

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL

*A Presbyterian semi-monthly magazine devoted to the
statement, defense and propagation of the
Gospel, the faith which was once for
all delivered unto the saints.*

"Entered as second-class matter May 15, 1942, at the Postoffice at Weaverville, N. C., under Act of March 1, 1879."

Volume VI — Number 10

SEPTEMBER 15, 1947

Library Reading Room
Univ of N Carolina
Yearly Subscription \$1.50

EDITORIAL

A Wedge - Not Of Our Making — Letter From Outlook Editor — Who Are
Driving The Wedge? — Tolerance Or Intolerance? — The Federal Council
And Pacifism — Christ - The Hope Of Glory — Are Denominations Evil?
Now Is The Time — By Grace Are Ye Saved Through Faith

PLAIN FACTS ABOUT THE SO-CALLED UNION BETWEEN THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AND THE NORTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

By Randolph B. Lee

PRESBYTERIAN PROGRAM OF PROGRESS

DOCTRINAL BELIEFS THAT DIVIDE THE NORTHERN AND
THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES

By Rev. Wm. C. Robinson, D.D.

"BUT WE PREACH CHRIST CRUCIFIED"

By Rev. Aaron Judah Kligerman, D.D.

WOMAN'S WORK

Edited By Mrs. R. T. Faucette

SABBATH SCHOOL LESSONS

(October 5-12)

Edited By Rev. J. Kenton Parker

YOUNG PEOPLE'S DEPARTMENT

(October 5-12)

Edited By Rev. W. G. Foster

Doctrinal Beliefs That Divide The Northern And The Southern Presbyterian Churches

By Rev. Wm. C. Robinson, D.D.

Columbia Theological Seminary

Decatur, Georgia

This Address was delivered at Montreat, N. C., on Thursday, August 14, 1947, to the Continuing Church Group.

This summer, it was my privilege to present to the Northern Presbyterian brethren at Princeton the issues which have divided American Presbyterianism. As far as the time permits I shall present these same issues as they concern our Church and the USA Church.

A few years ago some ministers introduced an overture asking that a particular synod declare itself in favor of union on any and every basis. The synod voted down the overture. But it seems to some of us that the majority of our Southern Presbyterian Committee on Cooperation and Union is in favor of union with the USA Church on any and every basis that the Northern Church asks. For example, the 1943 Plan provided the form of ordination used in the Southern Church. But when the USA liberals objected to the provision that a man notify his presbytery if he changed his doctrinal positions our Committee meekly agreed to the omission of this provision from the 1947 Plan. In his pamphlet on REUNION, Dr. Dunbar Ogden assured our Church that his committee could work out a plan of union on the basis of eight principles, one of which was the continuation of Negro congregations, presbyteries and synods. The Concurrent Declarations of the 1947 Plan, however, urged presbyteries and synods in the same territory to begin measures as soon as possible that will ensure within a reasonable time the merger of their bodies. These two changes are just the two things that the liberal Presbyterian Tribune of the USA Church objected to in the old Plan. Our Committee has thus accepted the demands of the Northern liberals, and, as far as I can see, secured nothing that the Southern conservatives have asked for in the Plan.

Because some people favor union on any and every basis, shall we reply that we oppose union on any and every basis? That is an easy way to answer a difficult question. I remember, however, that our fathers in the Assembly of 1861 both set forth our Southern Presbyterian positions and then stated their willingness to welcome into their fellowship any persons or groups who agreed with these positions. I want to stand where the founding fathers of 1861 stood. Let us state frankly and fearlessly the positions we hold, the doctrines which divide us and our USA

brethren, and then assure them of our willingness to establish union with them when and if a Plan is presented which safeguards the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. We object to the proposed plan because it does not maintain the doctrine of the sole Headship and Kingship of Christ over His body the Church (the very principle which gave birth to our Church), and because it does not safeguard the faith of the Son of God, the supernatural Christ of the Bible.

Ecumenicity

Men are using the word **ecumenical** as a term with which to conjure today. May I say that one of the principles of ecumenicity is that one Church is expected to make a sympathetic study of the other Church and seek to find therein any and every true testimony to the Lord and Head of the church. The 1947 Plan of Union does not show that our USA brethren have taken the pains necessary to understand our witness to our Lord Jesus Christ. Before any larger Church has the right to ask a smaller one to unite with it, it has the moral duty to examine into the life and history of the smaller one to find out wherein it has borne true witness to Christ and faithfully to incorporate that witness into the Plan of Union, otherwise some of the testimony that the Holy Spirit has called forth to the grace and glory of our Lord will be lost from the earth.

In his day Dr. R. L. Dabney saw the dangers from a superficial ecumenicity. He warned us that the time was coming when men would put inordinate value upon that of which God takes least account, namely organizational unification, and put too little value upon that upon which God gives most value, namely, doctrinal purity—the Word of His truth. I remember when Dr. Thornton Whaling was chairman of our Committee on Cooperation and Union. He told us how many of the brethren kept insisting that “union was in the air,” until he got tired of their remarks and answered: “Yes union is in the air, but the Scriptures tell us that Satan is the Prince of the powers of the air.” Instead of corresponding with the Devil would we not do better to go back to Dabney, the true and tried witness to the truth of God?

I. The Headship Of Christ. Let us look then concretely at the doctrines which divide the two churches. In 1861 Dr. B. M. Palmer preached our first moderatorial sermon on the sole Headship of Christ using Eph. 1:22-23 as his text. Thereafter our Church wrote this truth large into our Book of Church Order. Indeed, the Southern Presbyterian Church was established upon the Headship of Christ and has rested upon this glorious foundation from that day to this.

On the other hand the Plan of Union does not rest upon the Headship of Christ, but upon elaborately spread out eighteenth century principles. It is not a valid justification of this change to say that these Preliminary Principles were part of the heritage of the undivided Church. The Preliminary Principles and the "radical principles of Presbyterian Church government and discipline" found on Page 40 of the Plan were both adopted when Presbyterianism was handed out by Philadelphia and Princeton to the scattered handful of congregations in the South, before the Southern Presbyterians had begun to take a real part in shaping the policies of the Church.

The great statement on the Headship and Kingship of Christ found in chapter two of our Book is taken letter for letter from the Preface of the Westminster Form of Presbyterian Government. The Westminster Divines and the Southern Church base the Church upon Christ her living Head and King, the USA Church and the Plan base the Church upon Preliminary principles and slash the heart out of our great chapter on the Headship of Christ.

Our paragraph 9 is taken from the Second Book of Discipline of the Church of Scotland drawn up by Andrew Melville. It asserts that Christ rules the Church through His Word and Spirit by the ministry of men. The Plan utterly changes the meaning of this statement by inserting the word **and** before the phrase "by the ministry of men." According to the Second Book of Scotland and according to our Book Christ is ruling through men only when we ministers and elders rule according to His Word and Spirit. The Plan on the other hand dares to assert that Christ is ruling through ministers and elders when they presume to teach as doctrines the commandments of men.

Dr. Guy Gillespie has already shown that our paragraph ten is a magnificent statement of Presbyterian doctrine, but that it is mutilated in the Plan. Our paragraph 19 says that church power has the divine sanction when (1) it is in conformity with the statutes enacted by Christ the lawgiver and (2) when it is put forth by courts or officers appointed thereunto in His Word. The Plan does not assert the first of these two propositions and the recent USA disciplinary actions made no mention of the Word of God in their decisions. Our Paragraph 58 says that the Church can make no law binding the conscience, but may make regulations for the government of the Church and has the right of requiring obedience to the laws of Christ.

Then our definition of an offense is limited to that which is contrary to the Word of God. "Nothing, therefore, ought to be considered by any court as an offence, or admitted as a matter of accusation, which cannot be proved to be such from Scripture, as interpreted in these Stand-

ards." On the other hand the USA Church has made and does make the acts of its Assembly additional conditions of church membership and good standing in the Church.

The volume by Vander Velte on the Presbyterian Churches and the Federal Union 1861-1869 abundantly shows that the USA Church made loyalty to the Federal or Washington Government a condition for good standing in the Church. It required ministers seeking admission from the South to forswear the "sins" of slavery and of states rights and demanded that those seeking membership in the Church be required to confess their loyalty to the government. In Missouri men were required to take an oath of allegiance to the State as a condition for sitting in the synod of the Church.

In recent years the USA Assembly first compromised the testimony of the Church to the Virgin Birth. It found New York Presbytery guilty of licensing candidates who could not accept the plain statements in Matthew and Luke on the Virgin Birth of Christ and then proceed to compromise the matter. And then it "cracked down" on the conservatives who refused to obey a mandate of the Assembly requiring them to support a Foreign Mission Board in whose doctrinal integrity they had lost confidence. The 1934 USA Assembly approved Studies in the Constitution written by Dr. Pugh which states that a member who does not give to support the authorized Missionary Program of the Church is in exactly the same position with reference to the Constitution as one who refuses to partake of the Lord's Supper. Now the officially authorized program of the Presbyterian Church is a Church action. The Lord's Supper is Christ's Word. The 1934 USA Assembly thus put the word of the Church on exactly the same level as the Word of God!

And when she did so the USA Church took the Roman Catholic position against which Luther protested with all his vigor. Boehmer shows that the Reformation reached its crisis when Luther burned the Church's canon law at Eyster Gate in Wittenberg. The lawyers stood aghast. Luther returned to tell his students that they might expect martyrdom as he expected, but that since they knew the Gospel to desert the truth of God's Word for obedience to the Church meant giving up their salvation. In Luther's bold words the issue was: "Martyrdom or Hell."

Princeton's great scholar, Dr. Joseph Hromadka has shown that the essential difference between Romanism and Protestantism was that the Romanism puts the word of the Church upon the same level as the Word of God, while Protestantism subordinates the word of the Church to the Word of God. The Protestant Church listens to Christ, she waits upon His Word. Jesus has said that no man can serve two masters. The effort of the USA Church to place the word of the Church upon exactly the same level as the Word of Christ has resulted in judicial decision compromising the Word of God as given in Matthew and Luke and then enforcing the mandate of the General Assembly, thus treating the word of man as more sacred and inviolate even than the Word of God.

When I was a Pastor in the USA Church two of my best members refused to support the USA Board of Foreign Missions. They reasoned that

since Dr. Alexander, the President of that Board, had Dr. H. E. Fosdick to preach for him in the First Presbyterian Church of New York they could not trust his appointments in China. Therefore, these godly ladies gave their Foreign Mission money to the American Bible Society. Now I did not agree with them, but I would certainly have hated to suspend them from the Lord's Supper for such action as I would have been expected to do under the action of 1934 had I remained in the USA Church. Or, to bring the matter up to date: The Foreign Mission Board of the USA Church is now supporting the church merger forced in Japan by the war government of Japan known as the Kyodan. Suppose some minister of that Church decides that the Kyodan compromised the Christian testimony by worshipping at the shrine of the Sun Goddess and by eliminating from the Creed those things which exalted Christ above the Emperor of Japan and that consequently he can not allow his money to go through the Kyodan. Suppose he insists that his offering go through some channel that will reach those Reformed or Presbyterian ministers who have withdrawn from the Kyodan. Suppose such a man send his money through our Southern Committee on Foreign Missions to these men and refuses to give through the USA authorized program, he would, according to their 1934 action, be subject to discipline just as if he refused to attend the Lord's Supper and should be desposed from the ministry and excluded from the sacraments for such action!

By all means let us insist upon a Plan of Union that takes our definition of an offense and let us reject the definition of an offense found in the 1947 Plan which subjects us to the Studies of the Constitution adopted by the USA Assembly of 1934 and which will be enforced by the author of those studies, namely Dr. Pugh, Stated Clerk of the USA Church.

II. The Christ of Holy Writ. When liberalism in doctrine, the "scientific" attack upon the supernatural, and humanism in thought became dominant in Western Civilization, our Southern Church raised up two new defenses of the faith. We put in the added provision that if a minister changes his doctrinal views after ordination he will notify his presbytery of such change on his own initiative. This statement was accepted in the 1943 Plan, but, as noted, was deleted from the 1947 Plan because the liberal Presbyterian Tribune led the fight against it in the USA Church. Then in 1939 we unanimously passed the following declaratory statement:

The General Assembly hereby declares that it regards the acceptance of the infallible truth and Divine authority of Scripture and of Christ as true and eternal God who became also man by being born of a virgin, who offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and reconcile us to God, who rose from the dead with the same body with which He suffered and who will come again to judge the world as being involved in the ordination vows to which we subscribe.

Cedar Rapids Presbytery asked the USA Assembly to concur with us in this action, but instead Dr. Henry S. Coffin rewrote the Cedar Rapids Overture for the USA Assembly of 1941 and said something utterly different. In other words the USA Church has rejected both of the defenses our



An ideal way to perpetuate one's Christian influence, or the memory of a loved one, is to establish a permanent fund on the books of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions.

Interest from such a fund goes annually to the support of Foreign Missions—a perennial contribution in your name or in that of your loved one.

Permanent funds may be started with a small amount and additional deposits made from time to time as convenient.

Your Foreign Mission Committee, its officers and employees, pledge themselves to strive earnestly to meet the responsibility placed in their hands in making your gift accomplish the utmost for His Kingdom around the world.

|||||||

For particulars regarding such gifts and how they are made and used, write:

CURRY B. HEARN

Treasurer

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
FOREIGN MISSIONS
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN THE U. S.**

P. O. Box 330

Nashville 1, Tenn.

Church has set up to meet the current attack upon the faith and the Plan of Union contains neither of these defenses. Kierkegaard has a little story of a magnificent fortress which received a new governor. He filled up the moat broke down the fortifications and turned the fortress into a country estate. Then the enemy came and captured the fortress. At a meeting of the American Theological Committee Dr. Walter Horton told us that there were so many Unitarian ministers in the Congregational Church and that they were so well established that they could not be removed. Are we to enter mergers that will not safeguard us and our people from such a condition?

As a matter of fact the USA Church has accepted and given her highest positions to men who do not accept the Virgin Birth of Christ (Minutes USA Assembly of 1925). At least one of these men has since set forth views which do not present Christ as true and eternal God who became man, but only as a man, a temporal finite personality, in whom God was as personally present as He could be in any man in the period of the Roman Empire (Theological Liberalism—An Appraisal). One of their leading theologians set forth the Easter message in the Presbyterian Tribune of 1939 in which he denied the historicity and the objectivity of the Resurrection of Christ. Another of their leading theologians is out in the January 1947 issue of *The Journal Of Religion*

with a round denial of the supernatural. He cannot accept divine acts which supersede "the reign of law" in nature, but advocates a "naturalism which helps us to understand the modern man in a way indispensable for effective preaching and adequate theologizing today."

If and when the USA Church is ready to concur with us in a Plan of Union which bases the Church fairly and squarely on the sole Headship of Christ—which means the sufficiency of His Word—and which safeguards the whole truth of Christ as that is set forth in the Word, I am ready to vote for the plan. As far as the 1947 Plan goes I am thoroughly opposed to it because it does not maintain the Crown Rights of the Lord Jesus Christ and does not maintain the faith of the Church in Him—in His eternal Deity and supernatural intervention for us men and for our salvation. In my sin, my guilt, my depravity, my wickedness I need the whole Christ of the Word, the Christ who died for my sins and rose for my justification, who is my Righteousness at God's right hand, who ever liveth to intercede for me, who reigns over and defends me, who speaks to me by His Word and Spirit, who will come again in glory. But the Plan of 1947 will permit the acceptance and the committing of the most responsible positions in the Church to men who are just as modernistic as those who now hold significant posts in the USA Church.

"But We Preach Christ Crucified"

By Rev. Aaron Judah Kligerman, D.D.

Emmanuel Neighborhood House — 2405 Garrison Blvd.

Baltimore ... Maryland

From Europe comes the news of an International Emergency Conference to combat Anti-Semitism. At the Conference, we are told, were Catholics, Protestants and Jews from 17 countries. Reports and resolutions were presented of course, but just one resolution is of interest to us, namely, that which called for "a radical revision in religious instruction and preaching by Christians in reference to the part played by the Jews in the Crucifixion story."

This is not the first time that such a request has been made. Whenever and wherever Good Willers and Kosher Food tasters meet, and they meet quite often, there the subject of the Crucifixion pops up. Our self-appointed Jewish delegates with their Gentile-Christian comrades never fail to call upon Christendom to "cut out and tear up" all of those things within the New Testament which have been the cause of Jewish persecution and Anti-Semitic uprisings. The Crucifixion story is the most objectionable thing in the New Testament. (See Horace M. Kallen's "The Root of Anti-Semitism," *The Nation*, Vol. 116, No. 3008). They overlook the fact that Anti-Semitism anticipated Christianity by many centuries. We find it in full swing in Egypt, Babylonia, Persia, Greece and Rome. "And if we concentrate exclusively upon the religious factor," says Samuel F. Fox in his article on Judaism and

Anti-Semitism, "Judaism is seen in simultaneous and permanent conflict with the symbolism of Egypt, the apparent monotheism of Iran, the bureaucratic cult of Rome, and the polytheism of Halles." Surely, our Jewish leaders should know that the root of Anti-Semitism must be looked for elsewhere. No one wants to deny the fact that within Christendom there have been numerous Anti-Semitic uprisings resulting in much persecution and suffering. Who can forget Spain, Russia, Poland and Germany? But I also know this: The soil has never been fertile for Anti-Semitic propaganda in countries where the people had access to the Word of God. Only where the Bible had been chained to a pulpit or hidden in a monastery, and the people were forbidden to read it, or where the so-called Biblical specialists have dissected it as just another literary masterpiece—there the spirit of Anti-Semitism flourished and there our people were pogromized and degraded. Where the Bible is being read, taught, and obeyed, there the people are lovers of "The People of the Book."

I think it is time for our people to know that our only hope is in Christ, the Crucified One, and not in the removal of passages from the New Testament. It is time that we know that our best friends are to be found among Bible-loving Christians, and these are more numerous than we im-