

# CHRISTIAN WORK

A Religious Weekly Review

---

Count Karolyi and American Liberty

CHARLES AUSTIN BEARD

Pin Philosophy

JOSEPH DUNN BURRELL

Week-Day Church Schools

HERBERT W. BLASHFIELD

Disgracing Princeton Seminary

FRED EASTMAN

---

APRIL 18, 1925

\$3.50 a Year

10 Cents a Copy

# CHRISTIAN WORK

CONTINUING

THE EVANGELIST AND NEW YORK OBSERVER

Vol. 118.—No. 16.

New York, April 18, 1925.

Whole No. 3123.

## CONTENTS

### EDITORIALS:

- The Inclusiveness of Understanding: Alfred Williams Anthony..... 487  
"The Servant in the House:" Fred Eastman..... 488  
Faith—The Adventurer: Justin W. Nixon..... 488

### THE OBSERVER'S LETTER:

- Lily Dougall..... 480

### THE WEEKLY SERMON:

- Pin Philosophy: Joseph Dunn Burrell..... 490

### GENERAL ARTICLES:

- Disgracing Princeton Seminary: Fred Eastman..... 486  
Count Karolyi and American Liberty: Charles Austin Beard..... 492  
A Public Library as a Church Activity: Inez McFee..... 495  
Week Day Church Schools: Herbert W. Blashfield..... 496  
The Ideal Church Officer: By his Pastor..... 498  
Christianity and Human Relations: Bruno Lasker..... 499

### ONE BOOK A WEEK:

- Why the Church?..... 502

### OTHER BOOKS ON OUR SHELF.....

- ..... 502

### THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON:

- April 26: Stephen the First Martyr..... 504

## The World of To-Day

### *Karolyi's Shocking Statement*

NO wonder the late lamented Secretary Hughes shuddered when he thought of Count Michael Karolyi saying what he would in this land of liberty. Karolyi and his wife last week departed for Canada. No sooner had they touched foot to land ruled by an effete king than the Count began to say the dreadful things that our government in its almost more than human wisdom had forbidden him to say here. Think of it! Karolyi actually declared that the League of Nations, before it arranged an international loan to Hungary, ought to impose such conditions on them that the Hungarians by universal suffrage should decide for themselves what kind of Government they want—a republic or a monarchy; that the country should have freedom of speech and of the press; that the government should close the prisoners' camps—as it is, the authorities send to them anyone whose liberty is an inconvenience, a vague charge that one is a Bolshevik suffices—; that Jews should be allowed to attend the universities; that the

Fascist organizations should be disarmed—these are bands who march around under "Awakening Magyar" banners. If Karolyi could have talked freely in this country, he would even have gone so far as to say that if we granted the present Hungarian regime further loans, it would use them to rebuild the old, imperialistic machine, and sooner or later would bring on war. Everyone who has visited Hungary knows how the Hungarians sigh for their "lost provinces" more openly than do any other defeated people in Europe. If he had been allowed to talk here, Karolyi would have had the impudence to tell us that his platform for Hungary was "democracy, freedom of speech, universal suffrage, abolition of all reactionary institutions, and land reform," by which he meant the buying up of the big estates by the Government for sale to the peasants. "My foreign policy," he would have said, "would be one of friendly relationship with our neighbors, especially the Czechs and Jugoslavs, which would be possible with a republic in Hungary." How awful this is! How thankful we must be to good Secretary Hughes and good Secretary Kellogg that they have protected our ears against such things! No wonder that the soul of E. Stanwood Mencken, lately head of the National Security League, rose up in righteous horror at the thought even of Countess Karolyi venturing on our shores.

### *"The Land of the Free"*

HOW profoundly grateful we are that we are not like England and France and Canada and Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia, where this friend of the Allies, this Socialist, Karolyi, has talked freely. With our government as it is, we, at least, can boast that we have got well away from the ideas of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, however much the rest of the world in its darkness may cherish them. To be sure, time was when this government, under such flabby souls as Andrew Jackson or Abraham Lincoln, would have sent a foreign minister packing for trying to interfere with our own business. But perhaps Count Czeczenyi, the Hungarian minister, never dropped a word to the State Department. Perhaps we did it all of our own little

# Disgracing Princeton Seminary

**D**OES God love the conservatives as well as the liberals? We believe that He does. Will the conservatives be saved? We can at least pray to that end and we believe that many of them will be. Among these we think that Professor Charles R. Erdman of Princeton will be numbered. In justice to Dr. Erdman's position as well as to our own we wish to make it clear that it is not his theology which we think will save him, but his Christian spirit. In theology he counts himself a strict conservative, even a fundamentalist. Fundamentalism is, we believe, essentially heretical, for it is a pious form of materialism.

But real heresy is not a theological matter at all. It is deeper than that. Real heresy is heresy of the spirit—bitterness, intolerance, hatred. There is nothing of this in Dr. Erdman. He is tolerant, kindly, lovable. Although he differs from the liberals he does not believe in shooting their ecclesiastical heads off by court martial proceedings. He would give every liberal his constitutional right to be heard and tried by due process of ecclesiastical law. His position is very similar to that of Gamaliel who counseled a tolerant course in respect to certain alleged heretics in Israel: If their work be of God it will stand. If it be evil it will come to nought. Because of this tolerant attitude Dr. Erdman is regarded with suspicion by Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly and leader of the fundamentalist heresy hunters.

Mark Twain said that once when he was in India he saw a man with a dachshund going to hunt elephants. Mark said he doubted the wisdom of it: the dachshund didn't look bitter enough. Dr. Macartney and his like believe that the liberals are wild elephants and must be hunted with the most deadly weapons available. Dr. Erdman will not do for them. He is not bitter enough in his hatred. Therefore he is not a fit person to counsel the embryo preachers of Princeton. So last week Dr. Erdman was ousted from his position as student advisor.

The incident would be too petty to mention were it not the shadow of coming events. The ousting was not done by the students but by a coterie of the faculty under the leadership of Professor J. Gresham Machen. The students expressed their confidence and affection for Dr. Erdman on Thursday night of last week by gathering on his lawn one hundred and twenty-five strong and presenting to him a loving cup in "appreciation of his most unselfish devotion in our behalf as Christian minister, inspiring teacher, and loyal friend." But what the students felt about their advisor did not count. The charges brought by Dr. Machen against Dr. Erdman were, first, that he

was not in sympathy with the student desire to form a league of fundamentalist seminaries (the idea of such a league we understand to have Dr. Macartney's approval and it may have been of his creation); and, second, that Dr. Erdman was not sufficiently polemic in defending the faith. Dr. Machen mustered a majority in the faculty and this majority excused Dr. Erdman from further service as student advisor and appointed Professor Robert Dick Wilson to that post.

What coming events does this incident foreshadow? Within three days after Dr. Machen had marshalled his majority the "New York Times" carried an announcement under a Philadelphia dateline that Dr. Macartney will be nominated for the Chair of Apologetics and Christian Ethics at Princeton Seminary to succeed Dr. William B. Greene who retires. There seems to be no evidence at hand to believe that Dr. Macartney will be nominated for this position because of any scholarly training for it. But the position will give him a toe hold in the faculty. From that toe hold he can direct a campaign to oust any professor who falls short in bitterness against the liberals. If the toe hold is not sufficient, what then? Well, how about the Presidency of the Seminary? Why not? Has Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, who now holds that position, acquired any scalps of heretics to hang on his belt? Would it not be better to have some one in the chair who knows how to hate more ferociously than Dr. Stevenson? And once President of Princeton Seminary, and leader of a league of fundamentalist seminaries, and an engineer of the fundamentalist steam roller in the various Protestant churches, the churches will be saved!

Precisely, but saved from what? Dr. Macartney and Dr. Machen are perfectly sincere in their conviction that they are trying to save the Protestant churches from damnable heresies, but to many earnest Christians it seems that these men are trying to save Protestantism from religious liberty, from freedom to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, from the right to seek truth in whatever direction it may be found. In preference to that type of salvation men with any courage will prefer damnation instead.

Meanwhile what do the directors of Princeton Seminary propose to do? Are they content with the Macartney-Machen program? Thus far the Seminary has had an honorable history as a conservative and scholarly institution. Will the directors allow it to be dragged now into disgrace, tied to the tails of these hysterical hunters of heresy? Or will they prefer to continue in the spirit of Christ and in Christian fellowship with all those who count Him Lord and Master?

FRED EASTMAN.