

Suppose that a man who is giving to a foreign mission agency learns that this agency is supporting some who are denying the teachings of the Bible? Suppose he learns that this agency is joining with other agencies in the support of educational institutions in which there are professors who are attacking the Word of God. Suppose that repeated complaints have been given about these activities, and that the agency has declined to make any change? What is the reasonable attitude for the contributor to take? Shall he continue to support the agency, and piously hope that the good that is done will outweigh the evil that his money is supporting? Shall he designate his funds for individuals whose work he knows to be good, overlooking the fact that this designation merely releases other funds to be used for the spreading of Modernism? One who uses ordinary business common sense will certainly not follow either of these two policies. He will desire to give his money to an agency which will use every cent of it for the spread of the Gospel. That is why the Independent Board was founded. Its purpose was to provide an agency to which Presbyterians could give with full assurance that no cent of their contributions would be used to support Modernism. And it is for that reason that the Independent Board is continuing to operate.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

A Christian leader recently was heard to declare that the mission problem is more complex than would seem to be the case. He said, "I receive letters from missionaries who tell me that they are utterly dissatisfied with the Boards which are supporting them. They would like to resign from such connections. 'However', they say 'Here I am doing truly Christian work. I am preaching the Gospel of Christ and souls are being saved. If I leave, the Board will send a Modernist to take over my work and the Word of God will not be preached.'"

Here is a situation that calls for clear thinking. What is this missionary to do? Is he to continue preaching the Gospel of Christ, hoping to hold his field true as long as he lives, knowing that whenever he withdraws or dies his work will be taken over by one who will tear down everything that he has built up? Is it not wiser for him to withdraw immediately, even if his work is to be somewhat smaller for the time being? Would he not be much wiser to see to it that his work was performed under such auspices that he could know that the work which he was doing would not be turned down immediately upon his