

churches for support. The Synod should examine these agencies to ascertain that they are sound in the faith, and should repudiate them if they turn away from God's truth, but should leave to their own boards the task of spending long hours grappling with questions of means and methods of advancing the work.

To get the right balance among these three is not easy, but we believe that the result is worth the effort. Socialism in government leads to lethargy or corruption. The same is true in the church. When church bodies try to perform activities that should be handled by independent agencies competing freely, both the church and the agencies inevitably suffer, and very generally the result is that false doctrine eventually finds an opening. This is a vital difference between us and this other body, and one that we feel to be of tremendous importance, although of course, not so important as the very great difference that results from their refusal to cooperate in the world-wide struggle against apostasy.

When some of us, led by Dr. Machen, left the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1936, we incorporated in the constitution of the body that we formed the provision that each church should retain title to its property and should be free to leave the denomination at any time for reasons satisfactory to itself. We believe that such an attitude is required by our American principle of individual freedom, and is in line with Christian justice and fairness. However, it is my impression that both of these other denominations have departed from this policy, so that any church that has once joined either of them cannot leave without losing its property. The Bible Presbyterian Church, on the contrary, is bound together by mutual love and confidence and employs no coercion against any of its member churches.