

CHRISTIAN WORK

A Religious Weekly Review

A Blind Man's Faith

FREDERICK WINKLEMAN

The Issues at Columbus

MURRAY S. HOWLAND

J. GRESHAM MACHEN

Freedom in the Presbyterian Pulpit

HENRY SLOANE COFFIN

The Master of The Lilies

MARION BOYD

MAY 16, 1925

\$3.50 a Year

10 Cents a Copy

CHRISTIAN WORK

CONTINUING

THE EVANGELIST AND NEW YORK OBSERVER

Vol. 118.—No. 20.

New York, May 16, 1925.

Whole No. 3127.

CONTENTS

THE WORLD OF TODAY	611
EDITORIALS:	
War and Peace: Frederick Lynch.....	615
THE OBSERVER'S LETTER:	
The Foreign Student in America.....	617
THE WEEKLY SERMON:	
Freedom in the Presbyterian Pulpit: Henry Sloane Coffin.....	619
GENERAL ARTICLES:	
The Issues at Columbus: A Liberal View: Murray S. Howland; A Conservative View: J. Gresham Machen.....	623
The Master of the Lilies: Marion Boyd.....	629
A Blind Man's Faith: Frederick Winkelman.....	630
Through Beaten Germany: Part VII: Langdon Mitchell.....	631
A Community Church: M. G. Montgomery.....	633
ONE BOOK A WEEK:	
The Lady Julian: R. A. Thouless.....	634
THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON:	
May 24: Saul Begins His Great Career.....	636

The World of To-Day

Houghton's Speech

ACCORDING to custom, Alanson B. Houghton, our new Ambassador to the Court of St. James, gave his first real message to the British people at the dinner of welcome extended him by the London Pilgrim Society. A Harvard graduate, blessed with the real cultivation which Harvard frequently gives her sons, a business man who has always read what is best worth while and kept in close touch with the world of men and thought, Mr. Houghton had already proved his quality by his service as our first post-war Ambassador in Berlin. At London he had the humor and the perspicacity last week to smile at the twanging on the one string of "blood is thicker than water," usual in the speeches of less well furnished ambassadors to Great Britain. Instead, he told England and all the world what America expects just now of Europe.

The full measure [he said] of American helpfulness can be obtained only when the American people are assured that the time for destructive methods and policies has passed and that the time for peaceful upbuilding has come. . . .

They [the American people] offer no advice. But I

may say to you that they hope and that they fervently pray that a peace may soon be reached—not a peace of mere contrivance and arrangement based primarily on force, for that would merely be the prelude to another war, but a peace which contains the elements of permanency—a peace which will deserve and receive the moral support of mankind because it is just.

And they believe that such a peace can come in only one way. It must be based upon the assumption of good faith by all who participate in it. That assumption may be larger, or it may be smaller, but in proportion as men seek to eliminate it altogether their work will be in vain. For now, as always, peace can come only through mutual and hopeful endeavor. Peace is an adventure in faith.

The London papers read different messages between the lines of the Ambassador's speech. Some thought he aimed his words at France, some at Germany. As a matter of fact he was aiming at every nation which bases its foreign policy on suspicion. But the big brothers among nations bear the greater blame for international scrapping as much as do the elder brothers in a quarrelsome family. Mr. Houghton's words represent the feeling of President Coolidge and the administration. They received vigorous approval from Senator Borah and others in Washington. They put the duty of European nations to each other accurately and naturally. We wish that the Ambassador might now turn as frankly to his fellow citizens and free his mind on America.

Shall We Stop the Merry-go-Round?

THE minds of Westerners who have caught some glimpe of the East turn back again and again to the question whether our brothers in Palestine or India or Ceylon do not understand how to live better than do we. The men may go about with great patches on baggy trousers and the women may wear patchwork quilts, but they all have time of an afternoon to sit in the green grass beside the river outside the city; they have leisure to talk; the man in the bazaar may write poetry—even though its verbal jewels may shine a little glassily; people have a chance to dream and gossip and smoke. The papers last week carried a curious dispatch to the effect that some of the retail business men in Washington were put out with President Coolidge for advising personal economy. The announcement that he had bought no Easter suit and had had his old

A world that cares little for minor points of Christian doctrine, and which too often does not seem to care for the one big point—the will of God in Christ—looks on and laughs at these squabbles among Christians who should be a mutually tolerant fellowship animated by the one purpose of redeeming mankind by the love revealed in the Cross. We must have liberty, not because we wish to destroy ancient formulations of truth, or to deny what our fathers have believed—God forbid!—but because we wish to use all knowledge, ancient and modern, to set forth the Gospel convincingly. We should

not be loyal to the framers of historic confessions of faith, we should not be loyal to the writers of our Bible, we should not be loyal to Jesus Christ, if we did not follow them in stating the Gospel of God for the men and women of our day in the thought and speech of our day. Just because we believe, as did they, that the supreme need of mankind is to share God's eternal life, and that God waits and works through His Church to give this life, we must have freedom as ambassadors of Christ to plead in words as immediately persuasive as Christ's own words, Be ye reconciled to God.

The Issues at Columbus

A Liberal View

By Murray S. Howland

Knowing that our readers would wish to consider both sides of the issues confronting the very important meeting of the Presbyterian General Assembly at Columbus next week, we asked Dr. Howland, pastor of the Lafayette Presbyterian Church of Buffalo, to give us a Liberal's view of those issues and Professor Machen, of Princeton Theological Seminary, to give us a Conservative's view. They have complied with our request in the following articles.—THE EDITORS.

The Liberal View—Dr. Howland

THE great issue that is to be decided at this year's meeting of the General Assembly of Presbyterian Church in U. S. A., to be held at Columbus, beginning May 21st, is whether the Presbyterian Church is large enough in spirit to find a place within its bounds for both the conservative and the liberal, or whether the church is to be reduced to a company of those who hold a particular and specific interpretation of some of the great doctrines of Christianity.

It is a momentous instant in the history of the Presbyterian Church. Should the belligerent Fundamentalists win, it will undoubtedly mean, sooner or later, the splitting of the church, the forcing out of it of many of its leading men and most powerful churches, the crippling of the great boards of the church, the creation of bitterness of feeling that will long endure and the furnishing of weapons to the hands of the scorners. Such a division of the church will reveal to the world the absence of that spirit which Christ declared to be the badge of discipleship—love among the brethren. Whatever certain leaders within the church may think, the world has rightly judged that this badge of discipleship is far more important than the possession of exact theological conformity.

A Conservative View

By J. Gresham Machen

One would think that the history of the Presbyterian Church in this country might give pause to those who are so earnestly seeking to divide it. Twice before there have arisen movements similar to that which is being engineered in Princeton and Philadelphia. Both times its leaders were from Philadelphia. Both times they split the church, crippled its work, hampered its advance. In both cases also, after the passage of years, reunion was brought about. Those who joined in the reunions, looking back, could not conceive that the reasons that had brought about the divisions were adequate. They recognized the futility of such divisions. One would think that the men who today are preaching division would have learned from comparatively recent history, its futility.

While the liberal wing of the church and the Fundamentalist wing differ in their interpretation of some of the great doctrines, the most serious difference lies in their conception of the nature of the church and of Christianity itself. If the nature of the church is to be that held by the Fundamentalists, then the church becomes a club of those who hold the same theological point of view and the terms of membership of that club might at any moment be changed, both in character and purpose, by a sufficiently large vote of the dominant faction in the club. The membership of the church becomes thus a matter of ecclesiastical majorities. The Confession of Faith does not hold that the church is confined to those who adopt the Confession but it includes "all of those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children and is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ." The present attempt to cast out of the church those who do not agree with certain self-constituted authorities on doctrine, is a reduction of the church from a universal Church to a sect and schism, contrary to the entire spirit and teaching of the Gospel.

History has presented us a few examples of what such a conception of the Church is certain to produce. Rome has always been peculiarly insistent on the necessity of correct belief. Probably nowhere else has the Roman Church had such unlimited opportunity to enforce its belief as in Spain, where the Spanish Inquisition made uniformity of belief as nearly absolute as is humanly possible. One does not need to enlarge upon the failure of such a method as revealed by the helplessness and deadness of the Roman Catholic Church in Spain. Those who are demanding uniformity of belief in the Presbyterian Church, with something of the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition, if allowed to have their way, will in time inevitably produce similar results.

In accordance with this view of the church, the Fundamentalists are carrying on a carefully thought-out plan. They are seeking to elect only Fundamentalists to the boards of the church and to the Council. Year by year they will doubtless follow the plan pursued last year, when Dr. Merrill was displaced from the Board of Foreign Missions. In the second place, they are attempting to control admissions to the ministry. In his speech at Princeton, the Moderator emphasized this policy that the ministry of the church is to be made up of those who hold to the form of belief which this party deems the only possible form for Christians to hold.

It is in accord with this policy that an appeal is before the Judicial Commission of this General Assembly concerning the ordination of Mr. Van Deusen, solely on the ground that New York Presbytery disobeyed the directions of the General Assembly by ordaining a man who had not professed belief in the Virgin Birth (Van Deusen did not deny his belief in the Virgin Birth, but declared he was unready to affirm his belief in it). It was argued by representatives of the presbytery on the first appeal that, according to the constitution, the presbytery is the final judge of the fitness of candidates for ordination and that the question is not a theological but a constitutional one. Whatever decision the Judicial Commission may make must be reported to the General Assembly and either be approved or disapproved. It is possible that there may be an attempt before the General Assembly to represent a decision by the Judicial Commission sustaining the ordination of Van Deusen as a statement that the Presbyterian Church does not believe in the Virgin Birth, and therefore, also, that it does not believe in the divinity of Christ, and the demand may be made on these grounds for a reversal of such a decision. Such a plea before the General Assembly might confuse the issue for many of the commissioners and make them feel that the decision was an attack on the foundations of the church's belief. It is probable, however, that the sound and sober sense of the Assembly, which is tending to confirm all decisions by the Judicial Commission, rather than to retry the cases before the entire Assembly, would recognize

that the question is not theological but constitutional and that the constitution provides other ways for caring for theological issues.

It is very possible that in other directions this same conception of the church will find expression. Last year an attack was made upon the theological seminaries and a closer control of them may be demanded. The attempt to excise New York Presbytery is in thorough harmony with this policy. It is significant that Chester Presbytery, next door neighbor of Philadelphia Presbytery, has sent an overture to the General Assembly praying that New York Presbytery, because of its alleged disobedience, be cut off from the church. The burden of the charge is that New York Presbytery permitted Dr. Fosdick to complete his winter of service with the First Church instead of terminating it last fall. Should this overture be pushed and New York Presbytery cut off, it would undoubtedly mean that other presbyteries would leave the church, possibly the entire Synod of New York.

Because the liberals are not forcing the issue, they are relying upon constitutional guarantees for their position in the church. They claim that the constitution guarantees them the freedom which they have enjoyed. Their plea is "unity and peace." A year ago over thirteen hundred ministers, many of them conservatives, signed "An Affirmation, designed to safe-guard the unity and liberty of the Presbyterian Church," and many hundreds of others, both liberals and conservatives, declared their sympathy with and approval of this document. It would seem to be self-evident that no such large fraction of the church can be charged with either insincerity or infidelity. Among its signers are many leading men of the church, the fruits of whose labors are such that no unprejudiced person could question their Christian faith. All of these ministers resent the use by Dr. Machen of the term "pagan" as applying to them and they do not know by what right either of the Scriptures or of Christian courtesy he uses such a term in description of them. These signers of the Affirmation point to the fact that their position was upheld by a most important decision of the Judicial Commission a year ago, when it declared that no statement by the General Assembly on doctrine has the force of law unless and until it is approved by the presbyteries as well. This decision frees the church from "the tyranny of casual majorities," to use Dr. Hodge's words.

The constitutional history of our nation indicates why the liberals are standing for a liberal interpretation of the Confession of Faith. Due to the enormous changes in our manner of living in the 136 years that have elapsed since the Constitution of our nation was adopted and because of the intricate problems that have arisen, the Supreme Court has been forced to interpret the Constitution with considerable freedom. It has sought underlying princi-

ples and has not been held by too strict a literalism. To illustrate this the Supreme Court has construed the phrase "post roads" to apply to railroads, and eventually it will doubtless extend this interpretation to the air lanes along which government mail planes fly.

The liberals maintain similarly that the Confession of Faith contains the great fundamental doctrines taught in the Bible, such as the doctrines of the divinity of Christ, of sin, of atonement, of immortality, etc. They believe that these doctrines arose out of experience and have been authenticated by countless Christians. They also believe that the philosophical forms in which these doctrines were stated 300 years ago, cannot as a whole be used today. The philosophical forms and explanations must change with the years—the underlying experiences are enduring. Therefore the liberal when he subscribes to the Confession of Faith does so "only" as "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." It is the question as to this right to a liberal subscription to the Confession that underlies much of the discussion and division in the church.

To those who are closely in touch with the church at large, there is a growing hope that the theological controversy has aroused such a feeling of restiveness and indignation on the part of the mass of the church, with the continued attacks and sweeping charges of heresy made by the belligerent Fundamentalists, that some drastic action to end the trouble will be taken. Some months ago a letter sent out by the leaders of the Fundamentalists to various conservatives throughout the country. It insinuated dishonesty on the part of many in the ministry of the church and asserted wide-spread unbelief among them, called for meetings to stir up feeling all over the church, looking toward the election of so-called loyal commissioners to this Assembly. Unanimous protest was voiced by the Presbytery of Los Angeles, which is a conservative presbytery, to this letter and against such politicizing of the church and the stirring up of bitterness and antagonism by unsupported charges of heresy. All over the church, largely from conservatives, have come other protests at the methods of the Philadelphia group. Within a very short time the Presbytery of Grand Rapids, another conservative presbytery, adopted an overture to the General Assembly in which it asked the General Assembly "to warn all persons subject to its authority against encouraging distrust and suspicion in the church, to avoid rash statements of possible schism and division."

The recent action forced by the Fundamentalist group at Princeton Seminary in deposing Dr. Erdman from his position so long held as Student Adviser and the attack on him in "The Presbyterian" have reacted throughout the church, arousing intense resentment. The only reason for thus deposing Dr.

Erdman is the refusal on his part to be bitter and belligerent in his attitude toward liberals. The election of Dr. Erdman as a commissioner by New Brunswick Presbytery and the appeal for his support as Moderator by that presbytery are indications of this rising tide of feeling. The platform on which Dr. Erdman has placed himself is expressive of the attitude of the church at large. Theologically he is thoroughly conservative. He believes in resting all questions concerning the theological beliefs of the members of the church on the constitutional methods of procedure and he is opposed to wholesale charges of disloyalty and heresy. He believes that the legal methods provided are amply sufficient for settling all such cases.

To those who are looking for the development of more liberal ideas in the churches there are reasons for encouragement furnished by the last three years in the Presbyterian Church. Two years ago Mr. Bryan and the Fundamentalists were decisively defeated at Indianapolis on the question of their opposition to evolution. Last year the church refused to condemn Dr. Fosdick on theological grounds and decided against any attempt to impose the five points upon the church by action of the General Assembly. This year it is hoped that the great mass of the church, wearied by the unending attacks upon men doing a great and noble work in the Christian Church, such men as Dr. Vance of Nashville, Dr. Mott of the Y. M. C. A., Dr. Erdman of Princeton, Dr. James E. Clarke of Nashville, Dr. Coffin of New York, Mr. W. R. Moody and many others, will demand a cessation of the warfare.

The liberal conceives that Christianity consists in life and that the proof of the possession of true religion is to be found where Christ said it is to be found, in the fruits that a man's life bears. The Master warned His disciples not to stop those casting out devils in His name, though they did not follow Him. And he added words which Dr. Machen failed to quote in his recent widely sent sermon, "Those who are not against us are for us," though he quoted another passage from the same chapter.

The liberals believe that the great forces of the Spirit will in time prove, so that no one can question, the truth or falsity of their position. They wonder why it is necessary to take the sword of ecclesiastical warfare which has always cut the one using it. They wish that all might take the counsel of Gamaliel quoted by Luke with evident approval, when the Apostles were brought before the Council, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will be over-thrown, but if it be of God, ye will not be able to over-throw it."

Without question correctness of belief is important, but without question Jesus sought first from men their devotion to Him in personal trust, assured that correctness of belief would later emerge from

personal experience. The liberals are as truly evangelical as the conservatives. They believe that no amount of correct belief will take the place of the possession of the Spirit of Christ. It is the possession of this Spirit of Christ, without which we are none of His, that they emphasize in their preaching of the Gospel of Christ and the Kingdom of God, and they ask only that they be no longer interrupted in this, their God-given mission, by theological and ecclesiastical attacks.

The Conservative View—Professor Machen

DURING the years prior to 1923, it might have seemed to a casual observer as though the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America were to relinquish the Christian faith without even a struggle. The old forms indeed were preserved; but the reality was apparently gone. It was considered bad taste to defend the basic facts of Christianity in the boards and agencies of the church, and in countless pulpits the gospel was never heard.

In 1920 an attempt was made to crystallize this opposition to Christianity in the "Plan of Organic Union," which relegated our historic Confession of Faith and the central facts attested by the Bible to the realm of the non-essential and sought to found Christian fellowship upon a Preamble couched in the vague language of modern naturalism. That Plan of Organic Union, agnostic to the core, was approved by the Assembly without permission of the slightest debate. It looked as though the church were to cease to be Christian, and as though Christian men, if they were to be true to their principles, would have to withdraw from the Presbyterian ministry.

But when the Plan came before the presbyteries, it met with an unexpected rejection. The undermining process had not yet gone far enough for Modernism to attain its end; and the Christian character of the church was preserved.

After 1920 there was a return to the policy of "boring from within." Controversy for the most part was avoided, and the attempt was made to capture the citadel of the church before the rank and file became aware that the enemy was within the walls. But it is difficult for concealment to be complete; and when the preacher in the First Presbyterian Church of New York permitted publication of his vigorous attack upon evangelical Christianity in the sermon "Shall the Fundamentalists Win? Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney came forward in protest, as the spokesman of the evangelical heart of the church. The outlook for that protest was indeed rather gloomy, and the making of it was a courageous act—the kind of act in which principles, not consequences, are considered, and by which the witness-bearing of the church, in the heroic moments of

Christian history, has been preserved. But again the undermining process proved not to have gone far enough; and when in the General Assembly of 1923, one member of the Committee on Bills and Overtures stood for a clear pronouncement in the Fosdick case against all the forces of Modernism so firmly entrenched in the governing machinery of the church, that single voice prevailed, and the church testified its allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The election of a Moderator of the General Assembly in the following year brought a continuance of the conflict. The candidate of the evangelical part of the church was Dr. Macartney, the candidate of the Modernists was Dr. Charles R. Erdman. Dr. Macartney was personally unknown to the great mass of commissioners; Dr. Erdman, quite justly, was one of the most popular leaders in the church, who had commended himself not only by his personal qualities but also by his orthodoxy and his long service as a sound Biblical teacher. But the former of the two candidates possessed one advantage which turned out to be far greater than could have been foreseen—he stood clearly and firmly for the restoration of the church's witness to Christ. Others had been content to deplore the situation in private; he had been willing to bear the opprobrium of action, he had come forward bravely to speak the necessary word. The fact was not forgotten in that election. Dr. Erdman, despite his personal orthodoxy, had the plaudits of the enemies of the Gospel; Dr. Macartney bore the reproach of Christ. The result is a matter of history; the Assembly laid aside all personal considerations and stood for the defense of the Christian faith.

The remaining sessions of that Assembly, though generally favorable to the evangelical cause, accomplished only partly the work that needed to be done. The rejection of the "Philadelphia Overture" indeed was no defeat; for that overture had never had anything like the united support of the evangelical commissioners, and was of comparative unimportance. More serious was the unsatisfactory and ambiguous language in which the decision in the Fosdick case was couched. But even in that matter there was no decisive defeat. It is not really because he is a Baptist that Dr. Fosdick has been removed from the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church of New York (so much is freely admitted by the editor of *CHRISTIAN WORK*); the real reason is that he is an opponent of the Christian faith.

As for the chief business of the General Assembly, the election of members of the boards and agencies of the church, only a beginning was made by the Assembly of 1924. Whatever may be said of the evangelical majority in that Assembly, it certainly cannot be charged with any undue radicalism in the changes that it made in the personnel of the boards. A great principle was, however, established by the election of Dr. John F. Carson to the Board of For-

sign Mission—the principle that the Assembly should exercise its plain constitutional right of electing members of the boards on the basis of fitness alone. No man has any inalienable right to be elected—or re-elected—to a governing position in the agencies of the church; failure to elect a man is not at all equivalent to a charge of heresy; many a man who is personally Christian is yet, because of his ignorance of the present danger, utterly unfitted to direct the policy of the boards. The Assembly should indeed act advisedly and conservatively; length of previous service should be duly taken into account in determining fitness; but on the other hand, in the next few years the evangelical majority should, to say the least, be given some sort of adequate representation in the prosecution of the church's work. The agencies of the church ought certainly to be made safe investments for those who desire by their gifts to propagate the gospel of Christ.

At the eve of the General Assembly of 1925, the same issue is before the church as that which was present in 1924; but it appears this year in even clearer fashion. The Modernist party already active in 1924 in the Auburn Affirmation, is making ever plainer its divergence from the Christian faith and its endeavor to capture the Presbyterian Church. True, the use of Christian terminology is not altogether abandoned; the mask which has so long concealed from Christian people what is really going on, has not altogether been laid aside. But beneath that mask the lineaments of naturalism are being ever more clearly revealed.

Amid the mass of pamphlet literature, the sermon of Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin on "Freedom in the Presbyterian Pulpit" is fairly typical. In that sermon, Dr. Coffin attacks, first, the truth of the Bible, and, the second place, the historic witness of the church. The truth of the Bible is attacked by the notion that the supernatural elements in the New Testament account of Jesus, such as the Virgin Birth, are merely "interpretations" of something else. That is simply the old mythical theory of the New Testament, which has been held by the opponents of Christianity ever since the days of Strauss. The witness-bearing of the church is attacked in the sermon by the notion—supported by a truly extraordinary treatment of the history of our creed—that the supreme authority in religion "is not the Bible as an external law to be accepted in every detail, but the Bible as the record of the historic Self-revelation of God in the experiences of His people, culminating in Christ, attested and interpreted by the living Spirit within us today." Such assertions, which are at the roots of Modernism, of course impute to the Bible a point of view which is entirely foreign to the Bible itself. What the Bible is concerned with is not merely the revelation of a law or the record of an inner experience, but also the recording of facts—the historical facts that have

brought redemption to men. It is those facts, those events, upon which the Christian founds his life. Dr. Coffin's sermon does not merely reject, but rather utterly ignores, the Christian point of view.

This opposition to Christianity which appears thus clearly in the sphere of doctrine, appears also in the sphere of practice and of ecclesiastical policy. In the first place, the General Assembly is (at least if it be at all hospitable to the suggestion), to be asked to find some means of allowing Dr. Fosdick's return. Thus the church is to be requested to place the stamp of its approval upon this propaganda so diametrically opposite to the gospel for the propagation of which the church exists. In the second place, the "Cleveland Plan" of coöperation with the Congregational Church is apparently to be favored, at least provisionally, by the Committee on Coöperation and Union. Thus our church is to be asked to make common cause with a body that has in very large measure departed from Christian truth and is predominantly quite hostile to that gospel which is set forth in our Constitution. What we have here is a step on the same path which in Canada has led to the (apparently agnostic and tyrannical) church union, on account of which evangelical Christians in the Presbyterian Church have had to "continue" a body of their own. That Canadian union is definitely commended by Dr. Coffin, and held up for our emulation. The ravages of similar agnostic union movements on the mission field are already cause of deepest sorrow to true missionaries of the Cross.

Another attack upon the faith of the church is found in the communication of the Presbytery of New York, which, if approved, would permit that presbytery to continue unchecked its policy of admitting anti-Christian propagandists to the Presbyterian ministry. And finally there are indirect cases, in which the very nature of the church is involved.

But the Assembly must do more than ward off attacks; it must also undertake a great positive task. The greatest need of the hour is that the central administration of the church should be placed increasingly in the hands of evangelical men who understand the great issue of the day and have decided with regard to that issue to stand for Christ. Shall the church stand for the gospel or shall it stand for agnostic Modernism—that is the real question of the hour.

Unfortunately the discussion has not been conducted altogether on the highest plane; personalities have sometimes been allowed to intrude themselves, and a veritable riot of misrepresentation has disgraced the pages of the newspapers and of the religious magazines.

That campaign of newspaper misrepresentation about one particular matter is reproduced in convenient summary in the article by the Reverend Fred Eastman, entitled "Disgracing Princeton Seminary," in *CHRISTIAN WORK* for April 18th. That article continues the absurd campaign propaganda

which asserts that Dr. Erdman has been subjected to persecution on the part of his colleagues. In point of fact, the appointment of Dr. Wilson, instead of Dr. Erdman, as Faculty Adviser at Princeton, was due, not to the initiation of the faculty, but to a formal request of the Student Cabinet, attested, in the "Trenton Evening Times" for April 9, 1925, by the president and secretary of the Student Association, to the effect that the faculty should make a choice of an adviser to the students. The student request and the faculty's response to it were due not to any personal criticism of Dr. Erdman, but, primarily at least, to his negative attitude with regard to the new League of Evangelical Students into which the vast majority of the students desired to enter. The loving-cup presented to Dr. Erdman, of which Mr. Eastman speaks, and the appreciative resolution regarding him, were not protests of the student body against the faculty action, but were well-deserved tributes to his services, participated in even by men who were strongly opposed to his continuance as Faculty Adviser. Finally, the impression of the faculty that the vast majority of the students, as well as the majority of the faculty, favored the new League was strikingly confirmed by the vote of the Student Association in which 140 men stood in favor of the League and only seventy against it, although, since a three-fourths vote was required by the constitution of the League, even this overwhelming majority did not permit the immediate entrance of the Student Association as such into the League but required the formation of a voluntary chapter.

The misrepresentation of this one matter has been only typical. Equally false is the widespread representation of the closely contested meeting of the Presbytery of New Brunswick, in which those who favor Dr. Macartney's policy elected five out of the eight commissioners, as a sweeping victory for Dr. Erdman and a sweeping defeat for his opponents. In general no lover of fair play can be much impressed with the manner in which defamation of character and misrepresentation of facts have been used in this campaign by the opponents of the evangelical party in the church. In the combatting of what is called by its opponents, "Fundamentalism," almost anything apparently is regarded as fair.

To the regret of many friends of Dr. Erdman, it seems probable that again, as last year, he will be the candidate for the Moderatorship of the General Assembly, of the Modernist and indifferentist party in the church; and for him an extensive pre-Assembly campaign of circularization has been launched. Whether this campaign will be successful depends upon the extent of the division which can be produced by Dr. Erdman's supporters in the evangelical ranks. The Modernist party, embracing perhaps about one-third of the Assembly, will vote for Dr. Erdman to a man, as was the case last year; but the

result depends upon the number of evangelical men who can be induced, because of Dr. Erdman's personal orthodoxy, to stand with him on that Modernist side. At any rate, our opposition to the campaign depends not upon any lack of appreciation of Dr. Erdman's services as pastor and teacher, but upon opposition to his public policy in the councils of the church. There are many evangelical men who in this great crisis have not the appreciation of the danger in which the church stands to make them safe occupants of the Moderator's chair. So it is with Dr. Erdman. We regret that our opposition to him in this sphere of ecclesiastical policy has been represented as a personal matter. In reality it has nothing to do with personalities, but is due to our sense of the danger in which the church stands. A policy of palliation and of compromise will in a few years lead to the control of our church, as has already happened in the case of many churches, by agnostic Modernism. We favor therefore a continuation of the policy initiated by Dr. Macartney, and we deny most emphatically that that policy is unconstitutional. A great evangelical movement is in progress in our church; and we hope and pray that it may be continued until the full unity of the church's witness-bearing is restored.

We Are Thy Youth

We are thy youth, America!
We hear the charges which you bring against us.

We have no dreams?
What dreams have you save wealth and power?
We dream of peace—
We who have fought our nation's war
Because we thought we fought for peace:
Our life's blood lies in France.
And you! You manufacture bombs,
Build fleets, and cultivate dread germs,
And turn your back on international will.
While we—we dream of peace.

We have no God?
Where is your God?
In worn-out creeds, in ancient forms,
In pomp and show, and smug complacency?
One says, "This is the way," another, "This."
We are not seeking ways, nor forms, nor creeds.
We seek the Prince of Peace.
We cannot find Him in contending faiths;
We seek Him in your lives!

We are thy youth, America!
How have you lived to show us God?
What will you do to make our dreams come true?

—Fleta Bruer Gonso.