

THE FREE PRESS

VOL. 2, No. 4

1630 S. Hanover St., Baltimore 30, Md.

December 27, 1956

IBPFM EXECUTIVE REMOVES CROSS FOR "SABOTAGE"

STATEMENT BY THE IBPFM
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The executive committee of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, meeting December 21, 1956, took, with regret, action dismissing the Rev. Walter G. Cross as a missionary under this Board.

This action was taken because of the revelation of an elaborate plan which Mr. Cross was seeking to carry out concerning the division and sabotage of the work of the Board. Mr. Cross in a lengthy statement to the Committee, produced before the Committee, at its request, a letter dated December 1, 1956, which he had addressed to the Chile Mission of the Board. It became apparent that for some months Mr. Cross had been working against the interests of the Board and undermining the work it has sought to do in Chile and also other countries. It was learned that Mr. Cross had sent copies of his letter, outlining his plan for disruption of the work of the Board and diversion of its funds, not only to the Chile Mission, but also to leaders of the Japan, India, and Peru Missions. In this letter he suggested that other missionaries join him in taking the Chile Mission out from under the Board's ministry to another Board which has been set up as a permanent Committee of Foreign Missions by the Columbus Synod. He also indicated that the National Presbyterian Church of Chile, an indigenous church and at present a member of the International Council of Christian Churches and of the Latin American Alliance of Christian Churches, should be induced to go along in his proposed new venture. He further outlined a program for the diversion of funds from this Board to the Columbus Synod's committee. In the presence of the executive committee he intimated that he was firmly committed to this policy, and it was revealed that for a number of months he has been working toward this end, even though during this time he has been receiving a salary and living quarters from the Board.

It has been the earnest hope and prayer of this Board and many, many of its supporters that the sad difficulties inside the Bible Presbyterian Church should not be injected into the Mission fields and into the struggling Mission churches.

Immediately following the establishment of the official denominational missionary agency at Columbus, Mr. Cross in his letter of December 1 to the Chile Mission reported the formation of that Board and said:

"However, the question now is, what do we do? Do we sit down and twiddle our thumbs? I think I can truthfully say that in the last couple of weeks I have

"The Underground"

The Rev. Kenneth A. Horner, pastor of Faith Bible Presbyterian Church, Wilmington, Del., in a report to his congregation concerning the meeting of the Columbus Synod defended Dr. Robert Rayburn's position in regard to "the letters." Mr. Horner reported that Rayburn explained to the Synod, "The statements which had been quoted from the various letters were not evil in themselves but that the interpretation which had been put on them was evil."

The articles published in the July 12 issue of the *Christian Beacon* are carried again in this issue of *The Free Press*. No comment is necessary. We simply ask Christian people to read them, pay special attention to the quotations which are given, see if the interpretation is evil, or if the quotations themselves reveal the active "underground."

No defense of any kind was attempted until more than three months after the July 12 issue of the *Christian Beacon*. Now that people have somewhat forgotten and recovered from the shock of what they read, it is being said that the only evil was on the side of Dr. McIntire. "The Inside Story and the 'Underground'" speaks for itself.

become as rabid as any one in the Chile or Peru Missions. . . . I don't like for us to be the ones to make the first move, but knowing how you feel, that is, the Cranes and the Gilchests, and the way I feel, I think I can recommend that you have a meeting with the whole Mission and see what you think should be done in case you decide to turn in your resignation and as the board of the church to take you on. It seems to me that a letter could be sent to the executive committee of the Foreign Missions Committee of the Synod of your decisions and I will concur in them. They should include the idea of the two executive committees getting together and working out an equitable arrangement on the properties and perhaps be accompanied by statements of the Presbytery there that they wish to continue in relation with the present missionaries regardless of their affiliations in the USA. It might also be wise before taking action to write to the sessions of the supporting churches and ask if they would give in writing their continued support under the new committee."

As stated above, copies of this letter to Chile were sent also to Japan, India, and Peru.

It was recognized by Mr. Cross before the executive committee that The Independent Board has not changed its position, principles, or program. He admitted that his dissatisfaction was based on personal criticism of individual actions of members

(Continued on page 8)

MACHEN'S WARNING TO THE CHURCH

The late Dr. J. Gresham Machen, founder of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, was more than a scholar. He was a Christian warrior. He led in the establishment of a seminary, a mission board, a new church. He was accused of lacking love; in fact, this was the major charge hurled against him. As he opened the Second General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America, in his capacity as the moderator of the First General Assembly, he chose as his subject, "Constraining Love," and as his text, 2 Corinthians 5:14f, "For the love of Christ constraineth us . . ."

At the conclusion of this message, which we have in our possession, he issues certain warnings. He says:

"We shall be constrained, for example, not to weaken in the stand which we have taken for the sake of Christ. How many movements have begun bravely like this one, and then have been deceived by Satan—have been deceived by Satan into belittling controversy, condoning sin and error, seeking favor from the world or from a worldly church, substituting a worldly urbanity for Christian love. May Christ's love indeed constrain us that we may not thus fall!

"We shall be constrained, in the second place, from seeking unworthily our own advantage or preferment, and from being jealous of the advantage or preferment of our brethren. May Christ's love indeed constrain us that we fall not into faults such as these!"

In these two paragraphs, quoted in full, Dr. Machen prophetically placed his finger upon the sad state which has come upon the Bible Presbyterian Church.

First, in his first statement, he warns against weakening the stand. This is exactly what has happened in the softer approach and policy in the Bible Presbyterian Church at the Columbus Synod. This happened, too, in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, for that group long since has abandoned the militancy which was characteristic of Machen. In 19 years it had an increase of 9 ministers. Ministers went from its fold back into the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the Southern Presbyterian Church, and the United Presbyterian Church. The clean, clear testimony that Machen gave to the purity of the Gospel and the purity of the church gave way to the self-interest and internal struggles of men who once had a golden opportunity—but they turned back.

In the next paragraph Dr. Machen warns of jealousy, advantage preferment. Here it is within the Bible Presbyterian Church

(Continued on page 8)

The Inside Story and the "Underground"

BY THE REV. CARL McINTIRE, D. D.

"Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart" (Psa. 15:1, 2).

The modernists we have been dealing with through these years and the middle-of-the-road compromising brethren who belong to the National Association of Evangelicals have taken the "revolt" against me in the Bible Presbyterian Church, as it has come to the surface, and are using it in all sections of the world against the American Council of Christian Churches and especially with brethren in other lands against the International Council of Christian Churches. This is only natural, since the ICC, consisting of 57 Bible-believing bodies, is the one testimony which is challenging the World Council of Churches with its inclusiveness—modernists and communists on its central committee. We have been dealing with these enemies of the cross as they have sought to promote the inclusivist church and build the one-world superchurch!

In our own Bible Presbyterian fellowship we have had the most delightful time with brethren working together in confidence and trust. I have been pastor of the largest church in the denomination, and when a large church works with an increasing number of small churches oftentimes problems do arise. There was a time when there was practically nothing but the Collingswood Church. At the present time, 20 per cent of the denomination is in the Collingswood Church, and a larger percentage of the contributions are in the Collingswood Church. We have gone along, trusting everybody, delighting in our brethren, and holding up every phase of the movement, as evidenced by the benevolence budget of 50 per cent of all current receipts.

Letters now from the Highland College files, written by Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, former president; from the American Council of Christian Churches files, by Dr. Wm. Harllee Bordeaux, former general secretary; and from the files of the American Council of Christian Churches of California, present a wealth of information showing the operations of a few brethren in a long range plan to remove me from my position. Prominent among these was the Rev. Francis A. Schaeffer, a former missionary under the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and the Rev. Thomas G. Cross, secretary of National Missions of the Bible Presbyterian Synod.

Without exception these brethren have always been most gracious in their relationships with me, in all face to face contacts. One would never have thought that

there were serious differences or feelings. If they existed, they kept them from us!

I never had the slightest idea that there was such a thing as an "underground" operating to change the Councils, or to get me out. In a report of this kind, it is, of course, impossible to quote all the letters. There are scores of them. But from what we are able to quote, the Lord's people can draw their own conclusions. They read almost like a mystery novel!

BROWN-BORDEAUX EXCHANGES INTRODUCE "THE UNDERGROUND"

On May 29, 1952, the Rev. Lionel Brown, writing on stationery of the First Bible Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, wrote Dr. Bordeaux—I quote the entire paragraph:

"I had such a blessing in visiting and praying with Howard Oakley, that I should have reported that immediately. I learned that he is 'one of us,' and has been a co-member of our 'underground.' Phil Foxwell is also one of us, and assures us that Buswell also is persuaded with us. We have decided that the way to work is to pray, and have agreed together to hold up Carl until God either removes the offence from him, or him from the leadership."

What was the "offense" back in 1952? I would like to know! This was written just before Mr. and Mrs. Brown left for New Zealand on a 72-day visit for the ICC arranged by me.

On August 28, 1952, Brown reported to Dr. Bordeaux an entirely different picture from the one that he gave in a letter to me. He wrote Bordeaux: "Only on one instance after I felt the pulse of the country did I mention 'the issues' publicly." Yet Brown had gone out to New Zealand to help clarify the issues for God's people there. In concluding his letter, Brown wrote: "This much is for sure, I was not very proud of my affiliation with the ICC, either in Hawaii or N.Z. I told them everywhere of one Wm. H. B., and recommended him as an informer on the situation who would present the claims in the spirit and love of Christ. I arrived too late for Synod, so an early explosion was averted." And all this was to Dr. Bordeaux early in 1952.

During this time we were active in developing and promoting the regional conferences of the ICC, for the British Isles in Scotland, and for the Middle East at Beirut, which brought about the formation of the Middle East Bible Council, with Dr. Thomas A. Lambie as pres-

ident. But Brown wrote Bordeaux, "I suppose you had to keep the home fires burning while the rest of the boys were flying around on the Scotch and Armenian excursions." In an earlier letter, Dr. Bordeaux, and remember he was the paid secretary of the American Council in New York, questioned the influence which he thought that I was having on Brown, for Brown assured him, "No, Harllee, Carl hasn't taken me in." And on December 14, 1953, Dr. Bordeaux wrote Brown, "As I think I told you, I made no file copy, not even for the confidential file, so 'can't make a check-up.' . . ." These letters were written on the stationery of the ACCC and the typed signature is "Wm. Harllee Bordeaux, GENERAL SECRETARY."

SOLTAU-RAYBURN LETTERS REVEAL ACTIVITY OF "ASSISTANT" PASTOR

All this is just an inkling of what was going on in the "underground." The key spot was right in my own office in Collingswood. One of my assistant pastors, George Soltau, undermined me if ever an assistant pastor did!

He came to Collingswood in the spring of 1952 and was identified with the "underground," as we now know, from the very beginning. In Collingswood, with the full confidence of the session and myself and the people, he maintained the most cordial relations. He was most gracious, always representing himself as very "spiritual." He repeatedly explained to me that one reason he came to work under our ministry was that he would have opportunity to observe, and in close contact with me to receive valuable help for his future ministry. Many times he would come sauntering into my office, sit down, and proceed to ask questions. Never did I have the slightest intimation that he was going out immediately and writing long letters to Dr. Rayburn, on the stationery of the church, misrepresenting, often twisting what I had said. He also was going immediately for conferences, and even telephone conversations at length, with Mr. Schaeffer.

Mr. Soltau, it can be seen, was conscious of the dual role he was playing and was indeed careful lest he expose himself. He did much of his typing in the office at night. The girls in the office would notice him sitting over at a typewriter, writing lengthy letters, but no one ever saw what they were. These came to hand after he had left Collingswood to be pastor of the Enon Valley Church. They turned out to be single spaced, two, three, four pages in length.

AFRAID OF MACRAE

On September 26, 1953, on Collingswood Church stationery, he wrote Rayburn: "I was talking with Mac-

Rae [Dr. Allan A. MacRae, president of Faith Theological Seminary] last night and he wanted me to stay and talk over a letter he had just gotten from Schaeffer that made him feel very low, he said. It was then after midnight so I thought that I had better get home and too I didn't want to get into a discussion with him until I had some idea what the letter was about from someone else than MacRae. I shall have to check with Fran [Schaeffer]. Allan [Dr. MacRae] has been trying to have a talk with me for about three months now and so far I have been able to elude him successfully. I think he wants to know just how I line up in the whole business. I don't know that I want to reveal it all, yet. While I am here at Collingswood I like to put off talks like that with men like that! So I don't know what it is all about." Had MacRae become suspicious of an "underground" working against me, he, as a friend, would, of course, have warned me!

In another three-page letter, Soltau wrote: "MacRae is frantically doing all in his power to get me up to the seminary to have a good talk with me and he has been working on that little project since last April. Thus far I have resisted unto death. The latest method is to ask me to come up and speak at a chapel service and then spend the afternoon with him. I am getting a real education in diplomacy and maneuvering. It has, of course, meant walking with the utmost care and staying particularly close to the Lord. I suppose it is good for me although my ulcers will doubtless question that last statement."

What words describe a man like this working in a great church like Collingswood?

Following a lengthy and detailed report concerning something that had happened, which he wanted to rush to Dr. Rayburn, Soltau wrote: "All this is strictly off the record. I know that you will treat it as such. Oh, hum, I don't know what I shall do when I leave here and get away from such a source of all kinds of news and information. Doubtless live a happier life, I suppose, but I shall miss it all."

"BAITS" McINTIRE

On November 5, 1953, Soltau wrote Rayburn: "I sat in on a little explanation that The Doctor [McIntire] was giving to Charlie Richter [McIntire's first assistant] about the AC meeting in LA. It was most interesting! Some names were very prominent; others were conspicuous by their absence. . . . However, the names listed were names in every case of Carl's particular cronies. I baited a line a bit and tried to get him to say something or even mention your name in it all and he wouldn't take it." Replying to this particular report, Dr. Rayburn said: "He probably did not include my name among those he criticizes out here because he knew that Charlie and

you were good friends of mine. . . . I don't envy you in your peculiar position with regard to all these things there at Collingswood." Soltau's letter of November 5, 1953, concluded, "At times I feel as if I am walking across Niagara Falls on a tightrope!"

Mr. Soltau sat in on all the session meetings of the church and he immediately reported developments from the session. On April 6, 1953, he said: "Things are still going along about as usual here. Things are getting even tighter for Carl, if possible, here in the church through a few things that have come up lately. In absolute confidence, another elder has just left the church and Carl was really hit by it. This was not one of the cantankerous ones either but one who has been the most willing rubber stamp for years. It has just broken and no one knows about it here save the session. . . . This is strictly hush, hush." In reply, April 11, Rayburn wrote: "It is great to get your good letter of Monday, April 6. I always know I am in for a pleasant few minutes when I see a letter from you in the mail." And then, referring to students for the college, Rayburn says: "Thank you so much for the word about Jean Bond. I had already sent her old catalogue and the application blank to her house."

REPORTS "FAMILY" AFFAIRS TO CRITICS

November 26, 1952, writing on Collingswood Church stationery, Soltau wrote to Rayburn:

"Back here we are all in the midst of a terrific flurry with this new Bible. Carl wrote his pamphlet and I guess, since it was the only one out, it has been in terrific demand and the thing has completely taken over the whole time of the staff. In the past couple of weeks sixty thousand have been sent out and the demand is coming in stronger than ever. It sure has convinced me of the usefulness of having something timely. Even though it is no great scholarly work it was written for a special time, and, because there was nothing else particularly on it, it has really gone over.

"My past nine months here have been of real value to me, I think. I have gotten to know Carl well and I have been able to evaluate him in a way that I think will do me a great deal of good some day. I have even been able to have some really frank discussions with him about a lot of things that I have been concerned with in our movement and it has taught me a great deal about dealing with him. It has also taught me how to get along with him without taking any guff from him and I feel a lot more confident about my staying here if that is the Lord's plan for me. . . . So altogether, I think that I am in a far stronger position than when you were here this summer."

Rayburn apparently considered Collingswood, with Soltau active, very important. He wrote, November 9,

1953: "It was a real joy to have your letter of the 26th. I had been hoping to hear from you but realized that your schedule is a pretty busy one. It is always nice to have some news from 'Headquarters.' Don't fail to keep us informed."

May 17, 1953, Rayburn wrote a letter to Addison Soltau, brother of George, a missionary in Japan. He said: "A letter from Scotty Hastings got me really upset yesterday. I'm going to have to write to your brother [George Soltau in Collingswood] for the low-down." Hastings is the stated clerk of the General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church.

During these days I knew absolutely nothing about any such activity, and did not even suspect such developments. Rayburn became the leader in attacking the ACCC, and is now the president of the Synod-controlled college and seminary—Covenant, at St. Louis, which is against the ACCC and ICCC.

The first warning of these things that I received came to me from the Rev. Charles Richter, who told me that he had some questions in his mind about Mr. Soltau and what he was doing in the church among some of our people. He explained that Soltau had said concerning the coming 1954 Synod, "They are gunning for the Chief," meaning me. After this I began to watch him. But through all these weeks and months I had trusted my brethren and had the utmost confidence in them, believed that their love for Christ and their love for the cause would never permit them to do anything to scandalize the movement so dear to so many of God's people. I believed that all problems could be solved among brethren with their love for Christ.

RAYBURN LEADS PUBLIC ATTACK ON ACCC LEADERS

Dr. Rayburn would come to Collingswood and visit me in my office, rejoice in the way in which the work was going, assure me that he was 100 per cent behind all that was being done! Nobody would think for a moment that he was actively engaged in another program, seeking its consummation. The letters tell their tale. Never once did he speak about the problems which bothered him as they related to the American Council of Christian Churches, while all the time I was the chairman of the ACCC delegation from the Bible Presbyterian Church.

We now have an abundance of documentation leading up to the 1954 Greenville Synod. As chairman of the delegation to the ACCC, I had not the slightest intimation that Rayburn intended to present a minority report. In the statement which he made to the Synod, he accused the American Council's executive, every one of them, of deliberate deception in matters of -statistics and Council acts. Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft immediately came to the

defense of the ACCC and of me personally, and said that such a charge involved a question of integrity. This was the first public break of any kind, and I must say that I thank God that it happened. The brethren ill timed what they did, for, had they gone on with their underground operations a little while longer, the story would be entirely different today. The price Dr. Holdcroft paid for defending me was his removal, on secret ballot, as a delegate to the ICCC convention, and yet he was the president of the Associated Missions for all the missions of the ICCC. I was removed on a secret ballot from the American Council delegation and removed as chairman of the ICCC delegation. The "underground" was working and began to hold together like a "pack." And when the Rev. Arthur Slaght asked Mr. Schaeffer how it was that he was not nominated chairman of the ACCC's Radio and Recording Commission, he was told point blank that he had too much of the "mind of McIntire."

SCHAEFFER HEADS ATTACK ON ICCC

All of this just did not happen. One of the prime movers in it was Mr. Francis Schaeffer. Schaeffer was in Amsterdam in 1948 and he was not elected ICCC president, though he was a candidate. In the providence of God, without any desire or solicitation on my part whatsoever, the Lord called me to that task.

Early in 1950, and then in 1952, we became aware of the fact that Mr. Schaeffer was moving along different lines. Secondhand information led me to see that he was working behind the scenes. He came home on his furlough, 1953, and spent his time going through the Bible Presbyterian churches, talking to individual pastors and telling them about the terrible mistakes of the ICCC. Mr. Schaeffer was a member of the executive committee of the Council, and, before he spread stories to disrupt or hurt the Council, it was his duty first to bring these matters before the Council. This he did not do. He would preach stirring sermons on spirituality, talk about "sin in high places," and this "sin" turned out to be me. In the name of "spirituality," his speeches at conferences discredited the work of the ICCC, and particularly its president. When the Synod met in 1954, Schaeffer turned up as the chairman of the nominating committee. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions called Mr. Schaeffer to account for some of the things that he was doing as its missionary. The executive committee of the International Council called Mr. Schaeffer to account and received a promise from him that he would take up problems first with the Council's committee before he spread them to cause misunderstanding or to hurt the Council. But in Sweden in 1955 the Council's executive unanimously informed Mr. Schaeffer that he had violated his pledge to the Council's executive and told him the Council could no longer work with him. Schaeffer resigned from the Independent Board and he left it, having failed to give a financial accounting for certain receipts, covering a year, which were given to him for the Board, and which the Board never received! Schaeffer, it turned out, was working closely with Dr. Rayburn and others in the "underground."

Would anyone get the impression from that that Dr. Rayburn was against me and the things for which I stand? Yet, on November 9, 1953, the day before he wrote me, he wrote my assistant pastor, George Soltau, as follows:

"The American Council Convention was quite an occasion. Carl McIntire heard some reports before he left the East that made him suspicious that he was going to run into real opposition here. Actually, the day before the Convention, we had our State Convention at Highland College, and we passed a number of overtures to the national gathering. They were received with great unwillingness, and it was insisted that we were 'attacking personalities.' While personalities in a measure can hardly be divorced from some issues, especially the strong kind of personalities that are in the leadership of the American Council, our whole purpose was a change in principle rather than an attack on personalities."

RAYBURN VOICES DESIRE FOR CHANGE IN PRINCIPLE AND STRUCTURE OF ACCC

Here is a reference to "a change in principle." This documentation is exceedingly important, for the softer approach does involve a letting down on the stand of principle which the ACCC and the ICCC have taken.

On November 10, 1953, on the very day he wrote me, Rayburn addressed a two-page report to Mr. and Mrs. J. James Brown, Wilmington, Del. Mr. Brown was treasurer of the National Missions Committee of the Bible Presbyterian Church and his wife, Myrtle Anna, was secretary for Tom Cross. What was in the minds of these brethren as they sought their attack openly and publicly on the American Council of Christian Churches is here clearly revealed:

"I could fill a long letter telling you about the American Council Convention here." And he indicated that "considerable pressure is being brought to change the whole structure of the American Council," and I quote:

"On the day before the National Convention opened its meeting we had a state convention meeting here at Highland College, and we passed a number of urgent overtures which were presented to the National Convention. While we did not get specific action on more than one or two of them, we certainly let it known that we wanted a change in policy. There was stubbornness and some measure of backbiting; but I do believe that the Lord gave real victory and that we made progress along several lines. I am anxious to make my report of the whole thing to the Synod next spring. I believe that we as Bible Presbyterians are going to have to do something about the American Council and its policies. I believe the fact that the Lord has kept such men as Harlee Bordeaux in the very center of the movement means that He is going to do something for us."

Thus Dr. Rayburn revealed, in 1953, that he wanted change in policy, change in principle, change in the whole structure of the ACCC. But whenever he spoke about these matters, after open, public issue was made, they were only minor matters that he was really concerned

ground," if here is any question or going into public attack. Is this the way fundamental believers treat one another, especially when a man in my position is under terrific attack by the apostates and those who compromise the Word?

Brown then explained the future strategy: "Fran came north almost immediately, and after a survey of the situation as we both had seen it, concluded that exactly nothing had been accomplished that would immediately relieve the situation. . . . I collaborated with Fran more than any other, and if I kept silence when you thought I should have thrown my hat into the ring, it was because of his advice. You will note that we sat together. . . ." Who was calling the signals?

And writing of me, Brown said: "I came to the conclusion, influenced by my experience as a pastor for 15 years, that the long-term method is the best. I could have blown the lid off while he was uttering his flatteries which reeked with hypocrisy, but kept still, and I have the witness in my heart that I was prompted to such action by the Spirit. It comes to me from a good source that he does listen to my rebukes and respects them, and that leads me to 'hope all things,' and 'to dig and dung the tree for another year.' Though you may not approve, I do think it is the way of wisdom and of love. Fran encouraged me in it, and since he is one who knows the situation a hundred times more thoroughly than I, I have felt reassured." Brown has since left the Bible Presbyterian Church and joined the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, taking his church along with him.

BORDEAUX EXPRESSES HIMSELF TO BUNZEL

In reply, December 14, 1954, Bordeaux said, "I am very glad for the visit which you and Fran had after the Convention, and I see the situation as you men do." What was the underground going to do next year?

Claude Bunzel is no longer executive secretary for the ACCC of California, but he was very active. On June 9, 1953, Bordeaux wrote Bunzel concerning the program of the coming convention, and the only person whom he recommended as a speaker was Mr. Schaeffer: "May I ask if you do not think you would wisely consider the nomination of Mr. Schaeffer to be one of the evening speakers, remembering that evening attendances are usually larger than morning or afternoon sessions?" He suggested that Schaeffer be put on the program the first day for his report.

On January 11, 1954, Bordeaux wrote Bunzel: "I gain the same impression you have, namely, that for a long time we have been 'infiltrated by internationalists,' not only in political matters or among modernists, but among evangelicals as well. At the rate things are going, I should say that people will be concluding that the ACC is in this office by grace of the ICCC. Only today I had a letter from John M. L. Young (who certainly knows better) addressed to me 'care of the International Council of Christian Churches' at this address."

On May 19, 1954, Bordeaux wrote Bunzel, "Ultimately our men may come to realize why I strongly

with Dr. Rayburn and others in the "underground."

The "underground" has worked on the surface in the name of "spirituality." Such "spirituality" can be used to accuse men of unspiritual and fleshly desires and deeds!

Soltau's letter to Rayburn, of September 26, 1953, written on Collingswood Church stationery, says:

'One thing I was definitely wondering about is how this AC meeting in LA is shaping up. I hear that there have been a few little disagreements on the speakers for the affair with much letter writing and that sort of stuff going about. . . .

"The Chief is back and in running order again after quite a little trip around the world. . . . I guess that he had a very good time although I shall be interested to know in the future just how it all came out. I have heard a few things from my brother about the Japan Council meeting but that seems to have gone fairly well. How I wish I knew a little bit more about the European meeting. I have been unable to talk to Fran since Mac got back and I am looking forward to hearing all about it. I guess that Fran will be with you for a week fairly soon and I shall hope to know a bit more about the AC setup when he gets back from there. This year is a fairly crucial year, isn't it, what with election of officers and assorted affairs for next year. I want to see you on your toes out there, booby-trapping any tactics that resemble railroad yard methods!"

RAYBURN'S LETTERS SHOW CONTRADICTIONS

Previous to the meeting of the American Council in Los Angeles, Rayburn, writing on Highland College stationery and signing it as president, addressed a communication to the Rev. Harold Mare, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Denver, Colo., in which he said:

"Pray for the National Convention of the American Council here in Los Angeles next week. Some very definite changes must be indicated if our movement is to be saved from disaster. Those of us who must speak up need to be supported in prayer."

When a brother is a member of a delegation, would it not be proper for him to speak to his associates about any question he had before making such matters public controversy? Nothing of this kind was ever done by Dr. Rayburn. In his face to face contacts with me I maintained the most cordial and affable relations. Following the meeting of the ACCC in Los Angeles on November 10, he wrote to me: "We deeply appreciate your taking the time to come up and have lunch with our students [Highland College]. We are sorry that your time was so filled that you could not have time to bring us a chapel message, but we will hope that the next time you are in this area it will be possible for you to do that.

"We rejoice in the progress that was made in the National Convention of the American Council and believe that God had his hand of blessing upon the proceedings. Certainly, these are days in which our united testimony is needed as never before."

these matters, after open, public issue was made, they were only minor matters that he was really concerned about. There appeared to be, as we now have the facts, two different Dr. Rayburns, one to his "underground" associates and another, a public relationship, to leaders of the ACCC, including me. What was Dr. Rayburn's purpose in keeping me completely uninformed and in the dark as to his desires? Why did he write my assistant pastor the kind of letter he did the day before the letter of an entirely different tone and type was sent to me? Is that the way Christian brethren love each other? On November 12 he again wrote Mr. and Mrs. Brown, "Real progress was made toward the ultimate goal of changing the whole policy upon which the Council works!"

Now Rayburn and this underground set out to change the Bible Presbyterian Church also! They failed in the ACCC. Thank God, the Council has been preserved! Now they are working on the ICCC. On December 11, 1953 he wrote Peter Stam, Jr., about the Los Angeles meeting: "I do not care to be a party to deception and fraud carried on under the banner of 'contending for the faith. . . .' I have, however, planned a few things which I intend to get off my chest at Synod next year. I wish I might have a chance to talk with you personally about the whole matter. Perhaps I will get to the East later this year. I sincerely hope so."

He did come—came to my office, visited; all was fine. Why was he not willing to talk with me when he had every opportunity? Stam has left Faith Seminary and will serve as dean under Rayburn at Covenant College.

BROWN ACCUSES McINTIRE OF FALSIFICATION AND HYPOCRISY

The American Council's convention in California certainly had a great deal more going on "underground" than I was aware, but the correspondence and the files now tell the story.

Lionel Brown was there. He greeted me as a gracious friend. One time we sat down together and had a rather long talk about the ACCC and ICCC, and he asked me many questions. He spoke of the need of using "spiritual weapons" and of humility, with all of which we agreed most thoroughly. On December 3, 1954, seven months after the meeting, Brown wrote Bordeaux, and, referring to his visit with me, he said: "I believe I saw you immediately after and reported my impressions which were so favorable at the time. You can imagine my chagrin when I had conferred with Francis Schaeffer and Bob Rayburn and found out that right in the middle of what seemed a genuinely humble mood, he had falsified to me."

What these falsifications were supposed to be, I do not know. I have walked honestly and in truth before God. Have I become the victim of an "underground"? At the meeting of the Synod in St. Louis in 1955, Rayburn confessed to a faulty memory, stating that he had thought he said certain things to me at some past date which he now believed he had never said. It may have been that it was some question that Brown asked me concerning this. But brethren should confront brethren on things of this kind without writing in an "under-

On May 19, 1954, Bordeaux wrote Bunzel, "Ultimately, our men may come to realize why I strongly nominated one Claude Bunzel for the first Editor of a proposed new magazine for the AC, "THE AMERICAN COUNCILOR. . . ."

When men discuss the work of the Lord, there are questions, differences of opinion, suggestions, all sorts of things that they may think will advance the cause, all of which may be and have been discussed in a gracious spirit. There should be. But what is the situation when an "underground" is operating with designs and purposes, and men in paid positions are working with that "underground"? Can the work prosper and go forward as it should?

OFFICE OF NATIONAL MISSIONS COMMITTEE TAKES PART IN "UNDERGROUND"

The story concerning the office of the National Missions Committee of the Bible Presbyterian Church is a very lengthy one in itself and cannot be covered in an article of this kind. It concerns, of course, primarily, the Bible Presbyterian Church. But the files reveal correspondence by Mr. Cross with Dr. Bordeaux in New York, and with Dr. Rayburn. He was a part of the "underground." In one letter on National Missions stationery, written to Dr. Rayburn, January 5, 1953, and sent air mail, he said: "I am writing as friend to friend. Please do not use this against me. I hope that you might be around when Mr. McIntire has an opportunity to run through our new *National Missions Reporter*. I am sending you a copy of my letter to him, that you might know what I have written. If you notice a pleasant reaction, or otherwise, I would be pleased to hear from you."

I never had any idea that I was being "shadowed" or that the National Missions secretary was working to have me shadowed by my own brethren as we were doing the work of the Lord together.

The letters carry reports from the National Missions office direct to Dr. Rayburn, giving a host of reports concerning my attitude and activity.

When one of the members of the Collingswood Church died and her will did not have anything in it for National Missions, but did have something for Faith Seminary and several other agencies, Mrs. Brown wrote Rayburn: "She was a thorough McIntire-ite, which leaves National Missions and other Bible Presbyterian work under Synod out in the cold." I had nothing to do with the will and did not realize the National Missions office had such ideas! Denominational agencies can "crack the whip" — we saw it done in the old U.S.A. Presbyterian Church!

The letters contain stories of how the National Missions Committee seeks to get certain men into the pulpits of empty churches, rather than other men who are thought to be friendly to Dr. McIntire! I never knew that anything of this nature was taking place. I sent to the Committee numerous letters, spoke for the Committee, and our church increased its giving to National Missions until we discovered we were paying the salary of a man to fight us, the ACCC, and the ICCC!

One of the charges made against me was that I and a group of close associates were running all the agencies. In the first place, I was not on the board of all the agencies, but it is the testimony of those on boards that I did serve on, in an independent capacity, that I did not dominate them, but that I sat on them with others, discussed problems, and invariably decisions were arrived at by unanimous agreement after full consideration. Brethren worked together in confidence.

Mrs. Brown, writing on National Missions Committee stationery to Rayburn, March 10, 1953, said: "We're just plain sick of being the goat when Faith Seminary, the Independent Board, Harvey Cedars and other so-called Bible Presbyterian agencies are what could rightly be termed extravagant, have other questionable policies, and are going scot free with the blessing of the big wheels. I sometimes question the wisdom of writing so strongly, for you could use this against the N.M.C. and Tom if you cared to present it in certain circles. Jim and I, being just hired hands, can't be hurt. Let me just say that I have confidence in your friendship and ethics."

COLLINGSWOOD CONGREGATION IS INFILTRATED

These outside influences—Mr. Schaeffer, Dr. Rayburn, and Mr. Cross — developed ties in the Collingswood Church. These brethren preached in my pulpit, at my invitation, and they made friends, and used their friends to present their activities. Two of the elders in the Collingswood Church became familiar with and active in the "underground" without the others knowing it and without their pastor knowing it. A definite program began to unfold within my own congregation. I never was able to catch up with the stories. A move was made by the two "underground" elders to ask me to resign. The story was that Rayburn would be called to Collingswood. But the Synod meeting in St. Louis in 1955 revealed to the elders of the Collingswood Church the activity which was going on behind the scenes, when one of the Collingswood elders, a delegate to the Synod, providentially ran into a caucus meeting over which Dr. Rayburn was presiding. There he saw and heard the plans being made to "break" me. The letters, some of which have been quoted from in this article, a number of which dealt with the session of the Collingswood Church, were given to the Collingswood people and it was this documentation that turned the Collingswood people so decisively against the men who were seeking to discredit their pastor. The resolution of the congregation, the statement of the 24 elders, the statement of the American Council of Christian Churches itself before 900 people, are printed elsewhere.

*"The best laid schemes of mice and men
Gang aft a-gley."* (Robert Burns)

The letters quoted in this article are used with the

knowledge and consent of the agencies whose property they are. They are written on the official stationery of the agencies by men while they were in the service of the agencies.

The only reason we have printed this information is to give the Christian public throughout the world (many of whom have read something about these things in their denominational journals and the secular press) some indication of what was actually going on. Christians can draw their own conclusions. The ICCC must not be harmed! The cause is too great and too holy!

I have had to deal with these developments as I have sought to carry on the struggle against the apostasy. The Collingswood Church, 1600 strong, with the exception of the few who left, has stood with me and rejoices in all that God has done over the world. A new church auditorium, costing \$635,000, is to be built, and ground was broken for it on July 1, 1956. The Collingswood Church, which walked out of a \$250,000 building and went into a tent, stands today as it has through the years!

Following the 1956 Synod, when action was taken to withdraw from the ACCC and ICCC, the Bible Presbyterian Church Association was formed. This has the support of more than a majority of the people of the churches. This Association makes it possible for the churches that desire to do so to continue their fellowship with the ACCC and ICCC. These are the only churches the Councils really want!

I have thought here simply to give some of the early background of the "revolt." God will vindicate and deliver in His own time and in His own way. In the meantime, of course, this has affected practically every aspect of the Bible Presbyterian movement.

BUSWELL COLLABORATES WITH "THE UNDERGROUND"

Shelton College, which is independent, was brought into this struggle by Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., who was president at that time. Dr. McIntire had always delighted in and trusted Dr. Buswell, and he defended him until the very last. But Dr. Buswell was not able to build Shelton College. Several times he sought to give the school away in one form or another, and the Board of Trustees objected. The last time came when he made some confidential arrangements with a committee of the Bible Presbyterian Church for the Bible Presbyterian Synod to take over and make the college Synod-controlled. When these proposed plans were revealed to the Board, not by Dr. Buswell, but by other sources, the Board asked Dr. Buswell to resign. This was a unanimous request. The Board felt that the time had come when the college needed a president who would have faith that it would succeed and would lead it, and would seek to make it a success rather than to give it away. Dr. Jack Murray, the new president, is doing that very thing. The Board offered Dr. Buswell a position as Emeritus, or Professor of

Philosophy, offered him a vacation. Buswell refused and later there was nothing for the Board to do but unanimously remove Dr. Buswell from the presidency.

Buswell threatened that if he were removed he would take the issue before the entire Christian world. He immediately identified himself openly with the element that had been working in the "underground" and he assumed the pastorate of the little group that had left Collingswood Church. He has spent much time on

the campus of Faith Theological Seminary seeking to induce the professors to leave the institution and to go with him to the new Synod-controlled college. Four of them are going. His latest move was to write Dr. David Hedegard, in Sweden, after he heard a rumor that Dr. Hedegard had some questions and he thought maybe there might be a little disaffection there, but Dr. Hedegard informed him that he stood squarely with me in the position which I have taken in the Christian world for a militant, vigorous testimony against the apostasy as represented in the World Council of Churches.

Thank God that it is only within the Bible Presbyterian Church that this group has worked through its "underground." The other groups are standing and their leaders are firmly committed to the great crusade for Christ.

PRAY THAT GOD WILL OVERRULE

When the Christian public understands the nature of what has taken place, they will be able to evaluate and to appreciate the struggle through which we have been going, both from without and from within. My prayer is, "Lead me in a plain path because of mine enemies."

All those who stand for the Twentieth Century Reformation movement and the principles, the policies, and the testimony of the various Councils will stand together in love, forbearance, and grace. These are the ones who will support the Councils and help build true churches with a vision of their world-wide responsibility.

The difficulties which arose in the Bible Presbyterian Church, we believed, need not have become a world-wide scandal. We thought they would resolve themselves in peace and love, but they did not. The brethren who worked in the underground took the information to the whole world and the modernists have rejoiced. These developments are no excuse for God's people to be discouraged, or to remain in apostasy, or to neglect His call to stand faithful to His commands for the salvation of the lost and separation from apostasy.

The group in the Bible Presbyterian Church which has disassociated the Church from all these agencies and from its world-wide testimony has, we believe, an entirely different concept of the Church and the movement from that which God gave in the beginning. It is not right for men to come into a church and seek to change

(Continued on page 8)

The Attack Upon Dr. McIntire

There is scarcely a religious journal on the modernist side of the fence, or a religious periodical that lines up with the middle-of-the-road viewpoint of the National Association of Evangelicals, which has not, in the last few weeks, carried articles, some of them lengthy, against Dr. Carl McIntire, and the burden of them has been to the effect that Dr. McIntire's own Synod, the General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, has repudiated him and his leadership.

The Presbyterian Outlook, modernist organ in the Southern Presbyterian denomination, carried a series of articles on the subject, then published them in a six-page folder, and is circulating them by the thousands. The headline reads, "Bible Presbyterians Repudiate McIntire." Jesse Bader, a secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., ordered copies. They have been translated into Portuguese and circulated in Brazil against the coming International Council of Christian Churches' Congress, and against Dr. Israel Gueiros.

The *Christian Century* carried its story. The left wing *Living Church* of the Protestant Episcopal denomination carried a feature article and commented that Bible Presbyterians were having trouble with their "organizing genius." *Christian Life* has carried several articles heavily slanted against Dr. McIntire, and the *UEA*, official organ of the National Association of Evangelicals, reproduced in full the story which appeared in the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, the substance of which was confirmed and given to the *Bulletin* by Dr. R. Laird Harris, moderator of the Bible Presbyterian Synod.

Reports and questions have come now from virtually all sections of the world—What has happened to Dr. McIntire?

The meeting of the 19th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, April, 1956, in St. Louis, Mo.—an improper meeting which Dr. McIntire and some 45 other brethren did not attend—went right down the line: withdrew from the American Council of Christian Churches, withdrew from the International Council of Christian Churches, refused to endorse Faith Theological Seminary and the great historic Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions! It repudiated the *Christian Beacon*. It withheld its endorsement from every independent agency that had been established through the years in connection with the Bible Presbyterian movement. On the other hand, it continued a process: it established its own Synod-controlled and directed seminary and college, received reports from its Synod-controlled paper, and other Synod-controlled agencies. In fact, in two short years there has been an overwhelming revolution in the whole program and setup of the Bible Presbyterian denomination. The issues in the church have been discussed in *The Free Press* and *The Bible Presbyterian Observer*. Nothing has appeared in the *Christian Beacon*. The reason is that at the 1955 Synod, Dr. McIntire gave a solemn pledge to the Synod, which was requested of him, that he would not discuss these matters or report them in the columns of the *Christian Beacon*. He regrets that he gave such a pledge, but he kept it. And now that the moderator of the Synod has released a statement to the public press, which is being quoted against Dr. McIntire around the world, and the moderator of the previous Synod, Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., has also released statements, giving them particularly to *Christian Life*, Dr. McIntire feels that he is released from any commitments, and he did grant an interview to George Cornell of the Associated Press.

The problem originated as an internal, Bible Presbyterian denominational affair—many denominations have their internal problems—and because of Dr. McIntire's position in the Christian world, and the *Christian Beacon's* circulation being many times beyond that of the 3,500 copies that go into the Bible Presbyterian Church itself, the *Beacon* did not report this denominational difficulty but it has been used to press the great battle against the apostasy, as all of our readers are aware.

What has happened that virtually everything should be overturned, and the little, struggling Church brought into confusion? The whole affair was totally uncalled for, without justification, and a large measure of it was entirely unknown and well under way before Dr. McIntire himself became aware of what was actually taking place. This story we are telling separately, as it deals with the now famous "underground." The basis of it all seems to be:

First, that Dr. McIntire himself had too much power and too great an influence. This, a number of the brethren thought, had to be curbed. They used such phrases as "clipping his wings," and "picking his tail feathers," and "using the Synod to control him."

Second, there was a definite feeling that the separatist cause, as Dr. McIntire had been leading it, was greatly suffering because of his leadership. A "softer approach" was needed—a change in policy. The structure of the American Council of Christian Churches had to be revamped. In fact, some questioned even the "principles." All of this is now documented with letters which have been turned up as early as 1952, 1953.

Third, there was a desire for a tighter denomination; that is, more central control from the top down. As the church was set up in 1938, power was invested in the local churches and the people, and all powers not specifically granted to the courts of the church were reserved to the local church and the people. Here was the great basic principle of "states rights." The founders of the church had suffered at the hands of "federal authority," with the powerful General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. cracking down on men if they did not do what the Assembly said. Consequently, it was written into the Bible Presbyterian constitution that there were no "implied powers," and the constitution stated, "All the deliverances, resolutions, overtures, and other actions of the General Synod are to be accorded the weight which is proper in view of the character of the body, yet whenever such deliverances, resolutions, overtures, and other actions are additional to the specific provisions of the constitution they shall not be regarded as binding unless they become amendments to the constitution." But this left a weak, impotent Synod, consisting of a fellowship built on "mutual love and confidence," with decisions commending themselves to men's consciences, simply because of their merit in the light of the Word of God. A desire for more central "church power," and control found its expression in a turning away from the independent agencies which had been developed. Men said this was "Congregational" and "Baptistic"; that the Bible Presbyterian Church was a hybrid mixture of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism; that to be Presbyterian the denomination should control all the agencies! But historically that has not been "Presbyterian" in the U.S.A. Actually, it became a type of "state socialism," with competition removed and the "government running everything from the top."

When people leave the tightly controlled, modernistic churches, they are weary of this sort of overlordship. They want freedom. But most of all they want to be free to serve Christ as their conscience and the Spirit direct. As the Synod has taken to itself more authority and power, proceeded to give directions to men, the same arguments that were heard in the old Presbyterian, U.S.A., Church came again to the fore. Twenty years afterward, we hear the same line—being subject to one's brethren, not being loyal to the church, and "what Synod says we follow." But this is in conflict with the supreme position that the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments are the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

These are the basic causes of the conflict that developed in the Bible Presbyterian Church, which has not yet been settled by a long way. The Church has been divided into two camps: one which believes in the freedom of the local churches and the place and value of independent agencies; the other which represents a new concept introduced into the church, which would put all of the agencies—and has put all of them, with the exception of one and that will be taken care of at the next General Synod, according to plans—under the total control of the Synod where a little ecclesiastical machine which can run the Synod will run all agencies, too.

Men seem utterly oblivious to the history of the church and the foundation which was laid, and into all this Dr. McIntire, because of his place of responsibility

IBPFM...*(Continued from page 1)*

of the Board. He called upon Dr. McIntire, who was present, to resign and said that "the sooner we are free of McIntire and company the better."

This Board cannot sit by and permit the work that God has given it to do during these years to be undermined and diverted to a newly created denominational Board with repercussions over a wide area of the world.

A missionary of our Lord Jesus Christ, committed to the Gospel, should at least resign from his Board before he undertakes to divert and sabotage its work.

It is with deep regret that the executive committee of The Independent Board has felt constrained to take this action, but it is the only thing that can honorably be done, in view of all the facts.

We appeal to the churches, our supporters, and our missionaries to stand by this Board in their prayers and support. These are indeed days of testing, and the Board, under God, desires to be faithful to its commission and to maintain its work on the fields to which God has led it. We appeal to the Lord Jesus Christ, the great Head of the Church, whose blessing has been upon the Board through these years, to strengthen it, encourage and comfort our missionaries, and provide for the Board and its Missions an even larger circle of consecrated friends.

The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has been promoting truly Biblical Missions and it is determined to continue its course of service and leadership in the Twentieth Century Reformation.

Machen's ...*(Continued from page 1)*

that fleshly desires, feelings against brethren because of their position and prefer-

ment, entered in, as the letters from the "underground" clearly indicate, to a developing tension and conflict.

It is interesting indeed that Dr. Machen was aware of these two areas of peril.

Yet within the Bible Presbyterian Church transgression in both of these fields came in the name of being "more spiritual." This was used to soften the stand of the Church in the battle for the Faith and was used to cover fleshly purposes of men in relationship to brethren who believed that those of like precious faith suffering together could be trusted, and that for no reason would they scandalize the movement in its precious testimony to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Dr. Machen's warning must be a challenge, as it is a challenge to us and ought to be to every Bible Presbyterian, to save as much of the Church as can possibly be delivered for the carrying on of its original glorious testimony.

The Attack Upon Dr. McIntire*(Continued from page 7)*

as pastor of the largest church and his place of leadership in the Church, has been drawn, for he will not go along with the concept of a tighter church, a softer policy, or the repudiation of the historic stand of the Church in regard to the various agencies, and a forsaking of the ACCC and ICCS! His position has been that of freedom versus control from the top.

The climax was reached when the meeting in St. Louis set up a committee and directed that it proceed, if it thought wise, to file charges against Dr. McIntire and others associated with him in an independent committee which had been set up, and put them on trial. What was the offense? Dr. McIntire would not bow to the will of his brethren and accept the new Synod-controlled setup! Twenty years ago, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. also issued a Mandate against another independent committee. It was the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions that Dr. J. Gresham Machen organized. Its members were put on trial. The charges were that he disturbed the peace of the Church, violated his ordination vows. Just what specific charges against Dr. McIntire are contemplated now have not yet been revealed, but the line of attack is similar. He is disloyal to the Church, the group that ran the St. Louis Synod! And he will not stay out of the American and International Councils because this Synod took him out!

Dr. McIntire's position in the Church now is one of seeking to inform the Lord's people as to just how revolutionary the change has been in the church, and at the present time it is known that a majority of the churches and a majority of the people in the churches are standing with Dr. McIntire and those associated with him in their desire to be a part of the ACCC and the ICCS.

The modernists have, of course, taken hold upon all of this and with great glee are publishing it around the world, not because they are interested in the Bible Presbyterian Church, but because through it they are able, so they think, to restrain the influence of Dr. McIntire in his world-wide testimony against apostasy. Since the modernists are unable to deal with the facts and

answer the charges that Dr. McIntire is making, they can, when they say that his brethren have repudiated Dr. McIntire, have an effective weapon to hurt the separatist cause. The zeal with which they are using the Bible Presbyterian conflict indicates how effective the crusade for the Twentieth Century Reformation really has been. Dr. McIntire has, as all *Christian Beacon* readers know, kept his unabated pace in the battle with the apostasy. He was determined not to let the impasse in the Bible Presbyterian Synod hinder him, though at times he has had to stop and give some attention to the attack upon him from the rear!

The issue first came to the fore in 1954 in Greenville, when Dr. Rayburn arose on the floor of Synod and charged the leaders of the American Council, including Dr. McIntire, with "deliberate deception." This came as a complete surprise and shock to Dr. McIntire, but correspondence now reveals that it was being planned for weeks and months ahead by Dr. Rayburn and others who were associated with him. On the other hand, Dr. McIntire had been trusting his brethren, delighting in developments, doing all he could to promote the cause in every way, and taking his place of responsibility on the broad world level as a representative of his Church and of the Lord.

The enemy has been given aid and comfort. How it will end, God knows, but Dr. McIntire, his church, his Presbytery, the ACCC's and the ICCS's executive committees are informed and are standing with him. Time will bring many things to light. The ACCC and ICCS are on solid ground—the Word of God!

The Inside Story ...*(Continued from page 6)*

it over completely. If they want a different kind of church, let them organize one and build it—not take one over and revolutionize it.

"The Lord is my light and my salvation: whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life: of whom shall I be afraid?"

I truly can say with Paul, "The things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel."

The Christ of the church militant calls us!