

June 26, 1937

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 6

# The Presbyterian Guardian

One Dollar a Year

NED B. STONEHOUSE,  
Editor

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

THOMAS R. BIRCH,  
Managing Editor

## THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AMERICA

THE Presbyterian Church of America has shown once again that it is determined to go forward in the historic channels of Presbyterianism regardless of cost—regardless even of misunderstanding and misrepresentation. Presbyterianism first of all means loyalty to the whole Bible as the Word of God. And it comes to expression through faithful witness to its historic creed, the Westminster Standards, and through the faithful carrying out of the principles of Presbyterian church government. This creed and these principles are received as being founded upon the Word of God by all who take their vows as officers of the church.

### THE FIRST YEAR

At the First General Assembly, one year ago, a small company of ministers and elders, taking their stand upon these historic standards, banded together to perpetuate true Presbyterianism. They defied a great ecclesiastical machine, which had substituted government by men and government by resolutions of assemblies which had long ceased to be deliberative, for the government of the church by Christ through His Word. They turned against the current of modern unbelief which had become dominant in the old organization and dared, in a time when modernist church unionism or vague non-denominationalism had captured the fancy of most church members, to bring a new denomination into existence.

At the Second General Assembly, in November of last year, the foundations were more firmly laid and plans were developed for the mission and expansion of the new church. That assembly was notable because of its decision with reference to the doctrinal standards of the church. In the first place, the compromising

amendments of 1903, which greatly obscured the consistent witness of the creed, were eliminated. And, in the second place, the church decided that it would not tinker with the Confession of Faith when a declaratory statement with reference to Premillennialism was proposed as an amendment. No one will deny that Dr. Machen had a leading part in the determination of these matters, and, writing after that meeting, he did not conceal his joy at the result when he characterized these decisions as "a great victory for the Reformed Faith." The Assembly as a whole was solidly with Dr. Machen on these issues, but a small company dissented. Most of this latter group have now formed the Bible Presbyterian Synod, declaring their intention to take the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., including the objectionable amendments of 1903, and to amend the historic standards in the interest of Premillennialism.

Meanwhile, we who stood together at the Second General Assembly, with others who have joined us, have been going forward in common loyalty to our Reformed heritage. Some of us differ with regard to the "thousand years" of Revelation 20. But there has been mutual tolerance in this sphere, united as we are in the blessed hope of the personal, visible and glorious return of our Lord. We are indeed grateful that on more than one occasion recently Dr. Buswell has admitted that the issue which was dividing us was not one of Premillennialism *versus* Amillennialism, and we confidently expect that this view will prevail.

### THE THIRD ASSEMBLY

At the Third General Assembly once again there was great cause for gratitude to almighty God. For if ever there was zeal that the Head of the church should be honored and His Word held high, it was at this Assem-

bly. Again there was manifested a determination that The Presbyterian Church of America should be a truly Reformed body. New issues had come to the fore, but the line of cleavage was the same. This is particularly evident from the fact that the list of ministers who have announced their departure from The Presbyterian Church of America is almost identical with the list of those who voted against the adoption of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms in November.

### Foreign Missions

The first great issue at the General Assembly concerned Foreign Missions. The action taken with reference to the Independent Board and the formation of a Committee on Foreign Missions by the church was the culmination of months of momentous developments within the Independent Board. On the day following the Second General Assembly a coalition of the members of the Independent Board who had opposed Dr. Machen's stand in the church, and others who were sympathetic with their views, succeeded in ousting Dr. Machen from the presidency. The significance of this act is minimized, but that it represented a defeat for a consistently Presbyterian witness through the Independent Board Dr. Machen realized full well, and this became more and more apparent as time went on. The most patent manifestation of the change was expressed in the fact that the president and vice-president of the Board were entirely independent of any Presbyterial affiliation, but of course the issue involved more than matters of church government.

At the meeting of the Board held on the day before the Third General Assembly convened, issue was joined with those who were dominant in the Board. In particular, attention was called to the fact that Independency, which was the practice of a number of members of the Board, was in open violation of the charter of the Board; moreover, request was made that the Board should decide on the status of the members in question before proceeding to the election of new members. The majority refused the latter request, elected and brought in three new members who were known to be favorable to their point of view, and then declared that the

matter of Independency was irrelevant. Members of the Board declared that there was no inconsistency between Presbyterianism and Independency, and the minority report which was presented to the Assembly by Mr. McIntire stated: "Those who have now resigned from the Board have erected a new and artificial condition which was not envisioned by the pledge and which is not required by the pledge."

Had the dominant party in the Board shown its loyalty to the charter by dealing with this matter of Independency, a matter which required no investigation, an investigation as to the doctrinal soundness of certain members of the Board would have been proposed. However, the action which completely sidestepped this simple issue of fidelity to Presbyterianism in the matter of church government left no room for hope that the more involved matters of doctrinal divergence would receive consideration worthy of their import. Consequently, several members resigned after the meeting, declaring that "the usefulness of the Independent Board as an agency to promote the object for which it was founded, the conduct of truly Presbyterian Foreign Missions, is at an end."

The Third General Assembly virtually concurred in this conclusion, and decided to establish its own foreign missionary work. There was no thought here of besmirching the character of any fellow Christian, as has been charged. No, there was only the same zeal for a consistently Reformed or Presbyterian testimony that has characterized the church as a whole from the beginning. However, it appeared that within the church there were two conceptions of Presbyterianism: an easy-going, inclusive point of view and another which is zealous that the historic standards be maintained in consistent fashion. To our great joy the latter point of view emerged victorious.

### The Christian Life

The other great issue before the Assembly concerned certain proposed pronouncements on the general subject of Christian conduct. This issue arose as the result of an attack upon Westminster Seminary which came into the open after the Second General Assembly, and developed apace after

Dr. Machen's death. (In passing we would urge upon our readers the calm consideration of the statement made by the faculty, which is reported on page 100 of this issue, as setting some matters in a clearer light.) The widespread misrepresentation of the seminary is of a piece with the unprincipled charges that The Presbyterian Church of America is a "wet" church. The Third General Assembly was certainly convinced that it had no actual liquor problem before it, and there was great indignation at the campaign to bring the movement into disrepute.

There were, of course, great principles at stake. The hours devoted to debate on this subject were not taken up with questions of individual practice. The debate for the most part consisted of an appeal to the Bible and to the historic principles of Presbyterianism. And the lines were clearly drawn on the matter of principle.

Those who have been agitating this question for the last several months have taken the position that, although the Bible itself might countenance moderation, in this generation the beverage use of wine, no matter how moderate and irrespective of special circumstances, is always wrong. That this was the real issue became very apparent at the meeting of the Independent Board on May 31st. Several candidates for missionary service whose individual practice was that of total abstinence were told that they were "bewildered," and their cases referred back to the Executive Committee, when they made clear that they were unwilling to set up their individual practice as normative for other Christians.

Mr. Sloat's resolution (p. 93, col. 1) was in effect the answer of the Assembly to all of the overtures on this subject. In our opinion it was a very happy conclusion of the whole matter. Recognizing as sin only "any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God," this resolution avoided the great error of going beyond the Word. Zealous that the church should not undertake any action beyond declaring the Word of God, it avoided also the error of setting up alongside of the Word a human judgment of inexpediency. Let no one say that the action of the Assembly was against abstinence.

Without doubt the practice of the overwhelming majority is that of total abstinence. But the adoption of the Sloat resolution meant very definitely that The Presbyterian Church of America is unwilling to declare that total abstinence is "the only true principle of temperance," contrary to one of the overtures. We are profoundly thankful to our gracious God for the recognition of the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and life.

The action of the General Assembly is being represented by those who have left our church as a departure from American Presbyterianism, the evidence being found in resolutions of several general assemblies on the subject of temperance. We are surprised at the sudden zeal to set up resolutions of general assemblies as indicative of the character of Presbyterianism. In our judgment fidelity to American Presbyterianism must be determined by an appeal to the Bible and to the subordinate standards, and what could demonstrate more forcibly the determination of The Presbyterian Church of America to abide by these standards than the resolution which was adopted?

However, it remains true that the position taken by The Presbyterian Church of America is not an innovation. It is exactly the position of the renowned and saintly Charles Hodge, as expressed in an article on the subject of temperance which first appeared in 1843, and has been republished in *Church Polity*, pp. 224 ff. We wish that we had space to reprint the entire article for it is indeed a tract for the times. There was evidently diversity of opinion as to the true principles of temperance at that time, and Dr. Hodge says:

"Did we not know how liable we all are to have our minds clouded and perverted about the plainest matters, and how easily the evil resident in our nature mingles with everything we do, we should be surprised to find good men differing about such a subject as temperance, and unholy feelings influencing the discussions to which such difference of opinion gives rise. . . . To what does this diversity relate? Not to the sinfulness of intemperance; not to the prevalence of the evil, not to the amount of crime, degradation and misery, of which it is the fruitful source, not to the duty

*of all men to endeavour by precept and example to oppose its progress, not to the great good that has been effected by temperance societies, not to the desirableness of continuing and extending the influence of the reformation already so happily begun; but mainly to certain questions in morals, which are indeed of great practical importance. . . .*

After citing a resolution which declared it "a solemn moral obligation to cease forever from their [i.e., of intoxicating drinks] manufacture, sale and use, as a beverage," he went on to say:

"This declaration of the immorality of the manufacture, sale and use of all intoxicating drinks as a beverage, being founded, not on the peculiar circumstances of any time or place, but on the inherent nature and tendency of such drinks, is a declaration that their sale and use are, and always have been sinful. *And as it is a fact, just as clear as any other fact contained in the Scripture, that God and Christ did not prohibit, but allowed the use of such drinks, we cannot hesitate to say that the above resolution is infidel in its spirit and tendency, however many good men may have been cajoled or driven into the sin of giving it their sanction.* It has produced, therefore, its legitimate effects in vitiating the arguments, the measures, and, to a lamentable extent, the spirit of the Temperance Society. It has led to a disregard of the authority of the word of God, to a shameful perversion of its meaning, to shocking irreverence in the manner of speaking of our blessed Redeemer."

The latter part of the article deals with the important subject of expediency. Basing his argument squarely upon the teaching of the Bible he shows, first, that the application of expediency must vary with circumstances, and, second, that every man must be allowed to decide and act for himself:

"It follows, therefore, that any rule of duty founded on expediency must be variable. If I am bound to abstain from certain things only because the use of them would do my brethren harm, the obligation exists only when his real good would be promoted by my abstinence. If the obligation arises from circumstances, it must vary with circumstances. . . . Let real love to our brethren, guided by the word of

God, direct our conduct, and though we may not all act in the same way, we shall all act right.

"It follows also, from the very nature of expediency, that every man must be allowed to decide and act for himself. He is not to subject his conscience or conduct to the judgment of others in such cases. If a thing be indifferent in its own nature, if God has neither commanded nor forbidden the use of it, then I must decide for myself whether it is right to use it or not. It is a question which no man can decide for me, and which depends on whether most good will result from using or not using the thing in question; a point often exceedingly difficult, if not impossible with any confidence, to decide."

In a concluding paragraph, which is particularly appropriate at this time, Dr. Hodge went on to say:

"One of the greatest evils of these extremes, is that it forces those who oppose them into a false position. Because they oppose an erroneous and injurious method of promoting temperance, they are looked upon as opposing temperance itself; they are said to take part with the drunkard, and to stand in the way of all that is good. Did Christ favour the disregard of the Sabbath, because he exposed the error of the pharisees? Did he promote intemperance, because he resisted the ascetic doctrines of some of the Jews? So his enemies said, but was it true? If evil flows from these discussions about temperance, whose fault is it? Are they to blame who oppose false principles, or they who advance them? Reproach on either side is nugatory. The simple question is, what is true and right? May we not hope that brethren who agree in thinking not only that intemperance is a great sin, but that it is a sin which calls for special watchfulness and zealous opposition, will agree as to the principles on which that opposition is to be conducted? We may be certain that if the principles on which the temperance reformation is made to rest, is not sound, the whole effort will come to a disastrous end. Those therefore are the best friends of temperance, who contend for the truth."

The Presbyterian Church of America has shown that it is a true advocate of temperance because it has stood for the truth of the Word of God.

## The Third General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America

**A**BOUT one hundred delegates and many more members and friends met on the morning of Tuesday, June 1st, in the Spruce Street Baptist Church, Philadelphia, for the opening service of the Third General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America. At no other time during its short year of existence had the denomination faced problems more grave, more freighted with potential disaster, than at this Assembly. The minds and hearts of most commissioners had, for weeks, been occupied with the two burning issues confronting the church: The issue of endorsement of Independency *versus* strict adherence to Presbyterianism, and the issue of the enforcement of human concepts of expediency *versus* the Scriptural, Protestant principle of Christian liberty. Would the General Assembly answer these issues in accordance with its Presbyterian heritage?

The Communion service at the first session followed a sermon by the Rev. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., D.D., moderator of the Second General Assembly. A brief word of welcome was given by the Rev. Herbert V. Hotchkiss, pastor of the Spruce Street Baptist Church. In the celebration of the Lord's Supper Dr. Buswell was assisted by the Rev. Milo F. Jamison and the Rev. Leslie W. Sloat.

### Preliminary Business

The General Assembly was called to order and constituted with prayer by Dr. Buswell. The tentative docket, prepared by the Committee on Arrangements appointed by the previous Assembly, was the object of lengthy discussion and revision, due for the most part to the zeal of many commissioners to have the two central issues confronting the Assembly resolved at the earliest possible moment. Before the first session was well under way Dr. Buswell openly declared his intention to withdraw from The Presbyterian Church of America if the Assembly did not take what he considered to be the only proper action on the overtures involving the ques-

tion of total abstinence. The issue centering about the question of Independency was placed squarely before the Assembly by those who requested that the report of the Committee on Foreign Missions be given an early place on the docket. This



Moderator John J. DeWaard

report renounced the Independent Board for tolerating in its membership those who were ecclesiastically independent, and urged the formation of a committee to promote the foreign missions' work of the denomination. After extensive alteration the docket was finally adopted.

### Election of Moderator and Clerk of Assembly

In a brief but telling speech the Rev. Robert S. Marsden of Middletown, Penna., nominated for moderator of the Third General Assembly the Rev. John J. DeWaard, pastor of the Calvary Presbyterian Church of Cedar Grove, Wisconsin, which has the distinction of being the largest church in the denomination. Elder Peter Stam, Jr., of Wheaton College, nominated the Rev. Milo F. Jamison of Los Angeles, California. Mr. DeWaard was elected by a vote of 70 to 23. The Rev. Leslie W. Sloat of Washington, D. C., who had won his

service stripes as clerk of the Second Assembly, was re-elected to the same office, defeating the Rev. R. Laird Harris of Philadelphia by a vote of 74 to 15. The significance of the division of the vote on both these offices became increasingly apparent as the sessions of the Assembly progressed. Approximately the same ratio was maintained on all major issues before the body.

### Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions

ONE of these major issues was contained in the report of the Committee on Foreign Missions<sup>1</sup> which summarized the prevailing conditions in The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. The report adequately proved its contention that the Independent Board is now out of accord with its charter principles in that it condones in its membership certain persons, including the president and vice-president, whose practice "in matters of church government is that of Independency rather than Presbyterianism." The report went on to cite the refusal of the Board, at its meeting on May 31st, "to insist that its members bring their practice into accord with the principles of true Presbyterian church government or else resign from said Board," and, as further corroboration of this un-Presbyterian stand, pointed to the resignations of eight members and the general secretary.

"Therefore," continued the report of the committee, "be it resolved that this General Assembly does not find itself able any longer to recommend The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions as an agency for the propagation of the Gospel as set forth in the Westminster Standards."

The remainder of the report provided for the election of a committee of fifteen to receive and disburse con-

<sup>1</sup> The full text of this report, together with complete news of the recent Independent Board meeting, will be found in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for June 12, 1937.

tributions and in general to carry on the work of foreign missions.

A lengthy minority report signed by the Rev. Carl McIntire was read to the Assembly by its author. Space does not permit the printing of the complete text of this report, but some of the high-lights are given below:

. . . It should be pointed out that the pledge of the Board stipulates three things. Nowhere in the pledge does it say that a man, in order to be able to carry into effect the provisions of the charter and to promote the great design of the Board, must be a member of a particular Presbytery. . . . Those who have now resigned from the Board have erected a new and artificial condition which was not envisioned by the pledge and which is not required by the pledge. A careful examination of the same will reveal this.

2. The members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions at its meeting on May 31, 1937, reaffirmed the entire provision of the charter of the Board, including the pledge.

3. Members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions on May 31 elected to positions on the Board eleven individuals who are Presbyterians. . . . Eight of the eleven are members of the Presbyterian Church of America.

When the Independent Board adjourned on May 31 it had thirty-three members, twenty-one of whom were members of the Presbyterian Church of America. The eight who resigned, not having given any intimation that they would resign, nevertheless leave the Independent Board still in possession of a majority who are members of the Presbyterian Church of America. It should be noted that the Board is *independent* of any ecclesiastical Presbytery, Synod, or Assembly control, and for the Presbyterian Church of America actually to have a majority of members on the Board is more than reassuring that the mission program will not be out of accord with the historic Presbyterian Standards.

4. A resolution attempting to introduce an issue of independency into the Board presented by one who is mentioned as resigning in the majority report after full discussion was laid on the table. The action of the laying on the table of the resolution did not involve in any way a refusal to condemn independency. Certain men who were members of the Independent Board were in the resolution, by implication, challenged as to their right to be on the Board. . . .

It should be observed, as was pointed out in the meeting, that the above mentioned men have paid "the supreme sacrifice" ecclesiastically for the testimony of the Independent Board, and it appeared most ungrateful for their positions on the Board to be challenged in less than a year after the judicial decisions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.—to be questioned on the ground that they had no place on the Independent Board because they were "independent!" This was one of the arguments used by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. for the adoption of the so-called mandate ordering the

members of the Independent Board to resign. These men are now so-called independents because they were made that by their expulsion from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., and they have not yet seen their way clear to unite with a particular Presbytery. We would point out that, in view of the issues which have been raised in the Presbyterian Church of America, many have hesitated and are hesitating to unite with the Church until they are assured of the way it is to take; as to whether it is to be the true spiritual successor of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. or some other kind of a body. . . .

5. The letter of resignation tendered by the individuals who resigned *misrepresents* the position of the Board and the action which was taken before the Board.

The work of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is *not at an end*. Nowhere in the ministry of the Board on the mission field or in missionaries who have gone forth is there a single individual who does not approve fully of Presbyterian doctrine and Presbyterian form of government. Not the slightest inconsistency in the candidates of the Board who have gone forth as missionaries can be detected. So to allege would be a serious reflection upon the work and recommendation of the general secretary, the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge. . . .

THEREFORE, in view of the fact that this General Assembly has in the past recognized the great service of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, it does here and now reaffirm the action which it took at the second General Assembly concerning the Independent Board, and recommends the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions to the prayers and support of the members of the Presbyterian Church of America and to all those who love the propagation of the Gospel.

## II

WHEREAS it is not necessary that the Presbyterian Church of America establish its own missionary agency as is evidenced from the fact that the Independent Board has on its membership at the present more than a majority who are members of the Presbyterian Church of America, men who are in full accord with the doctrine and polity of the Presbyterian Church of America, and

WHEREAS it should be remembered that an attack upon the majority in the Independent Board, which Board has a majority of members who are members of the Presbyterian Church of America, loyal and in good and regular standing is an attack upon these members in their stand in behalf of fundamental principles of Presbyterian Church government, and

WHEREAS the Presbyterian Church of America should guard itself against any domination by a group of individuals who are also in control of the home missionary agency of the Church, or any group which would even appear to be functioning as a general council for the Church, and

WHEREAS it should be remembered that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. functioned for forty-nine years without any Board of its own, but author-

ized the sending of its gifts even to an agency which was congregational, the American Board of Missions, therefore let it be resolved that for the best interests of our infant and struggling church, the Presbyterian Church of America reject any proposal which is designed to weaken or to destroy in any way the testimony which God in His gracious providence has given to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions in which the moderator of the first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America played such a leading and historic role, and that it continue a Committee on Foreign Missions until the next General Assembly composed of five members, as at present, which members should be elected by this General Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

THE MINORITY.

The debate which followed the presentation of these two reports was long and vigorous, but for the most part without bitterness. The Rev. J. Lyle Shaw of Newport, Ky., pointed out that the Reformed Faith and Independency were mutually exclusive and could not permanently travel together. Dr. Buswell spoke to the minority report and made little effort to soften his blows.

"These men who are attacked in the majority report," he protested, "were good enough for the Board till other matters came up." He insisted that neither questions of Independency nor eschatology entered into the matter at all. Rather, he maintained, the issue was two-fold: A "little clique" that wanted to run everything, and the question of legislation regarding total abstinence. Dr. Buswell then launched into a lengthy discussion of total abstinence which might have continued indefinitely had not the Rev. Samuel J. Allen, rising to a point of order, pointed out the irrelevancy of Dr. Buswell's remarks.

The Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, who resigned on May 31st as general secretary of the Independent Board, delivered the masterful summation of the reasons for that resignation which is embodied in the article by him published in the June 12th issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN. Mr. Woodbridge spoke movingly of his former joy in promoting the interests of a truly Presbyterian board, of the shock that he and others had felt when, last November, the discontented majority on the Board had removed Dr. Machen from the presidency and put in his place a minister who was an Independent ecclesiastically. Finally came the inevitable reali-

zation that the Independent Board was lost to true, uncompromising Presbyterianism. Mr. Woodbridge, together with the eight members who later resigned, had done his utmost to secure favorable consideration of a resolution designed to return the Board to its charter requirements. All efforts failed. "The Board under which I had been serving," said Mr. Woodbridge, "had thus officially, and in clear opposition to its charter, condoned in its membership, and in particular in its leadership, persons who practice Independency, a form of church government which is contrary to historic Presbyterianism. There was, of course, nothing left for me to do but resign. . . .

"Now The Presbyterian Church of America is out of its swaddling clothes. It has learned to walk. It is only natural that the Church should have its own Committee on Foreign Missions, just as it has its Committee on Home Missions.

"Can we not see the hand of our sovereign God in all this?"

Debate then assumed the aspect of personal accusation as Elder Peter Stam, Jr., of Wheaton College, declared that the "rumors" of Independency and the resulting disturbance were created by Mr. Woodbridge, which he considered disloyal. Quietly, courteously, Mr. Woodbridge pointed out that, in addition to his duty as executive secretary of the Board, he also had a duty *as a presbyter*. In general the attitude of those favoring the reorganized Independent Board and the minority report of Mr. McIntire seemed to be that Mr. Woodbridge, the moment he found himself out of accord with the majority on the Executive Committee of the Board, should have resigned. The manifest error of such a view is immediately apparent. Mr. Woodbridge, when the majority of that committee took action which he considered to be in contravention of the charter of that Board, waited until the action of the Executive Committee had been ratified by the Board itself. He then resigned immediately.

Frequent mention was made, during the extended debate on the foreign missions situation, of the refusal of those who had resigned from the Independent Board to bring doctrinal charges against those whom they felt to be un-Presbyterian. Dr.

Buswell and others considered that if the minority doubted the doctrinal soundness of any member of the Board it was its duty to produce all available evidence. In answer to this, Elder Murray Forst Thompson, one of those who had resigned, pointed out the declared notice of intention to proceed with doctrinal investigation if, as and when the Board took action to bring its membership into accord with its charter principles in the matter of church government. Obviously, if the Board was unable or unwilling to discriminate between open Independency and the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government, no confidence could be placed in its judgment on other matters of Presbyterian doctrine.

The Rev. Samuel J. Allen of Carson, N. D., spoke at some length of conversations with Dr. Machen during the closing hours of his life. Dr. Machen saw clearly, said Mr. Allen, that the usefulness of the Independent Board as an agency for the promotion of Presbyterian missions was at an end. He quoted Dr. Machen as saying, "There is nothing now that we can do but organize a board in our church, if true Presbyterian missionaries are to be sent out and the Reformed doctrine propagated."

An attempt was made by Dr. Buswell to draw a razor-edged line of distinction between Presbyterian church government and Presbyterianism considered as a system of doctrine, completely ignoring the fact that the former is based squarely upon the latter.

The Rev. Milo F. Jamison said that, after three years of Independency, he had joined The Presbyterian Church of America to work with those who preached the Reformed Faith. But, he asked, cannot one who is unaffiliated with any presbytery, synod or general assembly still be a Presbyterian? In his own recent history he had been such a Presbyterian. But lately, he declared, he had discovered that the whole difficulty within the denomination arose out of the question of control: Whether the church should be dominated by a narrow minority or a broad majority. He felt that the narrow minority to which he had referred was preaching a peculiar "ultra-Reformed Faith" which did not represent the tradition of the Presby-

terian Church in the U.S.A. Instead of being controlled by them he felt that the church should foster "a true American Presbyterian" control.

It was pointed out by Dr. Ned B. Stonehouse, Professor of New Testament at Westminster Seminary, that Mr. Jamison's period of independency was an emergency measure taken when the apostasy of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. made it necessary to withdraw and prior to the formation of The Presbyterian Church of America. Mr. Jamison had repeatedly expressed a desire to join a truly Reformed and Presbyterian body. The members of the Independent Board whose policy of Independency was being protested had, on the other hand, given no intimation of an intention to affiliate with any Presbyterian assembly.

Dr. Stonehouse briefly called the Assembly's attention to certain inconsistencies in Mr. McIntire's minority report. Presbyterianism, said the report, does not involve relationship to an Assembly. But, said Dr. Stonehouse, unless the church be governed by representative assemblies it is in no sense Presbyterian. The report also pleads for more time for the transition stage between withdrawing from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and joining a Reformed or Presbyterian denomination. Yet the same report insists that even those ministers who are now ecclesiastically independent are nevertheless thoroughly Presbyterian.

The Rev. Professor R. B. Kuiper attacked with vigor the arguments from a so-called "American Presbyterian" tradition. Presbyterianism, he insisted, cannot be geographically catalogued. It is simply consistent Biblical Christianity. One might just as well speak of a distinctive Dutch or Scotch or American Christianity as speak of a distinctive Dutch or Scotch or American Presbyterianism. A man is either a Presbyterian or not a Presbyterian.

Mr. McIntire, in the final speech in favor of the minority report, declared that if he believed this were an issue between Independency or vague fundamentalism on the one hand and Presbyterianism on the other he would take his stand on the side of Presbyterianism. The funds of the Independent Board have fallen off, he said, because in the minds of the donors

has been raised the question of what type of Presbyterianism the Board would promote. He echoed Dr. Buswell's accusation concerning an alleged "little clique" and likened it to the un-Presbyterian General Council of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

A roll-call vote was called for and the Assembly rejected the minority report by the overwhelming majority of 75 to 19.

The two sections of the report of the Committee on Foreign Missions were then considered *seriatim*. Section I dealt with the renunciation of the Independent Board as an agency for the promotion of *Presbyterian* foreign missions. Several commissioners wished to have this section deleted in its entirety; others pointed out the necessity of retaining it in order to present the reasons for the church's proposed action in forming a new board, and because of the propriety of indicating why it could no longer recommend the Independent Board. The division of the vote on adoption of Section I was: 55 in favor; 27 opposed.

Section II of the report concerned the formation of a foreign missionary agency of The Presbyterian Church of America. After a few slight amendments Section II was adopted by an overwhelming majority vote.

Before voting on the adoption of the report as a whole the floor was granted to the Rev. Cary N. Weisiger, one of the appointees of the Independent Board who had asked that his appointment be canceled in view of the action taken at the meeting on May 31st. Mr. Weisiger said that he was addressing the Assembly because he, with others, had been accused of being "bewildered" when questioned, at the Board meeting, concerning his stand on total abstinence. He said that the barrage that he and his fellow appointees had received on this question from Dr. Buswell and others made it impossible for any of them to give a categorical answer to the question as phrased by Dr. Buswell, without involving themselves in possible misunderstandings. Mr. Weisiger showed no signs of being "bewildered" as he faced the Assembly. He declared eloquently that the real issue was not on the question of legislation concerning total abstinence; rather, it was one of devotion to the Reformed Faith. "Is that Faith," he asked, "in

## Your Contributions to Home and Foreign Missions

**I**T IS with the greatest pleasure that we announce that the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, formerly general secretary of the Independent Board, has been appointed general secretary of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension and of the Committee on Foreign Missions of The Presbyterian Church of America. Serving in this joint capacity Mr. Woodbridge brings to the work of the denomination his wealth of experience in the promotion of truly Presbyterian missionary enterprise.

Murray Forst Thompson, Esq., formerly treasurer of the Independent Board, is now treasurer of the Committee on Foreign Missions. All contributions for the work of foreign missions should be sent to him in care of the committee.

Dr. George R. Hunter has been chosen to serve as treasurer of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, and all gifts for the support of home missionaries and the extension of the work of The Presbyterian Church of America should be sent to him in care of the Home Missions' Committee.

Both of these committees and The Presbyterian Guardian will maintain their offices until June 30th, at 1212 Commonwealth Building, Philadelphia. On and after July 1st all three organizations will transfer their offices to 1526 Pine Street, Philadelphia. It is asked that all correspondence be addressed accordingly.

its consistency and entirety the first love of the Independent Board? We feel that it is not."

The entire report of the Committee on Foreign Missions, with the slight amendments of the Assembly, was thereupon adopted.

Two protests were later presented to the Assembly; one against the rejection of the minority report, the other against the adoption of Section I of the committee's report. The full text of only one of the protests is here quoted, since the other is identical in every respect except for the omission of paragraphs 4 and 6:

### PROTEST

The undersigned hereby respectfully protest the action of the third General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America in rejecting the minority report of the Committee on Foreign Missions and adopting the report of the Committee, for the following reasons:

1. The action of the Assembly in adopting the majority report included a condemnation and a judgment upon the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, a body which has no organic nor ecclesiastical relationship to the Presbyterian Church of America.

2. The judgment declaring that the Board was out of accord with the provisions of its charter was made by the Assembly without any inquiry into or investigation of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and without the members of the Assembly having before it the charter of the Independent Board; and further without the General Assembly having before it the certain individuals on the Board to whom reference was made in the majority report in order that they might have an opportunity to defend themselves on the charges made against them.

3. The resolution referred to as being introduced into the Independent Board by those who are mentioned as having resigned in the majority report was never presented to the Assembly in order that it might see the things involved in said report.

4. It is not a fact that the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is out of accord with the provisions of its charter, and the adoption of such a declaration on the part of the Assembly with the majority of the members of the Independent Board as presently constituted members of the Presbyterian Church of America seems to cast a serious reflection upon their integrity and honesty, or competency.

5. The declaration concerning the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is in effect an attack upon a Christian institution which has been used gloriously of the Lord in the great battle in defence of the faith. The Independent Board should have the best wishes of all the members of the Presbyterian Church of America rather than the official condemnation of the General Assembly. Section I of the majority report condemned

the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions without giving to that Board a hearing, and secured in effect a mandate or deliverance against the Board.

6. It was ungrateful for the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America in less than a year after its organization not only to turn its back upon the Independent Board but definitely to attack the Independent Board's integrity.

J. O. BUSWELL, JR.	V. V. WORTMAN
CARL MCINTIRE	J. F. M. SIMPSON
W. R. SIBLEY	R. JACKSON VAUGHN
PETER STAM, JR.	FRED L. GEISENHEIMER
J. U. S. TOMS	R. LAIRD HARRIS
P. DUB. ARCULARIUS	M. S. BLACK
PETER F. WALL	MILO F. JAMISON
ALLAN A. MACRAE	

The moderator appointed a committee to prepare an answer to these protests and submit it to the Assembly. When the answer was read it was, by motion, made the answer of the Assembly. The text is as follows:

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO ANSWER THE PROTESTS**

The Third General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America makes the following answer to Protests No. 1 and No. 2 against its rejection of the minority report of the Committee on Foreign Missions and its adoption of the majority report of said committee as amended:

1. The action of the Assembly constituted a judgment concerning the worthiness of a cause which had been commended to the church by the Second General Assembly. It is obvious that the Assembly has the right to cease to recommend any cause or object whether or not it is connected with the Presbyterian Church of America and to state its reason for such action.

2. The statement of the Assembly concerning the loyalty of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions to its charter was made after presentation to the Assembly of portions of the charter admitted to be relevant by members of the Independent Board who favored the minority report of the Committee on Foreign Missions as well as by members of said Board who supported the majority report, and after prolonged debate in which facts and arguments concerning the Independent Board were presented by both sides. The Assembly in coming to a conclusion concerning continued approval of the Independent Board, necessarily had to decide whether the actions of certain members of that Board were consistent with its charter.

3. The reference to certain individuals is irrelevant because the recorded action of the Assembly was based directly upon a voted action of the Independent Board.

The text of the Resolution concerning the practice of Independence in church government by certain members of the Independent Board was shown to the Committee on Foreign Missions of the Assembly. The substance of said resolution was presented to the Assembly itself. The Rev. Carl McIntire, the member of that committee who presented the minor-

ity report to the Assembly, was and is a member of the Independent Board. He presented to the Assembly such facts concerning the matter as he considered pertinent, and had any of the persons who signed the protests so desired, Mr. McIntire or others could have presented to the Assembly the exact text of said resolution.

4. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is out of accord with the provisions of its charter relating to the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government since it has refused to require those of its members whose practice in church government was and is Independence rather than Presbyterianism, either to bring their practice into accord with the charter or resign from the Board.

The action of the Assembly does not cast a serious reflection upon the integrity and the sincerity of purpose of those members of the Independent Board who are members of the Assembly. The action of the Assembly does constitute a judgment that those persons are mistaken in their understanding of what is meant by Presbyterianism in church government.

5 and 6. The Assembly admits that the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions "has been used gloriously of the Lord in the great battle in defense of the faith," but the Assembly believes, as above stated, that the Board is no longer in accord with its charter. For this the Assembly is heartily sorry. It hopes that almighty God who has so graciously blessed the Independent Board in the past will cause it to bring its practice and policies into accord with the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government in order that it may again be useful as an agency to promote truly Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

In spite of the Assembly's conviction concerning the Independent Board, it in no wise assumed to imply that God could not or would not use the Independent Board in accordance with His great purpose.

The Assembly simply states that it would not for a moment entertain the notion that it could issue a mandate or deliverance binding the members of an organization over which it had no control.

Since protest No. 2 contains no material not included in protest No. 1 this answer is therefore directed to both protests.

The Committee on Foreign Missions elected by the Assembly, in accordance with the recommendation of the report, is as follows:

**CLASS OF 1940**

*Ministers:* Franklin S. Dyrness; Paul Woolley; R. B. Kuiper. *Elders:* R. R. Stuart; J. Enoch Faw.

**CLASS OF 1939**

*Ministers:* Edward J. Young; Ned B. Stonehouse; John C. Rankin. *Elders:* Matthew McCroddan; Edward F. Hayden.

**CLASS OF 1938**

*Ministers:* John P. Clelland; Alexander K. Davison; Oscar Holkeboer. *Elders:* Murray Forst Thompson; Howard L. Lunt.

**The Overtures**

LATE in the afternoon of the first day of the General Assembly all overtures, requests, and papers had been read, but consideration of them was postponed to Thursday morning. Those overtures which dealt with the question of the Assembly's legislation or admonition about the use of intoxicating beverages were, of course, the focal point of interest and debate.

The overture from the Presbytery of Philadelphia was the first to be brought before the Assembly. In the form in which it was adopted by the presbytery it read as follows:

The Presbytery of Philadelphia of The Presbyterian Church of America, meeting at Philadelphia on May 17th, 1937, wishes to place on record that it does not concur in the overtures from the Presbytery of California and prays the Third General Assembly not to comply with the aforesaid overtures.

But in view of widespread laxity with respect to the great principles of Christian conduct and also in view of the fact that in many circles there is the disposition and attempt to elevate standards of conduct that have no authority from Holy Scripture as the only infallible rule of manners, The Presbytery of Philadelphia of The Presbyterian Church of America overtures the Third General Assembly meeting at Philadelphia in June, 1937, to call earnestly to the attention of all members and officebearers of the said Church the great Biblical principles of conduct enunciated in our Subordinate Standards, particularly the exposition of the moral law contained in the Larger Catechism, questions 91 to 148, and in the Shorter Catechism, questions 37 to 81. It is earnestly desired that these norms and principles of godly living will be exemplified in the life walk and conduct of all our people so that we may exhibit not only the form of godliness but also its power.

An amendment was offered by the Rev. Professor Paul Woolley which, in substance, made the following addition:

In view of widespread misunderstandings which have arisen concerning the position of The Presbyterian Church of America with reference to temperance, we wish to call particular attention to the Larger Catechism answer to question 139, which reads in part as follows:

"The sins forbidden in the seventh commandment, besides the neglect of the duties required, are . . . gluttony; drunkenness; unchaste company; lascivious songs, books, pictures, dancings, stage plays; and all other provocations to, or acts of uncleanness, either in ourselves or others."

The Rev. Leslie W. Sloat of Washington, D. C., clerk of the General Assembly, called for a recognition of

the church's constitution. "The constitution," he said, "speaks with perfect adequacy and perfect force on matters of Christian life and Christian conduct." Conditions in the denomination today, he continued, are the result of rumors and alleged reports that are without foundation in fact. He declared that he did not know of one single fact in support of the contention that anyone within The Presbyterian Church of America was encouraging practices contrary to the church's standards. Therefore, he did not believe that the Assembly should go any further than to re-state for the benefit of the public that which is contained in the constitution.

In order to accomplish this he asked that the Assembly adopt the following substitute motion in place of the Philadelphia overture:

The Third General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America has received an overture from the Presbytery of Philadelphia relative to the general subject of Christian life and conduct, and especially to the subject of the use of intoxicating beverages. The Assembly would make answer as follows:—

(1) We believe that the Westminster Standards speak with adequacy and force upon these subjects, in the Confession of Faith Chapter XX; Larger Catechism, Questions 122-148; and Shorter Catechism, Questions 63-81; and in particular in the following passages:

*Confession of Faith*, Ch. XX, Secs. 2 and 3:

"God alone is lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to his Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience, and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also."

"They who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, do practice any sin, or cherish any lust, do thereby destroy the end of Christian liberty; which is, that, being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life."

*Larger Catechism*, answer to question 136:

"The sins forbidden in the sixth commandment are . . . all excessive passions, distracting cares; immoderate use of meat, drink, labor, and recreations; provoking words; oppression, quarreling, striking, wounding, and whatsoever else tends to the destruction of the life of any."

Answer to question 139:

"The sins forbidden in the seventh commandment, besides the neglect of the duties required, are . . . idleness; gluttony; drunkenness; unchaste company; lascivious songs, books, pictures, dancings, stage

plays; and all other provocations to, or acts of uncleanness, either in ourselves or others.

(2) We do not feel that any situation has actually arisen within the Presbyterian Church of America which calls for further statement."

After the reading of this substitute motion the Assembly postponed further consideration of the Philadelphia overture, its amendment, and Mr. Sloat's substitute, in order to open debate on the overture from the Presbytery of the Chicago Area. This overture is too long to reprint in full, but the text of the resolution with which it closes is as follows:

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by this third General Assembly, of The Presbyterian Church of America that, recognizing that no Church judicatory may presume to deprive any person of that liberty of choice and action which is guaranteed by the Word of God, and declaring that in this matter we have no intention of so doing, we do hereby reaffirm the following deliverance of the General Assembly of 1877 of the church of which we hold ourselves to be the true spiritual succession:

"The Assembly recommend to all the members of the churches under their care to be found the fast, unflinching and active friends of temperance, abstaining from all forms and fashions which would countenance to any extent the sin of intemperance, avoiding even the appearance of evil, disentangling themselves from all implication with the traffic and manufacture, and especially presenting in their whole lives a standing and unvarying exemplification of the only true principle of temperance—total abstinence from anything that will intoxicate."

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in issuing this deliverance, this Assembly does not presume to criticize other ecclesiastical bodies with other traditions, but confines itself to reaffirming the historic American Presbyterian view concerning the relation between temperance and total abstinence, in which it believes the American Church was guided for generations by God's providence, and which it believes is founded upon and agreeable to the Word of God.

Probably the longest speech on the floor of the Assembly during the entire four-day session was delivered by Dr. Buswell in speaking to this overture. He insisted that he was not appealing to rumors, but to facts. He recounted a conference which he held with members of the faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary in which the faculty had almost unanimously declared its belief in the great Protestant doctrine of Christian liberty. The faculty had made it clear to Dr. Buswell that it believed that, on matters not expressly or impliedly

forbidden in the Scriptures, each Christian must decide for himself his own course of action, and that no one may on these matters presume to legislate for another. And although he neatly sidestepped any use of the word "sin" in this connection it was evident from his argument and his later actions that Dr. Buswell so regarded any and all beverage use of wine. That such a view necessarily involved a condemnation of Christ's activities while on earth was ignored in this speech by Dr. Buswell. "I stand by the type of Calvinism and apologetics of Charles Hodge," he declared. When the Rev. David Freeman of Philadelphia later read large portions of Hodge's *Church Polity*, which demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that the great Princeton theologian's position was identical with that of the faculty of Westminster Seminary, Dr. Buswell interrupted to point out that he had only expressed himself as in accord with "Hodge's Calvinism." Obviously Dr. Buswell believed either that, on this point, Hodge was un-Calvinistic or that the point in question had no relation whatever to Calvinism. In view of the fact that many appeals had been made by Dr. Buswell and others to "the American Presbyterian tradition," it seemed remarkable that Charles Hodge, perhaps the greatest American Presbyterian theologian, differed so radically with their views.

Charging that the overture from the Chicago area was an attack on the finality and sufficiency of Scripture, the Rev. Professor John Murray pointed out several inconsistencies in the resolution. If, said Mr. Murray, the *only* true principle of temperance were total abstinence then the presbytery and the church would be *bound*, contrary to the terms of the overture, to condemn "other ecclesiastical bodies with other traditions." Appealing to the *Confession of Faith*, Chapter XX, he said, "That great principle of Christian liberty has various applications. It is applied in Reformed theology to this very question." He pointed out to the commissioners that nowhere in Scripture is there any authority by which any individual or church may enjoin all Christians, or all Christians of one generation, to total abstinence. "The New Testament teaches," Mr. Murray continued, "that there are circumstances and condi-

tions under which it is inexpedient to use certain things: to eat meat, to drink wine, if these things would be an occasion of stumbling to a weak brother. In such cases all men are enjoined to abstinence." The Chicago overture Mr. Murray declared to be an attack upon the integrity of Christ, and called for a clear distinction between use and abuse.

Mr. McIntire, with utter disregard of Dr. Machen's lifelong battle for liberty of conscience and against all un-Scriptural prohibitions, pointed to Dr. Machen's personal policy of total abstinence in an attempt to persuade the Assembly that Dr. Machen would have approved the overture. The attempt convinced no one who knew Dr. Machen and his crusading fervor against all such legislation.

In a brief but impassioned plea the Rev. George W. Marston of Kirkwood, Penna., called on the Assembly to distinguish between that which is sin and that which is not sin. He spoke of those nominal Christians who think nothing of violating the sanctity of the Sabbath, yet who would shrink with horror at the thought of any compromise of total abstinence. Our ideas of sin, he said, are twisted.

At the conclusion of Mr. Marston's speech the Assembly voted on the adoption of the Chicago overture. The overture was lost by a vote of 65 to 24.

On Friday morning the substitute motion previously proposed by Mr. Sloat became the main motion before the house. The Rev. R. Laird Harris of Philadelphia, speaking against the motion, delivered the first attack from an appeal to Scripture. While manifestly faulty in much of his exegesis Mr. Harris' speech had the sterling virtue of being rigidly confined to an appeal to the Bible itself. He mentioned the Old Testament's approbation of the use of wine, but insisted that such approval must be discounted since the Old Testament also contained "approbation of polygamy." The Bible, he said, discountenances not only the abuse but also the use of wine. He attempted to cast doubt upon the averment that Christ Himself used wine during His earthly ministry, although he admitted that it was entirely possible that He did so. Later, the Rev. Professor R. B. Kuiper of Westminster Seminary pointed out

the *reductio ad absurdum* to which such reasoning must inevitably lead, and challenged Mr. Harris to produce evidence of any Scriptural approbation of polygamy.

Professor Kuiper called upon the General Assembly to go not one step beyond Scripture. The central issue, he said, is this: Would the Lord Jesus Christ, if He were alive today, take a different stand on a moral issue than He did nineteen hundred years ago?

The Rev. William T. Strong of West Collingswood, N. J., proposed an amendment to the motion which stated that this Assembly considered total abstinence to be the wise course in view of present-day conditions. Mr. Strong said that he felt that his amendment was necessary because of unfounded rumors, published in the daily press, that this is a "wet" church. We must make this statement for the benefit of the public, he contended, for the main motion alone would open the church to additional attack. The amendment was defeated, since some felt that it would compromise the Assembly's stand on the main issue. Later, Mr. Strong and others filed a protest.

It was discovered that the statements in the daily newspapers that The Presbyterian Church of America is a "wet" church had been made to representatives of the press by Dr. Buswell. For this sad misrepresentation Dr. Buswell was earnestly rebuked by the moderator.

The Rev. Samuel J. Allen of Carson, N. D., spoke with some heat of his indignation at hearing the utterly false and vicious rumor, during a recent visit to Wheaton, Illinois, of "drinking parties at Westminster Seminary." He said that he was a total abstainer who had fought the liquor traffic in North Dakota, but that he had not the slightest sympathy for those who had thus slandered Westminster Seminary.

Finally debate drew to a close, and the Assembly carried the motion of Mr. Sloat by a wide majority. Since the Assembly moved to take no further action on the other overtures relating to the same subject, Mr. Sloat's motion, found on page 93, column 1, became the complete answer of the Third General Assembly to the overtures regarding Christian conduct.

At this point the Rev. Milo F. Jamison served notice of his intention

to request the Presbytery of California to erase his name from its rolls. The moderator ruled that such notice could not properly be presented to the Assembly, and should be given to the lower judicatory. When Dr. Buswell stated that he was "regretfully moving toward the exit" the Rev. George W. Marston mentioned the fact that Dr. Buswell and others had been willing to remain for years in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. while that church was riddled with apostasy and honey-combed with sin. Amazingly Dr. Buswell retorted, "I left as soon as they committed an official apostate action." A possible implication—that the passing of the overture by Mr. Sloat was an "apostate action"—was vigorously denied on his behalf by one of Dr. Buswell's sympathizers.

The two other overtures from the Presbytery of California, one concerning communism and the other on preparedness and pacifism, were adopted. The latter overture was amended by the Assembly.

#### Report of the Home Missions' Committee

The following slightly amended report of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension was adopted by the Assembly.

The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension has endeavored to the best of its ability to carry out the instructions of the Second General Assembly.

#### WORK OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY

The General Secretary has made a number of short missionary journeys, addressing rallies in behalf of the Presbyterian Church of America. In addition to aiding in the organization of mass meetings in and near Philadelphia, he has made an extended tour of the middle West, visiting Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Illinois.

He has carried on the regular correspondence for the Committee. In addition he has aided in raising funds in order to meet the salaries of the home missionaries.

#### THE CIVIL SUIT

The Civil Suit of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. versus the officers and members of The Presbyterian Church of America was heard before the Court of Common Pleas No. 5, in the City of Philadelphia, on April 28th and 29th, and May 7th, 1937. The Presbyterian Church of America was represented by the well-known Philadelphia law firm of Saul, Ewing, Remick and Saul. Mr. Arthur W. Machen, member of the law firm of Armstrong, Machen and Allen, Baltimore,

Maryland, acted in an advisory capacity. The decision of the judge is now awaited.

#### MISSIONARIES UNDER THE COMMITTEE

Since the Second General Assembly the Committee has appointed the following additional ministers to labor as full time missionaries:

Rev. J. Edward Blair, missionary-at-large in Albany, Oregon (without financial aid); Rev. Bruce Coie, Trenton, New Jersey; Rev. A. Franklin Fauchette, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Thomas H. Mitchell, Youngstown, Ohio; Rev. Edward Wybenga, Waterloo, Iowa.

Since the Second General Assembly the following additional ministers have been granted aid according to the ability of the Committee:

Rev. M. Nelson Buffler, Camden, New Jersey; Mr. Lawrence R. Eyres, Negro Work in Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. George W. Marston, Kirkwood, Pa.; Rev. R. Jackson Vaughn, Chicago, Ill.

The Committee wishes to state that the missionaries have performed a noble service for The Presbyterian Church of America, often at great sacrifice.

The following is a complete list of full-time missionaries who are now serving The Presbyterian Church of America in this country:

Rev. Carl Ahlfeldt, Indianapolis, Indiana; Rev. Samuel J. Allen, North Dakota; Rev. J. Edward Blair, missionary-at-large, Albany, Oregon (without financial aid); Rev. Robert K. Churchill, Berkeley, California; Rev. Bruce Coie, Trenton, New Jersey; Rev. Edward B. Cooper, Pittsgrove, New Jersey; Rev. A. Franklin Fauchette, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. E. E. Matteson, North Dakota; Rev. Thomas H. Mitchell, Youngstown, Ohio; Rev. D. K. Myers, South Dakota; Rev. J. L. Shaw, Kentucky; Rev. Leslie W. Sloat, District of Columbia; Rev. Robert L. Vining, Pennsylvania; Rev. Peter F. Wall, Iowa; Rev. Edward Wybenga, Iowa.

The following is a complete list of aid receiving missionaries who are now serving The Presbyterian Church of America in this country:

Rev. C. A. Balcom, North Dakota; Rev. M. Nelson Buffler, Camden, New Jersey; Rev. John Davies, Wisconsin; Mr. Lawrence R. Eyres, Negro Work in Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. David Freeman, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mr. Donald Graham, Westfield, New Jersey; Rev. George W. Heaton, Bancroft, South Dakota; Rev. Walter J. Magee, Hamill, South Dakota; Rev. George W. Marston, Kirkwood, Pa.; Rev. R. Jackson Vaughn, Chicago, Illinois; Rev. E. Lynne Wade, Los Angeles, California; Rev. V. V. Wortman, Princeton, Iowa.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMITTEE

It has been encouraging to the Committee to receive funds from practically every group and congregation of The Presbyterian Church of America.

In addition, individuals in many parts of this country have sent in contributions for the work of the Committee. Since the last General Assembly the contributions of the Committee have increased from approximately \$1600 per month to about \$2100 per month. This represents an

average monthly gain of about thirty percent. The Treasurer's report gives the total amount of these gifts.

The budget of the Committee has been approximately \$2500 per month. Since the Second General Assembly the annual budget of the Committee has been increased by nearly \$3000. The Committee has had to face a difficult situation; ministers of the Church have been without fields of labor and funds, and at the same time the Committee has been hard pressed financially. The Committee has aided the ministers and missionaries to the best of its ability. Consequently it comes to the General Assembly approximately one month behind in its payment of salaries.

The missionaries have not complained even though at times they have been obliged to wait for the salaries due them. We are convinced that the work must not only be maintained but greatly increased. To these ends an increase of contributions is necessary.

The Committee calls upon the General Assembly to consider this need and opportunity, and to pray that the Lord will put it upon the hearts of many to give generously.

#### MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

The terms of the following members of the Committee expire at this General Assembly:

*Ministers:* Samuel J. Allen, W. Harlee Bordeaux, John H. Skilton, and Charles G. Sterling; *Elders:* John W. Dulles, Donald M. Perkins and Bert W. Tennant.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee makes the following recommendations: First, that the Committee be given power to carry on its work, and to receive and disburse contributions for the support of home missionaries and pastors who are receiving aid from the Committee; second, that the Committee be given power to aid in the support of other ministers and missionaries through and with the cooperation of the Presbyteries.

Prior to the election of the Foreign Missions' Committee the Assembly dissolved the existing Home Missions' Committee in order that the Assembly might elect a Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension of the same size and form as the proposed Foreign Missions' Committee.

The following committee was therefore elected by the General Assembly:

#### CLASS OF 1940

*Ministers:* Edwin H. Rian; Clifford S. Smith; Everett C. DeVelde. *Elders:* John W. Dulles; William McCaughey.

#### CLASS OF 1939

*Ministers:* John J. DeWaard; Robert Strong; John H. Skilton. *Elders:* Harry Fraser; Harry A. Worcester.

#### CLASS OF 1938

*Ministers:* Charles J. Woodbridge; Samuel J. Allen; John Murray. *Elders:* M. A. Campbell; George R. Hunter.

#### Report of the Committee on the Constitution

The *Form of Government* submitted by the Committee on the Constitution to the Second General Assembly and adopted provisionally by that body to be binding until the Third Assembly, was adopted finally with the following amendments:

In Chapter I, Section 1, the words, have governed the formation of the plan", were substituted for the words, "are basic to the Presbyterian form of church government".

In Chapter I, Section 4, the word, "a", was substituted for the word, "the", before the words, "great touchstone . . .".

On Page 20, in Section 9, the words, "do" and "their", were changed to "does" and "its".

On Page 24, at the end of Section XI, the following words were added: "It is also recommended that a fast day be observed in the congregation previous to the day of ordination."

On Page 27, in Section XVI, after the words, "as given above", the following words were added: "provided, however, that in no case shall an examination in theology on the floor of the presbytery be waived."

In Chapter XIV, Section 5, the words, "an examination primarily in theology but also in all matters relevant to our Standards", were substituted for the words, "an examination in theology".

Section 3 of Chapter XXIII was changed to read: "The Board of Trustees of a particular church shall ordinarily consist of the acting ruling elders and deacons, or the acting ruling elders, in that church, but other communicant members of the church may be elected as trustees if it seems desirable, provided, however, that the number of such members shall be less than one-half the total membership of the Board. Its duties shall be confined to the discharge of the business described in Section I of this chapter."

The *Book of Discipline*, prepared by the committee and recently sent to all ministers and sessions, was provisionally adopted, with the changes recommended in the report of the committee, to be binding until the Fourth General Assembly. It was understood that the Fourth Assembly would have power finally to adopt the *Book of Discipline*.

The text of the Report of the Committee on the Constitution is as follows:

The Committee on the Constitution desires to make the following report of its work and recommendations:

1. In accordance with the power granted by the last Assembly, the committee filled its vacancies by the addition of the Rev. R. B. Kuiper and the Rev. Robert Strong.

2. Following the directions of the last Assembly available copies of the printed

Form of Government, together with the modifications made by the Assembly were sent out to the various presbyteries for distribution. The Form of Government, which was adopted provisionally by the last Assembly, is before the Third Assembly for final adoption.

3. The proposed Book of Discipline, which has been distributed to the ministers and sessions of the Presbyterian Church of America, is recommended for adoption with the following changes:

A. Chapter V, Section 2, should read: "Any person may be a witness in a judicial case if the trial judiciary is satisfied that he has sufficient intelligence to understand, and can sincerely make, the following affirmation: 'I solemnly affirm that I will speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth concerning the matters on which I am called to testify.' The moderator shall require each witness before he testifies to make this affirmation."

B. Chapter VII, Section 5, should have "of" in the two instances where "from" occurs at the end of the first sentence.

C. Chapter VII, Section 6, should read "Officer" for "office-bearer" at the beginning of the first sentence.

4. The committee regrets to report that it has been unable to prepare a Directory for the Worship of God. The reasons for our failure to complete our work are the loss of Dr. Machen and the fact that the preparation of the Book of Discipline involved far greater labor than had been anticipated.

Respectfully submitted,  
N. B. STONEHOUSE, Chairman  
R. B. KUIPER  
MURRAY FORST THOMPSON  
ROBERT STRONG

The committee was continued until the next Assembly in order that it might complete the task that had originally been assigned to it.

#### **The Committee on Christian Education**

The following report of the Committee on Christian Education was received and its recommendations adopted by the Assembly:

The Committee on Christian Education submits the following recommendations:

1. That the General Assembly recommend to pastors and congregations the support of Westminster Theological Seminary with their prayers and generous financial gifts.

2. That the General Assembly recommend to pastors and members of the church the formation of local societies for Christian Day Schools.

3. That the General Assembly recommend to Presbyteries and sessions the formation of young people's societies looking forward to an organized young people's work.

4. That the General Assembly recommend to sessions and congregations the formation of summer Bible schools for children.

Respectfully submitted,  
CALVIN K. CUMMINGS, Chairman.

The Rev. Robert S. Marsden and Elder J. H. McClay were added to the Committee on Christian Education by the General Assembly. The other members of the committee are: The Rev. Cornelius VanTil; the Rev. Robert L. Atwell; the Rev. R. Laird Harris; and Elder Gordon H. Clark.

#### **Miscellaneous Business**

The following is the report of the Necrological Committee, appointed during the early sessions of the Assembly:

We humbly acknowledge the goodness of God who has granted to us the privilege of fellowship with His servants who, having completed their earthly tasks as ministers or elders of this church were called into God's blessed presence since our last Assembly. We gratefully recognize the privilege which has been ours of fellowship with men who counted loyalty to Jesus Christ more precious than the riches and honors of this world, whom God has called into the ministry of this church and into its eldership, and it is from such that some have been selected to stand in His presence. We regret that we are unable to record here by names the elders in this company.

From the number of our ministers three have departed from among us. The Rev. W. K. Fleck of Delta, Pa., served our Lord in the preaching of the Word and the pastoral ministry through a lifetime of service, marked by an increasing knowledge of God's Word, until taken to be with the Lord on December 13, 1936.

On January 1, 1937, in Bismarck, North Dakota, God called to Himself one who was a leader without a peer, the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D. Dr. Machen's teaching and preaching ministry has made the principles of God's Word more familiar to thousands and thousands of the children of the Lamb throughout the world, and the debt which this church owes to him can never be calculated.

The Rev. Arthur F. Perkins, of Merrill, Wisconsin, suffered deeply before his departure on December 29, 1937. Mr. Perkins was a burning brand of the evangel who travelled the length and breadth of the state of Wisconsin to make known the riches of grace and to plead with men to rid themselves of the shackles of a soul-destroying ecclesiastical organization.

We thank God for the testimony of these servants. May we be found worthy to follow in their train.

It was moved and carried that the report be received, and that a copy of it be transmitted to the immediate families of the persons mentioned. Following the presentation of the report, the Assembly joined in the singing of the hymn, "When I survey the wondrous Cross," and was led in prayer by Mr. Woolley.

The General Assembly accepted the invitation of the Rev. Franklin S. Dyrness of Faith Presbyterian Church, Quarryville, Penna., to hold the Fourth General Assembly in the church of which he is pastor. That Assembly will be held from May 31st to June 3rd, 1938, and Mr. Dyrness and Mr. Sloat were appointed a Committee on Arrangements.

By motion the Assembly expressed to the officers and members of the Spruce Street Baptist Church of Philadelphia "the deep and sincere appreciation of its members for the kindness of the officers and members of that church in permitting it to hold its meetings in their premises."

Late in the afternoon of Friday, June 4th, the Third General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America adjourned, with prayer by the moderator. Thus ended happily what had seemed to many the most potentially perilous assembly in the church's brief history. The church had taken its stand as opposed to ecclesiastical Independentism and, in order to insure the continued propagation of truly Presbyterian and Reformed foreign missions, had created its own Committee on Foreign Missions. In the consideration of the numerous overtures calling for legislation on the subject of total abstinence there was the ever-present possibility that the Assembly might forget that the Word of God is "the only rule of faith and obedience." Two groups, in sharp disagreement, seemed motivated by two opposing fears. One group feared to run counter to a widely accepted tradition whose appeal was not to the Word of God but to the doctrines and commandments of men.

But a far more powerful fear gripped the other group—a fear that left them fearless of all else. That was the fear of going one little step beyond the Word of God and the subordinate standards of the church, of erecting a norm of practice that could not find its sanction in the Holy Scriptures.

It is reassuring to know that by far the majority of commissioners to the Third General Assembly were willing, in the face of almost certain misunderstanding from enemies and friends alike, to "obey God rather than man."

—THOMAS R. BIRCH

## Life Everlasting

### A Meditation on Psalm Sixteen

By the REV. DAVID FREEMAN



Mr. Freeman

**T**HOSE who love God and keep His commandments are not only blessed in this life, but also they have the assurance of the life which is to come. They have a sure and steadfast hope which no trial can take away.

If Christ benefited believers in this life only, they would of all men be most miserable. Salvation is only salvation when Christ comes to receive His own. Hence those who believe, earnestly look for the Saviour from Heaven.

### Victory Over Death

Whence comes this assurance of the resurrection of the body, and eternal life? This faith rests upon the resurrection of Christ which David, the Psalmist, saw afar off. We know that such was David's hope because the apostles Peter and Paul apply this Psalm to the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 2:25-31; 13:35-37). Here is a distinct prophecy that the Messiah would be raised from the grave without experiencing corruption. The apostles argue from the fact that David did return to corruption in the grave like other men, that this Psalm could not have referred primarily to David, but that it had its proper and highest fulfillment in the resurrection of Christ.

It is then because of Christ's resurrection that the godly in all ages have been enabled to despise death and, with a note of triumph, sing, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

All men are under the just sentence of death. Hell only is their desert, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. How could David hope for release from death, unless he saw Christ's death and resurrection by the spirit of prophecy? There is but One who can give life to dying men. David saw Him in faith as we must see Him if we are to be sharers in His resurrection.

Christ, by His death and rising again on the third day, purchased immortality for His elect. He was utterly

and wholly exempt from corruption in His grave that He might call the redeemed into a fellowship of life. He is not the God of the dead but of the living.

It is true that those who now trust in Christ experience a blessed fellowship. The life of Heaven is theirs now, but the present glories bestowed upon believers are nothing to be compared with the bliss that shall be. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (I John 3:2).

### Pleasures for Evermore

Heaven will consist of pleasures for evermore. In this life God gives to His children things richly to be enjoyed. It is no mark of special godliness to despise God's gifts. The ascetic is not always a saint. But even the greatest joys of earth come to an end. No matter how secure the sources of our joy may seem to be we know that happiness here cannot last long, for life cannot long continue. The dearest friend that we may have may soon leave us. Health, so essential to the enjoyment of any comfort here, may soon fail. Property, however firmly it may be secured, may "take to itself wings and fly away." Not so will it be at the right hand of God. Happiness there will be eternal. Losses, disappointment, bereavement, sickness, can never occur. There will be nothing to mar the joys and pleasures of God's children forever.

Let no one think that he is more of a saint if he boasts no interests in the pleasures of Heaven. Certainly such a one is not interested in God's Heaven for that will be full of joys. The truly devout long for the day when they shall hear Jesus say to them: "Enter into the joy of thy Lord."

### Who Have This Hope?

Who alone have this certain hope of everlasting life? Those only who have taken God to be their portion. No one to whom God is not all in all is worthy of the Kingdom of God. Jesus said, "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother,

and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. . . . Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple." These are indeed hard words, but there must be no higher love than love to God. All happiness and life must be in God.

If we seek any good outside of God we are not worthy of Him. Men cannot love Him in part and think that will do. God will not and cannot accept a halfway allegiance. Christ is the Lord of His people. He must reign without a rival in their hearts and His lordship must show itself in their lives. No one can hope to be blest beyond Him or independent of Him. God comprehends within Himself the highest joy. He who possesses God wants no good thing, but apart from Him no good thing can be.

It is well for God's children to be able to point to some evidence of their love and attachment to God. Are they not called upon by the apostle Paul to "make their calling and election sure"? This is no idle charge. It must be taken seriously as an admonition from the Lord. They can, with David, point to their love of the brethren, for only as we love them do we know that we have passed from death unto life. "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death."

God's children have the marks of His grace. Can you point to them? If so your journey to the Celestial City will be with firmer step and with more joy.

### A Correction

**I**N reporting the postponement of the regular Independent Board meeting, found on Page 52 of the issue of May 15, 1937, it is felt by the Rev. Harold S. Laird and elder Peter Stam, Jr., that their honesty was called in question. Although they agree that the facts were accurately stated, they have asked THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN to make clear that Mr. Stam was present in Philadelphia because he had earlier been told that the Board meeting could not be postponed. His telegram was read by Mr. Laird solely to show the number of protests received, and no concealment of facts was intended either by Mr. Laird or Mr. Stam. THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN willingly makes this correction in the interests of fairness.

## Studies in the Shorter Catechism

By the REV. JOHN H. SKILTON

### LESSON 36

#### Christ Our Priest

QUESTION 25. *How doth Christ execute the office of a priest?*

ANSWER. *Christ executeth the office of a priest, in his once offering up of himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, and reconcile us to God, and in making continual intercession for us.*

#### Justice Satisfied



Mr. Skilton

**A**S OUR priest the Lord Jesus Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice, in our place, to cover, to hide from view, or to expiate, our sins (see Lesson 35). It was necessary for Him to perform His work of expiation in order that the justice of God might be satisfied, the penalty required of sinners by the law of God be paid, and the salvation of God's elect procured. Since God is holy He hates sin (Psalm 5:4-7; 7:11; Nahum 1:2). His unchangeable law, based on His holiness, requires perfect obedience of man (James 2:10; Matt. 5:17, 18; Rom. 3:31; 10:4; Luke 16:17). Failure to meet the demands of the law places guilt on man, brings him under the curse of the law, and exposes him to the wrath of God.

See Gen. 2:17; Rom. 5:12, 16, 18; 6:23; I John 3:4; Deut. 4:24; 17:6; 21:22; 27:26; 32:35; Isa. 59:18; II Thess. 1:6; Heb. 2:2; Rom. 1:32; II Kings 17:18; Micah 5:15; Psalm 2:12; 11:6; 75:8; 78:49; 89:32; Prov. 21:12; 24:20; Isa. 1:24, 28; Matt. 3:10; 24:51.

Since God is just He cannot permit sin to go unpunished (see Lesson 9). See also Gen. 18:25; Ex. 20:5; 23:7; Heb. 1:13; Rom. 1:18, 32; 3:25, 26; Jer. 17:10; Job 34:11; Psalm 62:12; Isa. 59:18; Ezek. 18:20; Col. 3:25. If God were to permit sin to escape punishment, He would deny Himself (II Tim. 2:13). He would not be God.

It is clear, then, that the penalty demanded by the law of God must be paid and the justice of God satisfied before man can receive the blessings promised in the covenant of grace

(see Lesson 30). That which our Lord Jesus suffered throughout His life on earth and in His death, fully satisfied the penalty of the divine law and met the requirements of God's justice. He did not suffer exactly, identically, the punishments that the law would have required of all the elect. He did not, for instance, die eternally—and that as often as there are elect persons. "His sufferings," says Dr. A. A. Hodge, "were no substitute for a penalty, but those very penal evils which rigorous justice demanded of his exalted person when he stood in our place, as a full equivalent for all that was demanded of us. The substitution of a divine for a human victim necessarily involved a change in the *quality*, though none whatever in the legal relations of the suffering . . . He did not, of course, suffer in his divine nature. But because of the infinite dignity of his person, his finite sufferings constitute an absolutely perfect satisfaction, sufficient to expiate the sins of all men" (*The Atonement*, p. 30). Perfect in meeting the demands of God's law and justice because of its own merits, Christ's work of satisfaction also perfectly accomplishes that which God designed. (I John 1:7; Heb. 10:12, 14; Col. 2:10).

That no other sacrifice than that of our Lord Jesus could have satisfied the divine justice is indicated in numerous ways by the Scriptures. The sacrifices of the Old Testament were unable to take away sins (Heb. 10:4). If righteousness of life could have come by the law Christ is dead in vain (Gal. 3:21; 2:21). God could not have required a sacrifice of such great magnitude (Rom. 8:32), a sacrifice which "measures" the extent of His love to His elect, if it had not been the sacrifice necessary to satisfy the divine justice—to make God just in justifying the sinner:

"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:25-26). See also Luke 24:26; Heb. 2:10; 9:22, 23.

Christ's perfect, necessary, unique

work of satisfaction, which no other could perform, is a final work, which will never have to be performed again. The Catechism speaks of His *once* offering up Himself a sacrifice. No other sacrifice will ever be required. The Old Testament types have been fulfilled. Never again will animals have to be sacrificed. Christ Himself can never again be offered for sin. Those who believe that He is present, "Body, Soul, and Divinity" in the Lord's Supper, again to be offered for sin, are guilty of grievous error. See the Confession of Faith, XXIX:2; Acts 3:21; Heb. 9:22, 25-28; Matt. 26:26, 27; Luke 22:19, 20; I Cor. 11:24-26; Heb. 7:23, 24, 27; 10:11, 12-14, 18; Rom. 3:24, 25; 8:32, 34; 10:4; Heb. 9:12, 25-28.

Even as no more sacrifices are necessary, so also no more priests are necessary. We need no men to serve as intermediaries between our Redeemer and His elect, between God and His church, or to offer sacrifices for sin. The Lord Jesus is our only Mediator, our only Priest. All priestly offices He perfectly, finally, and efficaciously performs. There is room for no pretenders to His priestly functions. See I Tim. 2:5; I John 2:1; Heb. 9:12, 24; 7:25; 10:14; Col. 2:10; John 14:6; Acts 4:12; Matt. 11:28; John 5:40; 7:37; Rev. 3:20; 22:17. Of course the elect, as Dr. A. A. Hodge points out, may in a sense be called priests: "Every believer has part in the priesthood of his head in such a sense that he has immediate access to God through Christ, even into the holiest of all, Heb. 10:19-22; and that being sanctified and spiritually qualified, he may there offer up, as a 'holy priest,' a 'royal priest,' spiritual sacrifices, not expiatory, but the oblation of praise, supplication and thanksgiving, through Jesus Christ, and intercession for living friends" (*Outlines of Theology*, ch. 21:22). See Heb. 13:15; I Tim. 2:1, 2; I Pet. 2:5, 9; Rev. 1:6.

#### God Reconciled

The Scriptures teach that it was because God loved His elect, unworthy though they were, that He sent His Son to die for them.

See I John 4:8-10; 3:16, 18, 19; Rom. 5:8-10; John 15:13-16; 17:6-19; 3:16; 10:11; Rom. 8:32, 33; Gal. 1:4, 5; Eph. 1:11, 12; 3:18, 19; 5:25-27; Psalm 16:18; 23; 27, 34; Luke 1:47-50, 78; II Cor. 1:3; 4:15; Eph. 1:6; 2:4.

All three persons of the Godhead loved the elect and all three required that justice be satisfied. We are not to think of God the Father as upholding justice, without love, as over against the Son, loving, and forced to propitiate the Father. It was necessary that the *Godhead* be propitiated by the sacrifice of Christ. The Son required this just as much as the Father.

We must not confuse the love of God to His elect with His benevolence exercised toward all men, but not resulting in their salvation (see Gen. 39:5; Psalm 145:8, 15, 16; 36:6; Matt. 5:44, 45; Luke 6:35, 36; Acts 14:16, 17; Ezek. 18:23, 32; 33:11; Matt. 23:37).

The greatness of God's love is evidenced by the fact that Christ performed that which enabled God to be reconciled to us, His enemies, who were lost in sin. Apart from the covering of our sin and the satisfaction of His justice, God could not look upon us without disapprobation and enmity because of our guilt. But by the sacrifice of our Priest, God has been rendered propitious, and has been reconciled to us. His enmity has been changed to friendship.

See Rom. 5:10, 11; II Cor. 5:18-20; Heb. 2:17; I John 2:2; 4:10; Rom. 3:25; Eph. 2:16. See Matt. 5:24 for light on the meaning of the term "reconcile."

It is important for us to realize that the primary reconciliation spoken of in Scripture is that of God to us. The atonement, Christ's work of satisfaction, is objective—it has a Godward reference (Heb. 5:1; Acts 20:28; I Cor. 6:20; 7:23). But because God has become reconciled to the elect by the death of His Son, we may speak of a consequent reconciliation, that of the elect to God. When the Holy Spirit imparts new life to us we, who were once opposed to God in our evil hearts, are made friendly toward Him (Rom. 15:13; II Cor. 5:19, 20).

### **Redeemed**

The Lord Jesus, our High Priest, is called our Redeemer (see Lesson 31), for He has obtained deliverance for us from evil by the payment of a ransom to God. The ransom that He paid is said to be Himself, His blood, His death. See Heb. 9:15; Eph. 1:7, 14; Rom. 3:24; 8:33; I Pet. 1:18; Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45; Luke 21:28; Eph. 4:30; Col. 1:14; I Tim. 2:6; Tit. 1:14; Heb. 9:12; Rev. 5:9; Acts

20:28; Cf. I Cor. 6:20; 7:23. We are redeemed by our Lord from the curse, the penalty, of the law (Gal. 3:13; 4:5); from the requirement to meet the demands of the law as a covenant of works, on condition of death (Gal. 4:4, 5; Rom. 6:14; 5:18, 19); from the power of sin (Gal. 1:3; Tit. 2:14; I Pet. 1:18, 19); from the "power of Satan" (II Tim. 2:26; II Cor. 4:4; Col. 2:15; Heb. 2:14; John 12:21); and from all evil—a deliverance to be fully realized in the future (Luke 21:28; Eph. 1:14; Heb. 9:12; Rom. 8:21-23; Eph. 4:30. Consider Isa. 41:14; 44:24; 35:10; 51:11; 62:12).

### SUBJECTS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

1. Is there any conflict between these statements: "God is love" and "Our God is a consuming fire"? Is there any conflict between the attributes, the perfection, of God?

2. Review the lessons on the perfections of God.

3. Was God the Father the only Person of the Trinity who required that justice be satisfied? Is it necessary for God to punish sin? What is sin? Is the law of God unchangeable?

4. What is the difference between the love of God to His elect and His benevolence?

5. Ask someone to report on the article, "Have We Dropped the Love of God?", by Dr. Ned B. Stonehouse in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for December 26, 1936, pp. 118-119.

6. What is meant by the phrase, "reconcile us to God"? Could we ever be reconciled to God if God were not first reconciled to us?

7. Was Christ's work of satisfaction necessary? Was God compelled to save us? If God planned to save us could He have saved us in any other way than by the substitutionary work of His Son?

8. Was Christ's work of satisfaction perfect? Was it final? Did it have a Godward reference? In what way is it unique?

9. Should believers be called priests? In the sense in which Christ is so termed?

10. Is Christ sacrificed again for sin in the Lord's Supper?

## **"BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD" ORGANIZED BY MEMBERS WITHDRAWING FROM PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AMERICA**

### **New Organization Joined by Fourteen Ministers and Three Elders**

IMMEDIATELY following the closing sessions of the Third General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America, and on the alleged grounds that the denomination had departed from the "historic position of American Presbyterianism," fourteen ministers and three elders withdrew from the church to form a new organization styled "The Bible Presbyterian Synod."

The new synod proposes to revise the four-hundred-year-old Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms "in any particular in which the premillennial teaching of the Scriptures may be held to be obscured." The Confession was adopted in the form which it possessed in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1936. The standards of the organization, therefore, contain the compromising revisions adopted in 1903 by the old denomination and used in an effective way to complete an organic union with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, whose standards were distinctively Arminian.

The Bible Presbyterian Synod enthusiastically affirmed its faith in and support of the Independent Board as it was reorganized under the leader-

ship of ministers who are either themselves Independents ecclesiastically or who are willing to condone the presence of such Independents on the Board.

In announcing the new organization the Rev. Carl McIntire, pastor of the independent Collingswood Presbyterian Church, declared that "all that will be left in The Presbyterian Church of America, is this little group around Philadelphia." Answering Mr. McIntire the Rev. Edwin H. Rian said, "Only seven churches are involved. I believe that five or ten more ministers will leave. In that approximately twenty ministers have joined since the last Assembly, we shall have one hundred or more ministers, or the same number as we had last fall."

Those who signed the Act of Association of the Bible Presbyterian Synod are:

R. Jackson Vaughn, Chicago, Ill.; Allan A. MacRae, Philadelphia, Pa.; Peter F. Wall, Des Moines, Iowa; Henry G. Welbon, Newark, Del.; Fred A. Geisenheimer, Chicago, Ill.; Verne V. Wortman, Princeton, Iowa.; Philip duB. Arcularius, Duryea, Pa.; Martin Luther Thomas, Los Angeles, Calif.; J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., Wheaton, Ill.; Charles G. Sterling, Wheaton, Ill.; W. R. Sibley,

Seattle, Wash.; Peter Stam, Jr., Wheaton, Ill.; Milo F. Jamison, Los Angeles, Calif.; A. Franklin Fauchette, Cleveland, Ohio; M. Stanley Black, Wenonah, N. J.; J. U. Selwyn Toms, Ocean City, N. J.; Frank Hamilton, Ventnor, N. J.

## WESTMINSTER FACULTY ADOPTS STATEMENT ON LIQUOR QUESTION

**A**T A meeting of the Faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary, held on June 8, 1937, the following important action was taken in order permanently to silence recent false rumors and misrepresentations:

"The Faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary is grateful to God for the many tokens of His grace during the academic year just closed.

"In the course of the latter part of that year there have been in circulation many misleading statements concerning the Seminary. In order to make clear the position of the Faculty, we wish to record:

"1) That we are grateful to God for the clear loyalty to His Word manifested by the Third General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America, though as a Faculty, of course, we have no official connection with that body.

"2) That since it is our conviction that the use of fermented or distilled liquors for beverage purposes is an important source of temptation in this day, we strongly urge upon our students that they 'walk circumspectly . . . redeeming the time, because the days are evil' (Ephesians 5:15), remembering that 'it is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak' (Romans 14:21), and observing the apostolic admonition, 'give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved' (I Corinthians 10:32, 33).

"3) That, though we believe the making of a rule to be unnecessary, yet, to avoid any misconceptions by the public, we establish a rule forbidding all beverage use of alcoholic liquors upon the grounds and in the buildings of the Seminary."

## MANCHOUKUO MISSIONARIES PAY TRIBUTE TO DR. MACHEN

**O**N Monday evening, March 15th, the members of the Manchoukuo Mission of the Independent Board met at the home of the Rev. and Mrs. Henry W. Coray and conducted a brief memorial service in honor of Dr. J. Gresham Machen.

The service was opened with the hymn, "Sun of my soul." The Rev. R. Heber McIlwaine led in prayer and read the fifth chapter of II Corinthians. The resolution given below was then read, and each member of the mission informally spoke of Dr. Machen and what he had meant to them. The hymn, "There is a green hill far away," a favorite of Dr. Machen, was sung in unison and the meeting was concluded with prayer.

The tribute is as follows:

He is indeed a person of narrow vision who is interested only in the commission to "strengthen thy stakes," forgetting its divine preface, "lengthen thy cords." It may not be said of Dr. Machen that he merely "contended earnestly for the faith" and sought to "strengthen the things that remain" in the home church, without also longing to save "other sheep . . . not of this fold." The Independent Board is a living testimony to his vision of the universal scope of the Church's activity. Those of us who serve under the Independent Board, therefore stood in a peculiar relation to him. He was the one to point out the necessity for its creation. He was its first president. God in His providence, raised him up to lay the foundation for a lighthouse that should not only guide the wayfarer into the harbor of truth, but also reveal the shoals of error.

The Manchoukuo Mission of the Independent Board does thank God for the valiant soldier of Jesus Christ. His unswerving, uncompromising loyalty to the Word of God, frequently at great personal sacrifice, has been a never-failing source of inspiration to us. Dr. Machen never ceased to wonder that the Son of God loved him and died for him, personally. Is this not the secret of his deep humility? He realized his debt to sovereign grace. Hence it

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Presbyterian Church of America . . . . .	85
AN EDITORIAL	
The Third General Assembly . . . . .	88
Life Everlasting . . . . .	97
David Freeman	
Studies in the Shorter Catechism . . . . .	98
John H. Skilton	

it is not unnatural that he should love the words of Isaac Watts' beloved hymn:

"Forbid it, Lord, that I should boast  
Save in the death of Christ my God."

It would seem as though his last campaign were a commentary on Paul's declaration, "Neither count I my life dear unto myself so that I might finish my course with joy." What an example he was to the missionary of the Cross! We pray that we too may be faithful unto death; that we may be willing to count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord; that we may press on with fresh determination to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ to the millions over here who stand in such desperate need of the Gospel which Dr. Machen loved and championed.

## NEW SEMINARY PLANNED FOR WHEATON, ILLINOIS

**G**ROUNDRWORK for a new theological seminary to be opened next fall on the campus of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, was laid at a public rally in Philadelphia, on Friday, June 4th. Leaders in the newly organized Bible Presbyterian Synod who, for several months, have been actively opposed to Westminster Seminary, were among the speakers of the evening.

The Rev. Allan A. MacRae, Ph.D., who recently resigned from the Faculty of Westminster Seminary and who, with the Rev. R. Laird Harris, will constitute the Old Testament department of the new seminary, announced that the proposed institution will be exclusively premillennial. "Those who deny this doctrine [of premillennialism] have almost without exception a hatred of this doctrine," said Dr. MacRae.

The Rev. Milo F. Jamison of Los Angeles, Calif., said that the seminary will be "not so narrow but what it admits all who believe in the infallibility of Scripture, nor so broad that it allows liberalism." It will have, said Mr. Jamison, a Calvinistic emphasis without going so far as to make it a mechanistic philosophy.

Wheaton, declared Dr. Martin Luther Thomas, will be militant, unafraid, dynamic.

The question of whether or not the new seminary would have any distinctively Presbyterian characteristics was sidestepped in favor of an emphasis upon the fundamentals of the brief undenominational Wheaton platform.