

*The Case Against the  
Federal Council of Churches*

By CHESTER E. TULGA, D.D.

---

PRICE: 25 C

*Published by*  
CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST FELLOWSHIP  
352 WELLINGTON AVENUE • CHICAGO 14, ILLINOIS

13,261

Copyright 1948 by  
Chester E. Tulga

Printed in U.S.A.

## *Contents*

	Page
<i>Introduction . . . . .</i>	7
<i>I. The Organization of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America . . . . .</i>	11
<i>II. The Federal Council of Churches: Its Claims . . . . .</i>	19
<i>III. The Federal Council: Its Social and Economic Philosophy . . . . .</i>	33
<i>IV. The Federal Council of Churches and Local Councils . . . . .</i>	38
<i>V. The Northern Baptist Convention and the Federal Council of Churches . . . . .</i>	42
<i>VI. The Baptists and the Universalists: A Failure in Christian Witnessing . . . . .</i>	48
<i>VII. How Shall the Convention Deal with the Council Problem? . . . . .</i>	51
<i>VIII. Membership in the Federal Council: A Theological Problem for True Evangelicals . . . . .</i>	57

### ***Introduction***

**I**N THE 1840's there were international stirrings among Protestants. Conditions in the religious world were somewhat alarming. Romanism was gaining ground and there was a universal demand for some sort of co-operation which would put an end to these threats and offer a channel for future action. So there came into existence the first semblance of a united Protestant front.

A preliminary gathering was held in Liverpool in 1845 which issued invitations to Protestants in all parts of the world to come to London in August, 1846, for united counsel and action. In response to the invitation over 800 gathered and formed the World's Evangelical Alliance.

1. *A doctrinal basis was adopted.* They immediately issued a statement of their doctrinal position, a position which provided ample justification for their use of the word "evangelical" in their title. The statement of faith was as follows:

1—The divine inspiration, authority and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures;

- 2—The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures;
- 3—The unity of the Godhead and the Trinity of persons therein;
- 4—The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall;
- 5—The Incarnation of the Son of God, His work of atonement for the sins of mankind and His mediatorial intercession and reign;
- 6—The justification of the sinner by faith alone;
- 7—The work of the Holy Spirit in conversion and sanctification of the sinner;
- 8—The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked;
- 9—The divine institution of the Christian ministry and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

This confession of faith epitomized the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, was thoroughly evangelical and distinctly Protestant.

2. *The Evangelical Alliance flourished for a time but gradually declined in influence.* Several factors contributed to this decline.

(a) James De Forest Murch says, "*The fly in the ointment was liberalism.* German rationalism and the social gospel had begun to penetrate America. Leading liberals at first tried to

streamline the Alliance to fit their new ideas, but they found both here and abroad an adamant stand for the fundamentals of the faith." (*United Action*, Nov., 1946, p. 8) Rev. J. Chalmers Lyon, Hon. Secretary World's Evangelical Alliance said, "We can not countenance Rationalistic efforts to water down the Scriptures of truth by casting doubts upon the miraculous element in the Gospels and on the true Deity of the Son of God. So-called Rationalism always had a paralyzing effect on the work of the ministry. As evangelicals we are set for the defense of the Gospel. We have a message that is supernatural; a Saviour who is the Eternal God manifest in the flesh; and a Book that is divinely inspired as no other book. We have a Gospel to proclaim which is the power of God unto Salvation to everyone that believeth." (Quoted by James De Forest Murch in *United Action*, Nov., 1946, p. 9).

John A. Hutchison (*We Are Not Divided* p. 15) said of the Evangelical confession, "It proved for the American branch to be a strait-jacket." Again he said, "The theological basis of the Alliance became more and more hampering in an age which was becoming increasingly anti-theological."

(b) *Membership in the Alliance, by its statement of faith, was strictly limited to evangelicals.* William Adams Brown (*Toward a United Church*, p. 29) commenting on the decline of the Alliance says, "One reason assigned for this was the fact that the limitations imposed by its creed not only confined its membership to Christians of a particular type but precluded the free discussion of basic theological differences." There is no doubt but that the thorough evangelicalism of the Alliance was displeasing to the new modernism which had taken on a Unitarian coloring. They wanted a federation of a more inclusive type which would accommodate itself to the

rising modernism and the new socialistic interpretation of the Kingdom of God.

(c) *Liberals, finding themselves in the minority, began to experiment with new and broader types of cooperative movements.* In 1894 the Open Church League was formed. In 1900 the National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers. Not all of those associated in these organizations were liberals but the directing spirits were definitely liberal and they prepared the way for the more inclusive Federal Council of Churches.

(d) *The Evangelical Alliance, while strongly social in the evangelical sense, would not lend itself to the promotion of the new liberal social gospel.* That the Evangelical Alliance was not lacking in social conscience is seen in the fact that the original constitution included a provision that membership should be confined to those who were not slave holders. William Adams Brown (*Toward a United Church*, p. 28) says of this, "While this was evidence of the strong social interest which animated the members it came near to disrupting the new body at the start. For this reason as well as others it proved necessary to postpone the organization of a branch in the United States until after the Civil War." But the new modernism did not want the social application of the gospel as evangelicals understand it, but a social gospel which would be free from evangelical theological limitations and able to find common ground with the rising tide of socialist thought. So Dr. Josiah Strong, who became secretary of the Alliance in 1886, resigned fifteen years later to become President of a new association, with a more pronounced social emphasis, called the Institute of Social Service. Still later he served as Chairman of the Commission on Social Service in

the newly organized Federal Council. The drift toward religious socialism as a substitute for the evangelical gospel was on. The men who led in the formation of the new Federal Council were men who did not care for the sturdy orthodoxy of the Alliance and who were not willing to accept the authority of the Scriptures in fixing the basis of the social approach of the churches.

### ***1. The Organization of the Federal Council of Churches in America***

1. *Its beginnings.* An invitation was sent out by a committee of the National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers calling for a conference of officials and denominational representatives. Official delegates representing thirty denominations gathered in New York November 15-21, 1905, labored and brought forth the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. The plan proposed in 1905 was ratified in Philadelphia in 1908.

2. *The Federal Plan.* The Preamble introduces the Plan, "Whereas, In the providence of God the time has come when it seems fitting more fully to manifest the essential oneness of the Christian Churches of America in Jesus Christ as their divine Lord and Saviour, and to promote the spirit of fellowship, service and cooperation among them, the delegates to the Interchurch Conference on Federation, assembled in New York City, do hereby recommend the following Plan of Federation to the Christian bodies represented in this conference for their approval."

The Plan of Federation, "For the prosecution of work that

can better be done in union than in separation, a Council is hereby established whose name shall be the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America." Then follows a list of thirty-two churches deemed eligible for membership, after which the plan continues: "The object of the Federal Council of Churches shall be:

- 1—To express the fellowship and Catholic unity of the Christian Church.
- 2—To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.
- 3—To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches.
- 4—To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.
- 5—To assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council to promote its aims in their communities."

Then followed the limitations: "This Federal Council shall have no authority over the constituent bodies adhering to it; but its province shall be limited to the expression of its counsel and the recommending of a course of action in matters of common interest to the churches, local councils and individual Christians. It has no authority to draw up a common creed or form of government or worship or in any way limit the full autonomy of the Christian bodies adhering to it."

3. *Its doctrinal basis was brief and undefined.* The nearest

semblance to a confession of faith are in the words in the Preamble in which Jesus Christ is acknowledged as "divine Lord and Saviour." The word "divine" was not in the original draft, but Dr. Samuel J. Nicholls (Presbyterian), of St. Louis, Missouri, demanded its insertion to assure the evangelical character of the organization. After considerable discussion it was unanimously voted. Concerning this so-called evangelical basis of the Federal Council several observations should be made.

(a) *At that early day only a few evangelicals knew that the word "divine" as used by liberals no longer meant the orthodox conception of the deity of Christ.* Historically, it carries the meaning of deity, but the liberals use it to mean that divinity which is common to all men, that Christ differs only from us in degree, not in nature and relationship to God. The victory won was an empty one. The word "divinity" was no longer an exclusive orthodox term.

Evangelicals, discovering the ambiguous meaning of the word "divinity" abandoned it in favor of the strong term, "deity." This, too, has been appropriated by the liberals and a new content put into it. Men of Unitarian convictions now unblushingly profess belief in the deity of Christ. So R. H. Beaven, President of the Baptist Missionary Training School of Chicago says, "Christ was both human and divine. He was human because he was a man. He was divine because God had made Himself one with Him in fellowship and had RAISED HIM TO A NEW LEVEL OF LIFE (emphasis ours CET)" (In Him is Life, p. 126). This is not what the Scriptures mean when they set forth the divinity of Christ. Again, concerning His deity, Beaven writes: "We shall never understand the deity of Christ unless we recognize that it is

not an idea. It did not begin as an idea. It began as an experience, out of which an idea grew. Men experienced a new and immediate relatedness to God in Christ. This is the heart of Christianity. Just as soon as we lose sight of this fact and interpret Christ's deity as an intellectual truth, just as soon does Christianity become another source of division. That is why so many liberals reacted . . . and RIGHTLY—against many who took Christ as *the* revelation to the heathen. For they were proclaiming Christ's deity as an intellectual truth and were thereby dividing themselves by pride from others who did not share their belief" (p. 123). Dr. Beaven does not accept the orthodox view of the deity of Christ, or the divinity of Christ. This is true of the leadership of the Federal Council and leading spokesmen for its constituent denominations. To claim that the Federal Council doctrinal basis is the orthodox conception of the personality of Christ is to assert what is no longer true.

Again, Georgia Harkness, a Methodist theologian, writes, "The main question about the doctrine of the Trinity lies in what we mean by Christ. If one believes what has been said earlier in this chapter about Jesus Christ as the supreme revelation of God and the Saviour of men, he will affirm belief in Christ as the Son of God. *This does not mean that Jesus was God.* It means that His life was so filled with the character and power of God that when men have seen Him, they have seen the Father." (Understanding the Christian Faith, 1947, p. 74) Miss Harkness denies John 1:1-14 which affirms categorically that Jesus is God.

(b) *The Federal Council has never defined these terms and has never asked its constituent denominations to define or interpret them.* Edward J. Carnell (An Introduction to

Christian Apologetics, 1948, p. 62) sets forth our problem very clearly. "The sole worth of a name is its ability to communicate meaning. . . . Agreement of words, is by no means a certain sign that there is agreement of meaning. The modernist, for instance, uses the term 'Christ' and means by it those ideals which he considers most God-like. The conservative uses the same term and means by it the second Person of the ontological Trinity. The meaning of terms is discovered by definition.

"Definition sets the limits to what we mean by terms. It is the medium that we must employ if we wish to let others know what is behind the words that we are using. We cannot know what a man's judgment is until we know how he is using his terms. It is the meaning of the words, therefore, and not the words themselves which are capable of being true or false." The doctrinal statement in the preamble of the Federal Council of Churches is actually without meaning, since so many contradictory meanings are being assigned to these words in Federal Council circles.

The Federal Council, in spite of the confusion concerning its position, and the many charges that it is untrue to the evangelical position, has never defined its terms which would positionize it on the central fact of the Christian faith: the person of Christ. Carl J. McIntire (Twentieth Century Reformation, 1946, p. 15) says, "We heard Dr. Luther Weigle, dean of the Yale Divinity School, while presiding over the 1942 biennial meeting of the Federal Council, say, when he was asked what the word divinity meant, 'We have never asked any group what they meant by the divinity of Christ when they joined us.'" Since there is no definite content of meaning recognized in these terms, the so-called evangelical

basis of the Federal Council is of little value, as its policies have indicated. If it attempted to require its constituent bodies to subscribe to the orthodox meaning of these words it would disrupt the Federal Council. The Council is not only lacking in an evangelical basis but due to the variety of interpretations placed upon its statement concerning Christ, it is impossible of reformation. Those who remain in it hoping to bring it back to an orthodox position are in fellowship with apostasy and while indulging in vain hopes are actually advancing apostasy by their support of the Council.

(c) *There is concrete evidence that the denominational bodies composing the Federal Council do not take the doctrinal statement seriously.* This was evident in the closely divided vote of the Council on the application of the Universalists for admission to the Council in 1946. Sixteen denominations voted on the application, four favoring their admission, eight against it, and four (including the Baptists) not voting. Some who voted against the Universalists did not stand on doctrinal grounds, but doubted the advisability of receiving them. In the plenary session 63 delegates voted for the admission of the Universalists and only 70 against. The close fellowship between the Unitarians and the Universalists is widely known, and the considerable sentiment in favor of their admission indicates how little importance is attached to the doctrinal statement of which the Federal Council boasts.

(d) *The men who have been honored with leadership in the Federal Council do not accept the evangelical interpretation of the Council Preamble.* Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, honored by the Council with many years on its radio program, confirms what we have been saying, "I believe in the

divinity of Jesus with all my faculties if we can come to an understanding about what we mean by *divinity*." Dr. Fosdick, very properly insists, not upon agreement with the word, but agreement as to its meaning. He continues, "If someone says, Well, we all have some of that divine spark in us; we all have some goodness, truth, love, and therefore on that basis the divinity of Jesus differs from ours in degree, indeed, but not in kind, I answer. Are you afraid of that conclusion? Of course the divinity of Jesus differs from ours in a degree but not in kind. . . . To say therefore that God was in Christ seems to me no theological puzzle at all. I think God was in my mother, the source of the loveliness that blessed us there!" (Hope of the World p. 103) It is obvious that this famed Federal Council preacher does not hold the view of the divinity of Jesus that entitles him or the Council to be called evangelicals.

Dr. Francis J. McConnell, a past President of the Council, appears to be in full accord with these views of Dr. Fosdick when he says, "Some students can hardly restrain their resentments at the tendency to deify Jesus, since that tendency seems to them to rob Him of His supreme value as a human ideal. To such students the tendency to make men into God seems not much better than other attempts of the kind which were characteristic even of the heathenism into which Christianity came. Critics point out to us that in the early days of the Church it was quite common even for popular thought to deify man." Then follows the question. "Is not this tendency to deify Jesus more heathen than Christian? Are we not most truly Christian when we cut loose from a heathen propensity and take Jesus simply for the character that He was and for the ideal that He is?" (The Christlike God, pp. 14-15). Many pages of un-evangelical quotations could be



produced from the writings of Federal Council leaders, indicating beyond any doubt that the so-called evangelical basis of the Federal Council is a meaningless jumble of words, and having no relevance to the policies of the Council and no relationship to the selection of its leadership. The so-called evangelical basis of the Council is a pious fraud, useful only in the deception of the uninformed. To refuse admission to the Unitarians and the Universalists because of their views of the person of Christ is sheer hypocrisy and unprincipled political expediency.

(e) *The Council's powerlessness to interfere in the doctrinal beliefs of its member denominations, makes it impossible to correct the situation which has developed.* Lacking an adequate doctrinal basis at the beginning, and with no disciplinary protections against apostasy from within, the progress of the Council from a weak and formless evangelicalism to a full bloom modernism has been steady and thorough.

A creedless council, with no defense against apostasy from within, and no disciplinary power over apostate members of the Council, must inevitably take on the theological complexion of its member-groups. Since modernism has captured the leadership of the leading denominations in the Council, it is evitable that this modernism would be expressed in Council leadership. The Council is not only a product of the apostasy of its member denominations but by its leadership and large influence it has at the same time assisted in the development of that apostasy from historic Christianity which marks the Federal Council and most of its constituent denominations.

## **II. The Federal Council of Churches: Its Claims**

1. *The Federal Council claims to be evangelical in doctrine.* "The theological position of the Council is positively Evangelical. Since the Council is a council of churches, not in any sense a superchurch or an authority above the churches, it has no separate creedal statement of its own but rests firmly upon the common elements in the official doctrinal standards of the denominations that comprise it. All these denominations, by virtue of their act in ratifying the Constitution of the Council, affirm their loyalty to Jesus Christ as 'Divine Lord and Saviour.' The Council has declined to receive into membership any denomination whose position with reference to the Person of Christ as Divine Lord and Saviour did not seem altogether clear. Beyond this crucial point the Council does not go in matters of doctrine, for the denominations, in drafting its Constitution, reserved the area of doctrine to themselves, declaring that the Council has no authority to draw up a common creed or form of government or worship. The responsibility for maintaining the loyalty of its own members to its historic doctrinal standards, therefore, rests upon each denomination." (Present Policies of the Federal Council of Churches.) Let us examine this statement.

(a) *There is no evidence (as we have seen) that the theological position of the Council is positively evangelical other than its own claim.* Also, evangelical is a word that must be carefully defined because of the current interpretations being placed upon it. The Christian Century, recording the resignation of Harry Emerson Fosdick from the Riverside Church, called his preaching "strongly evangelical", whereas all readers of his "Modern Use of the Bible" know that he flatly

rejects the very doctrines that identify an evangelical. The record of the Council, the statements of its leaders, and the position of its major denominations stamp this claim as untrue.

(b) *The doctrinal position of the Council is said to rest firmly upon the common elements in the official doctrinal standards of the denominations that comprise it.* This is not as firm a foundation as it seems. The Methodists have long since departed from their official doctrinal standards. The Presbyterians no longer hold faithfully to the standards of the Westminster Confession. The Congregationalists have long since forsaken Congregational orthodoxy and are often found in the company of Unitarians and Universalists. The Episcopalians have their High Church (Anglo-Catholic) group, their modernists and others. The Northern Baptist Convention long since departed from the historic position of the Baptists on the authority of the Word of God. Many other instances can be cited. The Council cannot rest its claim to be evangelical upon the faithfulness of its constituent denominations to their creeds. They have not been faithful.

(c) *It is not enough to say that all their constituent denominations at their admission accepted the divinity of Jesus as Lord and Saviour.* In the first place they were never asked what they meant by these words, and secondly, many since their admission to the Council have drifted far from their doctrinal moorings, e.g., Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists. They may not believe today what they believed when they applied for admission to the Council. This evidence is worthless in view of the changes that have taken place in theological thought since the formation of the Council.

(d) *The claim that the Council has declined to receive denominations whose position on the Person of Christ is doubtful, has little value.* The vote on the Universalists indicated that some Council denominations were perfectly willing to receive such a denomination. The vote in the plenary session showed an even greater sentiment for receiving them. It is not enough to deny Universalists and Unitarians a place in the Council. It is only enough when the Council itself refuses to take the same position. This it will not do. The vote to refuse the Universalists showed the inroads that Unitarianism has made in the Federal Council.

(e) *If the responsibility for maintaining the loyalty of its own members rests upon each denomination, and if they have not been true to this trust, but drifted into modernism, then they will inevitably carry the Federal Council with them.* This has been the case. Long ago the major denominations ceased to discipline heretics, then they ceased to preach against heresy, they then could no longer recognize heresy, and now there is no witness against heresy or apostasy in the official circles of the large Federal Council denominations. Analyzed realistically, the claim of the Federal Council to be positively evangelical is without any basis whatever. It is untrue and the claim is made only to deceive.

2. *The Federal Council claims to "represent a common Protestant front in support of the priceless heritage that all the member Churches have in the Reformation"* (Federal Council Bulletin, November, 1946.) Several observations must be made on this statement.

(a) *The Federal Council is no longer Protestant in membership.* The Federal Council Bulletin (June 1946) frankly

states that the term Protestant no longer fits the Council, for its membership now includes the Eastern Orthodox with its prayers to the Virgin Mary and the saints and prayers for the dead. Furthermore, the Federal Council in its official pronouncements of 1942 and 1944 referred to the Roman Catholic Church as a "sister communion" and as a "Christian" body. Martin Luther and the Reformers would never have referred to the Roman Church in these terms. The Evangelical Alliance which the Federal Council eventually displaced had a strong testimony against Popery. While the Federal Council and other liberals object to Romanism, it is not on doctrinal grounds as they have frequently emphasized. As the Council itself acknowledges, the word Protestant does not describe the Federal Council any more. The Federal Council has compromised our Reformation heritage.

(b) *The Federal Council is unfaithful to the cornerstone of the Reformation: the final authority of the Word of God in faith and practice.* This doctrine is not affirmed in its constitution, it has never been defended by its leaders, and is not held by the majority of its constituent denominations. There is no record of a reaffirmation of the authority of the Word of God against its modernistic saboteurs by any Federal Council leader. The releases of the Federal Council never appeal to the authority of the Word of God except on social issues where the Federal Council leaders happen to agree with the Scriptures. The Federal Council will use the Scriptures to give added weight to its pronouncements, but it has never been willing to change its position to accord with the Scriptures. It has appropriated the Reformation principle of private judgment while rejecting the Reformation principle of acknowledging the Word of God as a corrective of

private judgment. In rejecting the final authority of the Word of God as its leadership does, the Federal Council forfeits all claim to be the custodian of the precious truths recovered in the Reformation.

(c) *The Federal Council falsely claims to stand for the Reformation doctrine: justification by faith apart from works.* This great truth set Luther afire and became the very life of the Reformation movement. It was based upon faith in the atoning merits of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity. It made a sharp distinction between salvation by faith and salvation by works. The basis of this doctrine, and the sharp distinctions which this doctrine made, are noticeably absent from the preachments of the Federal Council and most of its constituent denominations. Modernism, with its question mark after every fundamental Christian doctrine, has undermined this doctrine, while still professing the form. Fundamentalism in all its forms today, is in direct line of succession on this great doctrine. Modernism and modern leadership not only fails to preach it but has rejected the presuppositions upon which the doctrine rests and which alone give it significance. Furthermore, the admission of the Eastern Orthodox Church with its prayers to the saints, its prayers for the dead and its mediatorial priesthood, is a sharp break with the very essence of the Reformation legacy. The Department of Evangelism, which might well be expected to stress this great doctrine, does not strike this note at all. The dominant note is human commitment, instead of Divine justification on the basis of the atonement of Christ. This Federal Council claim is false.

(d) *The Federal Council, with its doctrinal position dependent upon its member-denominations, has with them*

abandoned one of the great characteristics of the Reformation: the preaching of the great doctrines of the Scriptures. Since the member-denominations no longer agree on the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, the Council can neither expound these doctrines or defend them against those who would subvert them or destroy them. The Reformers contended earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints (Jude 3), this the Council cannot do and dare not do. If its member-denominations embrace apostasy, the Council leadership will express their apostate position. This it does consistently. The membership of any Council is responsible for the type of leadership they create. The Federal Council is no more apostate than the member-denominations that support and condone its apostasy. The absence of any exposition or defense of the great Reformation doctrines on the part of the Council indicates its spiritual break with the Reformation.

3. *The Federal Council claims to be "evangelistic in spirit and practice."* (Present Policies of the Federal Council) Edwin McNeil Poteat, editor of Baptist Freedom, Vol. 3, Number 8) calls the Federal Council "America's Greatest Evangelist." What does a liberal like Dr. Poteat mean by "evangelist?" What does the liberal Federal Council mean by "evangelism?"

(a) *There is no common agreement among its leaders concerning the saving elements in the Gospel.* E. G. Homrighausen of Princeton, a leader in Federal Council evangelistic activities, says of the Bible, "Few intelligent Protestants still hold to the idea that the Bible is an infallible book; that it contains no linguistic errors, no historic discrepancies, no antiquated scientific assumptions, nor even bad ethical standards.

. . . The Bible contains much history, some of it faintly imbedded in age-old myths, folk tales, battle songs, camp fire recitals and the like." (Christianity in America, 1936, p. 121.)

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick says, "Of course, I do not believe in the Virgin Birth. . . . I do not know of any intelligent Christian minister who does." (Letter to H. U. Fisher, Christian Beacon, July 24, 1947.) Dr. Fosdick was long a Federal Council radio preacher.

George A. Buttrick, past President of the Federal Council of Churches, says of the atonement, "Jesus was not a sinner. He had done nothing to incur God's wrath. And if God dealt with Him as if He were a sinner and the greatest sinner, then we must say of God (as a cynical Frenchman did say of these penal theologies): 'Our God is my devil'. Never was Christ more at one with God than in the sacrifice of Calvary." (Great Themes of the Christian Faith, 1930, p. 18.) We do not know of a single outstanding Federal Council leader who has publicly expressed himself in favor of the Scriptural interpretation of Christ's death.

There is no agreement on the meaning of the Gospel in the liberal world of the Federal Council. The Council has promoted vigorously the Interseminary Conferences for theological students. Leland P. Bechtel (Easterner of the Eastern Baptist Seminary 12-1947) reporting on the North American Interseminary Conference said: "In the student discussion group to which I was assigned there was little agreement as to the exact nature of the Gospel. . . . Lack of agreement as to the Gospel was evident not only in the student interpretation of the platform lectures . . . but also in the Bible study periods when the nature of the Gospel was discussed." The Federal

Council, like other liberal groups cannot agree on the nature of the Gospel.

Edwin McNeil Poteat, who called the Federal Council "America's Greatest Evangelist" is reported as saying, "We are often inclined to think of people because they are bad. In this usage 'bad' is often associated with any pattern of conduct not identical with our own." (Church News, Peoria, Illinois, 11-1947.) Angus C. Hull, in the same medium reports Dr. Poteat, "Dr. Poteat, speaking on the Lost Sheep, the Lost Son, and the Lost Coin, enabled us to see that many, if not most people, are lost not because they are bad, but simply because they have followed their own inclinations without serious thought of how it might separate them from God and from their fellows. Thus the lost sheep was simply grazing and followed its instinct to survive in eating the lush bunches of grass upon which it concentrated, until suddenly it looked up from its grazing and realized that it was lost. And then it became terribly lost and alone.

"People today are like that! They have followed their normal, actual instinct, not being particularly bad, and yet suddenly they have found themselves lost and alone. These are the people to whom the church must minister. This is the background upon which a great program of evangelism which most of the major denominations have launched, is built. People are hungry, they are lonely, they are bewildered." (Address given to the Illinois Baptist Convention, 1947.) While there is some truth in these statements, this is not the Scriptural picture of "lostness" upon which the atonement of Christ is based. In fact, the liberal leaders of the Council give no evidence of acceptance of the Scriptural teaching concerning lostness.

Federal Council evangelism is not based upon any common agreement upon the authority of the Scriptures, the person of Christ, the nature of the atonement of Christ, the meaning of the gospel or any other element in Scriptural evangelism.

Federal Council evangelism has no vital relationship to the great doctrines of salvation set forth in the Scriptures. Carl J. McIntire (Christian Beacon, 5-8-1947) asks pertinently, "Where is there any reference to the souls that have been saved; where is there any reference to the precious blood of Christ as the only ground of salvation? The Federal Council cannot talk about these things because it is not agreed upon them. It, therefore, must talk generally and vaguely in the hope that the Protestant laymen, untrained, uninformed, will accept these general sweet-sounding words." The Department of Evangelism of the Federal Council has to strike a common denominator that will satisfy modernists, fundamentalists, humanists, Barthians, Lutherans, Episcopalians, Eastern Orthodox and many others. It is a trumpet blowing an uncertain sound. Many of its churches, following its vague formula have had great ingatherings without forsaking their modernism, without abandoning their worldliness, without reviving their Sunday evening service or resurrecting their prayer meeting.

(b) The Federal Council program of evangelism is not only unevangelical but it is openly socialistic. In the name of the "larger evangelism" E. Stanley Jones, widely known Federal Council "evangelist" lays chief emphasis upon a socialized interpretation of the Kingdom instead of the apocalyptic Kingdom taught by Jesus. His social gospel envisions an economy in which the means of production are owned by the state instead of individuals. His books, without a single ex-

ception while paying lip service to the individual gospel, lay their chief emphasis upon the social gospel. Evangelism as set forth by Jones is of the social gospel type. One searches his writings in vain for clear-cut language indicating his adherence to the fundamentals of the faith as set forth in the Scriptures. One searches his books in vain for the Pauline plan of salvation which is the plan of salvation proclaimed by the Apostolic church. Jones cannot qualify as a Scriptural evangelist on the basis of his writings for they abound in liberal terminology and are noticeably lacking in the Biblical truths which characterizes the true evangel. His use of undefined terms sometimes deceives even the elect, for the elect often take pious words at their face value, unaware that modernists have adopted other meanings for these terms. The Federal Council is evangelistic in the modernist sense of that term. It is not evangelistic in the sense that it is an advocate of the Scriptural plan of salvation, and it cannot be for the majority of its leaders no longer believe in that salvation.

4. *The Federal Council claims to be a "warm Christian fellowship" composed of people of "like precious faith," endeavoring to exemplify that unity for which Jesus prayed (John 17:20-21). (What the Federal Council Is and Is Not.)*

(a) *The expression "of like precious faith" is a new one in Federal Council literature.* This claim will not stand examination. The Council is composed of churches so permeated with the denials and the speculations of modern liberalism that it could not possibly agree upon a definition of its own language, "like precious faith." To say that the Baptists, Congregationalists and the Eastern Orthodox churches have a "like precious faith" is to strip these words of any distinctive doctrinal content. This expression, again, is designed to allay

the fears of the uninformed, but it signifies very little, since it is undefined and cannot be defined.

(b) *Its claim to be a "warm Christian fellowship" is unwarranted if these words are to be interpreted in a Scriptural sense.* To call an organization composed of believers and unbelievers a "warm Christian fellowship," is to conceive of the Christian fellowship in modernistic terms, rather than Biblical terms. If the Council is a "warm Christian fellowship" composed of those of "like precious faith" there would be no reason for this paper. The violence of the present controversy over the Council would be inexcusable. This language, again, has value only as a technique of deceit.

(c) *Its claim to be a pattern of that oneness for which Jesus prayed is equally unwarranted.* (John 17:20-21.) The Federal Council does not quote Scripture as authority, but only Scripture which agrees with the position and policies of the Council. It has no hesitancy in lifting statements out of their contextual setting and applying them without rhyme or reason. This is the case with its use of John 17:20-21.

Hugh T. Kerr, (The Challenge of Jesus, p. 158) says, "Jesus does not use the word ecclesiastic. There is no mention of anything ecclesiastical here. He does not even mention the Church. What we mean by the Church has no place in this high priestly prayer. There is nothing artificial, organizational, ecclesiastical here. Jesus is thinking and living in another world. He is thinking in terms of men and women and little children who love Him, and He prays that they may be bound in the same spiritual unity that binds Him to His Father. Much of our discussion of church union is foreign to His language."

A. C. Gaebelien, (*The Gospel of John*, p. 330) says, "Our Lord did not pray for an outward unity expressed in an imposing organization." Our Lord prayed for that spiritual unity among believers which is the expression of their common love for Him. The illustration of the unity desired is that relationship which exists between Him and His Father. This unity can only be experienced by regenerate believers, not a great sprawling worldly organization composed of believers and unbelievers, the regenerate and the unregenerate, free churches and state churches, spiritual worshippers and ritualists.

A Committee of the Reformed Church in America in "A Study of the Federal Council" addressing itself to this problem in thorough-going fashion, says:

"We hold that the basic principle of Christian communion set forth in the New Testament and in the Protestant Reformation is agreement in essential doctrine and in Christian love. The trend in Protestantism which is represented in the Federal Council is to promote union and co-operation on the basis of affection and devotion to Christ only.

1. "In the New Testament we find this same insistence that there must be agreement in doctrine and love.

'He that is of God heareth the words of God: for this cause ye hear them not, because ye are not of God' (John 8:47).

'... one Lord, one faith, one baptism' (Ephesians 4:5).

'Make full my joy, that ye be of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind.' 'Have

this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus' (Philippians 2:2, 5).

'Whatsoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God: he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son. If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting, for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works' (II John 9-11).

2. This principle is illustrated by the position taken by historic leaders of Protestantism.

John Calvin defends and insists upon this agreement in faith as the primary principle for all Christian union. "That this union of charity (love) so depends on unity of faith, as to have in it, its beginning, its end, in fine, its only rule.' 'Where the Word of the Lord is not, it is not a union of believers, but a faction of the ungodly.' (Institutes. bk. 4-2-5)

Let no one suppose that when the Reformers insisted that the basis of agreement for Christian witness and activity must be agreement in doctrine as well as in love, that they meant that there should be agreement on all points of doctrine. The Reformers insisted that there were distinctions between essential and non-essential doctrines. On all essential doctrines there must be agreement, whereas there could be differences on minor points and still be a common Christian witness and activity.

"No one stated this more clearly than John Calvin, 'For all the heads of true doctrine are not in the same position.

Some are so necessary to be known, that all must hold them to be fixed and undoubted as the proper essentials of religion; for instance, that God is one, that Christ is God, and the Son of God, that our salvation depends on the mercy of God, and the like. Others, again, which are the subject of controversy among the churches, do not destroy the unity of the faith.' (Institutes Bk. 4-1-12)

"John Wesley made the same distinction in his sermon on the catholic spirit. Wesley defined catholic Christianity in classic terms, and declared, 'From hence we may learn, first, that a catholic spirit is not speculative latitudinarianism: It is not an indifference to all opinions: this is the spawn of hell, not the offspring of heaven. . . . A man of truly catholic spirit has not now his religion to see, he is fixed as the sun, in his judgment concerning the main branches of Christian doctrine.' (Sermons on the Spiritual Life, p. 351)

"Wesley's idea of the main branches of Christian doctrine can be seen when he says, 'If any doctrines within the whole compass of Christianity may be properly termed fundamental, they are doubtless these two: the doctrine of justification, and the doctrine of the new birth: the former relating to that great work which God does for us, in forgiving our sins; the latter, to the great work which God does in us, in renewing our fallen nature.' (Wesley's Sermon, 'The New Birth,' Ibid. p. 399)

"The Council departs from this Scriptural principle."

### **III. The Federal Council:**

#### ***Its Social and Economic Philosophy***

"The Federal Council is an instrument for bearing a combined witness to the principles, derived from the Christian faith, which must be applied in the social, political and international life of the world." (Samuel McCrea Cavert in address to the Federal Council, Dec. 4, 1946)

1. *In contrast to the prophets and Jesus, the Federal Council has a non-theological social approach, based upon the moralistic principles of Christianity, apart from the doctrines upon which they are based.* The Constitution of the Council prevents it from having a distinctive theology, and provides no protection against apostasy on the part of the member-denominations. Since its constituents have drifted from the historical Christian faith, it does not and cannot have the evangelical approach to the social problems of the times. If it has a theology: it is the theology of modernistic liberalism. This liberal theology is implicit in its policies and pronouncements. Liberalism itself being a non-theological, non-creedal movement, the approach of the Council is largely moralistic rather than theological.

In contrast to this, the social teachings of the prophets, lauded so highly by Council leaders, are deeply rooted in the theological convictions of the prophets and buttressed by the formula, "Thus saith the Lord." The social teachings of Jesus are likewise a part of his theological and apocalyptic teachings. The social teachings of Paul are part and parcel of his theology. The social approach of the Council is moralistic, rather than theological, humanistic rather than theistic, and



socialistic rather than theocratic. It is not properly related to the teachings of the Scriptures concerning God, man or the world order.

2. *The Federal Council social approach is philosophical and sociological rather than Scriptural.* One can read the social and economic literature of the Council continually and apart from its vague evangelistic phrases and its socialized "Kingdom of God" there is very little reference to the Scriptures and little appeal to their authority. The prophets of the Old Testament with their strong sense of the sovereignty of God and the reality of the supernatural would not feel at home in the social councils of the Council. The real philosophical basis of the Federal Council social program is that of John Dewey, Norman Thomas, Karl Marx and other secular prophets, instead of the prophets of Israel and the Messiah of Israel. Christian terminology is often used to give sanctity to Council views but nowhere is there any indication of the acceptance of the Scriptures as authority.

3. *The Federal Council social approach is humanistic rather than theistic.* It is person centered, not God centered. It is not primarily concerned with the precepts of God but with the problems of man. The prophets began with the will of God for man, but always arrived at the welfare of persons. Theism leads inevitably to the consideration of the good of men. On the contrary, social philosophies which begin with man do not lead men to God, as Socialism, Marxism and humanism attest. The Babels of the Federal Council begin with the earthly problem, not the will of God for men. Like the Babel of old they never quite reach to heaven.

Jesus and the prophets faced the problems of society from

the viewpoint of a holy God who will eventually judge men and nations for their sins. They also warned the nations that the disciplines and judgments of God are operating here and now in society: for they believed that the eternal God was not a remote God but the God of history. They also insisted that there would come to pass "the great and terrible day of the Lord" when the nations would be dealt with in judgment and equity and then God would set up His kingdom, the ideal social order under the rule of God. This is not the viewpoint of the Federal Council, for it is not theistic but humanistic in its social outlook.

There is no mention in the Scriptures of any good society, ushered in by a world church, or by the processes of democracy or by the preaching of social and economic justice. Modernists are religious socialists, using the techniques of secular socialism but endeavoring to infuse them with a religious spirit. The prophet's frame of reference was the demand of a holy God that men cease from sinning and return unto Himself. The Federal Council begins with reverence for personality, insisting that all men are sons of God by birth and nature, that man needs only to dedicate his life to a higher idealism and realize his moral and spiritual potentialities. The religious terminology used to express this, does not carry the meaning of the Scriptures, but the new meanings which modernism has surreptitiously put into these old words.

The Federal Council pays lip service to Christ as the solution of human problems, but a careful examination will discover that they do not mean the Christ of the Four Gospels and the Pauline Epistles, but the modernized Christ of the higher critics, the socialized Christ of the social gospelers.

Having paid lip service to this Christ created by the modernists, the Council then turns to earthly theories for the solution of human problems. Federal Council religious words are heavenly, but its philosophy is of the earth, earthy. The Federal Council's social approach has little in common with the prophets or with Jesus, but much in common with Dewey and Marx.

4. *The Federal Council social philosophy has no absolutes which can be used as yardsticks for individual or social behaviour.* One listens in vain for any "Thus saith the Lord" or anything comparable in authority. Indifferent to the great verities of the Word of God which do not lend themselves to its program, the leadership of the Federal Council is bogged down in the relativities of the human struggle. Their social philosophy is as vaguely expressed and as contradictory as their theology, its support coming not only from the trusting faithful of the churches, but from rich capitalists of the right and clergymen who are definitely of the left. Its moral judgments are humanistic, reaching no higher than those of the atheist John Dewey. Its yardsticks are not the majestic yardsticks of Isaiah and Amos but the inadequate yardsticks of humanism. The prophets whom the liberals praise, judged human society by the absolutes of Divine Revelation and began their thinking, not with the predicament of man but with the will of the sovereign God. Their alternative to human futility was not the weak reed of man's religious schemes, but the intervention of God in history to judge sin and set up His kingdom. Religion did not accommodate itself to the human situation in the prophets, but the human situation was brought into the white light of the Divine holiness and judged. The prophets thundered to men and society,

"Thus saith the Lord." The Federal Council having repudiated the final authority of the Word of God has no Divine frame of reference to which it can appeal. The Federal Council, while professing to believe in God, is in spirit and philosophy humanistic, rather than theistic.

An adequate approach to the social problems of our time cannot be had on the basis of a humanistic version of God, an unreliable Bible, an idealistic Christ divorced from the Christ of history; and indifferentism to theology, the intellectual expression of the Christian faith. The Federal Council, blinded by the illusion of effectiveness, fumbles on.

5. *Modernists, with their superficial view of regeneration, do not have the key to the building of a new world.* The foundation of a secure and just social order must in the last analysis depend upon the spiritual attitudes of the men who compose it. The history of jurisprudence has recorded that no law, however carefully framed, is ever safe from corrupt men and corrupt courts and corrupt governments who determine to pervert it. The history of human government demonstrates that no government can be organized, no constitution can be written, that is safe from the corrupting influence of its own citizenry.

Modernism with its superficial message, its shallow socialistic gospel, its lack of ringing denunciation of individual sins, its lack of the overwhelming power of the Holy Spirit to probe deep into men's lives, does not have the power to regenerate. The growing dissatisfaction with liberalism by liberals, the rise of the neo-orthodox movement and the constant, but never-finding quest for truth in liberal circles bear witness to the fact that the gospel of modernism has no antidote for the ills of society.

**IV. The Federal Council of Churches  
and Local Councils**

1. *The Constitution of the Council lists as one of the objectives "to assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council to promote its aims in their communities."*

2. *The Council affirms that this relationship exists between the Federal Council and the local councils.* Charles P. Taft, President of the Federal Council, speaking over radio station WJR, January 5, 1946 said, "There are now 634 state and local councils in the United States, with a total budget of over \$6,000,000. I know you will be interested that in five years, just since 1941, that has come up from 247, or two and a half times; and from \$1,800,000, or more than three times. So there you are with just a thumbnail sketch of the framework of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America."

3. *These Councils are often composed of Unitarians and Universalists, in violation of the statement concerning the divinity of Christ.* The New Hampshire Council of Churches includes not only the Baptists but the Unitarians and the Universalists. This is true of other groups in fellowship with the Council, such as Massachusetts and Connecticut. While it may be claimed that these groups are independent, it is nevertheless true that they exercise great influence in Federal Council circles.

4. *The fellowship of these councils with the national body is seen in the fact that they in every case reflect the policies and emphases of the Federal Council and work in coopera-*

*tion with it.* We do not know of a single exception to this rule.

5. *The Federal Council disclaims authority over these councils but says, "its function is to share with them the benefit of the experience of the churches in other communities and thereby to assist in building a strong voluntary cooperative life and fellowship among Christians in all parts of the nation."* Thus it will be seen that while there is no authority over the local council there is an intimate connectionism which secures the closest fellowship and cooperation. The evidence of this is seen in every American city of any size.

6. *Through these local councils the Federal Council has been able to oppose the selling of radio time to gospel broadcasters, asserting that such time should be given free to the churches.* They seldom go further and say that since the local federation will have the authority over the use of this time, that it will follow the example of the Federal Council on the national net-works and use no evangelical ministers. Since the liberals are generally in control of the local federations, many evangelicals refusing to fellowship with them, the bulk of the free time will go to the liberals. The national policy of the Federal Council in using only liberals on its radio free time gives ample credence to the charge that the Council, through the local councils is in favor of eliminating gospel broadcasters. The charge has been freely made and never successfully denied.

James de Forest Murch (United Evangelical Action, Nov. 1946, p. 15) says concerning this, "When NEWSWEEK spoke of the Federal Council as 'a virtual monopoly' in Ameri-

can Protestantism it expressed a common belief among evangelicals. Many hold that it not only restrains the freedom of non-cooperating denominations but often promotes liberalism at the expense of all Bible-believing, Christ-honoring Protestants.

"Religious radio is a case in point. The Council early recognized the importance of this means of disseminating religion. At a conference in Atlantic City Dr. Charles C. MacFarland, then FCCCA secretary, made this widely publicized statement: 'The ultimate plan to be worked out will probably be for the local federations of churches to endorse and local stations to present national programs provided on Sunday by the Federal Council, whereby all will have their choice of hearing . . . a few selected preachers who have received the full endorsement of the Federal Council.' Dr. MacFarland continued, 'The Federal Council is now surveying the entire field throughout the country and is signing up all available stations to carry its programs.' Mr. Frank R. Goodman, the present head of the FCCCA's Department of National Religious Radio, made this survey and signed up fifty or more stations 'with ironclad contracts obliging them to use the Federal Council religious programs and none other.'

"At the Atlantic City conference a reporter asked, 'Did you mean, Dr. MacFarland, that it is the expectation of the Federal Council to control all religious broadcasting, making it impossible for denominational conventions to get on the air and for pastors to broadcast sermons without Federal Council sanction?' Dr. MacFarland replied, 'Precisely. The Council feels this to be a wise policy.' Thus was laid down the policy which in principle at least has been perpetuated until the present.

In a land of boasted freedom of speech and freedom of religion it was manifestly impossible for the Federal Council to achieve its purpose openly by contractual relations. A much more subtle approach was necessary. Today the Council as a matter of policy opposes the sale of broadcasting time to any religious organization. It favors free, or sustaining, religious programs which can be controlled, according to Dr. MacFarland's 'ultimate plan,' through 'local federations of churches.' The national phase of religious radio is controlled through Protestant (FCCCA) representation on committees advisory to the great radio networks. Evangelicals do not sit on these committees and fundamental preachers do not appear on FCCCA radio network programs. So firmly entrenched is the Council's position in religious radio that the combined efforts of evangelical organizations have so far succeeded in securing less than five per cent of the sustaining time available to religion on national radio networks. Only the grace of God and the loyalty of millions of Bible-believing, Christ-honoring radio listeners in a still-free America make possible such evangelical broadcasts as 'The Old-Fashioned Revival Hour' and 'The Lutheran Hour.' Nevertheless these programs are under constant shrewd undercover attack designed to eliminate them from the air."

**V. The Northern Baptist Convention  
and the Federal Council of Churches**

1. *The Northern Baptist Convention is a charter member of the Federal Council of Churches and a contributor to its support through the Unified Budget.*

The Federal Council was founded in Philadelphia in December, 1908. The Northern Baptist Convention of 1908 voted to send delegates to the Conference which instituted the Federal Council. The resolution is as follows: "Resolved: That we desire to cooperate in every practicable way with all the people of God in the establishment of the kingdom of righteousness on earth, and accordingly instruct the Executive Committee to appoint our quota of representatives to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." (1908, N.B.C. Annual, p. 101.)

2. *The Northern Baptist Convention had no legal right to commit Northern Baptist Convention churches to membership in the Federal Council.* The action of the 1908 Convention was in direct violation of the Declaration of the Northern Baptist Convention as set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution. The Declaration says, "The Northern Baptist Convention declares its belief in the independence of the local church, and in the purely advisory nature of all denominational organizations composed of representatives of churches." The first sentence says plainly that we cannot act as a denomination, nor commit independent churches to anything by the action of the Convention or any of its agencies. Yet this was done in the affiliation of the Convention with the Federal Council.

In 1919, Shailer Matthews, a former president of the Convention, discussed the ideas expressed in the Declaration of the Act of Incorporation. This is what he wrote: "The Baptist denomination is a collection of independent democratic churches. Not one of these churches recognizes any ecclesiastical authority superior to itself. They are grouped in associations, State Conventions, and a national Convention, but none of these groups has any control over a local church, beyond that which lies in common faith, practice and service. The denomination, in so far as it has unity, is a federation of independent democracies. In the nature of the case, therefore, anything like organic church union of Baptist churches with other denominations is impossible. There is no centralized body that could deliver Baptist churches to any merger or corporate unity. If Baptist churches do not have organic unity among themselves, they obviously cannot have organic unity with other denominations. By the very nature of our organization, we are estopped from seeking organic unity with other denominations." (1938, Annual, p. 258.)

Hugh C. Burr, a liberal writer (Watchman-Examiner, July 3, 1947), says concerning this, "This paragraph by Dr. Matthews not only elaborates the Declaration; in one tremendously important particular it goes beyond it. What the Declaration states as a present belief, 'the purely advisory nature of all denominational organizations composed of representatives of churches,' he declares to be an immutable necessity. Is it not time to realize that our Declaration and our practice have not fitted? We face a situation in which national and world fellowships of Christians are federations of denominations, and we are in them by denominational action—the only possible way we can get in—while the Declaration says we

never can be one." There is no doubt but that the affiliation of the Northern Baptist Convention with the Federal Council was an illegal action.

3. *The representatives of the Northern Baptist Convention to the Federal Council represent only themselves.* The representatives to the organizing conference in 1908 had no legal right to commit the denomination to membership in the outside body, without action by the local churches. In 1909 the Convention voted to receive the report of the delegates to the Federal Council and referred it to the Executive Committee with power. (Annual, 1909, item 20, p. 35.) Dr. John W. Bradbury, discussing these matters says truly, "In their interchurch and inter-denominational relationships the Baptists cannot go beyond the advisory and consultative stage. . . . Autonomous churches—such as Baptist churches are—do not recognize anything as legally binding which a collection of Baptist individuals, voluntarily assembled in convention from the churches on the basis of common interest, courteous cooperation, and Christian fellowship, may decide. If they do that with their own privileged groups, how can corporate and legal obligations be formed with combinations of denominations which are not Baptist either in organization or policy? If it is done, it is fictitious and essentially dishonest, for it gives a false impression to the churches that they have done what they have NOT done, and it gives to the non-Baptist organizations the belief that they have a membership which they do NOT have." The claim of the Federal Council that they represent 1,500,000 is false, for it is not only illegal but actually untrue as an investigation will readily prove.

Dr. Bradbury continues, "We submit that when so-called

'representatives' to the World Council of Churches and the Federal Council of Churches are appointed, it is a fictitious and improper appointment, for such representatives have nothing to represent. They never have had anything to represent, nor can they have anything to represent. If delegates to a Baptist Convention have not and never have had the power to commit their churches—and such is the case—but assemble as individuals and fraternal messengers from the various churches to consider and resolve in an advisory capacity only, how can it be said that these individuals—who differ year by year—can vote to assign the affiliations and loyalties of churches which THEY do not even 'represent'? Such a situation must be delivered from its insincerities and its unethical processes. That can only be done by the faithful observance of the autonomy of the local Baptist churches. For if autonomous churches may be voted this way or that by a gathering of Baptist individuals, then the truth must be faced that such churches are no longer autonomous and their independence is a fiction. They are subject to the whims and fancies of meetings in which they have but a fragmentary part and in which their local church convictions have but feeble weight." The conclusion is inescapable: the Baptist representatives in the Federal Council of Churches represent no churches, only themselves. The Federal Council, by the same token, does not speak for Northern Baptist churches as it claims.

4. *Does the illegal character of Convention affiliation with the Federal Council absolve Northern Baptist Convention churches of moral responsibility in the matter?* By no means. Several observations must be made.

(a) *The Baptist churches in cooperation with the North-*

ern Baptist Convention have had the political power to end this affiliation and have not done so. If the Northern Baptist Convention is a democracy as is claimed, then the churches have had this power and failure to exercise it to end the affiliation, places the ultimate responsibility on them for this unholy alliance. They have consented to it by default.

(b) *The Baptist churches in cooperation with the Convention have consented to it by their contributions.* From the beginning the Convention has voted funds to the Council, thus in a positive way, reaffirming its affiliation. While from time to time, such appropriations have been protested by conservative delegates, nevertheless they have been voted. The churches of the Convention cannot escape the moral responsibility of such acts. Both liberals and conservatives have served as Baptist representatives in the Council.

(c) *The fact that a Baptist church has protested against this affiliation does not absolve it from guilt in this matter.* We grant the nobility of the protests, but when any minority after protesting, goes along with the majority, it assumes its share of the corporate guilt. The fact is that the majority of the conservative churches of the Convention, who presumably disapprove of the Federal Council, contribute undesignated funds to the Convention, thus involving them directly in the support of the Federal Council. A resolution against the Council, designation of funds away from the Council, does not release the churches from involvement in the Council as long as they permit the Convention to affiliate them with the Council. Every church in the Convention, must accept its share of the corporate guilt of this affiliation with modern unbelievers. This fact should be accepted honestly and not evaded.

5. *The churches of the Convention have in the main, accepted a false doctrine of ecumenicity, and supported it.* In their own fellowship they ordain ministers who believe the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith and those who do not. They elect to office men representing every shade of belief and unbelief and support them, admitting even modernistic officials to the pulpits of conservative churches. They support missionary societies which have adopted and followed inclusivist theological policies which permits both believers and unbelievers to sit upon their boards and represent them on the field. The churches of the Convention have many times, without protest, permitted unbelievers to speak on their annual programs. In fact, the churches of the Convention have permitted their own Convention and its agencies to practice the same inclusive practices of which the Federal Council is accused, and to permit unbelieving representatives of the Federal Council to speak from its platforms. Its various state conventions are in many cases, members of state councils of churches which go even farther than the Federal Council in including Universalists and Unitarians (New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut and others). The churches of the Convention, have in the main, accepted the false doctrine of ecumenicity of which the Federal Council is the outstanding example and practice it in their state and city inter-denominational fellowships. Only a lawyer, dealing in fictitious legal distinctions, can absolve any church in the Convention from a share of guilt in this modern apostasy.

**VI. The Baptists and the Universalists:*****A Failure in Christian Witnessing***

Editor Lippard in Missions Magazine (May, 1947) writing on "Unfair and Malicious Propaganda Against the Federal Council of Churches" makes an amazing statement. He says, "The Federal Council is accused of being theologically modernistic. It seems incredible that people continue to believe that against the fact that twice the Council has rejected the membership application of a large denomination because its theology is not in accord with the evangelical position of the 25 denominations that comprise the Council's membership." Dr. Lippard is referring undoubtedly to the twice rejected application of the Universalists. The difficulty with this illustration is that it proves the opposite, i.e. the modernistic character of the Federal Council of Churches. Note—

1. *The doctrinal position of the Universalists is clearly stated.* Discussing the rejection of the Universalist application for membership in the Council in 1944, the Christian Century (Dec. 13, 1944) said, "It was disclosed that the Year book of American Churches carried a statement concerning the Universalists, signed by the Secretary of their Board of Trustees (the same person who together with the President signed the application for Federal Council membership) saying that 'Universalists, as a body, are now practically Unitarians so far as the person, nature and work of Christ is concerned.'" That this is the truth is attested by many competent observers.

2. *The Universalists, in spite of their Unitarianism, professed to believe in "Jesus Christ as divine Lord and Saviour."*

In fact, in their application for membership in 1944 they used the exact words in the Preamble of the Federal Council, thus indicating that those of Unitarian views today can subscribe to these words. The fact that a number of denominations voted to accept them in 1944 and 1946 indicates that these words are being variously interpreted as we have before shown.

3. *The vote in both 1944 and 1946 indicates how seriously modernism is influencing the Federal Council.* In 1944 six denominations voted to receive the Universalists, while 12 voted to reject. It is interesting to note that the Disciples of Christ with whom many liberal Baptists want to unite, voted to receive the Universalists in 1944. THE NORTHERN BAPTIST DELEGATION IS LISTED AS NOT VOTING EITHER WAY.

In 1946 the Universalists again applied for admission. Sixteen denominations voted. Eight voted no, while four voted yes. Four others, including the Northern Baptist delegation, deferred decision pending further study. Again, the Northern Baptist delegation dodged the issue, while the Disciples of Christ again voted to receive the Universalists. After rejecting the Universalists, the Council sent them fraternal greetings and advised them to restudy the matter with Council representatives and try again. A large number of delegations were divided on the issue. In 1946 when the matter was placed before the delegates in plenary session, they voted to reject the Universalists by a small margin (70-63). The Christian Century, the voice of so called "evangelical liberalism," referred to the rejection of the Universalists in 1944 as a "regrettable action" (Dec. 13, 1944). It also revealed that some denominations which voted to reject the Univer-



salists did so on the grounds of expediency rather than conviction. If the rejection of the Universalists is a proof of the evangelical character of the Council, what shall we say of the Northern Baptist Convention whose representatives took no stand on either occasion? Instead of the rejection of the Universalists disapproving the charge of modernism, as the editor of Missions asserts, it revealed how serious have been the inroads of theological Unitarianism in the Council.

Mrs. Harper Sibley, wife of the Treasurer of the Federal Council, sums it up in these words attributed to her: "We have enjoyed the fellowship of the Universalist women. We have moved away from the faith of our fathers and are moving toward our own living faith today. There are men amongst us who do not go as far in the doctrine of divinity as do the Universalists. There are many who do go as far. . . . The Universalists really belong to our fellowship." (United Evangelical Action) This is a statement which for honesty and forthrightness puts Missions Magazine to shame. The Baptists have nothing to be proud of in their record on the Universalists. Furthermore, the two rejections of the Universalists really reveal the truth of the charges of apostasy within the Council.

### **VII. How Shall the Convention Deal With the Council Problem?**

1. *The legal problems.* Hugh Chamberlain Burr (Watchman-Examiner, July 3, 1947) offers a way out. "Should we not substitute in the Declaration of the Act of Incorporation, after the words 'Local church' in the second line, two clarifying sentences such as these? First, belief in the independence of the local Baptist church carries with it the belief in its competence voluntarily to affiliate itself with other Baptist churches for the advancement of the Kingdom through the appointment of delegates to represent it and the deliberate and official action of such delegates. Secondly, such voluntary transfer of a portion of the sovereignty of a local Baptist church to the Northern Baptist Convention may be, of course, withdrawn at any time by church action taken in two successive years. I believe we should make this substitution." There are several points in this proposition that should not be overlooked:

(a) *This would involve the loss of independence on the part of the local church.* To say that it is only a partial surrender of sovereignty is meaningless: it would lead eventually to the loss of all independence.

(b) *It would give the Convention authority over the churches which it does not now possess, for the delegates to the Convention in the past have seemingly been willing to vote for anything proposed by the leaders.*

(c) *It is easier for the church to vote away its independence than to get it back.* It is provided here that two years must elapse before the church could regain its indepen-

dence. The net result would be that the majority of the churches would lose their independence. This is a thinly disguised scheme to build an authoritative ecclesiasticism under the guise of giving legality to the illegal membership of the Convention in the Council. The cure is even worse than the disease, for it would give authority to a Convention which already manifests the theological complexion of the Council.

The other remedy is a simple one. Let the Convention vote to disaffiliate with the Council and permit its local churches to determine their own interdenominational affiliations. This is legal; it is ethical; it is Baptist. Furthermore, it would make the Council directly responsible to the churches for its actions which would make for more democracy. Since liberals seldom believe in democracy unless they control it, this solution of the problem is not likely to be adopted.

2. *The problem of financial support.* Spasmodic attempts have been made through the years to reduce the financial contribution of the Convention to the Council or to cancel it altogether, but without success. The Federal Council has long been a part of the Unified Budget and entitled to its share of the Budget dollar. Various methods have been adopted to offset the objections of the churches to supporting the Federal Council, none of them of any real value.

(a) *The designation privilege.* For a number of years it has been the privilege of a local church to notify the Convention that no portion of their contribution could be disbursed to the Federal Council. This has had no practical value in the larger sense, and even many conservative churches did not take advantage of it. It served to ease the conscience of

some churches but did not end the guilt of affiliation with an apostate organization.

(b) *The Kansas Plan.* Part of the resolution referring to the financial support of the Council is as follows: "We urgently propose to the General Council of the Northern Baptist Convention that the item in the budget supporting the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America be treated entirely by designation." (Watchman-Examiner, May 15, 1947). It was understood by the Kansas Baptist Convention that its resolution did not involve the merits or the demerits of the Council.

This, too, was of little value. The churches already had the privilege of refusing to support the Council if they so desired. The resolution would not in effect decrease the support of the Council, but might under certain circumstances increase it, since it would encourage the friends of the Council to seek designations. It did not touch the problem of our membership in the Council except to suggest that a study be made. Nothing substantial has come from it.

(c) *The Milwaukee Plan.* The Northern Baptist Convention (Milwaukee, 1948) adopted the Unified Budget for 1948-1949 which included \$13,360 for the Federal Council of Churches and \$1,150 for the World Council of Churches. The report on "Our Interdenominational Relationships" read by Dr. E. H. Pruden, Northern-Southern Baptist was approved. It provides that:

1. That the Northern Baptist Convention not only recognize the right of every local church to give to or withhold support from the Federal Council, but that in addition, full assurances now be given to all churches which prefer not to

support the Federal Council that this preference will in no way be interpreted as a failure to cooperate with the program of the Convention.

2. That designated gifts to the Federal Council will count on the suggested amount in the budget for the Federal Council, and if those funds do not reach the percentage of participation of other like items in the budget, the difference will be made up from the distributable undesignated funds from those churches which have voiced no objections to this arrangement.

3. That if any churches wish to be recorded as being opposed to participation in the work of the Federal Council, that the Recording Secretary be authorized to publish the total number of churches presenting such objections in the denominational year book.

An amendment was offered by Dr. I. C. Ellis, of Illinois to change the wording of Article II by inserting the word "not," thus changing the wording of "the difference will be made up . . ." to "the difference will not be made up from the distributable undesignated funds from those churches which have voiced no objections to this arrangement." Dr. E. B. Willingham, Dr. Gordon Poteat, and Dr. E. V. Pierce spoke against the amendment, while Rev. E. W. Hodson, of Southern California spoke for it. Dr. Pierce's point was that the Convention some years ago had provided the means to designate money away from the Federal Council so there was no need for it. The amendment was lost, and the report as given was carried. (Watchman-Examiner, June 17, 1948)

Several observations should be made on this Milwaukee Plan:

(a) *It is not the Kansas Plan.* The Kansas Plan was that the Federal Council was to be supported entirely by designations from favorable churches but not sharing at all in the distributable funds of the Unified Budget. This is not even a good compromise.

(b) *It places the Federal Council in a better financial position than ever before.* It gives churches the privilege of designating to it and no ceiling is provided. If the Unified Budget is raised it is protected against loss, in that any deficit is to be made up from Budget income. Contributions to the Federal Council have no ceiling, but they do have a floor, below which they cannot fall. Of course, if the Unified Budget is not raised in full the Council will suffer loss pro rata with other Budget interests.

(c) *The amendment offered would have placed into operation the Kansas Plan thus lessening the tension on this subject.* The rejection of this amendment will further the controversy.

(d) *The point made by Dr. Pierce that the churches already have the privilege of designating against the Federal Council is not as sound as it looks.* Kansas churches had this privilege yet out of their dissatisfactions came the Kansas Plan. Many churches do not know they have this privilege for many state secretaries and denominational officials have not informed the churches of this privilege. Furthermore, the Federal Council's place in the Unified Budget, sharing in the distributable funds places the stamp of approval of the Convention upon the Federal Council which is objectionable to Conservatives. Baptist democracy would always insist that a local Baptist church have the right to support any benevo-

lent interest that elicits its support. The Kansas Plan would have permitted them this democratic right, without involving other churches in the matter. Conservatives do not want the privilege of designating against the Federal Council, but the privilege of having no fellowship with it whatever.

(e) *It is of interest that conservative and liberal speakers united in opposing the Ellis amendment, thus keeping the Federal Council in the budget and involving the Northern Baptist Convention in the guilt of supporting an apostate organization. The feeble opposition to the Federal Council in the Convention indicates the depth of the involvement of the Convention in the sins of the Federal Council.*

(f) *The fundamental question was not faced: the sin of being in fellowship and in cooperation with this apostate group. This is the question that must eventually be faced.*

**VIII. Membership in the Federal Council:  
A Theological Problem for True Evangelicals**

The answer to this problem involves the nature of the Church, the definition of schism, the Biblical principle of separation, and the time and manner of its application to a given situation.

1. *The nature of the Church.* The Church as held by the leadership of the Federal Council of Churches is not the Biblical concept of the church, but a liberalized version of the Catholic doctrine of the visible, universal church. The Church, as held by American liberals, is not the Church as set forth in the New Testament composed of regenerated believers, but an inclusive Church which will include all persons professing Christianity, regardless of belief.

George Stewart (*The Church*, 1938, pp. 13-14) outlines two major conceptions of the Church. He says, "There are two major conceptions of the Church's function. The first regards the Church as an inclusive agency; the second, as an exclusive community of saints. The two concepts are generally designated the Church type and the sect type. . . . The Church as an inclusive agency of salvation is concerned to reach as many as possible, and for that reason is willing to meet them on their own level, attempting to raise them in the scale of moral and spiritual values. The sect, or community of saints is also concerned in making more saints, but especially in preserving the primitive patterns of faith and practice, even if membership is small."

Here Dr. Stewart states two diverse principles of the greatest importance. Are the Baptists willing to give up the

Biblical concept of the Church as a community of redeemed people, living separate lives, for a Catholic church composed of both the regenerate and the unregenerate, believers and unbelievers, who are held together while the Church seeks to raise this mixture to a higher and higher level of devotion? If so, all history and all experience is against the experiment. The "mixed multitude" that accompanied Israel from Egypt was a corrupting influence. History indicates that instead of the Church raising the mixed multitude to a higher level, the "mixed multitude" pulls the Church down to a lower level. It can be seen in the state churches of Europe, in the Church of England and in the Roman Catholic Church everywhere. It is exemplified in the Russian Orthodox Church before its destruction by the Soviet Revolution. Furthermore this catholic type of the church has all through the centuries proven to be the enemy of the prophetic type of Christianity. If Baptists embrace the new ecumenicity they abandon the Baptist and New Testament concept of the Church as a company of redeemed people.

There are those who advocate a still broader type of Church. William Adams Brown (How to Think of Christ, 1945, p. 186), for many years a spokesman for the Federal Council and World Council, suggests a broader church. "The Church of which Christ is the Head is not the church we see. That is only the framework and scaffolding. The true Church is the Church invisible but it is nonetheless real. Some of its members are in the existing Churches, others belong to other religions, still others make no profession of religion in any form. But Christ who said, 'Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is

in Heaven,' will recognize each of these unconfessed disciples as His own. This unseen Church, the true Communion of saints, known in its membership to the living Christ alone, is the true Bride of Christ, the home in which His Spirit dwells, the voice through which He speaks His present message to each generation of men." Here in brief is the doctrine of the Church as held by present day advocates of ecumenicity in America: a Church composed of all its visible members (believers and unbelievers); also many non-Christians who are adherents of another religion; many who profess no religion at all and who have never confessed Christ. Here is a new and blasphemous form of the doctrine of the invisible church, yet through this church God speaks even as the Catholic claims that God continues His revelation through the Roman Church. Since the members of this "church" are known to Christ alone, therefore, no man can deny that another man is a Christian, for no basis of differentiation exists.

Those conservatives who speak and write so glibly on the sin of schism, confusing separation from apostasy with schism in the body of Christ, are either ignorant of the liberal doctrine of the Church or have adopted the new catholicism—the latest heresy of modernism.

Conceiving of all groups professing to be Christian as a part of the Church Universal, the modernist views all attempt to divide it or hinder a closer union within it as schismatic. Therefore the fundamentalist emphasis upon separation from apostate religious organizations is classed as schism, because IN THE LIBERAL UNIVERSAL CHURCH THERE IS AND CAN BE NO SUCH THING AS

APOSTASY, SINCE THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH ARE NO LONGER STRICTLY RELEVANT TO ITS LIFE AND PURPOSE. Since ecclesiastical unity is more important to the liberal than the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, the true evangelical must take the position that these doctrines are more important than ecclesiastical unity and accept the conclusion of this position, even separation from the apostate body. This is not schism in the body of Christ but Scriptural separation from unbelief and the modern idolatry which is known as modernism.

2. *The Biblical principle of separation.* The Biblical principle of separation running from Genesis to Revelation in an unbroken thread is a teaching that needs no specific proof-texts. The entire Bible is the documentation of this principle. However, for clarification we deal with several texts, which, in principle, are relevant to our problem. (Many others could be cited such as I Tim. 6:3-5; II Thess. 3:6; II Tim. 3:5.) *II Corinthians 6:14-15 is a key text.* "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness: and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" While the original context undoubtedly referred to the necessity of the early Christians being sharply separated from contemporary idolatry, the same reasons for their separateness, namely, to preserve a pure testimony and a godly life, hold good for us.

Furthermore, the basic issue then and now is the same. Idolatry worships a false god, as our modernists do. False

gods are made of ideas as well as stone and wood. Growing out of this first century idolatry was a false philosophy of life which cut across the grain of first century Christianity. This is true today as between Christianity and modernism. Furthermore, that idolatry then led to atheism, as modernism in our day has developed atheistic humanism. This whole passage is profoundly theological and ethical in its sharp distinctions. To say that the early Christians should separate themselves from first century idolatry while modern Christians need not separate themselves from blasphemous apostasy is to reduce exegesis to a heap of rubbish. Such reasoning is not only erroneous but ridiculous. Modernism today rejects the God of the Old and New Testaments for another god. This is idolatry.

*II John 9-11.* "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed: For he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds." Here again the issue is theological and here again the ultimate remedy must be separation from such a person or group. Here again is the separative principle. In II Corinthians 6:14-15, God is saying that He will have no rival God. Here in II John 9-11 God is saying that He will tolerate no rival Christ, and that any believer who gives aid and encouragement to a false Christ participates in the iniquity of it. Here is the definite prohibition against fellowship with or support of, those who advocate a false Christ or a false doctrine of Christ. This certainly applies to those false teachers, or apostate officials of one's own denomination as

well as those of another fold. It insists that the pulpit must have one message, that the program of the Church must have one message and that the missionary and denominational contributions to the Church shall preach one message, the Christ of the whole Bible. The modern practice of conservative Churches in preaching a true Christ from the pulpit while supporting the false Christ of modernism with their denominational giving is unsparingly condemned. Such a Church or individual, John insists, shares in the guilt of the apostasy. This conclusion is inavoidable if these words receive an honest interpretation. That the Christ of modernism today is a false Christ has been documented a thousand times.

*Galatians* 1:8, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Here is the sharpest denunciation of those who preach "another gospel." Here it is implied that radical separation must be our relationship to such a one and refuse fellowship, regardless of denominationship is here explicitly taught, even to denunciation of those who preach such a false gospel. That the modernists of today are preaching a false gospel no real conservative questions. If so, then the conservative duty is clear—denounce such a one or group. Certainly the idea of withdrawal of fectional ties, denominational loyalties or personal friendship.

These three passages refer definitely to separation for theological reasons and the language is so sharp as to preclude any thought of fellowship between two such unlike persons or unlike groups. Separation from unbelief and infidelity (II Cor. 6:14-15), separation from a false doctrine of Christ (II John 9-11), and separation from a false gospel (Gal. 1:8) is commanded. Those who deny the plain meaning of these

texts say by their exegesis and by their policies that it is alright for believers and unbelievers to be unequally yoked together, if they are in the same denomination or ecumenical group. They say by their exegesis and by their policies that it is alright to contribute to the support of those who preach a false god or a false doctrine of Christ. They say by their exegesis and by their practices that it is alright to support and fellowship with those who preach another gospel. The objections of the modernists to the gospel Paul preached has been documented a thousand times, but many conservatives will not denounce them, if they are in their own denominational household.

The dilemma of those who reject the principle of separation from apostasy is the awful conclusion that the Bible does not teach separation from apostasy, and the startling conclusion that God has not commanded His people to separate from those deniers of the faith who eventually produce the anti-Christ and the apostate church. Those who deny separation from apostasy find themselves in a worse state than separatists: the dubious distinction of being in fellowship with the enemies of Jesus Christ and the Judases of the gospel ministry.

The Biblical principle of separation between believers and idolators, between believers and apostates, between saint and sinner, between righteousness and unrighteousness, between truth and error, between light and darkness is a radical principle as the existence of heaven and hell for the believing and unbelieving attests. This principle cannot be denied by those with any knowledge of the Word of God at all.

3. *The principle is radical, the application to a given situation is relative.*

(a) *The principle of separation in the local church should begin with the application of Biblical disciplines in the church wherever and whenever denials of Christian truth appears or departure from Christian living is observed (II Peter 2:1; Titus 3:10; II Thess. 3:6; Rom. 16:17).* Had New Testament discipline been preserved in the local churches and in the denominational bodies, the question of the separation of true evangelicals from the great denominations would not have been raised. If these disciplines were now being applied in these churches and denominations, the question would not be acute. However, hand in hand with the demand that evangelicals continue in modernistic bodies, goes the consistent refusal to apply the New Testament disciplines within these denominations. Many churches which consider themselves theologically conservative permit modernists who have either departed from the faith or question the fundamental doctrines of the faith to remain in their membership and even hold office. When a Christian belongs to a church which will not discipline departures from the faith, and which will not admonish and discipline those whose behaviour indicate a departure from following Christ, he faces the responsibility for decision on his own part. If the church will not discipline, the individual must separate after adequate time has been given and there is no indication of concern. If he cannot persuade the church or the denomination to stand for the faith, he must depart from that church or that denomination and give his fellowship and support to those who are obedient to Christ. Many Christians today face the decision whether to follow Judas into apostasy or to go with the rest of the com-

pany outside the camp bearing the reproach of Christ. The time when this step should be taken, depends not upon the individual conscience of the believer alone, but rather upon whether the Scriptural standards have been applied, whether the Scriptural steps have been taken. The individual conscience is never free to act independently whenever the Word of God is plain in its commands. The idea of many conservatives that they can conscientiously remain in fellowship with apostasy regardless of what the Word of God teaches is to take the subjectivist position of the modernist toward the Word of God. The time when this decisive step is to be taken is within the individual conscience, but only in cooperation and agreement with the Word of God on this subject. Unless the evils have been corrected, or unless New Testament disciplines are being applied, the command is clear: Be separate! No one who permits denominational loyalties to come between him and Christ is worthy of Christ.

(b) *The principle of separation in a denomination should begin with the application of Biblical disciplines.* Churches which depart from the faith should be excluded from local associations. The fact that the Riverside Church of New York City (Fosdick-Rockefeller Church) has not been excluded from the Southern New York Association is only one example of many. If the Association will not act against an apostate church, the responsibility rests upon the individual church to withdraw fellowship from such an Association. Ministers who deny the faith should either be denied ordination, or, if ordained, should be deprived of their credentials. But on every hand in the Northern Baptist Convention unbelievers are being ordained, thus adding to the apostasy. The only ministers whose credentials have been requested



have been those who are counted "disloyal" to the Northern Baptist Convention. Those who are disloyal to the Christian faith continue to be honored. Missionaries who are unsound in the faith should be called home. This is not being done. The unsound teachings of Dryden Phelps of West China have been repeatedly called to the attention of the Convention authorities but no action has resulted. Gordon Seagraves was permitted to remain on the missionary rolls while publishing books that revealed his unchristian position on many things. Instead of recalling him for discipline, his missionary books were praised and widely recommended by the Convention leadership. Schools which depart from the faith must be disavowed. Instead of that, they are claimed as Baptist schools regardless of their teachings and the most modernistic schools have their advertising regularly in *Missions Magazine* and the *Watchman-Examiner* and other periodicals. They are not disavowed but praised and supported.

Since the New Testament disciplines are not operating, then the responsibility rests upon the local church and the individual Christian to apply these disciplines. If found unavailing or impossible to apply, then separation must be the remedy, otherwise the church is found supporting the enemies of Christ and contributing to the deepening apostasy. The application of the separation principle is relative but the separation principle is a radical principle which must eventually be honored.

(c) *The principle of separation concerning interdenominational and ecumenical movements.* In the case of the Federal Council of Churches, the principle of separation also applies. Conservative Northern Baptists for years have pro-

tested against its departures from the faith. They have tried in vain to exclude it from the Unified Budget of the Convention. The Southern Baptists have protested by remaining outside of its membership. On every hand severe criticisms have been made and are being made of Council leadership and policies. Apparently none of these protests have been even mildly effective. Since it indisputably includes in its leadership those who worship a god of their own contriving instead of the God of the Bible; who speak and follow a Christ, remodelled after their own philosophies; and preach a gospel which is not the true Gospel, the command is clear, "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate."

When does this principle become operative for a local church? When the apostasy of the Federal Council leadership is clearly established (their silence on the fundamental doctrines of the faith is not orthodoxy); when the church has been well taught concerning these issues and the Biblical standards pertaining to them; when a reasonable length of time has elapsed and all protests have been without fruit and no abandonment of apostasy noted, then there is only one remedy for a church. The radical principle of separation must be applied, regardless of denominational ties, financial loss, or impairment of clerical prestige. The ultimate protest against apostasy must be separation from apostasy. The time and manner of this separation is relative, but the duty of separation is radical. The decision rests with the Christian conscience of the individual or the church, with the understanding that a true Christian conscience is one which reflects the teachings of the Word of God and the leadings of the Spirit of God. That conscience which disregards the Word of God, which claims the leadership of the Spirit in directions

contrary to the Word of God is untrustworthy and essentially anarchistic. Separation from apostasy is often costly for the individual or local church, but the penalty of non-separation from apostasy is to deny Christ, to share the guilt of the apostasy of our times and contribute to the rise of the Anti-Christ. The choice today is the ultimate choice: Christ or the Anti-Christ.