

A photograph of a narrow, rocky canyon. The walls are made of layered, reddish-brown rock. In the distance, two people are walking on a path. The sky is visible at the top of the canyon.

the presbyterian banner

November 2011

*They will tell of the power of your awesome works,
and I will proclaim your great deeds.*

Psalm 145:6

CONTENTS

Editorial	2
Justified by Faith—A Case Study <i>Considering Romans 4</i>	3
Life under the Banner <i>The Wisdom of Shutting Up</i>	5
The Past for Today <i>A Visit to the UK & Europe</i>	7
The World in the Banner <i>News & Views</i>	9
Synodical Treasurer <i>Updated Report</i>	10
Children in the Banner	12
Youth & Search Work	13
Society in the Banner <i>Littering my Father's World</i>	14
Churches in the Banner <i>A Visit from our OPC brethren</i>	15

ISSN 0729-3542

Editor:
Rev. Sjirk Bajema
44 Prospect Hill Road,
Narre Warren, VIC
AUSTRALIA 3805
Ph. (03) 9705 1505
Email: sjirkb@gmail.com

Subscriptions for 2011
11 Issues per year
Within Australia: \$35 [Bulk \$30]
Overseas: AU \$50 Airmail.

Direct Credit :
Bendigo (BSB) 633000
A/C No. 140124082

Editorial

There is a legend of a village in Southern Europe that boasted of a church called 'The House of Many Lamps.' When it was built in the sixteenth century, the architect provided for no light except for a receptacle at every seat for the placing of a lamp. Each Sunday night, as the people gathered, they would bring their lanterns and slip them into the bracket at their seat. When someone stayed away, his place would be dark; and if very many stayed away, the darkness became greater for the whole. The regular presence of each person lit up the church.

We have to say that the architect was very perceptive. He knew something about the place of the person in the pew, because without those people there would be no congregation. And without a congregation there can be no pulpit. For who is there then to pray for and practically support the preaching of God's Word in that place?

Because every congregation varies in size, just as church buildings vary in size, it is not the overall number or building dimensions that matter. It is the commitment of a congregation to its public worship services, studies, and other activities, that shows up how much light is shining through. A congregation of 40 meeting its budget and with a high proportion of attendance and commitment and personal witness to the Lord speaks much louder to me than a congregation of 400 where the proportion of commitment is a lot less, even if the facilities and the range of so-called 'ministries' is extensive. There is something about those who persevere with a small church regardless of what it lacks for the sake of faithful preaching and Christian fellowship. Let's be known as those who witness to the Lord first of all by the attendance at the worship service twice each Lord's Day, where we have such an opportunity. Let's show and tell our children, grandchildren, and friends, that this is our priority. If they come around on Sunday afternoon let them be well aware that when the time comes you will prepare for the worship service and leave for it. Indeed, you show by what you do on the whole Sunday that it's not just another day. It's the Lord's Day.

*Let us not give up meeting together,
as some are in the habit of doing,
but let us encourage one another –
and all the more as you see the day approaching.*

Hebrews 10:25

P.S. Don't forget to renew your *Banner* subscriptions. If your church doesn't get a bulk delivery, perhaps you could ask your minister or elder why not?

Photo Credit: Robert Hingston, Standley Chasm, Central Australia

The Presbyterian Banner is the official magazine of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia. The PCEA was established in 1846 and adheres to the Westminster Confession of Faith (1647) as its doctrinal standard.

Literary contributions are welcome. Submission by email is preferred.

The opinions expressed in signed articles are those of the authors - not necessarily of the editor or the PCEA - and may not be reproduced without permission. Articles written by the Editor may be reproduced without asking for permission, although with appropriate acknowledgement.

This magazine is available as a pdf file on the Church Website: www.pcea.org.au

Justified by Faith — A Case History

Considering Romans 4

George Ball

Paul has introduced us to the doctrine of justification by faith in chapter 3 of Romans. This may have been new to some people – it may even be new to you? People are often a little sceptical and wary of new ideas. That's why Paul here in chapter 4 takes up the case of Abraham (and to a lesser extent David). These men were two giants of the OT and superheroes of the Jews. The Jews all agreed there was none quite like Abraham or David. How were they made right with God? If it can be proven that they were justified before God by faith alone – and not by works - this will make a significant impact!

This may seem to be a lesson in ancient history and you may feel tempted to switch off! Don't. These words are still as relevant and valuable for us today. Paul says, 'these words – it was credited to him -were written not for him alone, but also for us.' (23-24). In preserving this account of Abraham's faith, Paul is not merely recording history, but presenting Abraham as the standard of faith for all believers. What was true of him is true of all those who believe as he believed. Abraham is described as 'the father of all who believe (16). This then is 'applied history.' It was written for us!

Romans 4 presents a clear picture of Abraham's faith. What do we see?

Abraham was Saved by Faith Alone – and not by Works (vv1-8)

'What does the scripture say? Abraham believed God – and it was credited to him as righteous' (v3); a quotation from Gen. 15:6. We see here that the doctrine of justification by faith is not confined to the pages of the NT! It was also in the Old. Abraham was justified before God – not because of anything that he did – but simply because he believed the word of God. God had given Abraham a promise – 'look up at the heavens and count the stars – so shall your offspring be. Abraham believed . . . '. Humanly speaking it was impossible for such a thing to happen. It was an outrageous promise that he and his barren wife

would have countless children who would inherit the world. But Abraham took God at his word. He reasoned that because 'God said it; I believe it; and that settles it!' He believed God could do something that was humanly impossible. He believed that the

Romans 4:1-12

¹ *What then shall we say that Abraham our father has found according to the flesh?*

² *For if Abraham was justified by works, he has something to boast about, but not before God.* ³ *For what does the Scripture say? "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness."* ⁴ *Now to him who works, the wages are not counted as grace but as debt.*

⁵ *But to him who does not work but believes on Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is accounted for righteousness,* ⁶ *just as David also describes the blessedness of the man to whom God imputes righteousness apart from works:*

⁷ *"Blessed are those whose lawless deeds are forgiven,*

And whose sins are covered;

⁸ *Blessed is the man to whom the LORD shall not impute sin."*

⁹ *Does this blessedness then come upon the circumcised only, or upon the uncircumcised also? For we say that faith was accounted to Abraham for righteousness.* ¹⁰ *How then was it accounted? While he was circumcised, or uncircumcised? Not while circumcised, but while uncircumcised.* ¹¹ *And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while still uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all those who believe, though they are uncircumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also,* ¹² *and the father of circumcision to those who not only are of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of the faith which our father Abraham had while still uncircumcised.*

same God, who made the stars; who specialised in creation; who made the world out of nothing could just as easily make a baby! . . . As a result of his belief, the Lord counted it to him; credited him; attributed it to him; as righteousness. Note the phrase. It is accounting language. Because of

Abraham's faith, God chose to make an entry in the 'righteousness' column that 'reckoned' or 'imputed' him righteousness even though he wasn't at the time.

There are two (lawful) ways of obtaining something. You can work for it or you can receive it as a gift (v4). If you work for somebody, then you don't get paid out of grace, but out of debt. If you work hard all month, then your paycheque is not a gift from your employer, is it? Could it be that what Abraham received was a paycheque from God as a reward for a life of hard earned righteousness? No! It was a gift! It was undeserved.

King David says the same thing (vv6-8). He was hardly an 'angel!' He had blotted his copy book – big time! Yet he says, after acknowledging his sin in Psalm 32, 'Blessed are they whose transgressions are forgiven, whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man whose sin the Lord will never count against him.' David might have said that God now treated him, 'Just-as-if-I'd never sinned'!

Salvation is not a wage that God pays as a reward to good hard working people – but a gracious gift to sinful people who believe in His promises.

Abraham was Saved by Faith Alone – and not by the Sacraments (vv9-12)

Very well, we have seen that Abraham was justified before God by faith alone in the promises of God. Where however does circumcision fit into the jigsaw? Abraham was circumcised. So presumably circumcision made some sort of contribution toward his salvation? To bring us up to date we might ask what part baptism (the equivalent NT sacrament of circumcision) plays in our salvation. The answer is that baptism does not save, not even in part. Look at Abraham's case (vv10-11a). When was he declared righteous before God? Was it before he was circumcised or afterwards? The an-

swer is – before! He was declared righteous in Genesis chapter 15. He was not circumcised until Genesis chapter 17 - fourteen years later! Circumcision therefore for Abraham was merely an outward sign to the inward faith he already had. Circumcision merely confirmed the faith he already possessed. Paul was never against the practice of circumcision as such, but strongly insisted that such things had nothing to do with one's salvation. That was a matter of God's grace through faith (Eph. 2: 8-9).

This clarification is necessary because many churchgoing religious people nowadays have a wrong notion of righteousness. Many so called Protestants are influenced more than they realise by the teaching of the Roman Catholic church; which still teaches that righteousness is 'infused' by way of the sacraments. (They teach erroneously that there are seven sacraments i.e. baptism, confirmation, the mass, penance, extreme unction, marriage and holy orders). Rome teaches that in the ordinary course of life five of these are indispensable to salvation (marriage and orders are optional). Whereas the Bible insists that salvation is quite apart from the sacraments; but is by faith alone in Christ alone. It was this great truth that flashed through the mind of Martin Luther, while still a monk. On a pilgrimage to Rome he was climbing the scala sancta, the 'sacred stairway' one step at a time and on his knees, trying to find peace with God. Suddenly the truth burst upon him and he saw the real meaning of the verse, 'the just shall live by faith.' Immediately he got up on his feet and walked down the steps. How wrong it was for him – or anyone - to think he could earn salvation through the works of penance!

Thus the story of Abraham shows that for Jew and Gentile alike there is only one way of justification – the way of faith (vv11-12). If we believe as Abraham believed, we will receive as Abraham received.

Abraham was Saved by Faith Alone – and not by Law (vv13-15)

We have established that Abraham was not saved by personal achievement, or because he was good, or

because he was religious. Paul further makes clear that Abraham was not saved by keeping the law. He couldn't have been. He was declared righteous by God in Genesis 15 – 350 years before the law was given! It was therefore impossible for Abraham to be saved in this way. If Abraham was saved by keeping the law then Genesis 15 is meaningless.

Romans 4:13-25

¹³ For the promise that he would be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. ¹⁴ For if those who are of the law are heirs, faith is made void and the promise made of no effect, ¹⁵ because the law brings about wrath; for where there is no law there is no transgression.

¹⁶ Therefore it is of faith that it might be according to grace, so that the promise might be sure to all the seed, not only to those who are of the law, but also to those who are of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all ¹⁷ (as it is written, "I have made you a father of many nations") in the presence of Him whom he believed—God, who gives life to the dead and calls those things which do not exist as though they did; ¹⁸ who, contrary to hope, in hope believed, so that he became the father of many nations, according to what was spoken, "So shall your descendants be." ¹⁹ And not being weak in faith, he did not consider his own body, already dead (since he was about a hundred years old), and the deadness of Sarah's womb. ²⁰ He did not waver at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strengthened in faith, giving glory to God; ²¹ and being fully convinced that what He had promised He was also able to perform. ²² And therefore "it was accounted to him for righteousness."

²³ Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him, ²⁴ but also for us. It shall be imputed to us who believe in Him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, ²⁵ who was delivered up because of our offenses, and was raised because of our justification.

People often think that the law was given so that if we keep it we win acceptance with God. This is to misunderstand the law's purpose. It was never given to save us. Let us illustrate by comparing the law to a thermometer. When we are ill the doctor uses a thermometer to find out our temperature and to show us how ill we are. But no one swallows a ther-

момeter in order to get better. So God's law exposes our sin and shows us how sinful we are. To try to win salvation by keeping God's law is like swallowing the thermometer in order to get better. Indeed it is worse. It makes out that Christ's death was unnecessary. Don't go down the law keeping road and think it will save you. It won't. You'll get lost. It's the way of despair and hopelessness. It's a cul-de-sac. 'The law brings wrath' (15).

Abraham's Faith is an Example to us (vv16-22)

If Abraham is our father in the faith, then as his descendants we should be like him. His faith is an example and inspiration to us. We learn from Abraham what faith is; and what faith does. Abraham's faith was founded on the character of God. That's important. A good foundation is vital. Our neighbour has discovered this lesson to his cost. He had trust in the architect and builder and council. He bought the house in good faith. He has now discovered significant cracks in the foundation. The house may yet be demolished. He is a very despondent man. His confidence in man has been shaken. Abraham's faith however was not misplaced. Verse 17 describes God as the One 'who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist.' God promised him two things: one, that he and Sarah would have a son and; two, Abraham would become the father of many nations. But there was a slight problem. Sarah's womb was 'dead' and Abraham being 100 years old was as good as dead. Their biological clock had stopped ticking. They were 'over the hill'. They were both pensioners ready for the geriatric ward – not the maternity wing! They were both living in 'God's waiting room'. Despite all these obstacles – Abraham believed the staggering promise. He believed that with God all things are possible. He believed that God can overcome the hindrances and obstacles. He believed the promise because he knew the nature of God. Resurrection and creation are two of God's

specialities (v17). Abraham did not waver through unbelief . . . but was fully persuaded that God was able to do what he had promised (20-21). . . . So when Abraham was 100 and Sarah was 90 baby Isaac was born! (See Gen. 21: 1-7). It was unbelievable! It was the talk of the district! Promise one was now fulfilled. Promise two is still being fulfilled today. Can we count the spiritual descendants of this man? We must be numbered in the millions! The glory and the credit go to God.

The question that I must now ask myself is this: 'Do I believe in Abraham's God? Do I believe in the God who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist'? Do I believe the gospel is the power of God to everyone who believes? Do I believe He is the God who can do miracles? Do I believe He is able to give life to the dead? Do I believe salvation is of the Lord? Do I believe that He is able to do that for my son? My daughter? My husband? My wife? My friend? My neighbour? If I didn't believe that I should resign and abandon the faith. If I doubt it I need to

look at Abraham as an example and inspiration. He did not waver in unbelief. Spurgeon said, 'Look at yourself and your doubts will increase. Look to Jesus and they will disappear.' That's what Abraham did.

We believe in a great God – the God of Abraham. We say in the Apostle's Creed, 'I believe in God the Father Almighty, creator of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord . . . I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen!' But do we really believe it?

Do we believe Jesus words when He said, 'In my Father's house are many rooms. If it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself' (Jn. 14: 2-3). The certainty of resurrection is compelling. People who know this live radically. Certain of their resurrection in Christ they give their time, money and lives for the coming age and they do so with joy. They lay up treasures

in heaven.

This was also the nature and scope of Abraham's faith. He believed in the God 'who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist.' He sought that city which has foundations whose builder and maker is God. He looked to the fulfilment of the promises of God. He overcame the obstacles and difficulties. He focused on the character of God, believed the promises and rested on the faithfulness of God.

'That is why his faith was counted as righteousness (22). Abraham was a friend of God. It's important to examine ourselves, to see if we have such faith. Time thus spent is never wasted.

Life under the Banner

The Wisdom of Shutting Up

Proverbs 11:12 says, 'a man of understanding remains silent.' This doesn't speak well for those of us who are preachers, does it? We would not remain in our calling very long if we remained silent whenever we step onto the pulpit. The whole point of preaching is to speak, to proclaim, to exposit with words what the Bible says.

And as a congregation, we respond to God's Word with our tongues. We sing the psalms in praise to God. It would not be very good for you to hold your tongue, keep silent, when the precentor starts singing and you're called to join in.

Or how about what we do after church? We wouldn't have a whole lot of fellowship taking place if we all stood around saying nothing. But being able to speak, we can catch up with one another and ask each other how we are doing. We grow in our communion of the saints, sharing with

one another in words our struggles and our joys.

Words are Necessary

The ability to sing, or just to speak, to convey ideas with words, it's such an incredible blessing. And more than that, we wouldn't be able to function without it. We need to be able to communicate.

For instance, a parent wanting to warn her child about danger needs to speak in order to help the child to understand how he could be hurt, so he can avoid the danger.

Another example of necessary speech is found in Proverbs 11:14 (just two verses after the statement extolling the virtues of silence) – 'Where there is no guidance, a people falls, but in an abundance of counselors there is safety.' This verse speaks of the necessity of leaders having many advisors if their nation is not to fall.

Jim Klazinga

Now, we might be under the impression that the leaders of our own particular nation are not always listening to the wisest of advisors. We might even imagine we could do a better job than their current advisors telling them how they should run the country. But regardless, we would have to concede that things would be a whole lot worse if our leaders did not have any advisors whatsoever. The Prime Minister and other members of government have to have numerous advisors if they are to fulfill the role they have been given; advisors such as MPs from their own party, opposition MPs, non-elected assistants and bureaucrats, etc.

The whole matter of giving advice and receiving it requires communication. People have to talk with one another. In fact, the whole point of having a parliament with a governing party and an opposition party is

so that policies and decisions can be debated. This involves having words fly back and forth. Now, we might question the manner in which issues are debated and the childish ways in which some of the discussions in Parliament are conducted. But it would still be worse if they didn't have any discussion at all, if they all kept silent. We can't do without words in government, and in every area of life. And we can be very grateful to God that he has given us the ability to make use of words, both in being able to offer our words to others and in being able to receive and understand others' words to us.

What makes the blessing of words all the more amazing is the manner in which God Himself makes use of words. God spoke, and creation came into being. God communicated with us in the most intense and personal way possible via His Son, the Word. And words are the means God has chosen to enable us to know Him and enter into fellowship with Him. God communicates to us via the words of Scripture, words that are written down and spoken. God works by His Holy Spirit working through His holy, inspired, infallible and inerrant Word.

Sometimes It's Better to Keep Silent

With words serving such a crucial purpose, you would think that it would be best to constantly make use of them, without ever letting up. Words are our friends, so silence must be our enemy, right?

And yet, there are also times when words should be avoided. There are times when we should hold our tongue and keep silent.

A portion of Proverbs 11:12 was quoted at the beginning of this article. Consider now the whole verse. It points us to one instance where silence is preferable to speech.

'Whoever belittles his neighbor lacks sense, but a man of understanding remains silent.'

The way in which this proverb is structured makes it clear that the two parts of this verse are connected with one another. They are focusing on the same truth, presenting it in two different ways. The point then is obvious: you should hold your tongue, rather than deride your neighbor. You

should remain silent, rather than show any contempt you may have in your heart for those around you. If your words are derogatory, then it would be wise just to keep them to yourself and not say anything.

Not only can communication in words be used by God to work in and through us, it can also be a tool used by our sinful hearts to serve wicked purposes. The very same tool that can do so much good can also do so much evil.

If that's what we're going to be using our words for, it would be better to not use words at all. If we find ourselves tempted to use words to sin, it would be better for us to just simply shut our mouths.

Ask yourself this: in the past week, how many times have you spoken words that put other people down? Perhaps you believe someone at work is incompetent, so you look down on him with contempt, and you're happy enough to communicate that contempt to him, or to others.



Parents, how many times have you spoken with others about your children, indicating that you believe them to be a burden? How many times have you spoken to your children in a way that is designed to tear them down rather than build them up? How many times have you spoken down about your brothers and sisters in the Lord? Maybe they have said something to you or about you that you believe put you down. You may need to use words to respond, but should you respond in kind? Does their speaking down about you give you right to speak down about them?

Your Words Say Something About You

Proverbs 11:12 tells us that when you deride your neighbor, you are show-

ing that you lack sense. Other translations speak of lacking judgment, or being devoid of wisdom. The word translated as 'lack' suggests a void, it speaks of not having something you need. The word translated 'sense' refers to our inner being, conscience, mind: our heart. When you deride others, you show there is something missing inside of you. There is a void in your heart. What you are saying says more about who you are, what is inside of you, than it says about those of whom you are speaking ill. You know, it often happens that when we're listening to a person deriding someone else, we're inclined to want to believe him. The act of talking with one another about someone else creates a kind of camaraderie. We appreciate this person's willingness to talk to us, to share his difficulties with us. We want to show our solidarity with him by taking their comments on board and looking down on the person he is deriding.

And yet, how often does it happen that when we hear the other side of the story, a different picture emerges. So we need to be careful about taking on board everything negative we hear about other people, especially before we in turn repeat those negative comments to others. We need to remember that listening to folks speaking ill of others often says more about the person speaking to you than about the people they are speaking of.

Oh, we can justify our sinful words so easily. We're simply expressing our concern for our family, for our workplace, our church, or whatever. We say what we say out of love. But do we really?

Remember the words of Ephesians 4:29: 'Let no corrupting talk come out of your mouths, but only such as is good for building up, as fits the occasion, that it may give grace to those who hear.' The teaching of Philippians 2:3 & 4 is also helpful here: 'Do nothing from selfish ambition or conceit, but in humility count others more significant than yourselves. Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of others.' Are your words about others motivated by selfish ambition and vain conceit, or

are they motivated by a desire to build up both your hearer and the person you are talking about. Are you elevating yourself, or others?

But don't we sometimes just need to vent? After all, it would not be healthy for us to hold our resentment to ourselves so that it builds up to the point where we explode, right? No, it wouldn't be. But the problem is not our lack of opportunity to vent our resentment; the problem is the resentment itself.

Mind you, the point here is not to say that we can never say anything negative. The old saying goes that if you can't say anything good, don't say anything at all. But sometimes you need to criticize, not to vent, nor to

elevate yourself, but to help your listener grow.

But be careful here. Examine your motives. Ask yourself what purpose you hope to accomplish. And if you are not sure your motivations are good, then maybe it would be better to simply keep your mouth shut. When you're inclined to use words to ill effect, remember the words of 1Peter 2:21-23: 'Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, so that you might follow in His steps. He committed no sin, neither was deceit found in His mouth. When He was reviled, He did not revile in return; when He suffered, He did not threaten, but continued entrusting Himself to Him who judges justly.'

Christ had every right to retaliate, to look down on sinners, to speak ill of those committing this utter travesty against him. But He didn't. And by His silence, He was working toward the accomplishment of your salvation.

So, appreciate the wisdom and virtue of sometimes shutting up. Instead of having your words prove you have a void in your heart, fill that void with love. You might think that there won't be anything left for you to say. But you might also find that using words to build up gives you more than enough to talk about.

The Past for Today

A Visit to the UK and Europe

Anna and I recently had a 6 week pre-retirement trip to the UK and Europe, and the Editor has invited me to write a bit about it. Anyone doing a trip of this kind using their own transport rather than a package tour is free to go where their interests lie, which is what we did.

We had a stopover in Singapore and so visited the Cemetery in Kranji where a relative of mine is buried. He had been part of the spectacular raids on Japanese ships in Singapore harbour in 1943 and 1944 by the top secret Z Special Unit, but he and his mates were captured and beheaded by the Japanese. On to Amsterdam and then to Belfast for a week with Anna's brother and his wife. Northern Ireland remains one of the most Christian parts of Europe. The Presbyterian Church is somewhat mixed but much more conservative in recent years. We caught up with George Ball's daughter Linda McKelvie and the family, now including three children, as well as friends in the Evangelical Presbyterian Church and others. A visit to the recently revamped Evangelical Bookshop was rewarding -- catching up with John Grier, the long-standing manager, and acquiring

some extra baggage (books) in the process.

Then to Scotland for a week, staying firstly with Willie and Ena Mackay in Edinburgh and attending the Tattoo together. They and many others are very disappointed with the way the Free Church has managed the worship issue, changing the practice of 450 years by a less than satisfactory



Sailing down the Danube in Budapest

procedure. Interestingly, the University of Edinburgh had a fine exhibition on the music of the Reformation which we much enjoyed. Then off to Glasgow where we stayed with former missionary Marie-Christine Lux, and caught up also with Ian and Alina

Rowland S. Ward

McKenzie. They both looked well. Alina has made good progress following cancer treatment. We worshipped in Downvale Free Church, from which Rev Kenneth Stewart had recently resigned over the worship issue. There was a good congregation and a fine message from Rev Ronnie Christie. The mid-week meeting was also encouraging with over 50 present, including younger folks.

Anna was the only lady present at the Free Church 'Purely Presbyterian' Conference in Larbert, but we much enjoyed the opportunity of being there for a morning session with excellent messages from James McIver, David Meredith and Gareth Burke. A bit of research in the Baptist Archives, back to Edinburgh so I could attend part of the Edinburgh Dogmatics Conference (where I caught up with two other Australians), and soon we were on our way to Amsterdam to pick up our leased Citroen.

We headed to nearby Haarlem to see the house of Corrie ten Boom (of *The Hiding Place*), but our time schedule didn't allow time for the guided tour that is available. Then off to Antwerp, and the next day to Ieper (Ypres) and Flanders fields including Passendale. Throughout Europe one cannot fail to be im-



Neuschwanstein Castle

pressed by the immaculately kept cemeteries managed by the Commonwealth War Graves Commission in respect of some 1.7 million war dead. Where graves are not known, the names of such are recorded on a wall or arch. On behalf of friends we took photos at the Menin Gate of the names of their loved ones. Moving into France we had a couple of days at an old manor in St-Venant, about 30 kms west from Fromelles and the headquarters for General Douglas Haig during the Somme campaign. We visited the very interesting La Coupole Museum near St-Omer; formed from the underground installation Hitler intended as a base for launching V2 rockets on London, but not used in the end as it was discovered by the Allies. A bit further on the ancient field of the Battle of Agincourt in 1415 was visited, where the outnumbered English longbows triumphed over the cream of the French nobility. But soon we were on our way through Villers-Bretonneux and Poitiers (where Rowland's father had been after Gallipoli) and on to Noyon in Picardy, where John Calvin was born in 1509. The reconstructed Calvin house (it was destroyed in WW1) is a museum but was somewhat disappointing as much of the display was in French, and it appeared to us a bit too academic for wide popular interest and appreciation of Calvin's influence.

This could not be said of the wonderful Luther Museum in Wittenberg we visited later. On through Rheims to Dijon, where we had a lovely time with the parents of one of our members. Strasbourg, Worms and Heidelberg were next on the route. Heidelberg is beautifully situated, and gave its name to the great Reformation catechism of 1563. Once a centre of Reformed teaching, the churches are in a bad way -- as with most of Europe. A Reformed witness has begun recently in Heidelberg under Rev Sebastian Heck. Stuttgart and Augsburg were the next major stops. Anna's brother and his wife were able to join us near Munich for the rest of our trip, so that was great. The royal castles of Howenswangau & Neuschwanstein made an interesting visit, and the crowds obviously thought the same. Something of the delusional thinking of German nobility was evident in the murals, and certainly explained a fair bit of subsequent German history. It was Kaiser Wilhelm II who claimed that at the last judgment people would appear before God and the Kaiser. Salzburg was an interesting place, its name indi-

cating how important salt was in earlier times, being more valuable than gold. Vienna (where we enjoyed a Mozart and Strauss concert) and Budapest were next. There is so much of interest in these places. Then up through Slovakia (where I inadvertently left my mobile phone) into Poland. Near Krakow the underground salt mines at Bochnia were not to be missed. Then came a sobering visit to Auschwitz, and next on into the Czech Republic. Our visit to Tabor south of Prague was because of the influence of the early Reformer Jan Hus, who was burnt at the stake in 1415. A section of the movement inspired by him established a fortress at Tabor in 1420. Prague -- what can one say of this beautiful place? Then on to Colditz Castle, where the directional signs (or lack of same) got us a bit confused, but it was very worthwhile. Then to Wittenberg, to stay at a building erected in 1520 where Luther had a meal in 1522. As mentioned, the Luther Museum is truly excellent; based in the large rambling house given Luther after his marriage, where up to 40 people lived, including students. After a brief excursion to Friesland we reached Kampen for a lovely time with friends, then on to Amsterdam completing our 5,546 kms drive ready for the long flight home. A busy time but most enjoyable, and it even came in under budget!



Statue of Martin Luther in Wittenberg market square

The World in the Banner

Multiculturalism and 'Dutch Treat'

The term 'Dutch Treat' is familiar to most of us. Apparently the expression came into the English language back in the days when the Dutch Prince William of Orange ruled the British Isles. The English labelled some questionable or bad things, as being 'Dutch.' So you had 'Dutch Courage' and a 'Dutch Uncle.' A 'Dutch Treat' was where you invited someone to go out with you but then had them pay their own bill.

That expression came to mind as I read a news item from the Netherlands recently. It seems that the Netherlands is formally turning its back on multiculturalism and is opting instead for a process of integration. The article read as follows:

'The new integration policy will place more demands on immigrants. For example, immigrants will be required to learn the Dutch language, and the government will take a tougher approach to immigrants who ignore Dutch values or disobey Dutch law. The government will also stop offering special subsidies for Muslim immigrants because... it is not the government's job to integrate immigrants.' The latter part of that comment brought to mind the idea of a 'Dutch Treat.' If multiculturalism is one person (the government) picking up the tab for everyone then integration puts a greater stress on everybody paying his own way.

Multiculturalism can be defined as the appreciation, acceptance or promotion of multiple cultures within the demographic make-up of a country. Canada was the first Western nation to formally adopt multiculturalism as a national policy in 1971. Australia followed suit some two years later. But Holland has undoubtedly been the most tolerant country in the world when it comes to accepting the existence of multiple cultures within the nation.

In The Netherlands over the last decade, that all changed. The issue of integrating more than one million Muslims who now live there became a hot political issue after the assassination of Dutch politician, Pim Fortuyn, for his views on Muslim immigration.

Two years later, filmmaker Theo van Gogh was stabbed to death for making a movie that criticised Islam. In June of this year another politician, Geert Wilders, was exonerated on charges of discrimination and inciting hatred against Muslims. That court case made it legal in Holland to be critical about Islam and gave the government courage to continue taking steps such as banning the burqa (as of January 2013).

Here in Australia, the Howard government took the first steps to move from multiculturalism to integration with its introduction of a citizenship test that must be passed before anyone can become an Aussie.

All of this is particularly relevant for us, as our High Court this week struck down the Gillard Government's so-called Malaysia solution. It's patently obvious that this decision will be a stimulant to the arrival of yet more boat people to our shores in the months to come.

I join many other Christians in this nation in expressing concern for genuine refugees and for Australia doing its share to provide a home for displaced people who are genuinely at risk in their country of origin. The love of Christ constrains us to show that kind of compassion.

My problem is with those who pay a small fortune to people smugglers to get them into a country that is supposedly prepared to pay for their welfare from the cradle to the grave. To people like that we need to say, 'Sorry, Australia believes in the 'Dutch Treat!' + *John Westendorp*

Loyalty to your minister

Dr. David J. Burrell related a story of Norman Macleod. A woman of his parish in Glasgow had fallen sick with a most grievous and contagious sickness. Instead of calling in her own minister she called in the minister of a neighbouring parish. After a few moment's conversation, he learned that the woman belonged to Dr. Macleod's parish. In surprise and with a little annoyance he said, "Why in the world did you not call Dr. Macleod?"

The answer was one that only a loyal Scottish parishioner could ever give:

"Hoots! Mon; we canna spare Normie."

If you love and cherish your minister in this way, all will be well.

+ *Taken from 'Macartney's Illustrations'*

Thrown Over the Fence – Infanticide, Canadian Style

Mark Steyn hit the nail on the head when he accused a Canadian appeals court of allowing for a 'fourth-trimester abortion' — that's right, the killing of a baby that is already born. The case emerged from the Court of Queen's Bench in Alberta, where a judge faced the fact that a woman had been convicted of strangling her newborn son and then throwing the baby's body over the fence into her neighbour's yard.

As CBC News reported, the woman was given a three year suspended sentence and will spend no time in jail for the killing of her baby. Katrina Efferts 'will have to abide by conditions for the next three years but she won't spend time behind bars for strangling her own son.'

Justice Joanne Veit, whose name should now go down in legal and moral infamy, tied this woman's act of infanticide to Canada's lack of legal restrictions on abortion. The judge's decision stated that 'while many Canadians undoubtedly view abortion as a less than ideal solution to unprotected sex and unwanted pregnancy, they generally understand, accept and sympathize with the onerous demands pregnancy and childbirth exact from mothers, especially mothers without support.'

She continued: 'Naturally, Canadians are grieved by an infant's death, especially at the hands of the infant's mother, but Canadians also grieve for the mother.' She also stated that the Canadian approach is a 'fair compromise of all the interests involved.'

Two juries had found Effert guilty of second-degree murder, but an appeals court had reduced her conviction to infanticide.

The willingness to kill within the womb leads logically to a willing-

ness to kill outside the womb. The horrifying illogic of abortion, even in the United States, means that this mother could have aborted her baby in the hours prior to his birth with no legal consequence.

This woman was convicted by juries of killing her son just after his birth. The appeals court reduced the crime, and then Judge Veit suspended the sentence. This judge has simply extended the logic of abortion, and catastrophically so. If the 'onerous demands' of parenthood justify killing one's own child, there is no logical reason to confine permissive infanticide to newborns, or even to younger children.

As far back as 1993, ethicist Peter Singer was arguing openly that babies 'are not born self-aware, or capable of grasping that they exist over time. They are not persons.' He went on to argue that 'the life of a newborn is of less value than the life of a pig, a dog, or a chimpanzee.' Singer, to our shame, now holds an honored chair in ethics at Princeton University. Other ethical philosophers, such as Michael Tooley and Jeffrey Reiman, had argued similarly. Tooley asserted that human infants do not qualify for personhood and Reiman argued that

infants do not 'possess in their own right a property that makes it wrong to kill them.'

Enter, Judge Veit. The philosophical foundations for the acceptance of infanticide were laid long ago. Now, an appeals court in Canada has applied them to law.

Add to this the moral inversion of motherhood in the eyes of this court. What kind of twisted logic produced this sentence from Judge Veit's decision? 'Naturally, Canadians are grieved by an infant's death, especially at the hands of the infant's mother, but Canadians also grieve for the mother.' Just imagine saying that out loud. A society is naturally to grieve an infant's death, 'especially at the hands of the infant's mother,' but the society is also to grieve for the mother?

Adding insult to injury, the CBC report reveals that Katrina Effert just might actually spend time behind bars — not for killing her son but for throwing the boy's body over the fence. For that infraction, she might serve 16 days in jail.

Mark this well — the horrific logic of this judge's decision will not remain in Canada. Indeed, it did not even start in Canada. Those arguments are al-

ready in place in the United States. If we will not defend life in the womb, eventually the dignity of every single human life is thrown over the fence.

+ *Albert Mohler*

Grafton PCEA sues Attorney-General!

Norman McLeod, Frederick Lowe, Donald Munro, Farquhar Fraser and Rev William McDonald sued the NSW Attorney General in 1908. [See *Sydney Morning Herald* 4 December 1908 page 5.] They claimed a declaration that they should be appointed trustees of lots 1,2 and 3 of section 108 in the town of Grafton which had been granted in June 1859. These were the three half-acre blocks on the SE corner of Villiers and Hoof Streets where a timber church was built in 1859. They also claimed that they were entitled to lands in Fry Street, Grafton, granted by the Crown in 1872, being the site, about 1.2km from the earlier one, on part of which the present church (1871) and manse are located. Mr Justice Street found in their favour on both matters. The lands granted in 1859 were sold to Mr W. Manning in July 1909. *RSW*

Synodical Treasurer's Report

As at 30th June the balances of the main *Working Funds* of the church Synod were:

<u>30/09/11</u>	<u>31/12/10</u>	
\$ 16,977	\$ Nil	Missions (General Funds)
\$ 38,309	\$ 37,389	Missions (DA Anderson Bequest)
\$ (28,427)	\$ Nil	Missions (TI Leggott Stipend Support)
\$291,114	\$ 291,114	Missions (Relief Fund – M McSwan Bequest – Equity Investments - values not updated as at 30/9/11)
\$ 48,260	\$ 58,501	Missions (Relief Fund – M McSwan Bequest – Working Funds)
-----	-----	
\$339,374	\$ 349,615	Total Missions (Relief Fund – M McSwan Bequest)
\$ 2,262	\$ Nil	Stipend Relief
\$ 8,640	\$ 21,555	Stipend Relief specific amounts set aside for Aid-Receiving Congregations.
\$115,989	\$128,036	Training of Ministry
\$ 8,931	\$ 11,482	Youth & Fellowship
\$ 1,368	\$ 4,871	Synod General Funds

The most pressing need in Synod funds is *Missions (TI Leggott Stipend Support)*. Whilst the account is currently overdrawn \$28,427 there are funds in the DA Anderson bequest to cover this. However, it is estimated that without taking into account any future donations received from congregations and individuals, there will only be sufficient funds available to continue the present level of support until 30th June 2012.

" A compassionate heart, and an helping hand, will gather by distributing; such giving is getting; such bounty is the most compendious way to plenty." [Thomas Gouge]

Will Iran Risk This Execution?

By Elizabeth Kendal

In Iran a trial court has ruled that whilst Youcef Nadarkhani was not a practising Muslim before his conversion to Christianity, he is an apostate because of his Muslim ancestry. As mandated by the Supreme Court, Pastor Nadarkhani was brought before the trial court on 25, 26, 27 & 28 September and provided with a daily opportunity to renounce Christ and return to Islam. Those who maintain that this blatant disregard for religious liberty is contrary to Islam are wrong. Some schools of Islamic jurisprudence maintain that three opportunities should be provided on the grounds of Sura 4:137. Other schools maintain that no opportunity should be given on the grounds of Sura 2:217 that deems 'fitna' (anything that shakes the faith of a Muslim) is worse than killing. Also the Hadith (sayings of Muhammad) is very clear: 'He who changes his [Islamic] religion, kill him.' This is about Islam and politics: sanity has really nothing to do with it. Meanwhile, standing firm in his faith, Youcef Nadarkhani has refused each opportunity to renounce Christ and return to Islam.

The case has caused an outcry in the West -- not 'internationally', as is widely reported -- with Western leaders decrying the situation as appalling and demanding Pastor Nadarkhani's immediate release. But, it must be noted, no such outcry is emerging from the Muslim world or from the regimes behind emerging powers such

as China or Russia, or from the UN. Furthermore, Iran is working hard to exploit the Arab uprisings with the aim of drawing Sunni Arab Islamists into the Iranian (political) axis. As Islam rises and Western leverage and influence declines, the Iranian regime may decide that a stand for Islam in defiance of the West can only profit them. Now that the court has confirmed Nadarkhani is an apostate and sentenced him to death, the regime has three options. It may:

1- defiantly execute Pastor Nadarkhani for apostasy, making a stand for Islam in defiance of the 'colonialist' and 'Christian' West;
 2- condemn Nadarkhani's apostasy, confirm his death sentence and then release him in a very public 'humanitarian' gesture before making sure he is quietly eliminated by the secret services. This is exactly what Iran did in 1994 in the case of Pastor Mehdi Dibaj. The Church will get the message, even if the Western political and journalistic elite do not. Or it may
 3- change the charge to one that otherwise discredits the accused and evokes revulsion (such as rape), and for good measure throw in a charge that, according to the constitution, is punishable by death or life imprisonment (such as treason). Presently it appears Iran is considering using strategy (3): the false charge -- used against Christianity from its earliest days. Today, all over the non-free world, the false charge remains the most common means of removing 'problematic' Christians.

Christians currently languish in prisons in China, Vietnam, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and elsewhere after being falsely charged and slandered as drug traffickers, swindlers, rapists, blasphemers and threats to national security. The West needs to talk to Russia, Iran's Orthodox ally, to ensure that if any harm comes to Nadarkhani severe sanctions will make it costly for Iran. The Iranian regime will only execute Nadarkhani if they believe that in doing so they stand to gain more than they would lose. If Pastor Nadarkhani were executed or assassinated, it would indicate that the Iranian Church is facing a whole new level of defiant, politically motivated, unrestrained persecution by the regime.

Further to all this, Christian Solidarity Worldwide reports that on 14 September eleven Iranian Christians who had previously fled Iran received emailed threats from a group calling itself 'The Unknown Soldiers of the Hidden Imam [the Mahdi: the Shi'ite Messiah].' The letter -- presumed to be from the Iranian secret police -- demanded that the Christians repent and return to Islam, warning that if they refuse they will be killed. The threats are being taken very seriously.

+ *Religious Liberty Prayer Bulletin* | RLPB 128 | Wed 05 Oct 2011

Please note your subscription renewal for 2011 is due

The prices are unchanged at \$30 per annum within a bulk order (5 or more), \$35 per annum for an individual subscription within Australia, and \$AU50 for individual overseas subscriptions.

We also welcome any donations to this ministry within our wider church life, as that helps sending our magazine to theological colleges and elsewhere.

Please send your subs in as soon as possible to ensure continued reception

Children under the Banner

More Miracles



Tobi was going to tell you about some of the miracles Jesus did. But Tobi stumbled and scrambled the letters. Use the Scripture references if you need help unscrambling Jesus' words.

E B L N E A C ! Mark 1:41

N S O ' R O U Y S S N I
E R A R G O I E N F V . Mark 2:5

E B T U Q I E !
O E M C T O F O M I H ! Mark 1:25

**P
J**

**L
A
T**

T T R C S E H T O
Y R O N D A H . Mark 3:5

L N S T I E ! Mark 4:3

From: 'Search and Solve: Bible Activity Sheet', by Betty De Vries, [Illustrated by Donna Greenlee]

Prescribed Search / Youth Work

NOVEMBER 2011

SENIOR and INTERMEDIATE (Intermediate omit questions 5 and 7)

RUTH chapter 1

1. Why did Elimelech and his family go to Moab?
2. Which members of the family died in Moab?
3. When Naomi told her daughters-in-law to return to their home, what did each one do?
4. What was Ruth's reply when told to return after her sister-in-law? (2 verses)
5. Why did Naomi wish to be called 'Mara'? (2 verses)

chapter 2

6. In whose field did Ruth happen to glean?
7. What facts about Ruth had been fully shown to Boaz? (2 verses)
8. What did Naomi say when Ruth told her the man's name was Boaz?

JUNIOR

RUTH chapter 2

1. What was the name of the kinsman of Naomi's husband?
2. When Boaz came from Beth-lehem, what did he say to the reapers and what was their reply?
3. When Ruth asked why she had found favour in Boaz's eyes, seeing she was a stranger, what was Boaz's answer? (2 verses)
4. What did Naomi say when Ruth told her that the man's name with whom she worked that day was Boaz?

Please send the answers to:
Mrs I Steel
PO Box 942
Epping NSW 1710
Or email to: iesteel@gmail.com

Society in the Banner

Littering My Father's World

I stopped at a rest area today. 'No big deal,' you might say. 'People do that all the time. A somewhat overrated experience to report on.' You know what? It is true that people do it all the time. You know what? You can actually tell very clearly that people do it all the time. I stopped at a rest area today. But it did not stop there: As I had my lunch, I looked around – and was offended. From time to time I sing this song, 'Oh Lord, my God, when I in awesome wonder consider all the works Thy hands have made...' either in the congregation or as I travel along by myself.

However, as I stop at a rest area, these words choke, because the awesome work of God is dirtied by people who stop at rest areas all the time. At the place where I stopped, there were drink bottles, cartons, and various other packaging items left willy-nilly around the area, even just a few steps away from the rubbish bins that were provided (and no, the rubbish had not been blown out of those or taken by birds, because the bins were of the closed lid variety).

It took me all of five minutes to tidy up a lot of the rubbish that was lying in the vicinity of where I had parked. Then I went to wash my hands at the lavatory a bit further down. As I arrived there a man was just being helped out of the car by his wife, as he was on crutches. He went ahead of me in the male toilet area. I followed him in, only to see him turn around abruptly, saying, 'I will use the ladies' toilet, this place is too dirty.' Indeed, dirty it was – and I will spare you the grizzly details. The toilet block was of good quality, well tiled and built for easy-care. It apparently makes no difference to some that there are other people wishing to use those facilities after them. I went to the water tower behind the block to wash my hands.

Gen 1:31 'And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, *it was very good.*' God did not just create the universe and our earth. He made it all beautiful, to be enjoyed. The world is not starkly utilitarian; it is aes-

thetically beautiful – until fallen man moves in to leave his marring footprint, as was the case along the Goulburn Valley Highway.

We're here to look after this world

This world is created by my God and He has given me responsibility to look after it. I will strive earnestly to look after it, because it is my desire to show that I love the God Who made and redeemed me. It incenses me when people treat my God's world with carelessness, when they consider the whole environment outside their car window as their rubbish bin. With this approach to God's handiwork, disdain is shown for the God back of it all. Surely, this is offensive to those who belong to Him, isn't it?



The government of the state of Victoria has placed signs along roadside to encourage the reporting of those who litter. Though some apparently (as showing on the government website) take the trouble to dial the number provided, 1800 35 25 55, I would suggest that not too many can be bothered. Christian, if you love the Lord your God, you will show it – among other things – by showing that you love the planet He created for your stewardship and enjoyment. Here is the rallying cry: When you happen to see some one dirty God's world, do not let that person get away with it. Do the right thing and report the litter bug.

Herm Zandman

Just imagine that every Christian in Victoria (and other regions which have a phone line organised for this) would ring in whenever dirt is thrown out of a car. Victoria would probably soon be as clean as Singapore (a country known for its superb cleanliness and punitive approach to litter bugs).

'What we do in life echoes in eternity,' declares Maximus in the film *Gladiator*. I have heard Christians mutter that it was not their rubbish, and that they would make sure that their own rubbish was always cleaned up. I used to tell my students at school that, whenever I would walk past a piece of litter on the school ground, such litter would cry out to me, 'Pick me up! Pick me up!' There were times I was in a hurry and would walk past – only to turn back with a guilty conscience and clean up. 1 Corinthians 3:11 -13 points out the following: For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; *Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.* What we do in this life does matter; God expects to see fruitfulness in righteous stewardship. Look after His world!

Martin Luther informs us that 'God writes the Gospel not in the Bible alone, but also on trees, and in the flowers and clouds and stars.' God writes the Gospel in the environment He created. Do not permit the beautiful tidings to be besmirched by litter bugs. Take action when litterbugs cross your path.

A Christian stopped at a rest area today. Was it cleaner when he departed from there?

Dr Herm Zandman is a former Christian school principal who is presently employed in truck driving. He and his wife live in Mt. Gambier, South Australia.

Churches in the Banner

A Visit from our OPC brethren

On Friday the 16th of September a number of our Melbourne ministers, together with one of our elders, met with two delegates from our sister church in North America – the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (we are also fellow members of the International Conference of Reformed Churches). After the Rev. Gavin Smith had introduced the Rev. Jack Sawyer (pastor of Pineville OPC in Pineville, Louisiana and Administrator of the OPC Committee on Ecumenicity and Inter-church Relations of the General Assembly) and Mr Mark Bube (the OPC's Foreign Mission's Secretary), he opened in reading from Scripture and prayer.

Following this Rev. Sawyer gave us an outline of OPC history and progress until the present day. He paid particular attention to the beginning of the OPC when, in a situation of much liberalism within the mainline Presbyterian Church (PCUSA), and following an unjust trial of J. Gresham Machen (a minister and professor at Princeton Theological Seminary), a group of some five thousand withdrew to begin the new denomination in 1936, based wholeheartedly on the Confessions. This new denomination would work with the Westminster Theological Seminary established in 1929, and the independent Board for Foreign Missions. It was a severe struggle. Congregations gave up their church buildings and manses, and meetings had to be held in barns and public halls of various descriptions; but the Lord blessed His people and over time they have grown to a number of around 30,000 members today, with about 300 congregations, and mission work throughout the world.

Right from its inception, the OPC has taken seriously contacts with churches of like mind. Because of their size and isolation, these contacts are vital for them.

There has been on-going discussion with the Presbyterian Church of America over the years. They share in publications work through Great Commission Publications; but the diversity

within the PCA over against the OPC's tighter government and approach to public worship meant these have not developed beyond the close fraternal ties in several seminaries and North American ecumenical gatherings.

Mark Bube then spoke of the OPC's mission work. The OPC firmly believes that mission is the work of the Church. This means establishing the public worship of God and casting His net for worshippers. When going into other countries, the focus is on developing indigenous denominations that are self-supporting. OPC mission is aimed at working itself out of a job in these areas. When a new mission is being begun at least two missionaries are sent out, so there is immediate support, although four are preferred to form a better establishment.

There has been encouraging contact with the Presbyterian Church of Bra-



zil, a denomination of some one million seeking to renew itself confessionally, and through that finding itself unable to have contact with the PCUSA. Instead, they sought out the OPC as a faithful continuation of the PCUSA. A number of their present ministers and professors have studied in the past at Westminster Seminary and now they are also coming to study at Greenville Seminary in North Carolina.

It was a great encouragement to see how the Lord richly uses a numerically small yet faithful Presbyterian denomination within that North American context to be a rich blessing to many others. In the same way we, too,

hold a similar position in this land and we must pray and work to continue bringing the glory to God in this way. While we can't see physical growth at this particular time, that is all the more reason to open our spirits in prayer to our Lord and be built up by Him in whatever way He chooses.

Further informal fellowship took place between the brethren. Also there was encouraging contact with a number of our Southern Presbyterian congregations with Mr Mark Bube, a ruling elder in the OPC, preaching in the Knox AM Sunday worship service and in the Sudanese PM service while Rev. Jack Sawyer preached in the Carrum Downs AM worship service and the Narre Warren PM service. These occasions were followed by the preachers speaking of the OPC after the worship service.

We were most grateful for this fellowship and our folk were most encouraged with the wider faithful ecumenical picture painted for them. May the Lord continue to be with our brothers and sisters in the OPC, keeping and blessing them in His Way.

Sjirk Bajema

Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia

FAMILY CAMP
at
Naamaroo Conference Centre,
Lady Game Drive
Chatswood, NSW

3 pm Tuesday 3rd January to
2 pm Friday 6th January 2012 (DV)

Enrolment Forms now out!

Right: Marie-Christine Lux. The picture was painted by her when a teenager. Lower right: Willie and Ena Mackay with their physicist son Eric. (See article on pages 7 & 8)



*Above (from left to right): Mr Mark Bube, OPC Foreign Mission Secretary & Rev. Jack Sawyer, OPC Ecemcnical Relations Committee Secretary
Right: Most of the office bearers of Southern Presbytery who met with the OPC men — Elder John Louden; Rev's A. Miranda, T. Yoa, & M.G. Smith, together with OPC brothers*

