

TRAGEDY, HOPE AND AMBIVALENCE:
THE HISTORY OF THE
ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
1936-1962

CHARLES G. DENNISON

Part One: Tragedy

Paying Old Debts

I wish to thank the Board and Faculty of Mid-America Reformed Seminary for the gracious invitation to present the 1992 Annual Fall Lectures. As an Orthodox Presbyterian (OP), I come to you with deep humility, knowing the great debt the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC) owes to the continental Reformed tradition and more particularly to the Christian Reformed Church (CRC). The names of Geerhardus Vos, R.B. Kuiper, Cornelius Van Til, Ned B. Stonehouse, all one-time members of the CRC, have meant much for the development of a Reformed consciousness within the OPC.

It goes without saying, these are harrowing times for the world of Protestant orthodoxy. The Christian Reformed Church, traditionally strong with an exemplary history, now shows evidence within itself of the extremities of our times. In many ways, present circumstances for the CRC remind us of the fundamentalist/modernist storm and stress period in American Protestantism earlier in this century.

It will be remembered that the OPC, organized on June 11, 1936, was born in that earlier struggle.¹ Nor can it be forgotten by us in the OPC how the CRC seemed the special servant of the Holy Spirit to comfort and advise us. J. Gresham Machen, the central figure in the founding of the OPC, believed the CRC the most blessed ally the OPC had. He reflected on the greetings sent by the CRC to the OPC at its

¹The Orthodox Presbyterian Church did not receive its present name officially until March 15, 1939. Originally known as the Presbyterian Church of America, it lost that name in its disputes with The Presbyterian Church in the USA. These articles will use the present name even in references to the church in the period in which it had its previous name.

First General Assembly: ". . . no other ecclesiastical body in the whole world could have [sent greetings] more welcome . . ." ² The happiness of Machen at those greetings could not have been greater, since they meant that the CRC recognized the OPC as a true church and correct in its separation from the Presbyterian Church in the USA (PCUSA); in other words, the OPC was not a schismatic sect.

But Machen went further in his remarks. He looked upon the CRC as a model of "a truly Reformed church," separatist in the very best sense, standing apart "in the interests of a true unity and purity of the Church." The CRC, he said, was theologically consistent, never "vaguely 'evangelical' or 'conservative' or 'fundamentalist' but always endeavor[ing] to be . . . Reformed." To Machen, this meant the CRC was not "content with some partial or piecemeal presentation of the truth that the Bible contains but [held] firmly to that glorious system of revealed truth . . . summarized in the great Reformed confessions of faith." Machen also admired the tradition of catechetical preaching in the CRC by which the laity were soundly and systematically trained in doctrine; he admired the exercise of church discipline and the CRC's commitment "to make the education of [its] children Christian throughout."

Machen's high praise for the CRC was reciprocated by H.J. Kuiper in his December 25, 1936, editorial in *The Banner*. Kuiper identified the establishment of the OPC as "One of the outstanding events of 1936 in the religious ecclesiastical world. [The] progress [of this church]," he continued, "will mean much for the preservation and propagation . . . of our Calvinistic doctrines and traditions." Kuiper noted how carefully *The Banner* monitored the OPC's formation and early days. He concluded with these words:

Let us add . . . that if we have been an inspiration to the leaders of the new Presbyterian Church, they have no less been an inspiration to us. We have often asked ourselves the question whether we would have been willing to suffer the hardship and calumny for our faith which they have endured the past few years. And let us not forget that our contacts with [these] men . . . who have stepped out or been cast out of . . . [the Presbyterian Church in the USA] have served us as a constant warning against the perils of modernism.

²*Presbyterian Guardian* 2 (July 20, 1936), 170.

Despite Kuiper's kind words, the OPC stood, at that time, more immediately and obviously in the CRC's debt. His words did, however, hold out the prospect for valuable service the OPC could render the CRC if times of suffering and hardship came in which the CRC was, in fact, face to face with "the perils of modernism." Subsequent history has brought great change to both denominations and to the once strong relationship they sustained with each other. However, the story of the OPC's formation and past history, both in its testimony to Christian courage and to human weakness, seems especially appropriate for CRC audiences these days. It is in the interests of discharging an old debt that I present these lectures. My prayer is for your profit as we of the OPC profited from the sacrifice and love of an earlier generation that stood in the tradition represented by this institution.

Setting the Stage

The dates in the title to these lectures take us from the year of the OPC's birth to the year of Ned B. Stonehouse's death. Stonehouse is the last of three significant figures around whom the lectures are organized, the others being J. Gresham Machen and Cornelius Van Til. I have matched each of these men to one of the words in the title, for example, Machen is joined to the word tragedy, Van Til to hope, and Stonehouse to ambivalence. More specifically, in this first segment, we will consider Machen's battle with the fundamentalists in the OPC at the close of his life, a battle that proved more devastating for him than his struggle against the liberals.

The second lecture reviews Van Til's remarkable but narrow victory in the 1940s over the visions of cultural Protestantism, championed by figures like Edwin H. Rian and Gordon H. Clark. This struggle made clear the fragile nature of the Reformed consciousness within the OPC, but also the fact that Van Til's theological and apologetical stand could not easily be disassociated from the new church.

However, the hope rising out of the controversy of the 1940s was qualified by a lingering ambivalence within the church. The last lecture looks at Ned B. Stonehouse, an ardent promoter of Machen and an extraordinary scholar. He initially proved vague and indecisive in the agonizing war with the subjectivism of the Peniel movement, a movement I will explain later. It consumed OP energies directly for fifteen years, in fact, into and beyond 1962, the year of Dr. Stonehouse's death.

But setting the stage for these lectures demands more than the introduction of subjects and personalities. We do well to give more than a nod in a cosmopolitan, less parochial direction. Without conceding to the larger sociological movements the key to understanding the particular features of history, we do not want to be ignorant of the world around us, neither its potential influence and threat nor its pressures that providentially drive the church to take a better look at herself.

The years 1936-1962 saw the collapse of Europe and the beginning stages of its redefinition. This period ends with Europe divided by a newly built wall between an economically attractive west and an intractable, determined, increasingly scientifically sophisticated East. American isolationism has been shattered and old world colonialism is dead. Asian and African interests cannot be ignored. In many respects, this period is one in which a "brave new world" takes shape, brimming over with hostilities born from the clash of fundamentally distinct ideologies and from the residual impact of nationalism and racial conflict.

Despite the diversity and discord, the years 1936-1962 do give evidence of a unifying theme, namely, the triumph of an immanentistic world consciousness. History is now understood — as at no point previously so pervasively and consistently — from within. No substantive appeal is made to external divine power or design. For example, the World Wars and subsequent conflicts of this century have been fought without much serious theological analysis by the traditionally Christian West.³ In the East, militarist mythologies lie in ruins.

Mankind is discovering a new religion, one beyond, but also the natural descendent of, theological liberalism. In the new religion the fatherhood of God disappears in the interests of the brotherhood of men. John Steinbeck's 1939 novel *The Grapes of Wrath* spells it out. Here, Steinbeck creates for us the picture of the Joad family that has lived through Egypt-like feast and famine days on the Oklahoma plains. But now the plague of the great depression and the dustbowl, together with the oppression of the modern Pharaohs, the machine-owning, land-grabbing syndicates, find them looking to the promised land: California.

The Joads are led on this pilgrimage by an itinerant ex-preacher named Casy, who is searching for a replacement for his rejected fundamentalism. In Steinbeck's recasting of the biblical Exodus story, Casy becomes the new Moses, the prophet of a religion devoid of

³An exception is Herbert Butterfield, *Christianity and History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949).

Jehovah. Before his death, Casy passes on the new faith to Tom Joad, the eldest of the Joad boys, who then confesses that man has no soul of his own, ". . . but only a piece of a big one." This one great soul is no testimony to a higher transcendent reality or to a heavenly world. Instead, it testifies to "a greater collective individuality" found only in the common lot of mankind. Steinbeck's novel, therefore, proclaims a new gospel, devoid of God and God's eternal Son, in which faith in humanity promises ultimate triumph over adversity.⁴

Humanity now rises from even the most monumental set-backs with confidence that it is winning the battle for control over existence. But with this confidence has come the new view of government in which political reality absorbs everything in view. The media draws together technology and politics for the catechizing of humanity in the modern immanentistic world consciousness. Abandoned is the Reformation commitment to service for the sake of God and his transcendent kingdom in its present and coming glory; what remains is propaganda for the sake of political advantage and supposed "truth," all in the name of the most "worthy causes."⁵

But we must not think that religion has lost its place in this world of the new gospel. Secularization has not meant the destruction of religion but rather its transformation in the interest of a political hope in that there is, in effect, no other reality. This radical change had been forecast by the social upheaval of the nineteenth century but now has become complete in the ecclesiastical reactions to the world wars, the depression, and the corollary and subsequent social crises. Therefore, the modern church, in its bold and most consistent expressions, finds itself quite at home within the emerging order and at odds with the stubborn resistance to the developing twentieth century enlightenment.

A book appeared in the sixties summarizing the theological consensus that congealed during the time covered by our study. That book, Harvey Cox's *The Secular City*, set out with powerful lucidity the radical reading of Bonhoeffer's "world come of age" and "religionless Christianity." Cox's radicalism was not, first of all, prophetic or

⁴Cf. Russel B. Nye, "The Grapes of Wrath — An Analysis," in T. Walter Wallbank and Alastair M. Taylor, *Civilization: Past and Present*, vol. 2 (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1961), 564-566.

⁵I have borrowed some of Jacques Barzun's analysis of modern culture at this point. For a compact introduction to his insights, see "The State of Culture Today," *The Columbia History of the World*, ed. John A. Garraty and Peter Gay (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 1144-1166.

prescriptive, as if he were selling a vision for what ought to be. Rather, Cox primarily described the present state of things, that which was undeniable. The world no longer understands itself religiously or in terms of the metaphysics attendant to a God who stands apart from the world. Such a state of affairs must not be viewed negatively but as inevitable and necessary, the only possible conclusion to the dynamics of the biblical record and its doctrine of creation.⁶ In the secular city, Christianity becomes the process of social change and political action in keeping with the program of reconciliation observed in Jesus of Nazareth.⁷

No one should be surprised by the theological lay-of-the-land since the sixties. The socio-political reading of the Bible has become a deluge. Jesus had been recast as the champion of "a new embodiment of the Kingdom of God." He was determined, so we are told, to overthrow Jerusalem's priestly temple system that stood in the interests of the

⁶This connection between the doctrine of creation and secularization bears closer study, especially among Reformed people. In the last two centuries, commitment in Reformed circles to the classic doctrine of the fourfold estate of man, a doctrine once understood as foundational to Reformed thought and its view of the covenant, has been severely revised. A once vibrant doctrine of heaven in connection with the fourth estate, together with its relationship to the third, has been eclipsed. An infatuation with the earth has intruded and, although mention is made of the changes brought about in the eternal estate, a "this earth" end-point to God's purpose gains supremacy, whether in the thinking of the evangelical advocates for relevance in culture, the postmillennarian champions of a theonomic state, or the representatives of an establishmentarian quest for *shalom*. In this last regard, people with roots in the continental Reformed tradition should be particularly alert to the preoccupation with the doctrine of creation in relationship to secularization, given the direction of such thinkers as Nicholas Wolterstorff (see *Until Justice and Peace Embrace* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983,]) and Cornelius Plantinga, Jr. (see "Not the Way It's S'posed To Be: A Breviary of Sin," *Theology Today* 50 [July 1993]:179-192). (I am indebted to my brother William D. Dennison, who has called my attention to restorational thinking in the CRC, i.e., that kind of thinking which sees humanity's future in terms of a restored Eden and interprets present responsibility in light of it. Relevant to this discussion are the recent articles by Michael Williams, "Of Heaven and History: The Verticalist Eschatology of Geerhardus Vos," *Pro Rege* 20 [March 1992]: 9-18; and "A Restorational Alternative to Augustinian Verticalist Eschatology," *Pro Rege* 20 [June 1992]: 11-24; see also Danny Olinger, "Vos's Verticalist Eschatology: A Response to Michael Williams," *Kerux* 7 [September 1992]: 30-38.)

⁷The ties between Albrecht Ritschl (1822-89) and the secularized gospel are obvious, justifying fresh study of this man's thought. We may even want to pay more careful attention to those who, at a distance, could see what was coming; I have in mind turn of the century theologians Orr, Warfield and Vos, each of whom spent much time dealing with the radicalism in Ritschl.

Roman/Jewish elitists and against the majority of Palestinian Jews.⁸ In a different but not unrelated approach, the early New Testament church appears as a primal equality movement that was squelched by a male power play, leaving female church leaders branded as heretics and women viewed generally as unimportant or as a threat.⁹

Of course, it must be remembered that the Bible itself is supposedly party to the suppression of the truth about Jesus' true mission and the early New Testament church's "politically correct" agenda. After all, the Bible gives comfort to those who could hide in "obsolete ethical directives," who would oppress women, homosexuals and minority groups. Therefore, if the Bible is to remain authoritative and something more than incidental to our present secular circumstance, it must speak to us about an over-arching theology of hope. We must discern in the Bible an "apocalyptic thrust, which will only find its fulfillment when the triumph of God will make an end to all evil, suffering, and injustice and bring about the joy of a world at peace."¹⁰

Those from the ranks of neo-orthodoxy (such as Barth and Cullmann), who have wanted to talk about "salvation in history" in the interests of the wholly-other God who acts in space and time, have been upstaged. Their inability to speak definitively about God's essential transcendence, about the ontological deity of God's Son, and about the substantive nature of the world to come, has left them victims in a conflict in which they have been co-conspirators. Ironically, they have generated their own irrelevance.

This, then, is the situation as it has taken shape over the course of this century and gained focus from the mid-thirties to the early sixties. A radical cultural and religious shift has occurred, signalling the triumph of an immanentistic world consciousness. Here is the context for the formation of the OPC and for the significance of her early leaders. Men like Machen, Van Til and Stonehouse do not deserve our attention in themselves but as they, together with the OPC and other faithful churches, have given response to the ecclesiastical and cultural demagoguery and deceit of our times. It has been a costly stand, but one in which these men, and those like them, have never wanted to be

⁸Cf. George V. Pixley, *God's Kingdom: A Guide for Biblical Study* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1981), especially the comments on Jesus' strategy, 64ff.

⁹Cf. Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "You are not to be called Father: Early Christian History in Feminist Perspective," *Cross Currents* 29 (1979): 301-323.

¹⁰J. Christaan Beker, "The Authority of Scripture: Normative or Incidental?" *Theology Today* 49 (October 1992): 376-382.

shielded from the scrutinizing gaze that detects whatever speck may be in their own eye.

Tragedy and J. Gresham Machen

Sometime during November 12-14, 1936, a young pastor named Robert H. Graham stepped into an elevator in the Manufacturers' and Bankers' Club at Broad and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia. Stepping in at the same time was the Rev. Carl McIntire, the flamboyant editor of the *Christian Beacon* and pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, New Jersey. These two men were on their way to the second floor and to the meetings of the Second General Assembly of the OPC. The bond between them went beyond their common denomination and, on this occasion, McIntire took Graham into his confidence. As Graham remembers it, McIntire said, "The fellow Machen is getting too much power."¹¹

With this statement, McIntire expressed the growing distrust of Machen felt within the OPC's fundamentalist wing. Such distrust forecast the break by fundamentalists from Machen and his movement.¹² That break eventually catapulted McIntire into the role of a fundamentalist luminary at the head of a vast empire, including the Bible Presbyterian Church. Although Machen died before the break came, he read all the signs and carried the weight of this coming fracture to his grave. The crisis with the fundamentalists in the OPC broke him.

Machen was prepared for the earlier crises of his career; he seemed to rise to them. When he faced the moderates (or indifferentists, as he called them), no amount of humiliation distracted him. They had come after him in the 1926 Baltimore general assembly of the PCUSA and attacked him in full view of the city in which he was raised and well-known. Having taught in the New Testament department at Princeton Seminary since 1906, he had been nominated to the chair of apologetics, an appointment that had to be confirmed by the assembly. But the assembly was moved by J. Ross Stevenson, president of the

¹¹This statement was repeated many times in my presence but detailed in a phone conversation October 26, 1992.

¹²McIntire has cast himself as the true follower of Machen. Just how far this is from the facts has been well established by Darryl G. Hart, "Doctor Fundamentalism: An Intellectual Biography of J. Gresham Machen," (dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1988). Cf. Dr. Hart's article, "The Legacy of J. Gresham Machen and the Identity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church," *Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991): 209-225.

seminary, who identified Machen as the spokesman for intolerance. Charles R. Erdman, Machen's colleague, also opposed him, calling him "thoroughly controversial." For moderate evangelicals like Stevenson and Erdman, Machen was possessed by "temperamental idiosyncrasies" and hampered by "serious limitation."

Although Machen lost the battle for the apologetics position and even saw the seminary remade in 1929 in a modernist direction, he remained resilient, determined and positive in his fight for orthodoxy. Late September 1929, Westminster Seminary opened its doors in Philadelphia to a Machen address in which he said, ". . . though Princeton Seminary is dead, the noble tradition of Princeton is alive."¹³

Machen was buoyant throughout the long, drawn-out battle with liberalism. He stood his ground against the PCUSA hierarchy and its defense of the Board of Foreign Missions. He threw himself into the emergency organization, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, which he with others formed in 1933 in protest to the denomination's liberal mission policies. He was finally deposed for this action by the PCUSA in a case that ran its course at the 1936 general assembly in Syracuse. But on June 11 a new church convened its First General Assembly. About this event, Machen wrote in the *Presbyterian Guardian*:

We became members, at last, of a true Presbyterian Church; we recovered, at last, true Christian fellowship. What a joyous movement it was! How the long years of struggle seemed to sink into nothingness compared with the peace and joy that filled our hearts!¹⁴

That was Machen in June 1936. But Machen in November wore a completely different face. Many remember him as much more restrained and somber. Stonehouse spoke about how much he had aged over the summer months. The first blow was the revelation during that summer of the sexual immorality of his right hand man, H. McAllister Griffiths, not only Machen's counsel throughout his ecclesiastical trials, but the editor of the *Presbyterian Guardian*. Griffiths withdrew from most of his church duties; but interestingly there is no evidence of church discipline

¹³"Westminster Theological Seminary: Its Purpose and Plan," *What is Christianity?* edited by Ned B. Stonehouse (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 232.

¹⁴*Presbyterian Guardian* 2 (June 22, 1936), 110.

in his case, and he retained his position on the Independent Board, a detail that would prove disastrous for Machen.¹⁵

Next, came the October/November row over R.B. Kuiper's *Banner* report on the OPC's First General Assembly. Kuiper had written that the CRC would have been delighted with the way in which candidates for the ministry, presented to the first assembly, were examined about "the anti-Reformed heresies . . . so extremely prevalent among American fundamentalists, Arminianism and the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible."¹⁶

On two counts Carl McIntire took Kuiper to task: first, his accuracy; and second, his anti-premillennialism. When Kuiper responded to McIntire's October 1, *Christian Beacon* editorial, McIntire refused to publish his letter. Machen's response was immediate. He charged McIntire with deliberate sabotage. He said that McIntire knew full well Kuiper's position and that he clearly distinguished between "the dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible" and an allowed premillennialism. Why, then, did McIntire portray Kuiper as opposed to all forms of premillennialism? Machen did not openly accuse McIntire with holding to Scofield Bible dispensationalism, but he did accuse him of trying to ruin Kuiper's reputation and bring down public ire on the *Guardian* which had reprinted Kuiper's article, and on Westminster Seminary, where both Kuiper and Machen taught.¹⁷

It is not difficult to recognize the characteristics of a power play in McIntire's actions. Machen contemplated bringing charges against McIntire. He wrote to J. Oliver Buswell, "I am afraid it is my duty to take the preliminary steps to bring some kind of disciplinary action against Mr. McIntire."¹⁸ When Buswell suggested a private conference

¹⁵A study of attitudes toward church discipline in mainline churches during the early twentieth century would be very helpful. We cannot but think it would confirm the suspicion that bringing charges against someone within the church became tantamount to a breach of ecclesiastical etiquette. Social convention sought to contain public embarrassment. This may explain in part how Griffiths avoided censure, but also why the conservatives in the PCUSA (including Machen) failed to proceed against the signers of the Auburn Affirmation.

¹⁶*Presbyterian Guardian* 2 (September 12, 1936): 227.

¹⁷The correspondence between Machen and McIntire on this matter runs through October and into early November 1936, and is on file in the Machen Archives, Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia.

¹⁸Machen to Buswell, November 2, 1936.

for the resolution of the problem, Machen responded that the conference he had in mind was "the courts of the church."¹⁹

It was as if Machen sensed that he and the OPC were being purposefully pressed to the limit. He had some idea that a confrontation was coming. Even after the first assembly and during the summer months, he confided in Kuiper, "Our struggles are not over; a serious conflict with the Fundamentalists is in the offing."²⁰ Where earlier in his career, Machen had himself been willing to be identified as a fundamentalist, he now rejected the term emphatically. Writing to fundamentalist New York lawyer, James E. Bennet, he said "I for my part am not 'Fundamentalist' at all, but a Presbyterian."²¹ Machen went further; he implied that the fundamentalists had no real commitment to the Westminster Standards;²² he suspected that their view of office essentially laid it open "to any man who is 'washed in the blood of Christ and saved.'"²³ He, with Kuiper and the rest of the Westminster faculty (with the exception of Allan MacRae), believed the dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible "to be terribly heretical."²⁴ He also had no sympathy for the fundamentalist view of "the separated life," since he saw it as a denial of Christian liberty of conscience.

The third blow for Machen came two days after the Second General Assembly. On Monday, November 16, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions met in Philadelphia. Machen was slated for re-election as president, a position he had held since the board's organization in 1933. He lost his position to an independent, Harold S. Laird; but more, he knew the board had been captured by fundamentalism and could no longer operate honestly in terms of its constitutional commitment to Presbyterian doctrine and principles.

The coup had been engineered by James Bennet, who had no regard for Machen's Presbyterianism and together with McIntire, another member of the board, believed Machen to be vested with too much, if not papal, power.²⁵ According to Mary Gresham Machen, J. Gresham's niece, the deciding vote against Machen was cast by H. McAllister

¹⁹Machen to Buswell, November 5, 1936.

²⁰Kuiper to Henry Coray, April 4, 1938.

²¹Machen to Bennet, September 16, 1936.

²²Machen to Bennet, October 23, 1936.

²³Machen to Bennet, October 29, 1936.

²⁴Machen to Bennet, November 9, 1936.

²⁵Bennet to Machen, October 22, 1936.

Griffiths, who had turned on Machen after being morally discredited.²⁶ Griffiths threw his weight to the fundamentalist side before a meteoric rise in McIntire's movement.

Machen was devastated. He told Kuiper that the loss of the board for the cause of the Reformed faith ". . . was the greatest shock of his life."²⁷ After his defeat, he phoned his sister-in-law Helen Woods Machen. Her record of that conversation is most distressing. Machen said to her:

They kicked me out as President, its the hardest blow I've had yet, I'm done for now I feel that I've been driven to the final humiliation of my life. I actually pleaded for myself, pleaded that I be returned to office. My back was against the wall and the whole life of the Board was at stake . . . and I've loved it so and now it's gone, absolutely wrecked, lost to everything it stood for, everything it stood for and the men who stand with me. . . . Now everything is in the hands of men who haven't the slightest notion of the issues at stake everything I've worked for, loved and suffered for, has been kicked out too. I feel it's the end for me, this time they've finished me.²⁸

Nothing in the remaining weeks of Machen's life contradicts Helen Machen's recollections. Machen was not himself at Christmas time. He was pensive, humorless and reclusive. It seems that what the moderates and modernists in the PCUSA had been unable to do, the fundamentalists of the OPC and Independent Board were successful in doing. Obviously, what wounded Machen the most was the betrayal, both doctrinal and personal, by those who had been wonderfully close. In this, something of the experience of his Savior intruded upon him in an unexpected way. But also and in ways many have been unable to grasp, the range of the great issues involved in the conflict was asserting itself.²⁹

During that Christmas break, Machen kept his long-standing appointment to speak to churches and groups in North Dakota. The weather was bad and Machen was sick. Stricken with pneumonia and

²⁶From an interview with Mary Machen. March 9, 1983.

²⁷Kuiper to Coray, April 4, 1938.

²⁸From an affidavit taken October 6, 1937; cf. Hart, "Doctor Fundamental. . .," 359.

²⁹I touch on the wider issues in the following lecture; for a more specific discussion, see "Machen, the OPC and American Culture," *New Horizons* 2 (May/June 1981): 15-16; "Machen, Culture, and the Church," *Banner of Truth* (July 1987): 20-27, 32; "Some Thoughts about our Identity," *New Horizons* 13 (June/July 1992): 4-5.

dying in a Bismarck hospital, he spoke of the Reformed faith: "Isn't it grand?" He also spoke of Christ's active obedience in a telegram to John Murray: "No hope without it," he wrote. Regarding that hope, he spoke to his friend Sam Allen about his vision of heaven: "It was glorious," he said. Machen died at about 7:30 PM January 1, 1937.³⁰

³⁰Note Stonehouse's account of Machen's last days in *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 506-508.