

# CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING  
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by  
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND  
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO.,  
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-JUNE, 1932  
Vol. 3 No. 2

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE  
Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at  
the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the  
Act of March 3, 1879.

## Christianity and External Authority

A GENERATION or two ago those calling themselves Christians were practically unanimous in holding that Christianity derived both its content and its sanction from external authority. Protestants and Roman Catholics differed as to the proximate seat of this authority—whether in the Bible or the Church—but they were wholly at one in their recognition of its existence. It is a historical error of the first magnitude to suppose that the Protestant doctrine of private judgment as advocated by our fathers carried with it a rejection of the idea of external authority in the sphere of religion.

Seventy-five years ago the rejection of external authority in religion was for the most part confined to those who were professedly antagonistic to Christianity. Today, however, such denial is an outstanding characteristic of multitudes of professing Christians, including many would-be leaders. We do not have to look outside the circle of the Presbyterian ministry to find those to whom the very idea of an external authority is anathema, notwithstanding the fact that without exception they have solemnly vowed that they believe that "the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice." How in view of this palpable contradiction they are able to retain a sense of intellectual honesty and moral integrity we do not profess to be able to explain.

Various causes have contributed to the bringing about of the existing situation. One of the most potent of these has been

the spread of modern evolutionary ideas. Where such ideas are dominant, all things are regarded as in a state of flux. There is nothing fixed or stable. Relativity belongs to the very essence of reality. If Evolutionism expresses the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, it needs no labored argument to prove that there is no such thing as an infallible authority in any sphere of life. In that case the existence of such an

authority is impossible in the very nature of things.

A closely related but deeper cause is that naturalism of thought and sentiment so characteristic of present-day thought, according to which the whole history of the world and man including religion and morality has come to pass without the operation of any supernatural factor. It is clear that in as far as we are naturalistic in thought and sentiment, we are precluded from the recognition of an external authority that speaks in terms of finality; for if there is such an authority it has a supernatural sanction. No doubt there may be a recognition of such external authority as the State, for instance, exercises where there is no recognition of the supernatural; but the existence of an external authority in any sphere of life that speaks in terms of finality is inextricably bound up with the reality of the supernatural as a factor in human life.

Other causes that have been potent are indicated when we speak of Rationalism and Mysticism. We mention these together because they are at one in finding the seat of authority within man himself. What is more, there is much to warrant the statement that the difference between Rationalists and Mystics is largely temperamental. "Warm up a rationalist and you have a mystic; cool down a mystic and you have a rationalist." Be this as it may, as belief in either Rationalism or Mysticism spreads belief in an external authority wanes.

### IN THIS ISSUE:

#### Editorial Notes and Comments

The Denver Assembly.....	2
Putting First Things First.....	3
Dr. Machen's Denver Sermon.....	4
What is an Evangelical?.....	4
The Popularity of Jesus.....	5
R. B. Kuiper	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	8
J. G. Machen	
The 144th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.....	10
H. McA. Griffiths	
The Fourth Montreat Assembly.....	18
J. B. Morton	
The United Presbyterian Assembly....	20
A. G. MacLennan	
The 58th Canadian General Assembly.....	21

In view of the currents of thought that flow up and down the modern world—some of which have been mentioned—it is not at all surprising that many should be telling us that the very idea of the existence of an external authority in religion and morals is outgrown. Despite the number and standing of these men, however, and despite the confidence with which they speak, we refuse to allow ourselves to be stampeded by their statements. In our judgment they speak without knowledge. We not only believe in the existence of an external authority in religion and morals, we believe that its recognition is indispensable to the very existence of Christianity as taught in the Bible and in all the great historic creeds of the Church. It seems to us therefore that the whole mass of that evidence that may be cited to prove the truth of Christianity may also be cited to prove the existence of an external authority in religion and morals. It is not too much to say, we believe, that Christianity stands or falls with the existence or non-existence of an external authority that tells us what we should believe concerning God and the duty He requires of us. The fact that the new Protestantism, so called, in distinction from both Roman Catholicism and the older Protestantism, denies the existence of such an authority is merely one indication of the extent to which it has ceased to be Christian.

That the existence of such an external authority is a prerequisite to Christianity is closely related to the fact that Christianity is a revealed religion. It is, of course, true that revelation lies at the basis of all religion worthy of the name. This follows from the fact that God is a person, and as such can be known only as He makes Himself known, only as He reveals Himself. But while there is a broad sense in which all religions may be spoken of as revealed religions, since apart from such general revelation of God as is to be found in His works of creation and providence there would be no such thing as religion in any proper sense of the word; yet, strictly speaking, there is but one revealed religion, because Christianity alone is based on that special, supernatural revelation—in word and deed—recorded in the Bible. As a result,

Christianity has what is lacking in all religions where there is no recognition of special, supernatural revelation, viz., the element of external authority. External authority, in other words, is a correlate of special, supernatural revelation. Where such revelation exists (or is supposed to exist), and only there, is there any recognition of an external authority that speaks in tones of finality. Because Christianity as no other religion is based on and derives its content from special, supernatural revelation, it is dependent as no other religion upon the concept of external authority both for its existence and its maintenance. Whatever may be true of other religions, Christianity stands or falls with the validity of its external authority.

No one has written with fuller knowledge or with clearer insight on the relation between Christianity and external authority than has the late BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD. Fortunately the most important of his writings are being made available through the volumes now being issued by the Oxford University Press. The latest of these volumes, fresh from the press, entitled "Studies in Theology," contains two chapters that deal with this subject under the titles, "The Latest Phase of Historical Rationalism" and "Mysticism and Christianity." It is hoped that this volume will receive the attention its merits warrant. "There is nothing more important," he writes, "in the age in which we live than to bear constantly in mind that all the Christianity of Chris-

tianity rests precisely on 'external authority.' Religion, of course, we can have without 'external authority,' for man is a religious animal and will function religiously, always and everywhere. But Christianity, no. Christianity rests on 'external authority,' and that for the very good reason that it is not the product of man's religious sentiment but is a gift from God. To ask us to set aside 'external authority' and throw ourselves back on what we find within us alone—call it by whatever name you choose, 'religious experience,' 'the Christian consciousness,' 'the inner light,' 'the immanent divine'—is to ask us to discard Christianity and to revert to natural religion" (p. 659). It is especially pertinent to note as Dr. WARFIELD proceeds to point out that it is particularly those elements in Christianity that enables it to meet the needs of sinners that must be omitted if we reject the notion of external authority. "Above all other elements of Christianity, CHRIST and what CHRIST stands for, with the cross at the center, comes to us solely by 'external authority.' No 'external authority,' no CHRIST and no cross of CHRIST. For CHRIST is history, and CHRIST's cross is history, and mysticism which lives solely on what is within can have nothing to do with history; mysticism which seeks solely eternal verities can have nothing to do with time and that which has occurred in time" (p. 662).

Those who reject "external authority" have broken in principle with Christianity.

## Editorial Notes and Comments

### The Denver Assembly

THE General Assembly of 1932 has met and adjourned—and all things continue very much as they were. It could hardly have been otherwise in view of the fact that the same group that has been dominant in the Assembly since the election of Dr. CHARLES R. ERDMAN in 1925 was again in control.

There was nothing surprising about the election of Dr. KERR as Moderator. It was only what was anticipated as soon as it appeared that he was to have the support of the main section of the "organization." It

would seem, however, that all was not harmonious among the powers that be—as is indicated by the nomination of Dr. VANCE—but there was little doubt as to what would be the outcome. How fully Dr. KERR enjoys the confidence of those who have controlled the policies of the Church in recent years is evidenced, (1) by his membership in the General Council, (2) by the fact that he was nominated by a member of the Commission of Fifteen whose iniquitous report in 1926-1927 was all in favor of those who would make the Presbyterian Church an "inclusive" church, and (3) by the fact that his nomination was seconded by a signer of

that heretical document known as the Auburn Affirmation. We would not be understood as implying that Dr. KERR is not himself personally loyal to the faith as set forth in our Standards. All the information we possess indicates that he is. It is evident, however, that there will be disappointment among those most responsible for elevating him to his high position should he fail to use his influence to further the tendencies that have controlled the policies of the Church in recent years.

We think it regrettable that there was no candidate in the field who ran on an out-and-out conservative platform—a platform that would stress the fact that our troubles as a church are doctrinal more than ecclesiastical and that what is needed most of all is the placing in positions of power men who will bear clear-cut witness to the Bible as the Word of God and to the gospel of the grace of God as set forth in the Bible against all who oppose whether within or without the Church. We hardly think that such a man would have been elected, but we think it safe to say that he would have been second in the final vote. We think that as at present organized the Presbyterian Church places altogether too much power in the hands of a few men; but we have relatively small interest in a reorganization unless it be made in the interest of purifying the doctrinal witness of the Church. After all it makes little difference whether this or that man is Moderator, whether this or that man is a member of the General Council (and on down the list) apart from its bearing on the corporate testimony of the Church to the gospel of the grace of God in its purity and integrity. It has again been demonstrated, it seems to us, that the one way of breaking the power of what is popularly known as "the machine," that offers any possibility of success, is the one that stresses the fact that doctrinal differences are at the root of our troubles as a Church.

While out-voted at all points at the Denver Assembly, the "Fundamentalists," so-called, have reason to be encouraged as they face the future. Bad as was the Denver Assembly from their point of view, it was not as bad as was the Pittsburgh Assembly. They had what was lacking at Pittsburgh, viz., able and courageous voices to state and plead their cause. The *Rocky Mountain News* in summing up the Assembly paid them this tribute: "Although they were in the minority on virtually every issue which came to the Assembly floor, it was the Fundamentalist forces which infused color and spirit into the proceedings. They fought vigorously for abolition of the General Council, which they branded as autocracy, and for the severance of all relations with the Federal Council of Churches. But the beautifully co-ordinated church machine was too powerful for this wing and it was defeated in every skirmish." Not only were the "fundamentalists" very much alive at

Denver but they had a large measure of success in their attempt to secure the severance of relations with the Federal Council. In order to keep the Assembly from voting to sever relation with the Federal Council, the friends of the latter were compelled to admit that it needed reformation from within and to plead that no action be taken pending the coming meeting of the Council in the expectation that desired changes would then be made. Apparently no one had the hardihood to defend that Federal Council as it now is. We will await with interest the outcome of the approaching meeting of the Federal Council. Unless there is genuine reformation from within, severance of all relations with the Federal Council by the next Assembly is by no means unlikely.

A comprehensive report of the Proceedings of the 144th General Assembly, that is both descriptive and critical, will be found on the pages that follow. It is written by our Managing Editor who attended the Assembly as a commissioner from the Presbytery of Philadelphia and who as such did so much to keep the blue flag of historic Presbyterianism flying in connection with its meetings.

### Putting First Things First

MUCH present-day preaching has been aptly characterized as "suburban preaching." It deals with what lies on the periphery of the things of CHRIST rather than with what lies at their center. "Suburban," however, is about the last adjective that could be properly employed to describe the sermon preached by Dr. WILLIAM CROWE of St. Louis at the opening of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church. Dr. CROWE, who later was elected moderator, preached at the request of Elder R. A. DUNN, the retiring moderator. With Acts 21:8 as his text and "Evangelism" as his theme, Dr. CROWE dealt with what is and ever must remain the central task of the Church of JESUS CHRIST if it is to fulfill its God-given mission in the world. "Any church," he rightly said, "in any Synod or Presbytery, anywhere, that suffers the loss of the spirit of Evangelism (defined as the 'mighty urge of the Church of JESUS CHRIST to tell the story of incarnate Deity to all the world') either in its local parish or beyond its parish borders is surely facing a day when its candle-stick will be removed."

It is the neglect of this primary task through absorption in things of secondary importance that, according to Dr. CROWE, explains as nothing else the present-day weakness of the Church. Lack of church attendance, diminished income, and such like, are merely symptomatic of the real trouble. The seat of the trouble lies in "confused thinking on the part of preachers and people." We cite a few typical passages:

"When the pulpit loses its positive note and

the pew its positive faith—the faith that makes all things possible—foreboding must prevail. . . . 'Away with the supernatural' is a slogan that gains in popularity. The doctrine of sin is taboo, of regeneration, an apostolic fancy. . . . Therefore the whole head is sick, the whole heart faint. . . . The Church of JESUS CHRIST has allowed itself to become allied to a party of theorists, dominated by an idea of shallow social reformation, all the while forgetting that the great Head of the Church came into the world solely for the purpose of giving power to men to become the sons of God. . . . The only adequate solution is to be found in a return to the program of our Lord, which is Evangelism. The Church needs to retrace its steps and get back to the doing of one thing. May God help it to do that one thing well. . . . National prohibition is an achievement for the American people. But it is no business of the Church of JESUS CHRIST in its organized capacity to promote the addition of any amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is not the business of the Church of JESUS CHRIST in its organized capacity to promote the election of any candidate for the presidency of the United States. Nor is it the business of the Church of JESUS CHRIST in its organized capacity to assume responsibility for defeating any candidate for the presidency of the United States. If the Church keeps up its program of meddling in the business of other people, the time may come when it will advise me to use some particular kind of roofing on my warehouse. Instead of spiritualizing business and politics, the Church is bent upon secularizing the Gospel of CHRIST."

Dr. Crowe shows himself a true son of the Southern Presbyterian Church in his insistence on the principle of the strict spirituality of the Church with its corollary, the non-participation of the Church in its organized capacity in the political and secular. We are not certain that our views fully coincide with his at this point but unquestionably they do for the most part. What is more, his representation is in harmony with Chapter 31, sec. 4 of our Confession of Faith, which reads as follows: "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs, which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition, etc.," true as it may be that in our own Church it has been "more honored in the breach than the observance." As individual Christians we are of course under obligation to do everything in our power to solve the complex social, economic and political problems that confront us and that call loudly for solution; but when the Church in its organized capacity has dealt with these and similar matters it has almost invariably done so at the cost of being unfaithful to the main purpose for which CHRIST established it.

Perhaps few things are doing more today to weaken the power of the Church than these misguided efforts.

### Dr. Machen's Denver Sermon

FOR the information of my readers we are reproducing the exact text of news-summary of Dr. Machen's sermon in the First Avenue Presbyterian Church of Denver, during the recent assembly. This is the only form in which the sermon was released to the press.

"SUMMARY EXTRACT FROM SERMON  
By J. GRESHAM MACHEN, Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. Preached in the First Avenue Presbyterian Church, Denver, Sunday Morning, May 29, 1932.

"According to the Bible, a minister is not, as is often supposed today, a mere promotion agent of a society of general welfare, and he is not a specialist in the investigation of the human phenomenon of religion, but he is a 'steward of the mysteries of God.' His duty is to make known the facts about God which God has revealed in His Word.

"Not only an individual minister but also a church is a steward of the mysteries of God. But the important thing about a steward is that he should be faithful. Is the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. a faithful steward of the mysteries of God?

"That question must be answered in the negative. The Presbyterian Church is not a faithful but an unfaithful steward today.

"Suspicion of that fact is naturally aroused by the secrecy and the discouragement of fair and open discussion which prevails in the councils of the Church. A treasurer who is afraid to let his books be seen is under suspicion. So also is a Church that checks investigation of its doctrinal witness. A secret trial of an evangelical minister has recently been conducted in the Synod of Pennsylvania. Such secrecy offends against the most elementary principles of liberty and fair play, and places the Presbyterian Church on a distinctly lower ethical plane than that which prevails in the world at large. A similar temper prevails in the administrative procedure of the Church. The really serious questions are covered up by a mass of verbiage, and the deep-seated unfaithfulness of the Church is being concealed.

"But gradually the truth is coming to light. It is becoming increasingly plain that the Presbyterian Church is dominated by a tendency which is hostile or indifferent to the deep things of the Christian religion.

"That tendency is represented by the Modernist document commonly called the 'Auburn Affirmation' which declares that the virgin birth, the bodily resurrection, the miracles of CHRIST, the substitutionary

atonement are non-essential for the ministry, and which attacks vigorously the doctrine of the full truthfulness of the Bible.

"This Modernist document was signed by thirteen hundred ministers in the Church, and the position which it represents is dominant in the Church's affairs.

"For example, the gentleman who seconded the nomination of the present Moderator of the Assembly is a signer of this Modernist Affirmation; and the same gentleman is a member of the present governing Board of Princeton Seminary, an institution which formerly, before its enforced reorganization in 1929, was the leading opponent of the Modernism that the Affirmation represents. Four out of eight ministerial members of the 'Permanent Judicial Commission' (practically the supreme court of the Church) are signers of the same Modernist document. So is the editor of the only official journal, *The Presbyterian Magazine*. So is the General Secretary of the Board of National Missions and so are six out of sixteen ministerial members of that Board. So is the 'Candidates Secretary' of the Board of Foreign Missions, who has the delicate and important duty of interviewing candidates for the foreign mission field and of encouraging them or discouraging them in their purpose. So also are many others high in the councils of the Church. There can be no doubt whatever about the fact that the entire corporate business of the Church is dominated by a tendency quite contrary to that for which the Church has historically stood.

"What shall be done under such circumstances by Bible-believing Christians in the Church? In the first place, they should face the facts and lay the facts before God in prayer. They should cease repeating in parrot-like fashion the untruth that 'the Presbyterian Church is essentially sound.' In the second place, they should insist on faithful stewardship. If the present Boards and agencies cannot be radically reformed, new Boards and agencies should be organized to propagate faithfully the gospel of the LORD JESUS CHRIST. The present condition of the Presbyterian Church is an offence against God. But the Spirit of God is all-powerful, and the darkest hour sometimes just precedes the dawn."

### What is an Evangelical?

THIS always timely question has been given special timeliness by the action of the last Assembly relative to the Federal Council of the Churches of CHRIST in America. The Committee on Bills and Overtures in reporting on the various overtures that had been sent to the Assembly urging the severance of financial and functional relations with the Federal Council recommended no action "in view of informa-

tion set forth in the Blue Book, pages 130-143" (*Assembly Daily News* of May 31, p. 3). This recommendation, therefore, carried with it approval of the claim that the influence exerted by the Federal Council is "fundamentally evangelistic" in character (see last issue of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY*, p. 3). Apparently it was on the supposition that the Federal Council is "standing on the rock of evangelical faith" that the Assembly approved "by an overwhelming vote" to continue financial and other relations with this organization. In our judgment, the Assembly acted in ignorance of the real nature of the influence exerted by this organization. Did we not so judge we would be compelled to think that the great majority of those who constituted the last Assembly were themselves non-evangelicals. As a matter of fact we expressed ourselves with restraint when in our last issue we stated that "its influence is pronouncedly anti-evangelical and in many respects definitely anti-Christian."

It is true, no doubt, that the word "Evangelical," like the word, "Christian" is employed so loosely in current usage that it may mean little or nothing to call a man an Evangelical (Compare WARFIELD, *Biblical Doctrines*, 395). But if we take it in its historical meaning, and as it is employed by careful writers, it not only has a very definite meaning but it directs attention to what is basic and indispensable to Christianity as it is set forth in the official creeds of the churches that constitute the membership of the Federal Council of the Churches of CHRIST in America. An Evangelical, according to any right understanding of the word, is one who holds: (1) that all the power exerted in saving a sinner is from God; (2) that in saving men God deals with them individually and immediately.

In affirming that God deals with the individual immediately the Evangelical separates himself from the Sacerdotalists like the Roman Catholics who teach that God saves men through the instrumentalities He has established for that purpose, i. e. the Church and its ordinances. Now in this respect, it is of course true that the influences that radiated from the Federal Council are Evangelical in character. No one alleges that the Federal Council is dominated by Sacerdotalists. It is equally important, however—even more important—to remember that an Evangelical is one who affirms that salvation is wholly of God. Much as the Evangelical is opposed to the sacerdotalism of Rome that puts the Church and its ordinances between the individual soul and God, he is even more opposed to those who like the Unitarians hold to a naturalistic conception of salvation according to which man is really his own saviour. Now it seems to us that it cannot be successfully denied that the dominant influence in the Federal Council is hostile to this basic

(Concluded on Page 9)

difficult to decide. In either case, it is fairly clear what Paul means when he says that by withdrawing from his former table-companionship Peter was "compelling" the Gentiles to Judaize. The compulsion referred to was not physical compulsion; and it was not even the compulsion of any definite command or advice. Rather it was the compulsion which Peter was exerting by his example. He had accustomed those Gentile Christians to table-companionship with him. Then he withdrew from them because they did not keep the ceremonial law. Would they not draw the inference that if they were Christians they were Christians only of a second rank? If they wanted to continue the companionship which they had enjoyed with the chief of the original apostles of their Lord, they must apparently do as the Judaizers had told them to do—be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. We can understand how powerful such considerations must have been; they would lend much weight to what the Judaizers had always said.

But if the Gentiles yielded to such considerations, that would mean that they were putting trust in their own works as being necessary to the obtaining of merit with God. And that would mean, according to Paul, that they had fallen from grace and that Christ would profit them nothing.

### A Peril to Men's Souls

We shall never understand the situation unless we see that for a Gentile Christian to keep the ceremonial law was a very different thing, according to Paul, from a Jewish Christian's keeping of it. If, indeed, a Jewish Christian's keeping of it meant that the Jewish Christian regarded it as necessary to salvation—necessary in supplement to faith in Christ—then a Jewish Christian's keeping of it would be just as bad, according to Paul, as a Gentile Christian's. But the point is that a Jewish Christian's keeping of it did not necessarily mean that, whereas a Gentile Christian's necessarily did.

A Jewish Christian might keep the ceremonial law on the ground that the gospel was still being offered to the

Jewish people as such, and that therefore the time had not yet come when the corporate identity of the people should be broken up. But if a Gentile Christian kept the ceremonial law, then, since that ran counter to all national custom and to all ordinary considerations of policy, it could scarcely mean anything else than that it was regarded as being necessary to salvation—as being necessary in order that a man should belong to the people of God. It could scarcely be regarded otherwise—or, to put the thing more cautiously, it *would* as a matter of fact, under the circumstances that then prevailed, scarcely be regarded otherwise—than as a meritorious work which a man needed to perform in order to win the favor of God. But if it was so regarded, then, according to Paul, it was contrary to the very heart of the gospel of Christ. A man who tries to earn his salvation, or to do anything

towards earning it, has, according to Paul, done despite to the free grace of God.

It was into such a deadly error that Peter's conduct was leading the Gentile Christians at Antioch. If Peter had never begun to hold table-companionship with those Gentile Christians, it is not at all certain that Paul would ever have blamed him. Paul did not demand—for the present at least—that the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem should give up their Jewish manner of life. But when Peter had once accustomed the Gentile Christians to hold table-companionship with him, then his withdrawal from such table-companionship would tend to lead them to seek a continuance of their table-companionship with him by keeping the ceremonial law. And that would mean, for them, the adoption of a principle of justification by works and not by faith alone.

---

## Editorial Notes and Comments (Concluded)

doctrine of Evangelicalism. Doubtless a voice here and there, under the auspices of the Federal Council, has sounded this Evangelical note; but as a whole the voices that have proclaimed its messages have been voices that have been silent on the basic contention of Evangelicalism, viz., that man is utterly unable to save himself, that if he is to be saved at all he must be saved through faith in the God-man who bore our sins in His own body on the tree. How many of its spokesmen believe in the real deity of CHRIST? How many of them teach that salvation is wholly of God, a supernatural gift made available only through the expiatory death of the Son of God? How many of them teach that CHRIST is to be worshipped equally with the Father and the Holy Spirit? If we had to choose (as fortunately we do not) between the modernism of Fosdick and those like minded and the sacerdotalism of Rome, we would choose the latter as Rome with the whole of organized Christianity teaches that ultimately salvation is wholly of God. The most fatal of all heresies is the heresy that man can save himself. Either CHRIST must save him or he is forever lost.

There are three thought and life tendencies struggling for the mastery within Christendom—Sacerdotalism, Evangelicalism, and Naturalism (Modernism). These three tendencies are not merely one-sided or partial expressions of the same fundamental

truths. They are flatly opposed as regards their basic principles. Sacerdotalism and Evangelicalism have much in common as over against Naturalism—they both proclaim the supernaturalism of salvation. But their agreement at a number of points should not blind us to the fact that in other vital respects they are flatly opposed. Evangelicalism and Modernism have much in common as over against Sacerdotalism—they both proclaim the immediacy of the souls relation to God. But this should not blind us to the fact that in their doctrines of salvation they stand as the precise contradictions of each other. Neither of these tendencies, therefore, can join forces with another of them as against the third. Each must continue to occupy a position of antagonism against the other two, since the triumph of one of them would mean the extinction of the other two. As Evangelicals we express our determined opposition to Sacerdotalism when we deny that any man or institution stands between our souls and God; but our equally determined opposition to Modernism because we affirm that it is God and God alone who saves. Those who maintain that the Federal Council is "fundamentally evangelistic" apparently think that a man is an Evangelical merely because he is not a Roman Catholic. It would be difficult to imagine a more preposterous supposition.

No one who really knows what an Evangelical is—provided he has no sympathy with Modernism—can approve of the Federal Council as it is now functioning.