deal with Philadelphia and Chester Presbyteries, nominator of Dr. W. C. Covert at the Cleveland General Assembly, and Executive Secretary of the Extension Board of the old Chicago Presbytery.

In a trenchant letter to the church at large, Mr. Brown explains his position and re-affirms his allegiance to the gospel:

September 27, 1936.

Dear Brothers and Sisters in Christ:

Inasmuch as God led me yesterday to sever all official connection with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., and to join the recently organized Presbyterian Church of America, He also leads me to assure you of three facts:

(1) There is no change in my love for God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and for all the sinners for whose salvation Christ shed His precious blood on Calvary's cross.

(2) There is no change in my hearty belief in the Holy Bible as the Word of God and the Gospel of salvation to sinners.

(3) There is no change in my acceptance of the original teachings of the Presbyterian Church in the matter of doctrine, government, and Christian living, and the dedication of my life to the gospel ministry according to my ordination vows.

In obedience to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and in fulfillment of my ordination vows as a Presbyterian minister; in view of what I consider the faithlessness of the old organization to the original doctrines, government, and Christian living of the founders, I am compelled to join the group of faithful protesting Presbyterian leaders who have been unjustly driven from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., as were our fathers from apostate churches in the early Protestant Reformation.

Your loving brother in Christ,

BENJAMIN MICKLE BROWN.

## NEW ENGLAND COMMITTEE ARRANGES WINTER PROGRAM

THE Committee for the Propagation of the Reformed Faith in New England has put into effect its arrangements for the preaching of the gospel in Brownfield, Belfast, Falmouth and Windham, Maine, for the winter months.

The committee has suspended services until next May in Back Narrows, Canaan and Stow, Maine, and Chatham and South Weare, New Hampshire.

The group at East Windham are planning to erect a church building in the spring of the year. The Rev. Dean W. Adair is in charge of the services in Memorial Hall, East Windham, and in Blackstrap School, Falmouth. The attendance at Brownfield reaches one hundred at the evening service. All services are held in the Town Hall and the Rev. Thomas B. Cooper is the preacher. The churches at East Belfast and North Belfast offer excellent opportunities to reach the entire city with the gospel. The Rev. A. Culver Gordon is the preacher.

The work of this committee is a venture of faith and merits the prayers and financial support of those who are anxious that the gospel be preached in this needy field.

## NEW BRUNSWICK PRESBYTERY ATTEMPTS WHITEWASHING

THE United First Church of Amwel, N. J., which, on September 10th, renounced the jurisdiction of the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., has become a focal point of interest in New Brunswick Presbytery. Soon after notice of the resolution of withdrawal was sent to the stated clerk a committee of three members of presbytery called upon the church's elders and interviewed them in their homes. The elders had been misled, said the committee, and the church was not really so very much tainted with Modernism.

The committee sought a meeting with the elders in order that "things" might be talked over and the congregation persuaded to reconsider.

Later that day the session voted

against such a meeting, considering it a definite step of retrogression, and notice of the decision was promptly sent to presbytery's moderator.

Said the pastor, Westminster Seminary student Bruce Wideman, "At the present time all is quiet on the western front, but the silence is ominous and I expect the storm to break at any time."

The church, known locally as the Larison's Corner Church, intends to remain independent until further notice, but will continue to function as in the past.

## CINCINNATI GROUP FORMS TRINITY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AMERICA

The Rev. Everett C. DeVelde  
Chosen Moderator of Session

MEETING on October 21st in the home of their pastor, the Rev. Everett C. DeVelde, more than fifty members of the Cincinnati congregation of The Presbyterian Church of America formally organized the local church. The name chosen by the members was the Trinity Presbyterian Church of America. Mr. DeVelde was chosen Moderator of the session.

Besides the Moderator, the group also elected three elders for three-year terms. They are Harry A. Worcester, Joseph F. Treon, and Theodore Cook Leonard. The Trustees are E. P. Gibson and John Klee-meier; Deaconess, Mrs. Robert Druck, and Deacon, C. A. Schumann. Miss Olive S. Talcott was re-elected treasurer.

On Saturday, October 24th, the new church purchased large space in the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, proclaimed in cogent style and large detail the basic facts of the history, organization and doctrinal stand of The Presbyterian Church of America, minced no words.

Trinity Presbyterian Church of America voted to sponsor the mission work in Newport, Kentucky, described elsewhere in these news columns. The group has met regularly each Sunday at the Hotel Alms' lecture room, and expects to continue to hold services there. Membership and attendance are steadily and gratifyingly increasing.

## MEMBER OF OLD ORGANIZATION ATTACKS BILL OF COMPLAINT

THE following letter published in *The Presbyterian* of October 29th, presents an attitude toward the Bill of Complaint recently filed by the old organization against The Presbyterian Church of America that should prove intensely interesting to every member of the new body:

*Editor The Presbyterian:*

In your issue of September 3, your readers are presented with the full outline of a "Text of Bill of Complaint Against The Presbyterian Church of America"! Sponsored by a committee of our leading ministers and elders, who claim to represent "all other officers and members of the said Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," it seemed to me, as one of that great family, a wise precaution to give this somewhat portentously worded "Complaint" a sufficiently careful study to either endorse or disavow a proceeding for which "all officers and members" are made responsible.

As a sort of "multum in parvo" outline of the forces and activities of the three Churches, Presbyterian, U.S.A., the United Presbyterian, and this latest intruder, "The Presbyterian Church of America," it supplies much useful information in compact form, and for this I am properly grateful. But as a complaint on the part of our great denomination against the comparatively tiny organization, which somewhat egotistically demands the right to march under the obviously top-heavy title, "Presbyterian Church of America," the assertions and charges embodied in the document give me an impression of either "Much Ado About Nothing," of elephantine jitters caused by the presence of a mouse, or, even less complimentary spiritually, of an ecclesiastical vindictiveness which, having done its own best, or worst, now seeks an ally in secular law!

Thus our complainants emphasize at one point that, like the conies, this Machen following "are but a feeble folk," since I read: "The organization and membership of the defendant Church at the present time is largely limited to a few individuals and churches located in Philadelphia County and adjacent areas" (since that writing, Southern California has hatched a Machen presbytery!) yet, if allowed to wear the magic panoply of the new name, "Presbyterian Church of America," what dynamically expansive or conquering qualities these same complainants attribute to the few! "The similarity of the name of the defendant Church to that of the plaintiff Church will cause, and is intended to cause, irreparable injury and loss to the plaintiff Church"! What a welcome revelation of their own powers these words ought to convey to the ousted rebels!

But, one may ask, is this similarity of names, thus denounced and evidently

feared, really any more confusing to intelligent Presbyterians than that of our Southern and Northern Churches, the U. S. and U. S. A.? These mean practically the same thing, yet in my sojourn down South I cannot recall seeing or hearing of Presbyterians who could not distinguish which from the other! But apparently if these Machenites disguise themselves in the ample folds of their chosen name, the present membership of the U.S.A. branch—and why not that of the U.S. branch also?—are fated, if we accept the dolorous outlook of the complainants, to develop an immediate mental collapse, and so become easy victims of

Machen's kidnapers! Not much of a compliment to the usual discriminating ability of Presbyterians!

One also notes how the complaint asserts that "they (Machen et al) renounced their membership in the plaintiff Church"! That they also employed every means of retaining that membership, renouncing it only after expulsion therefrom, is not even mentioned! Or would not the secular court be interested in the militant preliminaries to this establishment of a new Presbyterian organization?

On these grounds I object to any partnership in the complaint, but most of all because, as pointed out by Dr. Barnhouse,

such an appeal to Caesar makes light of Paul's solemn warning against airing Christian quarrels in secular courts. And if successful would it lessen by one iota the zeal of these battling opponents? Quite the contrary. Under some other name they would but redouble their attacks on their mother Church, which not only cast them out of her fold, but also sicked on to them the legal dogs of war. Prosecuted out of their Church, persecuted through secular aid beyond its ecclesiastical bounds; what a powerful incentive to fight!

ROBERT C. McADIE, S.T.M.

## The Presbyterian Guardian on the Air

### "This Week in Religion"

#### A Weekly Broadcast of Religious News

Every Saturday  
5:30 to 5:45 P. M.



Philadelphia  
610 Kilocycles

#### Beginning December 5th

Up-to-the-minute news, flashed by the magic of radio to countless thousands, winging the story of blessing or defeat, of faithfulness or denial, of triumph or a call to arms—all these, and much more, will fill the new Saturday evening broadcast period sponsored by THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN.

"This Week in Religion" will interpret, from the vantage-point of our Reformed heritage, all the wealth of important events now on the religious horizon. It will not confine itself to Presbyterian news alone, nor will it be limited by any geographical boundaries. Instead it will reach out to the four corners of the earth and into every denominational sphere, bringing to its listeners the ever new and ever fascinating saga of the March of Christianity.

PLAN TO LISTEN

TELL YOUR FRIENDS

## MOODY INSTITUTE PLANS CENTENARY OF FAMOUS FOUNDER

**T**HROUGH a series of international Moody Centenary celebrations the thinking of the Christian world will be directed in 1937 toward D. L. Moody and the work he established while engaged in his intensive evangelistic crusades.

Foremost in the observation of the Centenary of D. L. Moody's birth will be The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, established by him in 1886. Through its British Centenary Committee, of which the Marquis of Aberdeen is the President, Sir Leon Levison the Chairman, and Maurice Erlington the Secretary, together with many outstanding Christian leaders of Great Britain, plans are now being formulated for a simultaneous observance of the Centenary overseas. Among the American preachers and teachers who will represent the Moody Bible Institute in Great Britain will be Dr. Harry A. Ironside, Evangelist "Mel" Trotter, Dr. Max I. Reich, and Dr. Will H. Houghton. Meetings are being arranged for in the principal cities of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland.

Beginning early in January, a series of metropolitan Bible conferences will be held throughout the United States and Canada. Bishop Taylor Smith, of London, England, who was Chaplain-General of the British forces during the World War and is very close to the Royal Family, a strong evangelical evangelistic leader, Jock Troup, who was the center of the revival among the Scotch fishermen fifteen years ago, and the Rev. Herbert Lockyer, England, who has already become a familiar figure in this country as he has addressed Bible conferences and other gatherings under the auspices of the Moody Bible Institute, will supplement an American team of speakers, which will include Dr. William Evans, of California, Dr. Harry Rimmer, of Duluth, Minn., Dr. Will H. Houghton, and the Rev. Ralph E. Stewart.

These outstanding Christian leaders will speak at each of the metropolitan conferences, tentative plans for which have been made for the following cities: In *Eastern states*, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Pitts-

burgh, Buffalo; *in the South*, Atlanta, Birmingham, Louisville, Nashville, Little Rock, Memphis, San Antonio, Houston; *in Central states*, Chicago (Founder's Week), St. Louis, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Detroit, Cleveland, Kansas City, Tulsa, Wichita; *in the far West*, Seattle, Spokane, Portland, Salem, Eugene, Carson City, Sacramento, Stockton, San Francisco, the Bay cities, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, Tucson, and El Paso. *Among Canadian cities* are: Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver, and Victoria. Other cities will be listed.

Christians everywhere are invited to become prayer partners in this undertaking, to the end that the blessing of God may be upon this Moody Centenary celebration.

## NEW CHURCH ORGANIZED BY OREGON CONGREGATION

### Baptists Offer Use of Building for Organizational Meeting

**F**OLLOWING the farewell sermon of the Rev. Glenn R. Coie, former pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Bend, Oregon, a congregational meeting was called on Sunday, October 18th.

Mr. Coie, in his sermon, had outlined the reasons why he could no longer remain under the jurisdiction of the old organization. At the congregational meeting about fifty per cent. of the members, alert, well-informed, eager, voted to join their pastor. Thereupon was born the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Bend, Oregon, with most of the elders of the old First Church forming the nucleus of a new session.

### Publication Dates of The Presbyterian Guardian

**T**HIS issue of The Presbyterian Guardian is being mailed a few days earlier than usual in order that it may be received before General Assembly. The magazine is regularly published on the second and fourth Saturdays of each month.

The problem of a meeting-place for the Sunday afternoon organizational service was promptly solved by the local Baptist Church, which freely offered the use of its building for that purpose, much to the gratification of the withdrawing group and the dismay of the "stand-patters." It seemed to some that the only course now open to the presbytery and consistent with precedent was to "depose" the Baptists.

Mr. Coie is already a member of The Presbyterian Church of America, and the Westminster Church applied for membership at the first meeting of the Presbytery of the Northwest.

## MONMOUTH PRESBYTERY MOVES AGAINST FORMER MEMBER

**W**HEN the Rev. Leslie A. Dunn, pastor of the church at Columbus, N. J., failed to appear for trial when cited by Monmouth Presbytery's Special Judicial Commission, a committee was appointed to visit him in his home, another committee was instructed to continue investigating the affairs of the church (in spite of the fact that presbytery's jurisdiction had been renounced on July 7th), and the trial was adjourned until October 27th.

First action of the "investigating" committee was the issuing of a call for a congregational meeting. The call, posted on the door of the church, was promptly removed by the members. Mr. Dunn was likewise instructed by his session not to read the notice from the pulpit.

The "visitation" committee, composed of H. Gordon Harold, Charles T. Bates, and A. S. Layman, called on Mr. Dunn on October 5th. Benignly Mr. Layman said that the way was open for Mr. Dunn to re-establish himself in Monmouth Presbytery. Both Mr. Bates and Mr. Harold discussed Mr. Dunn's allegedly "mistaken and unwitting procedure of withdrawal." After much vague talk about "constitutionality," "irregularity" and "illegality," it developed that apparently the main purpose of the visit was to persuade Mr. Dunn to appear and be "deposed" because if he did not they would "depose" him anyway.