

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1934

The Sunday School Times

Copyright, 1934, by The Sunday School Times Co. Entered as second-class matter July 16, 1879, at the post-office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Entered as second-class matter at the post-office department, Ottawa, Canada.

Published weekly by The Sunday School Times Co., 323-327 N. 13th St., Phila., Pa.

Philadelphia, May 5, 1934
Volume Seventy-six. No. 18

\$2 a year, in clubs, \$1.50
See page 308

Lesson for May 20 in this issue

Lesson 8.—The Future of the Kingdom.
Matthew 24:1 to 25:30.

| | |
|--|---------|
| Notes on Open Letters: | |
| Little Jetties and Watchful Readers | 288 |
| Premillennialism and the Reformed Faith. II. By J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., D.D. | 289 |
| Shelving the Bible in America. By Clarence H. Benson | 291 |
| What Is Wrecking Morals and Governments Today? VI. By Joseph Taylor Britan, D.D. | 292 |
| Fundamental Sunday School Lessons | 294 |
| World Wide Sunday School News | 294 |
| International Uniform Lesson | 295-303 |
| The Golden Text in Song. By Robert Hark- ness | 297 |
| The Young People's Prayer Meeting. By John W. Lane, Jr. | 303 |
| Children at Home | 304 |
| The Victorious Life | 306 |
| For Family Worship. By Ernest M. Wads- worth | 307 |

"In Every Thing"

By Sally Neill Roach

In every thing give thanks. — 1 Thessalonians 5:18.

IN EVERYTHING? In sorrow, pain,
and loss?
When some hard lesson racks the weary
mind?
When, just before, there looms the threat'-
ning cross?
When nights are long, and morn brings
day unkind?

"In everything"! Each sorrow and each
pain
Is known by One who measures every day;
And lessons hard, well mastered, will make
plain
The faithful Teacher planning all the way.

Doest know the cross must come before the
crown?—
And seed unburied must abide alone?
Doest know the cloud that spreads its sullen
frown
Harms not the sun, whose power must be
shown?

Then waiting not for that which shall make
clear
The tender love in what seems harsh and
stern,
O Soul redeemed, look up! Dismiss thy fear!
Now is the time when thanks thou shouldst
return!

Why Fundamentalism?

Buildings that are to last require foundations that will last. Fundamentalists believe in foundations: the two words have the same root and meaning. Yet men have always been lured by false or flimsy substitutes for foundations, especially in matters spiritual and eternal, hence Fundamentalism has come forward to witness to the only Foundation that will stand every test. The annual Convention of the World's Christian Fundamentals Associa-

tion is held in Washington, D. C., May 6-13. It is fitting that this great and needed testimony should ring out from the nation's capital at a time when America and all the nations are in sore distress because they have turned away from the true foundations of life, salvation, and happiness. "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" asked David. Faith in the foundations is being destroyed on every side, and the Fundamentalists are pleading with the Church, the nation, and the world to turn back to the old and only foundation of blessing. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3:11). False teachings increase, "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his" (2 Tim. 2:19). May a great volume of prayer arise this week, that God may bring America to the place of repentance, confession, prayer, and belief, till the picture on the first page of this paper be actually realized.

God's Plea: Be Reconciled!

God does not want to condemn, but to save. When man broke with God by sinning, a gulf was made that only God could bridge. By the death and resurrection of Christ as the sin-bearer this was accom-

plished, and God is thus reconciled to all men, though they had violated and outraged his love. Now he entreats men to be reconciled to him. So Paul pleads, as an ambassador for Christ and speaking for God: "We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. 5:20). It is as though God were pleading with men not to let their hearts be hard and resentful toward him, but saying in effect: "I know your lives are hard, that there is pain and dying ever in your midst, but the explanation I have given in my Book. Since I gave you power to love and obey, or to disobey, and Adam brought sin and misery into existence by his sin, this state of affairs must needs continue for a little while; but I am going to do something about it and, having taken it all on myself, give you back a home fairer than the Eden you lost, and a state of being higher than the angels, and some day soon I am coming to wipe away the tears from all eyes. Will you not, therefore accept my offer of pardon, let me prepare you for the high destiny I have for you, believe my promises never to leave nor forsake you, my assurance that even your troubles are going to make you infinitely happier in the eternity just ahead, and be not bitter in your hearts against me, but 'make up' and be reconciled?" Saying "yes" to God in answer to this means eternal life now and here, with "joy unspeakable and full of glory."

A New Mission Board for the Old Faith

THREE thousand five hundred natives gathered one day in Africa to hear a member of the (Northern) Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. Messengers had gone through the forest paths to all the surrounding villages announcing the coming of the American to tell them about the Lord Jesus Christ. Three interpreters were present to transmit the message in the dialects spoken by the great company of people. And to these almost naked savages, bound by Satan in chains of lust and hate and greed, longing, almost in despair, for a hopeful word of deliverance, this man spoke on "The Power of Personality"! Oh, that some one had risen and said, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth"!

Four years ago one hundred and fifty missionaries, ready to leave for many parts of the world, were gathered in a conference in Hartford, Conn., under the auspices of eight different denominations. Modernism was the predominate note through the week. But an Indian Christian, when given the

opportunity to speak, said to the company: "When you come to India, bring us a Saviour who can save us from sin, not just a teacher to be followed." One faithful missionary candidate took him by the hand afterwards and thanked him for his clear testimony and his earnest plea for true Gospel preaching in India. In his turn, the Indian Christian thanked the young man for his encouragement, but told him he had been officially rebuked for what he had said and had been warned that, if that was the sort of message he was going to give, he had better keep still.

These were two of the amazing examples of Modernism in missions given by Charles J. Woodbridge, General Secretary of the newly formed Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, at the first public meeting of the Board held last month at the Central North Broad Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. This church has been standing like a lighthouse of Gospel truth and uncompromising testimony under the pastorate of Merrill T. MacPherson,

Premillennialism and the Reformed Faith

Has the "Pre" a good standing?

By J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., D.D. President of Wheaton College

FROM our orthodox brethren in the Reformed and Christian Reformed denominations have come several protests against the premillennial clause in the Fundamentalist platform, which reads: "We believe in 'that blessed hope,' the personal, premillennial and imminent return of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The following quotation will show the earnestness and the sense of wrong some of these brethren feel:

It seems hard to believe that Matthew Henry, Charles Hodge, and other grand Christians of the past could not be admitted to membership in the Association.

The following from a letter by a minister in one of the Reformed denominations also illustrates the point:

Now what I am anxious to learn is this. The Christian Reformed and Reformed people in the United States are at present maintaining about one hundred distinctly Christian schools, with over 400 teachers. These schools do not "teach or countenance any teachings contrary to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament."

But now comes the question as to Article VII of the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith as set forth in the platform of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association. It speaks about belief in "that blessed hope, the personal, premillennial and imminent return of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." All of our teachers certainly believe in the "blessed hope" of the personal return of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But none of them is supposed to believe in the *premillennial* coming. The reason for this is that we do not find it in Holy Writ, and moreover, this teaching is not countenanced by the great historic standards of the Reformed Churches, to which we are pledged to be wholeheartedly loyal.

A Surprise for Some Presbyterians

Now as a matter of fact, the historic standards of the Reformed faith do not exclude the premillennial doctrine. In order to make this clear, I have begun to prepare a detailed report upon the great historic standards of the Reformed Churches, such as the published standards of the Presbyterian Church and of the Reformed Church in America. I give a summary only, and repeat here the conclusions of others wiser than myself.

1. Although we shall not urge that the statements given below, or other similar statements, are essential to the Reformed system of doctrine, the standards of the Reformed Churches seem clearly to exclude the postmillennial view (that Christ will not return until after the millennium). An editorial in *Our Hope* (January, 1931) calls attention to the last paragraph of the Westminster Confession of Faith, which reads as follows:

As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, both to deter all men from sin, and for the greater consolation of the godly in their adversity: so will he have that day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and be always watchful because they know not at what hour the Lord will come; and may be ever prepared to say, Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.

That there are sound, true, Fundamentalist or Bible-believing Christians who are not premillennialists is an undeniable fact, which the premillennialists themselves heartily recognize. Unfortunately there are some of these orthodox brethren who deny to their brothers the right to hold the "Pre" view of the Lord's return and at the same time claim good standing in the churches of the Reformed Faith.

It is this question that President Buswell discusses, in his usual spirit of brotherly fairness toward those who differ with him, and at the same time with a scholarly and convincing investigation of the facts as to historic evangelical church creeds.

From the standards of the Reformed Church in America (see "The Confession of Faith of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church," revised in the National Synod held at Dordrecht, in the years 1618 and 1619) we quote:

XXXVII. Of the Last Judgment. Finally we believe, according to the Word of God, when the time appointed by the Lord (which is unknown to all creatures) is come, and the number of the elect complete, that our Lord Jesus Christ will come from Heaven, corporeally and visibly, as he ascended, with great glory and majesty to declare himself judge of the quick and the dead.

The two quotations here cited clearly teach the imminent return of the Lord, and it is obvious that if the Lord's return is to be regarded thus we cannot hold the postmillennial view; for if his return is to follow the millennium, it cannot be regarded as imminent.

2. The standards of the Reformed Churches sometimes refer to "the judgment" or "the resurrection" in such terms that a judgment of the living nations before the millennium as distinguished from a judgment of the wicked dead after the millennium (described in the last chapters of Revelation) seems to be excluded; and the resurrection of believers "out from among the dead" described by Paul (1 Thess. 4 and 5; Phil. 3:11, etc.) and referred to as "the first resurrection" (Rev. 20:5) and the "better resurrection" (Heb. 11:35), as distinguished from the resurrection of the wicked dead after the millennium (Rev. 20:5, 6, etc.), seems to be denied. Thus the Reformed standards would seem, on first view, to support the amillennial (or non-millennial) rather than the premillennial view.

We should urge, however, that it is a familiar fact in Scripture that events separated by a period of time are sometimes viewed and referred to as though they were but one event. A clear illustration of this principle is found in Isaiah 9:6, 7:

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called

Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of Jehovah of hosts will perform this.

On the first view it would seem that the child to be born would assume the burden of government upon the throne of David without any interval of centuries. As a matter of fact, the birth of the child took place about 6 B. C. in Bethlehem of Judaea, but the government of no earthly kingdom rests upon his shoulders, and he does not yet occupy the throne of David.

Many other examples of this kind could be cited. It is very common for Bible teachers to illustrate this point by reference to a distant view of a chain of mountains in which many peaks appear as one, as compared with a nearer view in which the separate peaks stand out. Reference, therefore, to the resurrection and the judgment in the standards of the Reformed Churches being based upon the Scripture, do not exclude the possibility of an interval of time intervening between different stages in the prophecies to be fulfilled. The saying of our Lord in John 5:28, 29 is frequently referred to in this connection:

Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment.

Even if these verses stood alone, without the eschatology of Paul's Epistles and Revelation, it would seem to us that they teach two resurrections. The words "the hour cometh" must be interpreted in the light of John 5:25, "The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." This "hour" evidently extends from the time these words were uttered on through the time of "the resurrection" which is expected at the close of this age.

"Soundest Among Westminster Divines"

I am indebted to the Editor of THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TIMES for the following clipping from an article by William H. Bates, D.D., in the *Moody Monthly*, January, 1921. Dr. Bates, in discussing the Westminster Assembly of 1643-1649, says:

"There are some historic facts that are illuminating. Principal Baillie, professor of divinity in the University of Glasgow, and strong against premillennialism, wrote from the Assembly back to Scotland: 'Many of the chief divines here, not only Independents, but others, as Twisse (the Assembly's Moderator), Marshall, Palmer, and many more, are express chiliasts' [premillenarians]. Principal Cunningham, of Scotland, affirmed that they who entertained this doctrine were 'of the soundest among the Westminster divines.' Lightfoot, antichiliast that he was, says: 'It hath got the deepest root, and the highest

seat, in the hearts of very many in these times.'

"Is it likely that 'many of the chief' and 'the soundest' of these 'divines'—premillennialists be it noted—would put forth an antipremillennial confession? To ask such a question seems almost the quintessence of absurdity. . . .

"Says Professor Charles A. Briggs: 'The idea of a future millennium before the advent is ruled out by the Westminster Standards. . . . The current theology pushes the Messiah behind the millennium, and fixes the hope of men upon an illusion and a defusion of human conceit and folly.' . . . Dr. James H. Brookes, of St. Louis, in his magazine *The Truth* (February, 1896), had an editorial headed 'Postmillennialism a Heresy.' He is speaking according to the standard of the Westminster Confession."

Talking with Theologians

Mr. Ralph C. Norton gives the following account (for which I am indebted to THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TIMES) of a conversation of his in April, 1918, with Dr. Francis M. Patton of Princeton, Dr. Dosker of Louisville, and another minister:

"I had a desire to know what Dr. Patton's view was on the imminence of the Lord's return, and after prayer and much trepidation, as I knew how very curt Dr. Patton could be if he thought the occasion justified, I asked what authority the premillennialists found in the Bible for their doctrine of the Second Coming. After a moment's hesitation he said: 'I have not gone deeply into this subject. When I say deeply, I mean I have not exhausted it as far as I am capable of exhausting it; but in my study of the Bible for my position on other doctrines, I am convinced that Paul and the apostles believed in the imminence of the Lord's return, and that this was also the belief of the early Church.'

"I replied: 'Why then has the church turned away from this doctrine?' And he said: 'In the first place the early Christians were led to expect the Lord's return, and as he did not come, and the Man of Sin was not revealed, they grew to feel that his early coming was not to be expected, and therefore the doctrine was lost sight of. And furthermore, the early church were occupied with settling many of the fundamentals of the faith, and this doctrine for the above reason, and for other reasons some of which have been forgotten, was neglected.'

"I then said to Dr. Patton: 'Might it not have been also that the church began to increase in goods, and becoming wealthy did not want to accept this great truth?' He replied, 'Yes, that is quite possible.'

"He said that years ago he read a book by Dr. Brown, who had taken the postmillennial view, and that that book had determined his position at that time, and that since then he had not given any careful study of the subject.

"I said: 'Dr. Patton, I have heard the story told on several occasions that you were one time asked why you were not a premillennialist, and you replied that it was probably because you had not studied the subject carefully.' And he replied, 'Yes, that is most probably what I said.' The war, he said, and the present conditions were surely giving the premillennialists a strong argument for their position, and it is very clear that there is a strong recrui-

descence of this truth at the present time. He said: 'I have no opposition to this doctrine, and I must confess that it produces holy lives on the part of those who believe it, such as my friend Dr. John A. Carson and others for whom I have the profoundest respect. If he should return in the manner that this truth teaches, I shall be willing to confess that I was mistaken.'

"Dr. Dosker said: 'Dr. Patton, I am glad to hear you say this, because I am lately inclining to the position of the imminence of His return, although I take a position midway between the post- and the premillennialist. I am convinced that the Scripture teaches that He will return for His saints, and afterward return in judgment. I plan to speak on this theme here, and I am glad to hear the statement you have made today.'

Dr. Trumbull has also permitted me to use an excerpt from a letter to himself from Dr. Howard A. Banks, dated August 4, 1918, in which Dr. Banks quotes Dr. W. J. Erdman as follows:

"When I was pastor of the Moody Church in Chicago, a number of the Princeton boys used to come to see me. One of them was named Bates, and he told me that Dr. Patton in class one day had come upon the subject of the Lord's coming. And in the course of his discussion he said to the class: 'If any of you are ever haled before the church court and charged with heresy for preaching this doctrine [the premillennial coming], send for me and I will come and defend you.' Years after that my son, who is now in the faculty of Princeton, quoted what I had told him and what I am now telling you, and he asked Dr. Patton if he had ever made that statement—if it were true. 'Yes, I did,' said Dr. Patton."

The Three Views of Christ's Return

There are three principal views, of the Lord's return held among orthodox Christians.

According to the premillennial view, the return of Christ will precede the millennium; that is, will precede the age or period referred to as "the thousand years" in Revelation 20.

Advocates of the postmillennial view hold that the return of Christ will follow the millennium.

And the amillennial (or non-millennial) position denies that the millennium will be a literal period of history upon the earth.

The following explanation of these three terms, from *Christianity Today* (April, 1931), is illuminating:

"In our judgment no conception of the future has the right to call itself Christian that does not attach epochal significance to the return of our Lord. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that the Christian must choose between what is known as the premillennial view and the postmillennial view, true as it is that much of the literature on the subject is fitted to convey that impression. As a matter of fact, there is a third view, viz., the amillennial, that has been widely held and that is widely held today.

"The late Dr. B. B. Warfield (a postmillennialist), whose knowledge of the history of Christian doctrine was perhaps

unsurpassed, once told the writer that this view [the amillennial] has the best right to be called the historic Protestant view. It is the view held by that erudite student of eschatology, Dr. Geerhardus Vos, as may be learned from his volume 'The Pauline Eschatology' and from his article 'Eschatology of the New Testament' in the 'International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.' It has been ably set forth in a more popular way by Dr. William Masse-link in the book entitled 'Why Thousand Years? or Will the Second Coming be Pre-millennial?' We mention these things merely to indicate that the amillennial view is not a new or strange doctrine (as some seem to think), but rather one of the three generic views of the Second Coming held by intelligent Christians.

Denying Any Earthly Millennium

"As the name implies, the amillennial view rejects the thought of a millennium either preceding or following the return of our Lord (its advocates hold that Revelation 20:6, rightly interpreted, does not teach the idea of an earthly millennium). Rejecting the thought of a millennium preceding our Lord's return it holds with the premillennialists that his return may be imminent; but because it equally rejects the thought of a millennium following our Lord's return it agrees with the postmillennialists that his return will be immediately followed by the general resurrection and the general judgment and so with the final consummation. . . .

"*Christianity Today* looks upon the differences between the three views mentioned as a difference between brethren. Its editors have their own convictions in regard to them, but editorially the paper seeks to take a neutral position."

What, then, is the essential meaning of the word "premillennial"? We ought not to exclude too much from our definition, neither ought we to include too much. We hold to an established doctrinal statement: "We believe in 'that blessed hope,' the personal, premillennial and imminent return of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Surely the true meaning of the word is the etymological meaning. The word "premillennial" is not one whose meaning has changed or shifted ground and moved away from the root meaning. One may honestly accept the word "premillennial" if he believes that *the Lord Jesus Christ will personally and visibly return to this earth before the "thousand years" referred to in Revelation 20.*

With the above definition in mind, it is important to remember that there are certain views held by some premillennialists that are not necessarily included in the word "premillennial" in the Fundamentalist platform. There are some beliefs and interpretations rather common among premillennialists which postmillennialists and amillennialists and others find an occasion of stumbling. We are not arguing against these views, but only suggesting that a number of details commonly held among premillennialists are not essential to the word "premillennial" as it occurs in our creed.

Thus the acceptance of the Fundamentalist platform does not involve belief as to various details concerning the content of, or what will occur during, the millennium. There are true Christian people who seem

to have gone beyond what is written in the Scriptures and have described the millennium with a wealth of detail that to others of us seems unwarranted. We cannot know all that is involved in the consummation of righteousness upon this earth. Differing views just here may be legitimate, and uniform views must not be expected of all premillennialists.

Again, no specific or particular interpretation of dispensationalism is required in the Fundamentalist platform. All evangelical Christians agree that there is a difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament, the dispensation of law and that of grace. But some have carried the dispensationalism to great extremes, and have insisted upon views that others cannot conscientiously accept as Scriptural. In this there must be latitude for individual freedom.

Having said this, we must state our belief, on the other side, that the word "pre-millennial" in the Fundamentalist creed, or in any connection, has a very rich meaning which ought not to be impoverished by any method of explanation. The word "millennium" is simply the word for "thousand years" that is repeated several times in the twentieth chapter of Revelation. Any orthodox Christian will admit that the word means something. It cannot be deleted from the Scriptures. It is in the Word of God, and has a content, and it is evidently identical with the perfection of the Messianic age so frequently described in the Old Testament. God has created this world in time and space for a definite history. Just as we believe in the Old Testament revelation as literal, in the virgin birth, the crucifixion and the bodily resurrection of the Lord as literal, and in the bodily resurrection of believers as literal,

so we believe in the Messianic age as a literal consummation and vindication of the purposes of God for the actual history of this earth.

Finally, let us remember that the premillennial doctrine is not merely incidental in the Christian system of truth. It is central. If the personal, visible, glorious return of our Lord Jesus Christ in power and in judgment must precede the consummation of righteousness for this earth, we have a reasonable answer to the problem of evil. Sin came into the world through the free moral rebellion of man, and this occurred when the loving fellowship of God's presence was a matter of continuous experience in the garden of Eden. We should expect, therefore, not only that the race of humanity would be sinful, as we know that it is, but that each successive generation of human beings would contain many individuals who will rebel against God and will not be won by his love. The only possible consummation of righteousness for a world of genuine moral choice and responsibility must be in a cataclysmic act of judgment, not in the gradual evolution of spiritual processes.

This is not a world which has got out of God's control and which he is gradually winning back into his power. It is a world which God controls in its every minutest detail, but in which he has allowed creatures, made in his image, a time to exercise their freedom of choice. It is not a world of failure on God's part, to be followed by an age of success. It is a world of probation, an age in which God is waiting, giving the members of our race an opportunity for repentance. This age is to be followed by a judgment and a new beginning.

WHEATON, ILL.

aggressive minorities gradually succeeded in eliminating it. Bible stories left the school readers. Bible memory gems, religious hymns, and daily prayers followed. Today we find the schools practically secularized, and anything of a religious nature is rarely found in the curriculum.

Protestants wanted the Bible in the schools. Catholics insisted that as American citizens they had an equal right to public funds for instruction in their catechism. The result of this long drawn-out school controversy was that both sides lost. Catholics lost their subsidies and were forced to support their own schools. Protestants lost the public teaching of their religion. Public school pupils lost the moral restraint that religion alone can impart. Churches lost many who would have become faithful members. The state found its tax burdens increased and its citizenship degenerating. The sad, sickening consequences of this godless education can be studied today in the juvenile delinquents who throng our courts and fill our prisons.

But the real tragedy in America is not that we have permitted the Bible to slip out of our public schools, but that we have so woefully neglected to teach it in either the home or the church. We lament the fact that Bolshevistic and Modernistic teachers have entered our colleges and other institutions of higher learning and misled our youth, when we should weep over our earlier failure to implant the Word of God in the heads and hearts of our boys and girls. One of our leading educators recently said, "That the Bible no longer holds the place it once did in the homes is a proposition that hardly needs proof." Even before the World War a prominent writer declared that family worship was so rare as to be almost phenomenal when found.

Nor have Protestants concerned themselves to see to it that the church was a teaching agency. While forty-seven cents of every tax dollar was spent to provide the best trained teachers for secular subjects, only two cents of every church dollar was contributed for teaching the Bible. A recent survey of 674 churches, whose annual budgets averaged \$11,000, revealed the fact that 60 per cent did not make any provision for the Sunday school, while the remaining 40 per cent did not give more than an average of thirty-seven cents per pupil. One hundred and fifty dollars a year for instruction in history, geography, and arithmetic! Thirty-seven cents a year for instruction in Bible! Nor is that all. Parents ably support the public school, but they leave their children to support the church. Yes, for every dollar paid from the church treasury into the Sunday school, there are eleven dollars paid from the Sunday school pupils' pennies into the church treasury.

As a result of this lamentable failure in school, home, and church, there are today 36,000,000 children and adolescents growing up without any systematic religious instruction. How long can the moral integrity of the nation be maintained when seven out of ten of its rising generation have a godless, Bibleless, and churchless preparation for American citizenship?

What will save the United States from

(Concluded on page 293)

Shelving the Bible in America

The dark picture of our land today where billions are spent for crime prevention and punishment, and a few dollars for Christian education

By Clarence H. Benson

Director, Christian Education Course, Moody Bible Institute, and Secretary, Evangelical Teacher Training Association

IN 1850 the character and culture of the American people commanded the respect of the entire world. European parents sent their sons and daughters to our institutions that they might imbibe this holy atmosphere. The Sabbath was nationally recognized and observed; churches were well attended. Divorces were rare. Juvenile courts were unknown.

Today America is one of the most lawless of the nations. The number of criminals at large and at work is greater than the combined number of soldiers and policemen, and criminal activities cost more than the entire appropriation for the army and navy. Of all crushing taxes that impede the economic recovery of the American people, the crime tax is the greatest. The cost of our crime has now reached the staggering sum of \$13,000,000,000 a year, an amount equal to the entire revenue of the United States. Every year 12,000 persons are murdered; 3,000 are kidnaped; 100,000 are assaulted, and 50,000 are robbed. One out of every five marriages ends in a divorce or an annulment. Walker

Gynne, in "Holy Matrimony and Common Sense," says that America has already reached a lower level, as regards the law of family and home, than the pagan Roman Empire.

What has happened to change this Christian concord of 1850 into this criminal chaos of 1934?

Eighty years ago Americans were still being reared in public schools that included religious instruction. The great "New England Primer," which for more than a hundred and fifty years had been the textbook of the American schools, was just passing into discard. Eighty-seven per cent of the contents of this remarkable book — which had built the sturdy character of fathers, grandfathers, and great-grandfathers — was Bible. But from that time on the Book of books ceased to be an important factor in public instruction.

Opposition to the Bible first appeared in New York City in 1840, and ten years later the Bible was being pushed out of the schools of Massachusetts. Since the Bible was in school by custom and not by law,