

JCHN NUTE  
CCT 1935-R  
GRAND RIVER N S CAN

# 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., Inc.  
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

DECEMBER, 1934  
Vol. 5 No. 7

\$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.

## Editorial Notes and Comments

### BISHOP MANNING'S PRONOUNCEMENT

**T**HE sermon preached by BISHOP WILLIAM T. MANNING, of New York, on October 21st, at Atlantic City, in connection with the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, continues to attract attention and comment. On that occasion, it will be recalled, BISHOP MANNING affirmed with all possible clarity and emphasis that the Protestant Episcopal Church as regards both its faith and its doctrine of the ministry is "fundamentally and definitely Catholic." "Her distinctive beliefs," he said, "are those which have been held and taught by the Catholic Church throughout the world since the Apostles' days, and she cannot compromise this position without disloyalty to her principles and disloyalty to her past . . . she holds definitely to the doctrine of the priesthood and to the necessity of Episcopal ordination." Most of these comments have been unfavorable. Many Episcopalians do not share the High Church views of BISHOP MANNING and so sympathize with Protestantism rather than Greek and Roman Catholicism. In fact it is hardly too much to say that apart from the Anglo-Catholic section of the Episcopal Church these comments have been generally unfavorable. Protestants in general, whether liberals or conservatives, by reason of the fact that they are Protestants, while they may commend BISHOP MANNING's upright attitude, have small sympathy with his anti-Protestant views. Roman Catholics on the other hand look upon BISHOP MANNING's Catholicism as a pseudo-Catholicism and do not recognize the validity of Episcopal ordination any more than Presbyterian ordination. The Anglo-Catholics are in the rather unenviable position of affirming that their position is in harmony with that of most of Christendom but finding no one except themselves to admit their claim.

BISHOP MANNING's pronouncement has significance largely because of its bearing on Church union. It indicates an insuperable barrier in the way of union between the Episcopal and other Protestant churches. So far from regarding Episcopal ordination as essential to the being of the Christian Church, Protestants in general do not even regard it as essential to or even as promoting the well-being of the Christian Church. We are disposed to look upon Anglo-Catholicism as a half-way position between Protestantism and Catholicism that has the disadvantages of both and the advantages of neither. But serious as is the obstacle that different conceptions of the ministry places in the way of Church union, it is by no means as serious as are the different conceptions that exist as to the Gospel itself. The difference between the Modernists and the so-called Fundamentalists is far deeper and wider than the difference between the sacerdotal and the evangelical conceptions of the ministry. Insistence on Episcopal ordination is a more or less harmless delusion as compared with the conten-

tion that Modernism in any of its consistent forms is an expression of Christianity. And yet there are plenty of "Presbyterians" who think that the "Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy" is much ado about nothing!

### "THAT NEW FOREIGN BOARD"

**U**NDER this heading DR. HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, President of Union Theological Seminary of New York, has written and the *Presbyterian Tribune* has printed (November 1) an article dealing with the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions with special reference to the character of its members and the action of the last Assembly instructing the presbyteries to discipline them for their "disorderly and disloyal" conduct. Inasmuch as Modernism in the Foreign Board was the occasion of the setting up of the Independent Board, it is illuminative as well as interesting to know what so outstanding a Modernist as DR. COFFIN thinks about the matter in question.

It may be noted, in the first place, that DR. COFFIN has no word of criticism for "our officially constituted Board." He has only praise for those connected with it. "The General Assembly," he writes, "has done well to state the truth concerning the fidelity of its tried and trusted servants, and to call on congregations to sustain them." It may be a source of satisfaction to those in control of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions to be assured that DR. COFFIN fully approves their conduct of the missionary enterprise. It can hardly be expected, however, that Bible-believing Christians have obtained any satisfaction from this assurance and that as a result they will be led to feel that they ought to do more in the way of supporting said Board. Rather it is safe to assume that DR. COFFIN's whole-hearted approval of the official Board will strengthen them in the conviction that the official Board, as at present constituted, is unworthy of their confidence and undeserving of their support. This is not to deny that there are many sound missionaries working under the auspices of the official Board. Neither is it necessary to imply that Bible-believing Christians may not safely contribute to foreign missions through the official Board—provided they designate their gifts in such a way that they can be used only for the support of sound missionaries. Those who give undesignated funds, however, can have no assurance that a part or even that the whole of it will not be used to further Modernism. If the policy of the Board was anti-modernistic we may be sure that it would not have DR. COFFIN's unstinted praise.

It may be noted, in the second place, that DR. COFFIN holds that the last Assembly "acted unwisely" when it directed the presbyteries to discipline any and all Presbyterians connected with the Independent Board. He seems to be sceptical as to the validity of the legal argument by which the General Council seeks to justify its action. At any rate he says that he read it "with mixed

## THE REFORMATION FELLOWSHIP AND THE AUBURN AFFIRMATION

**W**IDESPREAD publicity has been given to the fact that an organization known as the Reformation Fellowship had endorsed the action of certain of its officers in initiating judicial proceedings in Philadelphia Presbytery against those of its members who are signers of the Auburn Affirmation. Whether they will succeed in getting the Presbytery to consider the charges they have filed against these Auburn Affirmationists remains to be seen. The editor of this paper is not a member of the Reformation Fellowship and so had nothing to do, directly or indirectly, with the filing of these charges. Had he been consulted in the matter he would probably have advised against the step, not on the ground that these charges were not well-grounded, but on the ground that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is dominated by the Modernist-Indifferentist party to such a degree that there did not exist reasonable grounds for supposing that such a case would be tried on its merits. That the Auburn Affirmationists are heretics—the Bible and the standards of the Presbyterian Church being judge—seems to him as clear as the distinction between sweet and bitter, between day and night. To cite PROFESSOR CASPAR WISTAR HODGE: "The plenary inspiration (and hence the inerrancy) of the Scriptures, the Virgin Birth and bodily Resurrection of Christ, His substitutionary Atonement by which He rendered a Satisfaction to Divine Justice, and His personal Return, are not only explicitly affirmed in the Westminster Confession, but are also essential to that common Christianity adhered to by the Romish, Greek, Lutheran and Reformed Churches, and essential to the Christianity of the New Testament." But to suppose that General Assemblies such as we have had in recent years and such as we are practically sure of having for some years to come would pronounce the Auburn Affirmationists to be heretics indicates a confidence in their intelligence and integrity that he does not have. In his opinion even if the Reformation Fellowship suc-

ceeds in its efforts to get the Presbytery of Philadelphia to consider these charges the case will ultimately be set aside on technical grounds—unless it be true that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has apostasized to such a degree that it is prepared formally to declare that the Auburn Affirmationists are perfectly sound and orthodox in their teachings. If the rank and file of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. really approve the views expressed in the Auburn Affirmation common honesty demands that said church revise its creeds so as to bring it in harmony with its real views. No church should sail under false colors. Should that be done those of us who in all heartiness and sincerity believe the Bible to be the Word of God and that the Westminster Confession of Faith contains the system of doctrine taught in the Bible will no longer be able to justify our continuance in the membership of this church. But as long as the official creed of the church remains as it is, we at least have the satisfaction of knowing that the creed we profess is in harmony with our actual views. Moreover, it seems to be our duty to remain in the Presbyterian Church and work for its reformation as long as the creed of the church remains substantially as it is or until it becomes clear that the rank and file of the church has apostasized to such a degree that it is hopeless to suppose that it will ever return to its first love.

The editor of this paper wishes the Reformation Fellowship success in its laudable attempt to reform the Church so that, to cite its Certificate of Incorporation, it "may be purified of unbelief and controlled only by those who recognize and believe the system of doctrine of the historic standards of the Reformed Faith." Moreover, while he thinks it more than doubtful whether it will succeed in its immediate objective he does not think that there is any statute of limitation that can fairly be pled as debarring it from prosecuting the signers of the Auburn Affirmation. Be that as it may the very fact that the Auburn Affirmationists are pleading the statute of limitations is in effect a confession that they are fearful of having this case tried on its merits.

## The Independent Board and Its Critics

By the Rev. David S. Clark, D.D.

**W**HOM the gods would destroy they first make mad." And we fear that the officialdom of the Presbyterian Church is mad in both senses of the word. *The Presbyterian*, while fair enough to include articles on both sides, takes occasion to say of the Fundamentalists: "We are not able to accept their *ipse dixit* as complete proof nor their assertion as a formal proved condemnation of the Assembly's Board." Further: "It ought to be remembered that critics of the Board have as yet never brought into any Church court a definite process for judicial attention. They are the judges in their own case. On the other hand the Board . . . does not wish for safety and peace alone, but to prosecute the cause of preaching the shed blood of Christ all over the world, with the unswerving loyalty of all, and that, not because nothing has been proved against the Board, but because there is nothing that *can be proved* against the Board." (Italics ours.) Shades of Blackstone ! ! ! ! What constitutes proof?

1. Has it ever been denied that some of Dr. Fosdick's books were translated by an agency with which the official Board works closely and sent to the mission field? Did not a secretary of the Board boast of this as one of the out-

standing events of the year? Report has it that "The Modern Use of the Bible" by Dr. Fosdick is used as a textbook in Nanking University with which our official Board co-operates. Too much Fosdick influence in our official Board.

2. Pearl Buck. We hope that episode is over; but how did it happen that she could say: "It makes no difference if Jesus Christ never lived," and remain a missionary of the Board till she voluntarily resigned?

3. We hope the Hadley episode is over, but how did it ever happen that an Auburn Affirmationist was made candidate secretary, and that prospective missionaries were advised to read modernist literature, as a preparation for their work? And now it is said that his resignation has been accepted with regret. Why not with thanksgiving?

4. "Unthinking Missions." We never did like a diet of milk and water. The Board's reaction was too tame and complaisant. But since the pastor of a very rich church in New York City was a member of the Laymen's Commission, and also on nearly every important Committee of the General Assembly, even to making the new Hymnal, we

figure that it seemed quite expedient for a money-seeking organization to try to please all sides.

5. James Speers, vice-president of the Board, advocates the Laymen's Report, and says: "Our earnest hope is that the Report will become more and more effective, as the inevitability of its major recommendations is recognized by an enlightened Christian public. The Committee perceives clearly the rising tide of interest in the new viewpoint of missions, and is profoundly grateful for the part the Report has played in arousing such interest. . . . The Committee wishes to express its deep conviction that the truth in the Report will ultimately prevail." *That* from the vice-president of the official Board, wishing that the Unitarian onslaught on evangelical missions might sweep the church!

6. Study-books, prepared by joint committees of various denominations, have been rather unsatisfactory to conservative Presbyterians, even the teen-age bearing witness to the paucity of religious material.

7. "No judicial process ever brought into a Church court for judicial attention." At least the Philadelphia Presbytery sent an overture to the 1933 Assembly, couched in respectful language, with not one disrespectful word in it, praying the Assembly to elect to the Board of Foreign Missions only such men as are true to our standards and awake to the dangers that are imminent. Even a liberal said: "Any Christian ought to vote for that." How was that overture treated? Absolutely rejected, its proponents labeled as trouble-makers, and stigmatized as "Guerrillas."

It makes no difference that the overture was administrative rather than "judicial," the temper of the Assembly was clearly against any reformation, or redress of grievances. It was because of positive refusal to remedy existing evils that the Independent Board came into existence. Dr. Machen and his friends are not to be blamed for the outcome; but the Assembly itself, and the official Board. They have George Thirded it so long and so arbitrarily that they have compelled a Declaration of Independence.

Dr. Mark Matthews writes voluminously and thunders vociferously about proceeding by constitutional processes. It sounds big and means little. How can a Board be charged with heresy and brought to trial for deliberate and joint actions? And what would be the use if it could? The Assembly that whitewashes the Board would acquit it in a judicial process. The Conservatives might as well save their powder and shot. *The Presbyterian* says: "There is nothing that can be proved against the Board." Of course not—if no proof is admitted. But nonetheless that is a pretty sweeping statement.

In penalizing the independents the Assembly has acted *ultra vires*. After all the labor and bluster about a Constitutional Church, and Court of Highest Authority, and overwhelming majorities, the coercionists have not made out a case. A fraction of liberty still belongs to members of the Presbyterian Church.

The following has been cited so often that it is commonplace: *Directory*:—"The offerings may be apportioned among the Boards of the church, and among other benev-

olent and Christian objects, under the supervision of the Session." The church Session has some liberties which the General Assembly cannot deny. The Assembly itself is subject to the Constitution.

A better declaration is found in the concurrent declarations of 1869, the force of which no Assembly can repeal: "There should be one set of Committees or Boards for Home and Foreign Missions, and the other religious enterprises of the church, which the churches should be encouraged to sustain, though free to cast their contributions into other channels if they desire to do so." That certainly establishes the right of any man to give his contributions to any cause he pleases, and if he chooses to give them to the Independent Board, he cannot be called to account.

8. Cleland B. McAfee, in the August number of *Women and Missions*, says: "The issue at Cleveland was not one of soundness in the faith, had nothing to do with 'modernism' or 'liberalism,' both of which had been disavowed in definite terms by the Board and the General Assembly in all their declarations." On the contrary, every one knows that the whole affair has grown out of the modernism of the official Board. If there had been no modernism in the official Board there never would have been an Independent Board. The facts penetrate any smoke screen that Dr. McAfee can throw around the official Board.

9. Dr. Covert in his letter to the pastors August 1, 1934, says: "These charges the General Assembly of 1933 heard at great length through its duly elected Standing Committee on Foreign Missions, which Standing Committee by a vote of 43 to 2, and the General Assembly, by an equally overwhelming vote, declared unfounded." If the General Assembly voted these charges unfounded it voted an egregious untruth. Was Mr. Hadley never Candidate Secretary? Was he not a signer of the Auburn Affirmation? Did he never commend modernist books? Did James Speers never commend the Laymen's Report? Were the Fosdick books never translated and sent to the Mission field? Is it unfounded that the perfectly reasonable overture from the Philadelphia Presbytery received scant recognition in the Assembly? Is it unfounded that the Board has in its membership some very decided modernists? Dr. Covert further says: "The right to control the property of the members of the church or to prescribe how they shall dispose of their money is utterly foreign to the spirit of Presbyterianism." On reading this an acute Presbyterian asked the categorical question: "Then what is he kicking about?" He is "kicking" that there should be any organization to solicit and receive it and call itself Presbyterian. But the existence of the Independent Board enables the Presbyterians to support the kind of missions they prefer. Otherwise they could only support some unPresbyterian agency since they cannot support the official Board with its bias to modernism.

10. The official Board cannot deny nor escape the charges made against it. And it has manifested no change of heart nor mended its ways up to the present minute.

(Concluded on page 167)

**TRUE ORTHODOXY**

By way of contrast with both faulty and false orthodoxy, it should now be possible to name a few characteristics of true orthodoxy.

True orthodoxy refuses to compromise with error. It insists on Christianity as the supernatural religion and opposes the onslaughts of naturalism all along the line. It firmly declines to add water to the pure wine of the Scriptural teaching of supernatural salvation.

True orthodoxy is well-balanced. It sees the truth as a unified system and diligently seeks to give to each constituent element the same relative emphasis which it receives in God's Word.

True orthodoxy is intolerant of error. Because it loves the truth passionately it cannot but hate falsehood. It is militant in its opposition to all and every denial of the truth.

True orthodoxy springs from the principle of spiritual life implanted in the heart by the Holy Spirit at the new birth, and it issues in the Christian life, a life of loving and grateful obedience to God's commandments.

True orthodoxy adheres to the historical Christian faith. It knows the truth well, loves the truth dearly, holds the truth sanely, defends the truth valiantly, proclaims the truth actively, obeys the truth gladly.

Such is genuine orthodoxy. American Protestantism is in peril of perishing for want of it. Without it a revival is unthinkable.

**The Independent Board and Its Critics**

(Concluded from page 160)

*The Presbyterian* is authority for saying that on July 5, 1934, Rev. Mr. and Mrs. Blank sailed under the auspices of the Board to spend two years teaching and preaching in our missionary stations. We are reliably informed that they are both modernists. How can the Church have confidence in a Board that promotes modernism so openly and flagrantly? Dr. McAfee's denial that modernism is the issue does not change the facts.

11. Nothing has brought more disrepute on the Assembly and the officialdom of the church than sundry attempts at coercion and persecution. The persistent attacks on Dr. Machen have become picayune, at once contemptible, and small business for grown-up men. The threats of the General Assembly have not increased respect for it. And certain letters sent by the Stated Clerk, and the actions of Baltimore Presbytery, and the Synod of Pennsylvania will go down into history as a disgrace to the Presbyterian Church. The young men who declined to say that they would support the Foreign Board were absolutely right in the stand they took. No Presbytery nor Synod has any right to make such a requirement a condition of ordination. It is clearly unconstitutional. And it is a sin to require a young man to forswear himself to any Board, when no one knows what that Board may do or become. Christ

says: "Thou shalt not forswear thyself." Again I say that these attempts at coercion constitute a moral offense.

Why are not letters sent to the New York Presbyteries about the graduates of Union and Auburn? Why are Westminster graduates singled out for threats and persecution? Why are those who are true to the Scriptures and the Constitution of the Church discriminated against while Auburn Affirmationists, who repudiated the essence of Christianity, were never touched? Such persecution of sound and worthy young men will take money from the official Board and turn it into the treasury of the Independent Board. The conservatives would be most happy to support the official Board if there were any certainty that their money would not be used to propagate modernism. It is a shame, *Shame*, SHAME that they are driven to separation against their wish by conditions in the official Board. The Board would have no more enthusiastic supporters than the Conservatives if the Board itself were free from blame. In separating from the official Board they are obeying New Testament requirements: "Come out from among them and be ye separate." Dr. Covert calls it a "divisive movement." Well such movements become a duty when the purity of the Church is threatened. Paul says: "Withdraw thyself from every brother that walketh disorderly." If the Independent Board is a rival to the official Board, as is stated, there are some who think it ought to be. Shall our money be used to translate and distribute Fosdick's books? There are some of us who will utter a decisive No; not one red copper. We dissent from any such use of our money. Let the official Board return from its modernistic meanderings, and the Independent Board will have no further reason to operate.

The charges against the official Board have been proved, in our estimation; and the pretended refutation has never come to notice. Where is the refutation of the things cited in this article? We would like to know.

A recent issue of the *Presbyterian* contains a "vicious attack" on Dr. Macartney from the pen of Dr. Wm. B. Pugh, in which Dr. Macartney is accused of using "incorrect statements," "unsupported assumptions," "unwarranted inferences," "serious discrepancies," and "false interpretations," and the accusations against the official Board from other sources are called "false charges."

Will Dr. Pugh kindly go over the charges one by one and vindicate the Board from all complicity in modernism? By so doing he will confer a great favor on the Board, and upon the Conservatives as well.

Briefly, it seems to us that Dr. Macartney stands for the authority of the Constitution; and Dr. Pugh assumes that unconstitutional deliverances of the General Assembly have the authority of the written Constitution;—the very thing that the liberals wrongly accused the Conservatives of doing in 1923. The deliverance of the General Assembly, though 1000 to 1 constitutes no constitutional law. Brethren, we live in free America not under Hitler nor the Bolsheviki.

Tacoma's First Church and Independent Board member, were rudely shattered. Dr. Brumbaugh was backed by a united session and people who plainly informed the Presbytery that the Church was one with its pastor, feeling ran high. The Judicial Committee recommended that since Dr. Brumbaugh refused to resign from the Independent Board and refused to recognize the constitutionality of the action of the last Assembly, that he be declared in contempt of Presbytery and not in good and regular standing. (This without the formality of a trial.) This motion was finally tabled and Presbytery passed a motion to refer the question of the constitutionality of the last Assembly's action to the Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly, and then, if its constitutionality were upheld, that the case should be considered by the Synod of Washington.

### Dr. Henry M. Woods Elected to Independent Board

IT HAS been announced that the Rev. Henry M. Woods, D.D., of Ventnor, N. J., has been elected as a member of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and has accepted. Dr. Woods is internationally known as a missionary and author. His election has unusual significance in view of the fact that he is not a minister of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Dr. Woods is a long-time minister and a former missionary of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., sometimes called the "Southern Presbyterian Church."

### C. K. Cummings Becomes Secretary for League of Evangelical Students

THE General Secretary of the League of Evangelical Students, Rev. William J. Jones, resigned from office as of September 1st, 1934. For five years Mr. Jones served the League sacrificially and efficiently. It is now his intention to enter the active work of the Baptist ministry.

It soon became evident to the League's Executive Committee that another Secretary had to be appointed as soon as it was financially possible. On October 15, 1934, after careful consideration and prayer they unanimously appointed Rev. Calvin Knox Cummings, A.B., as Field Secretary of the League of Evangelical Students. The Executive Committee rejoices that God has raised up a man so thoroughly acquainted with the work of the League and so eminently qualified in every way for this work. Mr. Cummings is a former President of the League chapter at Lafayette College. He is a graduate of Lafayette College and Westminster Theological Seminary. Mr. Cummings began his services with the League on October 15, 1934.

Mr. Cummings is to be known as the

Field Secretary of the League. In addition to carrying on the necessary correspondence, it will be his chief duty to work among the college students and preach in various pulpits in the interest of the League. He will greatly appreciate any contacts which chapter members may give him for speaking engagements and for student contacts.

The work of the League has been reorganized so as to give Mr. Cummings more time to work among the colleges and churches. The President, Mr. Stob, is to be responsible for the Convention program. The Vice-President, Mr. Pleva, will acknowledge receipt of gifts. The Secretary, Mr. Andrews, is to pay bills and keep an account of receipts and expenditures; Mr. Konrad, of the Executive, is to write chapters concerning dues and the One Step Forward Movement. Miss Latta, of Executive Committee, is to write the chapters concerning their sending in their reports and reaffirming their belief in the doctrinal position of the League. Headquarters is now at the Reformed Episcopal Seminary, 25 South 43rd Street, Philadelphia, Pa. The Reformed Episcopal Seminary has kindly extended the use of their endowed guest room for the League's headquarters.

### Name of H. W. Coray Erased by Presbytery

THE Presbytery of Lackawanna at its meeting on November 12th, held in the Italian Presbyterian Church of Dunmore, Pa., erased the name of the Rev. Henry W. Coray, missionary of the Independent Board, from its roll. The Rev. Herbert Ure, of Fordy Fort, Pa., was appointed to appear before the congregation and to declare the pulpit vacant. The Rev. Richard A. Rinker, of Pittston, was named Moderator of the session.

The action was opposed by the minority in the Presbytery and complaint will be entered against it.

### Shantung Mission Executive Committee Votes Against Hospitality

IT HAS been learned that on July 7th last the Executive Committee of the Shantung Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. passed a resolution virtually barring missionaries under its jurisdiction from entertaining other missionaries in their homes, save in short and temporary cases, unless consent is given by the Mission and the office of the Official Board in New York. Said to be aimed at the new missionaries sent out by the Independent Board, it was rumored that the action was suggested first in America, not China. It is as follows:

"LOYALTY TO THE BOARD AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

"We solemnly urge upon our Station

groups in these times of high tension and ecclesiastical strain to take no action, either officially or by common consent, which can by any chance be interpreted by any one as being disloyal to our Board and the General Assembly's recent specific directions.

"Invitation to missionaries of another Board to reside in or work within the bounds of a station should be given by the station or individuals of the station only upon consent of the Mission and the Board, as such would be virtually the consummation of an affiliation agreement with another body."

### Reformation Fellowship Holds Annual Members Meeting

THE annual meeting of members of the Reformation Fellowship was held on October 30th, at 8 o'clock in the auditorium of Bethel Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa. Significant actions: re-election of all sitting Trustees whose terms had expired, including the election for the first time by the members of two Trustees formerly elected to fill vacancies by the Board. They are: the Rev. J. U. Selwyn Toms, of Woodstown, N. J., and the Rev. Lawrence B. Gilmore, of Morristown, N. J. Election of the Rev. Prof. Cornelius Van Til, Ph.D., as a Trustee; endorsement of the action of the Trustees in favoring judicial process against Auburn Affirmationists. This process, endorsed by the Trustees, was initiated by five persons not in their capacity as Trustees of the Fellowship, but as Presbyterians. Two of the five co-prosecutors are not Trustees of the Fellowship, one of these not a member. Of the five, only two are members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Two are ministers (one of these a pastor), two are ruling elders, and one a layman.

### Northeastern Branch of Christian Assembly to Meet

THE Northeastern Pennsylvania Chapter of the Christian Assembly will meet on Monday evening, December 17th, at 8 o'clock, in the edifice of the Scranton, Pa., Conservatory of Music, Madison Avenue and Mulberry Street. The speaker will be the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, General Secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. A large attendance is expected by this fast growing, aggressive branch of the Assembly.

At its last meeting, held on October 26th, in the Y. M. C. A. auditorium at Pottstown, Pa., the branch was addressed by the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, who outlined the history of the doctrine of final authority from apostolic times until the present. He explained the doctrine of the Reformers concerning the final authority of the Word of God and showed how this doctrine is opposed and denied by those who today are magnifying the machinery and power of the visible Protestant Churches.