

# The Presbyterian Guardian

September 26, 1936

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 12

One Dollar a Year

J. GRESHAM MACHEN  
NED B. STONEHOUSE *Editors*

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

THOMAS R. BIRCH,  
*Managing Editor*

## WHY THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN?

HAVING just undertaken the editorship of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, as announced in the last issue, we desire to say, in the first place, that this change in the staff does not mean any change in the position taken by the paper in the great issues of the day. We regard it as a great privilege to continue to the best of our ability the unswerving defense of the Bible and of the Reformed Faith which Dr. H. McAllister Griffiths has been maintaining, and we only hope that we may be able to follow in his footsteps.

What we shall now say, therefore, is not to be interpreted as an enunciation of any new principles or aims but simply as a reiteration, in view of present conditions, of principles and aims which have determined the policy of this paper from the beginning.

### WHAT IS MEANT BY "PRESBYTERIAN"?

In the first place, THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN is truly "Presbyterian."

That word "Presbyterian," etymologically considered, designates a certain form of church government. But as actually used in the course of church history during the past three hundred years it also designates a certain system of doctrine.

The system of doctrine which it designates is popularly called "Calvinism." More correctly it is called the "Reformed Faith."

The churches holding the Reformed system of doctrine on the continent of Europe came to be called the "Reformed" churches. In Scotland they came to be called the "Presbyterian" churches. When adherents of these various bodies came to America, they retained the terminology used in their native lands. So there are in America various "Presbyterian" churches and various

"Reformed" churches. The two terms designate essentially the same thing. "Presbyterian" doctrine is the same thing as "Reformed" doctrine, and "Presbyterian" church government is the same thing as "Reformed" church government.

THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN holds to that "Presbyterian" or "Reformed" system of doctrine, and to that "Presbyterian" or "Reformed" type of church government.

The reason why we hold to both of these things—which are related in the closest possible way—is that we believe them to be in accord with the Bible, which is the Word of God.

Believing as we do that the "Reformed Faith," or in other words "Presbyterian doctrine," is taught in the Bible, we are necessarily opposed to all doctrine which is contrary to Presbyterian doctrine.

Hence we differ from churches that have given up that doctrine no matter whether they are nominally "Presbyterian" or not. That is the reason why we withdrew from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

That church said to us in effect: "If you remain with us you must support the official Boards." But the official Boards are manifestly furthering Modernist propaganda. Modernism is diametrically opposed to Presbyterianism, since Modernism is actually anti-Christian and Presbyterianism is simply consistent Christianity. Hence if we had obeyed the order and remained in the church we should have had to cease being Presbyterian. We should henceforth have been Presbyterian in name but not Presbyterian in fact.

We could not make any such decision as that. Instead we withdrew from the church organization to which we formerly belonged. *We withdrew from the Presbyterian*

The Presbyterian Guardian is published twice a month by The Presbyterian Guardian Publishing Company, at the following rates, payable in advance, for either old or new subscribers in any part of the world, postage prepaid: \$1.00 per year; five or more copies, either to separate addresses or in a package to one address, 80c each per year; introductory rate, for new subscribers only: Two and a half months for 25c; 10c per copy. Address all editorial correspondence to: The Rev. Ned B. Stonehouse, Th.D. No responsibility is assumed for unsolicited manuscripts. Editorial and Business Offices: 1212 Commonwealth Building, Philadelphia, Penna.

*Church in the U.S.A. in order that we might continue to be Presbyterian.*

#### THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AMERICA

Having withdrawn from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in order that we may continue to be Presbyterian, we cherish with our whole souls the name "Presbyterian." If we abandoned that name we should be like an army without a flag. Hence we adopted—together with our brethren—the name "The Presbyterian Church of America."

The adoption of that name served a twofold purpose.

In the first place, it indicated clearly what is at the very heart of our movement—namely, the fact that our purpose is simply to remain true to our Presbyterian heritage. It made perfectly clear that we are endeavoring not to be some peculiar variety of Presbyterians, but simply to be Presbyterians.

In the second place, however, it distinguished us clearly from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Nothing could possibly have been farther from our minds than any confusion between our church and that church. We hold to the Bible. That church, we believe, has departed from the Bible. We have made the distinction between the two churches stand out clear from the very beginning, as appears plainly on the third page of the Minutes of our first General Assembly.

#### THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL

In the pages of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN special attention will of course be given to the affairs of The Presbyterian Church of America, to which all of the members of the editorial staff belong. But attention will also be given to the affairs of the whole Christian world. We desire to say that with some emphasis. The conflict which is raging at the present time between Modernism and the Christian Faith is a world-wide conflict. It is going on in many countries and in many ecclesiastical bodies, and everywhere it is essentially the same. We shall make every effort to keep our readers informed about the various phases of that conflict, and about the way in which, despite opposition from unbelief, God is blessing the true preaching of the gospel in many lands.

Thus we hope earnestly that our readers increasingly will be found among our brethren in other communions and in other countries than our own. What we said just now about our devotion to the Reformed system of doctrine must not be understood as betokening any coolness in our Christian fellowship with Christian brethren who do not hold that system. We believe, indeed, that the Reformed system is true, and can therefore never regard it as a matter of indifference whether a man holds that system or some other. But at the same time we gladly recognize the large measure of truth that other systems possess.

How warm, for example, is our Christian fellowship with our brethren of genuinely Lutheran churches such as the Missouri Synod! When the Atlantic District of that great church by official action sent greetings and congratulations to us in view of the forming of the Presbyterian Church of America, such action was expressive of a deep underlying community of mind and heart.

It is very evident to every man who keeps his eyes open that the forming of the Presbyterian Church of America is of profound interest to many men and women in many Christian bodies. There are many earnest men and women—not only in the Reformed churches but also in other communions—who see that a standard has here been lifted up which may well be followed by others who are now shackled by compromising associations with unbelief. So we in turn are profoundly interested in those who are our brethren in the Christian warfare, no matter where they may be found. It will be the earnest endeavor of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN to foster this community of interest in every possible way.

#### WHAT IS A "GUARDIAN"?

We have pointed out that THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN is Presbyterian. In closing, we desire to point out that it is a "Guardian."

Hence we are not at all ashamed of saying that we are endeavoring to defend the Christian Faith—that we are endeavoring to be truly a "Guardian."

In order that it may be truly a "Guardian," it must present the facts, no matter how alarming or discouraging they may seem to be. A real guardian is also a watchman, and so we are trying to be a watchman by telling Christian people what enemies are at work in the world and in the church.

Thus this paper will endeavor to present the news of the church throughout the world, recording the encouraging things when they occur, but also recording the steps in the widespread apostasy. We are going to endeavor to present the news of the church universal so clearly and succinctly that our readers may be truly informed as to what is really going on.

It should never be forgotten, however, that we are viewing the facts always in the light of God's Word. So this paper will not contain merely a bare chronicle of ecclesiastical happenings; it will also—and most fundamentally of all—contain expositions of the Bible and helps for the Christian's devotional life.

Thus, by its contents taken as a whole it will try to help its readers avoid the feeble if not spurious orthodoxy which withdraws from ecclesiastical responsibilities or makes common cause with unbelief, and it will seek to promote the real orthodoxy which leads men to take their stand as true witnesses to Jesus Christ.

# What Was Back of the Revision of 1903?

An historical survey of the movement of 1890-1903 for revision of the Confession in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

**T**ODAY we are hardly living in a creed-making age. I do not mean that in our time new creeds will not be formulated and old ones changed. The union in Canada, for example, produced a new creed. But I mean that this is not an age of faith in the Bible as the Word of God, and still less an age when men are convinced of the necessity of making a corporate testimony to their common faith through a written confession of faith. Furthermore, our times have very generally lost the conviction of our fathers that creeds were meant to be quite without ambiguity in their testimony to the truths of God's Word, and without equivocation in their exclusion of heresy. A story was told recently which illustrates the modern attitude. A Methodist advocate of the union in Canada, in apparent commendation of the new creed to a Scottish Presbyterian minister, declared: "The doctrinal basis of union is a most remarkable document. The articles of its creed are so stated that the Calvinist claims they are Calvinistic, and the disciples of Arminius claim them to be Arminian" (*Christendom*, Summer 1936, p. 674).

It is not strange that zeal for church union has so often gone hand in hand with confusion in theology. Doctrinal uncertainty and theological indifference provide the soil in which agitation for church union takes root and thrives. And wherever organizational reunion is regarded as the supreme task of Christendom, as is so generally the case today, zeal for maintaining the integrity of the Christian message can only be regarded as reactionary. The Presbyterian Church of Canada was asked to forsake its historic Calvinistic position in the interest of union. The proposed union of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the United Presbyterian Church would have lowered the testimony to the Reformed Faith both because the formula of subscription required of officers was to be greatly relaxed and because a diluted brief creed was to be given the same constitutional standing as the historic standards of Presbyterianism. And Cumberland Presbyterian Church,

---

*The Presbyterian Church of America is faced with the all-important task of adopting its constitution in November. It is committed to the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, and it does not intend to jeopardize its adherence to Calvinism by tinkering with the Confession of Faith. But the fact remains that not all churches have the same form of the Confession, and the exact form must be determined upon. At the Assembly in June the following charge was given to the Committee on the Constitution in connection with its task of presenting for adoption the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms as the confession of the faith of the church:*

*"The committee shall take as the basis of its consideration the particular form of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms which appears in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1934 edition. The committee shall have power to recommend the elimination, from that form of these Standards, of the changes made in the year of our Lord 1903, but it shall not have power to recommend any other changes. The committee shall also have power to recommend what relation this church shall bear to the Declaratory Statement of 1903."*

*In this issue we are pleased to present an article prepared by Professor John Murray, at our request, in which he marshals the doctrinal objections to the Declaratory Statement and to certain revisions of the Confession which were adopted in 1903. It will be observed that no exception is made to the revisions of Chapter XXII, Section 3 and of Chapter XXV, Section 6. All of the other changes had to do with doctrines that are at the very heart of the Reformed system of doctrine.*

*The article which is presented here provides an historical survey of the whole movement for revision.*

---

a church which was a militant opponent of historic Calvinism, and had sought to find a middle way between Calvinism and Arminianism, entered into a union with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1906 only because the latter had lowered its testimony to the Reformed Faith by several revisions of its confession in 1903.

## Two Phases of One Movement

In surveying the developments which led to these changes, it is necessary to distinguish two phases of one movement, the former as including the period between 1890 and 1893 and the latter between 1900 and 1903. The earlier proposals were defeated in the presbyteries in 1893 — the famous Briggs heresy trial had filled the church with alarm, and there was some doubt as to the legality of certain steps which had been taken. For a brief period comparative peace prevailed. But the call for revision would not be downed. While the final result in 1903 was a more moderate and less extensive revision of the Constitution than that which had been passed by the Assembly in 1892, it is quite proper to speak of the developments between 1890 and 1903 as one movement. In the main the same specific doctrines of Calvinism were in the center of discussion throughout. Further, the lineup for and against revision continued to show many of the same persons. Dr. Henry Van Dyke was one of the earliest protagonists of union and later became the chairman of Committee on Revision whose report was adopted by the Assembly of 1902. Professor Warfield, on the other side, urged the church in 1890 to retain the Confession in its integrity and in 1900 refused to serve on the Revision Committee. In a letter under the date of June 25, 1900, Dr. Warfield wrote as follows:

"The decisive reason moving me to request release from service on this committee is an unconquerable unwillingness to be connected with the present agitation for a revision of our creedal formulæ in any other manner than that of respectful but earnest protest. . . . I cannot think that the violent assault upon certain of our

confessional statements—statements which are clearly scriptural and as clearly lie at the center of our doctrinal system—in which the agitation originated, was a fitting occasion for a movement of this kind, or for any action of the church, except the rebuke of the assailants by the courts to which they were directly amenable. . . . I am thoroughly out of sympathy with the whole movement of which the work of this committee is a part. . . . It is an inexpressible grief to me to see it [the church] spending its energies in a vain attempt to lower its testimony to suit the ever-changing sentiment of the world about it.”

### The Issue Drawn in 1890

The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. was already an inclusive church in 1890. The agitation for revision took many forms. Some wanted a change in the formula of subscription. Many spoke for a completely new creed. A widely circulated pamphlet from Scotland declared that the Confession of Faith had become obsolete. And Philip Schaff, Professor in Union Seminary, expressed the views of many in the church, in his radical demands for a new theology and a new creed:

“Let us be honest and confess that the old Calvinism is fast dying out. It has done a great work, and has done it well, but cannot satisfy the demands of the present age. . . . Every age must produce its own theology. . . .

“We need a theology and a confession that is more human than Calvinism, more Divine than Arminianism, and more Christian and Catholic than either. . . . We need a theology and a confession that will not only bind the members of one denomination together, but be also a bond of sympathy between the various folds of the one flock of Christ, and prepare the way for the great work of the future—the reunion of Christendom in the Creed of Christ” (*Creed Revision in the Presbyterian Church*, 1890, pp. 40, 42).

On the other side, Abraham Kuyper warned from Holland against modification. And the fight in America engaged many able champions of historic Calvinism, among whom the Princeton worthies like Patton and Warfield had a prominent place. And Dr. Shedd, in defending the Westminster doctrine of the Divine decree,

which was under attack, defined the issue as follows: “The grave question before all parties is, whether the Presbyterian Church shall adhere to the historical Calvinism with which all its past usefulness and honor are inseparably associated, or whether it shall renounce it as an antiquated system which did good service in its day, but can do so no longer” (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, Jan., 1890, p. 25).

### The Second Phase

Between 1900 and 1903 the issues raised by the advocates of revision were vigorously debated, but the factors of the situation had not changed essentially. In a group of addresses delivered before the Presbytery of New York on March 4, 1901, three points of view were represented. President Stewart, of Auburn, demanded an entirely new creed. He said that the Confession “ought to be allowed to tell its story without variation to the end. Revision is a mechanical way for the church of one age to express its faith in terms used by a former and different age.” Professor Herrick Johnson, of McCormick, favored a supplemental restatement on the ground that the Confession of Faith did not, as he contended, represent the faith of the church correctly and adequately. Professor DeWitt, of Princeton, opposed any change in a time of doubt and unbelief, and attacked the changes that had been proposed.

The Committee on Revision presented its report to the Assembly of 1902. Its recommendations, which coincide with the changes which were finally adopted, were unanimous, except that Professor DeWitt filed his exceptions to certain of the proposals, notably one part of the Declaratory Statement and the change in Chapter XVI. This report included the Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith, which, while not receiving constitutional status, seems to have given a great deal of satisfaction to the parties that had demanded modification of the doctrinal standards of the church. A witness of the Assembly of 1902, writing in *The Presbyterian* for July 23, 1902, shows that the report of the committee was rushed through. His remarks remind us of recent Assemblies: “The debate too was limited at the outset. And when one of the rank and file began to speak in opposition he was laughed

at, and shouts of ‘question!’, ‘question!’ drowned all deliberation. The picture was not a beautiful one of our once calm and deliberative General Assembly.”

During the year that followed the Assembly of 1902 many efforts were made to arrest the movement for revision. *The Presbyterian* did all in its power to influence the church to vote “no.” In a calm and judicious spirit it analyzed the overtures which had been sent down to the presbyteries, and these discussions are very profitable reading (see the issue of September 10, 1902). Dr. Warfield continued to oppose the changes. Professor Greene, of Princeton, spoke of them as “theologically inaccurate and rhetorically mediocre.” John Fox described them as giving a “clouded and ambiguous standard of doctrine” and as giving peace and comfort to false teachers (issue of April 15, 1903).

But there was no stopping the movement. The presbyteries by an overwhelming majority adopted the overtures. It is perfectly obvious that the only reason which accounts for this final result is that the church had reached a very low ebb. Dr. Henry Van Dyke was promising that their adoption would usher in an era of peace, in which heresy trials would probably not trouble the church any longer. Dr. Fox, in the article cited above, reproduced vividly the spirit of the time when he compared the revisionists with the importunate widow who by her continual coming had wearied the unjust judge. The general impression which prevailed in the church at that time with respect to the changes was described by Dr. Fox as follows: “We are so thankful they are no worse and so fearful that if rejected something worse will be proposed, that we are willing to vote them through and be done with it.” Truly the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. had reached a low point when “peace” came to be counted as more important than purity.

### Afterward

After the deed had been done, it is true, the Princeton professors who had been so active in opposing revision were able to acquiesce in the amendments. While they did no doubt hold that the witness of the Confession had been toned down, they contended that the document still presented a Calvinistic system of doctrine. And a spokesman for the

Southern Presbyterians, Dr. F. R. Beattie, while contending that the creed was still Calvinistic, stated that the Declaratory Statement had toned down the clear form of the Reformed system found in the Confession (*Union Seminary Review*, Oct.-Nov., 1902, pages 10f.).

However, Methodists hailed the changes as breaking down the barriers between them and the Presbyterians. And in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church agitation for union began in 1902, as soon as it appeared that the amendments would be adopted, although its creed and general testimony were in violent opposition to historic Calvinism. The union was consummated in 1906 in spite of the fact that, as Dr. Warfield expressed it, it involved the reception of men who "up to the very moment of their formal acceptance of our standards . . . have been in open and polemic disharmony with them" (*The Presbyterian*, March 1, 1905). In a decision of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri in 1913, which has been brought to my attention by Murray Forst Thompson, Esq., Judge Van Valkenburg declared:

"The Cumberland Presbyterian Church had its origin in 1810, through certain ministers of the Presbyterian Church who had separated themselves from the parent organization because of differences in doctrinal belief. The church grew until it embraced many churches, presbyteries, and synods, and a General Assembly. From time to time throughout the succeeding century a reunion of the two churches was considered and desired by both associations. Their form of organization and methods of administration were practically identical. They were kept apart by what seemed to be distinctive and controlling differences in faith. In 1903, the Presbyterian Church, through the authoritative voice of its General Assembly, made such an explicit revision and interpretation of its doctrinal standards as, in the opinion of the General Assembly of both churches, removed all substantial differences between them and rendered their reunion not only possible, but desirable."

Evidently the court agreed with the Cumberland majority that favored union in the belief that the Presbyterian standards had been substantially modified in 1903. So even if the

system of doctrine was in fact still essentially Calvinistic, a thoroughly unwholesome and confusing situation had been created, a situation not unlike that which was brought about in Canada. For there, you will recall, the articles of the new creed were so ambiguous that an observer declared: "The Calvinists claim they are Calvinistic, and the disciples of Arminius claim them to be Arminian."

And there can be no doubt that the

advocates of revision in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. felt that they had gained a great victory. Moreover, the history of that church since 1903 confirms their judgment. The revision of 1903 was a definite step in the direction of toning down the articles which distinguish Arminianism from Calvinism, and did much to perpetuate the peace-at-any-price attitude which has proved so disastrous in recent years. —N.B.S.

## Shall We Include the Revision of 1903 in Our Creed?

A consideration of the theological character of certain amendments to the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

By JOHN MURRAY



Mr. Murray

**D**R. STONEHOUSE has reviewed certain phases of the history of revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The information embodied in that article is presupposed in this one. It is our purpose now to confine our attention to certain revisions and additions of the years 1902-1903, namely, the amendment of Chapter XVI, Section 7, the two additional Chapters (XXXIV and XXXV), and the Declaratory Statement as to Chapter III and Chapter X, Section 3. Our thesis is that these revisions or additions are distinctly in the path of retrogression rather than of progress, that they are very decidedly symbolic of a standpoint that would undermine the very foundations of the Reformed Faith, and that therefore they should find no place in the creed of a church that professes adherence to the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession. It should be understood that the evil we discover in these revisions is often concealed under the statement of some truth. Modern creed-making that has as its purpose the breakdown of a consistent testimony is very accomplished in this art.

### Works of Unregenerate Men

Chapter XVI, Section 7 of the Confession of Faith in its unrevised form reads as follows: "Works done by unregenerate men, although, for the matter of them, they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; yet, because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to the word; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore sinful, and cannot please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God. And yet their neglect of them is more sinful, and displeasing to God."

The revised form as adopted by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. reads: "Works done by unregenerate men, although for the matter of them they may be things which God commands, and in themselves praiseworthy and useful, and although the neglect of such things is sinful and displeasing unto God; yet, because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to His Word; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they come short of what God requires, and do not make any man meet to receive the grace of God."

The objections to this revised form of the section will immediately appear to any one imbued with the

teaching of Scripture on the depravity and inability of the natural man:

(1) There is a manifest difference between saying with the Confession that works done by unregenerate men are "of good use both to themselves and others," and saying with the revisers that they are "in themselves praiseworthy." To say the very least, the latter phrase is capable of an interpretation that places the works of unregenerate men in a category to which they do not belong. It is just this the Westminster divines were careful to avoid.

(2) The revision says that the works done by unregenerate men come short of what God requires, yet that the neglect of them is sinful and displeasing to God. But it refrains from saying what is really the central point of the indictment urged by the original Confession, namely, that they are *sinful and cannot please God*, and therefore that the neglect of them is not simply sinful, but "more sinful and displeasing unto God." The purpose and effect of this revision is to elevate the works of unregenerate men to a position not accorded them in Scripture, or at least to refrain from bringing to bear upon them the full measure of the divine condemnation. So there has been successfully eliminated from the Confession at least one emphatic assertion of the doctrine of total depravity, and to that extent the enemies of the consistent evangelicalism of the Reformed Faith may be comforted. But comfort to such at this point is fatal.

#### The New Chapters

Of Chapters XXXIV and XXXV the latter is, in the opinion of the present writer, by far the most objectionable. Consequently we shall devote more attention to it. It does not follow, however, that Chapter XXXIV is unobjectionable. On the great topic of the Holy Spirit it is inadequate. It appears to us destitute of that strength that characterizes the Confession as a whole and more especially so when it deals with the efficacy of the Spirit's work in the application of redemption. At least one statement, because of the unguarded manner in which it is stated, is likely to create a distinctly erroneous impression.

But even apart from such estimates of its character there is the paramount objection that it is superfluous. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is

adequately set forth in the Confession elsewhere, set forth indeed in a way that measures up to the high standards set by this the greatest of Reformed symbols. It is a pity that the addition of this chapter should be allowed to obscure that fact. In a word, it is superfluous to the extent of being distinctly misleading.

#### The Love of God

Chapter XXXV purports to express more fully than has been done elsewhere in the Confession the doctrine of the church on the subject "Of the Love of God and Missions." From the standpoint of the Reformed Faith the objections are principally three:

(1) There is a studied omission of the electing love of God, and therefore of the distinction between the love of God that is unto salvation and the general benevolence of God that is unto all but is not of itself saving. Such an omission is fatal. It is impossible to give creedal statement to the Reformed doctrine of the love of God without explicit enunciation of the particular love of God. This objection gathers all the more strength when it is remembered that the topic is not only "the Love of God" but "the Love of God and Missions," in other words, the love of God as it is directly related to the missionary work of the church.

It is true that the missionary who has an intelligent love of the gospel and zeal for the salvation of men does not forget the benevolence that God exhibits to all, nor does he fail to impress upon men the witness it bears to the goodness of God. But the chief message of the missionary, the message that pre-eminently constrains him to preach to the lost, is the message of that love that sent the Son of God into the world, the love that is electing and effectively redemptive. This revision, then, omits what a Reformed consciousness in the performance of its paramount duty precisely demands.

(2) But not only is definition of the particular love of God studiously omitted. When the extent of God's love is mentioned it is expressly universalized. In Section I the love of God is described as infinite and perfect love and in Section II it is said that "in the Gospel God declares His love for the world." There is, of course, a scriptural sense in which

God's love for the world is declared in the gospel. But in the context in which this is stated in this section it is calculated to teach a doctrine of God's love entirely different from, and at variance with, Scripture teaching and Reformed standards.

(3) In Section II there is careful omission of any mention of the efficacious grace of the Holy Spirit. The reply might be given that this phase of truth is sufficiently expressed in the preceding chapter and in the Confession elsewhere. This reply is not an answer to the objection. Why is the reference to the work of the Holy Spirit in Section II left on the plane of merely suasive influence? Why, we peremptorily ask, in a creedal statement that purports to set forth the official teaching of a Reformed Church on the subject of the love of God and missions should there be omission of the very thing that alone offers any real encouragement to the missionary, namely, the love of God coming to expression in the efficacious grace of the Holy Spirit?

In brief, the objection to this chapter is that it is not Reformed, indeed, that there is nothing distinctly Reformed in it. The subject treated of lies close to the very heart of the Reformed Faith. How possibly can a formulation so destitute of Reformed truth on so vital a subject be defended in Reformed Confession? There is no defense.

#### The Declaratory Statement

The Declaratory Statement is in three parts—an introduction and two paragraphs, the first of which deals with Chapter III of the Confession, and the second with Chapter X, Section 3. It is to the teaching of these two paragraphs that exception must be taken. We heartily concede in principle the right and even duty of a Reformed Church to declare certain aspects of revealed truth, which under certain circumstances and conditions may call for more explicit statement. Protection against heresy and preservation of integrity as well as testimony to the truth often require it. It is not, then, to the idea of declaratory statement that exception is taken, but to the kind of declaratory statement herein made.

In the first paragraph the Declaratory Statement reads: "With reference to Chapter III of the Confession of Faith: that concerning those who

are saved in Christ, the doctrine of God's eternal decree is held in harmony with the doctrine of His love to all mankind, His gift of His Son to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and His readiness to bestow His saving grace on all who seek it."

It is true, of course, that there is an important sense in which we may speak of God's love to all mankind. It is true also that we must speak in the language of I John 2:2 of Christ as the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. But when, as in the Declaratory Statement, it is said that "the doctrine of God's eternal decree is held in harmony with the doctrine of His love to *all mankind*, His gift of His Son to be the propitiation for the sins of *the whole world*" (italics ours), then the manifest implication is a doctrine of universal atonement, and universal atonement is in direct conflict with the teaching of the Confession. So what in view of the construction of the sentence and the collocation of the clauses is the straightforward interpretation of the Declaratory Statement cannot be held in harmony with the teaching of the Confession, and in particular with the teaching of Chapter III. The Declaratory Statement, therefore, brings contradiction into the creedal formulation of the doctrine of the Church.

Is it not apparent that here, as in Chapter XXXV, the settled policy and bias at work is the elimination or toning down of what is after all in this regard the distinctive feature of the Westminster Confession, namely, its consistent and all-pervasive particularism? It is just this that has made it both precious and offensive, precious to friends, offensive to foes. It is just precisely that that both the Declaratory Statement and Chapter XXXV would tone down or nullify.

### The Salvation of Infants

The second paragraph of the Declaratory Statement deals with what the Confession says in Chapter X, Section 3. "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth." This is an adequate statement, but much misunderstood and maligned. The Declaratory Statement adds to this what is intended to remove all objection. The first sen-

tence reads: "With reference to Chapter X, Section 3, of the Confession of Faith, that it is not to be regarded as teaching that any who die in infancy are lost." This is perfectly correct. The framers of the Confession with evident intention left the question of the extent of the election of infants dying in infancy entirely open. If any believe that all infants dying in infancy are elect and therefore regenerated and saved, then, so far as the statement of the Confession is concerned, they are at liberty to do so. If any suspend judgment on this question, then the Confession leaves them at liberty to do so. If any believe that not all infants dying in infancy are elect, then they are left by the Confession at liberty to do so. It is an exceedingly careful statement that allows for diversity of position on the *extent* of infant salvation.

But when the Declaratory Statement proceeds to say, "We believe that all dying in infancy are included in the election of grace, and are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who works when and where and how he pleases," it departs from the magnificent care exhibited in the reserved statement of the Confession.\*

There have been Reformed theologians of the highest repute who held to the position expressed in the Declaratory Statement. Dr. Charles Hodge for example (Systematic Theology I, pp. 26, 27) is unambiguous in his argument for the salvation of all infants dying in infancy. Other Reformed theologians of equal distinction scrupulously refrained from taking any such position. It is apparent, therefore, that there is surely room for difference of judgment in this matter. Our objection to the Declaratory Statement is that it incorporates into the creed of the church what is, to say the least, a highly debatable position, and therefore a position that should never be made part of creedal confession.

The Declaratory Statement epitomizes the entire difference of spirit and genius between the most distinguished of Reformed creed-makers, the Westminster divines, and modern

\*It should be noted that the subject with which the Confession is dealing in this chapter is not the topic of infant salvation, but that of "Effectual Calling."

ecclesiastics. The former were insistent upon dogmatic definiteness on questions that belong to the integrity of the Reformed Faith and therefore lie close to the heart of the Christian religion. In modern times the trend is in the opposite direction. The doctrines that lie at the very heart of our Faith are by vague, cryptic, ambiguous statement thrown into indefiniteness and obscurity. The purpose of the Westminster Confession was to state truth precisely to the exclusion of error; the genius of modern creed-making appears to be the power to devise enough elasticity to include error.

It is just such an indictment that bears against all the revisions we have considered, and therefore makes repudiation of them mandatory upon those who wish to bear an untarnished testimony to the truth.

## A Word to the Scattered

By the REV. EDWIN H. RIAN

**W**HAT should individuals do who wish to unite with The Presbyterian Church of America, and cannot because no congregation exists in their locality?

The first General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America determined that "elders, deacons, and laymen who unite with particular churches of The Presbyterian Church of America before the next General Assembly, be enrolled as charter members of The Presbyterian Church of America."

This resolution plainly implies that everyone who unites with The Presbyterian Church of America should do so through a particular congregation. Scores of individuals have written into the office of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, requesting that they be enrolled as charter members of the church. We have enrolled these laymen as charter members with the distinct understanding that they would join a local congregation. Where there has been no local congregation, we have recommended that the person unite with the church nearest at hand, and support the work of that church even though unable to attend.

This procedure accomplishes three things:

First, it maintains the Presbyterian idea of membership in the Christian

church. Individuals, according to Presbyterian practice, are to be members of an individual congregation.

Second, it seeks to emphasize the need of church extension work (by the nearest congregation) in the locality of the individual who has no church home. This, too, is in harmony with Presbyterianism, since it develops the responsibility and authority of individual churches and sessions. It also encourages presbyteries to establish new churches.

Third, it greatly aids and encourages congregations who may need additional personal support above what the local group can give. A striking illustration has come to our attention. A certain individual in Ohio

wrote requesting that she be enrolled as a charter member. We acceded to her request and recommended that she unite with the group in Cincinnati, even though too far away to attend regularly. This she did. She also pledged fifteen dollars a month to the work of the Cincinnati church. When her letter pledging support was read to the Cincinnati congregation, the people were inspired by such a generous act. Furthermore, it encouraged the Cincinnati people to consider church extension work in surrounding communities.

In fact, such a general policy will create new congregations more quickly and will tend to develop our church in a truly Biblical way.

respect. For instance, on page 125, the author says:

"Only two American groups are increasing the number of their missionaries [in China], the Roman Catholic Church and the very conservative Fundamentalist churches. The Roman Catholic Church is showing a missionary fervor that is inspiring. The liberal Protestant churches, the great denominations of America, are withdrawing their missionaries. The China Inland Mission, the Seventh-Day Adventists, and certain Holiness churches are carrying on without reducing forces."

It is also to be noted that Dr. Holt not only refrains from endorsing the Laymen's Inquiry and Rethinking Missions but even quotes from an appraisal of these by leading Japanese Christians which offers cold comfort to people who pin their faith in the Inquiry and the Rethinking:

"We have been reared in the midst of such great faiths as Shintoism and Buddhism. Even so, we find them insufficient. As Christians we stand to the last for the uniqueness and the absoluteness of the Christian faith. Of course, it is not our task to destroy the law and the prophets but to fulfill them. We therefore do not hesitate to show other faiths our good will. But we desire that the false impression that Christianity is not necessary be eradicated."

The author then suggests that the new strategy which he is seeking for Protestantism must grow out of three emphases. He starts well. The first one he enumerates is "A new consecration to God." In view of the many excellent things he has said and of the splendid start he has made one is led to regret that the next two emphases he sets forth are: "An elimination of duplication in the programs of co-operating organizations, as a step toward Protestant union," and "A union or a closer federation of Protestant Churches."

In other words, the new strategy for Protestantism must grow out of a new consecration to God and out of a better and more efficiently constructed organization. This is a very disappointing conclusion to what seemed an earnest and painstaking study of conditions as they exist in an effort to discover the said strategy. But, at least, Dr. Holt puts first emphasis upon a new consecration to God. He stands out in favorable con-

## The Chaos of Modernism

A Review by the REV. J. F. MINOR SIMPSON

THE SEARCH FOR A NEW STRATEGY IN PROTESTANTISM, by Ivan Lee Holt, Ph.D., President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Cokesbury Press, 1936. \$1.50.

AMONG thoughtful Modernists there is a feeling of bewilderment and of disillusionment which seems to be growing daily. It is being manifested in various forms. Some have begun to rail against Modernism or Liberalism and to call it a fair weather religion or system of thought. Others seem to recoil from it and to talk of another religion which will make God and not man the center of its faith. Some turn hopefully to the new Barthian movement and others take up Buchmanism, the so-called Oxford Group movement. Still others look hopefully at the different forms of mysticism. Others yield themselves up to different forms of pessimism and despair. Chaos seems to prevail in modernist thought.

This confusion and chaos is well illustrated in a recent book, "The Search for a New Strategy in Protestantism," by Ivan Lee Holt. The author took his B.A. degree at Vanderbilt University and his Ph.D. at Chicago. He is now the president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and pastor of the St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, South, St. Louis, Missouri. The material in this new book was

first delivered as the Bevan Lectures at Parkin College, Adelaide, South Australia, and later revised and delivered as the Fondern Lectures at Southern Methodist University.

Both on account of the position Dr. Holt holds in the church at large and on account of the circumstances under which the work was produced the book is entitled to careful study and to a courteous reply.

It must be said at the outset that Dr. Holt sets forth fearlessly and frankly the weaknesses and disappointments of Modernism or Liberalism. He also describes the confusion in current Protestant thinking caused by this, and the need of discovering some new strategy if Protestantism is to survive. The book is thus a healthy reaction from the cock-suredness which was all but universal in the Modernism of a few years ago when it was considered sufficient merely to say, "I believe in man." This superficial form of religion is certainly not defended by Dr. Holt.

The author in the remainder of his book discusses various proposals for a way out of the existing confusion. He discusses the existing economic crisis, the efforts for a larger fellowship and the new approach to the Christian world mission. Under these heads he says many things with which we are in entire agreement. And his candor in some cases commands our



trast to certain leaders of a large American denomination who seem to place loyalty to the existing church organization on a plane above loyalty to God and to Christ, the great Head of the church.

But Dr. Holt's position is further weakened by the fact that he points to Canada and the church union effected there in 1925 as an example of the kind of union to be desired by all Christendom. He says:

"In Canada there has come a union of Congregational and Methodist and Presbyterian churches. . . ."

He then goes on to speak of the success of church union in Canada. He was obviously unaware of the fact that after the union of 1925 there still remained a continuing Congregationalist and a continuing Presbyterian church; that the latter included in its membership just about half its former members and adherents if not more and has now a communicant membership of approximately 180,000 stretching from ocean to ocean. In other words, there were three denominations before 1925: Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregationalist, and after 1925 there were still three denominations: United, Presbyterian and Congregationalist. It could hardly be considered a success in the matter of union. The author very frankly admitted that in the case of the union in China the movement was not altogether a success, that some of the Presbyterians remained out of the union. He had been to China and knew that to be a fact, and was frank and free to admit it. In the case of Canada he had, apparently, not been to Canada and had no first-hand information. If he had he would not likely have spoken of it as he did as an unqualified success.

It is saddening to see a man of the position and gifts of Dr. Holt, after making an honest effort to find a way out of modernist chaos, to fail in that respect. After floundering around in the modernist morass he still fails to put his foot on dry ground. We trust that he will not become discouraged but that he will keep on trying and that he will finally discover that the way out of the existing confusion is a humble dependence upon the grace and mercy of God instead of upon human wisdom. A realization of the guilt and corruption of sin and of the inability of human nature, unaided by God, to uplift or save itself.

A realization of the fact that the second person of the Trinity left His exalted place in Heaven, came down to earth, took on our inferior nature, lived on earth as other men, only without sin, and finally died a shameful death as a propitiation for our sins, and rose again from the dead in the same body with which He was buried and by His resurrection and triumph over death has given us an assurance of a final resurrection at the time of His glorious second coming and of life everlasting. This is the

work of God and of His Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, and all that is required of us is simple faith in these glorious truths revealed to us in God's Holy Word which, being His Word, cannot err. This was the strategy of the early Church, of the Reformation Church and is the only strategy that will avail to bring the modern church out of its present chaos. And it is not just this humble writer who says it; it is God who says so in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, in the Book of Books.

## The Sunday School Lessons

By the REV. R. LAIRD HARRIS

**October 4th, The Macedonian Call. Acts 15:36 to 16:15, Romans 15:18-21.**



Mr. Harris

**W**HENEVER the Sunday School lessons return to Acts and the journey of Paul to Macedonia the church turns its eyes abroad and thinks again of the missionary imperative and the missionary program. Theoretically the entire Christian church of today believes in foreign missions. The great question of today is what sort of missions shall the church carry on and how shall it carry out its program.

It is interesting to notice that at the start of this the second missionary journey, the decisions of Paul and Barnabas are based, not on a supernatural call, but on Christian common sense. Notice that at the start of the first journey the work was begun by command of the Holy Ghost. There are times when God gives definite leading; there are other times when He leaves us to act according to the dictates of Christian common sense. It seems queer that both methods of His treatment are illustrated here. How Paul and Barnabas would have desired the express revelation of God's will in the matter of taking John Mark! But they had to settle that question according to their own sanctified good judgment. The revelation came later, probably as a surprise. And so in mission work it is not

to be expected that God will direct each step of our way. Nor will He leave His hands off of the enterprise. Where He makes plain His will by providential guidance, it behooves us to follow at once. And remember that in matters of principle He has made plain His will in His revealed Word. We need not ask guidance as to whether or not we should join with pagans in pagan work—we have God's Word to tell us not. But in matters of location of churches, times of passage, etc., He expects us to use our Christian common sense.

And it is legitimate for sincere Christians to differ in such matters of policy and judgment. We are not allowed to differ in basic beliefs. We dare not have fellowship with those who preach another gospel which is no gospel. But I believe it was all right for Paul and Barnabas to differ and to differ seriously. We have no apparent trace of hard feeling. Each in his own conviction departed from the other and the division which some, I suppose, today would call so distressing actually resulted in four workers going to the field in place of two. Notice that it is legitimate for Christian men to differ about policies and that Christian brotherhood *must* be preserved in the midst of such disagreement. In the case of a division that is doctrinal, brotherhood can no longer exist. Paul asks later for John Mark to come to him for he is profitable to him for the ministry (II Tim. 4:11). But a doctrinal difference demands absolute separation as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "If any

man love not the Lord Jesus let him be anathema" (I Cor. 16:22).

We follow Paul and Silas on the missionary tour. Through Asia Minor they went expecting apparently to stay in Asia Minor. But the revelation came of the needed help in Macedonia, a little country now included in Greece at the foot of the Balkan peninsula.

Help was needed; Macedonia and the world needs help today. Do we take seriously the need of men? Africa is still dark. China, though its civilization is hoary, still is in the throes of despair. But what sort of help does the world need? Panaceas for this country range from chain letters through the gamut of Utopian schemes. Do the African natives need houses or refrigerators? Do the people of India need automobiles? All these things might be convenient and fine. But the need which the apostle Paul set out under the guidance of God to fill was the need for salvation. Paul did not make any attempt to educate the people. In fact the crying need was from a land long famous for its intellectual supremacy. He never apparently urged the unfortunate to take up tent-making. Macedonia needed the gospel of the redeeming blood. And that was what Paul gave them. He could have taught them Hebrew, or logic, or philosophy. Paul was possibly a rhetorician and could have opened a school of expression, but instead he gave them the gospel of the suffering, atoning, rising Son of God in words long precious to the Christian Church. We know what he told them. He exalted Christ: "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . . and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:10-11). He gave the way of salvation: "That I may win Christ and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith" (Phil. 3:8-9). He turned their eyes to the glorious return of Christ: "For our conversation (citizenship, R.V.) is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ" (Phil. 3:20).

We may wonder about the results of Paul's preaching. He apparently left no committees to press legislation in Philippi that would benefit the un-

der classes and thus conserve the results of his revival. Like the Billy Sunday revivals, there were no results. No results except that souls were saved from hell by belief in the shed blood. No results except that heaven was rejoicing at sinners such as Lydia who were saved by grace. And so today, the missionary who is true is not the one who educates, doctors, and civilizes the people, but the humble servant of God who leaves behind a trail of brands plucked from the burning. Support that kind of missionary at home and abroad.

### October 11th, *Becoming a Christian.* Acts 16:16-40, Phil. 3:7-14.

The Lord calls out Christians in marvelous ways and in odd places, but few conversions, I suppose, are so extraordinary as that of the Philippian jailer. He was going about his duty, keeping safe his charge until, by God's power, his best precautions were thwarted and then he was ready to commit suicide. But called by the apostle he came trembling and became the great example of salvation by simple belief in the Lord Jesus Christ.

We wonder how long the demon-possessed damsel bore her testimony before Paul, being grieved, commanded the spirit to come out of her. The testimony was evidently true, yet not the sort of testimony God desires nor yet the sort of testimony which bears fruit. And as Jesus had in somewhat similar circumstances cast out demons (Mark 1:25), so Paul in the name of Jesus healed this girl. Certainly there is here a case of the strong man of the house being bound by one stronger. If the demon could testify to the most high God, how much greater a testimony it is when in the name of the most high God the demon spirit is conquered. There will be some who say that the girl was only insane and that Paul, like a good psychoanalyst, cured her some centuries before the rise of the science. Here is not the place to discuss demon possession, but we can notice that the apostle speaks of it as the opposition of the evil world and as definite possession by a demon. Likewise Jesus declares that He casts out demons not by Beelzebub, but rather He conquers Satan by the finger of God. If Jesus is to be believed at all, we must recognize this antagonism of

Satan against His kingdom as a very real and certainly a very terrible thing.

Furthermore, if there are some who say that the healing of the damsel was psychological, what will they say about the adjacent miracle which rocked the prison doors apart? Was then the earthquake deliverance a grand psychological nightmare super-induced by insomnia as the missionaries of the Lord sang praises to God? The point is that the prison deliverance is without question supernatural. And if it was so, the healing of the damsel is equally creditable. If you cannot believe either miracle you must destroy the text to such an extent that you will hardly believe there ever was a man called Paul. But such an extreme of skepticism cannot be held by scholars today. The evidence for the general historicity of the New Testament is too overwhelming. Even the rashest critics admit the historicity of the major epistles of Paul. And recently papyri of the gospels have been found (as noted in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for Jan. 20, 1936, p. 122) which add their valuable support to the orthodox teaching that the supernatural works of the apostles were not "cunningly devised fables" but were indeed the works of God.

The stage is now set to study the conversion of the Philippian jailer. Here were men with a message. It was not a message of condolence or an expression of value or a sop to feeling. It was a message of truth. And the truth was that men stand under the penalty of a righteous God. They did not say the Macedonians merely needed their personalities enlarged and their fears quelled. Their gospel was that men stand under the stroke of the axe of God. To quote what Paul said soon after at Athens: "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness" (Acts 17:31). Judgment was the message of Paul, and becoming a Christian to the jailer meant first of all safety. When he saw the foundations tumbling and had drawn his sword upon himself the man wanted no talk about courageous attacking of the problems in Macedonian society. He wanted salvation.

The genius of Protestantism was from the start this doctrine of justification, and justification by faith.

The Modernist says you need no justification, for sin is only a maladjustment and God will stand for almost anything. The Mohammedan and Jewish (and Christian) legalist says you are justified by being good and doing good and if you keep the fast of Ramadan or fast twice in the week or go to the church regularly and perhaps give to its boards and agencies, you need not fear. The Roman Catholic Church says if you confess and buy your indulgences the priest will absolve you. But the apostle said that Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, has Himself assumed the penalty for whomsoever believeth on Him. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

The Westminster Catechisms clearly delineate the steps which take place in our becoming a Christian. The belief of the jailer was not the first link in the chain. Long before that the work of redemption was done; and the jailer's faith would have been fruitless were it not for the sacrifice of the Lamb of God. Just so the faith in the quack religions of today and the modernist faith in the "worth of personality" will save nobody. The price of salvation must first be paid. We then become partakers in this redemption, the Catechism says, by the effectual application of that blood-bought redemption to us by the Holy Spirit. This He does by "working faith" in us. The faith the jailer expressed was first begotten by the effectual calling of God wherein, by compelling outward circumstances and inward testimony, the jailer's heart and will were changed. "Effectual calling is the work of God's Spirit, whereby, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ and renewing our wills, He doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to us in the gospel" (Shorter Catechism, Answer No. 31). In a word, we become Christians by being born again and in no other way. The Philippian jailer was saved by grace through faith. And being saved he was justified, adopted, sanctified and at last glorified by the same Christ who works in us today. Christ saves! And the answer of Paul is just as good today. You will not be saved in skepticism, you will not be saved by belief in the wrong thing or the wrong one. But "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house."

## How the Godly Man Lives

A Meditation on the First Psalm

By the REV. DAVID FREEMAN



Mr. Freeman

**G**OD has graciously conferred favor and blessing upon man. To this state of acceptance with Himself God calls men only through the Redeemer, Jesus Christ the Lord. Man cannot claim the blessing of heaven apart from the Savior from sin. That man alone can say "there is now no condemnation" who is found to be in Christ Jesus. (Rom. 8:1).

Godliness is not human goodness, but is the casting of the soul upon the mercy of God. And to be a true child of God there must be observed a devout study and keeping of the way of God as exhibited in His perfect law. What sets off and distinguishes the child of God from the one who is not the Lord's is just that the ungodly man is a stranger to God's ways. The law of God makes no difference to him, while to the godly man the law of God makes all the difference. He knows that apart from God's directions he will stumble and fall. The holy way of God is alone for him the path of light, peace and security.

It is because a man gives heed to divine commands that his position is such an enviable one. His condition stands firm. He is placed upon a rock. Upheld by God it is impossible for him to fall. Even the most adverse things that can happen to him are only for the furtherance of his welfare. And all that that man does shall have its full and glorious reward. Having a good conscience, being upheld in his inward parts by a solid and steadfast integrity, supreme happiness is his lot. Who is in such a place as the man in whom God takes pleasure?

Thus the pleasure of God is conditioned upon the keeping of God's law. This involves a careful study of it. And it must be such a study of it that shall lead to obedience. It ought to cause the believing soul to thank God that He has not left us to make a path for ourselves in religion, but has given us a rule of life. Our own way must necessarily be a wrong and an uncertain one, for what man can of himself know what duty God re-

quires of him! Unaided human understanding, as we see it in people unenlightened by God's directions, is exactly the opposite of God's ways. And being fallen and depraved creatures as we are, our ways cannot but be an abomination in His sight. With the help of God we should determine that henceforth we shall not be led by aught except the perfect rule of God.

And what is meant by the law of God? Any law of God is an expression of His character. He has given to us a perfect expression of Himself in the Ten Commandments. Again and again in the Old and New Testaments God's people are exhorted to keep them. (Deut. 6:6, 7; Joshua 1:8; Rom. 7:12, 14, 16; Gal. 3:10.) In any way to repudiate God's commands is to repudiate God.

But the law of God includes more than the Ten Commandments. It embraces all of God's Word. Are not the Holy Scriptures in their entirety an exposition of God's law? Do not the Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man? And is not this the purport of the law? The man of God, then, is he who neglects not the whole counsel of God. All of Scripture is for him the supreme rule of life and none of it is laid aside. He inquires into all of it, he believes all of it, and obeys all of it.

Here, then, in the first Psalm is an exhortation to read and study the Word of God and a rebuke for the neglect of it. We ought to cry with the Psalmist in another place, "O let me not wander from thy commandments. Blessed art thou, O Lord: teach me thy statutes. I will meditate in thy precepts, and have respect unto thy ways. I will not forget thy word."

What shall we say if we come to the Word of God just because we are driven to it as an unwilling slave is made to perform his tasks? Is the service of God a burden? Are God's precepts grievous to be borne? Is our religion an imposed something? Does it rob us of pleasures more to be

(Concluded on Page 264)

## COOPER BROTHERS ORDAINED AT IMPRESSIVE SERVICE

Presbytery of New Jersey  
Welcomes Men Refused  
by Old Organization

**T**HE West Presbyterian Church of Bridgeton (N. J.) on Friday evening, September 11th, was the scene of a solemn and moving service: The ordination of Thomas M. and Edward B. Cooper by the Presbytery of New Jersey of The Presbyterian Church of America.

The Rev. Clifford S. Smith, pastor of the church and moderator of the presbytery, presided. The Rev. William T. Strong, pastor of the West Collingswood Church, read the Scripture lesson, and the ordination prayer was offered by the Rev. Alexander K. Davison, pastor of the Vineland Church.

The ordination sermon was preached by the Rev. Carl McIntire, pastor of the Collingswood Church, and the charge to the newly-ordained ministers was delivered by the Rev. Professor J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D. A large congregation, including members of other churches in the South Jersey area, attended and gave their hearty welcome to the new ministers.

The Cooper brothers, graduates of Westminster Seminary, were long the focal point of interest and prayer among orthodox Presbyterians. On three separate occasions they applied for licensure under the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., only to be refused because they would not pledge "loyalty" to the official Boards of the organization.

The first refusal by the Presbytery of West Jersey came in June, 1935. A second request was denied on September 10th, 1935, at which time presbytery's Special Judicial Commission announced its conviction of the Rev. Carl McIntire on charges rising out of his Independent Board membership. The action against the Cooper brothers was later held wrong by the Synod of New Jersey.

Given the opportunity to supply fields in South Dakota the candidates did so with such acceptability that

their fields wished to call them. Letters as candidates were granted by the presbytery but, on April 15th, 1936—this time by the Presbytery of Sioux Falls, S. D.—reception was once more refused.

The Presbyterian Church of America was, of course, more than glad to welcome these loyal young men. At the present time Mr. Edward Cooper is organizing the local group in Woodstown, N. J. Mr. Thomas Cooper is laboring in Maine under the recently-formed Committee for the Propagation of the Reformed Faith in New England.

## KIRKWOOD CHURCH INSTALLS ELDERS AND DEACONS

**F**OUR elders and four deacons were ordained and installed on Sunday, September 6th, by the Rev. George W. Marston, pastor of the newly-organized Kirkwood (Pa.) Presbyterian Church. It will be remembered that Mr. Marston's complaint against the unconstitutional action of the Presbytery of Donegal was dismissed by the Syracuse Assembly. The installation of the new elders and deacons is merely the climax of three months of quiet, steady, prayerful work on the part of Mr. Marston and his loyal congregation.

Summoned before the local Sanhedrin on June 25th and charged with "disorderly conduct and violation of ordination vows" (because he had joined The Presbyterian Church of America), Mr. Marston entered a stirring denial. Nevertheless he was suspended without trial. On June 28th a representative of presbytery declared the pulpit vacant. Incensed by the unjust treatment accorded their pastor, aroused to the seriousness of the situation, and denied a congregational meeting in which to express themselves, more than two hundred people walked out of the church building.

Determined efforts were made by some stand-patting elders and trustees to force the group to "return to the fold." Issues were obscured by pious statements, sentiment and bitter denunciations. A very few weakened, but most of the church-workers and young people went to Kirkwood, about a mile distant, to form a new church which expects to affiliate with

The Presbyterian Church of America.

The Kirkwood Presbyterian Church now has 115 members on its rolls; the roll of the Sunday School exceeds ninety; attendance at the morning service averages over a hundred; and between 70 and 80 attend the evening service. The church is looking forward to evangelistic meetings this fall.

"The Lord has abundantly blessed us," said Mr. Marston, "and enriched our knowledge of His grace and joy. 'What a fellowship, what a joy divine.'"

## THE REV. D. K. BLACKIE FOUND GUILTY, "DEPOSED" BY LOS ANGELES BODY

**T**HE Rev. Donald K. Blackie, on August 31st, was "deposed" by the Presbytery of Los Angeles of the organization known as the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. This was done in spite of the fact that Mr. Blackie had renounced the jurisdiction of that body on August 29th, and therefore did not even appear before it. The charges and specifications used to sharpen the ecclesiastical guillotine, being of almost unparalleled thinness, are worthy of note. They are quoted in full:

### I. Charge:

Failing and refusing to submit himself to his brethren in the Lord, thus violating his vows in his licensure and ordination as a minister of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

1. Specification: On June 9, 1936, the Presbytery of Los Angeles through its Judicial Commission advised the Rev. Donald K. Blackie to refrain from "harsh judgment of others" and "confusion" of mind and "criticism," which endangered the peace, unity, and purity of the church of Jesus Christ; which advice he disregarded by advertising in the *Los Angeles Times*, June 27, 1936, "A mass meeting to be held July 2, 1936, at the Trinity Presbyterian Church, saying, 'Presbyterians awake!', 'The Crisis in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.' as the general theme for the meeting." The intent and purpose of this meeting as shown by the report of its proceedings (see stenographic report of meeting at Trinity Church, July 2, 1936) is clearly and unmistakably to disregard the advice given by the Presbytery of Los Angeles through its Judicial Commission on June 16, 1936.

### II. Charge:

Failure and refusal to maintain the peace, unity and purity of the church, contrary to the Word of God and the

rules and regulations of said church founded thereon in violation of his vows made at the time of his licensure and ordination on September 26, 1934 as a minister of said church.

1. Specification: On July 5, 1936, he brought before the Trinity Presbyterian Church the Rev. Bruce Coie, missionary to India under the "Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions" which Board he knew was not approved by the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., and by thus doing he encouraged dissension against the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. (see stenographic report).

### III. Charge:

Failure to be a good example to the flock over which he was made overseer in that he has sought to promote schism in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

1. Specification: That notwithstanding the Presbytery of Los Angeles gave him "advice" following acts and attitudes of indiscretion on his part in which he made statements before the session of Trinity Presbyterian Church bringing into doubt his loyalty to the Boards of the Church, which loyalty he had pledged before Presbytery at the time of his licensure and ordination; and in which he stated that the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. was propagating "a gospel other than the Gospel of Jesus Christ"; and in which, although he had promised loyalty to the Boards and agencies of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. he tried to influence the session to direct funds to the support of a missionary whose name had been erased from the roll of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. Furthermore, at the meeting held on Thursday, July 2, 1936, Mr. Blackie announced that an offering would be taken and when received would be given to the Rev. Bruce Coie of India (mentioned above) and on Sunday, July 5th, 1936, at the regular service of the Trinity Presbyterian Church he placed a receptacle on the table to receive a voluntary offering to be added to that of Thursday evening for the Rev. Mr. Coie.

2. Specification: On July 5, 1936, he brought before the Trinity Presbyterian Church the Rev. Bruce Coie, a missionary to India under The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions which Board he knew was not approved by the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., thus encouraging dissension and not being zealous to maintain the peace of the church.

3. Specification: The two preceding specifications were in direct disregard of the authority of the Presbytery of Los Angeles reporting through its Judicial Commission, June 16, 1936.

4. Specification: In an address to the meeting of July 2, 1936, he said (page 28, stenographic report), "The situation in the Church is at a crisis and I want it understood that in my heart of hearts I believe that the General Assembly meeting in Syracuse dethroned Jesus Christ as its Lord" and (page 44, same report) "This meeting would never have been called had the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. remained true to the original faith. So I am praying God earnestly, in the light of these facts and in the light of

the beacon light of truth, that we will be awakened out of our hopeless stupor and that we will stand for the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The crisis is not ahead. . . . We are at the crisis now!

"I got a letter today from a young man I went to seminary with. He has left the Presbyterian Church because of the same things I have been saying to you. And I know of other young men who are leaving the Presbyterian Church, feeling it is an apostate organization . . . hopelessly apostate. They would remain in it if they could but they cannot sail under a false flag.

"What are we going to do out here on the coast? Practically no stand has been taken. What are we going to do anyway?"

5. Specification: By the distribution of literature intended to provoke division and dissatisfaction in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., announcing its presence on a table at the July 2 meeting and urging those present to take it with them.

Paying little attention either to the sentence or the recent civil court injunction restraining them from the further use of their church, Mr. Blackie and his congregation, with a membership of more than a hundred, meet regularly in a tent and have called the new church "Gardens Tabernacle."

## WESTFIELD GROUP HOLDS MEETINGS TO INFORM LAITY

A SERIES of three meetings in Westfield, N. J., were held on September 11th, 13th, and 20th, for the purpose of bringing before the local laymen the history of the Presbyterian conflict. "My Church and Why" was the subject of a stirring address by Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, President of Wheaton College. The Rev. Edwin H. Rian, General Secretary of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, spoke on "A True Church." The closing address of the series was delivered by Dr. J. Gresham Machen, Moderator of the first General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America. His subject was: "Shall we obey man or God?"

Conceived and executed by two elders and one layman who hope soon to be able to organize a local church of The Presbyterian Church of America, these important meetings have done much to crystallize sentiment among those who previously had tried to avoid any decision re-

garding their membership in the body known as the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

The meetings were well attended and a new church is shortly expected in Westfield.

## MISSION SECRETARY ELABORATES VIEW OF OLD TESTAMENT

THE following letters supplement the account in our issue of July 20th of the correspondence between Miss Lee, a missionary under the Independent Board, and Dr. Dodds, who has recently accepted appointments as Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. At Miss Lee's request we call attention to Dr. Dodds' correction of the statement concerning his attitude towards the Old Testament.

We quote first from Miss Lee:

Kanauj, U. P., India,  
April 11, 1935.

My Dear Dr. Dodds:

This letter is to inform you that because of many events continually occurring in our midst unchallenged, contrary to "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," I am constrained to give information to the church at home. This will be the first time that I have done so since my return to India in 1933, but I think it fair to inform you that I am doing so now.

Since I believe that at the root of all these events is that (seemingly) little departure from *belief* mentioned by you in your letter of September twenty-fourth on page three, relating to the Spirit of God as not "making the writers infallible . . ." etc., and since I have pled with you yourself in vain, I am therefore now sending copies of our correspondence to the U. S. A. to be used in any way deemed fitting by those to whom I send them.

I believe with all my heart the conclusion drawn by atheists in the following quotation:

The forces of Modernism have won a sweeping victory in the last few years. Modernists now control the entire machinery and corporate life of the Presbyterian Church. . . . Much as we dislike Modernism because of its illogical compromising, we must recognize that *for many it is but a stop-over in the road to atheism.* (Annual Report of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism). (Underscoring mine.)

Atheists see it, and we see it. Would

that you who have dropped the key of faith may also see it before it is too late. And the point of departure—yes, the heart of that which in this quotation is called Modernism—is found in that one sentence in your letter to which I have referred.

I have not ceased to love the Mission, the missionaries, and the Board. I love them—and my Saviour—so much that I am willing to face whatever may be ahead of me for the sake of trying to help save them, and God's work in India and the world. But now, "We are as opposite as the poles. Both sides cannot be right. If the Bible is the inspired, inerrant, infallible Word of God, then Modernism is an Anti-Christ system."

Yours for the purity of the Gospel,  
L. LEE.

From Dr. Dodds:

#### THE INDIA COUNCIL

of the Punjab, North India and Western India Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

"Lowriston"  
Dehra Dun  
U. P., India

Office of Secretary.  
Miss L. Lee,  
A. P. Mission,  
Kanauj.

April 27, 1935

Dear Miss Lee:

I was hoping to see you at the Mainpuri conference to talk with you in person about the correspondence which you are proposing to send to America. Though it appears that we do not agree in our theological positions, I have full confidence that you will be fair in the matter. I am not so sure that those to whom you might send the correspondence will be as fair. It is always possible to extract sentences, which in isolation from their contexts give very wrong impressions. If you will assure me that such will not be done, I have no objection at all to the correspondence being made public.

However, there is one letter, that of November 9, in which you report that I do not "believe Old Testament to be equally inspired with the New." I do not consider that this statement represents my position. I may have said that the teachings of the Old Testament need to be checked by what is said in the New; but that is rather because of a progressive revelation than of different degrees of inspiration. I had thought that this was a truth accepted by all. For example, the permission in the Old Testament to keep slaves has to be checked by the New Testament law of love. Christ himself said that the laws of divorce, as given in the Old Testament, were below the ideal standard and were given because of their hard-heartedness.

Again, may I say that I am sorry that you find it impossible or undesirable to fellowship with the rest of the missionary group and to embark an active propaganda against them. You may be right and I may be wrong, but somehow I cannot picture Christ doing the same thing for the same reasons.

Cordially yours,

J. L. DODDS

## NEW PRESBYTERY OF NEW JERSEY FORMS; OLD PRESBYTERY OF WEST JERSEY MISINFORMS

### New Body Receives Twenty-three Members

**T**HE Presbytery of New Jersey of The Presbyterian Church of America was formally erected on Tuesday, September 8th, at the West Collingswood Presbyterian Church. Included in its membership are nine ministers and fourteen elders who have renounced the jurisdiction of the organization called the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Ministerial members are: Carl McIntire, Collingswood; William T. Strong, West Collingswood; M. Nelson Buffler, Haddon Heights; J. U. Selwyn Toms, Wenonah; Frank Hamilton, Ventnor; Leslie A. Dunn, Columbus; Clifford S. Smith, Bridgeton; Alexander K. Davison, Vineland; and Leonard S. Pitcher, Wildwood.

Elders admitted to presbytery are: Edward B. Cooper, Bridgeton; C. Preston Sellers, Bridgeton; Samuel E. Iredell, Bridgeton; Leslie W. Gibson, Bridgeton; Ralph Ellis, Vineland; Dr. Alvin D. Stultz, Vineland; Donald M. Perkins, Vineland; H. M. Partington, Westfield; J. Enoch Faw, Westfield; J. Herbert Rue, Merchantville; A. R. Jackson, Columbus; George Haines, Tuckahoe; Edgar Sheppard, Tuckahoe; and Dr. Franklin C. Woodruff, Atlantic Highlands.

When the presbytery was called to order the Rev. Leonard S. Pitcher was named temporary clerk. Subsequently the Rev. Alexander K. Davison was elected Stated Clerk, and the Rev. Clifford S. Smith was chosen Moderator.

Then the new presbytery passed a series of resolutions restoring all ecclesiastical powers to the ministers who were "suspended" or "deposed" by the former West Jersey Presbytery. These resolutions were similar to those approved by the first General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America.

One resolution adopted by the group sets forth that the new presbytery succeeds the Presbyteries of West Jersey, New Brunswick, Newark, Elizabeth, Jersey City, Mon-

*(Concluded on Next Page, Column 1)*

### Old Body Asserts "Deposed" Ministers May Not Function

**M**EETING in the Somerdale Church on Tuesday, September 8th, the Presbytery of West Jersey of the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. voted to accept the resignations of three more ministers. After accepting the resignations—which automatically severed all connections between the ministers and the presbytery—that body then decided with typical zig-zag reasoning, to give the three men an opportunity to show cause why they should not be deposed. They and all other ministers and elders who have signified their intention to withdraw, were cited to appear on October 13th before the Synod of New Jersey.

The three ministers who resigned are: the Rev. Alexander K. Davison, Vineland; the Rev. M. Nelson Buffler, Haddon Heights; and the Rev. J. U. Selwyn Toms, Wenonah. All three joined the Presbytery of New Jersey of The Presbyterian Church of America a few hours later.

High-spot of the meeting was the reading by Stated Clerk Addison B. Collins of a letter from state director of public health, Dr. J. Lynn Mahaffey. This letter purported to notify the presbytery that certain ministers, previously "deposed," would no longer be allowed to conduct marriage ceremonies. Dr. Collins, however, neglected to inform the presbytery that this letter, dated July 13th, was merely the first reply from the state health board to a letter from West Jersey Presbytery asking if "deposed" ministers could continue to solemnize marriages. When, a few days after the receipt of that letter, the ministers themselves wrote to Dr. Mahaffey explaining that they were continuing in the ministry despite the action of presbytery, they were promptly told that they should proceed as before, that since they were not abandoning the ministry they had every legal right to perform marriages. Although wide publicity was given this second letter Dr. Collins had never heard of it.

*(Concluded on Next Page, Column 2)*

## NEW JERSEY NEWS (Concluded)

(From Preceding Page, Column 2)

mouth, Morris, Orange and Newton. These Presbyteries are still affiliated with the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

The West Church, Bridgeton, was the first church to be admitted to the new presbytery.

The applications of Thomas M. and Edward B. Cooper, Bridgeton, for admission as ministers, were approved. They were licensed to preach and were ordained on September 11th, in Bridgeton.

Mr. Strong was named chairman of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, to organize new churches. Others on the committee were Mr. Buffler, Mr. Davison, Mr. Perkins and Mr. Rue.

The entire meeting, according to one observer, was a true deliberative session in which the enthusiasm and interest of each member was concentrated in a beautiful Christian unanimity of purpose.

## ASKS NAME REMOVED FROM SIGNERS OF AUBURN AFFIRMATION

THE Rev. V. K. Beshgetoor, whose name appears on the list of signers of the heretical Auburn Affirmation, has requested that the following communication be given publicity:

"Alma, Mich.,  
"August 25, 1936.

"To the Editor of

THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN.

"Dear Sir:

"My name appears as a signer of the Auburn Affirmation. While I have no recollection of having done so, I assume that I must have signed it. I must have done it without careful thought of the far-reaching significance of said affirmation and probably more as a step toward peace in the church. However, since I am diametrically opposed to its spirit and have asked Dr. Nichols to remove my name as one of the signers, I wish to be known as such and not quoted as one of the Auburn Affirmationists.

Cordially yours,

V. K. BESHGETOOR.

(From Preceding Page, Column 3)

T. Kenney Reeves, treasurer of the presbytery, tried to pour oil on the troubled waters, but was met with silence after he remarked:

"We are anxious that all seceding churches come back. But how can they when we treat them like outcasts?"

He declared it has already cost the presbytery \$2000 to oust the Rev. Carl McIntire. He recommended that a per capita tax of 23 cents now imposed be increased to 25 cents next year because of a deficit caused by withdrawing churches.

The Rev. O. W. Buschgen, Weldonah, further tried to promote a sweetness-and-light atmosphere by suggesting that the next meeting of the presbytery, which will be a promotion session, be devoted to world affairs.

"Let us forget our own troubles and get back to the evangelistic ideas of the first and second centuries," he declared.

But on the heels of his suggestion the Rev. Curtis L. Bosserman, Cape May, moved that two pulpits, at Vineland and Haddon Heights, be declared vacant and new Moderators be appointed. The motion was carried.

The Rev. H. M. Taxis said he was endeavoring to reunite the West Collingswood factions. He reported that 80 members have left with the pastor, the Rev. William T. Strong, and 40 have remained "loyal."

Vineland members who had refused to withdraw with their pastor, complained they were "being left high and dry by the presbytery." Stated Clerk Collins declared the presbytery is doing all it can in civil courts to regain possession, but did not reveal the plan of action.

What appeared to many as the first rewards to the Rev. Joseph H. Schaefer, Barrington, for his recent beautiful devotion to the machine (see THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for August 17th) came in the form of a salary increase from \$100 to \$250 yearly for his work as permanent clerk of presbytery.

The presbytery demanded immediate action to recover the property of the West Collingswood Church and the West Church of Bridgeton, "possession of which has been seized by

a schismatic group styling themselves as The Presbyterian Church of America." The Moderator was authorized to name a committee on seizure of church property.

## CHARGES OF HERESY PRESSED AGAINST DR. ANGUS OF AUSTRALIA

### His Supporters Try to Quash Proceedings

LATEST reports from Sydney, Australia, disclose that an effort is being made to reopen the Angus Heresy Case. Professor Angus has been charged with proving false to his ordination vows "to maintain and defend the doctrine held by the Presbyterian Church" in regard to the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, His Atonement, His Bodily Resurrection and other truths.

The Rev. J. A. Carter, supported by the decision of the New South Wales Assembly that the Presbytery of Sydney has erred in failing to deal with his charges against Dr. Angus, initiated the action. Evidently the presbytery was unfriendly. Mr. Carter himself was subjected to a form of questioning that led one member of presbytery to object that the proceedings were being reduced to a farce.

Early test votes showed the strength of the opposition to Mr. Carter. A motion "that in accordance with the rules for discipline in the Presbyterian code a commission be appointed by the presbytery to confer with Dr. Angus" was defeated by 35 votes to 12. And a motion by the Rev. John Edwards, a supporter of Dr. Angus, that Mr. Carter had failed to substantiate his charge that Dr. Angus has obtained his theological professorship at St. Andrew's College "by concealing from the New South Wales Assembly his real opinions" prevailed by the same vote. In a statement to the newspapers Mr. Carter repudiated the construction placed upon this statement, declaring that his view was that "if Dr. Angus held the views which he now holds at the time of his appointment, and had made known to the Assembly or presbytery what his opinions really were he could never have been appointed." A motion by Mr. Edwards

that "the reopening of the case is an unnecessary disturbance of the peace of the Presbyterian Church and that the presbytery therefore resolves to proceed no further in the matter" was carried over to the next meeting.

Dr. Angus was born in Ireland in 1881. He spent several years in America, including three years at Princeton Seminary and Princeton University. He also spent several years at European universities before receiving his appointment as Professor of New Testament at St. Andrew's College, University of Sydney, in 1914. He has occupied that chair ever since, except for brief periods when he returned to this country as a visiting professor at Western Theological Seminary, Yale and Columbia. He is the author of several books, notably *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*. A review of his book, *Truth and Tradition*, a defense of charges of heresy against him, will appear in the next issue.

## BALTIMORE CONGREGATION BECOMES SELF-SUPPORTING

### Two Months' Work Brings Outstanding Results

ON JULY first, Mr. Theodore J. Jansma, a senior at Westminster Seminary, was sent to Baltimore by the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension to help organize a group of friends of The Presbyterian Church of America. He was granted a small stipend by the committee.

His work met with instant success. At the first Sunday service on July 5th, 36 were present. Since then there have been an average of 70 at each service, and with the beginning of September the number is increasing.

On September first, Mr. Jansma came into the office of the committee and gave the General Secretary a check from the Baltimore people for the exact amount which the committee had sent to Mr. Jansma for the months of July and August. Furthermore, he stated that from then on the work in Baltimore would be self-supporting.

The Baltimore group gives promise of becoming a large and influential

church. It is hoped that all of the congregations of The Presbyterian Church of America will become self-supporting as quickly as possible.

## PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS TO COMPLAINT OF OLD ORGANIZATION FILED

COUNSEL for certain of the defendants who have been served in the law suit by those in control of the body known as the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. against individuals supposed to represent The Presbyterian Church of America, on September 15th filed "preliminary objections" to the bill of complaint. These are designed to clear away certain legal questions which must be settled before litigation can go further. If these objections should be sustained, the case would be thrown out either in part or as a whole unless the plaintiffs should amend the bill of complaint. If the objections should be overruled, however, it would not be a defeat for the defendants but would simply mean that they must then prepare and submit to the court an answer on the "merits" of the case. No answer to the bill of complaint as a whole has yet been made, nor will a decision on the "preliminary objections" necessarily be determinative of the case. The objections are quoted in full:

I. The Bill is defective in that it is an attempt on the part of the plaintiffs to secure by law a preference for a religious establishment in violation of Section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which provides as follows:

"All men have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship."

II. The Bill is defective in that it is multifarious as to parties plaintiff and causes of action, and all of the plaintiffs are not interested in all of the causes of action alleged to be set forth, any alleged cause of action of the Trustees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, a corporation, being separate and distinct

from any alleged cause of action of the individual plaintiffs.

III. The Bill is defective in respect to any alleged cause of action of the Trustees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in that

1. The Bill fails to set forth the particular property owned or held by the corporation.

2. The Bill fails to set forth the terms and conditions of the trusts under which the corporation holds the property.

3. The Bill fails to set forth the particular property held by the corporation which it is alleged is being interfered with by the defendants.

4. The Bill fails to set forth the manner in which the defendants are alleged to be interfering with the said property.

IV. The Bill is defective in respect to the allegations of the authority of the individual plaintiffs to file the Bill in that

1. The Bill fails to set forth the Constitution governing the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, from which the Court could determine whether or not such authority exists in the individual plaintiffs,

2. The defendants aver that, if such Constitution were set forth in full, it would show that Henry B. Master, who files the Bill as "Moderator of the General Assembly," and Lewis S. Mudge, who joins in the Bill as "Stated Clerk of the General Assembly," and George Emerson Barnes, Robert B. Whyte, Mark A. Matthews, William B. Pugh, John H. DeWitt, Adrian Lyon and Hallock C. Sherrard, who join in the Bill as "a specially constituted Committee of the General Assembly," have no authority to file this Bill of Complaint on behalf of approximately two million members of the unincorporated association called "The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." The defendants further aver that the Form of Government, which is part of the Constitution of the plaintiffs' church, provides in Chapter I, Section I and Section VIII as follows:

"I. That God alone is Lord of the conscience; and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to his word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship; therefore they consider the rights of private judgment, in all matters that respect religion, as universal and unalienable: they do not even wish to see any religious constitution aided by the civil power, further than may be necessary for protection and security, and, at the same time, be equal and common to all others."

"VIII, Lastly, That, if the preceding scriptural and rational principles be steadfastly adhered to, the vigor and strictness of its discipline will contribute to the glory and happiness of any Church. Since ecclesiastical discipline must be purely moral or spiritual in its object, and not attended with any civil effects, it can derive no force whatever, but from its own justice, the approbation of an impartial public, and the countenance and blessing of the great Head of the Church universal."



The Confession of Faith, which is part of the Constitution of the plaintiffs' church, in Chapter XXIII, Section III, in referring to Civil Magistrates, provides,

"Civil Magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the Word and Sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or, in the least, interfere in matters of faith. Yet, as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the Church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger. And, as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his Church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let, or hinder, the due exercise thereof, among the voluntary members of *any* denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief. It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner as that no person be suffered, either upon pretence of religion or of infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury to any other person whatsoever: and to take order, that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance."

3. The resolution which the Bill quotes purporting to authorize the bringing of this suit is insufficient for the purpose.

V. The Bill is defective in respect to the claim of the individual plaintiffs in that it fails to allege any facts constituting a valid cause of action.

1. (a) The Bill avers that the defendants are violating the principles and practices of comity which are alleged to prevail among all other protestant evangelical churches and societies, but the Bill fails to state what these principles and practices of comity are.

(b) The Bill fails to allege the manner in which the alleged principles and practices of comity have been violated by the defendants.

(c) The defendants are advised by counsel, believe and therefore aver that, if the Bill is attempting to aver that there is in effect a kind of religious trade agreement or monopoly in respect to the Protestant religion, the Bill is defective in failing to set forth the terms of the said religious trade agreement or monopoly.

(d) The defendants are further advised by counsel, believe and therefore aver that such religious trade agreement or monopoly, if it exists, violates the religious freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and is illegal and void.

2. The defendants are advised by counsel, believe and therefore aver that the individual plaintiffs have no right under the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to interfere with any person or persons who seek to induce the members of any church organization to change

their religious affiliations, and are advised by counsel that the assumption that any religious denomination in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has any vested right to protect its members from being requested to withdraw from such religious organization by a decree of a court of equity is contrary to the guarantees of religious liberty set forth in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

3. The defendants aver that the Bill is defective in connection with its allegation that the defendants are attempting to induce members and individual churches associated with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to withdraw therefrom with the church property under their control and bring themselves and said property into the membership and support of the church with which the defendants are associated in that

(a) It does not describe the property with which the defendants are alleged to be interfering.

(b) It does not allege that such interference is unlawful.

(c) The defendants are advised by counsel, believe and therefore aver that under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the title to the property held for religious purposes in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is in the lay members of the several congregations and in the event of any unlawful interference therewith on the part of anyone, the right of action to protect such property is in the trustees of the several incorporated congregations.

4. The Bill is defective in that it is based upon an erroneous assumption that the plaintiffs in the Bill have some kind of property right or monopoly in the future charitable and religious contributions not only of all persons who believe in the Confession of Faith with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and who generally consider themselves Presbyterians, but also of the public generally and of casual worshippers, and the defendants are advised by counsel, believe and therefore aver that such assumption is contrary to the principles of religious liberty guaranteed by the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that the enforcement of such doctrine would mean the establishment of a State church in violation of the Constitution.

WHEREFORE, the defendants, J. GRESHAM MACHEN, PAUL WOOLLEY and EDWIN H. RIAN, request the Court to hear argument upon the foregoing objections and to dismiss the Bill of Complaint with the costs to these defendants to be paid by the plaintiffs.

Bible-believing Christians will note with interest that in the bill of complaint (quoted in full in the last issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN) two of those named as plaintiffs, George Emerson Barnes and Robert B. Whyte, are signers of the notorious Auburn Affirmation. A third plaintiff, Hallock C. Sherrard, vice-

moderator of the Syracuse General Assembly, is widely known as a large cog in the bureaucratic machine.

## WITHDRAWING CHURCH HOLDS FIRST SERVICE IN VINELAND, N. J.

SUNDAY, September 13th, in Grange Hall, Vineland, N. J., was the scene of a thrilling service attended by two hundred friends and former members of the old Vineland Presbyterian Church. Five of the nine elders, about ninety per cent. of the Sunday School workers, and more than seventy-five per cent. of the active membership of the old church are strongly allied with their pastor, the Rev. Alexander K. Davison, Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of New Jersey of The Presbyterian Church of America.

First prayer-meeting of this enthusiastic group was held Thursday, September 10th, in the home of one of the members, with more than fifty in attendance. The initial Sunday School service in the new building found 154 attending, with about the same number at the evening meeting. Later about seventy persons packed the new manse to sing hymns and offer thanksgiving for the Lord's blessing.

A brief resolution was prepared for the signatures of members who wished to abandon the body known as the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and unite with the new group. About 125 names were signed at the first Sunday service.

The new church has been blessed financially. One non-member who was about to join gave fifty dollars for the purchase of a Communion service. Another sent sixty dollars to buy new hymnals. Offerings at each service have been gratifying.

Elders and trustees who have joined with the new church are: *Elders*: E. L. Robinson, A. D. Stultz, I. T. Mullen, Ralph Ellis, Donald M. Perkins. *Trustees*: Prof. T. T. Unger, H. R. Finney, Dr. R. H. Ellis, Mrs. Velma Whisonant.

At a meeting held Thursday evening, September 17th, the congregation voted unanimously to join The Presbyterian Church of America. The name chosen by the congregation is the Covenant Presbyterian Church of Vineland.

## FEDERAL COUNCIL'S PREACHING MISSION BEGINS HUGE PROGRAM

### Modernist Organization Plans to Hold Meetings in Twenty-eight Cities

**G**ERMINATING in the mind of Pittsburgh's Dr. Hugh Thompson Kerr, President of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., relayed to the modernist-dominated Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and finally springing full-panoplied from the corporate soul of a special representative committee, the National Preaching Mission of the Federal Council has launched its ambitious program.

The avowed purpose of the mission is to bind together in spiritual unity all the Christian forces of the nation, to present the gospel, in contemporary terms, to the people of our day and generation. This has been cleverly phrased by its leaders, in what has seemed to many a strange combination of uplifted eyes and crossed fingers:

"Triumphantly aware of the redeeming, transforming grace of God in Christ, it would confront through group contacts and public meetings the clear thought and courageous will of the American people with the imperative necessity in the high cause of the future that Christianity should gird itself for a real struggle, to stress once more the reasonableness of the Christian faith in the personal God and its aptness to the deepest needs and farthest aspirations of human life, and its redemptive and creative power in organizing and shaping of a bewildered society toward the standards and ideals of the kingdom of God."

The National Preaching Mission will be conducted from September 13th through December 9th in twenty-eight cities of the United States. Four days will be spent in each city by about fifteen well-known speakers. These four-day sessions are the first phase of the mission. Then will follow a series of five or six two-day preaching missions in communities adjacent to the original centers. This

is phase number two. The third phase is the holding, by local congregations, of an eight-day simultaneous mission, probably during November.

A partial list of the personnel of the National Preaching Mission has been tentatively announced as follows:

President Albert W. Beaven, of Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.

Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder, of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C.

Dr. George A. Buttrick, Auburn Affirmationist pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York.

The Rev. Edmund B. Chaffee, Auburn Affirmationist editor of *The Presbyterian Tribune*.

Mrs. Harrie R. Chamberlin, of Toledo, President of the National Convention of Young Women's Christian Association.

Dr. M. E. Dodd, of the First Baptist Church of Shreveport, La., and former President of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Rt. Rev. Henry Wise Hobson, of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Southern Ohio.

Mr. Harry N. Holmes, of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches.

Dr. Ivan Lee Holt, President of the Federal Council and pastor of St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, South, St. Louis.

Dr. Douglas Horton, lecturer at Chicago Theological Seminary.

Dean Lynn Harold Hough, of Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. Y.

Dr. E. Stanley Jones, of India.

Dr. T. Z. Koo, of Shanghai.

Miss Muriel Lester, of Kingsley House, London.

Dr. John A. Mackay, of Princeton Theological Seminary.

Dr. Raphael H. Miller, of the National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C.

The Rev. Richard C. Raines, Hennepin Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, Minneapolis.

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, San Antonio, Texas.

Mr. Fred Ramsey, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. Merton S. Rice, of the Metropolitan Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich.

Rt. Rev. Richard Roberts, Moderator of the United Church of Canada.

Hon. Francis B. Sayre, State Department, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Paul E. Scherer, of the Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity, New York.

Dr. Robert E. Speer, of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Professor William Taliaferro Thompson, of the Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

Rev. Channing H. Tobias, National Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations.

Dr. George D. Truett, of the First Baptist Church, Dallas, Texas.

Principal John S. Whale, Chestnut College, Cambridge, England.  
Bishop William Scarlett, Bishop of Missouri.

Cities and dates for the mission have been announced:

Albany—September 13.  
Buffalo—September 14.  
Syracuse—September 15.  
Rochester—September 16.  
Pittsburgh—September 17, 18, 19, 20.  
Kansas City—September 20, 21, 22, 23.  
Detroit—September 24, 25, 26, 27.  
Indianapolis—September 27, 28, 29, 30.  
Atlanta—October 1, 2, 3, 4.  
Birmingham—October 4, 5, 6, 7.  
Louisville—October 8, 9, 10, 11.  
St. Louis—October 11, 12, 13, 14.  
Cleveland—October 15, 16, 17, 18.  
Des Moines—October 18, 19, 20, 21.  
Omaha—October 22, 23, 24, 25.  
Billings—October 25, 26, 27, 28.  
Seattle—October 29, 30, 31, November 1.  
Vancouver—November 1, 2, 3, 4.  
Portland—November 5, 6, 7, 8.  
San Francisco and Oakland—November 8, 9, 10, 11.  
Los Angeles—November 12, 13, 14, 15.  
Dallas—November 15, 16, 17, 18.  
Chicago—November 19, 20, 21, 22.  
Washington, D. C.—November 22, 23, 24, 25.  
Raleigh—November 26, 27, 28, 29.  
Philadelphia—November 29, 30, December 1, 2.  
Boston—December 3, 4, 5, 6.  
New York City—December 6, 7, 8, 9.

## SUCCESSFUL BIBLE CONFERENCE HELD AT CRESCENT LAKE

**O**N SEPTEMBER 5th, 6th and 7th a special conference for adults was held at the Crescent Lake Camp in northern Wisconsin. This camp was established in 1934 by the Rev. Arthur F. Perkins and others of Winnebago Presbytery as a protest against the Modernism in the official camp of the presbytery. For that "crime" Mr. Perkins was "suspended" from the ministry by the Syracuse General Assembly.

The Rev. John J. DeWaard, pastor of the Calvary Presbyterian Church of Cedar Grove, Wisconsin, and the Rev. Edwin H. Rian, General Secretary of the Church Extension Committee of The Presbyterian Church of America, were the speakers at the September conference. Present were men and women from many parts of the state. The consistent testimony and influence of this camp is felt throughout Wisconsin.

## CINCINNATI CHURCH HOLDS LARGE PUBLIC MEETINGS, HEARS DR. MACHEN

New Ohio Presbytery  
Organized Next Day

**T**HE local congregation of The Presbyterian Church of America on Sunday, September 13th, held two well-attended services in Cincinnati, Ohio. The Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., was the speaker at both meetings. The morning service, in the Y. W. C. A. Auditorium, was under the auspices of the Calvary Lutheran Church; the evening meeting in the Walnut Hills Baptist Church was sponsored by the new local church, whose pastor is the Rev. Everett C. DeVelde.

Wide publicity was given to the meetings, and the enthusiasm of the many who attended holds the promise of substantial and immediate increase in the church's growing membership.

On Monday, September 14th, the Presbytery of Ohio of The Presbyterian Church of America convened for its first meeting in the Christian Reformed Church of Cincinnati. Received into the new presbytery were: The Rev. Carl Ahlfeldt, Indianapolis; the Rev. E. C. DeVelde, Cincinnati; the Rev. Thomas H. Mitchell, Mineral Ridge, Ohio; and the Rev. J. L. Shaw, Cleveland. Mr. DeVelde was elected Moderator, and Mr. Ahlfeldt, Stated Clerk. The new presbytery will include congregations in Ohio and Indiana.

## OLD PRESBYTERY OUSTS ROSLYN PASTOR

**T**HE Philadelphia North Presbytery of the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. on September 15th went through the motions of suspending the Rev. Laurence H. Jongewaard, pastor of the Roslyn Church.

Mr. Jongewaard, who did not appear to answer the charges, has taken his stand with The Presbyterian Church of America.

The charges against Mr. Jongewaard, as read at the meeting in Holy Trinity Presbyterian Church, are that "he is in rebellion against the government and discipline of the

church; that he maligned the church whose peace and purity he promised to maintain; that he stirred up the people to revolt against the church's authority and led a large group to declare their independence of its government, and that he joined another body not recognized by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A."

## NEW GROUP ORGANIZES IN NORTHERN NEW JERSEY

**O**N SUNDAY, September 13th, a group of Presbyterians from the New Jersey sections of the Oranges, Montclair, and Bloomfield held services in the W. C. T. U. Hall, of Orange. Richard W. Gray, a senior at Westminster Theological Seminary, working under the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension of The Presbyterian Church of America, conducted the services. About thirty people attended each meeting.

At the beginning of the morning and evening services, Mr. Matthew McCroddan, for forty-five years an elder in the large Westminster Presbyterian Church of Bloomfield, explained the purpose of the group. He said in effect that the group were compelled, for conscience' sake, to withdraw from the organization of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. He also added that the purpose of the group was not conflict or controversy but to preach the pure gospel, without compromise.

Leaders in this movement are: Matthew McCroddan, of Bloomfield; Raymond T. Crane, member of the Independent Board; Alfred Stapf, who promoted the Independent Board rallies; Charles Freytag, elder in the First Church (last pastorate of the

late Dr. H. H. McQuilkin, trustee of Westminster Seminary); Colonel Moses Greenwood, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Bloomfield; F. E. Caspar, trustee in the German Presbyterian Church of Orange.

Under the present plans, the group intends to hold services every week, and to organize formally a unit of The Presbyterian Church of America in about a month.

## WISCONSIN PASTOR "DEPOSED," REFUSED SALARY ARREARS

**A**T A *pro re nata* meeting of Milwaukee Presbytery held September 8th, the Rev. Oscar Holkeboer, former pastor of the Oostburg, Wis., Church, was "deposed."

After report was given by the judicial committee alleging probable grounds for trial, charges and specifications were read by the Rev. W. Clyde Wilson and adopted by presbytery. Then a resolution, read by Mr. Wilson and again rubber-stamped, dissolved pastoral relations with the Oostburg Church. Thereupon Mr. Holkeboer renounced the further jurisdiction of the church and statement to that effect, upon motion once more by Mr. Wilson, was received and placed on file. Following this, by resolution Mr. Holkeboer was "deposed" on the grounds of alleged "slander" and "schism." Secession was threatened in a petition circulated among the people, a petition which Mr. Holkeboer did not initiate or formulate, and said petition, read on the floor of presbytery July 27th, was made ground for the accusation of "schism." Statements he had made public, such as that in his resignation which referred to the actions of the last General Assembly as "apostate," were adjudged "slander."

When Mr. Holkeboer asked for a copy of the transactions that concerned him he was refused. When he asked for payment of salary arrears of some \$400 he was told that he would be paid only if the congregation remained intact, a condition that obviously could not be fulfilled.

The congregation hope to organize a new church in Oostburg. At least fifty per cent. are prepared to leave the old church, and nearly \$13,000 has been subscribed for the new.

### Westminster Seminary Opening

**T**HE public is cordially urged to attend the opening exercises of Westminster Theological Seminary to be held on Wednesday, September 30th, at 3 P. M. in Witherspoon Hall, Juniper and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia. The Rev. H. Henry Meeter, Th.D., will deliver the address.

**How the Godly Man Lives***(Concluded from Page 255)*

desired? Such religion, such a worship of God, is far from meeting with God's approval. It is no better than none at all. When the Israelites offered their sacrifices to God because of custom and external restraints, the word of the Lord came to them: "When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations. . . . I am weary to bear them . . . I will hide mine eyes from you." What does this teach us but that nothing else will do but an inward and continual leaning

on God's Word. Let us beware lest we serve Him with the activities of the body only.

None are true inquirers after God and disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ but those to whom the precepts and doctrines of God are a delight and pleasure and joy. When such are in the presence of God what more is to be desired? Here is the chief place of their interest. What more is to their profit than when they are learning of God? What place in this world is more sweet to them than at the feet of Jesus? In fact when by God's grace they walk in God's precepts, any other way would be pain and misery.

What a standard for the truly pious man we have presented to us! Who is not conscious, even if once he took delight in God's Word, of some interruption in this pleasure? The Apostle Paul felt something of this when he said, "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." Every child of God knows something of this experience too. But through Jesus Christ our Lord there is offered to us grace to study and keep all that God has so wonderfully revealed to us.

## *We Reduce Our Subscription Rate*

### *New Yearly Rate*

"The Presbyterian Guardian" is happy to announce that, beginning with this issue, it has reduced its yearly subscription rate from \$1.50 to \$1.00. Our only purpose in making this one-third reduction is to increase the circulation, and hence the influence, of the magazine. There will be no lowering of our high standard of editorial content or format. On the contrary, plans are now being formulated to insure an even finer magazine during the coming winter. Present subscriptions are being extended on the new basis.

### *New Club Rate*

To justify this drastic price reduction "The Presbyterian Guardian" must, during the next twelve months, double its present subscription list. This can only be accomplished by the loyal support of present subscribers. In order to encourage gift subscriptions, and to enable groups and churches to subscribe as a body, we are also adding a new club rate: Five or more copies, either to separate addresses or in a package to one address, will be accepted at 80c each per year, only slightly more than 3c an issue.

### *The Challenge and The Answer*

Won't you help us double the power and influence of this truly Christian, truly Presbyterian news journal? Shall "The Presbyterian Guardian" go forward as a mighty force in the world of Christian thought? The answer lies with you.

## *The Presbyterian Guardian*

1212 Commonwealth Building

Philadelphia, Penna.