

What Modernism Has Done to Presbyterian Missions in Siam

Report of Board of Foreign Missions
of Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Reveals Tragedy and Loss: World
Picture Confirmed

BY THE REV. CARL McINTIRE, D.D.
Collingswood, N. J.

Modernism Takes Its Toll Of Mission Work

BY THE REV. BOON MARK GITTISARN
Bangkok, Siam

TB
266.51593
MAC

Nr. 67



FE

TB266.51593 MAC

6.71/8303

C.

its

—10092

k

MODERNISM TAKES ITS TOLL OF MISSION WORK

BY THE REV. CARL McINTIRE, D.D.

President of the International Council of Christian Churches

The Bible is the Word of God. "The scripture cannot be broken" (John 10: 35). Jesus said, "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:46, 47.)

Modernism denies that the Bible is the Word of God. It questions the full truthfulness and inerrancy of the Scriptures. It is an attack upon the historic Christian faith.

Modernism which has been so prevalent in the United States is also taking its toll and having its disastrous effect on the mission fields around the world. It is another gospel. It destroys the work of the early missionaries. It brings controversy on the mission field. It dries up the sources of mission giving in the home church. It does not produce new missionaries with the spirit of self-sacrifice. It misleads national churches. It confuses the national leaders who have had confidence in those who support their work. It is an enemy of the souls of men, of the church of Christ, and of the Lord of glory.

62118207

1950 — the mid-century — is an appropriate point at which to stop and see what modernism has done to the missionary program of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The Northern Presbyterian Church had a vigorous mission program, and started work in 18 fields. Yet modernism found its way into the Presbyterian Church during this half century, and was expressed in the foreign missions program of the denomination. This became an issue in the church. The effect of this can now be appraised in a number of ways.

Like other major denominations — the Northern Baptist, the Episcopal, the Methodist — modernism has taken its toll.

I.

The particular struggle in the Presbyterian Church, however, reached its climax in the formation of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions in 1933, the struggle immediately preceding that going back many years. In 1923 there was the famous Auburn Affirmation in which 1293 ministers said it was not necessary to believe in the virgin birth, the blood atonement, the bodily resurrection, and the miracles of Christ, and that the doctrine of the inerrancy of the Scriptures was harmful to the church. The struggle stimulated by this began to be felt in the church, when, in 1929, Prince-

ton Theological Seminary, the bulwark of orthodoxy in the denomination, was captured by the inclusivist-modernist element in the church. These men believed that the modernists and the Bible believers should be permitted and encouraged to work and fellowship together, and that Princeton should be representative of all beliefs.

Then the missionary question came to the fore by the publication of *Re-thinking Missions*, which reduced Christianity to the level of a pagan religion, and by the startling statements of a missionary to China under the Board, Pearl Buck, endorsing modernism. The attempt by the late Dr. J. Gresham Machen, defender of the faith, to have the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church reformed so that it might conform to the doctrinal standards of the church and to see that only the true Gospel was preached failed. Then, in 1933, the Independent Board, separate from the General Assembly, came into existence. In 1934 the famous Mandate, prepared by the late William B. Pugh, was drafted and adopted by the Assembly and the church embarked upon a period of ecclesiastical trials and persecution. The members of the Independent Board were told they were unfit to preach Christ, suspended, deposed, unfrocked. Division came, and the effect of this has been felt through the

church, on the mission field, and over the whole world. The remnant which withdrew formed separate churches. The issues here are also the issues of the hour in the Christian world and have become so acute that no church or mission calling itself Christian can ignore them.

Now at the turn of the half-century the larger picture can begin to be seen. A definite movement has taken shape, bringing together those from many churches from all portions of the world who defend the faith, who believe in the purity of the church, and in aggressive evangelism. A real standard *against* the combined efforts of those representing inclusivism and modernism in the World Council of Churches has been raised by God—the International Council of Christian Churches.

II.

The one thing, however, which brings all this into the clearest possible focus is the latest official report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., submitted to the 162nd General Assembly, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 18-24, 1950, and published in Part II of the Minutes of the General Assembly, "Board Reports," which is divided into five sections: "Personnel, Operations, Budget, Policy, High Noon."

The report states, "The number of mis-

sionaries in active service during the year 1949 dropped from 1170 to 1140 and our spiritual impact overseas has lessened proportionately." Then we are told, "The net gain in five years has been four missionaries." But the report goes on: "The peak of the missionary staff was reached in 1927 when 1606 were on the roll. The number has steadily fallen since that time, although the membership of the Presbyterian Church has considerably increased. Meanwhile there has been no lack of urgent requests from all fields for reinforcements." From a peak of 1606 the downward trend has continued until now there are only 1140 missionaries, a decrease of 466 missionaries! What has happened? What has brought about such a sustained reverse? Could modernism have anything to do with it? Could the struggle in the United States over the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, the disciplining of Bible-believing ministers and the separations which took place have anything to do with this? We think it has the most direct connection.

The report then emphasizes the needs of Africa, India, Japan, and declares: "Yet the Board dare not authorize large annual quotas of new personnel without more assured backing from the Presbyterian Church. Until a clear mandate for advance personnel is apparent, the Board

must plan on the basis of a static or slowly diminishing overseas force."

A great church accepted the inclusivist policy. Members have joined the church, joined in strength numerically, but its whole missionary program has faltered and lost. Modernism has no power in it to inspire the sacrifices necessary to take the Gospel to heathen and dark lands. The same situation exists in the case of the American Baptist Convention (formerly the Northern Baptist Convention) and others.

The section entitled, "Budget," also parallels what has happened to the personnel. Naturally, inflation has hit the picture. The report states: "Except for minor outlays to meet urgent needs, the Board was unable in 1949 to cross any new financial thresholds or make available adequate funds for buildings and equipment. *This frustration reflects three factors working at cross purposes: 1) abundant opportunity to expand the world mission and an insistent call for more missionaries; 2) inflationary costs of current operations; 3) an inadequate rise in receipts from the Church.*" . . .

"It now costs \$500,000 more to support 330 fewer missionaries than 20 years ago, and \$1,000,000 more to support only one more missionary than five years ago."

Then we are told as to receipts: "There

has been an increase of 126.8% in the receipts from living donors during the ten-year period since the close of the depression.

"This increase has been steady and is gratifying, but to obtain a clear picture, two other factors must be kept in mind: 1) *The national income has almost tripled in the same period; and 2) costs overseas have much more than doubled.* Thus, unless there is a real outpouring of contributions to the world mission by the Church, there is no prospect that the Board can move out into advance work. It is even uncertain whether the current work can be maintained, due to the inability to modernize property and equipment."

We think that the key to the entire problem can be seen in this statement, "Gifts from individuals are less than they were in 1940, although personal incomes have much more than doubled." If the giving were in proportion to the income the situation would be altogether different. The will to give, therefore, is the point. What has happened to that? This deals with the heart and motives of people!

The section concludes, "The Board awaits a new mandate from the Church to move forward into the opportunities of this supreme moment of the Christian world mission." But it was a "mandate"

— the same word — from the church that cracked down on ministers in the church who objected to the modernist missionary program and chose to support an independent board with an uncompromising Gospel. The church had a "mandate" to attack such men, but for some reason there seems to be no mandate to provide the funds to send out the missionaries to replace the dwindling force.

The significance of this report and these figures is self-convicting. It should be carefully considered by God's people everywhere and by mission churches in all fields of the world. Hath God's hand been removed? Has the modernist gospel broken the power and the missionary vision of the home church? Something certainly has!

There is a concluding section to this report entitled, "High Noon." It quotes the Board secretary of fifty years ago, Dr. W. A. Halsey. His report states, "The dawn of the twentieth century is radiant with hope. May its noon-day be full of glorious achievement." Then the report adds, "A 50-year appraisal of achievement is called for."

We are given figures: In 1899 there were 728 missionaries, in 1949 there were 1140. In 1899 there were 69 new missionaries, in 1949 there were 70 new missionaries. This summary follows: "In

the year 1899-1900, the 69 recruits sent out were hailed as the largest number in Presbyterian history. It is no achievement that lack of funds compelled the appointment of only 70 in 1949, when a minimum of 125 was proposed and the requests from the field were for even more. While it is true that the unit cost of maintaining a missionary in 1899 was \$681, as compared with \$2,425 last year, it is hard not to draw the conclusion that our Church in 1949 failed to provide support for all of its sons and daughters ready for foreign service and that a net gain of 412 missionaries in 50 years is no source of pride to a Church which has increased nearly 150% in its membership over the same period."

III.

Naturally the place to look is at the policy. What has been the purpose and end of the missionary program? We are told, "The Board of Foreign Missions is constantly re-examining its policies." Then, "In 1949 a number of policy matters were acted upon and some of them are listed briefly here." Among those listed are: "Steps were taken to make more clear the broadened task of the Presbyterian Church as a result of its present service relationship to sister Churches in Europe and the young Churches of its

fields of missionary endeavor. While its legal name remains unchanged, the Board now describes its task as 'Foreign Missions and Overseas Interchurch Service.'" The name Presbyterian has been dropped. Significant — yes, exceedingly so.

Earlier in the report we are told that the Presbyterian work in certain fields has been combined in union church movements, and, of course, the name Presbyterian has been abandoned. The name Presbyterian is not worth keeping any longer. There has come up a generation that "knew not Joseph." This is indicative of the trend and of the emphasis which is purposely preparing the way for the "ecumenical" or "world church."

Again, we are told, "The Board instructed its delegates to the Foreign Missions Conference in January, 1949, to vote for that body to join the new National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. and has pressed towards that ultimate end, even though the first vote of the Conference was in the negative." It was the modernist boards of the big denominations that forced the issue in the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. Here is proof of this, and the impact of the Board is to help build the great super-system, the colossal organization, which by the very weight of its numbers they think will influence the course of the

world. Yet, it is "not by might . . . but by my spirit, saith the Lord" (Zech. 4:6).

Another of its policies is given in these words: "Following its policy of delegating all possible responsibility to the young Churches, the Presbyterian Church co-operated fully in the East Asia Conference in Bangkok in December, under the joint auspices of the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches. The conference was held on the campus of Wattana Wittaya School, one of our institutions, and the Board's president, Dr. John A. Mackay, as chairman of the I.M.C., was one of its leaders."

The Board, in other words, has thrown the full weight of its influence and finances behind the organizing of East Asia for the ecumenical dream. Dr. T. C. Chao, the pro-communist Chinese president of the World Council of Churches, was scheduled to be at Bangkok. He did not arrive, but with others sent a message which favored the "new order." The best information seemed to be that the Siamese Government refused to give him a visa to come into the country. He believes that "one can be both a Christian and a communist in China." Others who were scheduled to be there representing the China movement are leaders in China who are promoting the communist cause, support-

ing the revolution, and endeavoring to bring in the "kingdom of God" in China under communist direction.

We are not told so in this report, but Dr. John A. Mackay came back from Bangkok and held his famous conference in New York City in which he advocated the recognition by the United States of communist China.

There is more seen of the policy of the Board, however, than that which is written. All one needs to do is to study the report as a whole and notice the statistics and ask a few questions. The Board has had the problem of adjusting itself to 466 less missionaries and even in the last year, when the figure fell from 1170 to 1140, there were 30 less missionaries. In this adjustment, what field has been favored and what fields have suffered, and can any conclusions be drawn at all from the facts given as to which way the leadership of the Board is going?

We read: "From our large area of responsibility in Cameroun, West Africa, for example, comes such a statement as this: 'The missionaries on the field in 1947 numbered 77; in 1948, 66; and this year but 43.'" And 23 less missionaries were on the Cameroun field in one year! But the Cameroun field is considered to be one of the most "conservative" and "fundamental" of all the Presbyterian

fields. China, India, and Siam are in the liberal column, and the Philippine Islands are being concentrated on. China and India are the fields to which the most money went last year. It is interesting to observe in the over-all statistics that the bulk of the younger missionaries have been sent to the Far East.

The vice-president of the Board of Foreign Missions is Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, president of Union Theological Seminary. He has been chairman of the committee that had to deal with candidates for the mission field. His liberalism is well known, his commitment to the ecumenical movement is apparently the passion of his life. He has plotted the "united strategy" to bring in the world church.

We read, concerning the new appointees: "Each of the 70 appointees in 1949 was carefully screened by more than a score of officers and members of the Board." Will these new missionaries support the ecumenical movement? Will they back the great dream to eliminate the word "Presbyterian" and build up the united world church? Certainly, with dwindling funds and dwindling missionaries and the passion to bring to pass this great world consolidation or promotion of the "holy Catholic church" as one great visible body and organization, the

screening must involve such questions. This is also significant in view of the attitude expressed in at least two editorials in the *Christian Century* in recent months, calling attention of the mission boards to what they think is a tragedy in Korea. The orthodox or the "ultra-fundamentalists," as they try to smear them in Korea, the nationals, are standing together and refuse to follow mission policies. The *Christian Century* says the responsibility rests squarely at the door of the mission boards which have been sending out missionaries who have not been doing their duty in leading and conditioning the churches for the new responsibilities incumbent upon them in view of the growing and expanding ecumenical dream. Yes, the Board is always responsible. In that much we do agree. The Board has the authority!

Naturally all this constant falling off of missionaries and funds is not very complimentary to Dr. John Mackay, chairman of the International Missionary Council and president of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Has his leadership of the missionary emphasis in the Presbyterian Church produced this? Has neo-orthodoxy or Barthianism, which is the new modernism that Dr. John Mackay has embraced, failed to offer any real

stimulus to the mission movement in his denomination, to produce the mandate for an expansion of his Board's work, which he heads? Instead of going down and down, and down, it should be going up and up. Modernism is telling its tale and Dr. Mackay is powerless. Compromise with modernism is bringing home its fruit. - There are, of course, sound missionaries on the field — older missionaries. They have not yet broken with the Board; they have accepted the situation somewhat, thinking it does not relate too much to them or to their field. But it does, and always has! When the home church does not have the recruits to send out and when the home church has only young men who are trained in seminaries like Dr. John Mackay's, with their Barthianism, what possible hope can there be for the sound missionaries left on the field? Their life's labors, the strength of their years is going to slip away in vain. It is all in the hands of men, Board members, whose policies are directing the whole program down a foreign and disastrous road.

IV

More work has been done by the Board of Foreign Missions in China than in any other field. "142 Presbyterian missionaries were still at work in China. All these are in Communist territory except

17 on the island of Hainan and a group in Hong Kong." So states the Board in its 1950 report.

Additional light on what these missionaries are doing, at least some of them, can be seen in the 1949 report by the Board of the General Assembly. Writing of the missionaries remaining in China, we are told: "Two Presbyterian missionaries are still continuing their work in Paoting, which is now under Communist control, while eleven missionaries have voluntarily chosen to stay at Communist-controlled Yenching University, outside the city of Peiping. A few are also still working within the city of Peiping." Eleven Presbyterian missionaries are working on the staff of a communist-controlled university!

These facts should be put together with other information which has been given to the country. The *Christian Century* for March 2, 1949 contains the article, "Days of Rejoicing in China," by Dr. T. C. Chao, written from Peiping, China, January 27, 1949. Dr. Chao is the dean of the School of Religion at Yenching University, and is, as we have said, one of the six presidents of the World Council of Churches, elected at Amsterdam in 1948. Dr. Chao writes: "At present the whole faculty and student body of Yenching are joyfully facing the reality of their libera-

tion.' Those who had misgivings were given ample opportunities to leave our university, and they are now safe in other places. We who remain have reasons to rejoice in the success of the revolutionary forces, though we are by no means Communists ourselves." He must be speaking about the eleven Presbyterian missionaries who remained. The statement is all-inclusive — Presbyterian missionaries rejoicing in the success of the communist forces and joyfully facing the reality of the "liberation." The "whole faculty" is of this spirit, and these eleven Presbyterian missionaries certainly are included.

This raises the basic question of communist sympathies, pro-communist activities on the part of missionaries, where all shades of opinions from that of a mild socialism to a pro-communism prevail. It has been known for years that some Presbyterian missionaries in China have been sympathetic to the radical cause.

In every report given by the Board of Foreign Missions to the General Assembly there is a list, "Union and Co-operative Foreign Missionary Work of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." In the 1950 report there are 27 such projects throughout China. One of them is Yenching University. It is communist-controlled and has been, according to the Board's own statement, for

more than one year, and still the Presbyterian Church co-operates with it. There can be no excuse for this!

Another co-operative work is listed as "National Christian Council." Dr. Mackay, president of the Board, publishes in *Theology Today*, for October, 1950, a quarterly which he edits, an article by E. Bruce Copland, secretary of the Church of Christ in China, and one of the leaders of this National Council. Dr. Copland writes: "Since the government has a genuine concern about social welfare, there is considerable common ground between Chinese Communists and Christians in China." He also reports: "In some rural districts Communist officials have found that Christians are better educated than others and trained in social responsibility so they are sought out to lead in the Communist rural organizations."

Who gave these Christians their training in "social responsibility" which is now so helpful and pleasing to the China Reds?

It is evident that some missionaries under the Board of Foreign Missions have followed the line emphasized in the World Council of Churches, represented by such leaders as John C. Bennett who believes that "there is much overlapping between Communist goals and Christian goals."

The message of modernism is helping in the world revolution which is taking place,

and it is helping on the side of the communists, not on the side of freedom and individualism.

Coupled with this tragedy — it is a heart-rending affair — is the fact, and in this fact we rejoice and thank God, that among the general policies of the Board which have been referred to above is the encouragement of mission churches to become national churches. The result of this policy is that national leaders can act independently of the Board and its demands. As this world-wide picture of modernism and the ecumenical movement comes home to national leaders and they are informed as to the fact, as they are being informed and have been informed and will continue to be informed by the twentieth century reformation movement, they can decide to stand and fight for the Son of God. The journey around South America in 1949 by leaders of the International Council of Christian Churches bore fruit. The "battle of Bangkok" in 1949, when leaders of the International Council of Christian Churches went to East Asia to raise these basic questions, produced a tremendous response.

How must the leaders of the Mission Board of the Presbyterian Church feel when they see their national churches questioning their policies, turning away from their leadership, and looking instead

toward those movements and those groups on the face of the earth that have paid a price to be free and true. We are witnessing the crumbling citadel of modernism because it has no foundation. Shiftings and the adjustments are now taking place. Churches are being preserved, mission churches on the fields are rallying. The men who thought that they could bring modernism into the church, get it accepted and the inclusivist policy adopted, then silence the objectors and drive them from the church, are now finding that the beautiful dream which they had dreamed is turning out to be somewhat empty, and also humiliating.

V.

Out on the mission fields these modernist missionaries and their associates have the problem of trying to change the faith of the church and of the national leaders. An example of how this is attempted has been presented in the mimeographed "Report of the Ministers' Institute in Theology," Tacloban, Leyte, the Philippine Islands, October 25-27, 1949. This Institute brought together the Protestant ministers and the national leaders in that particular area for a three-day conference for "discussion on the main points of evangelical Christian theology." The conference turned out to be mainly an argument between the missionaries and the national

leaders, with the national leaders defending the Bible as the Word of God and the true Gospel, as opposed to the neo-orthodoxy of the missionaries, Mr. Hal B. Lloyd, Mr. Albert J. Sanders and Mr. McKinley. Lloyd and Sanders have been sent out by the Board of Foreign Missions since 1927.

We quote from the report: "*Mr. Sanders* asked Mr. Pia [a national leader] what he meant by saying that Christ is our substitute. *Mr. Pia* answered that Christ did something for us that we could not do for ourselves. *Mr. Ortiga* [another national] added that Christ took the punishment which should have been placed upon us. Someone said that Christ paid a debt which we owe. *Mr. Sanders* said that is a classical view of the atonement but we should not insist upon the literalism of it too much." This happens to be the point of view taught in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

A lengthy paper on the Bible was presented. It said: "Today among Christians there are three principal theories regarding the Bible and each of these stems from the historical views I have sought to explain. The *first* is now generally known as the *Fundamentalist View*, which holds to the verbal inspiration of the text and the infallibility of the contents of the Bible. The *second* is sometimes called the *Modernist*

View, which has its roots in the Rationalism of the 18th century. . . . The *third* view is advocated by that group of theologians who are commonly called Neo-orthodox. . . . Those in this school contend that the Bible is primarily the revelation of God and not an infallible setting forth of history, science, and doctrine. . . . The Bible is the vessel, and a very precious and necessary vessel it is, but Christ Himself is the treasure. . . . Strictly speaking, they hold that the Bible is not the word of God but that it conveys the Word of God."

There are not three principal theories among Christians regarding the Bible. The Christian position has always been that the Bible is the Word of God, infallible, inerrant, as presented by God! The assumption here that the modernist view and the neo-orthodox view are on the same level with the so-called fundamentalist view is one of the subtle assumptions which pulls down the truth to the level of a theory. The modernist view and the neo-orthodox view are not Christian. They are pagan attacks upon the Bible and the Christian faith.

The speaker in the conference, according to the report, proceeds to give most of his space to an attack upon the fundamentalist view — "the one with which most of us are best acquainted." After this was presented, we read: "After the reading of

this paper the table was open for more discussion. *Mr. Contado* asked if we might some day revise the Bible, eliminate some books and passages, and change the errors and so have a new Bible." A most appropriate question, indeed!

Next we read: "*Mr. Ortiga* presented a view of verbal inspiration and asked what authority we can use if we do not accept the whole Bible. He said we must stand for the fundamental doctrines of Christianity and fight against modernism. Both *Mr. McKinley* and *Mr. Sanders* asked him to define his terms, that is, to tell what he meant by 'modernism.' He said he meant the people who deny the authority of the Bible and the Virgin Birth and other fundamental Bible doctrines. *Mr. McKinley* said that we must be careful not to use those terms thoughtlessly. *Mr. Sanders* said that very few responsible theologians support Modernism now, and likewise Carl McIntire's Fundamentalism represents only a small and uncooperative group of people in the U.S." Here the national leaders were actually fighting their missionaries. They have been taught the view which is in the Westminster Confession of Faith, the view which the Bible itself teaches, and now these missionaries who are sent out by money from the Board of Foreign Missions were endeavoring to dissuade them and to destroy their faith

in the Bible as God's verbally inspired and infallible Word.

This concrete evidence of what actually happened in the Philippines is an indication of how the approach is made in one way or another to turn the national church away from the historic foundations upon which it was built. Yet, in the Philippine Islands there are missionaries who say they are sound. But how can missionaries remain a part of an organization which attacks the Bible and spends time trying to destroy faith in the Bible in the minds and hearts of nationals who are the fruits of sacrificial missionary endeavors in the past? Is it any wonder that the Board is losing money? When facts of this kind are given to people in the United States who do believe the Bible, they cannot be expected to give their money to destroy the very thing that they want to see built in the minds and hearts of those in foreign lands.

And the story is not yet told.

VI.

Another aspect of this picture needs to be considered. The monies have failed to come forward. Some monies have come. From whom did they come? Explaining the loss of funds, the section on the budget says: "First, that the women's organizations, which during the depression saved

our foreign mission from disaster by providing nearly half of the receipts from living donors at a time when the churches slumped badly, have continued their solid contributions and have increased their giving in the ten-year period by more than \$300,000. Second, the churches are now shouldering a proper share of the budget, nearly 74%, as compared with less than 56% ten years ago." Notice, it is the work of the women, the missionary society women. They are the ones above all who are concerned with the Bible and with helping the mission fields. It is their money that helps keep even those that are there. And what of the churches shouldering their proper share of the budget? That figure must be considered in the light of the mandate of 1934 in which the Assembly adopted a policy that it was as much the duty of the churches to give to the officially approved program of the denomination as it was to take the Communion of Jesus Christ. There has been tremendous emphasis inside the church in whipping churches into line, raising questions concerning any outside giving of any kind, and now it is being reflected here.

Pressure was enforced upon the churches. This has come through the presbyteries. This has come by seeing that proper candidates were put in the churches who would recommend this to the congre-

gations. In other words, here is the ministerial leadership of the church, the younger men who have come in, being brought into line to support the denominational program. They can see to it that what money the church has goes to the mission board and is not squandered on outside independent or faith mission works of any kind.

This is the picture — pressure on one side, good conscientious women working on the other side. We have always said that if the true Bible believers, those who have a passion for missions, would quit giving to modernism and quit supporting the inclusivist policy, the whole thing would virtually collapse, and, if they would give instead to true sound mission agencies, the entire world picture of missions would be changed and passion and vision would be restored and returned.

I cannot conclude this survey, important as it is to this point, without stating that the breakdown and loss which we have witnessed here in the mission program of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is also reflected in international affairs. With all of these missionaries preaching the Gospel, with the church on fire for the truth, certainly its missionary giving and its missionary personnel would have continued in proportion to the increase in the

membership of the church. And the impact of this upon the world would have been felt for good, as opposed to communism, as opposed to the attacks upon the West. The world picture would definitely have been affected.

These are matters now which God's people who give must see. These are matters which every Presbyterian must consider as he is a part of a denomination which is carrying on this type of missionary program.

It also is a testimony to the wisdom, to the usefulness of the separationist movement, and to the marvelous way God has put His hand upon it, and particularly upon the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. It is to this Board that more and more Presbyterians are looking and sending their money, and they want to support missions and missionaries who do not compromise and who are helping to save the mission churches and to build true churches in foreign lands. Modernism is to blame for it all. God's people who co-operate with modernism and help support its program are going to have to answer to God for such sin and folly.

WHAT MODERNISM HAS DONE TO PRESBYTERIAN MISSIONS IN SIAM

BY THE REV. BOON MARK GITTISARN

Pastor of the Bangkok Church and vice-president of the Bangkok Conference of the International Council of Christian Churches

MODERNISM

Modernism has spread into our churches by the successors of the fundamental missionaries who worked here a century ago. Many young and new missionaries took the place of the retired old missionaries and modernism also took the place of fundamentalism. The modernism got hold of the influence and votes in the meeting. The fundamental missionaries could do nothing but just keep silent and have a good spell with his hopeless wife at home. I also was swept away into a chaos by this false doctrine. But our good brothers came from China and lifted us up to the old faith which was once delivered to the saints. Hallelujah! Praise His name!

HARMS BY MODERNISM

When I was baptized in 1915 they told me that there were about 8,000 Christians, and I took up my secretaryship of the Church of Christ in Thailand. I have all the statistics added and we have less than

8,000 Christians. That was in 1934. Roughly we will say that in twenty years' time there was not one soul added to the church. Besides that, where were the children of the Christians? They had grown up to be men and women, but where are they? They are lost, and perish by the false doctrine. The modernistic missionaries have to be blamed for it and the fundamental missionaries have to be blamed also, for they did not defend the faith.

Now they say their membership runs up to 10,000 Christians and it was reported last year that they lost 1,000 in that very year. They have a new policy to win souls, headed by the new moderator of the Church of Christ in Thailand. They called it "Winning Souls Program." I will tell you how they do it. They went into a certain church and called a meeting of the leaders of the church and asked them for co-operation. Then they had the assembly meeting and asked everyone who wanted to join the team to bring one of his Buddhist friends. They had seven nights successively preaching the so-called gospel, and at the very last night they asked those who were present if they wanted to become Christians. They were pushed and pulled by the one who brought them; so they decided to accept Christ. Some of them said they were deceived and

most of them never came to church again after that. Those who were left are only nominal Christians. As I have traveled among these churches, I have not seen one true Christian who was brought in and baptized in a week's time. Of course, the missionaries got the numbers and made a big report to the home church. But what became of them? They never make any report of that. They report more and more on the "received" side, but what about the big loss?

They have big schools and hospitals. They got good acknowledgement by the government, but not by Christ. How can He say, "Well done," to such a work, for there are more than 80 per cent in the staffs who are Buddhist and most of the rest are nominal Christians. Drinking, smoking, movie-seeing, cheating, and dancing are common in their staff, and even committing adultery has happened often. It cannot be proved, but there was some abortion and some were born without a father. One of the nurses in a Christian hospital told me worse than this, which I do not know how to tell you.

There are 70 churches, but not one church that can be counted as self-supporting, self-governing and self-propagating. Most of the pastors are paid by the mission. When the deputy went into Siam to see the church affairs, he was

surprised to see that not one church has its own pastor, though there are about 70 ordained men. Most of the hospitals and schools are run by nominal Christians who do not care to go to church. Some of the schools have Buddhist head teachers, and many times I have heard the missionaries say that Buddhist teachers are better than Christian teachers. Are these things not the result of the modernistic doctrines?

DURING THE WAR TIME

When the second World War broke out and when we had to fight with the Japanese against Britain and America, I heard many times by broadcast over the radio that Christianity is a foreign religion and the Christians are fifth columnists. Faithful Christians were accused falsely and were put into prison. Nominal Christians ran away from the church. Please do not be frightened if I tell you that the moderator of the Church of Christ in Siam has denied our Lord Jesus Christ and proselyted himself to Buddhism. He came back again to the church without confession, and is now in a big office with the mission and church. I tell you he is a very good man, a man of good respect in every way, or else the church and mission will not put him back again in the big offices. It may be true in his heart that he never denied Christ, but the modernistic doctrine has

made him weak. I have seen him fight and struggle with tears. He did not want to do it, but he has no power to resist. Oh, poor man and poor modernistic doctrine! I was the executive secretary of the Church of Christ at this time, and I was in this office at the birth of this organization. I was there twelve years altogether.

One church in the northern part was persecuted by the officers of the government and more than thirty of them denied Christ and became Buddhists. Many leaders at that time had gone to work with the Catholics, some with the Japanese, and some left the church work and minded their own business. It was the rainy season at the time. It was the Rev. Boon Mee Rungreungwongse who was put into prison for ten days for the cause of the church. He and a young man who now is his son-in-law went with me to this said church and brought all of the 30 people back again to the church. I wish that you could have seen the scene at the church on that Sunday morning. The pastor who had denied Christ and the rest and all the members wept. Oh, it was weeping for joy! Why did they not stand firm? They wanted to, but they were weakened by this false doctrine.

In one of their stations in the northern part, many of the Christians became Jehovah's Witnesses. The sad part was

that many of these people were the leaders of the church. Four of them were ordained men. One of these people came back, but I heard that he taught that Christ is not divine.

Meanwhile the missionaries were all sent home by the exchanging of prisoners. We who were left and stood firm in the faith called for general councils and a general assembly meeting. We had a very good time together — one faith, one goal, and one spirit in what was decided and that which was done. Why? It was because we all believed in redemption by the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. But this unity has been broken to pieces since the missionaries came back again to Siam. We wish that they had never come back again and now we have many churches which have become independent and self-supporting, self-governing and self-propagating. With the full program of the mission not one church yet has her own pastor and has come up to the standard of self-support and self-propagation.

Can they do it? Why not? They can! They are farther ahead in numbers, finances, and property than my church, but they are far behind in faith and in spirit. We are not better than they, but we have the living faith and the living Person. Our church alone has reached the masses and sold portions of Scripture and tracts

more than these 70 churches combined. We have good tracts to reach Buddhist people — more than all the mission has produced. Strange that they use our tracts, and these people are fundamental who still compromise with modernism. They can never grow by compromising. Sometimes we pray for war. Why? Because we hate modernist doctrine. This is our land and this is our country and we do not want the modernistic doctrine to be sown here, especially in the Church of Christ in Thailand. They are not American churches, they are Siamese churches; but our Siamese churches cannot become Siamese until the American people let them alone. I love the American people as a whole. It does not matter who they are, but I would love to see all the American missionaries let our churches alone. They are Siamese churches; they are my church. Now by the Holy Spirit they do not belong to the American Presbyterian Mission. They belong to us Siamese Christians; they belong to the real body of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Please do not say that, if the missionaries leave us, the churches will fall. There is no truth to it. We were growing in the war time, both in quantity and quality. My poor Independent Church and the poor Cheingmai Free Church have proved that we can be alone and grow,

and grow fast, too.

One modernist missionary said to me that if I agree with the policies of the mission they will back me up 100 per cent. I am sorry that I smiled and kept quiet and said nothing. But I said in my heart, Why don't you support your 70 churches who agreed with your policies to become self-supporting and to become indigenous churches. As long as the American Presbyterian Mission tries to support and help to take care of them, they will never become indigenous churches.

I want the Board of Foreign Missions and the members of all the Presbyterian churches to call their modernist missionaries back and send the fundamental missionaries to the pioneering work where there is no Christian and where there is no church. If you do not do as I tell you, your people there will have to fight with us, and we will fight our heads off to bring all the churches out of your empire. They are not yours — they are ours. The Lord has sent your people here to preach the Gospel. After we have received the Gospel, your duty is to go to other places which are untouched by the Gospel.

My breaking away is not the same as the others. I broke off in order to pull out all the churches from their bondage of the false doctrine. I have seen many good signs that the Lord is with me. The

Lord has said unto Joshua, "As I was with Moses, so I will be with thee: I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee." I am sure of the victory, for I know that God is with me.

You say that now the church has come up to the state of "brotherly partnership." But I say and know for sure that now we have come up to the state of "brotherly separationship." The more we separate the more we will grow. Partnership at this time will bring our church to catastrophe.

THE PROMISE HAS FAILED

Some of the fundamental missionaries who sympathized with the work I did in war time nominated me to be sent abroad and to study in the Bible school for two or three years in America. This was unanimously voted in the temporary executive committee meeting of the Presbyterian Mission. But the modernist missionaries foresaw that I would not join their policies. So they wrote to the home board and by that letter the promise failed. The two missionaries who were sent by that committee to ask me if I wanted to go and study abroad never came back again to tell me the situation and why they have failed me. The situation must be a very bad one; so they cannot talk about it. I tell this not because I am angry or sorry

that I could not be sent, but I want to let you see how strong is the influence of the modernist missionaries in Siam over the Board of Foreign Missions.

The Lord thought it best that I should not be sent by the modernist people. He knows His time and He has His plan. I have worked with this Presbyterian Mission, faithful to the call and to the Bible, for 24 years. My reward is that they excluded me from their church and mission. I was associated with the International Council of Christian Churches about one week's time, and now they sent me to America. They trust me and believe in me because we have the same faith and the same spirit and the same goal. We are in the same divine body of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Copies of this booklet may be procured from Christian Beacon Press, Collingswood, N.J. at Ten Cents per copy. Special rates on quantities.