

GUARDIAN

Hope Thou in God

(Suggested by Psalm 42)

As panteth the hart after waterbrooks free
So thirsteth my soul, O my God, after thee.
I feast on my tears—day and night they prevail
While tauntings of skeptics my faith oft assail:
 Then seek I God's house with my song's adoration
 For he is my help and my wondrous salvation.

God's waves and his billows in floods o'er me roll—
I cry, "Why forgotten?" in anguish of soul—
Yet sweet lovingkindness by day he conveys
And night brings his song of rejoicing and praise:
 Then look I to him who's my Rock amid strife
 And offer my prayer to the God of my life.

Though all of my enemies ceaselessly cry,
"Oh, where is thy God? Has he now passed thee by?"
Yet why, O my soul, art thou downcast today?
Yes, why so disquieted, filled with dismay?
 Still hope thou in God with thy song's adoration
 For he is thy help and thy wondrous salvation.

R. E. N.

The Judge of All

THEODORE J. GEORGIAN

C. S. Lewis, in the preface to his book, *The Great Divorce*, has this to say concerning the destiny of the world: "We are not living in a world where all roads are radii of a circle and where all, if followed long enough, will therefore draw gradually nearer and finally meet at the center: rather in a world where every road, after a few miles, forks into two, and each of these into two again, and at each fork you must make a decision . . . Good, as it ripens, becomes continually more different not only from evil but from other good . . . Evil can be undone, but it cannot 'develop' into good . . . If we insist on keeping Hell . . . we shall not see Heaven; if we accept Heaven we shall not be able to retain even the smallest and most intimate souvenirs of Hell."

According to the Scriptures, history is moving irresistibly toward a grand finale which will be ushered in by the personal coming again of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. At that time the age-long conflict between Christ and the Devil will end, and our Lord will destroy the Devil and his kingdom of evil. That is the theme and message of the Book of the Revelation. Jesus himself predicted his return in these graphic words: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." To the same effect were the words of the angels to the apostles on the mount of ascension: "Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up into heaven? This Jesus, who was taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven."

No Escape

Squarely based on such biblical teachings is the article of the Apostles' Creed, in which we confess our faith "in Jesus Christ our Lord who . . .

sitteth on the right hand of God the Father almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the living and the dead."

Paul was no fool. If ever there was a sophisticated man he was it. Yet think how Paul preached to the cultured pagans of Athens. Cultured or not, they were ignorant of the true and the living God. Therefore Paul plunged right into his message, proclaiming this God as the only Creator, the God of providence, and the God of judgment. Men ought to know and worship this God. If they are ignorant of him, they ought to repent. Why? Because God has fixed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, whom he has appointed as Judge of all the earth. Such was the gospel according to Paul. Writing to the Thessalonian Church he taught that when Christ comes in power and glory, he will "inflict vengeance on those who do not know God and on those who do not obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. They shall suffer the punishment of eternal destruction and exclusion from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his might."

According to the uniform and pervasive teaching of God's Word, Christ will be the universal Judge. There will be no exemptions, no special passes. Not even death can exempt us from the certainty of final judgment. Nor will the pronouncements of prominent theologians alter the picture. One of these theologians has said: "No visible return of Christ to the earth is to be expected, but rather the long and steady advance of his spiritual kingdom . . . If our Lord will but complete the spiritual coming that he has

We present here the first of a series of articles originally given as radio talks. Mr. Georgian is the pastor of Covenant Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Rochester, N. Y.

begun, there will be no need of a visible event to make perfect his glory on the earth." And another has written: "Not through an abrupt catastrophe . . . but by the slower and surer method of spiritual conquest the ideal of Jesus shall yet win the universal assent which it deserves, and his spirit dominate the world."

Jesus Will Come

Such skepticism is hardly novel. Peter was faced with it in his day. In his Second Letter he wrote: "You must understand this, that scoffers will come in the last days with scoffing, following their own passions and saying, 'Where is the promise of his coming? For ever since the fathers fell asleep, all things have continued as they were from the beginning of creation.' They deliberately ignore this fact, that by the word of God heavens existed long ago, and an earth formed out of water and by means of water, through which the world that then existed was deluged with water and perished. But by the same word the heavens and earth that now exist have been stored up for fire, being kept until the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men."

How many people, even among professing Christians, take biblical Christianity seriously? How many really believe that Christ is coming again, that he is on his way, and that he will be here soon? For remember: "with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." Our Lord himself has promised, "Surely I come quickly." Yet many Christians are living as though they think he will never come. It is difficult enough to communicate the gospel to our world, without Christians alienating the world by not taking their faith more seriously. The thought of the second coming of Christ should shatter our complacency and our casual posture. For the day of the Lord will come unexpectedly, as a thief in the night. "Therefore you must be ready; for the Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect." For this reason, "What sort of persons ought you to be in lives of holiness and godliness, waiting for and hastening (desiring) the coming of the day of God?"

(continued on page 104)

The Presbyterian Guardian is published monthly (except combined in July-August) by the Presbyterian Guardian Publishing Corp., 7401 Old York Rd., Phila., Pa. 19126, at the following rates, payable in advance in any part of the world, postage prepaid: \$3.00 per year (\$2.50 in Clubs of ten or more); \$1.00 for four months; 25c per single copy. Second Class mail privileges authorized at the Post Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

The New Catholicism —

Where Is It Headed?

STUART P. GARVER

Vatican Council II will be remembered more for what it made possible than for what it accomplished. No new and startling doctrines were announced, nor were heretics and heresies assailed as at the Council of Trent in the 16th century or at the First Vatican Council in the 19th century. This council was neither a theological convention nor a witch hunt for false teachers; it was a pastoral council, a clinic for the care and improvement of the Roman Catholic Church. Its constitutions, decrees and declarations are somewhat like the laboratory reports of experts seeking to diagnose the ills that have plagued the Church, the state and man himself. Its pronouncements are pressed upon people as prescriptions for the recovery and rejuvenation of both the Church and its individual members as effective witnesses.

That which appears as neo-Catholicism, therefore, is not a radical alteration of its teaching but a pragmatic shift in action. The theological principles of Catholicism remain, its practices only are to be drastically revised according to guide lines established by the official pronouncements of the Council. As the well known Catholic theologian, Hans Kung, has expressed it:

Catholic reform, being renewal, lies midway between two extremes, revolution and restoration.

It is not revolution; it does not aim at the violent overthrow either of values or authority: it is not bent upon what is new in a doctrinaire, fanatical fashion . . . it is not innovation but *renewal*.

Catholic reform is not restoration; it does not aim lethargically at the maintenance of an old system but courageously advances toward ever greater truth. It has no wish to reestablish old forms, but to discover new forms appropriate to the times. It does not wish . . . to revive some outworn disciplinary system but to renew the Church's institutions from within.

Neo-Catholicism, then, is the attempt of the Roman Catholic Church to accommodate herself to the needs

of the present, to so speak to the modern world that it might draw together unto itself all of mankind into one visible family of faith.

Flexibility

To do this, the Church must keep itself flexible enough to adjust quickly to the constantly changing world situation. It cannot allow itself to be shackled with traditions which would render it powerless to cope with the present social, political or economic life of mankind. The adaptation of Catholic action to world needs, therefore, will not only be gradual but *as unpredictable as history itself*. Only one thing is certain about the new Catholicism: it is determined to confront the modern world with all its vast resources of power and diplomatic know-how. Pope Paul VI himself made this quite clear in his address before the United Nations, saying:

You are a network of relations between states. We would almost say that your chief characteristic is a reflection, as it were, in the temporal world, of what our Church aspires to be in the spiritual field: Unique and Universal.

Having thus viewed the Church and the United Nations as institutional twins, he asked:

Is there anyone who does not see the necessity of coming thus progressively to the establishment of a world authority able to act efficaciously on the juridical and political levels?

The implication is very clear: a world authority acting efficaciously in secular matters, and a world authority acting equally as efficaciously in religious matters. Both authorities, the secular and the religious, face a common challenge:

The hour has struck for our "conversion," for personal transformation, for interior renewal . . . The hour has struck

This address was delivered by Mr. Garver at an annual banquet of friends of Christ's Mission in New York City earlier this year. It is reprinted here by permission.

for a halt, a moment of recollection, of reflection, almost of prayer. A moment to think of our common destiny. Today, as never before, in our era so marked by human progress, there is need for an appeal to the moral conscience of man. For the danger comes, not from progress, not from science. No, the real danger comes from man himself, wielding ever more powerful arms which could be employed equally well for destruction or the loftiest conquests.

What is "new," then, in Roman Catholicism's Vatican Council II? Its determined preparation to confront the world as architect of a modern civilization built upon Roman Catholic spiritual principles, which will at once illuminate and animate all of mankind. As the United Nations, in the words of Pope Paul, "offers an extremely simple and fruitful formula of coexistence" so the Roman Catholic Church is in search for an extremely simple and fruitful formula for the coexistence of all men of faith and all religious communities.

These determined preparations may be seen in three specific areas dealt with by the bishops. Those areas of preparatory change are seen:

- I. In the Structure of the Church.
- II. In the Strategy of the Church.
- III. In the Sacred Theology of the Church.

I. THE CHANGES IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE CHURCH

The Roman Catholic Church of the sixteenth century was dominated by an aristocratic monarchy. The powerful Curia or supreme court of the Church was under the control of wealthy families such as the Borgias, the Medicis and the della Roveres. The Jesuit scholar, R. E. McNally relates that: "Ecclesiastical and family interests were interlaced as a (church)

An interpretation of recent changes within the Roman Catholic Church

policy. With the conclaves of this epoch of (Catholic history) the 'capitulations' as signed and sealed pacts point invariably toward the interests of the families in the Curia." So corrupt were the aristocratic Cardinals that Pope Leo X and Pope Paul III were forced to break the power of the Curia by appointing 31 new cardinals. It is true that worthy men from any class or social level could be admitted to any ecclesiastical position. The fact remains, however, that the control of the Church rested in the hands of the aristocrats.

This idea of an aristocratic monarchy was reflected in the missionary expansion programs of the Church. The principle which insisted "the religion of the prince shall be the religion of the people" led Catholic missionaries to evangelize the ruling class of a nation first, and the poor and needy second. The concept of evangelism was simply, "Get the prince and you will secure the people!" There were exceptions to this rule, of course, but the general practice prevailed. The Church was a monarchy led by aristocrats and it functioned largely for their social and economic advantage. "Fundamentally," writes Felix M. Cappello in an article on the public jurists of the Roman Church, "the government of the Church of Rome will never change, for, according to the teaching of that Church, Christ willed that it be monarchic since he gave all power to St. Peter, constituting him as the Head of the Church which He came upon earth to establish."

Papal Primacy

At the First Vatican Council the monarchical power of the papacy was further established by defining the primacy and personal infallibility of the Pope himself. He exercises supreme authority in doctrinal matters and without his approval no changes in present doctrines nor any new definitions of theological dogma may be promulgated. As Pope he exercises the fullest powers over all the clergy and laity, and may also determine the measures to be taken to silence men who propound unorthodox views. In the decree on the Office of the Bishops, Vatican Council II clearly states that bishops, too, are the successors of the apostles and share with the Pope full

teaching and pastoral authority. Nevertheless, the decree carefully insists that:

Together with its head, the Roman Pontiff, and never without this head, the bishops exist as the subject of supreme, plenary power over the Universal Church. But this power cannot be exercised except with the agreement of the Roman Pontiff.

The structural changes of the Roman Church made possible by Vatican Council II, therefore, are briefly these:

A) *A decentralization of administrative functions and an internationalizing of its policy-making body.*

The Roman Curia has for centuries exercised full authority over the entire Church. Bishops scattered over the earth had little or nothing to say about its decisions. Furthermore, the Curia was controlled almost entirely by Italian prelates whom the rest of the bishops felt were too restricted in their world outlook to effectively administer the affairs of the Church in distant lands.

To correct this two-fold criticism of the Curia — its exclusive authority to decide questions of Church administration and its narrow nationalistic viewpoint — the Pope outlined a five-point program for reform:

- 1.) The Curia needs "a larger supranational vision."
- 2.) It must be "educated with a more accurate ecumenical preparation."
- 3.) The Curia "will not be jealous of the temporal prerogatives of other times, nor of external forms no longer suitable for expressing and teaching truths of profound religious meaning."

The Rev. Stuart P. Garver observed the Second Vatican Council at Rome as a journalist. He is executive director of Christ's Mission, a Protestant ministry to men who voluntarily leave the Roman Catholic priesthood. The Mission under Mr. Garver's leadership has also worked to improve Protestant-Catholic understanding by re-examining the basic causes of their differences. In 1964 the Mission published the world's first dual version Protestant-Catholic New Testament.

Mr. Garver is also editor of Christian Heritage magazine. He has been invited to participate in the World Congress on Evangelism in Berlin, in October 1966.

4.) The Curia will not be "miserly with its powers, which today, without injuring universal ecclesiastical order, bishops themselves can exercise better locally."

5.) Finally, questions of economic advantage will never weigh in suggesting a certain reserve and a certain centralization of organs of the Holy See, unless necessary for the good of the ecclesiastical order and the salvation of souls.

In short, the Pope said that Italian control of the Church must end, that bishops from other countries must be given a greater voice in the Church, that censorship and the role of economic self-interest must have less influence in determining the decisions of the Curia.

The Bishops

To afford adequate administrative machinery for this reform of the Curia, Vatican Council II stressed the collegiality of the bishops. That is, that the bishops share with the Pope the administrative functions of the Church and share an authority with the Pope exceeding that of the Curia itself.

B) *A Synod or senate of Bishops was provided for by the Council to assist the Pope in the governing of the Church.*

There are three types of synods, each one determined by the nature of the need that arises. An ordinary synod, an extraordinary synod, and a special synod. According to the decree, each synod has deliberative power, that is, its decisions can be considered as law — but only when so specified and approved by the Pope.

From this we gather that while bishops may now be more directly involved in administering the Church, the position of the Pope is unchanged:

The college or body of bishops has no authority unless it is understood together with the Roman Pontiff's . . . His power of primacy over all, both pastors and faithful, remains whole and intact. In virtue of his office as vicar of Christ and pastor of the whole Church, the Pontiff has full, supreme and universal power over the Church, and he is always free to exercise this power . . .

C) *In addition to these synods which the Pope may summon to Rome for special consultation, national episcopal conferences were given more authority to decide matters directly affecting their own country. Each coun-*

try, it is recognized, has its own peculiar social, economic, political and educational problems. A central body (in Rome for instance) can only provide general guide lines for administrative offices; local bishops must find solutions best suited for their own countrymen. Hence the national bishop's conferences in each country are transient reservoirs of concentrated Catholic power. They will act on their own authority for the highest advantage of their Church in the life of their respective nations.

D) Finally, to achieve its goal of distributing the administrative powers of the Church for a more effective ministry in the modern world, Vatican Council II gave much consideration to the layman or lay apostolate as it is called. It is the Council's attempt to have lay people act as a universal priesthood of believers. Bishops are urged "to make every effort to have the faithful actively support and promote works of evangelization and missionary work." Priests are urged to discover their needs and manifest genuine concern for improving their social conditions. Without doubt, if the Roman Catholic Church can recruit laborers for Christ from among the laity, as Protestants have been doing for centuries, this change in the structure of the Roman Church will be the most far-reaching of any other feature of the new Catholicism.

II. THE STRATEGY OF THE CHURCH

The second area in which we may look for evidences of the new Catholicism, is in the strategy of the Church.

Nothing has really changed in the Roman Catholic Church, only its posture is new. The polemics of the Reformation are ignored. Theological debates are shoved aside in the pursuit of more pressing matters—the pastoral concern for people who are living a pagan life in a secular society, indifferent to the claims of religion altogether.

But exactly what do they mean by pastoral concerns and how to do those concerns determine their strategy? Let me illustrate by two brief passages from the biography of the founder of the Worker's Priest Movement in France, Henri Perrin. While a war prisoner in Germany he could not conduct Mass or perform any of his ordinary priestly services. He writes:

How could I have any nostalgia for the services we know too well in France—those "private" and mechanical prayers which are mostly routine, those low masses said by a solitary priest and attended by a few of the faithful, lost in the four corners of an almost empty church, or almost worse, those worldly masses with the spirit of prayer almost entirely gone out of them. I suffer more and more as I remember how the services and ceremonies have lost all meaning for the Christian people . . . the living expression of the prayers of God's people is almost dead in most of our Churches. I recall masses where people fell asleep, where everyone sat bored in total inertia, where the alms boxes, the seat offering, the collection, and the sermon spoke of nothing but money.

Then turning his thoughts towards his fellow prisoners he complains that as soon as he tries to talk about religion to them they act

like people forced to drink something which has made them sick before, or asked to wear something they'd stowed away in the attic because it was tight and out-of-date . . . I can't treat them as Christians; they not only do not 'practice' Christianity, they haven't the faintest desire to practice it . . . They are not Christians and they have no right to claim the title, since they have nothing to do with Christ . . . Whether they mean to or not, they live in utter paganism. Although they've been baptized and lived for awhile in a Catholic environment, bit by bit they've lost the tastes, needs, reflexes and convictions of a Christian . . . It is not a question of "recalling them to their Christian duties." What has to be done is to awaken in them the desire to be Christians.

This then is the strategy, the pastoral concern of the Roman Catholic Church: to reclaim for herself the multitude of her baptized children who have forsaken the Church and now are drifting helplessly in the swirling currents of modern paganism. It is the spirit of evangelism in Roman Catholicism that is new; a plea for genuine spiritual revival. And who is to say the Spirit of God absolutely refuses to or cannot raise up an evangelist in their midst?

Separated Brethren

But the strategy of the Roman Church is directed outwardly also; it seeks to draw separated brethren into its fold. And here we are supplied a theological basis for such pastoral concern for those not yet in full fellowship with the papal Church.

Christ established the Church with St. Peter as its head upon earth as the universal means of salvation.

God is not willing that any should perish but would have all men to be saved.

Therefore, since the Church of Peter is the divinely ordered means of salvation all mankind must be in some way united with the Church of Rome, either by baptism, by desire, or by intention. Whether perfectly joined to the Church, therefore, or imperfectly united with Rome, the Pope regards all mankind as his people. This is how it is stated in the decree on the Church:

All men are called to belong to the new people of God . . . In the beginning God made human nature one and decreed that all His children, scattered as they were, would finally be gathered together as one. It was for . . . this purpose that God sent His Son that He might be . . . the head of the new and universal people of God . . .

It follows, therefore, . . . there is but one people of God, which takes its citizens from every race, making them members of a heavenly kingdom . . . so that he who occupies the See of Rome knows those afar (off) as his members . . .

The strategy of the new Catholicism, therefore, is to strive for cooperative coexistence among all men of faith, whether they are in union with the Pope, or reject his authority as the Vicar of Christ on earth. As Pope he must serve all mankind, be a pastor, a true shepherd of the sheep, always striving to bring those who have separated themselves as straying sheep back into the fold.

Hence, we may expect ecumenical meetings, cooperative civic programs, and joint legislative action between Protestants and Catholics, and Catholics and other religious communities to increase enormously in the future. Since the Council has not changed any of the basic doctrines of the Roman Church it is not likely that there will be any reunion of Protestant denominations with Rome; but we can look for what I call ecumenical civic programs of every description. The Roman Church will be far more active in local, national and world politics than ever before.

III. THE SACRED THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH

This leads us then to our last point of observable changes in Neo-Catholicism, that is, in the field of sacred theology.

It is important to understand precisely what is meant when we use that word "change" in reference to theology in the New Catholicism. It is really a metamorphosis of doctrine. As the caterpillar changes into a but-

terfly, so Catholic theology takes on the appearance of something entirely new. This is what Catholic theologians call the evolution of doctrine. What changes is not the doctrine but our understanding of all the implications of that doctrine. Nothing the Roman Church has always taught as dogmatic truth is destroyed, it simply is examined and formulated more perfectly as our understanding increases. This is how Dr. G. C. Berkouwer puts it in a chapter entitled "The New Theology":

The starting point of Rome is that the treasury of revelation was closed with the death of the last apostle, and that all development must issue from this treasury under the direction of the ecclesiastical doctrinal authority.

Development is the outgrowth of what is already present in the bud. Actually it is no new dogma that grows, but knowledge and insight. The Vatican Council of 1870 declared . . . that Peter and his successors by the presence of the Holy Spirit should preserve and explain the substance of faith.

But here is a genuine difficulty. Suppose our knowledge and understanding of revealed truth should lead to the discovery that the earlier Popes were in error when explaining some doctrine. What would happen then? Could not the Fathers of the Church make mistakes? Did they understand perfectly what the Holy Spirit revealed? And do not the discoveries of modern scholarship give us much more accurate materials for study? The truth of the matter is, scholars today must

go back to the original sources of faith, back to the Bible itself.

Here, then, is where we look with great expectancy for changes in the New Catholicism. If the Church of Rome returns to the Word of God, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who can tell what might happen? As the great Reformers experienced the saving grace of Christ through their study of Scripture, so a new Reformation *could* spring from the present return of Catholic scholars to a direct study of the Scripture.

Yet let us be very cautious here. The language of Roman Catholic theologians may sound very evangelical, very Protestant-like. In reality, however, like words do not always convey like meanings. When they talk of Christ they frequently use His name as synonymous with the Church. Or when they use the word Christian, it is really synonymous with the word Roman Catholic, etc. . . . Doctrinal definitions, therefore, are not lightly stated nor interpreted. Nevertheless there is a marked determination on the part of those engaged in theological studies to return to the Word of God for their understanding of the Will and Work of God.

In conclusion, then, we ourselves can confront the New Catholicism only by a genuine renewal ourselves, a genuine returning to the Word of Truth we hold in our hands, and with a renewed consecration give a clear and convincing demonstration of the transforming grace of Christ in every area of our own lives.

in store for church and religion is that you had all better get together if you wish to live much longer. The secular side of the church—its power, property and respectability—will keep you all going for quite a while. But science and education will sometime catch up with religious superstition just as medicine is fast wiping out the influence of the witch doctor."

To which the other may reply: "The point of view espoused turns very largely upon the meaning of the terms used, namely, 'science' and 'education.' First of all you err in identifying science with one form of 'scientific' theory. What you are pleased to regard as science isn't really science at all but only a certain kind of scientific philosophy. Science is one thing, philosophy another, and real science is never godless."

Again, what you think of as education isn't education at all for real education is never godless. As God has said, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" and "thy Word is Truth."

"Thou art the Truth: Thy Word alone
True wisdom can impart;
Thou only canst inform the mind,
And purify the heart."

Modern naturalistic evolutionism comes forward in the name of science. But it should not be confused with science itself, for true science is committed to search and discovery of truth, and godless evolutionism is just another false philosophy. So also all education which proceeds on the basis of naturalistic evolutionism is essentially godless and therefore false, just because it leaves God out. For the atheist atheism is "the wave of the future" and for the theist his theistic faith.

Now there have ever been and are schemes of thought, other than these, which have laid claim to a monopoly of the future. Rome did so, as also Greece in her day. And there were other claimants before them. So it was not so very long ago with Germany and Japan. And as for national imperialism, France and England can hardly plead not guilty; even America herself is not completely innocent. Still and all the principal claimant to

The Rev. Mr. Rankin, retired Orthodox Presbyterian minister, resides in Worcester, N. Y.

Whose the Future?

JOHN RANKIN

Whose is the future? Who, if any, have a right to claim inheritance of the future? Here, indeed, is quite a question. The situation seems to be that, since presumably nobody knows, it is easy for each and all of every belief and persuasion to claim it for themselves.

It is natural for everyone to think of his own faith and conviction as right; and since it is generally assumed that "right will win the day," therefore the future belongs to—whom? and what? Yes, whose phil-

osophy, whose faith, whose way of thought and life shall eventually triumph is quite a question.

Perhaps the first thing for us to do would be to observe how true it is that each and all, of whatever faith and conviction, tend to advance their own claim to possession of that portion of world history which may be presumed to lie ahead.

To illustrate. A certain individual, committed to a certain position, may say to another of the contrary viewpoint: "My own view of the prospect

possession of the future in our day is atheistic Communism as represented in Russia and China.

All heretical cults and false religions indulge themselves in visions of the future. Religious liberalism has always done so and still does. So also evolutionism in both science itself and education. And yet for all of these various claims and pretensions the fact remains that the claim of itself proves nothing and ever only begs the question. After all of the aspirants have been heard, still the question remains—*Whose is the future?*

So we come to the problem regarding the Christian position relative to the question. Here we find divergent views of the shape of the future, based on diverse interpretations of Scripture. One view is that Christ must and will come to snatch victory from defeat. The other is that the cause and kingdom of God and of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ shall eventually overcome all opposition and wrest victory from apparent defeat prior to the grand finale of his coming.

This latter view, long known as post-millennialism, although extremely unpopular in any time of great de-clension such as we have today, is still a respectable view and not lacking in apparent Scriptural support.*

Christian View

Certainly all believers, of whatever eschatological persuasion, will agree that the future, as well as the past and present, belongs to God. It is in his hands. "The meek shall inherit the earth." "The gates of hell shall not prevail" against Christ and his church, for:

"Right is right, since God is God;
And right the day must win;
To doubt would be disloyalty,
To falter would be sin!"

One great fundamental lesson of God's Word is that God himself, the almighty and eternal God, is present and working in the world. He who made, preserves, directs and governs all things ever "standeth in the shadows keeping watch above his own."

If the future belongs to anything

* Among those who may be cited for this view are: the late J. Marcellus Kik, Oswald T. Allis, Loraine Boettner, Warfield, Hodge, A. Kuyper, and H. Bavinck. See also Prof. John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. II, comments listed under "Conversion, of Israel (and the Gentiles)."

or anyone it belongs to God, his Word, his Son, his religion and his elect. "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

Only let us be perfectly sure with regard to whom and to what the possession of the future is given. It belongs to God himself, and yet of course not to deity in general or to any other God (for there are gods many and lords many), but only to the one only living and true God.

And so the future belongs to religion, and yet not to religion in general or to any given religion, but only

to *revealed* religion. And that means Christianity—the one and only true religion that has come from God, and is in its own nature the way, the only way, of salvation.

So just as surely as the future belongs to God and to his Son and his religion, just so surely does it belong to the church of God and of Christ. And yet not to whatever may be called the church of Christ, or to any particular so-called church, but only to Christ himself and his redeemed people—to Jesus Christ and his own true church which he bought with a price, his precious blood.

BOOKSHELF AT THE MANSE

Behind Campus Doors . . .

College is a place where God opens doors. One is labeled *Think*. Behind it are people who ask "Why?" This brings up one of the basic opportunities of the Christian student—relating Jesus Christ to his studies. Paul Schrottenboer offers some sound guidance in two short articles. *Integral Christian Scholarship* describes the basic religious stance of the Christian in his studies—subjection to the Scriptures as they tell us about God, ourselves and the structure of creation. Biblical principles relevant to education and scholarship are set forth and summarized here. *The Christian Student in the Modern University* is dedicated to helping you "find a path through the labyrinth of ideas with which you are confronted from the first day onward . . . (and to) reconcile the faith with which you came to school with the science of the classroom and laboratory." (Both are available for 25¢ each from the Association For Reformed Scientific Studies, 729 Upper Gage Avenue, Hamilton, Ontario.)

Sometimes people just ask, "How?" How is it possible to have a personal relationship to God? Does it work? Prepare yourself for this door by reading *Freshman Firsts* by Inter-Varsity Press (130 North Wells, Chicago, 60606). Actually a group of seven booklets, this is great material for a student's spiritual tune-up. There is: a challenge to more thorough discipleship (*Sacrifice*), a booklet to get you started in regular personal Bible

study (*Christ In You*), a guide for having fellowship with God (*Quiet Time*), John Stott's answer for those who want to know Jesus Christ (*Basic Christianity*), an allegory-like review of your personal relationship to Christ (*My Heart—Christ's Home*), and two booklets on your relationship to the pre-Christian whom God is preparing for conversion (*Personal Evangelism* and *Lost Audience*). \$2.50 buys this packet of essential reading for university life.

Another door at college is labeled ASEX. Some people don't dare to touch that one and others plunge ahead without much thought. What do you do? In *The Secular City* Harvey Cox does a masterful job of unmasking the sexual idols—Miss America and the Playboy—of the campus. However, since he has decided that orthodox Christianity is not the answer for the Secular City, Cox can not really offer much concrete help to those who grapple with the problem of their sexuality.

Donald Tweedie, a Christian psychotherapist, is more able to offer help to the student with his, or her, problems of personal growth towards mature Christian sexuality. On a solid biblical basis his book, *Of Sex And Saints* (Baker Book House, \$1.), discusses sex in terms of physiology, psychology and theology. The goal is appreciation of "God's gift of sexuality as a possession not of fear and folly but rather of faith and fullness."

Also along the same line Harpers has published Walter Trobisch's *I Loved A Girl* (\$95), a missionary's account of his involvement with two native Christians in the search for Christ's approach to courtship and marriage. A very realistic, helpful book.

Bible Study and Prayer

Behind another door is a dorm-room. A Bible study is going on. Using a study guide on Proverbs (Neighborhood Bible Studies, 269 Broadway, Dobbs Ferry, New York, 10522) these six girls are seeking the wisdom of God for their daily life on campus. Over in one of the Greek houses three fellows are studying the life of Peter, seeing how he came to faith and then maturity in Christ. For pointers and helpful discussion questions they use *Look At Life With Peter*, (Inter-Varsity Press, \$.75).

Yes, God opens doors at college. We have saved one door until last. In many ways it is the most critical of all the doors. On it are these words: "Always maintain the habit of *prayer*: be both alert and thankful as you pray. Include us in your prayers, please, that God may open for us a door for the entrance of the gospel. Pray that we may talk freely of the mystery of Christ . . . and that I may make that mystery plain to men, which I know is my duty." Have you been using this door regularly? It is the key to confident entrance thru the other doors marked Think, Sex, and Witness.

LAURENCE C. SIBLEY, JR.
Glenside, Pa.

Georgian

(from page 98)

The Christian's Hope

What is the purpose of Christ's coming as Judge? Certainly it is *not* to decide who is to be saved and who will be lost. This question will already have been settled. Listen to these solemn words from the lips of our Lord: "He who believes (in me) is not condemned; he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God."

Surely one of the primary purposes of Christ's coming is to take his people to himself, so that they may be with their Lord for ever. Then will be fulfilled that beautiful passage in the Book of the Revelation, Chapter 21: "Behold, the dwelling of God is with men. He will dwell with them, and

they shall be his people, and God himself will be with them . . ."

The Christian believer will not be terrified in the Day of Judgment for, as John Calvin reminds us, "we shall stand only at the tribunal of a judge who is also our advocate, and who has taken us into his faithful protection." And this is also the perspective of the Heidelberg Catechism when it asks: "What comfort is it to you that 'Christ shall come again to judge the quick and the dead'? That in all my sorrows and persecutions, with uplifted head I look for the very same Person who before has offered himself for my sake to the tribunal of God, and has removed all curse from me, to come as Judge from heaven; who shall cast all his and my enemies into everlasting condemnation, but shall take me with all his chosen ones to himself into heavenly joy and glory."

Works as the Test

When Christ comes as Judge he will make his judgment public. When he comes he "will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart." The apostle Paul speaks of "that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus." In other words, the intricate pattern of everyone's life will be laid out before God, like a printed circuit. Like an open book will be our true motives, our fundamental interests, our every thought, word, and deed. These are sobering thoughts indeed.

But now let us ask, What standard or criterion will Christ use as he judges? The Bible answers this question, in our Lord's own words: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of the Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." To precisely the same point is Paul's teaching: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body."

Does this mean that we can work our way to heaven? That those who are saved are the good people of the world who are to be rewarded for their deeds? If that is so, then I am afraid there isn't much hope for any of us. And heaven will be a deserted place, while hell is going to be crowded. God help us if we are going to be judged on the basis of our re-

cord! For do you know what that record is? The Bible tells us: "None is righteous, no, not one; no one understands, no one seeks for God. All have turned aside, together they have gone wrong; no one does good, not even one." Now, mind you, that is *God's verdict* on you and me!

What did Jesus mean when he said that he would judge every man according to his works? It will help to substitute the word "fruits" for "works." Jesus will judge men by the outward evidence of what is really within them. If we have been united to Christ by a true faith, we must bring forth fruits of thankfulness. Such fruits will come from a heart that loves God, that seeks to live according to the Word of God, and whose goal is to live unto the glory of God. Only such people can do the kind of works which Christ calls good.

There are two kinds of people who will be surprised out of their wits, come judgment day: those whose works have been done without faith; and those who thought they could have faith without works. Christ will condemn both. Works without saving faith may be called 'good' by men's yardstick, as men measure goodness, but not in the sight of Christ, who looks into the heart. On the other hand, faith without works is simply dead, as far as Christ is concerned.

Are you ready to face Jesus Christ when he comes? He will judge us according to our works. What kind of works will you present to him? Works from an unrepentant and unbelieving heart? Then you will be condemned. But if your works—the fruits of your faith—come from a heart cleansed by his blood, Christ will receive you into his favor. And he knows our hearts!

New Addresses

Rev. Ivan J. DeMaster, 1817 Balmoral Ave., Westchester, Ill. 60156.

Rev. Robert W. Eckardt, 1029 Landis Ave., Vineland, N. J. 08360.

Rev. Richard G. Hodgson, Janacres, Colchester, Vermont 05446.

Rev. Kenneth J. Meilahn, 11 Park Drive, Bellmawr, N. J. 08031.

Rev. Cromwell G. Roskamp, P. O. Box 243, Burke, Va. 22015.

Rev. Daniel van Houte, 5150 Date Ave., Apt. 1, Sacramento, Calif. 95841.

Rev. Samuel van Houte, 3411 Albion St., Denver, Colo. 80207.

EDITOR

Robert E. Nicholas



All correspondence should be addressed to The Presbyterian Guardian, 7401 Old York Road, Phila., Pa. 19126

Disappearing Presbyterianism

At a rate scarcely imagined a decade ago Presbyterianism as found in many of its major denominations is preparing to disappear from the face of the earth. The process is being undertaken deliberately, step by step, and at a tempo that becomes increasingly irreversible.

We have written often of the departure from the historic Christian faith of some Presbyterian bodies. In that sense much that goes by the term *Presbyterian* is actually so in name only. Now, however, we are thinking of proposals for structural changes that when realized will, for all practical purposes, remove the great majority of the millions of Presbyterians from their heritage of more than three centuries.

In the eyes of the ecumenists, of course, this is all to the good. But for all who believe that what the Bible teaches is the Presbyterian — or Reformed — faith, it is tragic to see that faith both denied and ignored in the cause of union without unity and fellowship apart from common faith.

Much has happened since the so-called Blake-Pike proposal of December 1960. That scheme was suggested by the then Stated Clerk of the United Presbyterian Church (now General Secretary of the World Council of Churches) in a sermon in the home church of Episcopal Bishop Pike in San Francisco. It envisioned a merging of four major bodies: the Methodist and the United Church of Christ besides the two already mentioned.

That plan has now been superseded by the Consultation on Church Union (COCU) which could result in a merger of some 25 million Protestants in not too many years. As of this writing nine denominations are actual partici-

pants, with others sending observers. The United Presbyterian Church is certainly a leader in COCU, which has approved a set of "Principles" with chapters on faith, worship, sacraments, and ministry. While the structure of the united church has not been precisely worked out, its ministry is to include bishops, presbyters (elders) and deacons — sort of an episcopalian combination. Perhaps the most astounding thing about the whole scheme is the decision to bypass a formal constitution for a generation. The organization will be effected under a provisional council; the churches will learn to "grow together" with wide latitude in worship, beliefs, and practices. Then when all have come to enjoy fellowship apart from doctrinal commitment and when it is too late to raise questions that might divide the brethren, a constitution will be formulated. Possibly the UPUSA "Book of Confessions" idea will be followed, with divergent historic creeds serving as "guidelines" but not as "tests" of orthodoxy, together with new "declarations" that seek to keep the church abreast of the changing opinions of men and the shifting social patterns.

Southern Presbyterians

Surprising to some, but only because the drift became a rush, was the action of the recent General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. in voting to become a full participant in COCU. Representatives were sent to the Consultation held in Dallas, Texas early in May, shortly after the Southern Presbyterian Assembly. Thus Presbyterians, who have been more concerned than most to spell out their distinctives on the ground that the Scriptures present a coherent system of changeless truth, are now in the forefront of efforts that will openly set aside historic Presbyterianism both in doctrine and in polity in these large communions.

Nor is this trend confined to the United States. As long as 40 years ago in Canada about two-thirds of the Presbyterians merged with Methodists and Congregationalists to form a United Church. The June 1966 General Assembly of the (continuing) Presbyterian Church in Canada reflected "a new mood of change" according to a publicity release. While no proposals for organic union are under consideration, the moderator suggested that a federation of churches

on an inter-communion basis could be a first step toward settling major differences between the larger faiths. (And this Assembly followed the example of several of her sister churches in opening the door to women as ministers.)

In both New Zealand and Australia the Presbyterians are engaged in conversations with Methodists and Congregationalists looking toward possible church union. More recently the Anglicans have entered the talks in New Zealand — which points up the fact that in both instances some form of submission to the episcopacy will be an essential element in any final plan. Congregationalists and Presbyterians in England and in Wales are reportedly in advanced stages of union negotiations.

In mid-summer the executive Committee of the World Presbyterian Alliance (104 churches with a constituency of 50 million) endorsed a 1964 proposal by its General Council to unite with the International Congregational Council (21 churches of which the United Church of Christ in the U.S. is the largest). The ICC had endorsed the plan at its 10th Assembly a few weeks earlier, and if two-thirds of the churches of both groups approve, a uniting council may convene by 1970.

To conclude on a note of hope, there is increasing need for such a fellowship as is provided by the Reformed Ecumenical Synod, in which more than 25 Reformed and Presbyterian bodies, some large and some very small, strive to strengthen one another both by admonition and encouragement. In such churches and through such a fellowship expression may be given to our precious unity in Christ. Here too is reason to pray that historic Christianity as found among Presbyterians will not disappear but in God's providence may yet increase.

— R. E. N.

EDITOR'S MAIL BOX

Dear Sir:

In "A Responsible State" I read, "Why is it contrary to God's law . . . for the citizens of a community . . . to vote to tax themselves for a community hospital?" If all the citizens want and are willing to pay for the

hospital, it is unnecessary to vote to call in the police power of the state via the tax collector to build it. It is not to coerce ourselves but the unwilling neighbor that we vote for this tax. In the first case the vote and consequent coercion is superfluous; in the second, immoral. What moral right do I have to force my neighbor by my vote to pay for medical expenses for myself or another neighbor?

Sincerely yours,
FRANCIS E. MAHAFFY
Chicago, Illinois

* * *

Dear Sir:

If the government builds a hospital, Mr. Mahaffy calls this plunder. But what will he call it when the church builds a hospital? Foreign missions?

Yours truly,
JOHN W. MOORE
Portland, Oregon

* * *

Dear Sir:

I should like to address myself to the questions both raised and somewhat answered in yours and Mr. Mahaffy's articles.

First of all: Were we able to live in a theocracy instead of a sinful and imperfect world, the problem of arbitrary "redistribution of wealth" could not arise, for each religious community or local church would obey the injunction to "love our neighbor as ourself." What compassionately precise admonitions the Christian has: Give to him that asketh; if you see your brother naked, clothe him; open your hand to the needy. Indeed our treatment of the needy provides the very touchstone of our faith; for only that faith which issues in heart-compliance with the Lord's commands to feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, visit the sick and the prisoner, will cause us to hear his blessed word "come" instead of "depart."

However, and I think this is the crux of the matter: We Christians have most imperfectly followed God's commands. For had we "according to our opportunity" (or income) "done good to all men, particularly those of the household of faith," there would be little need for the welfare programs which do indeed threaten to swamp us. And they *are* administered frequently through the governance of venal men often to the venal and

undeserving.

Through our neglect of the office of mercy we have indeed sown to the wind and I believe we are most justly chastised by having to reap the whirlwind.

Very truly yours,
ALICE ZEBLEY
Chalfont, Pa.

Dear Sir:

* * *

Thank you for the article, "A Responsible State." Both Presbyterianism and democracy imply self-government by the people under God. In this great blessing of freedom lies our greatest irritation. We have to hear the opinions of all men. This is the essence of self-government and is right and necessary.

There is therefore room in the world and in the church for the Christian who holds, for example, that theological conservatism is best applied in a liberal politico-economic environment. God be praised.

Sincerely yours,
PHYLLIS H. REIF
Glenside, Pa.

* * *

Dear Sir:

The articles in the July-August *Guardian* concerning the relation of the state to the church, the family and the individual were very thought-provoking and particularly appropriate in this day when on the one hand liberal churches have plunged their organizations into full-scale politics and on the other hand conservative Christians shrink from individual involvement in providing a responsible Christian voice in civic affairs.

It appears to this layman, however, that the editor's view of the role of the state being responsible for the general welfare is not consistent with biblical principles.

It is assumed here that the "state" is the Constitutional Republic of the United States of America and that the "proper" role of the state refers to the degree of conformance to the Word of God which is the orthodox Christian's standard. It should be noted that except for obeying the laws and honoring rulers the Bible says little about the specific function of the state.

The "state" means among other things, according to the dictionary, "a political community organized under a

distinct government recognized by the people as supreme; the functions or powers collectively of a state or nation; civil government." It is obvious, according to this definition, that there are many different "states" in the world today, and that historically there have been many more states, each of which has or had different standards by which the different functions could be judged as to their degree of conformance to the "proper."

In the United States the Christian finds a government which was founded upon a standard which is the same as his. For our country was perhaps unique in the history of the world in that Christians sought to establish a government which acknowledged to God the authority which had been his from the foundation of the earth. In this context, the "proper" function of the state becomes the degree of conformance to the Constitution and the principles upon which the country was founded in so far as these principles conform to the biblical standard.

Moral Law for Individuals

It can be readily agreed that the state is subject to God, as is all creation, but the moral law of God was given to individuals, *not* to a state. It is the degree of conformance of the individuals to the moral law which determines the extent to which a nation is righteous or not. Individuals will be judged at the last day, not states. Therefore it would seem that the proper function of the state is to protect the rights given by God to individuals so that individuals may try to conform to the moral law. This was so stated in our Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men . . ."

Thus the state *does* have an obligation to pass pure food and drug laws, *not* to uphold the positive side of the law not to kill, but to protect the God-given right of men to life.

Nicholas states that "the responsibility of the state in its proper sphere encompasses more than the coercion of evil. We all recognize the principle of sphere sovereignty." It appears that these two ideas conflict.

The principle of "sphere sover-

eignty," a heritage of the Reformed theology and the basis upon which Abraham Kuyper founded the Free University of Amsterdam, holds that each sphere of authority is limited by its own societal relationships which properly stand in a horizontal and coordinate relation to each other, not in a preferred or subordinate position. Each authority therefore is responsible for the affairs of its own sphere. The protection and development of the sphere affects and demands conditions valid for other spheres (thus local civil authorities may require the church to meet fire regulations).

Paul Woolley: *Family, State, and Church—God's Institutions.* Grand Rapids, Mich. Baker, 1965. \$1.00. 48 pp.

In this brief volume Westminster Seminary's Professor of Church History recognizes the "group as a God-ordained entity" in three basic structures: the family, the state, and the church.

After setting forth the scriptural basis for each of the three and outlining its sphere of obligation, Mr. Woolley devotes the latter part of the booklet to a consideration of ten modern American problems. Among them are Sunday closing laws, tax exemptions, the military chaplaincy, marriage and divorce laws, public schools and religion, and state assistance to private schools. The author states his own positions sharply, but invites the reader to think through the principles and their application for himself. Thought-provoking questions are appended to each section.

The book will serve as a text for group discussions as well as for individual study. We commend it to all who are concerned about the issues that are thrust upon us in understanding the relations between home, state, and church in these changing times. — R. E. N.

The authority in one sphere cannot rightly seek to assert itself in a relationship of another nature for to do so is to reject the expression of God's absolute sovereignty over his creation in Christ from which the authority of each sphere is derived.

Thus the state exceeds its function when it interferes in economic life by determining individual conditions affecting the credit that properly belongs to the individual decision of the enterprise concerned.

As van Riessen says in *The Society of the Future*, "What is striking in socialistic literature is that it does not do justice to the different nature of a

number of social forms in society. It has, therefore, no adequate basis for the recognition of the independent authority of such associations, and so can only control the relations between such spheres of authority in terms of the 'general welfare.' The ideology of the socialist does not permit him to admit the essential significance of the fact that the various associations of society, e.g. the economic, political and ecclesiastical, have a nature of their own."

As to the practical reasons for not providing general welfare by taxation, Frederick Bastiat said over one hundred years ago in *The Law*: "Nothing can enter the public treasury for the benefit of one citizen or one class unless other citizens and other classes have been forced to send it in. If every person draws from the treasury that amount that he has put in it, it is true that the law then plunders nobody. But this procedure does nothing for the persons who have no money. It does not promote equality of income. The law can be an instrument of equalization only as it takes from some persons and gives it to other persons. When the law does this, it is an instrument of plunder."

With this in mind, examine the protective tariffs, subsidies, guaranteed profits, guaranteed jobs, relief and welfare schemes, public education, progressive taxation, free credit and public works. You will find that they are always based on legal plunder, organized injustice.

Van Riessen wisely foresaw in *The Society of the Future* that "the scriptural principles valid for the societal relationships formed by men and their inter-relationships are the 'balance of authority and freedom' and 'sphere-sovereignty.' In defending sphere sovereignty in principle and practice Christians ought to remember that it is here that the decisive battle will be fought against totalitarianism and in the contest for a Christian society."

Very truly yours,
B. EDWARD PRESCOTT, JR.
Silver Spring, Md.

Calls Accepted

The Rev. Ivan DeMaster and his family have moved to Westchester, Ill. from Center Square, Pa. after accepting the call of Westminster Church.

The Rev. Robert Eckardt family planned to move into the manse of Covenant Church, Vineland, N. J. the first of September, leaving Wilmington, Delaware.

The Rev. Kenneth Meilahn and his family are taking up residence in Bellmawr, N. J. early in September, leaving the principalship of the Middletown, Pa. Christian School to become pastor of Immanuel Church.

Licentiate Ronald Shaw and his wife have moved to Fawn Grove, Pa. since he has accepted the call of Faith Church.

Licentiate Luder Whitlock and his family now occupy the manse in Hialeah, Florida. A 1966 graduate of Westminster Seminary, Mr. Whitlock has accepted a call from Sharon Church.

The Rev. Jack Peterson family moved to Florida during the summer from Stratford, N. J. in order to accept the call of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension to labor in a new field in West Palm Beach.

The Rev. Maurice Riedesel has also accepted a call from that Committee to work among the Spanish-speaking people in Vineland, N. J., coming from the Eureka, S.D. congregation of the Reformed Church in the U.S. and earlier as a missionary in Honduras.

(As of the end of August there are at least ten Orthodox Presbyterian congregations without a pastor or regular pulpit supply.)

Oostburg SAVE Team

Four young people of Bethel Church, Oostburg spent a month this summer in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Following a week of classes and house-to-house calling they assisted in the Vacation Bible school of Trinity Church, Hatboro. The nearby Warminster RP, ES joined in the school with attendance reaching 150.

After a weekend at French Creek they joined the Rev. Boyce Spooner in a week of evangelism at the Boardwalk Chapel in Wildwood, N. J. Before their return to Wisconsin they were to visit New York and Washington. The SAVE team was made up of John DeMaster, Bonnie Ingelse, Ruth Van Stelle, and Patty Smies. Other Oostburg young people assisted for a week at the Hanover Park, Ill. VBS in mid-August.

Collingsworth's Lectures — VI

The Throne of David

Edited by R. K. Churchill

Infant-baptists believe that the visible kingdom is made up of adults and infants. The Anti-infant-baptists join issue and say that while the visible church that existed for two thousand years was made up of such membership, it ceased to exist at the coming of John the Baptist or Christ, and a new church or kingdom began which does not allow infants a place in it. This is the exact point of difference so far as membership is concerned.

The next point of difference, of grave character, is: The Infant-baptists assume that the old Abrahamic church was *perpetuated*, and continues to exist. This the Anti-infant-baptists deny, claiming that a *new* church began. Then our work has been mainly laying a strong foundation for an examination into the *perpetuity, identity, and unity* of the church, by first examining into the perpetuity of the Christ of the church.

I again read from the 89th Psalm, first from the 3rd and 4th verses:

I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever and build up thy throne to all generations.

This is the covenant God made with David to perpetuate his kingdom, and mark you it is settled by the oath of God that his "throne" is to be built up to the last generation. If generations continue to exist so does David's "throne" also, or God swore falsely to David. I read verses 28 and 29:

My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever and his throne as the days of heaven.

This throne stands connected with the "days of heaven." At the 4th verse it says it shall stand to all generations. Then, if the days of heaven continue, David's throne continues. The reader's attention is called to the fact that David never had any literal throne, seat or rostrum or material substance; he never occupied a literal throne, and in the course of these investigations I will show that the throne David occupied was called God's throne. God never had any literal throne, neither

in heaven nor upon earth; the phrase simply signifies his *right to reign, rule or govern*.

Perpetuated

Solomon did indeed build up a literal throne after the death of David his father. It was an ivory throne. Some one may presume to offset my arguments by saying David's throne has long since gone down to dust in the destruction of Jerusalem, but David never had a literal throne there, to crumble to dust. The word throne simply expresses governing in connection with the kingdom. Then that governing and that kingdom must be perpetuated or God swore falsely to David. Now, read the 36th verse:

His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me.

Are the generations of men still moving onward? If so, David's throne must be continued to the last generation by the oath of God. Are the days of heaven still numbering? If so, David's throne still goes onward and will continue as long as the days of heaven. Does the sun continue before God? David's throne must continue.

I desire to read two or three other passages.

And what one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible, for thy land, before thy people, which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, from the nations and their gods? For thou hast confirmed to thyself thy people Israel to be a people unto thee forever; and thou, Lord, art become their God (II Samuel 7:23, 24).

For how long did he make them his people? It is here said that *he made them his people "forever."* As a church, as a compact, as a people we find them perpetuated. God redeemed Israel out of Egypt as his family or *visible* church. He had sent them down to Egypt and they sojourned there awhile; and when he redeemed them out of the house of bondage he confirmed them to be his "people forever." And he became their God. This people were to be perpetuated as his *visible* church *forever*. The throne of

Israel was so called because Israel was the kingdom. It was also called the throne of the Lord, because the people belonged to the Lord. It was called David's throne, because he was appointed by the Lord to be king over Israel. He was to rule the kingdom of Israel. Thus it is called the Kingdom of the Lord, and the Throne of the Lord, the Kingdom of Israel, and the Throne of Israel, the Kingdom of David, and the Throne of David. So, it matters not by which of these terms it is designated, it was the compact that was to be perpetuated forever. It was to be perpetuated in all its essential departments from its organization to the end of time.

Promises

We have seen what the promises were. We have read Nathan's language to David concerning the "throne" and the "kingdom." We have read the Psalmist's language in the 89th Psalm concerning the same throne and the same kingdom; and he gives us to understand a little more than Nathan, who said nothing about God having appealed to his *own holiness* in swearing to David. But when the Psalmist is pouring out a living current of music, a volume of melting melodies, he says God swore by his own holiness, "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David." There are the promises. Now we read Isaiah 9:6:

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.

Here the two natures of Christ are revealed — the *human* and the *divine*. Christ is the last king in David's line according to the flesh. He was born for that purpose. God had promised David that he would raise up one from him to sit on his throne, and that Christ as the son of David, was the last to occupy the throne of the kingdom. Here the two natures are brought to light. The child was David's flesh. The flesh continued to be flesh, and the divinity continued to be divinity; but that was the Son of God and the son of David in one person. The son of David was the child born, and the Son of God was the divinity connected with the person. Now I read the 7th verse:

Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end.

Do you believe this?

Rule without End

We have confidence in that surely. If you thought it was coming to an end soon, or if you did not know it was to be eternal, would you give yourself much concern about it? You believe this is so. I believe it is so. Here we all agree. Why do you believe it? Because it is there recorded in the Book. He is to be an eternal King because the kingdom is to be an eternal kingdom. I have all confidence because God said it was to be so. Then it is the word of God that gives us confidence: *Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end.*

Where? Where? What throne? What kingdom? He administers peace without end upon what throne? From what kingdom? He is to be a king of peace, and is to administer peace without end; but from what throne? From what kingdom?

Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of . . .

"Upon the throne of . . ." What do you say, my Baptist brother? "Why on the throne of the new kingdom of course." What do you say, my Reform (Campbellite) brother? "Why on the throne of the new kingdom that David never saw nor occupied." Is that the way you understand it? "Surely it is. You know we understand it that way." Yes; I know you say that old throne is gone—David's old kingdom that had babies in it. That God grew tired of it, and then built up another and left the babies out, and that is the kingdom Christ reigns over, and that is the throne he administers peace from now. That is the new kingdom. It is not David's kingdom that he is to order and establish and administer peace in. No! No! Well, let us see! It would not do to stop here and not say what throne it is, would it?

Isaiah's Prophecy

Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this (Isaiah 9:7).

What is the promise of the Lord to David? How long shall his reign be? "*From henceforth even forever.*" Will it be so? Is it so? You tell us it is not. And in order to let the Anti-infant-baptist church organization stand, the word of the Lord spoken

by the prophets must be falsified. For these truths are the words of the prophet Isaiah, who looked from his prophetic standpoint down through the dark ages to the sufferings of that Christ on the cross, and talked so movingly of him as a lamb led to the slaughter that opened not his mouth.

But I must pass from that to the next Scripture. Sometimes the Anti-infant-baptist brethren say: "O, we know that by going back to the *Old Testament* you can prove anything you please about the children. That is admitted. We all know that during the age that terminated at the coming of Christ, the children were in the church. But that ceased, and you Infant-baptists are always going back to the *Old Testament* for your proofs."

Well, did not the great man Paul, after he was introduced into the apostolic office, say (2 Timothy 3:16) that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God." Yes, he said that. And what else? "It is profitable for doctrine." Then if it is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, those who will not have it, lose some profitable doctrine. Paul told Timothy that the *Old Testament* Scriptures could make him wise unto salvation through faith in Christ. Why? Because Christ was back there; and Christ is revealed in the *Old Testament* as well as the *New*. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and it is profitable for doctrine; and we have read from the *Old Testament* to show that it accords with the *New*, and that these things are carried out and shown to be true in the *New Testament*.

New Testament Theme

And now I go to the *New Testament*. *Now what is the theme?* Was David's kingdom perpetuated after Christ came in the flesh; after John was put to death; after the crucifixion of Christ, and after his resurrection? Was he to "establish" the same kingdom, the same throne? That is the *theme*. Was the long line from Abraham unbroken? Was it the same church, the same kingdom? If we establish that, the Infant-baptists are right. Their organization is right; and it is an Infant-baptist's church. If we do not establish that, it may be that the Baptists and Reformers (Campbellites) are right. Now, when Christ *began his reign*, was it in the same kingdom David reigned over? Was it

on the "throne" David occupied? If so, the question is forever settled.

Now, I have been giving you testimony that ought to suffice in any court. I have laid before you the testimony of God himself. I have submitted the words, or promises of God, and then covered them up with the *oath* by his holiness, and that ought to suffice. But we learn somewhere in the good Book that in all teaching it is to be "line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little." We must bring it up in every way, in every aspect, and vindicate our Master's cause, no matter from what quarter the opposition comes. I am standing before my God and am called by him as well as by my church to vindicate his honor, to vindicate his throne, to vindicate his character, to vindicate his Christ, to vindicate his kingdom. To do this we must look out from all points and drive back the invading foe that comes from any quarter. We must meet them all.

Suppose . . .

Suppose you could be impressed with the thrilling thought that the angel Gabriel had left his shining seat near the throne of God, and was making his way down through the pathless ether. There is a meeting here tonight. Many persons have come to the sanctuary of God. Suppose the angel Gabriel should occupy the desk where I am — not comparing myself to Gabriel — would not all be hushed to the profoundest silence by the thought that it is Gabriel talking and that God has sent him? There is something of moment pending. Gabriel has left heaven, that pure and holy place! Gabriel has laid aside his crown, and looking his brother angels in the face, bids them adieu to make his way down from the plains of fadeless glory!

Ladies and gentlemen, if you could be impressed with that thought, would there be one inattentive hearer in the house? Would you not involuntarily rise to your feet? It is Gabriel talking! God has sent him, and he comes to tell us what He would have us believe! If you did not forget yourselves to be human beings, would you not pour down tears and not know why, unable to tell the deep cause of your strange feelings? If you knew that he was Gabriel, an angel from the presence of God, sent by God to talk to you, would you not be inclined to his

words and be moved by them? But he has not come; God has not sent him.

Gabriel's Message

Yet Gabriel *did* once come to earth and *did* bring a cheering message from the upper world. His news has filled the earth with joy from that day until now. It has been proclaimed on the hilltops and in the valleys, over the railways and on the wires, and is now being carried to the four quarters of the globe. It is a message that will live on till the earth is wrapped in its winding sheet of flames. The promise of the coming Messiah in the flesh was the burden of his message. No ancient prophet ever saw the son of David connected with divinity except in vision. No ancient saint ever saw Christ in the flesh. They had the living Christ with them, but not connected with the flesh of David. But the time comes when he is about to be born in fulfillment of that mysterious prophecy.

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace (Isaiah 9:6).

The time draws nigh when God is going to place the *last* son of David on his throne. Gabriel is sent to bear the news. The long looked for Messiah is to be born. David's throne is to be occupied by his last royal Son *forever*.

And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David (Luke 1:26-32).

David's Throne

Now his birth is announced. The long looked for One is announced as coming in the flesh. He is to come of the line of David. Joseph was of the line of David, and Mary was of the line of David; for they were not allowed to marry out of the peculiar

line of the church. Hence he was David's last son born to be a king. And now to substantiate the covenant of God, the promise of God, the oath of God's holiness, and the language of the prophets, the angel Gabriel comes from another world. Isaiah was of this world, and all the prophets were of this world as men. We have had testimony of the highest character; but now Gabriel is sent from heaven, and he tells Mary that this son shall be born, "And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne . . ." Well, *what* throne?

Why, Howell and all the Anti-infant-baptists say the throne of Christ is the throne of the *new* kingdom, the *new* church. Now what is the point at issue? Was the *old* kingdom perpetuated? That is the question. Here we have found the *last king* that is to reign over that *old* kingdom—that old church. What *throne* is it the Lord God shall give unto him? What must it be, to make all the testimony harmonize?

Will You Believe It?

Are you willing to hear all that Gabriel said on the subject? Will you believe it? Are you all inclined to believe he told the truth when he said this child should be born? All say that is true. Do you think he was right when he told Mary she should call his name Jesus? Yes; Gabriel told the truth then. Do you think he told the truth when he said the Lord God should give him a throne; and that of his kingdom there should be no end? Yes; you all receive it pleasantly and say it is all true. Well, Gabriel said something more, and now let us see if you receive that so pleasantly, and believe it:

He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David.

No; you will not believe that? But there it is, and I would like to see the man's face that says it is not true. Howell had the temerity to say in a book that Christ never occupied the throne of his father, David. He says emphatically that promise was a *failure*. Is it possible!

If God has given him another throne he would have forsworn himself. God said his "throne should be built up to all generations," that it should stand "as the days of heaven"; and Isaiah said Christ should sit on that throne, and order his kingdom,

and establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. God swore to this, and if he did not give Christ the throne of his father David, it would all be *false*. Yet we are told there is nothing in all the Book that looks like Infant-baptist doctrine! Allow Anti-infant-baptists to talk, and write books, and there is nothing in all the Bible like it; but let the Bible talk for itself and you cannot see anything else. Why? Because Baptist and Reform organizations are unknown to the Bible.

God never made a covenant with a *new* kingdom; God never swore to any such thing; Gabriel never thought of any such thing, but that David's throne, under Christ as David's son according to the flesh, is to be perpetuated from age to age. If ever the time comes that generations exist after David's throne has ceased to exist, God will have sworn falsely. If the time ever comes that the heavens remain, and David's throne does not exist, God will have sworn falsely. If the time shall ever come when the sun shall shine and David's kingdom is gone, God will have sworn falsely.

But let us examine the New Testament evidence a little further. "And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign." Who? the *child*, the son of David. The last son of David born to be a king. "And he shall reign over" — *What?* The *new* kingdom? The *new* church? No indeed! "And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." There it is. How long? *Forever*. Nathan, in his message to David said, "I will establish his kingdom forever." David reigned over the house of Jacob; and the angel says Christ his son "shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end (Luke 1:33)."

The House of Jacob

Is the Reform (Campbellite) church the house of Jacob? Tell me. Do you profess to be? Is it the house of Jacob that David reigned over? There is not one that will say Yes. If he does he stultifies himself. There is not a Baptist minister anywhere that will not spurn the idea. "Why, we are not of that old house of Jacob, and you know it." Yes, I know that. You say you are not in the house of Jacob as an organization, yet you say that Christ reigns over you as a *church*. You know you are not of that *old* organization; and

you know that if Christ is reigning over that old organization, he is not reigning over your church. Now I challenge you to say you are in the house of Jacob. I challenge you to say you are not; and it doesn't matter which way you say it. *Either way is death.* If you are in it, you must bring in the "babies"; if you are not in it, down goes your *new* church. And yet there is nothing in the Bible like Infant-baptist doctrine! God may say it and swear to it, yet it doesn't look that way!! The angel Gabriel may be sent from heaven to tell it to Mary, yet it doesn't look that way!!! The prophets may say so, still it doesn't look that way!!!! Brethren, you don't seem to realize that you unchurch yourselves.

Peter's Interpretation

The reader's attention is now called to the first inspired explanation of that new covenant transaction. At the 29th verse, Acts two, I read. We are going to an inspired statement of this question. On the very day Christ began his reign; the very day he began to "order" David's kingdom "and establish it," and build it up, Peter makes a speech and offers his defense of Christ the King:

Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne . . . (Acts 2:29-30).

This is the Pentecostal affair. The opening day of the *new* dispensation. God raised him up to *sit on David's throne*, and *order David's kingdom* according to his own will. Now here is the *new* dispensation opened. Here is the *new reign*. Here is the beginning of the *new* covenant. Where did Peter understand Christ to be reigning? On the throne of David. Where then is the *Baptist* throne? Where then is the Reformer's (Campbellite) throne? Where then is the *new* kingdom that David never heard of and never thought of? Peter's understanding was that Christ the son of David, was to perpetuate the affairs of David's kingdom; for God had sworn to perpetuate that kingdom to all generations; as long as the days of heaven rolled; as long as the sun, with his broad face, throws light upon the earth. Though Christ was dead God raised him up; for God swore to David that his



The Rev. Messrs. Bell, Newsom, Edwards, and Black

Installations

Wallace A. Bell was ordained to the ministry and installed as pastor of Westminster Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Bend, Oregon on June 17 by the Presbytery of the West Coast. Mr. Bell had served the church as stated supply for more than a year. The Rev. Albert Edwards, moderator, presided and gave a charge to the congregation.

A sermon was preached by the Rev.

Robert Newsom of Newberg, and the Rev. Glenn Black of Eugene delivered a charge to the newly ordained minister. Elders R. E. Jewell and Joseph Boyd also participated.

The Rev. Mr. Bell and his wife are natives of Ireland. They have two children. Mr. Bell had served independent churches in the Northwest prior to his coming to a full persuasion of Presbyterianism.

Visitors at the service reported that the interior of the building has recently been remodeled, enhancing its attractiveness.

* * *

First Church of Waterloo, Iowa rejoiced at the installation of the Rev. William A. Shell as its minister on July 22. Mr. Shell, who was ordained in 1965, had been teaching in Timothy Christian High School, Elmhurst, Illinois. The Rev. George Marston, Moderator of the Presbytery of Wisconsin, presided and delivered a charge to the new pastor.

The Rev. Henry Fikkert of Cedar Grove, Wisconsin gave a charge to the congregation. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Cromwell Roskamp of Baltimore. Other ministers who participated were the Rev. Max Belz of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod and the Rev. S. P. Miersma of the Christian Reformed Church.

throne should be perpetuated. Christ then has been placed upon the throne of his father David to "reign over the house of Jacob forever."

This was the transcendently thrilling theme that welled up in the poet's heart, and gushed out in living currents of pure, transparent poetic waters, when he sung, *never* so charmingly, *never* so *sweetly*, as when he poured out his soul thus:

All hail the power of Jesus' name;
Let angels prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown Him Lord of all.

Crown Him, ye martyrs of our God,
Who from His altar call;
Extol the stem of Jesse's rod,
And crown Him Lord of all.

Let ev'ry kindred, ev'ry tribe,
On this terrestrial ball,
To Him all majesty ascribe,
And crown Him Lord of all.

O, that with yonder sacred throng
We at his feet may fall!
We'll join the everlasting song,
And crown Him Lord of all.

Mr. Kenneth Austin
P.O. Box 4376 Campus Station
Athens, Georgia 30601
Feb 66 67

The Changing Scene

HENRY W. CORAY



WHAT WILL YOUR CHRISTMAS CARDS SAY?

Merry Christmas? Season's Greetings?
Happy Yuletide?

Why not let your cards tell the real Christmas message—"Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" Pleasant as holly and poinsettias are—traditional as evergreens and candles may be, they do not speak of the Word made flesh.

By their unique combination of biblically oriented art and greetings composed only of Scripture text and Christian verse, Great Commission cards present a positive witness to Christ.

All Great Commission cards are printed in rich, full color on high quality paper stock. They possess warmth and dignity, yet are inexpensive.

Send now for your free illustrated full-color brochure.

GREAT COMMISSION PUBLICATIONS
7401 Old York Road
Philadelphia, Pa. 19126 Dept. G

Please send me the Great Commission Christmas card brochure.

Name.....
Address.....
City..... State.....

At first glance you think you are viewing a shot of the interior of the Copacobana or the Hungry I. In the background you see two enlarged playing cards pinned to a curtain. Under the ace of hearts a young man stands staring in fascination at a statuesque blond facing him in sinewy pose, with arms outstretched. She is wearing a slinky form-fitting black evening dress and elbow-length black gloves.

Below, you read the explanation: "Ann Wilson, '66, sings 'Gimme God Blues' to J. Randall Nicols, '67, during the performance of 'For Heaven's Sake!' in the Campus Center Auditorium."

Where is this picture to be found? In the Princeton Theological Seminary Alumni News, Spring, 1966.

One cannot but regard the scene with profound sorrow. It is symbolic of the radical change that began in 1929 when that once great school of the prophets was reorganized and the new theology took over. Where now is the God-centered system of doctrine and pattern of holy living represented by the Hodges, Patton, Warfield, Wilson, Machen and other devout theologians? In that momentous hour when the books are to be opened and every man shall be called to account for his actions, the architects of liberal thought at Princeton will surely have to answer for the way they are shaping the thinking of their students.

In this moral tragedy there is one consoling note. The godly scholars of old Princeton, in God's wise counsel, have been spared heartaches that would inevitably have stricken them were they living on earth today. "Merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come."

* * *

On the President's Page of the same publication, Dr. James I. McCord has an illuminating message to

his fellow-ministers. He writes:

Theology is now a shambles. That is the long and short of it. We have entered a period that has witnessed a massive defection from neo-orthodoxy, the point of view which was dominant during the past three decades. Neo-orthodoxy has been judged for its failure to inspire great preaching, for the lacuna that has been left in the field of ethics, for its inability to motivate the Church in her mission, and for its failure to give the believer any real understanding of the nature of the struggle that is going on in history. Thus a new generation experiences an absence of meaning in today's world and is unable to participate significantly in the struggle that has engaged mankind. A theology which has tended to limit God's action either to the past or to the future and has taught that we live in an interim has had little light to shed on the problem of a Christian style of life during this interim.

President McCord sees the need of meeting the threat of the "God is dead" theologians. They must be answered, he insists. How? "It is not enough to affirm that He (God) is present, but we must make His presence real through our lives and ministries," he urges. "Only in this way do we bear witness to Him who is active in the life of the Church and also the world today."

Does Dr. McCord really believe that instructing young people in the art of chanting blasphemous pop songs is a proper way to affirm the reality of the divine presence?

* * *

Francis Schaeffer, in his lectures at Wheaton last fall, sounded a ringing challenge to the students:

There is one thing I do not understand for Bible believing Christians, and that is to be a Bible believing Christian and not to be excited about the Christian answers. There is something especially horrible to be orthodox, evangelical, Bible believing without excitement. This is a peculiar form of name-calling against the God that we say is there. This is something to be excited about. This is an explosive bomb; it is a bomb into the 20th century if I understand what is involved, not something to take and say, I've heard about it since I was little.

Which is another way of stating the proposition laid down by the French philosopher Amiel and which every disciple of Christ ought to keep reminding himself of: "Truth must be communicated by contagion."

The Presbyterian Guardian