

both that extreme liberalism and your extreme conservatism far behind. . . .

CHARLES M. KNAPP

Almira Community Church  
Almira, Wash.

As an Anglo-Catholic . . . I approached your paper with grave suspicions. I thought it might be scholarly; but, as with other Protestantism I had known, I thought it would be Satan's instrument toward division and even self-destruction. But slowly—very slowly, because of prejudice on my part—I was forced to admit that it has values to offer which are not present in Catholicism (whether Anglican or Roman). . . . You stand for matters (knowledge of the Bible and definiteness of conversion) that might very well be found within the Catholic Faith (Anglican or Roman). And so I've been forced to conclude that I should have your paper. Here, then, is my subscription. . . . CHARLES H. HARRISON  
Society of St. Theresa  
New York City

I am sorry to read . . . that the vicar of Hornsey is too catholic and too English to "see foreign protestant literature." To a true catholic, as for the scholar, of course, nothing is "foreign". . . . It is possible to be both catholic and protestant at the same time. For the commonly accepted meaning of protestant here is that one rejects the papal claim to have divinely given jurisdiction over all Christendom, and this we claim was never part of the original catholic faith. . . . To be truly catholic one must be protestant. T. A. COULSON  
St. Matthias' Church  
Torquay, Devon, England

I want to say how much I appreciate CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Of course there are many points in it with which I disagree; it would be dull reading if it were otherwise. But it is most important for us of the Church of England to keep in mind the trend of Protestant thought abroad or we shall get narrow minded; and after all we are Protestant in doctrine. A. H. A. EMPSON  
Ministerley, Shropshire, England

I don't know how many of our isolated and impecunious country clergy are the fortunate recipients of your admirable magazine, but I would like you to know that I am one who is most grateful. . . . It lasts me a fortnight.

I am the more impelled to let you know this, by what I thought a most ungracious letter from a London Vicar. As a monastery-trained Anglican priest, I

daresay I may have forgotten more of our version of Catholicism than he will ever learn, but when our *Church Times* prints an article by a leading Bishop, denying . . . eternal punishment and follows up with letters in approval, I say, thank God for CHRISTIANITY TODAY, by which American Protestantism safeguards for the world the sound, orthodox, Gospel truths without which we cannot be saved. J. F. E. MORTON  
Downholme Vicarage  
Richmond, Yorkshire, England

#### NOTHING TO FEAR

Although I eschew the doctrines of the substitutionary atonement and the plenary inspiration of the Bible—at least as these doctrines are usually put forward—I am forced to wholeheartedly congratulate you on your publication. It is a much needed contribution to the field of Christian journalism, presenting a responsible, forthright, conservative point of view. I have read all of your issues so far, with profit, though with much disagreement.

I think that Mr. Yeaman's letter to Gordon Clark entirely misses the point—the Virgin Birth cannot be disproved by scholarship, Bultmann's or any other. The fact that it is in a pericope is not point, for so is the *kerygma*. The statement that it is in a less important pericope shows Mr. Yeaman's theological bias, and not his scholarship.

All this granted, however, I think that Mr. Clark's reply also misses the point. His enclosure of the word "discoveries" in quotes is also an expression of theological commitment and not of scholarship. As a matter of fact, there are various levels of certainty derived from historical scholarship. . . . When Mr. Clark dismisses the results of scholarship with a set of quotation marks, and the blithe statement that "Orthodox Christians have always known that this scholarship was mistaken," he shows a closure of mind which befits neither a conservative nor a "modernist". . . . Orthodoxy has nothing to fear from scholarship, for it rests in divine hands and is enriched, not impoverished by prayerful research and study. If it is destroyed by that study it cannot claim to be orthodoxy. JERRY HANDSPICKER  
Yale Divinity School  
New Haven, Conn.

Professor Handspicker holds that I missed the point in my reply to Mr. Yeaman and insists that I should either prove the historical existence of the

Hittites or keep quiet about the fact that orthodoxy has always accepted them as historical.

First, I disclaim any such obligation in a short reply to Mr. Yeaman. It seems to me legitimate to assume that the historicity of the Hittites is commonly acknowledged today. The evidence, on display in the Oriental Institute, cannot be put in this column.

Second, Mr. Yeaman assumed that a certain discovery settled the unimportance of the Virgin Birth; and his argument presupposes that the acceptance of discoveries is an intellectual obligation. I put the word *discoveries* in quotation marks to suggest that the alleged discoveries of scholars (in the past hundred years) often have been false conclusions. Professor Handspicker takes my quotation marks as evidence of shut eyes and a closed mind. On the contrary I have with open eyes seen clearly these nineteenth century blunders.

Third, when Professor Handspicker asserts that both Mr. Yeaman and I, at a certain point, express our theological commitment and not our scholarship, he makes a disjunction which, though common, is in my opinion faulty. The conclusions of scholarship are invariably related to the scholar's theology. This is the reason, I believe, why the existence of the Hittites was denied.

Now, finally, if my faith were based on the changing opinions of scholars, then indeed it would have a shaky foundation. Since Professor Handspicker does not tell us what foundation he would identify as a rock, it would be inappropriate to embark on further speculation here, for I judge that he and I would not agree as to what the criterion of truth is. But can anyone doubt that the orthodox acceptance of the Hittites was correct and that the scholarly discoveries were false? GORDON H. CLARK  
Butler University  
Indianapolis, Ind.

#### UNITED NATIONS DISUNITY

The spate of cynical lying and misrepresentation put forth by the Communist bloc and the so-called anti-colonial Afro-Asian group, Nehru's lofty moralizing (though Pakistan now accuses him of colonialism and he does not implement U.N. decisions that he does not like) while accepting Russia's statistics on Hungary and rejecting British statistics on Port Said, the utter cynicism of Russia's use of the U.N. as a pawn in the cold war to be ignored when it suits her convenience, the fact pointed out by Professor Gilbert Murray that the voting strength of the U.N. is now so disposed