

expensive scheme?" "The Church's present agencies are sufficient and can do the work best." These are common remarks made by Chinese leaders.

There is good authority for believing that the Chinese pastors in Shanghai do not favor the plan. Of their own accord they invited Dr. Hugh White to address them on the subject. The Pastors' Association of Soochow does not favor it; advocates of the Council said that this was due to foreign influence; the ministers hearing this, declared that this was not a fact, their attitude was due to no outside influence. The Kiangpoh Presbytery does not favor it, and the Independent Church, one is told, will have none of it. It is a great mistake to suppose that the agitation for a National Council came from the Chinese Church. Some Chinese favor it, but it appears to be largely the result of a vigorous foreign propaganda which has been conducted in China since the Edinburgh Conference years ago.

It is also significant to note the difference in the men who take opposite views of this question. The men who favor the new movement are not men of long religious experience, nor are they the ones who have built up the Chinese Church. They are mostly young men who have been educated abroad in "liberal" institutions and hold radical views. The men who do not favor the movement of which the National Council is a part, are the active pastors and evangelists who have borne the burden and heat of the day, and have largely built up the Chinese Church.

IV. Another reason why the North Kiangsu Mission does not favor the National Council is that the affiliations of most of the promoters are with Modernism. The movement is largely a modernist movement. While some conservative men are on the various committees, the majority are men of modernist sympathies. The Chinese put forward as speakers and leaders in the National Conference, with the exception of Dr. Chen Ching I, were mainly of the same class. The whole general drift of the movement, both as regards religious beliefs and administration, is opposed to the convictions and policies of our Southern Presbyterian Church. This movement, like other union movements, is popular with men who hold radical views, because it practically removes all religious standards and leaves each one to believe and teach what he pleases, with none to say him nay. Is not this attitude wholly different from that of our beloved Church which has definite standards and believes that it has truth of infinite value to witness for?

While the National Conference, under pressure, was forced to make some statement of doctrine, that statement was purposely vague and dodged the vital issue between radicals and evangelicals; they would not declare that the whole Scriptures are the Word of God, the "only infallible rule of faith and practice." A loophole was left so that each radical could believe or reject just as much as he pleased of the Holy Word. The "Fundamentals" were mentioned, but they were afraid to state what those fundamentals were! An attempt was made in the interest of peace and truth to get some assurance as to what the doctrinal position of the future National Council would be, but they refused absolutely to give any such assurance. The Council which would have such tremendous influence for good or evil was left free to believe or disbelieve, as its members saw fit! Can our Church be expected to endorse a plan which leaves things "at loose ends" like this? Would it be reasonable or businesslike to do so? And would our Mission

be loyal to its trust if it approved of a Council formed on such a basis? And if we come under such a Council, holding totally divergent opinions on questions of vital importance to the management of union institutions, how is it possible to act harmoniously, with one party teaching views which the other party knows to be absolutely destructive of Christian faith?

(Signed)

Henry M. Woods,  
Hugh W. White,  
S. I. Woodbridge,  
Jas. B. Woods,

Delegates of the North Kiangsu Mission to the National Christian Conference.

(To be continued next week.)

### JESUS NOT OUR EXAMPLE.

By Rev. H. H. Leach.

This is true in the sense in which this expression is generally understood and taught. The teaching that Jesus was a Model to be copied, an Example to be followed, and came for that purpose alone, is very widespread. It is the heart of Unitarianism. The central dogma of Christian Socialism is the "Imitation of Christ;" it makes Him a philanthropist, not a Saviour. It holds He came as a Teacher. Jesus considered as an Example is the central idea in all the humanitarian and latitudinarian gospels (so called), and this "gospel" is now like a banyan tree, with many a root in many a place. Likewise the "Imitatio Christi" is the chief corner-stone of the "moral influence" theory which sets forth the whole work of Christ as a Teacher and an Exemplar, in philanthropy, benevolence and kindness. How plausible, therefore, the cry of the Christian Scientist (falsely so called), "You must heal the sick, cure all diseases, or not be Christian, for He healed all manner of diseases."

This teaching that Christ's work consisted in setting us an example has permeated the denominations till we see Christians everywhere who think they can find out every duty by simply asking, "What would Jesus do?" Several million copies of a book bearing that title have been sold in the United States.

So widespread is this view of Christ's work and of Christian duty, that the writer fears he will be charged with disloyalty, if not with out-and-out heresy, if he suggests this is not the correct theory of the Christian religion.

The literal following of Christ in all things is not the standard of Christian living, the ideal of Christian conduct. There are too many difficulties in the way of this interpretation.

1. **Historical:** All those whose lives dated "B. C." had no instruction as to their duties to God and man for such "Example" had not then been given.

2. **Metaphysical:** That is, one growing out of the nature of man and the nature of Christ. Jesus is a divine human being, a God-man, and a God-man is not a pattern for man. From the nature of the case, a man cannot be like and act like a God-man. Here man cannot "follow copy."

3. **Evangelical:** According to the Scriptures Jesus is above all things a Saviour. "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Are His disciples all to imitate Him in this way and to save men as He saved them?

4. **Practical:** On this explanation of Christ's mission no one can be His follower and imitator; for He cannot be born like Him; he cannot be a child like Him; he cannot be baptized

like He was; he cannot be tempted like Him; he cannot preach like Him, for He spake as never man spake; he cannot perform like "mighty deeds;" he cannot be a carpenter; he cannot be a pauper like Him; he cannot remain unmarried like He did, else he would wreck society; he cannot forgive sins like He did; he cannot receive worship like He did; he cannot answer prayer like He did; he cannot "lay down his life of himself and take it again," as He did; he cannot ascend to the right hand of the Father as He did.

Yet, it cannot be denied that, according to the Scriptures, Christ is our example. "He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also to walk even as He walked." Christ-likeness is the Scriptural ideal for all disciples. "Be ye holy; for I am holy." "We shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." "Behold, I have given you an example, that ye should do as (not what) I have done." "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." "He that taketh not up His cross and followeth after Me cannot be My disciple."

In what sense, and to what degree are we to follow Jesus? Precisely in this, and in no other: Jesus is our example in His obedience to the moral law. Here then is our duty, Keep Gods' commandments just as Jesus did. Herein lies the whole duty of the Christian.

The work that Jesus did as a Saviour of sinners is not for imitation. It was never done before; never will be again. No one but the God-man can do it; and He needs to perform it but once.

The "mighty deeds" wrought by Him were primarily for the purpose of proving He was the Messiah sent of God. "The works which the Father hath given Me to accomplish, the very works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent Me;" "The works that I do in My Father's name, these bear witness of me." "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs which God did by Him in the midst of you." His Messianism and appointment of God as Saviour being duly attested to the world, and the record of them being preserved in writing, there is since then, no call for miracles. And he who attempts to work miracles today in copying Christ's example is therefore proving himself an impostor.

Jesus, in executing His office as Mediator between God and sinful men, did two things: First, He fully satisfied all the penal demands the law, broken by sinners, had upon them; and second, He obeyed the moral law with absolute perfection—every precept to the last "jot and tittle."

In His suffering the penalty of the law, His is not, and from the nature of the case, cannot be our example to follow. It is no believer's duty to endure the curse.

In His obedience to the moral law Jesus is our example. The question for the Christian to raise is not, "What would Jesus do?" but "What does the law require?" Or, if he desires to cling to the question, "What would Jesus do?" let him always obtain the only correct answer, Jesus would keep God's commandments.

The law, as summed up in the ten commandments, outlines the whole duty of the Christian.

Christ in His perfect obedience illustrates the way the duty is to be performed.

The grace of Christ's Spirit, working in and through His Word, is the power by which the Christian is to "follow Jesus," as He did whatever the moral law requires.

Swan Quarter, N. C.