names today: Barthianism, New-Orthodoxy, and so forth. It is a viewpoint which seems to be diametrically opposite to Liberalism. It is a message which says, "No, your ethics is not enough. One can try to live a good life and you cannot live the life you ought to, you struggle and you fail. You cannot succeed by your efforts alone." At this point it sounds good. Existentialism is another name for it. And the existentialist question as it is expressed sounds very good. It sounds as if man is hopeless, helpless, he has got to find help somewhere else. It sounds like the absolute denial of Liberalism and when it goes along and gets the answer and the answer it gives is nothing but the old Liberalism under another phraseology. It misses completely the point of the Scripture.

A noted pastor, right over here in Philadelphia 25 years ago went to see Karl Barth and talked to him. This man could not talk German and Karl Barth at that time could not talk English, so they talked French, of which each of them knew a little. And he came back and in his magazine he wrote an account of his interview with Karl Barth, and he said in it that was a Fundamentalist and in fact, a premillenialist. He asked Karl Barth, "Do you believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ?" And Barth said, "Certainly I do." The Liberal would say, "O, no, I believe in the spiritual resurrection." But Barth said, "Yes, I believe in the physical resurrection." He said to Barth, "Do you believe in the second coming of Christ?" And Barth said, "Yes, I believe in the second coming of Christ?" And Barth said, "Yes, I believe in the second coming of Christ." "Do you believe it could come at any time?" "O, certainly." Barth said. And so he says, "Barth is a pre-millenialist and a Fundamentalist. He believes in the doctrines of salvation."

Just last year I got Barth's book, his commentary on Romans, the first book that started his great movement and I went through it, and it just burns with emotion and feeling as he presents the burden which he has for the world, the burden for the resurrection of Christ, the burden for the second coming of Christ - the burden for these things - and then, what does he say? He says, "The resurrection of Christ is not something past, the second coming of Christ is not something future, these two are the same thing and it did not occur in the past or future, but it occurs right now." What does that mean? It is nothing like historic Christianity. The Barthian says in the strangest language. "I believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ." And then he goes on to say, "Just what happened to those particular bits of matter of which His original body was composed? Well, I don't know; I don't know what happened to them." "I believe in a bodily resurrection." But when you get through with it, he doesn't believe in any resurrection at all. He believes in some sort of a something that he cannot describe he thinks he has an answer to a problem when all he has got is the problem.

You know, as I look at these two trends of our day, I can't help thinking of the parable that our Lord Jesus Christ gave, the parable of the seed. And you remember that when the sower went out, some of the seed fell by the wayside and the fowls came and devoured them up; and some fell among thorns and the thorns sprung up and choked them. And it seems to me that that is exactly our situation in theology. God has given us the Word, and He tells us to preach