

REPORT ON A POSSIBLE APPROACH OF THE ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

HISTORICAL SECTION.

The various overtures dealing with a certain form of contact with The Orthodox Presbyterian Church submitted to the General Synod of our Churches in Hamilton, 1962, centered around the assertion, "That the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is a church which presents itself as a continuation of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.", and "that we are dealing with a community which RETURNED to the true service of the Lord."

However, the necessary evidence was not presented by the Regional Synod which made the overtures, reason why no further action could be taken.

The committee appointed by the Regional Synod of the Canadian Reformed Churches in Ontario of June 19, 1964 therefore sees it as its primary task to submit this historical evidence which would prove beyond any doubt that the afore mentioned assertions are true.

The historical section of this committee report will briefly submit the following considerations for further study:

- I. The Presbyterian Church originates in England-Scotland and their origin must be observed against the english-scottish historical background.
- II. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church (continuation of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.) is an American Church and was called to defend the pure testimony of God's message of salvation against heresies that confronted them. This confrontation led to a serious schism in 1936.
- III. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church has been called upon to continue defending the true doctrine of salvation and the orthodox way of life according to the Historic Reformed Tradition even after the schism of 1936.

In this historical section of the report the question to what extent criticism of the Presbyterian Confession and Form of Government is warranted will not be dealt with. This can be found in another section.

I. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES ORIGINATE IN ENGLAND-SCOTLAND.

A few remarks about the Reformation in England may suffice. Contrary to the continental Reformation, which was a Reformation of common people, who took to the Bible, the English Reformation was primarily a political one. Starting with the reign of King Henry VIII, various kings and queens had experienced many difficulties with the Pope and the Church of Rome. These difficulties were often of a political nature. The writings of Luther did have some impact but mostly on the nobles and learned people. These also were the people involved in the various political schemes. Under the government of Mary Stuart I (Mary Scott) John Knox especially turned his attention to the unchristian way of life of the Queen and country. In 1557 the Scottish Covenant was established, soon John Knox prepared his first confession inspired by John Calvin: the Confessio Scotia. This is the ground of the Presbyterian Church of which the basic system is the establishment of a church of local believers, allied with sister-churches in other places, locally governed by presbyters who maintain the local discipline. This system, following the Scriptural institutions, was in contrast to the Anglican or Episcopal systems where a Church is established by the government agencies with an episcopal hierarchy responsible to and supported by the government, maintaining the Roman Catholic liturgy and sacramental institutions.

The Reformed Churches in Scotland and England had to cope with many adversaries. On several occasions through the animosity of kings and queens toward the new religion the Roman Catholic Church seemed to be winning ground. In 1638 the Scottish Presbyterians formed the second

Covenant and were heavily persecuted. Yet they were able to force the king, Charles I, to ban the Roman Catholic bishops from the House of Lords. Parliament, which consisted primarily of Presbyterians, called a Synod at Westminster, which prepared the Westminster Confession of Faith and the two Catechisms, which still today are the confessional standards of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. (1643-1648).

Later the Presbyterians had a difficult battle with the protestants of the Independent or Congregational conviction. (Cromwell, 1599-1658). These Independent Churches, also formed because of the oppression of the Roman Catholic Church, believed in a church formed by a group of believers without any authority of consistory, established offices of elders, presbyters or ministers, major assemblies, confessions or discipline. This Independentism was to have a great influence in later years in the U.S.A. during and after the periods of emigration and the believers in the New England states. The mentioning of names as Puritans, Mayflower, Plymouth, Quakers, Wm. Penn, will give sufficient illustration of the climate we are dealing with. Although Calvinistic of character these people nevertheless rejected many of the institutions we believe in, and which are based upon scriptural revelation. Also the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (Later Orthodox Presbyterian Church) kept itself aloof of this denomination.

May this short summary indicate that the Presbyterian Church as it was organized during the time of the Reformation was a TRUE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST maintaining the pure teaching of the gospel, the pure administration of the sacraments and strict discipline to punish sin and save the sinner.

II. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.

In dealing with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. we have to be more elaborate. It lies within the scope of this committee's instructions to show which heresies Satan introduced to obscure the true preaching of the gospel and how he misused the established offices to persecute the faithful believers.

We will do this by observing especially the three main issues which in the history of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. caused so much upheaval in the mid-twenties that it finally led to a split in the church and caused the majority of Church members to drift away from the truth and created the situation of today.

Our attention will be focused mainly on:

1. The Auburn Affirmation.
2. The struggle for Princeton Seminary.
3. The Independent Board of Foreign Missions.

1) The Auburn Affirmation.

For a good understanding of the position of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. AT THE TIME of the Auburn Affirmation it may be remarked that during the latter part of the 19th century many attempts had been made to introduce modernistic thinking, such as the denial that man is completely lost in sin and is completely dependent upon the substitutionary atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ. This thinking was introduced mainly in the form of amendments to the Westminster Confession which finally in 1903 were approved. Dr. B. B. Warfield of Princeton Seminary wrote, commenting on a report on revision, that it: "exhibits a decided tendency to lessen the sharpness and precision of the doctrinal statement of distinctive Calvinism."

From this moment on, modernism crept persistently into the Church. But faithful ministers and believers stood up to the forces of decay. In 1922 an incident in New York City aroused many hostile feelings between the conservatives and the modernists. Some Sunday in May a Baptist minister, the Rev. H. E. Fosdick served as supply minister in the First Presbyterian Church and named his sermon: "Shall the Fundamentalists

Win?" A complaint by the presbytery of Philadelphia against the Presbytery of New York was lodged: "to take such action as will require the preaching and teaching in the First Presbyterian Church of New York to conform to the system of doctrine taught in the Confession of Faith." This overture was adopted by the Assembly of 1923, but the presbytery never acted upon it and locally the modernists won.

While the storm between the two opposing lines of doctrine was raging the name of Dr. J. Gresham Machen appears more frequently. This theologian of Princeton Seminary addressed several meetings and spoke filled with the pure Reformed faith urging the believers to be loyal to their creeds and not to accept substitutes. In 1923 he published a book "Christianity and Liberalism", in which he clearly defined the issues of the day. In this book he proves that Modernism is not a perversion of Historic Christianity, but a new, opposing religion sprouting from a different root. Where many modernists deny the historic events related in the Bible on which the whole conception of faith is based. In this book Machen stresses the historic truth of the gospel as a rock upon which faith can be built. He writes

"For Christianity depends not upon a complex of ideas, but upon the narrative of an event. Without that event, the world, in the Christian view is altogether dark, and humanity is lost under the guilt of sin. There can be no salvation by the discovery of eternal truth, for eternal truth brings naught but despair. But a new face has been put upon life by the blessed thing that God did when He offered up His only begotten Son."

The book made a compound impact in the conservative and fundamental circles. However, the Modernists were not idle. In 1923 a group of 150 ministers being together in Auburn, N.Y., issued a statement in answer to the 1923 Assembly action concerning the Fosdick case. The prime contention of this Affirmation was to register their opinion that the five doctrines mentioned by the General Assembly in its representation of Fosdick's preaching were non-essential to the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures and were mere theories. This statement is called: An Affirmation designed to safeguard the unity and liberty of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

We may here briefly state that it practically, under an avalanche of devout traditional language denies the following basic Scriptural truths:

- 1) The Infallibility of God's Word.
- 2) The factual Virgin Birth of Christ.
- 3) The factual miracles of Christ.
- 4) Christ's substitutionary atonement.
- 5) Christ's resurrection.

From the day this Affirmation was issued until the schism in 1936 this statement was an outstanding monument of Modernism. But thanks to the Grace of God Who preserves His faithful Church there were also many champions of faith who time and again found occasion to oppose the advance of Modernism. Eventually about 1200 ministers signed this Affirmation and in doing so displayed contempt for the Presbyterian Standard which they subscribed to with their ordination vows. However none of these was ever brought to account for this according to the regulations outlined for this in the Presbyterian Form of Government. There was only opposition from within through speech and pamphlet but no disciplinary action was taken.

The Presbytery of Cincinnati submitted an overture to the Assembly of 1924 with the purpose to put the signers under censure but the Assembly took no action. It acted against its own creed which states in the Westminster Confession art. XXXI that: It belongs to synods and councils to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience and to determine whether these cases are "consonant to the Word of God."

2) The Struggle for Princeton Seminary.

However the conservatives looked for guidance to the "rock of orthodoxy" Princeton Seminary. This institution for many years had produced

ministers who only stood for the pure unadulterated Word of God. It was committed by its charter to uphold the Westminster Confession as well as the two Catechisms. It was governed by a board of directors and a board of trustees while the actual teaching was guided by the faculty. Slowly also here a divergence of doctrinal opinions became evident. Especially between most of the faculty members and the president of the board, Dr. J. Ross Stevenson. This theologian considered the Seminary a representation of the sentiment of the whole Church, while the faculty maintained its doctrinal allegiance to the Westminster Confession. It would not serve an immediate purpose to relate in this brief all the struggles which caused tension at Princeton internally, but it centered mainly on the proposed amalgamation of the two boards. Of course in the new board set up the adherents to the Auburn Affirmation would have the lead. After much debate, writing and campaigning for and against, both boards were amalgamated by the Assembly of 1930. Dr. Stevenson became president of the new Seminary and the signers of the Auburn Affirmation of board and staff were unopposed.

Dr. F. Rian in his book "The Presbyterian Conflict" asked the question, "Were the fears of the minority fulfilled and was the historic position of the institution changed from Old School Theology or Biblical Christianity to twentieth century Barthianism and Modernism?"

The fact that Emil Brunner in 1938-39 was guest professor of Systematic Theology is sufficient evidence. From this Barthian scholar it is reported comes the illustration that the Bible is as a phonograph which produces the clear sounds but also the scratches which distort the clear sound, the scratches being the human errors and mistakes which in his opinion also are in the Bible. This degrades the divine authority of the Word of God as it is confessed in the Westminster Confession, art. I.

Many other examples can be cited in reply to Rian's question. He said, "The lack of protest against the evident Modernism is almost eloquent in its silence." It was Princeton that spoke out against church unions based on foundations other than the Truth of God's Word. But now Princeton's colour had changed from historic Christianity to modernism and this had a profound effect on the position of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

The majority of the teaching faculty refused to serve under the new board and they severed their ties with the Seminary. On Sept. 25, 1929 Westminster Seminary opened its doors, profoundly committed to the teaching of the full rich Word of God as found in the Divine Revelation.

It is strange that even this development did not cause a split in the Church yet. This may be attributed to the peculiar way the Presbyterian system controls its agencies outside the immediate control of local churches. None of the conservatives saw clearly their calling to maintain the unity of the body of Christ by separating themselves from those who no longer were true church. Dr. Machen himself devoted many articles to this subject and his main efforts were directed to reforming the Church from within and particularly through ministers who were properly instructed. He still hoped that Reformation would come from within. The Church at this point, had not yet "ascribed more power and authority to itself and its ordinances than to the Word of God". If so, events soon would give ample opportunity to have it do just that. This anti-church climax was to be seen in the situation which developed in the Board of Foreign Mission.

3) The Board of Foreign Mission.

The missionary program of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. was administratively organized by the Board of Foreign Missions and subject to the Assembly. Missionaries were called and instructed and maintained by the Board. This Board, supported by gifts from Church members, exercised the discipline over the missionaries. The interviewing and encour-

aging of candidates for the foreign mission fields was placed in the hands of a secretary.

It was Dr. Machen who brought to light that this individual was a signer of the now famous Auburn Affirmation. He also discovered that the secretary recommended literature to these prospective missionaries that was highly modernistic to say the least. One quotation from such a book may suffice: "These alone understand the teaching of Jesus who knew that it is NOT TEACHING AT ALL, but simply the loving utterance of one who had achieved rebirth in a new condition of life." (From: Devotional Diary).

Such and similar utterances were condoned to be taught and inspire Christian Missionaries whose task it would be to preach to the pagan people the Gospel of the Redemption through the blood of the ONLY living Mediator who died and was resurrected. No discipline was kept over missionaries under the charge of the Board. One of these was the famous author Pearl Buck (Author of The Good Earth). She was not only a missionary in the service of the Board but very prominent throughout the China and Asia of that day. In a Magazine article she once made the statement: "To some of us he (Jesus) is still the Divine Son of God, born of the virgin Mary, conceived by the Holy Spirit. But to many of us he has ceased to be that. I don't believe in original sin. I agree with the Chinese who feel their people should be protected from such superstition."

Such statements Dr. Machen felt compelled to attack and he did so most vigorously. He presented an overture to the New Brunswick Presbytery in Jan. 1933.

In this overture he called the Board to its duty to keep Modernists from its rolls. He submitted a 110 page pamphlet and his verbal presentation is recorded as a most passionate plea for keeping the missionary message pure. Right from the beginning he made clear that his only standard of judgment was the Word of God. He demanded that everything under the Board's auspices was to be judged by that Word. In his submittal he appealed to the Confession of Faith, Chapter I, section X, which states that the Holy Spirit speaking in Scripture is the Supreme Judge by whom all controversies are to be determined. Of his speech at the Presbytery meeting it is reported:

"It was an appeal to return to the Word of God. Here is God's Truth: His Holy Book. It was a joy for him to speak of that Book, to testify of the Christ of the Bible, against the whole current of the age that held the minds of men so rigidly embraced in death. He was glad to have spoken a word for Christ, to call men to return from the wisdom of the world to the wisdom of God." (Christianity Today, April 1933).

Dr. Robert Speer answered for the Board. He dodged the issue by stating that the Board was in good standing and so were its members, by the previous assemblies, there were no administrative difficulties and at the end the Presbytery rejected Dr. Machen's overture.

The Presbytery of Philadelphia, however, passed an identical overture assuring that the situation would come up in the next Assembly-meeting. But the Assembly of 1933, too, turned deaf ears to the cry for Reformation in the Missionary program and so also here Modernism was confirmed.

Some people with Dr. Machen formed a new board: The Independent Board for Presbyterian Missions.

Now one could apply the words of art. 29 of the Belgic Confession: As for the false church, it ascribes more power to itself and its ordinances than to the Word of God, and it will not submit itself to the yoke of Christ.

Soon the last sentence: and persecutes those who live holily according to the Word of God and rebuke it for its errors, covetousness, and idolatry, could be added.

Dr. Machen and others were accused of having violated their ordina-

tion vows in not supporting the official agencies of the Church (Foreign Missions Board). They were urged to discontinue their activities in the Independent Board. However, they claimed that it would be against the Confession to do so and the churchmember should be free in his choice which society to support. The 1934 Assembly took action and issued a mandate that a person who:

"will not give to promote the officially authorized missionary program of the Presbyterian Church is exactly in the same position with reference to the Constitution of the Church as a churchmember or an individual that would refuse to take part in the celebration of the Lord's Supper"

All Presbyteries were instructed by the Assembly to institute action against members who supported the Independent Board of Foreign Missions.

Not only forced the Assembly now in a most hierarchical way the minor assemblies to condone their actions based on human authority rather than on the Word of God, but it also directed them to proceed with "persecuting those who live hoily according to the Word of God".

Yet Dr. Machen saw not yet reason to separate from those who do not belong to the Church. His reaction was summed up in a wire to the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin: "Action of General Assembly does not necessarily mean a new denomination because it is quite contrary to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and is therefore invalid . . ."

His idea was that the Modernists should recognize that their actions were NOT in accordance with Confession, Church Order and not Presbyterian and he claimed on the basis of that that they should leave the Church. He upheld the Word of God and the Constitution and therefore his place was in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The others must go.

But God would soon indicate that he was wrong. The Presbytery of New Brunswick soon picked up the executioner's axe handed them by the Assembly. On Dec. 20, 1934, Dr. Machen was brought to trial to account for his offences. The charges against him were such as: the violation of his ordination vow, disapproval of the government and discipline in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., renouncing and disobeying the rules and lawful authority of the Church, advocating rebellious defiance against this authority, refusing to sever his ties with the Independent Board, not being zealous and faithful in maintaining the peace of the Church, etc.

During the trial, Dr. Machen was in no way afforded the opportunity of giving defending evidence for the simple reason that all assertions of a doctrinal difference of views was overruled. The Presbytery ruled that there was no doctrinal conflict within the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and that the only ground for this trial was administrative and all defense must be directed towards that end. Subsequently the Word of God was not heard and Dr. Machen had no other defense. E. Rian in his book "The Presbyterian Conflict", remarks that even Luther was given all possible chance to show that his doctrines were in accordance with the truth of the Scriptures. "But Machen, in the twentieth century of enlightenment, was denied the very basis of justice and fairness".

So Dr. Machen was convicted and suspended from the ministry. Others followed as various presbyteries acted upon the mandate of the Assembly. E. Rian says, "In 1893 the Church suspended Dr. Chas. Briggs because he did not believe the infallibility of the Word of God, in 1936 the same Church suspended Dr. Machen from the ministry because he was determined to follow the teachings of the infallible Word of God". But Isaiah 30 tells us that they will be brought to naught who "Make a man an offender for a word, and lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gate . . . concerning the house of Jacob: Jacob shall not now be ashamed, neither shall his face wax pale." (Isaiah 29:21,22)

Many believers already had expressed concern with the situation and on June 27, 1935 an organization, the Covenant Union, was formed of faithful believers who supported those who fought in the frontline. Their purpose was set out in the Covenant Program: Making every effort to bring about a reform of the existing Church organization, and to restore the Church's clear and glorious testimony, which modernism and indifference have now silenced. But after a year the Covenant was dissolved and now the Presbyterian Church of America was formed. This today is the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

However, we would not do these Churches justice if we said no more. Still in 1936 the two Presbyterian traditions of old, the Old School and the New School were represented. They also have been named Old Side and New Side. Both had been united in their struggle against Modernism, but since the yoke of "assembly-crazy" had been lifted, both views demanded attention. Both claimed the reorganization was a return to the old Presbyterian tradition. But what was this Presbyterian tradition?

In order to properly evaluate the further developments within the Presbyterian Church of America we must briefly outline what the two traditions represent. What are the two schools of theology that for many years lived side by side?

In the mid-eighteenth century the New Side and the Old Side were divided. The New Side can be characterized as having been influenced to a great extent by the New England Puritans (see above), subscribing to subjective preaching, inclined to co-operate with the revivalist movement that at various times rocked the American continent, an exemplary way of life. The Old Side was more of the Scottish-Irish colour, John Knox recognized authority, discipline by means of established offices.

The issues that kept them divided were threefold: Doctrinal (Puritan view), Moral (condemn slavery, use of alcoholic beverages), Political (co-operation with non-presbyterians in missions, church-unions, education and moral reform)

Both parties united in 1785 but split again in 1837.

It has been said that the New School attitude of doctrinal tolerance opened the door to liberalities in the church. The Old School did not favour this co-operation and tolerance.

In 1937, one hundred years after this split the same issues faced the renewed, purified church again.

Again we must exercise extreme brevity, but we will endeavour to display the issues so that our church members may get a clear idea of what the Orthodox Presbyterian Church really stands for today.

At the first Assembly in 1936 all were in full agreement that the Scripture was the only infallible Word of God. The Westminster Standards contained the system of doctrine taught in Holy Scripture and the Presbyterian government founded on the Word of God.

But when the second Assembly convened certain lines of division became evident and in such a way that the Old Side — New Side, Old School — New School controversy showed up again.

One of the first tests was the question of maintaining the 1903 amendments to the Westminster Confession. At the first Assembly a committee was formed to prepare the abolition of these amendments. This was opposed in certain New School quarters, represented by the Rev. Dr. Carl McIntire. His main argument was that in the interest of maintaining "the true spiritual succession of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. such consideration should be postponed. But Machen and others contended that "to a Church that stood for the Word of God, and desired therefore to eliminate all compromising features from its faith and practice, there could be no temporizing in the fundamental matter of the truth or error of its doctrinal standards".

The second Assembly eliminated the amendments thereby indicating that the Reformation of the Church was a true Reformation.

But other issues still divided the brothers. They can be basically identified in the same way as we indicated the difference between the Old School and New School in 1837.

- A) Dispensationalism and Premillennialism (Doctrinal)
- B) Total Abstinence and Christian Liberty (Moral)
- C) Independency and Co-operation (Political)

Each of these issues was instrumental in separating the groups and in calling for a true Reformed stand against each other.

A) Dispensationalism and Premillennialism

In the New School (New Side) theology a certain emphasis has been placed on the premillennialist view, based on the prophecy of Rev. 20. During the Modernism versus Conservatism conflict, a certain degree of toleration had been exercised. But doctrinally the men from Westminster were of the opinion that this premillennialism was not Scriptural. In 1935 (still before the split) Rev. Dr. John Murray wrote a series of articles in which he said that the modern dispensationalism was contrary to sound doctrinal belief. He claimed that the Westminster Confession teaches that the covenant becomes operative as a result of the fall; law and grace work at the same time. These sounds from Westminster disturbed many New School millennialists who were fully in agreement with the struggle against Modernism. Dr. Machen once stated why he was aligned with these Fundamentalists for the common cause. So the New Group, at that time still in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., but organized as a Covenant Union, already lost many potential allies. They were opposed to the Reformed exclusivism which opposed premillennialism. Dr. Carl McIntire was an exponent of this line of thought.

The test was to come soon after the division. In October 1936 the Presbytery of Philadelphia after much discussion admitted the Duryea Presbyterian Church into the alliance. This church was completely devoted to the premillennialist view. They had insisted that complete eschatological liberty was granted and the Presbytery agreed. When the second Assembly approached it was obvious that this question would rock the foundations of the newly liberated church.

B) Total abstinence and Christian Liberty

Another difference between the New School, New Side-Old Side was the view on the use of alcoholic beverages. The New School had always been willing to align itself with any denomination that battled alcoholism. Rev. Dr. Carl McIntire raised the question of drinking on the campus at Westminster Seminary and he demanded that the use of alcoholic beverages be forbidden.

Dr. Paul Woolley objected: "Is it not left to each Christian to judge what is temptation to his brother?"

It must be noted that the U.S.A. in these days lived under the Prohibition legislation. As the use of alcohol was outlawed the illegal sale and bootlegging to satisfy the craving of the people was moral problem No. 1. A church that had the nerve to condemn this stand and leave the use of alcohol to the liberty of the individual was branded in public opinion. Yet the Presbyterian Church of America (Orthodox Presbyterian Church) took that stand.

C) Independency and Co-operation.

We have already related that an Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions had been formed in 1933 of which Dr. Machen was President. This Board was truly independent in as much as it was not attached to any denomination, only to its Westminster Standards. It co-operated with other denominations in the practical pursuit of its task: to bring the true Christian Gospel of salvation to pagans. Its charter stated that it

supported only those missions "which are consistent with the Westminster Standards and the Fundamental principles of Presbyterian government". It must be noted that here in its Independency Dr. Machen broke with his own tradition.

But unrest was brewing in this institution. Dr. Carl McIntire in the Board accused Dr. Machen of controlling a "machine" and having a stronghold on the Church and the agencies such as Westminster, Independent Board.

In 1936 Dr. Machen is opposed as president and not re-elected. Soon afterward he died, on Jan. 1, 1937.

This is an exposition of the issues facing the Church. We shall now conclude our summary by showing how the Church disposed of these issues and purified itself from within of unscriptural tendencies.

A) Dispensationalism and Premillenianism.

The admission of the Duryea Church into the Presbytery of Philadelphia, with its premillennial view had started many pens moving. Especially the Presbyterian Guardian expressed strong opinions. The Presbytery of California had tabled an overture with the second Assembly with the purpose to stop the Presbyterian Guardian in its attacks and to insure that "definite and emphatic and ambiguous eschatological liberty be written into the Constitution of our beloved Church".

Dr. Machen declared himself strongly opposed, even some in the premillennialist camp, such as Dr. J. Oliver Bushwell. Dr. Machen argued that the Church should start with nothing more than the Westminster Confession. This had also been his stand in relation to the 1903 Amendments which at this same second Assembly were deleted.

After much debate the resolution was rejected but the Presbytery of California protested. It expressed the fear that the premillennialists were not welcome in the Presbyterian Church of America.

But we may conclude that no "fourth form" was added and the Confession was left to stand on its own record.

B) Total Abstinence and Christian Liberty

The issue of alcoholism, or Christian liberty soon led to a division of personalities at Westminster Seminary and the withdrawal of some of the Faculty staff. The Faculty did not concede to Dr. McIntire's wishes to ban the use of alcohol. His accusation that drinking on the campus was excessive was completely unfounded. At the same time an attempt was made to change the views of the Faculty in respect to the premillennialist controversy. When this did not work, Dr. Allen MacRae resigned because, as he alleged, Control of the Faculty has passed into the hands of a small alien group without American Presbyterian background. The major emphasis of the teaching, he continued, is no longer primarily against Modernism, but against Fundamentalism. Two members of the Board of Trustees also resigned.

The Faculty maintained that they were solely committed to the Reformed faith. Soon a rival Seminary was formed: Faith Theological Seminary.

The question of total abstinence appeared on the tables of the Assembly of 1937 with an overture of the Presbytery of Chicago. It appealed the various New School Assembly declarations which recommended: Total abstinence from anything that will intoxicate. This overture only had a minority backing, the majority being in favour of an overture submitted by Philadelphia, which stated

"We believe that the Westminster Standards speak with adequacy and with force on these subjects, Larger Catechism questions 122-148, Shorter Catechism questions 63-81."

Two ministers, Mile F. Jamison and J. Oliver Bushwell left the denomination. Shortly afterwards 14 more ministers and some elders withdrew and organized the Bible Presbyterian Synod.

C) Independency and Co-operation.

Remains still to deal with the complicated issue of the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions. This Board was formed in 1933 to support a truly Presbyterian Scriptural Mission. In its ranks served people also from other than Presbyterian denominations. Also here we find a majority and a minority. The majority was led by Dr. Carl McIntire who, as we have seen, referred to Machen's leadership as the "machine". After the death of Dr. Machen who just before his passing away was not re-elected as president, the new president Harold S. Laird belonged to the Independent Church, and several members of the Board were affiliated with the Independentists. The minority, mostly Westminster men, were not happy with this situation and they disapproved of the independency of the Board.

To remedy this situation they introduced a resolution whereby members were asked to conform to the charter which was committed to the Westminster Standards. They called upon the majority to bring this allegiance into practice. Submit to the Charter all the way. This in effect was to be interpreted so that the Constitution of the Board excluded "interdenominational" membership.

This resolution was not passed and the minority withdrew from the Independent Board of Foreign Missions. It was obvious that the action of the minority certainly had something to do with their conviction and wish to establish a denominational Board within the Presbyterian Church of America. Also this issue was tabled with the third Assembly, in a minority and majority report. The minority report defending the independency was rejected.

And so in 1937 the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, which had adopted this name because of a courtorder (it was ruled that their original name "Presbyterian Church of America" caused confusion with the denomination that had ceased to be church: The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.), started out liberated from an unjust "assemblycracy", purified from many of the New School distortions and all sorts of additional forms and confessional declarations.

It had lost its spiritual leader during the battle to purify the Church but it had found again the Great Leader, the Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ Who liberated His Church from the heresy of sin and eternal death. The Great Leader but also the Active Servant in Whose active obedience Dr. Machen gloried when, shortly before his death, he sent out his last message to his friend, Rev. Dr. John Murray, "I am so thankful for active obedience of Christ. No hope without it." He had made it his life's task to ban any human substitute of this gospel and it is our belief that the Church which he helped see the light of Scripture again, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, today still brings that same gospel.

It is the purpose of this report to show evidence which may prompt the next Synod to appoint deputies to study these matters more in detail and to see whether here we may have found the seven thousand on the American Continent, "all the knees which have not bowed unto Ba-al, and every mouth which has not kissed him."