

MAR 16 1955

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL

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

L. U. N. C.
Carolina Room

MARCH 16, 1955

*"I was hungry . . .
and you gave me food"*

HELP ALLEVIATE HUMAN
SUFFERING AND NEED
IN THE NAME OF CHRIST



ARAB REFUGEES RECEIVING RELIEF FOOD

**GIVE TO
THE EASTER OFFERING
APRIL 10, 1955**

**FOR WORK NOT INCLUDED IN THE BUDGET OF THE
DEPT. OF OVERSEAS RELIEF AND INTER-CHURCH AID
BOARD OF WORLD MISSIONS • BOX 330 • NASHVILLE, TENN.**

VOL. XIII NO. 46

\$2.50 A YEAR

Library, Reading Room
University of N. C.
Chapel Hill, N. C.

During recent weeks there has been a hot debate in Washington over extending to taxpayers a reduction of \$20.00 per individual. At the same time, one of the "economic experts," called in to testify, not only advocates this tax reduction but at the same time advocates more government spending.

One can but wonder at those legislators who have been willing to vote for a reduction in taxes which would cost the government over four billion dollars a year while, at the same time they know that each year finds our budget unbalanced and the national debt increasing to astronomical proportions. This may be "good politics," designed to win the votes of the unthinking, but it is neither moral, nor is it patriotic.

Walter Lippmann, in his new book, *The Public Philosophy*, writes of the "necessary and natural duties of government" and specifies these to include *order, security and solvency*. From the nature of their implications the loss of any one of these three can imperil the other two.

And yet, beginning twenty-four years ago our nation was sold a philosophy of national finance and spending which, if renewed, is as sure to bring about our ruin as the wanton squandering of a spend-thrift insures his ultimate bankruptcy.

We are not speaking of the inevitable indebtedness caused by modern warfare. Nor are we objecting to reasonable amounts spent for justified foreign aid. But, there has been a willingness to blindly spend for spending sake, a philosophy which teaches that the wilful and prodigal increase of the national debt for the sake of placating voters, or "priming the pump," is a justified economic procedure. To this writer such a philosophy comes from minds either unwilling to admit basic economic laws, or from some (and there may be both kinds represented here), who would wilfully lead our nation to fiscal chaos.

True statesmanship demands that our citizens be faced with the facts. The government does not make the money it spends—it comes from the taxpayers. For those in government to manipulate such funds for political purposes, or refuse to acquaint the public with the cold hard facts of debt and solvency, is tragically short-sighted. Social gains are desirable, and some in our country were long past due, but these are "gains" only when based on sound economic principles.

In some quarters the Church has seen fit to foster and further certain economic policies. Never, as far as we know, has a responsible Church court warned the government against the moral and spiritual implications of an

ever-increasing national debt. If such a warning is "out of place," then the economic policies which have been advocated in some Church circles are even more uncalled for.

The recent increase in salaries for the members of congress and the judiciary are, we believe, long over due. We, as Christians, could well express our approval of these measures while, at the same time, telling our elected representatives in Washington that the time has come when we should balance the budget and start paying off our national indebtedness.

This we believe to be both basically Christian and also *sound economics*. —L. N. B.

The Use of Pictures of Jesus for Worship

Several years ago in these columns, the writer asked: *Is the use of pictures of Jesus in worship Presbyterian?* The editorial received favorable comment, particularly from missionaries who had seen the evils of the use of pictures and statues in sundry religions. A really able article by our distinguished Korean missionary, Dr. J. V. N. Talmadge, was called forth. Dr. Talmadge pointed out that he could use a score of pictures of Biblical events, showing Jesus doing this and that which the Gospels record Him as doing. But he would not use a single picture of the face of Jesus, for in that case, such a wholly imaginary picture would become fixed in the minds of the believers as though it were a real likeness of Jesus. Then it would evoke to that picture religious emotions that should be directed only to our crucified and risen Lord and from this fictitious picture blessings would be sought that can come only from the living Christ reigning at the right hand of God.

At this time, we again invite the fathers and brethren of the Church, yes and the elect ladies thereof, to reconsider this matter. And that for the following reasons:

First, the Second Commandment. Thou shalt not make unto thee any likeness . . . thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve (worship) them. And our Lord Jesus says, If ye love ME, ye will keep my commandments. Again, He warns us not to break or teach others to break even the least of His commandments.

Secondly, our Church's official interpretation of this Commandment as given in the Larger Catechism. Answer 109 states that the second commandment forbids, "the making of any representation of God, or all, or of any of the three Persons, either inwardly in our mind, or outwardly in any kind of image or likeness of any creature whatsoever; all worshipping of it, or God in it by it." A purely imaginary picture of Jesus with the text, "I am with You Always" written across it, comes very near being an effort to represent the Second

Person of the Godhead. For, whatever may be held in Lutheran theology, the Reformed faith insists that only the Divine Person, not the human nature, can be everywhere present at the same time.

Thirdly, the early Church art as set forth in such histories as those by Schaff and Liezmann. This art was limited to what was merely decorative, symbolic, or didactic. Christ might be symbolized by a fish, an anchor, or an everyday shepherd carrying a lamb. In the last case, the picture was not an effort to portray the features of Jesus, but to say that as this shepherd carries his lamb, even so the Good Shepherd carries the lamb we have buried here, in His bosom. There were pictures of Biblical events such as Daniel in the Lion's Den or Jesus healing the man lowered through the roof. But the purpose here was to teach the event. Every effort to represent the features of Jesus was absent because of the Second Commandment, and also because there was a difference of opinion as to whether His visage was marred more than any man in His whole life, or only in his crucifixion.

Fourthly, the doctrine of the Reformed Reformation. In distinction from our dear Lutheran brethren, our Reformed Reformation numbered the commandments differently so as to bring out the full meaning of what we denominate the Second Commandment. As a result, pictures and statues and crucifixes were removed from the old sanctuaries when they became Reformed Churches. When the lines were drawn distinguishing the Reformed from the Lutheran Reformation in Upper Hesse in 1607 the first two Reformed points were: The Commandments (especially the second) and the abolition of pictures. In the abbreviated form of the Ten Commandments taught in Luther's Child Catechism the commandment we number second is gone. It is treated as part of the first and dropped in the abbreviation. Of course, it appears in the full text of the Ten Commandments published in the same book.

Fifthly, the New Testament does not set forth that Christ is to dwell in us by a picture carried in a wallet, nor shown on a screen at the end of an appeal for dedication. The Epistle to the Ephesians prays that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith, and Colossians exhorts us to let the Word of Christ dwell in us richly.

Sixthly, the worship-center that the living God has Himself established. Neither in the Old nor in the New Covenants has God set up a picture as the center of true worship. In the Old, the center was the ark hidden behind the curtain in the Holy of Holies. In the New, the center is the Lamb standing in the midst of the Throne as it had been sacrificed, the High Priest ever living to intercede for us. This center is in heaven, in the Tabernacle that God pitched, not man.

Anyone who sets up another worship-center is challenging the sufficiency of the One God has established, and in so far as the other is success-

ful, it detracts from the One God has ordained. If the eye of faith focuses on a picture or statue or crucifix amid candles at the focal center of a sanctuary, by that very fact the eye of faith is so far deflected from focusing on the Lord Jesus Christ, living, interceding on the basis of His completed work, speaking through His own Word, reigning by His Spirit. There is power, coming ever from the worship-center God has established—His people. There is no power that really comes from a picture. And that this is a danger for Protestant people is shown in a letter which a fine Pastor in West Virginia has written of two cases where Protestant people prayed to pictures for grace and for healing to come from these pictures.

Seventh, the fact that many of these pictures are perpetuating the now outmoded image of the "liberal" Jesus. At a Seminar in McCormick Theological Seminary last summer, Dr. Daniel Jenkins of the University of Chicago pointed out that the conception of the "liberal" Jesus advocated by such men as Dr. Fosdick was now outmoded, and was preserved in these "Icons of the liberal Jesus," such as Sallman's head of Christ.—WCR.

The Power of Resurrection

Some sixteen years ago the Easter Message in *The Presbyterian Tribune* bore the title "Risen with Christ." That article denied the historicity and the objectivity of the Resurrection of Christ. It made this only a subjective, inner, experience of a few people who felt the presence of Jesus. This is described as turning from physical-mindedness to spiritual-mindedness in which they, with Sir Oliver Lodge and R. W. Emerson, realize the value of the immortality of the soul. By this subjective experience with Jesus one grows surer of the immortality of the soul.

A year or two earlier, an American theologian called for *The Recovery of Ideals* and offered as a continuing creed a transmutation of the mighty acts of God in Christ into general truths, thus:

I believe in a continuing incarnation—symbol of the eternal union of God with man . . .

I believe in a continuing cross—symbol of the eternal union of love with suffering . . .

I believe in a continuing resurrection—symbol of the eternal union of tragedy with triumph.

Over against these forms of Platonism, the New Testament affirms the mighty act of God in raising Jesus our Lord from the dead, attested by those who saw, heard, and handled Him after His resurrection. Even prior to His death, Jesus told the Sadducees the reason they rejected the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was that they knew not the Scripture or