

UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

Vol. XLVIII.

OCTOBER, 1936.

No. 1.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAS OF THE REFORMATION ON EARLY AMERICAN EDUCATION.*

BY THE REV. EDWARD H. PRUDEN, Ph. D., D. D.,
*Professor in the University of Shanghai,
Shanghai, China.*

It is an undisputed fact that the early Protestant settlers in America were, for the most part, thoroughgoing Calvinists. Those who landed at Jamestown in 1607 and at Plymouth in 1620 were alike animated by the spirit which characterized the Reformer of Geneva. In the foreword of a recent historical treatise, Ralph H. Gabriel has the following to say: "Calvinism, that faith of the *Mayflower* folk, was the basis of the beliefs not only of the Puritans of New England, the Dutch of New York, the Moravians of Pennsylvania and the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians who in the eighteenth century guarded the frontier from Pennsylvania to the Carolinas, but even the Anglican doctrines of the planters south of the Potomac were colored by it."¹ And the educational principles which soon became operative in New England constituted no small part of this Calvinistic heritage. The influence of Calvin on these matters can be traced back through England and Scotland to

*The last in a series of three articles on "John Calvin and Religious Education," the others having appeared in the REVIEW of October, 1935, and April, 1936.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIANS: WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM THE PAST.*

BY THE REV. ERNEST TRICE THOMPSON, D. D., D. Litt.,
*Professor of Church History and Church Polity
in Union Theological Seminary,
Richmond, Virginia.*

It is generally difficult for me to choose a topic for an occasion of this sort. This year the problem was not so great. We are celebrating our Diamond Jubilee, the 75th anniversary of our birth as a denomination. And it seems to me most appropriate that we should look back over the way which God has led us, in order that we may chart our course more confidently for the future. I want to speak to you therefore on Southern Presbyterians—what we can learn from the past.

I am going to try to be modest. One of the best books dealing with Presbyterianism is the little book by Dr. Walter L. Lingle called "Presbyterians: Their History and Beliefs." Dr. Lingle tells us that when he had finished the manuscript of this book he gave it to his son to read and evaluate. When he had finished the boy said: "Father, I don't like it." And when Dr. Lingle pressed him for a reason, he replied: "You seem to think the Presbyterians are the whole cheese." That is a danger that one runs when he speaks or writes of the Presbyterian (or any other) denomination. I am going to try to avoid that danger. Some of you may think when I have finished that I have gone to the other extreme. To deal with our history critically may not be so flattering to our pride, but it will help us to advance the Kingdom more effectively in our own day and time.

*An address delivered at the opening of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., September 16, 1936.

I. Colonial Period.

Our Presbyterian ancestors have been in America for a long time. They came to Virginia in the days of Captain John Smith; they arrived in New England soon after the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock. Most of them however came in the 18th century, beginning about 1725 and continuing to the eve of the Revolution. Some came for economic reasons, that they might better their fortunes in the new world; many of them for religious reasons, that they might worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. They came mostly from four great countries: England, France, Scotland and Ireland, with a smaller number from Germany. Puritans from England, Huguenots from France, Presbyterians from Scotland and the north of Ireland, Reformed from Germany, each added an essential element to our Presbyterian stock.

The first ingredient was the Puritan. Some of us may not acknowledge this with pride. The word "Puritan" has come into disrepute. None of us today want to be regarded as "puritanic." We need to remember however that the Puritan is almost always sadly caricatured, and sometimes grossly libeled. No doubt he was extreme in many of his views. But there is danger today that we shall remember his faults and forget his virtues. In thinking of this people who have contributed so much to our church and done so much for the upbuilding of America we might recall the words of John Richard Green. After speaking of the severity of the Puritan regime and the inevitable reaction under Charles II, he says in his classic *History of the English People*: "As soon as the wild orgy of the Restoration was over, men began to see that nothing really worthy in the work of Puritanism had been undone. It left them what Puritanism had made them, serious, earnest, sober in life and conduct, firm in the love of Protestantism and of freedom. Slowly, but steadily it introduced its own seriousness and purity into English society, literature and politics. The history of

English progress since the Restoration on its moral and spiritual sides has been the history of Puritanism." The Puritans, he might have added, have done more to lay the moral and religious foundations of America than any other group.

The second ingredient was the Huguenot. Preserved Smith in his "Age of the Reformation" says: "Of all the fine types of French manhood that of the Huguenot is one of the finest. Gallic gaiety is tempered with earnestness; intrepidity is strengthened with a new moral fibre like that of steel."

The Huguenots suffered more severely for their faith, and more extensively, I think, than any other people. They came to America in great numbers after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685.

The third ingredient was the Scotch. The people of Scotland had been won to Presbyterian by John Knox. Williston Walker in his "History of the Christian Church" says: "He was, to the utmost fibre of his being, typical of the land of his birth. Intense, religious, argumentative, democratic, fearless, intolerant, forceful, he led Scotland as no other man in its history has done. He influenced the character and religion of his nation as no other."

I do not know whether we would admit it or not, but I am afraid we Presbyterians share some of the weaknesses of John Knox. We also share some of his strength. Scotch Presbyterians came to America after 1660, many of them driven to this land by the fierce persecutions which arose in the days of the Covenanters.

The fourth and by far the most important ingredient was the Scotch-Irish. These descendants of the Scotch who settled in Northern Ireland came to America in tiny dribblets after 1660, in great waves after 1725, so that by the end of the colonial period they constituted one of the largest single elements in the American colonies. They came partly for religious reasons, persecution continuing in Ireland long after it had ceased in the rest of the British Isles, but mostly for economic reasons, their rents increased, their trade stifled by the exactions

of the English. One stream directed its course toward New England. The Scotch-Irish found it difficult however to practice their religion in a country dominated by Congregationalism, and ultimately most of them found their way into New York, adding strength to the Presbyterian churches of that state. Another stream entered America by way of Charleston, in South Carolina. Finding the tidewater section already preempted they sought the fertile forest lands of the upper country and gradually extended their settlements southward and northward. The great mass of the Scotch-Irish however entered America by way of the Delaware River, debarking at Newcastle or Philadelphia. Most of them made their way westward, realizing that the best opportunity for their families and themselves was on the frontier. Western Pennsylvania, the section about Pittsburgh, is today the stronghold of Presbyterianism in America. It was inevitable that sooner or later some of these adventurous Scotch would discover the fertile Valley of Western Virginia. Immigration here began about 1732; eight years later the Scotch-Irish had begun to pour through the foothills of North Carolina, and ten years later still into the South Carolina Piedmont and into upland Georgia. After the Revolution the same people led the way across the Alleghanies. Theodore Roosevelt in "The Winning of the West," says: "They were the first and last set of immigrants to plunge into the wilderness, all others having merely followed in the wake of their predecessors. As a result they put the stamp of their strong moral and religious convictions on a wider range of colonial possessions than any other element of the population."

As a result of this fourfold immigration and the strenuous home missionary endeavor, especially of the Northern Presbyteries, the Presbyterian Church which began its organized existence rather late (in 1706) had become by the opening of the Revolution the second largest church in America. The largest church was the Congregational, the second, the Presbyterian, third, the Baptist, and, fourth, the Episcopalian (Church of England). The Congregationalists were confined to New Eng-

land. The Presbyterians had their strength in the Middle colonies and along the frontier, a stalwart barrier of strong and sinewy men, thrust in between the Indians to the west and the older colonists along the Atlantic seaboard.

But in spite of its rapid growth the Presbyterian Church, particularly in the South, had not lived up to its opportunities or met the needs even of its own people. Thus it is estimated that in North Carolina there were by 1760 40,000 Scotch-Irish with Presbyterian traditions. In this same year there were not more than fifteen or twenty Presbyterian congregations among the Scotch-Irish in the whole colony, and sixteen years later when the Revolution broke out Scotch-Irish Presbyterians did not number more than three or four thousand. Scotch Highlanders began to settle along the Cape Fear River as early as 1729, but there was no minister among this Gaelic-speaking folk till 1757, and except for a few brief years one minister served till after the Revolution. Huguenots came to Virginia and to South Carolina to preserve their Presbyterian faith. Receiving little help from the Presbyterian Church, most of them ultimately became members of the Establishment (Church of England).

The Presbyterian missionaries were not able to collect their own Presbyterian folk. They made little or no effort to reach the non-Presbyterian population in the South except for a brief interval in Eastern Virginia. The Episcopal Church was the established church in all the Southern colonies. It failed dismally to meet the needs of the masses of the people. In 1700 it is estimated that not more than five per cent of the population were in touch with the church. The Presbyterians were the first evangelical group to enter Virginia and should therefore have swept the state. After a few years however their evangelistic zeal declined, and missionary interest confined itself once more to the Scotch-Irish in the Valley. After they had had their opportunity, and had failed, the Baptists came and succeeded. The growth of the latter was due not to immigration, as was that of the Presbyterians, but to evangelism. The Pres-

byterians were handicapped so far as numbers were concerned by the high educational standards which they required of their ministers. The schools in Pennsylvania and New Jersey and the educational institutions established in Virginia shortly before the Revolution could not produce enough ministers to serve established congregations, to say nothing of reaching out for the unchurched. The Baptists had no such restrictions, and their missionaries outnumbered those of the Presbyterians almost twenty to one. The church with the largest number of missionaries and with the most aggressive missionary policy had won by the end of the colonial period that numerical ascendancy in Virginia which they have retained in Virginia and the South down to the present day.

II. *Ante-Bellum Period.*

Throughout the colonial period the mass of the American people were little touched by organized religion. In 1776 there were more unchurched people in America than in any other so-called Christian land. Following the Revolution there was a great spiritual decline. The moral and religious life of America reached its lowest ebb. Only five or six persons out of a hundred were members of the Christian church. Atheism and scepticism were gaining ground. Enemies of the church were predicting its early demise.

It was just at this time when the church was smallest, proportionally, in numbers and weakest in resources that heavy migration began to the West. It was one of the greatest mass movements that the world has ever known. Hundreds, thousands, millions of people crossed the Alleghanies and settled in the great Mississippi Valley. Most of those who went had no interest in religion. Missionaries beyond the Mississippi estimated that not one family in fifty possessed a copy of the Scriptures. Many of course took their Bibles, and their catechisms too, but they went into a land where there were no settlements and no churches. The hardships of the frontier

along with separation from the ordinances of religion left the spiritual life undernourished. The moral life deteriorated, and many of the frontier settlements were characterized by lawlessness, vice and crime.

To follow this hurrying, heedless throng into the wilderness, over forest trails and mountain paths and unbridged rivers, to arouse the indifferent, to awaken the sinner, to seek out and tend those who were concerned was a gigantic undertaking, the most difficult, the most momentous task ever faced by the American churches. The future of religion, the future of America itself, depended upon the way in which Christians met the challenge of the West. And the churches which met that need most successfully were destined to become the great popular churches of the future.

Presbyterians were the first to send their missionaries across the Alleghanies in pursuit of the fleeing pioneers. They occupied, as we have seen, the strategic position for the winning of the West. Their churches extended in a line along the frontier from North to South, and it was their people who led the way across the mountains. The Presbyterian Church was the second largest church in the nation. To crown it all, the Congregational Church, largest in numbers, and at that time thoroughly Calvinistic, entered into a Plan of Union with the Presbyterian Church in 1801 under which Presbyterians and Congregationalists would cooperate rather than compete in carrying the gospel to the West. It so happened that a very large proportion of the churches founded by Congregational missionaries and composed of Congregational stock came ultimately into the Presbyterian Church. As a result it may be said that Congregationalists and Presbyterians labored together to build up Presbyterianism in a large part of the West. And yet in spite of these various strategic advantages the Presbyterian church in the first decades of the 19th century fell far behind the Baptists, and even the Methodists, whose first missionaries had come to America just a few years before the Revolution. We have a good illustration of what happened in Kentucky. This state had been settled very largely by the Scotch-Irish,

and Presbyterian missionaries were early on the scene. In 1820 the state had a total population of 563,000. Approximately 50,000 were members of the Christian church. Of this number about 21,000 were Methodist, an equal number were Baptist, and only 3,700 were Presbyterian—and these were divided into two different groups. The same proportions hold for practically every southern state.

R. E. Thompson in his *History of the Presbyterian Church* says: "Had the [Presbyterian] church been able to maintain [its] position in the nation's religious life (the position it held at the end of the Revolution), and had it even been able to retain in its membership the children of the great Ulster immigration and to continue to assimilate the New England overflow, it would now take rank not as the third [now the fourth], but as the first of the great Protestant communions of America. The ranks of the Baptists and the Methodists, of the Episcopalians and the Disciples, have been swollen at its expense. Of the descendants of the Ulster Presbyterians in America probably not much above a third are today Presbyterian. However large the membership and extensive the influence of the church, therefore, it cannot be called successful even in holding its own, much less in aggressive power."

What is the explanation of this comparative failure on the part of the Presbyterians? Dr. Thompson gives as his first explanation: "The scholastic shape in which the doctrines of the church were presented in its confession and catechism, and the influence of these upon preaching and teaching. Calvinism," he adds, "as John Duncan well says, is 'a sheep in wolf's clothing.' It is sure to repel those who for the first time have their attention fixed on such things until further thought brings them to see that the difficulties which attend are not to be got rid of by denying man's inmost dependence upon God." The unfortunate schisms which again and again divided the Presbyterian body undoubtedly played a part. So also did its lack of an adequate home missionary plan.

But the fundamental explanation, which overshadows all the others, is lack of men. In every southern state the Pres-

byterian missionaries were outnumbered by Methodists and Baptists, approximately twelve to one. And one Presbyterian missionary, however consecrated, however able, could not accomplish the work of a dozen Methodists and a dozen Baptists. The Presbyterians lacked an adequate number of missionaries because of their lofty educational standards. They insisted that a man was not qualified to preach the gospel unless he had received a classical education. And such men could not be supplied in sufficient numbers to met the desperate needs of the rapidly growing west. We Presbyterians today ought to know that our church lost its opportunity of becoming the largest Protestant church in America because of just one thing, its insistence upon an educated ministry. To put it in other words, Baptists and Methodists gained numerical supremacy in America in the opening decades of the 19th century because they were willing to employ laborers on less exacting terms at a time when the fields were ripe and bending under the harvest.

The policy of the Presbyterians however had its compensations. There was no system of public education and the educated Presbyterian ministers taught and largely developed the educational life of the South. Dabney in his recent book, "Universal Education in the South," says, "The Presbyterians did more to start schools in the South and West than any other people." W. W. Sweets (a Methodist) in "The History of Religions in America," declares that the Presbyterians and Congregationalists made the largest contributions to the educational and cultural life of the frontier. And in his most recent work, "The Presbyterians, 1783-1840," he adds: "The various agencies . . . engaged in establishing Presbyterianism on the early frontier undoubtedly exerted the principal cultural and educational influence in that region for at least a third of the nineteenth century."

There was another advantage. L. W. Bacon (a Congregationalist), in his "History of American Christianity," says that in 1837, the time of the New School schism, the Presbyterian Church was the most influential religious body in the United States. Its numbers "were an inadequate measure of its in-

fluence. It represented in its ministry and membership the two most masterful races on the continent, the New England colonists and the Scotch-Irish immigrants; and the tenacity with which it had adhered to the tradition derived through both these lines, of admitting none but liberally educated men to its ministry, had given it exceptional social standing and control over men of intellectual strength and leadership." It is only fair to add that in almost every community today the Presbyterian Church has an influence far out of proportion to its actual numbers.

III. *Modern Period.*

Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States November 4, 1860. In December, South Carolina seceded from the Union, followed by the other states in the far South. Fort Sumter fell in April, 1865. President Lincoln issued immediately his call for 75,000 volunteers to crush the Southern rebellion. Virginia, forced to make a decision, aligned herself with the South. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church met in Philadelphia in May, in an atmosphere seething with excitement. All the southern states had seceded by this time except North Carolina and Tennessee. North Carolina withdrew from the Union four days after the opening of the Assembly. Eight days later, after extensive debate, the General Assembly adopted the famous Gardiner Spring Resolutions: "Resolved, that this General Assembly do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and strengthen, uphold and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble constitution; and to this constitution in all its provisions, requirements and principles we profess our unabated loyalty."

To me the surprising thing is not the adoption of these resolutions but the submission of a protest against the resolutions by the famous theologian Dr. Charles Hodge and 57 other commissioners to the Assembly. "We make this protest," they said, "not because we do not acknowledge loyalty to our

country to be a moral and religious duty . . . but because we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians is due, and its right to make that decision a condition of membership in our church”

That Northern men, loyal themselves to the Union, would risk inevitable misunderstanding at a time when the Union itself was endangered, and issue a protest of this sort, is truly remarkable. As a matter of fact, adoption of the Gardiner Spring Resolutions did not make loyalty to the Federal Government a condition of membership in the church. It was an *in thesi* deliverance, with no constitutional authority. The Hodge protest, however, drawn up by Northern men, expressed exactly the sentiments of the South. It was in fact difficult, practically impossible, for Southern Presbyterians to remain in a church which had pledged its allegiance to a government not merely alien but actively hostile to their own. During the ensuing Spring and Summer therefore the Southern Presbyteries renounced their connection with the Assembly, the chief reason being the “un-Christian and revolutionary action” of the General Assembly in the adoption of the Gardiner Spring Resolutions. Commissioners from these Presbyteries met in Augusta, Georgia, December 4, 1861, and organized the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.

It has been publicly stated during this Jubilee year that this church, our own church, has consistently avoided the mistakes of the parent organization. One of the most influential ministers in our church recently wrote: “In these years of suffering and high feeling, our church courts, assemblies, synods and Presbyteries held faithfully to their ideals of the spiritual and non-political character of the churches, and we search their records in vain for any political deliverances.” Unfortunately this is not true. The Southern Presbyterian Church, through its ministers and through its courts, supported the Confederacy just as loyally as the Northern Presbyterians supported the Federal Government, and the political deliverances are there

embedded in the deliverances of the Assembly. So far as I can see there is not much to choose between the two.

The Civil War continued for four long years. During its continuance a new conception of war emerged, the idea that war should be waged not only against combatants but also against non-combatants; that a deliberate attempt should be made to break down the morale of the civilian population, so as to bring the strife to a speedy end. This new method of war, the method of frightfulness, allowed by Grant, practiced by Sherman, is now accepted by all the "civilized" nations on the face of the globe. Naturally it worked unparalleled hardship on the South, which was slowly crushed under the feet of the invader. When the strife ended, its currency was worthless, its slaves freed, its land devastated, its property wantonly destroyed. The South which once had been the richest section of the nation was now the poorest. Even now we suffer from the blight of the Civil War, and the darker days of Reconstruction. Judged by almost every standard of social value the South today is backward compared to other sections of the country. To a large extent, though not altogether, this is due to the ravages of the War. Take, for example, the matter of education. The South spends more money per capita on education in proportion to its wealth than does the North, but due to its comparative poverty, to its larger proportion of children and to the necessity of maintaining a double system of education it lags far behind the other states of the Union. The same situation affects the institutions of the church. Our seminaries, our colleges, for example, are not endowed as adequately as those of the North. This is true not because men of means in the South are less generous than such men in the North, but because the total resources of the South are so much less than those of the North. As wealth increases in the South we have the right to expect that its possessors will be as generous to the institutions of the church as their brethren in other sections of the land.

Abraham Lincoln, who was not a member of any Christian church, delivered his second inaugural address in March, 1865,

pleading persuasively for "malice toward none; charity toward all." Two months later the Northern General Assembly declared its purpose to ignore the existence of the Southern Presbyterian Church and voted not to receive any Southern Presbyterian into membership unless he acknowledged that his former views regarding states' rights and slavery had been a sin. Southern Presbyterians smarted under the insult. The iron seemed to have entered their very soul. When in 1870 the Northern Presbyterians had a change of heart, and voluntarily offered us the right hand of fellowship, we refused to be reconciled. We stated that they had completely fallen from the faith, and proceeded to insult them almost if not quite as grievously as they had insulted us. I mention this because Southern Presbyterians generally assume that all the mistakes were made by one side. As a matter of fact, both branches of the church fell below the standards of Jesus Christ in those intensely bitter days that followed the Civil War. It is sad to recall that we did not formally recognize each other as brothers in Christ till 1883, almost twenty years after the ending of the war. Since that time however we have gotten along very well together. We cooperate now on the foreign mission field and on the home mission field, and various Synods cooperate in the field of Christian education. Some of us dream of the day—it is only a dream—when Presbyterians North and South, East and West will once more be united in the common faith and cooperate again for the advancement of God's cause at home and abroad.

Since the Civil War the Southern Presbyterian Church has gained slightly on the population. There are more Southern Presbyterians now in proportion to the population than there were seventy-five years ago. But a graph indicating accessions on confession of faith would reveal a series of mountain ranges. The mountain peaks would indicate years when the ratio of additions on confession of faith was high; the valleys, years when the ratio was low. And the disturbing fact revealed by such a chart is this: that each mountain peak is a little lower than its predecessor, and for many years now, almost

twenty years, in fact, the valley has been leveling down to a plain. This decline in the birth-rate of the church is due in part to a declining birth-rate in the nation and in particular to the declining birth-rate of the Presbyterian stock. It is partly due to the fact that a much larger proportion of the nation now belongs to the church than it did seventy-five years ago. But all this is only a partial explanation. The fact remains that we have not grown as rapidly in the last seventy-five years as the Methodists, the Baptists, or even the Northern Presbyterians. In recent years we have not even kept pace with the general population. At our present rate, in another seventy-five years there will not be as many Southern Presbyterians in proportion to the population as there are at the present time. Evangelism is certainly one of the vital problems that confronts our church today, and not only our church but all the churches in the land. A few years ago we depended very largely upon revivals. But a great change has taken place since the World War. In most all our cities, and increasingly in the country districts as well, those who come to revival services are already members of the church. Our recent churchwide evangelistic campaigns have been most disappointing in their results. It becomes more and more plain that we will have to discover new methods of reaching men for Christ. It looks as though we will have to put more dependence on the personal efforts of men and women in the ordinary contacts of life.

Then there is the problem of home missions. In every period in the past, the Presbyterian church has failed to measure up to its opportunities because seemingly it has failed to see the need. Today the situation is greatly changed. The old frontier is gone, many of our communities are badly overchurched. Nonetheless, populations continue to shift, new needs constantly develop. In the future as in the past the growth of the church will depend upon a wisely conceived, an adequately supported home missionary plan.

We seem to have come, too, to a critical period in our foreign missionary enterprise. In 1861, when our shores were blockaded by a relentless foe, our first General Assembly adopted

a ringing declaration of foreign mission purpose that has continued to inspire the church down to the present day. Under the influence of that declaration our church has been a great foreign mission church. We have given far more to the mission cause in proportion to our numbers than most other Protestant bodies in America. But in recent years a subtle change has occurred. It was natural and inevitable that foreign mission income should decline with the depression, but the decline set in before the depression came. Every minister with whom I have talked acknowledges that there is not the same sense of missionary obligation that there was a few years ago. It is our task today to nurture a new sense of missionary responsibility, to develop new motives for the support of the foreign missionary cause, to arouse a new passion for the salvation of souls at home and abroad.

We are facing new problems connected with the ministry itself. All through its history the Presbyterian Church has suffered from a lack of a sufficient number of ministers. Today some think we have more than we need. It would be more accurate to say that we have more than we can support. The salary we pay some of our home missionaries is a disgrace. At the same time we are one of the few of the larger denominations with no ministers' annuity scheme. More pressing just at present than the minister's support is the matter of vacancy and supply. It is continually borne in upon us that we have no system, and that until we do have some adequate system, innumerable ministers and innumerable churches will continue to suffer, and that the kingdom will continue to suffer.

Then, lastly, there is the problem of education. To my mind it is nothing less than a tragedy that the Presbyterian Church, which has made greater contributions to education in the South than any other denomination, and which definitely gave up its opportunity to become the largest Protestant denomination in America because of its insistence upon an educated ministry, is today falling behind other denominations in the support of its educational institutions. It is natural that the southern churches should fall behind those in the North. But

the Presbyterians in the South are lagging behind other denominations in the South. This is not due to lack of interest, surely, but, I suppose, to our smaller numbers, to the fact that we are attempting to carry too heavy a load and to the fact that many Presbyterians give more liberally to other causes than they do to their own church. We are not giving adequate support to our own institutions, and we are neglecting almost altogether religious work in the state institutions which train the greatest proportion of our Presbyterian students. Our colleges and seminaries meanwhile are not producing our due proportion of scholars,—preachers, yes,—but scholars, no.

These are some of the problems which our church faces at the present time. There are many others of course, problems which we must solve if the church is to advance in our own generation as it has advanced in some others. Perhaps I should end on a more optimistic note. But it seems to me that we ought to end our survey of our church's history with a glance at least at our present task.

As I look back over the history of Southern Presbyterianism three things stand out in bold relief.

First: The difficulties which we face today are light compared with the difficulties which our fathers faced,—in the colonial days, when they came to America that they might worship God according to their own conscience; in the ante-bellum days, when they faced the necessity of following that hurrying throng across the Alleghany mountains with the gospel of Christ; in the days of the Civil War; and the darker days of Reconstruction, when our fathers faced the necessity of building a new South out of the ashes of the old.

Second: The labors of Christians in one generation affect the labors of Christians in all subsequent generations. This is the one point that I have been most anxious to make. I think sometimes it is the most important lesson that history can teach. If we solve our problems successfully, our children will enjoy the fruit of our labors. If we fail to solve our problems, then the sins of the fathers, our sins, sins of omission as well as sins of commission, will be visited upon our children's children, not

only to the third or fourth generation, but even to the end of time.

The last thing is this: We Presbyterians are a strong and virile people. I will never forget the words of a Huguenot pastor spoken at one of our Pan-Presbyterian gatherings. He said: "I represent a great Presbyterian Church. I may say the greatest, when I think of what she has suffered for Christ, and for the cause of human liberty. And though we are weak now, our poverty has become the riches of the nations." In a sense, that could be said of the Presbyterian church as a whole. I will not say that Presbyterians have been more faithful to their Lord than members of other denominations. I am sure that is not true. But I will say as a matter of plain historic fact that Presbyterians have been called upon to suffer more extensively, and have suffered more extensively, for their faith than any other people. And though we are not the largest denomination in the world, no group has made greater contributions to the progress of God's Kingdom. We have the blood of the Huguenots, the blood of the Puritans, the blood of the Covenanters, flowing in our veins. And I am quite sure that the faith and the courage of the fathers will continue to live in their sons.

THE EVANGELISTIC CHALLENGE OF CHANGE IN HOME MISSIONS.*

BY THE REV. WILLIAM R. KING, D. D.,
*Executive Secretary of the Home Missions Council,
New York City.*

One hesitates to announce such a theme in these days when so much is being said about "change" and "challenge." They are both very much overworked words. As a matter of fact,

*First of a series of three addresses delivered in the Home Missions Conference, Montreat, N. C., August 2-5, 1936, and kindly furnished us through our Executive Secretary of Home Missions, Dr. Homer McMillan, Atlanta, Ga.