

F. S. DYRNES
MAY 1935-R
R 2
QUARRYVILLE PA
14950

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO., Inc.
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

AUGUST, 1934

Vol. 5

No. 3

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Entered as second-class matter May 11,
1931, at the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Notes and Comments

UNITED PRESBYTERIANS REJECT MERGER

IT SHOULD be a source of satisfaction to all intelligent and informed Presbyterians that the Plan of Union proposed by the Joint Committee on Organic Union has failed. The consummation of this union, as we have consistently maintained, would not have been for the best interest of either of these churches. It would not have been for the best interest of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. because it would have been obtained at the cost of a serious lowering of its doctrinal standards and under conditions that would have made further revision in the direction of Modernism relatively easy. It would not have been for the best interest of the United Presbyterian Church because it would have resulted in a church which on the whole is seemingly soundly evangelical in a Reformed sense—despite the reduced and in some respects erroneous creed which—we are at a loss to know why—it adopted a few years ago, being swallowed up by a church which, whatever may be true of many of the rank and file of its ministers and members, is dominated and controlled by a modernist-indifferentist group that is not only hostile to or indifferent to the system of doctrine taught in the Bible and in the Westminster Standards, but which is seeking to wrest from its members as a whole their constitutional and Christian liberties. CHRISTIANITY TODAY is the only paper in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. that has opposed the plan of union proposed by the Joint Committee. While it seemed a foregone conclusion that it would receive the endorsement of our General Assembly, we have all along thought it likely that the United Presbyterian Assembly would reject it. Our already high opinion of the United Presbyterians has thereby been increased.

The vote in the United Presbyterian Assembly was 113 for and 123 against with a two-thirds vote required for approval. It has been repeatedly alleged in the press that the vote against the merger in our Assembly was only twenty. That is unquestionably a misrepresentation. It is more accurate to say that approximately one hundred voted against it with a considerable number not voting because it was obvious that the opposition was hopelessly outvoted. But even if the vote against it had been less than twenty, it would still be true that this was one of the many cases in which the minority has been right and the majority wrong.

The United Presbyterians dismissed their Committee on Organic Union. It would seem to be high time for the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to do likewise. The department on Church Cooperation and Union should be abolished or at least have its personnel changed and its functions modified. It certainly has proved itself an expensive as well as an inefficient department. The abolishment of this department would not mean

that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is averse to union with other churches. It would be much better, it seems to us, to appoint special committees to consider particular proposals of union rather than have a standing department. Such a department feels that it must do something to justify its existence and so is under constant pressure to promote mergers even where there is no real demand for them on the part of the rank and file of the churches concerned.

"GOD GETS SECOND PLACE"

UNDER the above title *Church Management* for July contains the following editorial comment on the last General Assembly:

"If you like family fights you should have been at the meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. which recently met in Cleveland. A fundamentalist group headed by PROF. J. GRESHAM MACHEN, believing that the foreign board has grown modernist, has organized its own board of foreign missions. This the church fathers agreed is all wrong. So they served notice, in no indifferent way, that every minister and officer in affiliation with the new board must withdraw. If they failed to do so in ninety days they must stand trial before their respective presbyteries.

"The little group fought back, appealing that it had an obligation to God and conscience which must come ahead of the ruling of the Assembly. But it was overruled. The Presbyterian Church is a constitutional body. The right of conscience can be granted only so far as it does not interfere with the law of the church.

"Several days later the same assembly debated war. But what a difference? Now it held that 'Christians owe an allegiance to the Kingdom of God superior to loyalty to their own country.'

"So as far as this assembly is concerned it appears that the Presbyterian Church comes first, God and conscience next, while the nation must take third place."

The editorial we have just cited contains about the most illuminating press comment on the last General Assembly that we have noted. Most of these comments are suggestive of many if not most present-day sermons. Just as one might listen indefinitely to these sermons without obtaining any real understanding of what Christianity is or the purpose for which it was established—even those that do not give a positively false conception of the nature and purpose of the Christian religion—so these comments even when not positively misleading (as many of them are) are strangely blind to the significance of what took place at Cleveland. Here, however, is an editorial that has been written with insight and understanding. We are glad to be able to pass it on to our readers.

representative of this paper. Moreover while its managing editor is a very important factor in the production and publication of this paper, the responsibility for its contents rests wholly upon its editor.

Westminster Seminary also sustains no official relation to the Independent Board. It is true that two members of its Faculty and five members of its Board of Trustees are members of the Independent Board, but six members of its Faculty and twenty-six members of its Board of Trustees are *not* members of the new Board. What is more, the Independent Board has not sought or obtained any sort of approval or indorsement on the part of Westminster Seminary. Some of the representatives of Westminster Seminary approve and some disapprove the Independent Board but how many approve and how many disapprove no one, as far as we know, has attempted to discover. "The two institutions," to cite the President of Westminster's Board of Trustees, "are as distinct and separate as they can be." Approval of Westminster Seminary does not necessarily involve approval of the Independent Board or *vice versa*. To speak as though the interests of these organizations are identical is sheer misrepresentation.

The question whether the organization of the Independent Board was wise or unwise is relatively unimportant compared with the questions which have been raised by the action of the last Assembly together with the actions of certain presbyteries in refusing to license or ordain men, otherwise admittedly well qualified, because of their refusal to pledge themselves to support whatever agencies may be sanctioned by the General Assembly whether or no they believe those agencies to be loyal to the Constitution of the Church and the Word of God.

Is the General Assembly the final seat of authority in the Presbyterian Church so that its deliverances are superior to the

Constitution and even to the Word of God? Must Presbyterian ministers pledge themselves to a blind obedience to whatever the shifting majorities of General Assemblies may determine? Must Presbyterians support the official Boards of the Church "to the utmost of their ability" even though they are convinced that these Boards are engaged in Modernistic, *i. e.*, anti-Christian propaganda? Are men to be received into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church who deny and even flout such basic doctrines as the full trustworthiness of the Bible and the deity, atoning death and glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ while men whose only offense is that they refuse to support the official agencies of the Church, save in as far as these agencies are loyal to its Constitution and the Word of God, are excluded? Are men conspicuous for their loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God and for their fidelity to the gospel to be excluded from the Church while Auburn Affirmationists and worse are exalted to positions of honor and influence? Is the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. no longer a Church in which it is acknowledged that God alone is Lord of the conscience and that He hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any way contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith and worship?

It is the questions just put, and questions such as these, that have been raised by the action of the last Assembly (and of certain presbyteries). We submit that in comparison the question whether the Independent Board is wise or unwise, desirable or undesirable, is relatively unimportant. In opposition to this action all true and loyal Presbyterians, whether they judge the Independent Board wise or unwise, desirable or undesirable, should present a united front for the maintenance of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. as a truly Christian, a truly Protestant and a truly Presbyterian and Reformed Church.

The Synod of Pennsylvania in 1934

A Study in Present Day Presbyterianism

By Rev. Prof. Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D.



ATTENDANCE at the sessions of one of the higher judicatories of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is calculated to raise in the mind the insistent question, What is the primary purpose of these annual gatherings? Is it inspirational and educative? Or are they intended to be deliberative, administrative and judicial in character? For an answer to this question, let us look at the Synod of Pennsylvania recently in session at Washington, Pa.

On Tuesday evening, June 19th, after a brief Devotional Service and the Address of the retiring Moderator, Dr. W. M. Lewis, president of Lafayette College, Synod was "constituted" by prayer. Then came the Roll Call. Answering the Roll Call is the first official act of a commissioner. Only commissioners are *members* of Synod. They are elected for one year; and apparently only the retiring Moderator is ordinarily regarded as eligible for re-election. Hence the Synod of 1934 differed in its personnel almost totally from that of a year ago. What proportion of its commissioners had ever attended Synod before, it would be difficult to say. Synod is in session less than three days, having only five business sessions. If the purpose of Synod is simply to educate its members, this practically complete change in its membership is almost ideal. If it is to secure their mature judgment on the matters pending before Synod, it leaves much to be desired.

As if to offset the defect just alluded to, a very definite element of permanence and continuity is added to this ephemeral body called the Synod by its General Council, Permanent Committee on National Missions, and Trustees. The General Council is made up of twenty-four men: the Moderator, his two nearest predeces-

sors in office, the chairmen of National Missions and Promotion, and one representative from each of the nineteen presbyteries, nominated by their respective presbyteries. The Executive Committee of the Council consists of the three moderators and two other members of the Council, the Stated Clerk serving in an advisory capacity. The Permanent Committee on National Missions consists of 20 men: an executive president and 19 ministers representing the presbyteries of Synod. All the presbyterial representatives serve for three years and are eligible for re-election. But since the Presbyteries elect ministers and elders in alternate years to the General Council, immediate re-election is possible only for members of the Committee on National Missions, all of whom are ministers. This year the Synod re-elected for at least a third term the members of the Committee on National Missions whose term had expired, which means that all six will have served at least nine years on this Committee when their new term is at an end. The Trustees, seven in number, also serve for three years and are eligible for re-election.

The Council is required to meet shortly before Synod and to continue in session during at least part of it. The Committee on National Missions meets "immediately preceding the meeting of Synod." The Trustees must meet at least once annually, prior to the meeting of Synod. Thus it appears that Synod practically consists of two almost distinct bodies. The one body comprises the members or commissioners—they number about 120; they are elected for one year; they are usually new men; *they have the vote*; they are the Synod. The other consists in the main of the Council and the National Missions Committee—they number about 40; they serve for *three* years (sometimes for many

more than that); they meet at practically the same time as Synod; they prepare its docket and reports; they guide and advise and all but direct; but *they have no vote*. A remarkable situation!

The first important act of Synod after Roll Call is to elect a moderator. To many of the commissioners the rival candidates, if there be such, are unknown or little known. Consequently, they have to trust to what they are told by others and much canvassing is often done and many assurances are given by proponents of the rival aspirants. In the Synod the Moderator occupies a more dominating position than in the General Assembly. He appoints all the members of the seven standing committees (a total of 40 men, which is about one-third of Synod!). By serving for three years as one of the five members of the Executive Committee of the General Council he is in a position to influence the policies and acts of the Synod for three years after he has with a stroke of his gavel dissolved the Synod which elected him and over which he has presided for two days and a half. If he is a forceful man or the representative of an influential group, his position is formidable. The successful candidate this year was Dr. B. B. Royer of Franklin, Pa.

The next act of Synod is to approve the "docket." This, as we have seen, is prepared for it by the Executive Committee of the General Council. Several things attract attention. The first is the relatively large amount of time which is given to what is not in the strict sense the "business" of Synod. Synod was in session at Washington only from Tuesday evening to Friday noon. There were consequently three evening, three morning, and two afternoon sessions, a total of not much over 24 working hours. The three evening sessions, except for the time on Tuesday evening devoted to the constituting of Synod and the election of the Moderator, were devotional sessions at which no business was transacted. Besides this the first *hour* of each of the three morning sessions was given to a devotional service and address. The standing rules of Synod provide for a "Devotional Service" and set the time as a "half hour." But for some years, apparently, this has been extended to an hour, the greater part of the time being given to the address. This year the speaker was Dr. Buttrick, the successor of Dr. Henry Sloan Coffin as pastor of the Madison Avenue Church of New York City. One of the evening preachers was Dr. Hindman, pastor of the First Church of Buffalo of which Dr. Buttrick was formerly pastor. The other was Dr. J. Harry Cotton of the Broad Street Church of Columbus, Ohio. How thoroughly the docket of Synod was in the hands of the Modernists is shown by this list of speakers. For certainly the least that could be said of these gentlemen is that not one of them would wish to be classed as conservative. We believe with the Preacher that "there is a time to every purpose under the heavens" and we raise the question whether the primary purpose of Synod is to listen to inspirational addresses, be they liberal or conservative, or to transact the business that has called it together.

In addition to these devotional addresses, with which that of the retiring Moderator properly belongs, there were a number of others of a promotional character. Most of Wednesday and Thursday mornings was given up to such addresses: Dr. Randolph of the Farm School, Asheville, N. C.; Dr. Reid S. Dickson of the Board of Pensions; Dr. W. P. Shell of the Foreign Board and the Rev. A. C. Salley of Brazil; Mrs. Beitler, president of the Woman's Synodical; the Rev. H. C. Weber of the Every Member Canvass; three students and Dr. Covert for the Board of Christian Education; and on Friday morning Dr. Covert again in his capacity as Moderator of the General Assembly. All of these addresses except the last came under the head of "Program." Wednesday and Thursday afternoons there were "Reports." These Reports were already in print in a 39-page pamphlet, which was given to the commissioners when they reached Washington. Yet in the face of protest considerable time was devoted to reading more or less fully from them. It would seem a simple matter to have mailed them to the commissioners a week or two earlier. Had this been done much valu-

able time might have been saved. Especially noteworthy is it that not only were these Reports prepared for Synod by committees of or under the direction of the General Council; they were actually presented to Synod by the chairmen of these committees who themselves presided at the sessions at which their causes were presented, despite the fact that none of them had to be—in fact only two out of seven actually were—commissioners to and so members of the Synod.

Turning again to the docket we notice further that not a word is said anywhere about new business. The only intimation that Synod might want to "start something" is found, if indeed it is intended to appear even there, under the item "Miscellaneous Business." This item appears as one of ten which are to occupy Synod during the last hour of its final session. The docket suggests that anything in the nature of new business is an intrusion which will not be welcomed by the chair unless absolutely necessary.

The question of the docket has an important bearing upon what will probably prove to have been the most important business of the Synod of 1934. This Synod had a judicial function to perform: "complaints" from several presbyteries were to come before it. The Synod has a Standing Committee on Judicial Business with seven members, *all* of whom are appointed by the Moderator. These appointments are announced at the beginning of the first morning session and papers of a judicial nature in the hands of the Stated Clerk are on motion referred to it. But no place on the docket is assigned this committee. This makes it look as if the reports of this important committee were an intrusion on the regular business of Synod.

The Committee on Judicial Business made its first report early in the afternoon session of Wednesday. It recommended the setting up of a Judicial Commission and the transmitting to said Commission of the complaint against the licensure of W. T. Jackson by Chester Presbytery, the reason for the complaint being the inadequate academic preparation of Mr. Jackson. The motion was then made that "the Moderator nominate and the Synod elect" such a commission. Objection was made to the motion that the Moderator nominate the Commission on the ground that this would not constitute an "election" in the meaning of Chap. XIII, Sec. 1, of the *Book of Discipline*, since any nominations from the floor would be at a hopeless disadvantage as over against the Moderator's slate. But the motion to amend by striking out the words "the Moderator nominate" was voted down. The Moderator read the list of his nominees and put the vote without asking if there were any further nominations. The election, consequently, amounted merely to the *approval* of the Moderator's choice. Consequently the Committee on Judicial Business was actually appointed, the Judicial Commission was practically appointed by the Moderator.

The result of this method of constituting these important bodies is interesting. Membership on the Committee and Commission was distributed among the presbyteries as follows:

Presbytery	Committee on Judicial Business	Judicial Commission
Pittsburgh	2	2
Carlisle	1	2
Kitanning	2	1
Erie	0	2
Clarion	1	1
Donegal	1	1
Huntingdon	0	1
Lehigh	0	1

There are 19 presbyteries in the Synod. Pittsburgh, the presbytery of the Permanent Clerk, had four representatives; Carlisle, the presbytery of the Stated Clerk, had three; Erie, the presbytery of the Moderator, had two. In other words, the three presbyteries of which the chief officers of Synod were members had a majority on the Commission and three out of seven on the Committee. Eleven presbyteries were not represented at all. Of these eleven, four (Chester, Lackawanna, Northumberland, and Philadelphia) had judicial business to be adjudicated by Synod and were properly not represented on the Committee or

Commission. But why were Beaver, Blairsville, Butler, Philadelphia North, Redstone, Shenango, and Washington thus completely ignored?

About two hours later the Committee on Judicial Business made a further report. It recommended that action upon the complaint against the reception of Dr. Machen into Philadelphia Presbytery be "held by the Synod of Pennsylvania until the next regular meeting of Synod." In connection with the offering of this recommendation a letter from the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly to the Stated Clerk of Synod was read by the latter who explained that he had thought it wise to secure the advice of the former in view of the "difficult situation" now confronting Synod. Since when, we may well ask, has the great Synod of Pennsylvania ceased to be competent to conduct its own business on its own initiative and responsibility? The full text of the letter is as follows:

June 11, 1934.

Rev. Glenn M. Shafer, D.D.,
243 S. Hanover St.,
Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

Dear Dr. Shafer:

There does not seem to be any "difficult situation facing the Synod of Pennsylvania in its consideration of the complaint against the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia in admitting Dr. Machen to membership." On the contrary the answers to the three questions which you present in your letter of June 8th indicate clearly what the action of the Synod of Pennsylvania should be.

1. Dr. Machen now belongs to the Presbytery of New Brunswick and will be so reported in the forthcoming Minutes of the General Assembly. Chapter II, Section 3, of the new Book of Discipline, states that "a minister dismissed from a Presbytery shall be subject to its jurisdiction until he actually becomes a member of another Presbytery." Since the complaint against the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia was signed by more than one-third of the members of the body present when the action was taken the reception of Dr. Machen into the Presbytery was automatically held up and he has not as yet, in the language of the above quotation of the Book of Discipline actually become a member of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

2. As Dr. Machen's membership is still in the Presbytery of New Brunswick it is necessary for me, in accordance with the instructions of the last General Assembly, to send a communication to that body instructing it to take up the matter of Dr. Machen's relationship to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. This communication will be sent within the next few days and will, therefore, be in the hands of the Presbytery of New Brunswick before the convening of the Synod of Pennsylvania at Washington, Penna. As this communication is authorized by the supreme judicatory of the Church, namely, the General Assembly, it must take precedence over all other matters in the Church which may affect Dr. Machen's ecclesiastical status.

3. Since Dr. Machen is now under the jurisdiction of New Brunswick Presbytery and that body has been directed by the General Assembly to take up certain matters with reference to his relationship to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, any attempt on the part of the Synod of Pennsylvania to adjudicate at its meeting in Washington, Penna., the complaint already before it would affect Dr. Machen's relationship and thereby interfere with an action already begun between the General Assembly and the Presbytery of New Brunswick. Under such circumstances it would seem to me that the logical thing for the Synod to do would be to hold the complaint pending the action of New Brunswick Presbytery. This could be done very easily on the recommendation of the Committee on Judicial Business without having the complaint placed in the hands of a Judicial Commission.

If there is any further information you desire upon this matter do not hesitate to write me immediately. With warm personal regards and the earnest hope that you may have a very fine meeting of the Synod, believe me

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) Lewis S. Mudge,
Stated Clerk.

It is not necessary to discuss this letter in detail. The most significant thing about it is the phrase "it seems to me" which occurs toward the end of the fourth paragraph. Dr. Mudge had no authority from the Assembly to instruct Synod. He wrote purely on his own authority at the invitation of Dr. Shafer. Furthermore Dr. Mudge's presentation of the facts is not convincing.

The direction of the Assembly to which he refers reads as follows:

"That all Presbyteries having in their membership ministers or laymen who are officers, trustees or members of 'The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions,' be officially notified and directed by this General Assembly through its Stated Clerk to ascertain from said ministers and laymen within ninety days of the receipt of such notice as to whether they have complied with the above direction of the General Assembly, and in case of refusal, failure to respond or non-compliance on the part of these persons, to institute or cause to be instituted promptly such disciplinary action as is set forth in the Book of Discipline."

The direction, it will be observed, is intentionally indefinite. No individual is named: no Presbytery is designated. If it be granted that owing to the complaint Dr. Machen is still in New Brunswick Presbytery, the dismissal of the complaint would make him a member of Philadelphia Presbytery. The result would then be simply this: New Brunswick Presbytery would report to Dr. Mudge that Dr. Machen was no longer subject to its jurisdiction, and Philadelphia Presbytery would have one more member (eight instead of seven) of the Independent Board to whom the Assembly's mandate would be applicable. What is there difficult about that? A letter from the Stated Clerk of New Brunswick Presbytery stating the facts would be all that would be needed. Why should New Brunswick Presbytery be obliged to go to all the trouble to make a special case of Dr. Machen when Philadelphia Presbytery could simply add him to its already sizable group of offenders?

The object of the reading of this letter was clearly to give the impression that the recommendation of the Committee on Judicial Business was in accord with the recent action of the General Assembly, as interpreted by its Stated Clerk, and that any other action on the part of Synod than acquiescence would be discourteous to or defiant of the highest judicatory of the Church. In short, it constituted the introduction of *ex parte* testimony for the purpose of influencing the decision of Synod. Nevertheless the recommendation was vigorously debated. It was pointed out that it was unjust to deprive Dr. Machen of his rights as a Presbyterian minister for a year. (Until this case is decided Dr. Machen can vote and deliberate neither in New Brunswick nor in Philadelphia Presbytery.) It was further pointed out that, if any question of courtesy is involved, it should be remembered that New Brunswick Presbytery dismissed Dr. Machen to the Presbytery of Philadelphia with a letter stating that he was "in good and regular standing" and that the majority of Philadelphia Presbytery voted to receive him on the basis of that certificate. It was discourteous of the minority in Philadelphia Presbytery to contest its action in receiving Dr. Machen. It would be discourteous of Synod to refuse the majority of that Presbytery an opportunity to secure vindication through a hearing and decision by the Judicial Commission. It was pointed out that the deciding of the case by Synod would in no wise interfere with the mandate of the Assembly regarding the members on the Independent Board. If the complaint were dismissed Dr. Machen could be reached with several of his colleagues in Philadelphia Presbytery. If the complaint were sustained, he could be tried by himself in New Brunswick. In either event, if appeal were made, the matter would go to the General Assembly; but, at least, Synod would have done its duty. It was even pointed out by more than one plain spoken commissioner that the reason for the great desire of some to keep Dr. Machen in New Brunswick Presbytery was that it would be easier to convict him there than in Philadelphia. One youthful commissioner even ventured the remark that Dr. Machen ought to be glad to stand trial in New Brunswick Presbytery, because were he cleared there, it would be all the greater vindication. We commend this new principle of justice to our civil courts; the place to try a man is where his chances for a favorable verdict are of the slightest. Finally it was voted to refer the case back to the Committee on Judicial Business to be reconsidered.

Thursday morning a further report of the Committee on Judicial Business was made the "order of the day" for 2 o'clock. Probably the expectation of many was that the debate on the

Machen case would be resumed. If so, they were doomed to disappointment. The Committee repeated its recommendation that action be delayed for a year. The Moderator took it upon himself to inform the Synod that, in his opinion, it had debated the question long enough the previous afternoon (an hour, at most!), which, of course, was equivalent to saying that they should accept the recommendation of *his* Committee. A commissioner from Philadelphia, one of its two commissioners who were among the complainants against its action in receiving Dr. Machen (twelve were in favor of that action), moved the "previous question" which is undebatable and so discussion of the recommendation was shut off. The motion was put and carried by a vote of somewhat more than two to one. After this wise the Synod of 1934 washed its hands of one of the most important matters that came before it, and was ready to listen to more reports and addresses.

Later that afternoon an overture was introduced dealing with the Board of Foreign Missions. It was referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, considered by them, modified slightly with consent of the mover and reported to Synod in the following form:

Recognizing that there is a widespread conviction that the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is tolerating and even fostering activities not in harmony with the doctrinal standards of our beloved Church, the Synod of Pennsylvania in session at Washington, Pa., respectfully overtures the 147th General Assembly to take such steps as are necessary to remedy the situation in order that the Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions may ask and receive the united, loyal and enthusiastic support of all who believe in the great cause of truly Biblical and Presbyterian Foreign Missions."

The unanimous recommendation of the Committee was "no action." And this recommendation was approved by a large vote.

The treatment of this overture is significant. There are many who, in private, are willing to admit that all is not well with the Board of Foreign Missions, there are even those who hold that a house-cleaning is needed; but when it comes to doing anything they prefer to keep silence or denounce the Independent Board. Yet it is as plain as day that the most effectual way to put the new Board out of commission would be to remedy the situation that brought it into being, Modernism in the Assembly's Board.

On Friday morning the Judicial Commission announced its judgments upon four cases that had been referred to it. The most important of them had to do with the complaint against the licensing of two Westminster Seminary students by Chester Presbytery. The complaint was based solely on their unwillingness to give unqualified support to the Board of Foreign Missions.

The decision of the Commission was not unanimous, the complaint being sustained by a vote of 6-4. The Commission also dismissed the complaint against the action of Lackawanna Presbytery in outlawing the Independent Board. In both of these cases the Board of Foreign Missions had a direct interest and only in these. It is, therefore, noteworthy that one of the members of this Commission was a foreign missionary serving under the Board of Foreign Missions. The fact that he served on the Commission and voted on these cases was in direct violation of the provision of the *Book of Discipline* (Chap. V, Sec. 2) which expressly declares that no member of a judicial commission shall sit in judgment upon a judicial case "who is personally interested in the issue thereof." If four presbyteries were denied representation on either the Committee or Commission because they were interested in one or more of the cases to be heard, what excuse can be found for the placing of a foreign missionary on the Judicial Commission? He should at least have refrained from sitting and voting on the cases in which the Foreign Board was directly interested. Instead, these were the only ones at which he was reported as present and voting. The especial heinousness of this violation of the law of the Church is shown by the fact that it may have been the decisive factor in the verdict in the Chester Case. For the shift of one vote from the majority to the minority would have resulted in a tie and the complaint, instead of being sustained, would have been dismissed. All of this is stated without intent to question the integrity or impugn the motives of this gentleman for whom the writer personally has a high regard.

The announcing of the judgments of the Judicial Commission, all of which were without debate declared to be the judgments of the judicatory, marked the conclusion of the Synod. Only a little routine business remained and the Synod was adjourned.

Notices of complaint were subsequently filed with the Stated Clerk of Synod against the action of Synod regarding Dr. Machen, against the way in which the Judicial Commission was "elected," and against the judgment of the Commission in sustaining the second of the Chester complaints. These will all come before the Judicial Commission of the General Assembly in 1935.

We have endeavored in the above to show how curiously the Synod is constituted, how thoroughly it is dominated by a non-voting machine, how much time it gives to matters of secondary moment, how little to matters of great importance. The Pennsylvania Synod of 1934 will be longest remembered not for its obedient adoption of the Reports and Recommendations which were submitted for its "O.K.," but for the way in which it dealt or failed to deal with the vital issues which came before it.

The Church Militant, the Church Expectant, and the Church Triumphant

By Lawrence B. Gilmore, Th.D.

Text: "... I will build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (Matt. 16:18).

NEW YORK papers of October 26, 1933, reported an auction of books and manuscripts of Eugene Field's writings. The sale attracted wide interest. Its items included a manuscript copy of Field's famous column "Sharps and Flats" in *The Denver Tribune*, love letters to his wife, and handwritten pages of his much-loved poems, such as "Little Boy Blue" and "A Dutch Lullaby."

One extraordinary item in this auction was a sermon composed by Field at the age of nine. In his childhood years his grandmother, a pious Vermont woman, was in the habit of paying him ten cents a sermon. This sermon, written in a wavering, childish script, begins with the sage remark:

"The life of a Christian is often compared to a race that is hard and to a battle in which a man must fight hard to win. These comparisons have prevented many from becoming Christians."

Our Saviour and His Apostles certainly do teach us that Christians as individuals and as a Church must expect hardship and conflict. Our Lord's words in our text, stating that the gates of Hades should not prevail against His Church, indicate that He expected His Church to be bitterly and perilously opposed. But He confidently predicts that neither the forces of dissolution and death, nor the machinations of Satan and his allies, will be able to conquer the Church.

Our Lord here appears to be thinking of the Church as a building His enemies cannot wreck, or a fortress they can-