tianity has done during the first half of the twentieth century. But it is a luxury now that we can no longer afford. Many sensitive critics are convinced that we have seen the end of the Protestant era. In the economy of God it has been allowed four centuries."

Speaking of the younger, indigenous churches, he declared, "They have seen the inadequacy of our old structures and forms and are agonizingly seeking new forms of ecumenical expression and experience. This challenge can be met by nothing less than a willingness on our part to take a radical step forward in our quest for visible, corporate unity. . . ."

LESSLIE NEWBIGIN

Bishop Lesslie Newbigin, general secretary of the International Missionary Council, a bishop in the Church of South India, was the current authority on the "church union" movement.

Addressing the Faith and Order luncheon, he pounded hard against the divisions, declaring, "Our divisions mean that somewhere, somehow, some of us have misunderstood our Lord." The NCC's press release reported, "He stressed the necessity for Christians to listen to one another and 'receive correction from one another' as they seek the 'truth in Christ.'"

One wondered what he meant by the "truth in Christ," and he made it plain before he completed his address. He emphasized, "Unity in the truth does not necessarily mean 'unanimity in verbal statements.'" He insisted: "Such unity is constituted not by consent to a set of beliefs but 'the action of the Living Lord' who commands us to follow Him. 'In a real sense we do not know the truth except as we obey and do.'" It is clear, therefore, that the "truth in Christ" of which he speaks is not related to any Confession of Faith or any book called the Bible. It is related to *action* on the part of the church and to listening to one another.

The denominational publications and the theological institutions and colleges connected with the National Council of Churches will, we believe, immediately reflect this tremendous emphasis and also the urgency with which these leaders insist that these matters be undertaken. The drive to build the one-world church at a quickened tempo has been publicly espoused by the leaders of American Protestantism through the National Council of Churches.

This was emphasized especially in the "Message to the Member Churches" unanimously adopted on December 8.

MESSAGE TO MEMBER CHURCHES

The burden of this message deals first with the problem of the reunion of the churches. It specifically said, "We call upon all churches to continue to pray and labor for the full unity, visible and invisible, of the people of God." This is none other than the one-world superchurch. Sin in this twentieth century is not unbelief. Sin is not the rejection of the Lord Jesus Christ. Sin is the division in the church and the failure of the church itself to heal these divisions and to bring about this visible, united world church. The message declared: "We stand at the beginning of the second half-century of the ecumenical movement. Through this movement the church has been given a sharpened understanding of the tragedy of its divisions and a clarified vision of the greatness of its hope for ultimate unity."

These church leaders are possessed by the idea that if they can unite the church into one great visible organization, they will in some way gather to themselves the power which they want to use in world affairs. Having departed from the Scriptures, as is clearly the case, these men no longer understand or have confidence in the blessed promises of the Word of God. It is "not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord." Furthermore, you do not hear the glorious emphasis of Romans 1:16: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."

Already the churches are working for this, and the "message" says: "We rejoice in the churches' growing habit of planning their programs in conference with one another. We are thankful that some of these ministries are now carried forward unitedly." This explains the Revised Standard Version of the Bible and the united support given to it by the boards and agencies of the denominations connected with the National Council of Churches. This explains the Fifth World Order Study Conference and the cooperation of the churches as they sent official delegates to the Cleveland convention, when they called for the recognition of Red China. As a matter of fact, the "message" declares, "In our common task we have received a new vision of the mission of the church to the world. Through conversation and vigorous encounter with one another, each participating communion has gained a fresh appreciation of the strength and Christian fidelity of other traditions."

The same powerful thrust that has been felt in ecumenical circles expressed itself in this "Message to the Member Churches," so far as division is concerned. It stated, "Not the churches' diversity but their separation from one another is the heart of this sinfulness."

"We acknowledge that in our sinfulness we have not allowed him [Christ] to be in all things the Lord of the Church." Christ is not the Lord of the church, according to the National Council of Churches, until the churches have all been reunited in a visible body. That this is what is involved is as clear as language can make it. "We cannot expect, the 'message' says, those outside the church to recognize His Lordship if the church, in which obedience ought to be total and complete, withholds such obedience with respect to its unity." How far afield all this has gone from the simple message of the Scriptures that as soon as a man believes on Jesus Christ he becomes born again and Jesus Christ from that moment on is his Lord! Moreover, He is indeed the only Head and King of the church.

How about "complete obedience" in "the faith"? In the virgin birth? In the blood? What the National Council has actually done at this point is to repudiate completely the historic Protestant position concerning the diversity, pluraformity, and independence of the churches.

It would seem that the visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Pope John XXIII, the plans of Pope John XXIII for his own ecumenical council, and the election of John F. Kennedy, a Roman Catholic, to be President of the United States have all contributed to this intensified drive on the part of the Protestants, the Anglicans, and the Greek Orthodox in the National Council of Churches to promote the visible unity of the churches.

What is the "Message to the Member Churches"? A strategy, or technique, has been developed by the ecumenical leaders by which they intend to propagandize their own churches. These "messages" which are a standard part of any ecumenical meeting or council gathering are in substance the same program over and over again.

Through the years leaders of the old Federal Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches have insisted repeatedly that they were not seeking to unite the churches into one organization. That, indeed, they said, was not the purpose or the function of the National Council of Churches. All of that is now history. The National Council of Churches has become the major instrument for the reunion of the churches into one great superchurch, a monopolistic, religious organization. The "Message to the Member Churches" on December 8, 1960, spelled out the NCC's function in this regard. It said:

"We are called to face the truth that the autonomy, or even continuing identity, of our denominations is not the paramount issue, but rather our openness to the intent of Christ for his church in these times, recognizing that such openness may lead in directions which are new and unfamiliar to us. We believe that the National Council can increasingly serve the churches by reminding them that their oneness in Christ is a deeper reality than their divisions and enabling them to give united witness to the Lordship of Christ through further development of co-operative and common ministries."

Thus the Council of Churches is the instrument, the present and most effective instrument which the churches possess, leading them to deny themselves and to develop the one-world church which they believe is "the intent of Christ for his church."

In one of the most dramatic developments of the entire Assembly, Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, the president, announced that the report which they were about to hear was one of the most important ever to come before the National Council of Churches. This was the presentation of the report on long-range planning. Briefly, this is the over-all strategy which the National Council is setting up for itself whereby the Council is now going to become the instrument for church union in the United States. The process is already under way, and somewhere along the road the decision has been made to use the National Council of Churches in this way.

The Rev. Robert W. Spike, of the United Church of Christ, put it this way, "I would hate to see us spend the next 20 years spending our energies into putting denominations together. The piece by piece approach is too slow." The transition is to be made from co-operation, which the National Council originally represented, to co-ordination and ultimate church union. Already the National Council of Churches in its labyrinth of commissions, departments, and agencies is taking over the functions of the denominations and is becoming in fact a superchurch.

ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT

"Christian Concern for World Community" represented another statement dealing with the social program, the United Nations, the call for disarmament, and the like. "World Community" is another phrase used by these ecumenical dreamers to describe world government.

No sooner had the National Council of Churches adopted its strong resolution on the United Nations, in which it was pointed out that with the admission of the new bloc of Afro-Asian nations there was a possibility that the United States would be out-voted and that it was a task for the churches to prepare the Americans against the shock of this new experience, than the Oakland *Tribune*, edited by former Senator William Knowland, published a penetrating and searching editorial showing the fallacy of the NCC's position in regard to Red China. The top leaders of the Fifth World Order Study Conference, who called for the recognition of Red China, were among those who were leading the San Francisco Assembly and those who had a part in the adoption of the resolution concerning the United Nations.

RECOGNIZING RED CHINA

The one issue upon which the United Nations is about to act against the interest and firm position of the United States Government is the recognition of Red China. Moreover, at St. Andrews, Scotland, on August 22, the central committee of the World Council of Churches, on which many of these same leaders sit, called upon all the churches of the world to work for conditions which would make possible the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

The Fifth World Order Study Conference, with the difficulties which it encountered because of its championing of the Nikita Khrushchev program for peaceful coexistence, was defended on

(Photographed from Oakland, Calif., *Tribune* of December 8, 1960)

Churches and U.N.

The delegates to the general assembly of the National Council of Churches in San Francisco have a proper right to be concerned when they are presented with proposals such as a merger of creeds, but when they turn their weight toward dictating foreign policies of the United States Government, they lay themselves open to criticism.

The resolution adopted during the closing sessions which declares that the United States may soon have to subordinate its will to that of the United Nations, seems scarcely in keeping with an assembly whose ecumenical interest revolves around the pulpit.

It is true, as the resolution stated, that as the United Nations is now constituted and in view of new memberships to come, that this country faces the new experience of being outvoted. It is true too that the people of the United States should prepare themselves for such an eventuality.

Up to that point the resolution has an essence of realism. But when it reaches the conclusion that this country must accept whatever might entail from that new experience, it steps out of bounds. It surely is not the will of the people of the United States that they waive their sovereign rights at the whim or will of a majority of the United Nations. The American people are not about to surrender our constitutional system or our Bill of Rights guarantees to a world government wherein international communism has substantial power.

The drafting and approval of this resolution brings wonder if perhaps the same influences were not at work in San Francisco that led to the adoption of a resolution by the World Study Conference in Cincinnati a little more than a year ago calling for U.S. recognition of red China and admitting Peiping into the United Nations.

The Cincinnati conference was sponsored by the National Council of Churches and some of its higher authorities were participants. Yet to this day the National Council of Churches has not repudiated the World Study Conference resolution, either through its board of directors or in assembly.

That is why it is easy to believe the same influences that were responsible for the Cincinnati resolution were behind the San Francisco resolution.