

Fourth Edition

**McMASTER'S APPROVAL**  
OF  
**DR. FAUNCE'S INFIDELITY**

Single Copies This Issue, 10c.

An Address by Dr. Shields, Page 13

**The Gospel Witness**

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, BY JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO, CAN., AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY.

T. T. SHIELDS  
PASTOR AND EDITOR

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."—Romans 1: 16.

Address correspondence: The Gospel Witness, 130 Gerrard Street E., Toronto.

Vol. 2

TORONTO, JANUARY 31st, 1924

No. 38

**The Jarvis Street Pulpit**

**WHY SOME INDIVIDUALS AND INSTITUTIONS NEED TO BE BLOWN UP WITH DYNAMITE.**

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, January 20th, 1924.  
(Stenographically reported)

"That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death;  
"If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."—Philippians 3: 10, 11.

**T**HESE are the words of the Apostle Paul. They express the supreme desire of this great man of God. Above all other things, he desired that he might know Christ. It is a good thing to meet Christ; but there is a world of difference between meeting Him and knowing Him. There was a time when Saul of Tarsus met Him and was converted; and from that moment he subordinated all the interests of life, all his ambitions, to this one great passion that he might know Christ as intimately as it was possible for a human soul to know Him. Like a student with a thirst for knowledge, who deprives himself of all the luxuries of life; who wears his coat until it is threadbare; who is content to live upon the plainest fare, and in the humblest quarters, and to make every conceivable sacrifice in order that he may finish his course, and that he may obtain the education upon which his heart is set; so this man had put the knowledge of Christ above all other sciences: it was of all branches of knowledge the most excellent. He said, "What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ—no matter what the price, I am determined that I will permit nothing to stand in the way of my knowing Christ as fully as it is possible for me to know Him."

And yet Paul was a man to whom had been given an abundance of revelations. He had been caught up to the third heaven; he had seen and heard

things which it was not lawful for a man to utter; he had been privileged above his fellows. But when he wrote of the things of God, he was careful to explain how it was he knew so much—"How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery . . . whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ"—he did not find it out for himself; it was especially revealed to him. He had been more abundant in labours. He had passed through experiences in which he had learned much of the faithfulness of God. One might have supposed that if anywhere there could have been found a mature student of the things of God, and one who was entitled to high rank in spiritual scholarship, it was this man Paul the Apostle. But still he said in effect: "I am only in the kindergarten class. I have not learned much. 'I count not myself to have apprehended.' There are worlds of spiritual knowledge beyond me, to which I have never attained; therefore, I have resolved that everything shall be subordinated to this one passion—that I may know Christ."

#### I.

The weakness of our modern Christianity is that a great many people who meet Christ do not go on to know the Lord. It is one thing to be born again, to become a babe in the Father's household; it is quite another thing to become an instructed child of God, informed in the things of God. There was a day when parents were content to put their children to work as soon as they had learned the "three R's"—and, in many cases, before that, they had to help to swell the family exchequer. But the poorest man, in our day, is ambitious that his son should have all the advantages of a good education; and he is willing to make every sacrifice in order that he may obtain it. But the Christian church, instead of seeking to instruct people in the things of God, have given themselves over to the making of playgrounds, and of gymnasiums, and of bowling alleys, to providing entertainment—anything, everything, but teaching people the Word of the Lord. What wonder that every "ism" that has issued from the Pit is making inroads upon all Evangelical churches; and that scores and hundreds of those who have professed faith in Christ are swept away, driven about by every wind of doctrine; that there is nothing stable about them because they are not established in Christ?

We all need clearly to apprehend the principle of this text—that it is not only necessary to bring people to Christ; but that when they are converted it is necessary that they be nurtured; that they be given "the sincere milk of the Word that they may grow thereby"; that they may be taught that the supreme thing in a Christian's life is to go on to know Christ: "That I may know him." There are a great many supposedly mature Christians who know little of Christ. Here was a man who had no question about the Virgin birth of Christ. Dr. Faunce says that Paul never said anything about it. Somebody said to me, "Don't you feel when you read it as though you would like to throw the Bible at his head?" I said, "Yes; I do. I feel as though I should like to make him eat it, so that he would know what is in it." That is what the prophet said: "Thy words were found, and I did eat them." This man had no doubt about the birth of Christ; he did not question that He "was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness." He was no longer troubled about the question of the Deity of Christ: he knew Who He was. He had no doubt about the vicariousness of the Atonement, nor did he question the necessity of the new birth. Never was it difficult for him to believe that Jesus was coming again, even though it involved "a physical miracle," as Dr. Faunce says, "on the literal clouds of the sky." That is what Paul believed and taught; but still he said: "My one and only ambition is 'that I may know him,' 'in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,' and 'in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily'." He is the source of all wisdom; He is the centre of all knowledge; He is the Creator of all things; and "In Him all things consist," as our McMaster Motto reads. And this man says, "I am going to find out all that may be known about Him. I am going to live only for that." And if you are a Christian, that is what you will do; that should be the ambition of every man who has tasted that the Lord is gracious.

If there are any here who are not Christians, let me tell you that conversion means entering the school of Christ—it means more than that, of course: it means a change of heart; it means to be begotten of the Holy Ghost; it means being brought into living fellowship with Christ; but after that, it means growing up into Him Who is our Head in all things. What a prospect there is

before us! Some student graduates from college, and he says, "I have my education." Why, young man, you will never have your education! Education is not a possession; it is a process. The educated man is the man whose mind is always enlarging; who is always multiplying his correspondences; who is learning more and more of the works of God. But the truly educated man is the man who is not content with knowing about the works of God, but is resolved to know God, and to go on to know Him, not in time only but through all eternity. We shall never get through with our education; and the blessing of it all is, we shall enjoy it.

One thing, however, we must know: *the alphabet of this great knowledge is that we should know Him as Saviour.* Have you begun with Him? Do you know that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the scriptures"? Do you know He is "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world"? Do you know what it is to be redeemed by precious blood—saved with an everlasting salvation? If not, you know nothing of Christ. Oh, yes; I must correct it. You know about Him: it is one thing to know about Him, but an entirely different thing to know Him. It is one thing to read about the Bible, to know about the Bible; it is another thing to know the Bible. It is one thing to hear what men have to say about Christ; it is an entirely different thing to know what Christ has to say for Himself, and to live with Him all the time, so that He is multiplying His revelations, unfolding His purposes and His great heart of grace continually.

To know Jesus as Lord is an important thing. Oh, I have said it a hundred times, but lest I should not have an opportunity of saying it to some of you students again, I repeat, that *to know Christ is to make Him Lord.* He is the Standard to which everything must be brought. There are no sciences, except that which is science falsely so-called, that are at variance with that which Christ has said. He is the last Word of God to men. Our friend, Dr. Faunce, objects to our making that a fundamental—that the Bible is true in matters of science and of history. If my Lord Jesus could make a mistake in anything, I could not believe Him to be the Incarnate God. He never did utter a word that is not forever true. Make Him your Lord. And then, carry Him back into the Old Testament and let Him settle every problem of the Old Testament—the authorship of the Pentateuch; He will tell you who wrote it. Ask Him about the historicity of Jonah; He will tell you whether there was a real Jonah. Ask Him; and when He has spoken, set His Word against the word of all the alleged scholarship of the world, and live and die on what Jesus has said. One of the greatest Bible scholars of the world to-day tells how there came a time in his life when he resolved that for six months at least he would absolutely shut himself up from all other things, and concentrate upon the Word of God. "Oh," but you say, "that would be foolish, not to read the newspapers, not to keep up-to-date!" You shut yourself up with God's Word for six months, and learn God's thoughts; and you will come from that study better qualified to interpret the events of the day than the man who has been through all the universities of the world, if he has not known Christ. Cultivate a passion "for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord." To know Him is the most excellent of all the sciences. Therefore, I beg of you to make that the ambition of your life. O no; do not go down to the book-store to-morrow and buy books that have been written about Christ. Let Him speak for Himself. Study Him. You have Him in this Book.

## II.

That is very well as far as it goes; but this apostle was *not content with an objective knowledge of Christ.* It is very necessary to know that Christ was divinely begotten; that He was clothed with miraculous power; that He is the Incarnate God; that He is not only immanent in the things that He has made, but that He is divinely transcendent and personal—He is above all His works. It is well to know that He died on the cross for sinners, and that He was raised again; that He is in the heavens, and that some day the white horse and his Rider will come down the skies; it is a fine thing thus to be instructed in the great fundamentals of the faith; but you may know all that, and not know Him. And so this apostle said, "I want that objective knowledge about Christ to become part of me; and I live that 'I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection.' I want all that to be actualized in my own experience. I want

the truth of the gospel to be transmuted into character and conduct; so that I may become myself like Christ; that I may pass through the experiences through which He passed; that I may know these things to be true because I have entered into an experience of them—that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection.’”

The word “power” in the original is the word from which we get our word “dynamite”. The apostle said, “I want to know Him, and the dynamite of His resurrection.” There is a dynamic in the truth of the resurrection. There is a power of dissolution, a power of destruction, a power that can blow things up, a high explosive of which the Devil and all his hosts are terribly afraid. When Jesus rose from the dead, there was no scarcity of high explosives in the armies of heaven. Here you have the dynamite that can blow up Hell itself. Nobody can stand against it. “O, well,” somebody says, “I thought that preacher would spoil it before he got through, talking about the power of dissolution, the power of destruction.” But is there nothing in your life that needs to be destroyed? Do you not need a charge of dynamite to blow you up? Are there not some things in your life that have defied every power you have exercised against them? There are passions that cannot be subdued; iron doors that no key can unlock; great barriers between you and spiritual progress that you have no power to remove. Do you not need dynamite? I am sure you do. We need it all the time. If I were to give an invitation to-night—as I shall do—to some man to walk down the aisle and acknowledge his need of Christ, his heart will say, “Go,” but he won’t go. Why? He will not humble himself. Between him and that open confession there is a great mountain of pride, and only the dynamite of the resurrection can blow it up and make a path through to God. And then, there is prejudice. I do not expect all you who have come here to-night to agree with me. It is a great congregation for a zero night. We have a lot of people come here, metaphorically you know, with their coats buttoned up, as though they would say, “Now, Mr. Preacher, touch me if you can.” But I cannot; but by God’s grace I can blow you up! It has happened more than once. Some of the best members we have in this church to-day came in anything but an amiable mood the first time they came to church. I am not at all afraid of what people say. The Lord can make the wrath of men to praise Him, and make all things work together for good; and, if a man’s ways please the Lord, He will make even his enemies to be at peace with him. Is there something between you and the realization of the desire of your heart? It can never be removed without the dynamite of the resurrection.

*And there are churches, too, who need a little dynamite, beyond any doubt.* An editorial paragraph in one of the papers last evening said that it was rather a dangerous thing for any preacher to talk about the use of dynamite. A week or two ago I was in Winnipeg, and went around the North shore of Lake Superior. You know how rocky and barren that country is. At last, the train swept into that commercial metropolis of the West, and I said to myself when I got there, “How did I get here? What makes this prosperous city?” It is those lines of communication with the outside world. But how was that line made? With dynamite. Great rocks had to be blown up, and great mountains of stone had to be tunnelled, before those trains with their rich freightage could come in and build up that Western country. And there are some churches that will never receive the trains from Heaven, freighted with spiritual blessing, until some things in their membership are blown up with the dynamite of the resurrection.

I got on the train last week late at night, I think it was in Minneapolis, and as I went into the sleeping car, I noticed a card hanging just inside the car. “Quiet is requested for the sake of those who have retired.” And as I looked at that, I said to myself, “One of these days I am going to steal one of those cards to hang in the vestibule of some churches I know.” (Laughter.)

I have heard a story, I think it is authentic, of my good friend, John MacNeill, now of New York, who used to be in Cook’s Church in this city. When preaching in Free St. George’s, Edinburgh, some of the elders met him in the vestry, and said, “Mr. MacNeill we are delighted to have you here this morning; and we are sure we shall greatly enjoy your message.” But a titled gentleman, Lord Somebody—I forget who it was—said to him, “I thought, perhaps, you would not mind my suggesting to you that you have a way of saying things somewhat roughly sometimes, and in a way that we are not accustomed to in

this place; and that, as you were preaching this morning, you would try to remember that you are in Free St. George's." "Thank you, my lord," said Mr. MacNeill. And when he went into the pulpit by and by, he turned to the scripture in Revelation—the letter to the church of the Laodiceans—and read until he came to that passage, "I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot." . . . He read it over and over again: "I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will—I will"—what can it be? He came up to those rough words again and again, "I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will"—"but I am in Free St. George's. Let us pray." (Laughter.)

Ah, yes; the deacons of the church come to the pastor, and say, "Sh, be careful; do not wake anybody up." Oh, I have had enough of it in time past. I remember once I tried, literally, to wake somebody up who was fast asleep. Perhaps it was my fault, or the fault of his breakfast or dinner; I do not know. But I ventured to wake somebody up, and one good brother said, "I wish you would not do that. He is very sensitive about that."—"Quiet is requested for the sake of those who have retired." A church like that needs a charge of dynamite. ("Amen!")

"The power of his resurrection." There is always an interesting analogy to be traced between the attitude of men toward the Incarnate Word and their attitude toward the written Word. History repeats itself. You know what forces were arrayed against the Lord Jesus,—the religious world with its religious pride, the pride of birth, the pride of training, the Saduceeism—the naturalism which said, "There is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit"; and you know how organized religion invoked the political power to silence the Word Incarnate. Someone said to me the other day, "You know, Pastor, you need to be very careful." I said, "Why?" "Well," he said, "at a certain Baptist Association, a certain minister dealing with the critics and criticism of Modernism, said, "These attacks have to be stopped; and it appears as though it never would be stopped until somebody is sued for libel." He said, "Be careful." I said, "All right; but let them begin to-morrow morning." Why, of course, the Pharisees will always get the Roman soldiers to help them if they can. But we are not afraid of them. They all conspired, and they put Him in the grave; they rolled the great stone upon it, and sealed it, and they said, "We have done with Him." But on the third day there was a great earthquake; there was an explosion. The powers of Deity rolled the stone away, and He came forth triumphant. And you might as well try to bury Him as to bury the Bible. Men have been trying to do that for a long time; but the power of the resurrection always prevails.

And there is another story in the Bible—I never get tired of reading it—of a great man, well born, of the stock of Israel—he was no mongrel as you and I are. That is what you are—a bunch of mongrels. You do not know where you came from, only I hope you know that you did not come from monkeys. But this man was pure-bred, "of the stock of Israel—of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews." He was a man of great natural power, and one whose native powers had been cultivated to the highest degree. He was a distinguished student of the great teacher Gamaliel. He had been brought up at his feet; and I have no doubt that Professor Gamaliel had predicted great things of young Saul of Tarsus. And he was going to carry out his teaching, his training. He was a religious man—"concerning zeal, persecuting the church." Picture him going up to Damascus, like an educational secretary going up to a Baptist Convention—"breathing out threatenings and slaughter." He is going to attend to the critics of his institutions! Now, what are you going to do with a delegate like that, I wonder? How can you bring him to his senses? I see him going on the road; he hears a voice, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" He answered, but I do not think there was over much humility in that first answer; I am not at all sure that he was not rather complimented that a voice had been addressed to him: he said, "Who art thou, Lord?" And then came the reply, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." In that word, Heaven itself released a charge of dynamite, and it blew up all his pride and all his prejudice. And, "trembling and astonished," he cried, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Just to get a view of the risen Saviour is all that we need—then down into the dust before Him we must fall.

But there is more than dynamite here. From this same word, we get our word "dynamo." Do you see what is back of that—(turning on the electric light)? A dynamo, a power of orderly progression. This church is flooded with light because that dynamo is working somewhere. By and by, Brother Penney will turn the switch there, and we shall have music; and we shall sing because the dynamo is working. We have been here for some little time; and shall be here some time longer. But the air is perfectly sweet, warmer than outside, but just as pure; because there is a dynamo working—driving a great fan which takes the zero air and puts it through steam pipes, filling this church with air that is perfectly pure. We have the pure atmosphere because the dynamo is at work. And there is all that in the resurrection of Christ. There is power to flood the world with light; there is power to bring into human lives the atmosphere of the heavenly places: He "hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus"—to breathe the very atmosphere of Heaven; it attunes our lives to the will of God, and helps us to make melody in our hearts unto the Lord; it warms us in the chilly winter weather of this selfish world. How foolish it is for the Christian church not to link itself on to that dynamo!

I go to the printing office every week for an hour or so. Just imagine one of those great presses. The printers have made up their form, and they are all ready to print. But I see some man get at that big fly-wheel and try to turn the thing. He can just move it, perhaps, a very little. He calls to another man, and says, "Jack, come over here and help me." Then the two of them try to turn it. By and by, he calls another man, and still another, until he has all the men in the shop. I say to him, "What are you going to do?" He replies that he is "organizing" to turn this wheel. "What for?" "We are going to print this thing." But that machine was not made to be operated that way. It is not a hand-machine; and even I know enough to go and move the lever and turn on the electric power until that wheel would rapidly revolve, and the form would begin to fly back and forth. Why? The machine is made to be operated by power.

And, my friends, the Church of Christ is so conditioned that it must have the dynamo of the resurrection or do nothing. More than half the time we are busy trying to turn her wheels of organization and getting nothing done—making a noise, but transforming no human lives. And so I could go on. You can carry that figure as far as you like. Some day we are going to get into the chariot and ride up the skies. I remember seeing in London a year or so ago in an underground train a picture of one of the great generating stations—great dynamos—and underneath it the words, "Fast asleep; but out of their sleep comes the power to move London." Ah, yes: there is power in the risen Saviour to move Toronto and move the world for Christ.

How are we going to get it? Simply by asking for it.

I was reading not long ago an account of a demonstration of wireless transmission of power at the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. They had a bulb there, I think it was 120 watts; and it was cut off from all connection by wire. These electrical engineers stood around and they saw that bulb glow with a white heat when the power was turned on; and the engineer who pointed out the difference and demonstrated it, said, "Gentlemen, that is the beginning of the wireless transmission of power." Possibly the time will come when we shall have no wires along the street. We do not need it now for radio. And perhaps power will some day be similarly transmitted so that we can receive the power of Niagara without wires.

What an illustration of what this old Book said long ago: "Ye shall receive dynamite, ye shall be linked up with the dynamo of omnipotence, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses". Yes; we shall have the power to carry us safely through life, and to take us home to glory when we are done.

Now, are you afraid of that kind of dynamite? A lady called me up, and said, "I am awfully afraid. I am so anxious for you; and I am praying for you. I am very much afraid for you to speak on that subject to-morrow night." But I am not afraid, I want to live in vital union with this dynamo, so that I can live by "the power of his resurrection."

### III.

*Is there anything to pay?* Yes. We must have "fellowship with his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." There can be no resurrection without the death of crucifixion. The problem of the transmission of power is the problem of insulation. The problem of the transmission of spiritual power is the problem of insulation. "Fellowship with his sufferings"; yes, you will have to pay that. You cannot know "the power of his resurrection" and walk hand-in-hand with the world, my friend. You cannot know "the power of his resurrection" and keep company with those who deny Christ. I had rather forever part company with all the friends I have ever known than I would part company with my Lord. I want to know Him, and the power of His resurrection. Paul knew what it was. There are many passages in the New Testament that I myself, if I may venture to interject a personal word, have come to understand, as I never understood before, in the last few years. I fancy there was a time when that great apostle was very popular. Some people would go to hear him preach, and stand on the outside and say, "Wasn't that wonderful? Did you meet him?" "O no; he was there with the rest of the apostles and the elders of the church. I would count it the greatest honour of my life if I could shake hands with him, that wonderful man of God; but I should fear to intrude." Yet there came a time when this great preacher and scholar wrote this: "The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain, but, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found me. The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day." Onesiphorus was a humble man. We do not know much about him; but when he went to Rome, and he knew that Paul was in chains, and that a lot of people were afraid to have anything to do with him—he sought him out very diligently, and found him. He was not afraid to let anybody know that he had called on the Apostle Paul. And I am sure that Modernism is of the Devil, because of the spirit it breeds. You take your stand for Christ, and you will break your companionships of a lifetime. There will be ministers who won't call on you. There will be ministers who will not speak to you on the street. You will find ministers who will be afraid to stand on the platform with you. I know something of what it is to have people call upon me by night because they were afraid to come in the day time—literally, afraid that anybody should see them coming to my door. At a Convention one time, a young man came to me and said, "I have been warned not to be seen in your company." That is the spirit of Modernism. It is not in the least modern, but is the same spirit that killed Abel, and that kindled all the martyr fires.

"The fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." He was not speaking merely of the general resurrection, but that he might enter into that experience of the resurrection now: and then, especially, that he might have part with those who shall rise at Christ's coming.

I wonder if there are any Baptists here to-night who say, "I do not believe that?" Then you have no right to be a Baptist; for that is what your baptism means. That is the confession those who were buried with Christ by baptism made this evening. This same preacher, the Apostle Paul, prayed for the Ephesians—"I cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers; that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints". Praying for these Ephesian Christians, he said, "You know Christ; you have the earnest of your inheritance; but I am praying that He may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation; that your eyes may be opened, that you may see into the heart of God's purposes; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead—that ye may know the energy of the grasp of his might, when he raised him from the dead—and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named".

"The power of his resurrection" blasted a triumphant path through all the ranks of principalities and powers, and carried Him through the gates into the City, a Conqueror—King of kings and Lord of lords. And Paul said, "I am praying that you may know that power, and that you, too, may ascend above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come". "And hath put all things under his feet." That is why He rose from the dead. "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus"—and in Him the pledge of our ultimate triumph.

Do you want a salvation like that? That is the salvation we offer you. You can have the beginning of it now; and it will last for ever.

THE publication of this paper as a missionary enterprise is made possible by the gifts of members of Jarvis Street Church and others, and is sent to subscribers by mail for \$2.00 (under cost) per year. If any of the Lord's stewards who read this have received blessing, we shall be grateful for any thank-offering you may be able to send to The Witness Fund at any time; and especially for your prayers that the message of The Witness may be used by the Holy Spirit for the defence of the Faith, the salvation of souls, and the exaltation of Christ. As our funds make it possible, we hope to add to our free list, from time to time, the names of ministers at home and missionaries abroad.

## EDITORIAL

On January 24th, we received the following communication:

### THE STUDENTS OF McMASTER.

The following resolution was passed almost unanimously at a meeting of McMaster Student Body held on Monday, January 21st, 1924.

WHEREAS certain insinuations from well-known quarters respecting the worthiness and sound Christian character of the members of the Faculty have been widely circulated; and

WHEREAS we, the students, have a better opportunity of knowing the teaching ability and are in a better position than any other group of people to give testimony to the personal worth of the Faculty and to test the validity of the content of their teaching;

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the Student Body of McMaster University, express our unreserved confidence in the Chancellor and Faculty of the University and that we heartily endorse the presentations of the doctrines of our Christian faith delivered to us by them.

(Signed) G. M. HENRY,  
President of the Student Body,  
McMaster University.

In *The Evening Telegram*, Toronto, January 25th, there appeared the following item:

Students of McMaster University are almost unanimous in their opinion that the Shields-McMaster controversy is hurting the denomination as a whole far more than it is the University. They have passed a resolution affirming their belief in the institution.

"A public meeting of the students was called at 5 o'clock in the afternoon on Monday, January 21, and was attended by between 175 and 200 students," said G. M. Henry, president of the McMaster Student Association. "Some of the students had prepared the resolution beforehand. It was moved by Murray Simmons, and seconded by C. Briscoe." Mr. Henry did not think that more than two or three students had voted against it, and these had done so because they wanted to give Dr. Shields a chance to first present his side of the argument. "There was quite a lot of discussion," Mr. Henry acknowledged, but it had not been to any extent in defence of Dr. Shields.

"The insinuations against the men in the University, whom we trust,



were absolutely repudiated at that meeting," declared Mr. Henry. Asked what the opinion of the student body was on the question of whether there were "modernistic" tendencies in McMaster University, Mr. Henry replied: "I have been here five years, and I have heard nothing of such a thing. The orthodox principles are upheld, including the virgin birth and the vicarious sacrifice. The meeting was called absolutely on the initiative of the students, and no suggestion was received from the faculty or other governing bodies of the institution."

Some of the students of McMaster University were kind enough to inform us of the facts in connection with this interesting action of the Student Body. There are attending McMaster just now in Intra Mural courses, including students in Arts and Theology, two hundred and seventy-seven, with other Extra Mural students numbering twenty-three, or a total of three hundred. Some of the students measured the room in which the meeting was held, and, making the most liberal allowance, discovered that the utmost capacity of the room was one hundred and thirty. This meeting of the students was hurriedly called; and a number of the theological students not in residence had to be called by their friends by telephone. A resolution proposing confidence in the governing bodies of the institution met with such disfavour that it was withdrawn. Most probably because the students felt it was fair to hear both sides before forming a judgment. The resolution which passed, in its final form, is printed above. Ten of the students had held a prayer-meeting before the meeting; and at least six of these did not vote at all. Thus it was not possible that more than one hundred and twenty-four voted for the resolution.

The resolution, however, has no bearing whatever upon the controversy between the Editor of this paper and the Senate of McMaster University. His criticisms have been directed against the action of the Senate in conferring a degree upon Dr. Faunce. Whoever proposed that the students should make a pronouncement on this case was no friend of the students. If a man should ask another, "Don't you think my wife is a most excellent woman?" what answer would he expect to receive? And when a resolution is proposed, expressing confidence in the Faculty, at a meeting of the students, right in the midst of examinations, what could any reasonable person expect but that the resolution would carry? This does not mean that the body of students were without opinions, or lacking the courage to express them, on the main issue as to the action of the Senate in respect to Dr. Faunce. They were clear-headed enough to see that, the resolution proposed had nothing to do with it. As a matter of fact, we have been informed by more than one student that one student declared at the meeting that in his opinion the action of the Senate in conferring a degree upon Dr. Faunce was "a horrible mistake."

The foregoing was passed at a meeting held Monday, January 21st. Most of the students felt that as the Editor of this paper was to present his case on Thursday, the 24th, fair play demanded that they should suspend judgment until they had heard his statement.

But why do we write thus? In the Student Body, as everywhere else, there are at least two bodies of opinion. In our issue of November 22nd, we expressed our gratification that the students of McMaster University, at a meeting of the McMaster Fife Society, by a vote of ninety-three to twenty-nine, determined to have nothing to do with the so-called "Student Christian Movement of Canada," which Movement is, beyond doubt, wholly Unitarian in its tendencies. But we are informed that those who led in the effort to link McMaster University up with this Movement were responsible for the

attempt to get the Student Body of McMaster to pass a resolution in line with that passed by the Senate, condemning the action of the Editor of this paper. From the foregoing it would seem that out of a company of two hundred and seventy-seven students, only one hundred and thirty were represented at the meeting, some of whom did not vote for the resolution.

#### THIS WEEK'S WITNESS.

This week's issue of the paper is of an unusual character; and we beg to urge our readers to give it a most careful reading. The questions discussed in this issue are of tremendous importance—first, to the life of every believer; then, to the life of every New Testament church; and especially, also, to the spiritual welfare of our beloved denomination. We shall be glad if those who read this issue will co-operate with us in its circulation. We should like to have pastors send to us lists of names to whom they would like to have this issue of the paper sent. The names of pastors sending us such lists will be held in strictest confidence; but we do urge every pastor who reads this issue, and who feels that it is important that the matters of which it treats should come before our Baptist people, to send us the names of all his deacons, the clerk, Sunday School Superintendent, and of any other members of his church whom he would like to have a copy of this issue. They will be mailed to all such free of charge.

We venture to make an earnest appeal to all who believe with us to help us to put our case before the denomination. The Senate has the treasury of the University to draw upon to pay its printing bills, as well as having free access to *The Canadian Baptist*. We have no such facilities, but pray God to open the hearts and hands of His stewards. When the address was given, a collection of something over one thousand dollars was taken; but this will not be nearly enough to enable us to send this paper free, as we have undertaken to do in the foregoing paragraph.

**WE SHOULD BE GLAD, THEREFORE, IF PASTORS WOULD CALL THE ATTENTION OF THE PEOPLE IN THEIR CONGREGATIONS WHO ARE ABLE TO DO IT, TO THE NECESSITY OF HELPING IN THIS MATTER; AND IF THE LAYMEN AMONG OUR READERS WHO ARE ABLE WILL COME TO OUR HELP. MANY COULD EASILY SEND US FIVE DOLLARS, OTHERS TEN, OTHERS FIFTY, AND, PERHAPS, SOME ONE HUNDRED. WE DO NOT ASK PEOPLE TO AGREE WITH ALL THAT WE HAVE SAID; BUT THE FACT THAT "THE CANADIAN BAPTIST" HAS REFUSED TO GIVE US ACCESS TO OUR BAPTIST CHURCHES THROUGH ITS PAGES, COMPELS US TO ASK EVERY LOVER OF FAIR PLAY TO COME TO OUR HELP THAT THIS MAY GO BEFORE THE PEOPLE.**

#### A WORD ABOUT THE GOSPEL WITNESS.

Thousands of people will read this issue of *The Gospel Witness* who have never seen the paper before. We, therefore, give this information:

It is published weekly, as is stated on the front page. The regular issue contains twelve pages. Every number contains a stenographically reported sermon by the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church.

In addition to this, there is an exposition in the Whole Bible Sunday School Lesson Course. We venture, to suggest that, even where Bible Schools are following the International Lesson, many Christian parents might find this useful in the home. They could encourage their children to take the outline of the lesson given in *The Witness*, and with their children pursue a course of study that would take them all through the Bible. As the Whole Bible Course takes several chapters for each lesson, the sections of the lesson might be taken up at family worship, and thus would help the head of the household to lead his family day by day in a consecutive study of God's Word.

Once more: The Editorial section of *The Gospel Witness* is devoted to the discussion of important matters. This issue is rather a belligerent number of necessity; but we should be glad to send sample copies of past issues to anyone applying. We are very anxious to increase the circulation of *The Gospel Witness*.

Another item of interest will always be found in the news from Jarvis

C  
Street Church. To God's praise, we report that God is blessing this great church in a marvellous way. Over three hundred were added to the church during the last calendar year. Conversions take place at practically every service. The three great prayer-meetings weekly are an inspiration; and news of all these activities appear weekly in this paper.

The price of the paper is two dollars a year. It is issued at that figure because the members of Jarvis Street Church contribute annually some thousands of dollars to make it possible as a missionary enterprise.

Send us your subscription at once; or, if you prefer to examine other issues, send us your name and address with application for sample copy. Please address all correspondence on this matter, The Gospel Witness, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto.

---

## THE WHOLE BIBLE S.S. LESSON COURSE.

LESSON XIX.

FEBRUARY 10, 1924.

### THE PASSOVER—Exodus 11-13.

Here we are brought into the very heart of the New Testament. In preparation for this study, read I Cor. 5: 6-8; and 10: 1-4.

I. Judgment was to fall upon those who refused to acknowledge God. That was Pharaoh's sin. He said, "Who is the Lord that I should fear him?" And thus it is ever. The distinct characteristic of the wicked is that there is no fear of God before their eyes (Rom. 3: 8-18; John 3: 19).

III. Salvation could be obtained only in God's way. Object as we may, it is God Who has been offended; and it is He Who must be placated. Therefore, the terms of salvation must always be His. Not what we have thought to be sufficient to satisfy the demands of divine justice, but that which God has declared will alone suffice. Hence it is of the very essence of faith that it shall be preceded by repentance, by a surrender to the divine will, and a recognition that God is God.

III. God's way of salvation was by vicarious sacrifice. A lamb without blemish was to be taken, and by the shedding of its blood people were to be saved. Into this mystery we none of us can enter; but the typical teaching of this history is unmistakably plain. "The life of the flesh is in the blood." "Without shedding of blood, there is no remission". It was for the blood the destroying angel looked; and it was over the houses protected by blood God promised to pass. Thus we are to regard our Lord Jesus as the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." It was thus John the Baptist introduced Him at the beginning of His ministry. It is popular to represent Christ as an Example; and such He is to those who have first of all been quickened by His Spirit. It is common to speak of Him as a Teacher; and He is this also to those who have ears to hear. But He is, first of all, a Sacrifice and a Substitute for sinners—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, fulfilling God's plan and purposes in the redemption of men.

IV. The application of the blood was also shown to be necessary. It was not enough that the lamb be slain; the blood must be sprinkled upon the side-posts and upon the lintel. So, too, with the hyssop of faith we are to appropriate the redemptive work of Christ; and thus the blood of Jesus Christ will cleanse us from all sin. It had been a fearful calamity if, when the lamb had been provided for the household, and the blood had been shed, it had been left in the basin instead of sprinkled upon the two side-posts and upon the upper door-post of the house; for then the destroying angel must have entered. The Lamb of God has been slain, and thus the way of escape from judgment has been provided; and if any perish, it must be because they have not believed on the Name of the only begotten Son of God (John 3: 16-18).

V. They were to abide under the blood. "None of you shall go out at the door of his house until the morning." It is by virtue of the blood we are saved from beginning to end. Even in Heaven itself, the Lamb, as it had been slain, will be all the glory of Immanuel's land. Whatever progress we may make in the Christian life; however advanced our knowledge of the things of God, we must none of us go out of our house until the morning. Only as our trust is in the blood can we have peace.

VI. While saved from the wrath by the blood of the lamb, they were in a figure sustained in life by the flesh of the lamb. "If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." The Lord's Supper is the fulfilment of the symbolism of the passover. It was at the celebration of the passover feast the Lord Jesus instituted the ordinance of the Supper; and in that ordinance we profess not only to trust in the blood for our redemption but to feed upon Christ for our sustenance.

VII. All that was thus promised was fulfilled. The judgment fell upon all who were not sheltered by the blood, while not one who was thus sheltered perished. Let it teach us how certainly the Word will come to pass: "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

---

#### THURSDAY EVENING LAST.

People began to gather for the great meeting one hour before the advertised time of opening. The prayer-meeting room was crowded; and some time before eight o'clock every available seat in the great auditorium was taken, and when the meeting began large numbers were standing both upstairs and down. Many were present from out-of-town. The interest was intense throughout; the best of order and the finest spirit prevailed. The collection—over one thousand dollars—was a generous one; and although the address lasted until eleven o'clock, comparatively few of the great company assembled left—and most of these had to leave to catch trains or cars for distant parts. It was a great night, which will be long remembered by those who were present.

---

#### LAST SUNDAY IN JARVIS STREET.

The mercury registered below zero. Notwithstanding that, we had 458 in our Bible School at a quarter to ten in the morning. We had a great service, and fifteen responded to the invitation at the close of the sermon. In the evening we had another great service. Notwithstanding the extreme weather, the congregation was large; three were baptized, and nine came forward at the evening service. Many of these twenty-four will be baptized next Sunday evening. Three were also baptized at the Parliament Street Branch.

---

#### WOMEN'S MISSION CIRCLE.

The regular monthly meeting of the Women's Home and Foreign Mission Circle will be held in the Church Parlor Thursday, February 7th, at 3 p.m. The programme is being arranged by Mrs. L. F. Shields and Miss Sarah Webster, and will consist of a "Home Mission Survey" of the work being done by the Women's Baptist Home Mission Society of Ontario. It is hoped there will be a large attendance, especially of the new members of the church who have been visited during the past week, and many others of the congregation. At the close of the meeting a short time will be spent in getting acquainted with one another. Collectors will please report.

---

### The Church Calendar

#### Sunday.

For the week beginning February 3rd, 1924.

9.45—Bible School, including an Intercessory Class. W. J. Hutchinson, Supt.

11.00—Public Worship. Rev. T. T. Shields.

6.00—Prayer Meeting in Church Parlor.

7.00—Public Worship. Rev. T. T. Shields.

Baptism will be administered.

8.30—Communion and reception of new members.

Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday—8.00—Prayer Meeting.

Tuesday—8.45—Address by Dr. Shields on the Bible School lesson—

The Passover—Exodus 11-13.

Wednesday—7.15—Junior Mid-week Service.

The Parliament St. Branch, 250 Parliament St. Sunday: Bible School,

3.00. Evangelistic Service, 7.00—Rev. W. L. McKay will preach.

Monday—8.00—Young People's Meeting.

Wednesday—8.00—Prayer Meeting.

Friday—7.15—Junior Meeting—Mr. F. Turney and Mr. W. J. Hutchinson.

# McMASTER'S APPROVAL


OF

## DR. FAUNCE'S INFIDELITY

AN ADDRESS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

IN REPLY TO A STATEMENT OF THE SENATE OF McMASTER UNIVERSITY PUBLISHED IN "THE CANADIAN BAPTIST," JANUARY 17th, 1924, DELIVERED IN JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO, THURSDAY EVENING, JANUARY 24th, 1924.

(Stenographically reported)

 I WANT to begin by expressing my appreciation of your courtesy in coming here in such large numbers to hear a statement of another side of the case of which you have read in the daily papers. Had the Senate confined its deliverance to my criticism of their action in respect to Dr. Faunce, my task this evening would be both simple and easy. But, inasmuch as they have gone far afield in an attempt to prejudice the minds of the members of the Baptist denomination against me, it will be necessary for me, not only to travel as far as they have gone, but also to go a little further.

### An Appeal to the People.

I am happy this evening to have the opportunity of presenting my case to a jury of my peers. My chief offence is that in these matters I have appealed to the people. But I frankly say that I have great confidence in the collective judgment of the multitude. The famous Junjus, in a letter criticizing Sir William Draper, said: "Sir William Draper does himself but little honour in opposing the general sense of his country. The people are seldom wrong in their opinions; in their sentiments they are never mistaken. There may be a vanity, perhaps, in a singular way of thinking—but when a man professes a want of those feelings which do honour to the multitude, he hazards something infinitely more important than the character of his understanding." It is, however, exceedingly difficult to get these matters, which so vitally concern the life of the denomination, before the people of our churches. We have paid secretaries going up and down the country, at the denomination's expense, who are constantly visiting the churches, and upon their representation of denominational affairs a great many people largely depend.

### The Canadian Baptist.

The only other organ of denominational opinion is *The Canadian Baptist*—and this is an organ which is controlled by those who desire to use it for special pleading. I cannot be charged with having burdened the columns of *The Canadian Baptist*, either by my personal correspondence, or by news from Jarvis Street Church. In last week's issue of *The Canadian Baptist*, dated January 17th, almost an entire page was devoted to a communication from the Chancellor of McMaster University, setting out the resolution which the Senate had passed

only at midnight on the 14th. Those who write for *The Canadian Baptist* will know in future that it is quite possible to print a full page of matter supplied to the Editor after midnight on a Monday. After the Chancellor's statement had appeared, I sent the following letter to the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist*:

JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH

Toronto, January 18th, 1924.

The Editor of The Canadian Baptist,  
223 Church Street,  
Toronto.

Dear Mr. Kipp:

In view of your publication in this week's issue of the *Baptist*, of the statement issued by McMaster University respecting my protest against that Institution's action in conferring an honorary degree upon Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, of Brown University, I write to request that you will kindly give publication in your next issue of the letters appearing in *The Gospel Witness* of November 29th, 1923, which are the basis of the University's action. I am sure you will recognize that inasmuch as the Senate's resolution is communicated to the Baptist constituency through the medium of your paper, fair play requires that the people should have the opportunity of reading the letters upon which the Senate's action is based.

I am sending this letter to you by the hand of my Secretary, Mr. Fraser; and beg to request that you will inform him of your decision in respect to this request.

I enclose a copy of *The Gospel Witness* for November 29th, with the portion marked in blue which I venture to ask you to publish.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) THOS. T. SHIELDS.

My Secretary called at the office of *The Canadian Baptist* Friday afternoon, but found the Editor had left. He called again Saturday morning and delivered my communication. The Editor informed him that it would require a good deal of thought to decide upon the right course, and this would take time. On Saturday afternoon he called the Editor at his home, but was informed that he would not be able to give a decision until Monday. On Monday forenoon he called at the Editor's office again, and was handed the following communication:

Toronto, January 21st, 1924.

Rev. T. T. Shields,  
Jarvis St. Baptist Church,  
Toronto.

Dear Dr. Shields:

I have your letter, with enclosure, of January 18th, in which you request that I publish in the next issue of the "*Canadian Baptist*"—Jan. 24th—the correspondence that passed between Chancellor Whidden and yourself in regard to the LL.D. degree conferred upon Dr. Faunce recently.

In reply I beg to state that

- 1— The three letters were printed in full in your own paper on Nov. 29th, 1923;
- 2— The number containing them was sent to many Baptists;
- 3— A summary of the letters was used by many of the leading Canadian papers and the Faunce degree incident appeared in many United States papers at that time.

Therefore the content of the correspondence is widely known already, so I see nothing to be gained by re-printing what appeared in your paper two months ago—and also in the daily press.

Yours very sincerely,

THE CANADIAN BAPTIST,

(Signed) L. F. Kipp, Editor and Manager.

The following three letters, with the brief paragraph, "A Regrettable Incident," comprise the item from *The Gospel Witness* of November 29th, 1923, which *The Canadian Baptist* refused to publish.

#### A REGRETTABLE INCIDENT.

The following letters explain themselves. We regret the necessity of writing them, and still more of publishing them. In the last paragraph but one of the first letter we announced our intention of publishing the letter last week; but afterwards felt that, in fairness to the Chancellor, we should await his reply. On receipt of his letter we felt there was nothing for us to do but to make our protest. We trust this incident was no more than a blunder; but even on that score, it is surely necessary that some protest be made.

#### THE EDITOR'S LETTER TO THE CHANCELLOR.

Dear Dr. Whidden:

20th November, 1923.

I regret exceedingly that I find it impossible to be present to-day on the occasion of your installation as Chancellor of McMaster University. While I voted against your appointment as Chancellor on account of the record of Brandon College under your Presidency, it is my hope, as I intimated at the Convention in Montreal, that McMaster University will so shape its course as to make it possible for those who believe in "the faith once for all delivered to the saints" to give it their cordial support. I am writing now, however, in order that you may be under no misapprehension as to the reason for my absence to-day.

It was impossible for me to be present at the meeting of the Senate when it was decided to grant the honorary degrees which are to be conferred to-day. I am aware that the University does not necessarily approve of positions taken by the recipients of its degrees; but I assume that honorary degrees are intended to serve as a recognition of service rendered.

In the list of those whom McMaster seeks to honour to-day, I have observed the name of Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, President of Brown University. It must be known to yourself and to the Senate of the University that, although called a Baptist, the principles of Dr. Faunce's teaching would absolutely destroy the foundations upon which McMaster University professes to stand. I venture to quote as a matter of record the following from Dr. Faunce's pamphlet—"What are the Fundamentals?"

"But the literalists, curiously enough, reject the theory which so easily lends itself to spiritual interpretation and insist that the Creator did not grow things but made them by fiat. As if creation in a moment were more divine than creation by the increments of a million years! Then to protect Christianity from modern thought and thinkers they have announced a new set of 'fundamentals,' among which they enumerate the Virgin birth, the Deity of Christ and a substitutionary atonement, the inerrancy of the scriptures in science and history as well as in religion, and the imminent physical return of the Lord on the literal clouds in the sky.

"The question as to the nature of Christ and His death is not directly related to the teaching of science, and need not be discussed here. But science and religion do come into touch the moment men affirm that the church must believe in a scientifically inerrant Bible, in the Virgin birth, and in an imminent physical catastrophe which shall wind up all human history. To the first Apostles of the Christian faith such things were never the fundamentals of Christianity. The writers of the New Testament never ascribe inerrancy to the Old Testament, but on the contrary often pronounce its teaching defective and preparatory to something better. The Virgin birth, which is related with noble reticence and reverence in two New Testament passages and which has for centuries been accepted by the great majority of the church, is not mentioned in any of the New Testament epistles or in any of the apostolic sermons recorded in the Book of Acts. It apparently formed no part of the preaching of the twelve apostles or the seventy disciples. If that miracle was not considered fundamental in the days of the apostles, can it be made so to-day? But the Fundamentalists affirm that belief in a miraculously inerrant Bible, in a physiological miracle in Bethlehem, and a physical miracle soon to occur in the sky, that these beliefs are the fundamental things in Christianity—which is not only a transformation of the early faith, but a palpable inversion of moral values."

I regret exceedingly that McMaster University should in any way recognize as a servant of the Baptist Denomination the author of such words as these. If it be contended that the degree is conferred in recognition of Dr. Faunce's contribution to the cause of education, I have only to say that I was under the impression that McMaster represented a type of education which finds its truest and most comprehensive summary in the University Motto—"In Christ all things consist." If McMaster University proposes to have any kind of fellowship with the philosophy of Dr. Faunce; the last reason for any believer in Christ giving it any support will have vanished.

I frankly say that in my humble judgment the presence of Dr. Faunce on the McMaster platform is a dishonour to the University and an insult to the Denomination. I am prepared, however, to recognize that possibly members of the Senate may have voted for a recommendation of a committee without realizing all that was involved; but I cannot help asking myself what sinister influence seems ever to be seeking to commit the University to a course which one cannot approve without being guilty of treason to Christ and His Gospel.

I write this letter, Mr. Chancellor, in order that I may dissociate myself as a member of the Senate and Board of Governors from the Senate's action in conferring an honorary degree upon one whose teachings I regard as being absolutely anti-Christian. It is still, in my judgment, pertinent to enquire "What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?"

I should be glad if you will present this letter to the Senate and Board at its next meeting. And may I add that I intend to put this letter in our church paper, which will go to press to-morrow evening.

I should, of course, be very glad if you could give me any reason for letting this strange action of the Senate pass without public notice.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Thomas T. Shields.

Chancellor H. P. Whidden, M.A., D.D.,  
McMaster University,  
Toronto.

**THE CHANCELLOR'S REPLY.**

November 24th, 1923.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,  
96 Winchester Street, Toronto.

Dear Dr. Shields:

Your letter of recent date reached me late Tuesday afternoon, in the midst of a day filled with a great many duties and distractions. The contents of the letter were read as soon as numerous and frequent interruptions made possible.

My impression is that the Honorary Degree Committee made its recommendation to the Senate re President Faunce in good faith, thinking of him as head of the oldest Baptist University, an institution with a wonderful record. Probably the members of the Senate had never read a theological statement by Dr. Faunce. I myself had not seen any of his pamphlets.

Your request to have your letter read to the Senate and Board is noted, and I shall be pleased to carry out this wish at no distant date. It would seem to be right that all such matters should be discussed first with the body held to be responsible for action taken. My understanding of Baptist and of British procedure leads me to hold to this view. I trust you will find it convenient to meet with the Senate when your letter is read.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) Howard P. Whidden.

**THE EDITOR'S SECOND LETTER.**

28th November, 1923.

Dear Mr. Whidden:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 24th inst. I can well understand that my letter reached you at a very busy time, and I did not expect an earlier reply.

I must, however, confess my surprise that the members of the Senate were unaware of Dr. Faunce's theological position. You say that President Faunce was honoured "as the head of the oldest Baptist University, an institution with a wonderful record." Whatever the record of Brown University may be, its President is certainly in no true sense a Baptist. He has taken a leading position as a Liberal theologian avowedly opposed to the great doctrines of Scripture which are written into the Trust Deed of McMaster University.

I think it is greatly to be regretted that Dr. Faunce was selected for recognition on any account; and is especially deplorable that McMaster University should have honoured him as the head of a "Baptist" University. If His Majesty the King had conferred the honour of Knighthood upon one who was an avowed enemy of the British Constitution, and who was doing his utmost to destroy the British Empire—and that in time of war—it would not have been a greater affront to his loyal subjects than for McMaster University to have selected for academic distinction one of the most conspicuous of the protagonists of Modernism to be found in America.

When requesting that my letter be read to the Senate and Board, I did so only for the purpose of lodging my protest with the body responsible for this unfortunate blunder.

I cannot, however, agree with that part of your letter which says: "It would seem to be right that all such matters should be discussed first with the body held to be responsible for action taken. My understanding of Baptist and of British procedure leads me to hold to this view." It is impossible for the Senate to rescind its action; the damage has already been done publicly; and I feel that I should be recreant to my trust as a minister of the gospel if I did not make my protest equally public.

I hope it may be possible for me to attend the meeting of the Senate when my letter is discussed. I shall certainly endeavour to do so.

In the meantime, however, I think it is necessary that my protest should be published. I shall, therefore, publish my first letter to you, with your reply, and this letter, in "The Gospel Witness" of this week. I do this because I can see no other way. It must be understood that such actions cannot be allowed to pass without protest.

I am,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Thomas T. Shields.

Rev. Howard P. Whidden, M.A., D.D.,  
Chancellor, McMaster University,  
Toronto, Canada.

This audience, I feel sure, will put its own interpretation upon this action. The denominational paper is used to publish the Senate's condemnation of what they are pleased to call my "conduct and methods." But *The Canadian Baptist* refuses to set before its readers the basis of their charge. I have had some little experience of public life, and have had something to do with secular papers;



but I have never yet known a secular paper which, having published one side of a controversial matter, absolutely closed its columns to the other. My only recourse, therefore, is to reach the denomination as I am attempting to reach it to-night, and as I shall attempt to reach it through the publication of this address.

#### Who are the Troublers of Israel?

I am frequently referred to by my opponents as a "disturber of the peace"; and an effort is made to give the impression that I am a sort of denominational Bolshevik with whom it is impossible to agree. I do not complain that so many epithets should be hurled at my head; and, being exposed to such treatment, I find myself in a worthy succession. Every man who in time past has raised his voice against the evils of the time has been so described. In modern times, the world's greatest preacher, Charles H. Spurgeon, enjoyed the distinction of having a vote of censure passed upon him by the Baptist Union of Great Britain. Wesley and Whitfield were not greatly loved by the formalists of their day, against whose lifeless religion they so vigorously protested. One has only to call the roll of such names as Knox and Luther to be reminded that men who have stood for God against the tendencies of their time have always been looked upon as disturbers. Going back to apostolic times, one finds that all the apostles were so regarded; and it was for this very reason that our Lord Himself was nailed to a cross of wood. It was Ahab who asked the question of Elijah, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" to which Elijah replied, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandment of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim." It would, of course, be presumptuous to claim rank with those who have so heroically devoted their lives to turning back the tide of unbelief; but one may at least, without immodesty, point out that all who have made the attempt have incurred the enmity of those whose practices they have rebuked.

#### A Difficult and Unpopular Course.

I would venture, in order that I may lead you at least to believe in the sincerity of my purpose, to point out that whether my course in this matter has been right or wrong, it has certainly not been popular. In this church, a few years back, I had the Chairman of the Board of Governors of McMaster University and several members of the Board; the Chairman of the Home Mission Board with several members of that Board; the Chairman of the Publication Board and some members of that Board also; the Secretary of Foreign Missions; the Secretary of the Sunday School Board; the President of the Women's Home Mission Society and a large number of the Board; and the President of the Women's Foreign Mission Society, and several of the Board. With all these holding office both in the Convention and in this church, it was certainly not easy for me to take the position I have taken. Had I consulted my own ease and comfort, I should have drifted with the stream, as so many others seem determined to do. And you, my friends, who have come to hear me to-night, may question my judgment, but I think a moment's reflection will convince you of the sincerity of my purpose.

#### Is There Cause for Alarm?

I beg further to enquire, in order to lay a foundation for the position I shall later take, *whether there is any reason to be concerned about the attitude of Baptist Educational Institutions toward the religious thought of the day.* One might

sometimes suppose that the Pastor of Jarvis Street was the only man in America who is troubled about these matters; and some seem disposed to represent him as living in a perpetual nightmare, far removed from theological reality. What are the facts? Practically every Evangelical denomination in the United States is all but rent in twain by this same controversy. I do not discuss it; but no man can deny it without exposing his ignorance of the religious life of the day. Nor are we any freer from this menace in Canada than in the United States. If anyone doubts this, let him attend a general ministerial meeting in almost any city in Canada, and he will find that those who hold to "the faith once delivered to the saints" are comparatively few. When the influenza scourge was epidemic, the people generally were publicly advised by physicians to be alarmed by the slightest symptom of influenza, and to begin to fight it immediately. When unbelief is epidemic, those who are wise will ever be on the alert.

#### McMaster's Recent History.

I confess my impatience to plunge at once into the Faunce matter, and to give myself the luxury of dealing with the Senate's charges. *But some matters need to be viewed historically in order to understand all their implications. I hold it to be necessary, therefore, that I should as briefly as possible review the recent history of McMaster University, especially my own relation to it, in order that we may take a just view of the matters now in dispute.*

#### Dr. Elmore Harris and Professor I. G. Matthews.

The late Dr. Elmore Harris brought charges of false teaching against Professor I. G. Matthews in the Senate of McMaster. It is a favorite practice of my opponents to represent me as some sort of roaring lion with whom no one can be at peace. (Laughter). They do not argue the case, but endeavour everywhere to prejudice even those who would stand with me theologically by insisting that Mr. Shields shows a very bad spirit. No one, surely, will ever charge that the late Dr. Harris was a man of particularly strong speech. He was a man of very amiable disposition, soft and gentle as a woman—indeed, if I may venture to say without offence, much more gentle than some women. (Laughter). And yet those who now oppose me had the same bitter things to say about my late friend, Dr. Harris. Someone recently said to me, "Pastor, you have not much to complain of. They have not said half as much about you as they said about Dr. Harris." The fact is, whoever offers them an effective resistance will immediately find himself exposed to their calumnies.

#### The Bloor Street 1910 Convention.

I would remind this audience that in 1910 I joined with Dr. John MacNeil in presenting a resolution to the Bloor Street Convention, which I hoped would save the Convention from disruption. It put the responsibility upon the Senate and Board of Governors of McMaster University to keep that institution in line with the statement it had submitted to the Convention. And yet, notwithstanding the undoubtedly heretical teaching of Professor Matthews, he was continued in office until he voluntarily resigned in the Spring of 1919. There was a group of men on the Senate and Board at that time, and they are there still, who made orthodox professions at Conventions to the denomination, and yet maintained on the Faculty one whose teaching was beyond all peradventure subversive of Evangelical faith. And I am constrained to say that it would be difficult to imagine a policy more likely to lead the University to disaster than that in which this dominating group have so long persisted. During all these

years, McMaster University has really divided the denomination. A semblance of unity has been obtained at Conventions; but no one who knows anything of the life of our churches can question that there is scarcely a church throughout the Convention in which there are not found some who feel dissatisfied with the conduct of our educational affairs. Complaint was made some time ago that so few bequests had been received. To my certain knowledge more than one will has been altered, and McMaster University has been removed from the list of beneficiaries, because of its persistent disregard of the principles for which the denomination stands.

#### The Founder of McMaster University.

McMaster University had its origin in this church. The same man whose munificence made the erection of this building possible at a time when Baptists were few and comparatively poor, left his fortune for the establishment of McMaster University. The late Senator McMaster was a man of profound conviction. The doctrines for which he stood are written into the trust deed of this church and into the trust deed of McMaster University. When two men, who would perhaps be regarded almost as conservative to-day, who were on the Faculty of McMaster University, were found to entertain somewhat liberal views, Senator McMaster never rested until their positions were vacated. What encouragement has the course of McMaster University of recent years offered to Baptists of conviction and means to give a place to McMaster University in their wills? The solemn compact, mutually agreed upon by the late Senator McMaster and the Baptist Denomination by the Denomination's acceptance of his bequest on his terms, being so lightly regarded, what assurance has been given by the governing bodies of McMaster University of recent years, that money left by other donors would be used for the propagation of Baptist principles?

When Professor Matthews left McMaster University, I pointed out to the Senate at that time the importance of appointing a conservative man to succeed him. This was done; and in the ministry of Professor Curr, I believe this denomination has one of its greatest assets. (Applause). But when Professor Curr, after a year's service as lecturer, was appointed to the professorship, his appointment was opposed by three members of the Senate—two of whom, in season and out of season, have advocated modernist principles, while the third has always been the obedient tool of these two.

Why refer to these matters now? Only to show that the element which has secured control of the Senate is the element which for years have been the apologists of liberal views.

#### The Ottawa 1919 Convention.

I shall insert here the complete text of the resolution which I had the honour of proposing, and which was overwhelmingly endorsed with only about thirteen voting against it, as reported in the Baptist Year Book, 1919, pp. 24-27:

##### "Resolution of Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.

Dr. Shields moved: Whereas "The Canadian Baptist" is the official organ of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, and therefore may be regarded as editorially representing the general denominational attitude toward questions with which its editorials deal;

And whereas the issue of "The Canadian Baptist" of October 2nd, 1919, contained an editorial entitled, "The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture," the first four paragraphs of which read as follows:

"Some fifteen or twenty years ago the question of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures agitated the evangelical churches of Great Britain a great deal more than it does to-day.

"This agitation has now largely ceased in the old land because the leading men in whom these churches have large confidence have brought themselves and their people into clearer light. Occasional echoes of the old acrimonious disputations are still heard there, but in the main they have ceased to interest or influence intelligent Christian people.

"It is a singular circumstance that on this continent a considerable number of Christian people, including a fair proportion of ministers, are still threshing away at many of those questions touching the Scriptures, which are regarded as settled questions in Great Britain. To some extent this is true among churches in Canada, and it is especially true in the United States, where some crude theological views still prevail in many quarters, in which some partially educated but very dogmatic preachers are still making loud proclamations of views and theories of the Scriptures, which were laid aside years ago in England and Scotland.

"Any of our readers, who are still perplexed as to the disputations that occasionally prevail in our midst, touching the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, will be greatly helped by the recital of the story of how light and relief came to Christian people in the old land. Incidentally, reliable light is also thrown on the way in which the methods of modern scholarship affect our views of the Scriptures, when these methods are used by trusted, reverent and scholarly Christian men who abound in England and Scotland."

And whereas the said editorial reviews a book which it represents as containing:

"The story and explanation of how certain conservative Christian men in Great Britain have made the transition from many untenable theories and inherited beliefs about the Bible to a position in which their religious beliefs can be contained without creating a breach with other spheres of knowledge";

And whereas the said editorial calls it "a singular circumstance" that some on this continent still dispute over "questions touching the Scriptures which are regarded as settled questions in Great Britain," and characterizes the religious views which "still prevail in many quarters" as "crude theological views," and inferentially defines the said alleged settlement of these questions as the substitution of some implied new view of the Scriptures for "views and theories which were laid aside years ago in England and Scotland";

And whereas the said editorial implicitly commends to the readers of "The Canadian Baptist" this new view of the Scriptures, and implies that arguments for the maintenance of the former view "have ceased to interest or influence intelligent Christian people," thus impugning the intelligence of all who maintain the former view of the Scriptures; which view, it implies, is held only by people who are "partially educated";

And whereas at the Convention held in the Bloor Street Church, Toronto, October, 1910, the report of the Senate and Board of Governors of McMaster University presented to the Convention, October 24th, contains a report from the Theological Faculty of the University to the Senate in which the following occurs:

"The trust deed of Toronto Baptist College commits the care of the institution to the regular Baptist Churches, and these are described as holding and maintaining substantially certain specific doctrines, among them this:

The divine inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice";

And this further:

"The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, and are the only sufficient, certain and authoritative rule of saving knowledge, faith, and obedience";

And whereas the said report of the Senate and Board of Governors of McMaster University to the Convention in 1910, containing the foregoing historical statements with respect to the Scriptures, the latter dated 1885, and former being embodied in the trust deed of Toronto Baptist College, declared,

"These statements refer to fundamental doctrines and indicate the attitude of the people of our Baptist Churches, as well as the attitude of the University towards the Bible";

And whereas the said Report of the Senate and Board of Governors of McMaster University, including these statements respecting the Scriptures dated 1885, was approved by the Convention as being still representative of the unaltered attitude toward the Bible of the Churches of the Convention in 1910;

Therefore this Convention hereby declares its disapproval of the editorial in "The Canadian Baptist" of October 2nd entitled "The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture," on the ground that in its representative character as the organ of the Convention, "The Canadian Baptist" in the said editorial commends to its readers some new vague view of the Scriptures different from that to which the Convention declared its adherence in 1910, and upon which the denominational University is declared to be founded.

Rev. W. W. McMaster, Hamilton, seconded the motion."

The amendment aimed to side-track the pronouncement of the resolution in favour of the historic Baptist position. Let me read that amendment as reported in the Year Book of 1919, page 27, that you may see the relation of that action to what has since followed:

Mr. James Ryrie moved, in amendment to my resolution, that the Convention reasserts loyalty to the Baptist positions:—

- " (1) That the Bible is the inspired Word of God, and is the sufficient and only authoritative standard in all matters of faith and practice, and
- " (2) That the individual believer has an inalienable right to liberty of thought and conscience, including the right of private interpretation of the Scriptures in reliance on the illumination of the Holy Spirit.
- " (3) At the same time the Convention strongly deprecates controversy at this time as to the interpretation in detail of our distinctive beliefs as uncalled for, and sure to minister to heart-burnings and divisions in our body, when we ought to be presenting a united front in grasping the opportunity of the hour.

Rev. W. A. Cameron, Toronto, seconded the motion."

What is the purport of it? Simply this: that we declare that we believe certain things, but if we dare to say what we believe we shall divide the body. Do not tell anybody what you believe. To publish the interpretation of our distinctive principles, the very things for which the denomination stands, will be sure "to minister to heart-burnings and divisions in our body." I said at that time, and I say it again, if that be true, that the standing for Baptist principles leads to division, then let division come at once! (Loud applause).

Where was McMaster?

Now, what has that to do with this? By whom was that amendment prepared? By his own confession, it was prepared by the then Chairman of the

Board of Governors, the late Dr. D. E. Thomson. By whom was the amendment moved? By Mr. James Ryrie, a member of the Board of Governors and of the Senate of McMaster University. By whom was the amendment seconded? By the Rev. W. A. Cameron, a member of the Board of Governors and of the Senate of McMaster University. By whom was the amendment supported? By Professor A. L. McCrimmon of McMaster University. On such a vital matter one might have expected a pronouncement from the entire Faculty of the University. What was their attitude? Dr. Farmer, the Dean in Theology, pleaded with me personally not to submit my resolution; and then delivered a colorless speech which gave direction to no one. As a matter of fact, there was but one voice from the entire University raised in support of the resolution, which reaffirmed the denomination's loyalty to Evangelical truth, and to the principles embodied in the University's charter, and which the Convention overwhelmingly adopted.

#### The Pastor of Jarvis Street and the University.

In this connection I turn aside a moment to discuss *the attitude of the University toward myself*. At the time of the Ottawa Convention I had been nine years and five months Pastor of Jarvis St. Church; and all my ministry had been exercised within the bounds of this Convention. Before I was called to Jarvis Street, unknown to me the Pulpit Committee investigated my record in every church I had served and made inquiry of nearly every pastor with whom I had laboured in Evangelistic effort. And with such knowledge as they obtained before them, I was called to a church that represented the very heart of the denomination, and on the recommendation of a committee whose chairman was also the Chairman of the Board of Governors of McMaster University. Certainly, then, up to 1910 I could not have lived the life of a denominational outlaw, or I should never have been called to Jarvis Street. (Laughter). And what of my Jarvis Street record? Through all those years I did the very best I could to co-operate with McMaster University. The then Chairman of the Board of Governors, Dr. D. E. Thomson, told the Board on one occasion, when someone voiced some sort of criticism of me, that they had better leave Mr. Shields alone; that Jarvis Street had done more for McMaster University of recent years than any church in the denomination, and that all that had been done had been done on the initiative of the Pastor. I have said this only to show that up to 1919 I had done my utmost, so far as my conscience would allow, to support McMaster University.

#### The Pastor of Jarvis Street and the Denomination.

I may be permitted, also, to speak a word here in respect to *my relation to our denominational work in general*. For fourteen or fifteen years I served on the Home Mission Board. For several years I gave more time to the work of Home Missions than to the work of Jarvis Street Church. When I spoke to my deacons about it, and talked of seeking relief, the Chairman of the Home Mission Board, Mr. James Ryrie, refused to listen to it, and extravagantly exclaimed, "You are more than all the rest of the Board." The Chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. Albert Matthews, said he would not stay on the Board twenty-four hours if I left it. Surely, I was not a denominational outlaw in those days! (Laughter). I will venture frankly to say that I had the honour of initiating the movement that resulted in the upward trend of our Home Mission Pastors' salaries, and that converted a deficit of more than twenty

thousand dollars into a surplus of eight or nine thousand within two or three years—and that in war time. Notwithstanding all this, a movement was initiated in Montreal to drop me from the Home Mission Board. It is true that my other duties have occupied me so fully that I have not been able to give the attention to the work I formerly did; and I refer to it now only to show the spirit which this controversy has engendered.

#### The Home Mission Text Book.

In this connection, I will dare to relate another incident. A year ago or thereabouts, a mission text-book for use in Young People's Societies, dealing with Baptist work in Canada, was issued by the Home Mission Board. I did not see a single line of what was written until after the book was on sale in the Book Room. Then a copy came into my hand. Even then, I did not immediately read it until someone called my attention to a chapter on Toronto Baptists. That chapter began with a history of Jarvis Street Church as the mother of Baptist churches in this City, carrying the history down to the present pastorate. Following this, there was printed a paragraph from the last annual report of the Jarvis Street Church, giving a statement of the additions to its membership during recent years, and also of its revenue. When I read it, I felt that a disproportionate amount of space had been given to Jarvis Street Church, and that not enough had been said about other churches in Toronto. The book had been approved, however, by the Young People's Convention, meeting in Brantford, for use as a text-book by Young People's Societies. But shortly after this a protest was sent from Walmer Road Church against that part of the book which related to Jarvis Street. I was then a member of the Home Mission Board and of the Executive Committee of the Home Mission Board; but, so far as I know, without consulting either the Board as a whole or the Executive Committee, the books were recalled from circulation; they were withdrawn from sale at the Book-Room; the whole edition was torn apart, the section relating to Toronto Baptists was rewritten, and the edition rebound. I think the chapter in question was open to criticism, as I have suggested—not for what it contained, but for what it omitted. But, obviously, its offence was that it set in circulation facts about Jarvis Street Church which it was not desirable that the denomination should know.

I am charged sometimes with manifesting an ungentle spirit. I felicitate myself, however, that in my attitude to some elements in this denomination I have shown the patience of several Jobs. (Laughter). I have never referred to this incident before; and in one respect it is not germane to the subject before us; I quote it now, however, as a further illustration of the spirit of my opponents.

Following 1919, I shared with the then President of the Convention, Dr. John MacNeill, the work of bringing the Forward Movement before the denomination by a tour of all the Associations in the two Provinces. Had I been at that time such a denominational outlaw, I surely should never have been invited to represent so important a work in such a way. Again, in 1921, because the modernist group had not had time as yet to carry their campaign of slander throughout the denomination, I shared with others in the conferences conducted throughout the denomination in the interests of the spiritual aims of the Forward Movement; and, by request, wrote all the leaflets that were issued, and edited, anonymously, the Forward Movement section of *The Canadian Baptist* for the month of April of that year.

### The Capital Offence.

But what has been my offence? *That I secured an overwhelming expression of the denomination's conviction at the Convention in 1919. From that time I was sentenced to death denominationally.* A friend of mine overheard a conversation in the train shortly after that Convention, in which it was said by certain important persons, "We must get Shields out of Jarvis Street." Where are we? (Applause). Unless I am dreaming, this is still Jarvis Street. ("Hurrah!" and loud applause). And I think I will stay a little longer. (Applause).

The recent history of Jarvis Street is too well known to require repetition; but here once again I solemnly assert that the tremendous upheaval we have experienced was inspired by that little group of men, to the further progress of whose views I had been enabled to offer an effective resistance in the denomination.

### The Resolutions of the Senate.

I proceed now to discuss the resolutions passed at the meeting of the Senate held Monday evening, January 14th. The resolutions, as reported in *The Canadian Baptist* of January 17th, were as follows: (The paragraphs are numbered to facilitate reference).

At a largely attended meeting of the Senate, held on Monday last, a statement was presented by the Honorary Degree Committee in reply to the letter of protest by Dr. T. T. Shields, re the conferring of the honorary degree of LL.D. upon President Faunce. This statement was briefly discussed and adopted and the chairman authorized to communicate same to the Baptist people of Ontario and Quebec through the columns of *The Canadian Baptist*. The following is the statement:

#### "Statement re Protest of Dr. Shields Against Conferring LL.D. Degree Upon President Faunce."

1. "In view of the protest made by the Rev. T. T. Shields in regard to the granting of the degree of Doctor of Laws to President W. H. P. Faunce, it is desirable that the Honorary Degree Committee communicate to the members of the Senate the following statement in regard thereto:

2. "As a careful study of the list of those who have heretofore received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from McMaster University will reveal, it has never been the understanding of this Senate that the granting of such degree involves the investigation of the intimate theological or political views of proposed recipients. In this matter McMaster maintains the same attitude as other Baptist Universities. At the same time, so far as Dr. Faunce is concerned, we call attention to the following facts: Dr. Faunce for a quarter of a century has occupied his present position, and is recognized as a Christian gentleman, who accepts in his daily life the Lordship of Christ. He is a member of the oldest Baptist Church in North America, and has also recognized standing in the Rhode Island Baptist State Convention and in the Northern Baptist Convention. He has for years been looked upon as loyal to our Baptist faith, and is an avowed believer in the absolute Deity of Jesus Christ.

3. "In choosing men for the degree of Doctor of Laws, it has always been the habit of our Senate to make careful selection of men belonging to a circle which we should naturally wish to recognize, whose ability, standing and character are such as to mark them as worthy of academic recognition. With this in mind, the committee in charge of arrangements for the installation of the new Chancellor on November 20th, believing that it was highly desirable that the head of an American University should be included among the distinguished educationists selected for recognition, named the President of Brown, both because of the fact that Brown is the oldest University under Baptist control and has a unique history, associated from the earliest days with distinctive principles of religious liberty; and also because of the distinction and standing of its present president as scholar, administrator and leader in the field of education. The committee, therefore, believes that the conferring of this degree has been in harmony with the traditions and principles of McMaster, and



in accordance with the high academic standards which in these matters we have always sought to maintain.

#### Statement by the Senate.

1. "In view of the fact that Dr. T. T. Shields has forwarded to this Senate a letter to be read at some meeting at which he could be present, and in view of the fact that this letter, protesting against the degree of Doctor of Laws recently conferred by McMaster University on the President of Brown University, has been duly read.

2. "Be it resolved that, at this meeting arranged to suit the convenience of Dr. Shields and the first since the Montreal Convention, this Senate put itself on record as follows:

3. "Dr. T. T. Shields, although a member of the Board of Governors and of the Senate of McMaster University, was absent from all meetings in which the plans and programme for the installation of Chancellor Whidden were discussed, and remained entirely silent regarding these matters, about which it was his duty to keep informed.

4. "Dr. Shields, after the decision for the conferring of degrees had been finally made and published by the Senate, and only three hours before the Special Convocation, sent in a letter of protest against the conferring the degree of Doctor of Laws upon Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, who for a quarter of a century has been the honored President of the oldest university in America, controlled by Baptists, and who is a member in good standing of the oldest Baptist church in America.

5. "Dr. Shields, without consulting his colleagues on the Senate, proceeded, through the press, and in a public address delivered in an American city, to send out insinuations as to what was involved in the action of McMaster, which were calculated to impair confidence in the University, and to create misunderstanding and suspicion throughout the Convention as to the teaching and policy of McMaster University.

6. "In statements made in the same connection, Dr. Shields has cast reflections upon the good faith and qualifications of Dr. Whidden after his appointment as Chancellor had been accepted by the Convention, and at a time when he was being so enthusiastically received as our leader.

7. "On another recent occasion Dr. Shields has published in his church paper innuendoes against the character and honor of Dean Farmer and Professor McCrimmon, two members of the Faculty who have, by many years of faithful service, gained the confidence of our people in a remarkable way.

8. "In addition to this, the church, of which Dr. Shields is pastor, acting presumably on his advice, served notice in March, 1923, of the withdrawal of its support of McMaster University through its regular financial budget on the ground of lack of confidence in the University, notwithstanding the fact that the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec a few months previously had put on special record its confidence in the work being done by the University. This notice was sent at a time when, according to his speech at the recent Montreal Convention, he professed to rejoice in the clear-cut statements as to the purpose and policy of this University presented by the University and adopted at the previous Convention, and also to be gratified with the additional statements made by members of the Board of Governors elected at that Convention.

Now be it resolved:

9. "First: That this Senate express its unqualified disapproval of the conduct and methods of Dr. Shields as disloyal to the Senate itself and hostile to the good work McMaster University is seeking to do.

10. "Second: That this Senate declare its confidence in Chancellor Whidden, Dean Farmer and Professor McCrimmon, and express its deep resentment at the unwarranted reflection attempted to be cast on them by Dr. Shields.

11. "Third: That this Senate call the attention of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec to the manner in which Dr. Shields has discharged the responsible tasks imposed on him by the Convention, and express the opinion that the circumstances hereinbefore recited are but symptoms of a general attitude toward the University, characteristic of Dr. Shields. That this Senate further declare its belief that the actions and attitude of Dr. Shields make it obviously impossible to co-operate with him longer in any constructive work with any hope of success.

12. "And be it further resolved: That the Chairman of the Senate be authorized to communicate this resolution to our constituency through *The Canadian Baptist*, or by other means, together with any relevant documents or resolutions which he deems proper."

HOWARD P. WHIDDEN, Chairman.

I shall discuss the resolutions clause by clause, taking the last resolution first. I must, however, say a few words about the meeting itself.

#### A Picture of the Senate.

Some people may think of the Senate as an august body of distinguished academicians, as an aggregation of learning and mental acumen under the control of a high moral purpose, and all assembled to weigh with impartial and judicial calmness such evidence as might be submitted respecting an allegation affecting the reputation of an institution they have solemnly engaged to conduct in the interests of Evangelical truth. For your information, let me submit a mental photograph of this august body. I made no notes as to the persons present; but, as I sat with them for four hours, my mind retains the impression of a time exposure. (Laughter).

They are sitting around a long table. On one side in the centre is Chancellor Whidden, in the chair; on his right, the acting Dean in Theology, Professor J. L. Gilmour; next to him, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors, Dr. Frank Sanderson; next to him, a Mr. Edwards, of Ottawa, whom I had never seen before, although I have been a member of the Senate and Board for over three years; beside him sat Mr. J. N. Shenstone, whom I have never before seen at any meeting either of the Senate or the Board, although I believe he attended one other meeting this year in June, from which I was absent. Next to Mr. Shenstone sat Mr. James Ryrle, who moved the celebrated amendment at the Ottawa Convention of 1919, which was aimed to side-track the resolution to which I have referred. Next sat the Rev. Andrew Imrie, who bravely opposed by speech and vote the resolution of the Senate. (Applause). Then followed in order, Professor Keirstead; Mr. McKechnie, of Belleville; Mr. Evan Grey, whom I had never seen present at a meeting before; Miss Whitesides, Principal of Moulton College; Mrs. Zavitz; Rev. W. W. McMaster; Mr. W. E. Robertson; Mr. R. D. Warren; Rev. B. W. Merrill; Rev. John MacNeill; Principal Ralph Wilcox, of Woodstock College; Professor Moon; Mr. J. B. McArthur, leader of the late self-appointed Men's Committee of Jarvis Street Church, which attempted to carry out the Sanhedrin's sentence and kill Shields in Jarvis Street; Mr. Harold Firstbrook, another of the "young men"; Mr. J. H. Cranston, who opposed my coming to Jarvis Street on the ground of my friendship for Dr. Harris, and my opposition to Professor Matthews; Rev. W. A. Cameron, who seconded the celebrated amendment at the Ottawa Convention; Mr. Geo. Matthews; Dr. S. S. Bates; Mr. Albert Matthews, Chairman of the Board of Governors; Dr. Walter McLay, Dean in Arts; and Mr. E. J. Bengough, the Registrar of the University. In addition to these, I may add that I also was present (Laughter); and, I suppose, was not altogether an inconspicuous figure.

This was the jury assembled to try the case as to whether I was justified in my protest against the Senate's action—their own action—in conferring the degree upon Dr. Faunce.

#### The Jury Panel.

Look at the jury panel! Who are they? An ex-deacon of Jarvis Street Baptist Church; an ex-Associate Pastor, for whose resignation I had been compelled to ask; an ex-Chairman of Jarvis Street ex-Finance Committee and in-

stigator of the Jarvis Street futile insurrection; still another member of the Jarvis Street ex-Finance Committee; another ex-member of Jarvis Street, who began a newspaper campaign against me on account of my theological position before I began my pastorate in Jarvis Street, and before I even knew that such a distinguished person was in existence. Three other members of the Senate whose election to the Board of Governors I had opposed; and a Chancellor against whose appointment I had felt compelled to vote. What lawyer would consent to argue a case before a jury so constituted? It was evident from the beginning of the meeting on January 14th that every man had been assigned his part. There had been no meeting of the Senate to prepare a course of action; no committee had been appointed, authorized to do so; for the resolution stated that it was the first meeting of the Senate since the Montreal Convention. Yet the resolutions had all been carefully prepared. The very questions asked had been prepared in order before the meeting; and everything was ready for the execution of their hated opponent.

On account of sickness in a home, to which I had hastily been summoned, I was a few minutes late in arriving at the meeting. On my entrance I found the circle complete—the Senate sat around a long table. Although I came to the meeting as an elected member of the Board of Governors, neither the Chancellor nor any of the officials had the courtesy to propose that the circle be extended to include me. Of necessity, I sat outside the circle, as though it were deliberately designed that I should appear before that august body as a prisoner on trial. (Laughter). And I want to interject that I felt a great deal more comfortable outside the circle than I should have been inside. (Applause). But after some time, one member of the Senate offered me a chair; and then the chairs were re-arranged at one end of the table so that I was no longer compelled to look at the backs of half the members of the Senate,—although that had not been a particular hardship. If any should think that this is irrelevant, I reply that I am describing the spirit of the jury—precisely the same spirit as presided in the palace of the high priest on a certain memorable occasion recorded in Holy Writ. But I have thus given you a glimpse of the personnel of the jury that you may see that the Senate's action is only an attempted rebuttal of the Ottawa resolution; I say I have given you this glimpse of the personnel of the jury that you may see its relation to the Convention's action at Ottawa; that you may see that these resolutions are only an attempt to redeem the Jarvis Street defeat; another bombardment by the heavy artillery of the Walmer Road Convention; another demonstration in force, commanded by that invisible generalissimo whose headquarters are in a place to which I pray no one here may ever be consigned.

#### **The Chancellor Asks and is Asked Questions.**

I want now to tell you *how the meeting began*. The Chancellor said that, before the statement prepared by the Honorary Degree Committee was submitted to the Senate, he would like to ask me some questions. He then enquired whether I was prepared to move that the resolution granting the degree to Dr. Faunce be rescinded. I replied that before answering that question it would be necessary for me to know whether a stenographic report would be taken of the proceedings. The Chancellor replied that a scientifically accurate report would be taken. To this I replied that, inasmuch as I was there in the attitude of a critic of the Senate and, so far as I knew, stood alone, I begged to request that I be permitted to have a stenographer to take a verbatim report

of the discussion. This was interpreted by one or two speakers as a reflection upon the Registrar, who is an expert stenographer. To this I replied, I had no intention of reflecting upon the Registrar, but that on a certain occasion more than a year ago I had found it necessary to make certain observations at a meeting of the Board of Governors on a particular subject. In making that speech I spoke with the greatest care, and guarded my utterances with many qualifying words at every point, with a desire to avoid all possibility of misunderstanding. At the next meeting Dr. Sanderson tried to hold me to what he alleged was a stenographic report of what I had said. On hearing the report read, I recognized that there was not one word reported which I had not said, but that every qualifying word about which I had been so careful, had been left out, with the result that the report gave exactly the opposite impression of that which I intended. I refused, therefore, to speak before the Senate, or in any way to discuss the question after that experience, without having another report for my own protection. After some discussion it was ultimately decided that no stenographic report should be taken; and to this I very readily agreed.

#### The Senate's Resolution.

I come now to a discussion of the resolution itself. I begin with the third paragraph:

"Dr. T. T. Shields, although a member of the Board of Governors and of the Senate of McMaster University, was absent from all meetings in which the plans and programme for the installation of Chancellor Whidden were discussed, and remained entirely silent regarding these matters, about which it was his duty to keep informed."

Let us for a moment suppose that to be a fair representation of fact. What then? *If the action taken by McMaster University in respect to Dr. Faunce was wrong, can it be justified by the further fact that I was not there to protest against it?* By what principle, I ask, is a special obligation to safeguard Baptist interests imposed upon me? What would be thought of a man who should break into some jeweler's store on Yonge Street, and when charged with the crime argue in defence that he was not to be blamed because there was no policeman present to prevent him? An honest man does not need a policeman to keep him in order; and true Baptists, surely, do not need anyone to be constantly on guard to keep them true to Baptist principles. ("Amen!" and applause).

The issue facing us to-day is not whether I made my protest in a proper way, but simply *whether the Senate's action is right or wrong*. There may be a right way and wrong way of ringing a fire alarm: the important question always must be, however, *Is there a fire to be extinguished?* If there is, then the alarm had better be sounded in the wrong way than not at all. But examine that paragraph carefully. With the writer of that, the issue is not the Senate and Dr. Faunce, but Dr. Shields. The question seems to be, *How can we further slander him? What can we do to prejudice denominational opinion against him? How can we most effectively destroy the influence of our hated critic?* Hence the poor Senate is to be excused, because, forsooth, it is alleged I was absent from all the meetings at which these proceedings were taken!

#### How Many Were "All Meetings"?

But now we must enquire, *How many meetings were there?* I wrote the Registrar of the University on January 18th asking him to be good enough to give me the number and the dates of all meetings of the Senate, and of all meetings of the Board of Governors held during the year 1923, with the names of those present. This he very kindly did; and in his letter he says:

"At the Senate meeting of May 14th a committee was appointed to arrange for an Installation for Chancellor Whidden. At the meeting of October 11th this committee reported, also the Honorary Degree Committee, who cooperated with the Installation Committee. The arrangements for the Installation were made by the committee appointed by the Senate, and the matter is not mentioned in the Minutes of the Board."

Thus, according to the official records of the University, "all meetings" mentioned in this paragraph were two—namely, May 14th, which only appointed a committee, and October 11th, which received the report of the committee. Why was I not present at these meetings? On May 1st, I left Toronto for Texas. I preached in Fort Worth on May 6th. I was in Kansas City, Mo., from May 10th until the 17th. I gave an address before the Baptist Bible Union on the evening of the 15th, and was present at the sessions of the Southern Baptist Convention, Wednesday and Thursday, May 16th and 17th. When I left Toronto on May 1st, I had received no notice of the Senate meeting of May 14th; nor did I know of such a meeting until after the meeting was over. Had I known of it, I was too far away to have made attendance possible. Had I any right to make an appointment to go to Texas and Kansas City? or does membership on the Board of Governors impose upon me an obligation to sit down and wait for communications from the Registrar of the University, like a fireman waiting for a fire call? (Laughter). The Registrar informs me that the Committee appointed on the 14th of May reported on October 11th. Why was I not present at the second and last of "all meetings"? I left Toronto September 28th for Danville, Ky., and preached there every evening from September 30th up to Thursday, October 11th. Therefore, I received no notice of the Senate meeting of October 11th until I returned to Toronto, Saturday, October 13th, when it was all over. While the meeting of October 11th was in progress, I was preaching the gospel in Kentucky. Again I ask, Am I to be blamed for leaving Toronto two weeks before the meeting of the Senate, when I had received no advice that such a meeting was to be held? The Registrar says: "The arrangements for the Installation were made by the committee appointed by the Senate, and the matter is not mentioned in the Minutes of the Board." Therefore, the Senate had nothing to do with the arrangements for the installation, beyond appointing the Committee; but the Honorary Degree Committee made its recommendations to the meeting of the Senate on October 11th. I ask, therefore, what opportunity I had of knowing of "these matters, about which it was my duty to keep informed"?

#### Trifles to Confuse the Mind.

I ask the pardon of this great audience this evening for taking up your time with such trivial matters; but I am dealing with a paragraph issued by the Senate of McMaster University, and their defence is that I was not present at "all meetings," and that I failed to keep myself informed. What is the object of that paragraph? Somebody told me that some people felt the Senate had made a strong point in saying I had been absent from "all meetings" at which preparations had been made. But that paragraph was written to create the impression that I deliberately absented myself from the meetings of the Board, and then rushed into print in order to expose their mistake publicly. Certainly the statement that I was "absent from all meetings in which the plans and programme for the installation of Chancellor Whidden were discussed," was intended to convey the impression of a greater dereliction of duty than to be absent from the only meeting to which the Honorary Degree Committee report-

ed; and to be absent from no meeting "at which plans and programme for the installation of Chancellor Whidden were discussed," for the Registrar says, "The arrangements for the Installation were made by the Committee appointed by the Senate, and the matter is not mentioned in the Minutes of the Board.

#### How Honorary Degrees are Conferred.

But now I must ask another question: *What might have occurred had I been able to procure an aeroplane and fly from Kentucky to attend that meeting?* How are honorary degrees conferred? First of all, who composed the Honorary Degree Committee? Calling them by name—Dr. Whidden, the Chancellor; Dr. McLay, the Dean in Arts; in this instance, Dr. Gilmour, the acting Dean in Theology; Mr. Albert Matthews, Chairman of the Board of Governors; and Dr. Frank Sanderson, Chairman of the Executive Committee. At the meeting of the Senate on January 14th, I enquired of the Chancellor whether it was customary for the Honorary Degree Committee to make a selection of those whom it was proposed to honour, and then to seek the authority of the Senate before enquiring of the gentleman concerned whether they would accept the degree. To this the Chancellor replied, he did not know what was the usual procedure. I then enquired what had been the procedure in this case; and was informed that *the Honorary Degree Committee had selected the men, had communicated with them, had received their acceptance of the proposed honour, before ever the matter was brought to the attention of the Senate at all.* Had I been at the meeting of October 11th when the Honorary Degree Committee made its report and recommendation, what could I have done? Had I then opposed the proposed action, I should have been informed that Dr. Faunce had already been asked if he would accept the degree, and that he had consented to do so. As a matter of fact, *the thing was all done by the Honorary Degree Committee; and the Senate knew absolutely nothing about it until it was too late to do anything but either accept the Committee's recommendation or withdraw the offer of the degree, which had already been accepted.* No announcement of the Senate's action is ever communicated to individual members, and I saw no announcement until I read it in the evening paper the day before the degree was to be conferred. I then deliberated for some time as to the proper course to pursue; and at noon of the following day wrote the letter which I sent by the hand of my Secretary to the Chancellor in the early afternoon.

#### The Honorary Degree Committee.

But again I ask, Seeing the Senate had no option but to accept the recommendation of this Committee, who are the Committee? I have given you the names—the Chancellor; the Deans in Arts and Theology; Mr. Albert Matthews, the Chairman of the Board of Governors; and Dr. Frank Sanderson, the Chairman of the Executive. Who was chiefly responsible for the selection of the recipients of honorary degrees? Certainly not Mr. Albert Matthews, the Chairman of the Board; for in reading the first resolution of the Senate stating the case for the Honorary Degree Committee, he said that he had not written the statement, and that in one particular he dissented from the principle laid down: It is extremely unlikely that the very cautious and diplomatic Professor Gilmour would take the lead in such a matter; nor yet is it probable that Dean McLay would take the initiative in such a case. I would fain believe that it is unlikely the initiative was taken by the new Chancellor. And I remind you that there was one other member of the Honorary Degree Committee, who never fails to take the initiative in anything—Dr. Frank Sanderson.

But look at the array of distinguished men assembled on that occasion! There was, of course, the great Sir Arthur Currie, whom all the British Empire delights to honour. There was also a distinguished representative of Toronto University. But no one would think of associating either of these men with any pronounced theological opinions. It was not for their place in the theological world they were selected; for, great as they are, they are not theologians. There was, of course, Professor Mullins, the orthodox President of the largest theological seminary in the world, and President of the Southern Baptist Convention; but he was the only conservative theologian. There was Dr. Faunce, of Brown University; the President of Newton Centre Theological Seminary; Crozier Theological Seminary was represented by Professor I. G. Matthews, whose teaching has been such a blight upon the life of this denomination that we can scarcely hope to recover from it in a generation.

AND NOW I CHALLENGE THE HONORARY DEGREE COMMITTEE TO SAY UPON WHOM SOME MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE PROPOSED TO CONFER THE DEGREE FROM CHICAGO UNIVERSITY, AND WHY THAT DEGREE WAS NOT CONFERRED. And why? They did not dare to recognize Chicago. *The will to do it was there, and to commit the Senate and this Denomination to an endorsement of the chief infidel factory on the whole American Continent, namely, Chicago University.* It was, however, proposed to recognize that University. What have you, then, from so-called Baptist institutions to mark the beginning of a new Chancellorship—Brown, Newton, Crozier, and Chicago—with Dr. Mullins of the South thrown in for camouflage. (Laughter).

"He That Doeth Truth——"

I am blamed for publishing my protest without consulting my colleagues on the Senate. That is ever the complaint. Modernism thrives behind closed doors and in committees and boards, and hates nothing so much as the light of publicity. I have attended meetings of the Senate before; and I knew that suggestions of mine would be unlikely to receive sympathetic consideration.

Alleged Reflections Upon Dr. Whidden.

In paragraph six, I am charged with having "cast reflections upon the good faith and qualifications of Dr. Whidden after his appointment as Chancellor had been accepted by the Convention." I voted against the appointment of Dr. Whidden on the ground of his record as Principal of Brandon College. Into that matter I shall not now enter, merely for want of time. It is enough to say that I had very grave fears that the Senate were recommending to the Board the wrong man. I said at the time that I hoped McMaster University would have been able to command the services of a man of greater ability and of larger capacity than Dr. Whidden appeared to be. From all that I had heard of his Brandon record, I feared that he was a man of compromise who would not give to McMaster University the strong leadership it so urgently required. Furthermore, I knew that some members of the Nominating Committee, when looking for a Chancellor *did not look for a driver of the car, but for an agreeable passenger who would be willing to stay with the car wherever the driver cared to drive it.* (Laughter.) I say, I had my fears, but yet hoped for the best. I voted against the Chancellor's appointment, and asked that my contrary vote be recorded, as I felt conscientiously obliged to do in

the interests of the denomination by whom I was elected to the Board of Governors. But I kept my fears to myself. After the Chancellor's acceptance, however, through the Chairman of the Board, I sought opportunity to meet the Chancellor face to face, that we might talk things over and discover how far we were in agreement. It occurred to me that such defects as I thought I perceived in Dr. Whidden's Brandon record might possibly be due to administrative weakness rather than to any personal bias; and I wanted to ascertain whether I could conscientiously support him. Speaking to him over the telephone, I told him frankly of my contrary vote; but that I had not voted against him on personal grounds, but only that I might reserve to myself liberty of action in case my fears in respect to his personal attitude toward the great principles for which the denomination stands should be confirmed. The Chairman of the Board of Governors approved of the proposal that we should endeavour to meet, and I believe did everything in his power to bring about that meeting. Dr. Whidden, however, absolutely refused to meet me. When I referred to this matter at the Senate meeting on January 14th; Dr. Whidden explained that he had refused to meet me on the advice of several members of the Board of Governors whom he had consulted on the subject. Evidently those members entertained a different view of the proposal than that of the Chairman of the Board, through whom the negotiations for the meeting were conducted. Notwithstanding Dr. Whidden's refusal to meet me, however, *I still kept my fears to myself, and publicly promised the Chancellor at the Montreal Convention my hearty support if he would keep McMaster in tune with the statements of faith which had been made by the University on several occasions, but particularly at the Walmer Road Convention. Nor did I say a word to the contrary, either publicly or privately, until after the Faunce incident, when one of the newspapers demanded to know why I had voted against the Chancellor; to which I replied that in my judgment Dr. Whidden was a weak man and not sufficiently courageous for the responsible office of Chancellor of McMaster University. And I have no hesitation now in declaring that my worst fears in respect to these matters have been fully realized.*

#### Dean Farmer.

We next come to paragraph seven, which reads:

"On another recent occasion Dr. Shields has published in his church paper innuendoes against the character and honour of Dean Farmer and Professor McCrimmon, two members of the Faculty who have, by many years of faithful service, gained the confidence of our people in a remarkable way."

Objection was taken to a paragraph in the Editorial in *The Gospel Witness* on the Stockholm Conference in its treatment of Dr. A. C. Dixon, in which I said it would seem that somebody "could not remember" some things. This makes it necessary for me to reopen a matter concerning which I have remained silent since the Walmer Road Convention. Prior to that Convention, in *The Gospel Witness*, I had suggested the advisability of retiring certain members of the Board of Governors—Dr. Frank Sanderson among them. I intended then, and intend now, no affront to Dr. Sanderson personally. No doubt he is an estimable gentleman. I objected and still object to his views and their influence upon the administration, which are in my opinion, and in the opinion of others, inimical to the highest interests of the University. In the paragraph in *The Witness* relating to Dr. Frank Sanderson, I said: "On one occasion, in a certain place, following an exposition of a passage in John's



Gospel, the speaker reported that Dr. Sanderson had asked him if he was unaware that in the view of all who were informed on such matters, John's Gospel had been discredited and discarded. Shall we entrust the responsibility of appointing a Chancellor to one who has discarded that incomparable compendium of the Gospel of grace, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life"?

**Mr. W. F. Hayden's Affidavit.**

To the statement contained in that paragraph, Dr. Sanderson from the platform of the Convention gave a categorical denial. The gentleman who reported that conversation to me was the late Mr. W. F. Hayden, who, unfortunately, was at the time of the Convention ill in bed. I, therefore, telephoned Mr. Hayden's house, after the morning session of the Educational discussion, and asked if he would consent to make that statement in the form of an affidavit, which might be used by me in my speech in the afternoon. Mr. Hayden agreed, and his affidavit follows:

DOMINION OF CANADA  
Province of ONTARIO  
To Wit:

IN THE MATTER OF A statement made by  
Dr. Sanderson

I, William Foster Hayden of the City of Toronto  
in the County of York

Do solemnly declare that

1. I was for fifteen years a member of The Walmer Road Baptist Church and was elected a Deacon of that Church about the month of February, 1921.
2. Dr. Frank Sanderson was a member of that church at that time and at the time hereinafter referred to.
3. That I was present at the usual weekly prayer meeting in the Walmer Road Baptist Church in the month of June, 1920, and at that meeting Dr. J. H. Farmer, Dean of Theology in McMaster University addressed or spoke at the meeting and in his remarks he quoted from the Gospel according to John.
4. Dr. Farmer and I walked out of the meeting homewards together and Dr. Farmer then told me that Dr. Sanderson had come to him at the close of the meeting and asked him  
"If he didn't know better than to quote from John's Gospel, a Book that had been discredited and discarded by everyone that knew anything about it."  
Dr. Farmer said to me after this statement that he was "amazed" to think that any Christian man would doubt the Gospel of John. I was also greatly astounded to hear this, as Dr. Sanderson was a Deacon of Walmer Road Baptist Church.
5. I recall the occasion most clearly. I have a vivid remembrance of what took place. I remember that Dr. Farmer and I together had walked down Brunswick Avenue and Dr. Farmer reported the language that Dr. Sanderson had used just after Dr. Farmer and I had turned from Brunswick Avenue into Bloor Street. It left so deep an impression on my mind that I could not possibly forget it.
6. In the interests of the denomination and of the cause of truth I informed Dr. T. T. Shields of the same.
7. I fully expected to be present in person at the Convention and state the above facts, but owing to illness I am prevented from doing so and it is because of my illness and the Doctor's prohibition that I am not present to-day in Walmer Road Church. I am suffering from a weak heart. AND I MAKE this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the CANADA EVIDENCE ACT.

(Signed) "W. F. Hayden."

DECLARED before me at the City of Toronto  
in the County of York this 25th day of  
October, A.D. 1922.

"John D. Bissett"

A Commissioner & Notary Public.

### Dr. Farmer Could Not Remember.

After this had been read in my speech at Walmer Road, Dr. Farmer was called upon, and replied that he did not remember. I had no opportunity to question Dr. Farmer at the time, or to make any comment upon his response to Mr. Hayden's affidavit. *I think it is due to the memory of Mr. Hayden, who has since been called home, that I should offer some observations on that matter this evening.*

### Who was Mr. Hayden?

First of all, I must enquire, *Who was this Mr. Hayden?* Mr. Hayden had been a member of the Walmer Road Church for about fifteen years, and until about a year before the Walmer Road Convention, when he left it to return to Jarvis Street where he had been a member for many years before. What was Mr. Hayden's record in Walmer Road Church? Was he a thoughtless, irresponsible man, or one who enjoyed the confidence of those who had known him? The answer to that is, that at the Annual Meeting of the Walmer Road Church of 1921, he was elected to the diaconate of that church after having been earnestly solicited by the Pastor, according to his report to me, to allow his name to stand. And at that same meeting, if I am correctly informed, and the books of the Walmer Road Church will give the facts, Dr. Frank Sanderson, who had for years been a deacon of Walmer Road, and who was again nominated on that occasion, failed of election. *Obviously, therefore, at that time the confidence of the membership of Walmer Road Church in Mr. Hayden was not less than in Dr. Frank Sanderson; for Mr. Hayden was elected at the same meeting which failed to elect Dr. Sanderson.*

### The Relation of Dr. Farmer to Dr. Frank Sanderson.

Who, then, is Dr. Frank Sanderson? and what was his relation to Dr. J. H. Farmer? Both these men were for years deacons of Walmer Road Church. Dr. Sanderson for a long period, I believe about twenty-one years, had been a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University. For a considerable part of that time he had also been Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors of McMaster. Dr. Farmer had been during the whole period, Professor in McMaster, and for much of the time the first and only Dean in Theology in that institution. For ten years of that time a fellow-member of Walmer Road Church, a colleague of Dr. Farmer in the Theological Faculty, Dr. I. G. Matthews, a Professor in the institution of which Dr. Sanderson was a Governor, had been the storm-centre of the Denomination; moreover, the chief critic of that Professor, and the leader in the demand for his removal from the Faculty, was Dr. Elmore Harris—the first Pastor of the church, and the one to whose munificence, in a material sense at least, the church very largely owed its existence. Furthermore, everybody familiar with the history of McMaster must know that Dr. Frank Sanderson was one of the chief defenders of Professor Matthews in the advocacy of his liberal views. Would it not, therefore, appear a very strange thing, in view of all these circumstances, if the Dean in Theology of McMaster University should be unaware of Dr. Frank Sanderson's theological position?

### What About Mr. Hayden's Sworn Statement?

On the other hand, a careful examination of the affidavit made by Mr. Hayden will show that it is the word of a man who had a very vivid recollection of a conversation which had much disturbed him. No one, surely, will say that Mr. Hayden deliberately fabricated his story, nor that it was the result of a vivid imagination.

*In view of all these facts, it is certainly, to say the least of it, extraordinary, that such a stricture, based upon his comment at a prayer-meeting by one sustaining the relationship which Dr. Sanderson sustained toward Dr. Farmer, should so completely have faded from the memory of the Dean in Theology. I am charged with the serious offence of having expressed surprise that Dr. Farmer could not remember. I beg to call attention to the implication of his forgetfulness, as it relates to the sworn testimony of a great and good man, who had been honoured by election to the diaconate of Walmer Road Church.*

### Professor A. L. McCrimmon.

In the next place, paragraph seven charges me with having reflected upon the character and honor of the ex-Chancellor, Professor A. L. McCrimmon. The only word that I have spoken or written about him was my criticism of his conduct of the educational sessions of the Convention at Walmer Road as its presiding officer. I have no doubt that Chancellor McCrimmon in the main is a very amiable gentleman. Some men, even the best of us, I suppose, may have lapses and not play the game always. I criticized what I felt was one of Dr. McCrimmon's lapses.

I ventured in the beginning of the educational discussion at Walmer Road to suggest the propriety of Dr. McCrimmon's retirement from the chair, inasmuch as it was his own department which was under criticism. No candid mind will surely object to that principle; and in this address, when it is printed, I appeal to the men who have had experience, for example, in political life and in commercial enterprises, to say whether, when an institution is under criticism, it is a fair thing that the man who has been responsible for its administration should preside over the court that is to try the case. My suggestion was considered a very serious reflection upon the presiding officer. I have only to say that it ought not to have been necessary for any one to make the suggestion. But I here and now affirm that my suggestion at the beginning was abundantly justified by the President's conduct of the business of the educational session. Any one must have been blind who could not see that a perfectly articulated political machine had been erected, of which the Convention's presiding officer, who ought to have been impartial, and to have known no sides, was appointed the chief engineer. From morning till noon, and from the beginning of the afternoon session to the time I rose to speak, there had never been a suggestion that speeches should be limited. Three or four men had occupied the whole time. But the moment I rose, the President asked for a ruling as to how long I was to be permitted to speak; and in response to his inquiry, one was instantly on his feet to move that my speech be limited to ten minutes. (Laughter.) I did not complain of the Convention's treatment of me, for the delegates forced the hand of the President, and, by vote, accorded me a fair share of the time at the Convention's disposal for my presentation of the case. But I do charge that the President was blind to anyone who stood upon his feet until the appointed members of the political machine had done their work. To show that I am not alone in this, I submit the following statement.

### Letter From Mr. Thomas Urquhart.

This statement is signed by Mr. Thos. Urquhart. Mr. Urquhart, an ex-Mayor of the City of Toronto, must be a man who has enjoyed in large measure the confidence of his fellow-citizens, or he would not have been three times elected Mayor of Toronto. Mr. Urquhart is also a past President of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. He must, therefore, enjoy the confidence of the Baptists of this Convention or they would never have elected him as their presiding officer. He is at this moment a member of and solicitor for the Baptist Home Mission Board for Ontario and Quebec, and has been a member of that Board continuously for twenty-nine years. He is, therefore, a man who has long enjoyed the confidence of his brethren, as he does to this day.

Toronto, Canada, January 23rd, 1924.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,  
Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto.

Dear Dr. Shields:

In reference to your question regarding the conduct of the Educational Session of the Baptist Convention, held at Walmer Road Church in October, 1922, my recollection is that I stated at the time in a brief address from the floor of the Convention that I took exception to the conduct of the meeting as being unfair and I believed then and believe still, that the conduct of the session was planned before hand and that the President of the Convention did not give fair or proper attention to those who desired to speak against the manner in which the affairs of McMaster University had been conducted. I am of the opinion that the meeting was not fairly conducted for the following reasons:

1. The President of the Convention was a Professor in McMaster University, and even though he was President of the Convention I do not think it was the proper thing for him to preside when the affairs of the University of which he had formerly been Chancellor were to be discussed and when his own management might be called in question.
2. Five addresses, occupying two hours, on behalf of the University were given before there was any chance for any real discussion of the report.
3. Several speakers who desired to speak against the report were not noticed by the Chairman, although they were on their feet several times.
4. When demonstrations from the gallery were made in favour of the position taken by Dr. Shields these were condemned by the Chairman, but when like demonstrations were made in favour of the University there was no word of condemnation.

Yours truly,

(Signed) THOS. URQUHART.

Mr. Urquhart is not the only man who observed the operation of a well-oiled political machine, of which the President was the chief engineer, on the occasion of the Walmer Road Convention. Many have assured me who watched the proceedings of that day that the conduct of the educational session evidenced inexcusable partisanship.

### Alleged Withdrawal of Support by Jarvis Street.

In paragraph eight of the Senate's resolution, it is charged against me that I had advised the Jarvis Street Church to withdraw support from McMaster University. Let me here read the letter which was sent by the Church Secretary with a contribution for Christian Education, which will speak for itself:

March 29th, 1923.

Mr. Elvan J. Bengough,  
Treasurer, McMaster University,  
Toronto.

Dear Mr. Bengough:

Please find enclosed a cheque for \$208.72 for Christian Education from Jarvis St. Church.

This amount has come in through the budget during the year; and by instruction of the church at its last Monthly Business Meeting is now forwarded with the explanation that it is not to be regarded as an expression of confidence in McMaster University, but is, rather, merely the result of the fact that many members of the church give weekly to our mission budget, in which, during this church year, Christian Education has been included.

I am instructed also to advise you that by resolution of the Jarvis St. Church, at its Monthly Business Meeting held March 22nd, 1923, "Christian Education" was transferred from the regular mission budget to the list of special offerings to be taken as circumstances may permit, and as the future conduct of our educational work may justify.

The Jarvis St. Church regrets the necessity for this action, but the argument so generally employed by certain representatives of McMaster University, and especially by the Educational Secretary, that increased revenue for Christian Education resulting from the more general adoption of the budget plan by the churches of the Convention, was to be interpreted as an evidence of an increased confidence in the educational institutions on the part of the Denomination, left us no option but to separate Christian Education from the budget which included the popular missionary interests of the Convention, and let it stand apart upon its own merits.

It is desired that this action of Jarvis St. Church be understood as being without prejudice to the cause of Christian Education *per se*, the action being taken in order to place the church in a position where its contributions to this object shall be regulated by the measure in which the quality of work done by McMaster, Woodstock, and Moulton shall command the confidence of the church.

Very sincerely,

(Sgd.) VIOLET STOAKLEY,

Church Secretary.

#### Are Baptist Churches Still Independent?

A church surely has a right to determine how its offerings shall be made. An examination of the letter will show that we are not opposed to Christian Education; that we have not permanently withdrawn support from McMaster University; but have simply put McMaster on a special list in order that it may stand upon its own merits. *I commend this plan to the consideration of all the churches of the Convention.* The fact is, McMaster University has crept in under the wings of our popular mission interests. So far as many of our people are concerned, she is finding passage as a stowaway. I believe it would be to her interests and to the interests of the denomination, to make her pay her fare. I mean by that, to stand upon her own merits; for *were she relieved of some few disabilities—mark! they are few, but they are great disabilities—I am convinced her merits would be sufficient to assure her all needed support from this Convention.* But what if this church determined no longer to support McMaster University? Would that be crime? Since when did independent Baptist churches submit to ecclesiastical control? That is the tendency of the time, that every church is to be measured by the degree in which it conforms to the requirements of some particular institution. *Let McMaster University behave herself, and we will try to beat every church in the Convention in supporting her.* ("Amen!" and loud applause.)

#### The Senate's Statement at Walmer Road.

It is true that I expressed my gratification at the statement both of the Senate and those who were elected to the Board of Governors. Why should I not do so? Both the Senate and the Governors were compelled to make

these statements in order to carry the Convention. At the meeting of the Senate of January 14th, a very ingenious effort was made to make it appear that I had expressed satisfaction from my own pulpit the Sunday following the Walmer Road Convention with the statement made by the Senate and Board; and that later I had advised the church to withdraw support; and further, that I had promised co-operation at Montreal, but now opposed the new regime. To make this point, Dr. Bates quoted from a stenographic report of my utterance from this pulpit the Sunday following the Convention at Walmer Road. But he quoted only a part of what I said. I suppose I ought to feel complimented by having a stenographer in the gallery to keep a record of what I say; but two can play at that game. Practically every word I utter from this pulpit is stenographically reported; and here is what I said Sunday morning, October 29th, 1922, duly reported and filed for this day, which I knew would come sooner or later. (Laughter). On that occasion this church was good enough to present a resolution of confidence, its spokesman being Dr. C. J. Holman; and this is a stenographic report of my reply:

"I had no intention whatever of referring to the experiences of last week this morning, until I was informed just at the beginning of the service that Dr. Holman was to present this matter. All I have to say is, that had I to do the matter over again I would do what I have done. The matter is before the people there for their judgment. The result of the action taken has been to secure an expression, not only from the Board of Governors of McMaster University, but from the whole Convention. Nothing could be clearer than the statement presented; nothing could be clearer than the statement made by the members of the Board of Governors. If that statement had been made before, there would have been no necessity for my protest."

The gentleman who quoted from the stenographic report quoted that, and not what followed. I suppose they did not know I had a report. I asked the Senate, when Dr. Bates quoted from his report, how it was that men were able to rise in the Senate and produce a stenographic report of my utterances. I called attention to this justification of my precaution at the beginning of the meeting, when I asked to have two stenographic reports or none at all.—But to continue the quotation.

"On the other hand, I still am obliged to question in my own mind why such an impression was created on the minds of those who were associated with the Governors in question. Because the brother who had made a statement respecting one of the Governors was unable to be present after the morning session, his statement was secured and presented to the Convention. The only answer given to that statement by the Dean of Theology in McMaster University was, 'I do not remember.' These two brethren were members of the same church; they were deacons of the same church; one of them was Dean in Theology in McMaster University; the other was a Governor of the University. And if such a statement had ever been made one might suppose it would have been remembered. On the other hand, if the attitude, through years of acquaintance of that Governor, were clearly understood to be on the side of the inspiration and authority of God's Word, one might have supposed it would have been the easiest thing in the world to say, 'It would be impossible for that man to make such a statement.' The matter is left to the judgment of the Convention. At all events, we have borne our testimony; and with that our responsibility in the matter ceases."

"The Governors of McMaster University have laid down a platform upon which they will have to stand; and every professor in that University is now duly authorized by mandate of the Convention, as well as the Senate and Board of Governors, to keep that University in strict accord with the things for which this denomination stands. If that is done, we have secured

the only thing we desired to secure: we have no desire to secure a victory over anybody. We simply wanted the University to be true; and it has expressed its determination to be true. Whether it was merely—and one finds it difficult after the years of experience not to feel that there was a desire after all to carry the Convention—to secure the votes of the Convention, it was done; it was done, and in order to do it, it was necessary to make that clear and emphatic statement. What we set out to do was to bring that University into strict accord with the principles for which the Baptist Denomination stands; and before all the world from Governors down, the Convention has declared that is exactly where we stand.

"Well, if that is so, we are happy. That is what we want; and we can only desire that they will live up to that standard.

"I am grateful for the resolution this morning. I frankly say I did not need it. I had not any doubt whatever as to where the people of Jarvis Street stand in this matter."

#### What the Foregoing Statement Implied.

As politely as I could, I publicly said I questioned the sincerity of one at least of the Governors, but that we would endeavour to make them live up to their profession. *The action of the Jarvis Street Church was an attempt to discharge our duty in that respect, by conditioning our further support upon the University's living up to their promises.*

When the new Chancellor was appointed, I said I had grave doubts—I have grave doubts still; but served notice in Montreal that, so far as I was concerned, my support of his regime would be conditioned upon his loyal adherence through all his administration to the official statements of the University's theological position. When the University took the action respecting Dr. Faunce, which has reopened this controversy, I felt that my worst fears had been justified. I feel so still. *But I emphasize the fact that I said nothing of my fears until after the Faunce incident.* This statement will be printed; and when it is published, I ask you to study it, and to see whether what I said from the pulpit following the Walmer Road Convention of 1922; and my action in advising this church to condition its support upon the University's conduct of its affairs; and my speech in Montreal in which I promised the Chancellor my hearty support upon the same conditions, and my warning him in the same speech that united effort on the part of the Denomination would be impossible upon any other terms than loyalty to Baptist standards; and my recent action in protesting against what I believe to be the University's unpardonable affront to all true Baptists, namely, the conferring of a degree upon one who is one of the outstanding champions of theological liberalism in America, or, as I should prefer to call it, theological Bolshevism—I say, *I ask you to study these several actions in their mutual relations when you have the printed statement before you, and see whether any other course than that which I have taken was possible to a man who would be true to his pledged word.* The Educational Secretary is prepared to go up and down the country telling the people that I have not lived up to my pledge made from this pulpit and from the Convention platform in Montreal; for this was Dr. Bates' argument at the Senate meeting. It was evident that there was a concerted effort to make such representation to the Denomination. But, if we receive money enough, I am resolved that a statement of fact shall precede him to all the members of the churches we can reach in Ontario and Quebec, and through other channels, throughout the Continent.

#### Not "Hostile" to McMaster.

I desire now to deal with paragraphs nine to eleven of the Senate's resolution.

Here I am charged with being "disloyal to the Senate itself and hostile to the good work McMaster University it seeking to do." To that I reply that I consider it no part of my duty as an elected representative of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec to put loyalty to the Senate of McMaster University before loyalty to Christ and His truth. ("Amen!"). Nor do I consider that anyone can be truly loyal to an institution which professes a love for truth, who consents to that institution's conferring an honour upon one who dishonours the Word of the Lord, and the Lord of the Word. ("Hallelujah!" and loud applause.)

I deny absolutely that I am hostile to McMaster University. I believe that it is potentially the Denomination's greatest asset, and under proper management would soon become actually so. Nor am I in any sense "hostile" to any "good work McMaster University is seeking to do." *But I am hostile, implacably hostile, to the attempts of a little group in the Senate to so direct the course of McMaster University that by a careful insertion of the Modernist wedge the Denomination will gradually become accustomed to an educational policy which is subversive of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints."*

The Senate further says "that the circumstances hereinbefore recited are but symptoms of a general attitude toward the University, characteristic of Dr. Shields." I desire to inform the little group in the Senate that have so persistently sought to poison the springs of our denominational life that *they are not McMaster University*. I am hostile to their principles. I have no confidence in the sincerity of their professions, nor in the Christian worthiness of their purposes. But I am not hostile to the University as such; and I am resolved to do my full duty in an endeavour to purge the University Senate of those whom I regard as the worst enemies of the Baptist Denomination. (Applause).

#### **"What Concord Hath Christ With Belial?"**

The Senate declares its belief "that the actions and attitude of Dr. Shields make it obviously impossible to co-operate with him longer in any constructive work with any hope of success". If by that they mean that the Senate has so surrendered to the blind pilot who has for years been steering the ship towards the rocks, that they refuse to co-operate with the look-out in the Crow's Nest when he cries "Rocks ahead," our answer is that we shall not hold our peace on that account. If they mean by this resolution publicly to call for my resignation, my answer is, I was elected by the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, and until my term expires next October, I have no intention of resigning ("Amen!" and loud applause), but intend to do my full duty until I hand back to the Denomination the stewardship which I received at its hand.

#### **The Real Issue.**

Thus the whole question in respect to the principle at issue in this particular case resolves itself into this: **WAS DR. FAUNCE WORTHY TO RECEIVE HONOUR OF A UNIVERSITY WHICH PROFFESSES TO GIVE THE LORD JESUS CHRIST IN ALL THINGS THE PRE-EMINENCE AS THE INCARNATE GOD?** ("Never! No! No!") Wait until you hear the evidence.

#### **The Senate's Statement.**

I now beg your further patience as we examine the statement issued by the Senate in justification of its action in conferring an honorary degree upon Dr. Faunce. You will please remember that this statement was prepared and presented by the Honorary Degree Committee. The statement says: "As a



careful study of the list of those who have heretofore received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from McMaster University will reveal, it has never been the understanding of this Senate that the granting of such degree involves the investigation of the intimate theological or political views of proposed recipients." This statement was presented by Mr. Albert Matthews, Chairman of the Board of Governors. In presenting it, Mr. Matthews said that he did not write the statement, and added, in effect, that had he done so he would have used other and stronger terms; that, while he believed that this was a sound policy in relation to ordinary cases, when a man was selected because he was a Baptist and a Baptist leader, he felt that the University ought to concern itself in ascertaining his intimate theological views.

I call attention to the fact that it is exceedingly significant that we have the statement of the Chairman of the Governors himself that he did not prepare the statement of the Committee. There were only four others. The Chancellor had newly come to his position, and would not be so familiar with the former practice of the University as the other three members of the Honorary Degree Committee. It is not difficult to detect by whose hand this statement was prepared.

#### Verbal Vessels of Orthodoxy Used for Anti-Christian Poison.

At the meeting of the Senate, the Chancellor quoted a letter from Dr. Faunce in which he stated that he believed in "the absolute Deity of Jesus Christ". This also is embodied in the statement of the Senate—not as a quotation from the letter; but it is stated that Dr. Faunce believes in "the absolute Deity of Jesus Christ." It is regrettable that the language of Modernists can no longer be accepted at its face value. Any one at all familiar with the theological literature of the day will know that it is the practice of the so-called liberal school to use the very terminology of orthodoxy, while putting into it their own content. As for example: my friend, Dr. Dixon, related to me that in answer to a question Dr. Cornelius Woelfkin emphatically declared he believed in the divine inspiration of Scripture; but later added he also believed in the divine inspiration of his mother's letters! It is necessary, therefore, to enquire whether Dr. Faunce belongs to that school. And in this we must allow Dr. Faunce to speak for himself.

#### The Chancellor's Two Statements.

In the Chancellor's reply to my protest, dated November 24th, and which was published in *The Gospel Witness* of November 29th, he said:

"My impression is that the Honorary Degree Committee made its recommendation to the Senate re President Faunce in good faith, thinking of him as head of the oldest Baptist University, an institution with a wonderful record. Probably the members of the Senate had never read a theological statement by Dr. Faunce. I myself had not seen any of his pamphlets."

That, surely, would be a strange procedure, to confer a degree upon a theological leader without knowing anything of his position! What value could attach to such a degree? But now we have another statement over the Chancellor's signature which says:

"In choosing men for the degree of Doctor of Laws it has always been the habit of our Senate to make careful selection of men belonging to a circle which we should naturally wish to recognize, whose ability, standing and character are such as to mark them as worthy of academic recognition. With this in mind the committee in charge of arrangements for the installation of the new Chancellor on November 20th, believing

that it was highly desirable that the head of an American University should be included among the distinguished educationists selected for recognition, named the President of Brown, both because of the fact that Brown is the oldest University under Baptist control and has a unique history, associated from the earliest days with distinctive principles of religious liberty; and also because of the distinction and standing of its present president as scholar, administrator and leader in the field of education. The committee, therefore, believes that the conferring of this degree has been in harmony with the traditions and principles of McMaster, and in accordance with the high academic standards which in these matters we have always sought to maintain."

#### Dr. Faunce's "Circle."

We are told, then, that Dr. Faunce was "carefully selected," and that he belonged to "a circle" which McMaster would naturally wish to recognize. *I shall now endeavour to show to what "circle" Dr. Faunce belongs, that you may determine whether the Baptist Denomination wishes to recognize such a circle.*

#### McMaster Justifies Dr. Faunce.

In a press despatch from Stratford the day following the meeting of the Senate, Dr. Whidden is reported to have stated that he had received a communication from Dr. Faunce to the effect that it was not necessary for him to make any reply to my charges as *he considered the action of McMaster justified his position.* That, of course, is the effect of the whole argument of members of the Senate on January 14th, and of the statement publicly issued. Every speaker at the Senate meeting supporting the resolution endeavoured to justify Dr. Faunce's position.

*What, then, is Dr. Faunce's position?* I have before me a pamphlet published in June, 1922, entitled, "Charges of teaching False Doctrine are herein brought against the Rev. W. H. P. Faunce, President of Brown University, by the Rev. Charles Hillman Fountain, Plainfield, N.J.," from which I shall now quote. Mr. Fountain, by the way, was graduated from McMaster University in 1905.

### Dr. Faunce's Position

#### CHARGES OF TEACHING FALSE DOCTRINE BROUGHT AGAINST THE REV. WILLIAM H. P. FAUNCE, D.D., PRESIDENT OF BROWN UNIVERSITY, BY THE REV. CHARLES HILLMAN FOUNTAIN.

The quotations given in support of the charges are from his book entitled, "What Does Christianity Mean?" The context in every case is fully considered.

*The charges are as follows:*

1. HE TEACHES THAT CHRISTIANITY WOULD BE TRUE, EVEN IF CHRIST WAS NOT DIVINE, AND DID NOT RISE FROM THE DEAD.

*Proof of this charge is an extract from his book:*

A long argument for the truth of Christianity he throws away by saying: "Even if we were to follow the extremist criticism of the four gospels, and resign all but the nine 'pillar-passages' of Schmiedel, those passages would leave our faith untouched and clear."

Pages 50-53. "Beholding Jesus touching the eyes of the blind men, weeping at the grave of Lazarus, scourging the hypocrites, driving out the money-changers, blessing little children, we see the characteristic quality of God; but we see also what should be characteristic in human life. What Jesus com-

manded, that he himself was. But what he was for thirty-three brief years in a single far-away province, that—as good as that—God must be throughout all ages. Those brief years are as a little rift in the clouds, through which we get a glimpse of the blue firmament beyond. The rift was small and soon was closed again. But we know the sky which overarches all is of the same color and quality as the little patch of blue that was visible. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." The language may stumble in which we try to say it; the cumbersome nomenclature of the historic creeds we may utterly reject, as Saul's heavy armour was rejected by the stripling David. But somehow—say it in whatever phrases you will—the great all-conquering assurance of Christianity is that in quality and temper, in undying sympathy and purpose, what Christ was God is. And then follows that great illumination of life, that vision which, once seen, never departs: the religion of Jesus is nothing more and nothing less than the revealing of the purpose which is eternally in the life of God, and the implanting of that purpose in the minds and lives and laws, and institutions of men.

"When once we accept this insight, a vast sense of relief may well come to a perplexed and burdened church. If this is the centre and core of Christianity, a multitude of other things are relegated to a subordinate position on the circumference. A score of problems regarding the Christian documents are at once seen to be less than central. The documentary theory of the Pentateuch or of the prophecy of Isaiah is indeed interesting and important, but must never be so exalted as to obscure questions lying at the centre of faith and life. Questions of date and place and method of composition of the New Testament books are all of interest. But no vagaries of criticism—and its vagaries at times have been fantastic and astonishing—can hide from us the central quality in the life of Jesus. Even if we were to follow the extremist criticism of the four gospels, and resign all but the nine 'pillar-passages' of Schmiedel, those passages would leave our faith untouched and clear. That faith does not depend on any single passage, not on any manuscript discovered or yet to be discovered, not on any critical theory old or new. It is a faith which is written in all manuscripts, which shines out of every parable, sermon, saying of our Lord, which is woven as a scarlet thread into all the texture of Christ's conviction and utterance. It is a faith in the present Christ-likeness of God, and the future Christ-likeness of perfected human society. Criticism can no more rob us of that than it can render uncertain the light of Arcturus and Orion."

In this passage and elsewhere in his book Pres. Faunce says things that are true, but everything true that he says is vitiated by his statement that "even if we were to follow the extremist criticism of the four gospels, and resign all but the nine 'pillar-passages' of Schmiedel, those passages would leave our faith untouched and clear."

These nine "pillar passages," which Schmiedel says are the only undoubtedly genuine ones in the gospels, are as follows (with an indication of their content):

Mark 3: 21—"they said, He is beside himself."

Mark 10: 18—"Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good?"

Matt. 12: 31, 32—"whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him."

Mark 13: 32—"of that day and that hour knoweth no man . . . neither the Son."

Mat. 27: 46—"my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Mark 8: 12—"there shall no sign be given unto this generation."

Mark 6: 5, 6—"he could there do no mighty work."

Mark 8: 14—21—depicting the stupidity of the disciples. Schmiedel says the feeding of the multitudes is parabolic, not literal.

Matt. 11: 15—Christ's answer to John's doubt. Schmiedel says these miracles are spiritual, not physical.\*

I do not say that these are the only passages in the gospels that Dr. Faunce accepts. They are not. He accepts more than these passages, as his book

shows. He tries to prove that Christianity cannot be destroyed by criticism, which of course is true. But in attempting to prove it he betrays the fact that the Christianity he has in mind or is willing to allow others to cherish, is so void of the supernatural that it can be built up, if necessary, on these few passages. He truly says that that faith does not depend on any single passage, or on any manuscript, or on any critical theory; but it most emphatically depends on more than these nine passages. His teaching is that these passages are sufficient revelation of Christ to establish faith in him. This teaching is tremendously significant. It means that these nine portions of Scripture, which seem to have been selected by Prof. Schmiedel of Zurich with vicious intent as proofs of our Lord's human as against his divine nature, are sufficient to build our Christian faith upon. Dr. Faunce says that if these few passages were our only source of knowledge concerning Christ our faith in him would be "untouched and clear." He says that the whole superstructure of Christianity can be raised upon these few words which emphasize the mere humanity of Christ, and certain aspects of it at that which Schmiedel apparently uses as evidences of his weakness and limitations.

Dr. Faunce's statement that we could reject everything about Christ except what these verses teach, and still have our faith "untouched and clear," means that we could reject Christ with his sinlessness, his deity, his miracles, his resurrection, and still have our Christian faith unimpaired. It means that Christianity is not the gospel of a divine Redeemer, but is merely a system of ethics. It means that a human Christ is sufficient for our faith and the salvation of the world. It means that Christianity is not a revealed religion, that there has been no incarnation of God in Christ. It is Unitarianism pure and simple. Infidelity itself raises no objection to what President Faunce claims for the faith he calls divine. Infidelity itself is perfectly willing to acknowledge such a Christ as he offers, shorn of all redeeming Saviourhood.

In view of this teaching what becomes of the fine things he says about Christianity elsewhere in his book? They are seen to have no value at all because he gives them all up in this concession he makes to infidelity. A man who makes this concession has absolutely no conception of what Christianity really is, or what it means, a matter which Dr. Faunce's book is supposed to discuss. What Christ was God is, he truly says; but we never could know what Christ was from only these nine so-called "pillar-passages."

## II. HIS DOCTRINE OF "CONTINUOUS REVELATION" OBLITERATES THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE UNIQUE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE WRITERS AND THE COMMON INSPIRATION OR ILLUMINATION OF CHRISTIANS TO-DAY.

*Proof of this charge in a portion of his book.*

Pages 71—73. "For one thing, it (the modern conception of God) compels us to believe in the continuous revelation of God. If that vast purpose is now unfolding in the unfolding world, we cannot conceive that all communication of God to men stopped at a certain date near 100 A.D. We cannot believe revelation was confined to one Syrian province, and one happy century. We cannot believe that inspiration ceased with the apostles, or miracles came to an end when some Christian prophet gave up the ghost. To deny that God is now speaking to his world is the first step toward denial that he has ever spoken. Of course a certain race may for pedagogic reasons be chosen as special light-bearers—the Greeks to show us the world of beauty, the Romans to expound the value

\*See The Encyclopedia Biblica, Vol. II, 1881—1883.

of law, the Hebrews to exalt righteousness. Of course a single personality may be chosen for the culminating expression of some truth—as Hosea or Micah or Savonarola. But to say that when the race or the person or the period has vanished, all communication of the divine ceases, and henceforth we can only make commentaries on the past—that is the crowning heresy possible to man. Rather must we believe that the universe is the 'continuous conversation of God with his creatures.'

In reply to this doctrine of "continuous revelation" it may be said that God does indeed speak to us to-day as truly as he did to the prophets and apostles, but not in the same way. Else why are not new Bibles produced? He makes no new revelations to-day. There is no evidence of them among the heathen, who only attain to spiritual conceptions of God through the introduction of the Bible to them, the revelation already made. Missions would be unnecessary if revelation were given apart from them. No book or literature has ever been produced that can even begin to be compared with the Bible. Whatever Pres. Faunce's theories about what God ought to do may be, the fact remains that there is only one Bible, only one revelation.

But God speaks to us through that revelation to-day as truly as ever he spoke in the past. Christ promised us the Comforter, who should take of the things of Christ and show them unto us. And the things of Christ are measureless and glorious, and out of those measureless glories the Comforter ministers unto us in our need and ignorance. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches," is the exhortation of Christ in the Book of Revelation. During Christ's life on earth the Father commanded men to hear the Son. Now during his ministry in heaven the Son commands them to hear the Spirit. He promised to be with us 'till the end of the age, and being with us by his Spirit he communicates with us. Just how to distinguish the Spirit's operation in revealing truth to the prophets and apostles from his operation in the general inspiration or illumination of believers to-day, we may not know; but that there is a radical difference between the two operations all history and personal experience testify. There is no "continuous revelation," but there is continuous guidance and fellowship on the part of God with men. Dr. Faunce's doctrine is a denial of the inspiration of the Bible, because he puts it on a level with literature produced since the Bible was written. There was a radical difference also between the mission of the Hebrews and that of the Greeks and Romans, which Dr. Faunce seeks to erase in his universal levelling process.

### III. HE DENIES THAT GOD HAS EVER INTERVENED, OR MADE ANY 'REAL REVELATION OF HIMSELF IN HISTORY.

#### *Proof of this charge.*

Pages 73—74. "The older orthodoxy, like the older rationalism, put God at a distance. Paley's world was like a watch once wound up, now left to run down except when the maker interfered. It is precisely that interference which has now become incredible. We cannot grant that the creation was so bungled and misshapen as to need any belated interference. We cannot believe in a *Deus ex machina*, or a God who comes and goes, coming in at emergencies like a policeman or a fire patrol. We cannot believe that he appeared once at the creation of the world and again at the dawn of life on the planet, and again intruded into the cosmic order to establish consciousness or to create man. For us he is everywhere or nowhere. His action indeed is not like that of gravitation, always the same because always blind. It may vary vastly from century to century and land to land. But the unchanging purpose behind all the variation is ever present—'Raise thou the stone and there am I.'"

Pres. Faunce says we cannot grant that the creation was "so bungled and misshapen as to need any belated interference." But the creation was and is

"so bungled and misshapen" by sin as to need the "interference" or intervention of God in Christ. The damage wrought by sin was the cause of the incarnation. But the incarnation was not a "belated" intervention; it was conceived in the mind of God before the foundation of the world. There can be no redemption without God's intervention. John 3:16 is the statement of this intervention.

We must believe that God "appeared once at the creation of the world," because matter is not eternal, and needed a Creator. We must believe that he appeared again "at the dawn of life on the planet," because life cannot come from the non-living, and must have been communicated by God. We must believe that he "intruded again into the cosmic order to establish consciousness or to create man," because the qualities that distinguish man from the brute could not have been derived from the brute, but must have been imparted by God.

The fact that God is "everywhere" does not obviate the necessity of special exercises of his power for special purposes, called miracles.

#### IV. HE DENIES THE RETURN OF CHRIST TO THE WORLD.

##### *Proof of this charge.*

Pages 217—219. "Jesus adopted in his teaching considerable of the apocalyptic dress that was used by his nation. He clothed his thought in that oriental garb as he clothed his body in tunic and turban. We can cast aside the imagery of the 'twelve thrones,' and 'coming in the clouds of heaven,' and the 'great sound of a trumpet,' as we cast aside other garments now antiquated. But the essential fact of a common Kingdom of God to be established in the life of humanity,—if we cast that aside there is no Christianity left. Nearly every one of Christ's parables begins: 'The Kingdom of Heaven is like . . . . In the centre of the Lord's Prayer is the petition for the Kingdom. In the centre of the Lord's life is deathless determination to erect that Kingdom on the earth. What he has in mind is a union of all souls that are in union with God, a world-order in which the will of God shall be reproduced in all human lives. To establish that Kingdom in east and west and north and south, in trade and industry, in philanthropy and education and government and religion, in home and school and church, among all nations and all races—all that, whether fully anticipated or not, is now seen to be involved in the great overmastering vision of Jesus of Nazareth."

All this sounds very fine, and is well calculated to lead one who is not well taught in the Scriptures to believe that Dr. Faunce is sound at heart, and holds to the real substance of the doctrine of the Second Coming, even though he may cast aside what he calls the particular Oriental form in which it is presented in the Bible. But the thoughtful student will consider that if the return from heaven is not literal, neither was the ascension into heaven literal. If a literal advent is impossible, a literal ascension likewise is impossible. Admit that our Lord literally ascended to the right hand of the Father, and you must admit that he can literally return from there. Moreover, the denial of this advent is the denial of his resurrection. He predicted that he would rise from the dead, and he predicted that he would come again. The first prediction was literally fulfilled; the second likewise, spoken by the same divine Lord, will be literally fulfilled. He who could predict his resurrection could predict his second advent. But if he could not predict his second advent, neither could he predict his resurrection, and Christianity is gone, and hope for the salvation of the world is destroyed. If Dr. Faunce would spiritualize, or allegorize, or vaporize the second coming, he must likewise spiritualize, or allegorize, or vaporize the resurrection of our Lord. His teaching, clothed as it seems to be in the garb of truth and apparently anointed with the unction of piety, is the repudiation of the foundations of Christian belief, not

only in regard to the triumph of the kingdom in the future, but in regard to the divine Person and work of our Lord and his inspired Word.

The question naturally arises, is a man who teaches these destructive views of the Christian religion fitted to be at the head of a Christian college? For Brown is a Christian college in the sense that Christians are responsible for the influence that goes forth from it. The charter requires that a majority of the two governing boards, the Fellows and the Trustees, shall be Baptists. This being the case, why is Dr. Faunce continued as president? It is the duty of the Trustees and the Fellows to remove him from office and replace him with a man who is loyal to Christ and the Bible. One would think that his sense of honor would have led him to resign long ago and leave the denomination, and join the Unitarians or some like body.

To this end, these charges are being mailed to the Trustees and Fellows. As Baptists, claiming to submit to the authority of the Word of God, they are in honor bound to terminate Dr. Faunce's administration. The fact of his apostasy from the faith is demonstrated by evidence in black and white that cannot be disputed. If the governing bodies of Brown do not remove him, they are not worthy, and the college is not worthy, of the confidence of Christian people. The school under his influence can be nothing but a menace to the Church and the nation, and these charges are made that the college may be Christian, not in name only, but in fact also.

(This ends the quotation from Mr. Fountain.)

#### Dr. Frank Sanderson Defends Dr. Faunce.

In the Senate meeting of January 14th, Dr. Frank Sanderson read extracts from "The Educational Ideal in the Ministry," by Dr. Faunce, in an effort to establish Dr. Faunce's orthodoxy. In reply to my question, Dr. Sanderson said that the book was published in 1908. Men travel a long way, theologically, nowadays in fifteen years; and I prefer to judge Dr. Faunce by a more recent utterance.

#### Dr. Faunce as a Baptist (?)

Dr. Faunce contributed a series of articles to "The World's Work" last summer, entitled, "What are the Fundamentals?" These articles have since been issued in booklet form, and are almost the last word on what Dr. Faunce has to say on the fundamentals. Dr. Faunce was selected by McMaster University because he was a Baptist; and I quote the second paragraph of this booklet:

"The question is this: Is American Christianity strong enough to include, as does the Bible, various types of personality and various modes of thinking, or is it a one-track affair which excludes all minds that do not run in a single groove? Is the American church to be broad and deep enough to guide the conscience of a hundred million people, or is it to be a group of petty sects, controlled by literalists, excluding all germinating ideas and forward-looking minds?"

What does Dr. Faunce mean by "American Christianity"? What does this Baptist leader mean by the "American church"?

#### Dr. Faunce as an Educator.

Dr. Faunce was selected as a "leader in the field of education." Let us hear what he has to say on that subject: (Our comments here are within parentheses.)

In some colleges the control of teaching has been taken out of the hands of trustees and faculty, and lodged in an annual mass meeting. But it is precisely the mass which needs to be educated, and so is disqualified

to direct education. (Dr. Shields: That would put an end to the election of school trustees. It aims at the very foundation of democracy.) In other colleges the teachers are cowed and silent because of the attacks of local publications which demand that all teachers repeat the shibboleths of a former generation or retire. The failure of the Kentucky legislature by a single vote to pass a law banishing modern science from the schools of that state, and the presentation of a similar bill in the legislature of Minnesota, show how fast and how far has gone the propaganda in favor of the world view held in the Sixteenth Century. (Dr. Shields: Dr. Faunce says that a measure was introduced in the Kentucky legislature and a similar one in the Minnesota legislature to banish "modern science" from the school. And he knows, if he knows anything, that is absolutely untrue. It was to banish the teaching of evolution as a religious philosophy, based on the ground that the school is a State institution, and, as such, has no right to teach religion; and that if the Bible was to be excluded from the public schools, then those text-books which aim to undermine men's faith in the Bible should also be excluded. But this man identifies modern "science" with his pet theory of evolution.) Political freedom has been achieved by whole nations and races since 1914. But freedom of teaching, liberty to declare the facts of history and biology and anthropology, as they are known to the foremost scholars in each department, is now threatened in the name of the religion which declares: "The truth shall make you free."

The college which surrenders to the control of the mass meeting not only is unworthy of the confidence of the public, but utterly fails to prepare its students to face the realities of life. (Dr. Shields: What is the use of electing Governors for McMaster University? The college that surrenders its control to the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, I suppose, is unworthy of anybody's confidence. We had better hand it over to the control of the Honorary Degree Committee. (Laughter). Sooner or later those students must meet the facts—in the popular pages of Wells and Van Loon, (Dr. Shields: And who but Dr. Faunce would ever think of going to H. G. Wells or Van Loon for "facts"?)—(Laughter.) if not in the authoritative volumes of Thomson and Bateson and Osborne. (Dr. Shields: If you want to know about Osborne's authority, read McCa's book, "God or Gorilla." He shows that Professor Osborne is one of the greatest charlatans ever known. Genesis says that woman was made from a rib, but Professor Osborne has made the "Piltdown" man from less than that.) A college which should still teach the science of ancient Israel might fittingly call to its chair of astronomy "Uncle Jasper," or make Dowie and Voliva professors of geology and history.

The colleges, however, will not permanently yield to obscurantism and reaction. Their roots are deep in American principle, and all of them are striving to be true to the ideal embodied in 1764 in the charter of Brown University: "Into this liberal and catholic institution shall never be admitted any religious tests, but, on the contrary, all the members hereof shall forever enjoy full, free, absolute, and uninterrupted liberty of conscience." It is the churches, necessarily local in constituency, without endowment, served by rapidly changing preachers, affected instantly by popular demand, that most clearly face a crisis." (Dr. Shields: But as for the colleges, they are secure; they are endowed; they will snap their fingers at the multitude and dare them to interfere. I am not at all surprised that our good friend, Dr. Frank Sanderson, should want to honour a man who holds such views as that. And mark this, if McMaster selected Dr. Faunce as representative of "a circle they would naturally wish to honour," and if Dr. Faunce's ideals of education are the ideals which McMaster espouses, it is the mightiest possible argument against a further endowment of McMaster University! The longer I live the more profoundly I am convinced that the only safe thing for an educational institution dedicated to "Christian education," is to make it dependent upon the good will of the body it is appointed to serve. Once give a college its portion of goods, and it will straightway take its journey into a far country.—(Laughter and applause.)

Every boy or girl attending a high school north of Mason and Dixon's line is now being taught some form of the doctrine of evolution. The



competent teachers of America and Europe are practically agreed that the physical world as we see it is a growth from simpler forms into more complex, and that so far as man is physical—of course he is vastly more!—he, too, is the result of growth from the simplest forms of life to the brain of an Aristotle and the heart of a Florence Nightingale. (The italics are ours).

Dr. Shields: Do the Baptists of this Denomination want to honor a man who holds that view? ("No! No!"). I say it again and again, Dr. Faunce may boast of such a pedigree if he will. I absolutely reject it. There are no apes in my family. (Applause). And ladies and gentlemen, if that be true, the fifth chapter of Romans is all wrong. It is not true that, "as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." The atonement is unnecessary; the Incarnation is an impossibility. That position is a denial of every single fundamental of the Christian faith. And this is the man upon whom McMaster has put its imprimatur! But I am not surprised. I asked a graduate of McMaster University, putting that statement before that graduate this evening. "Is that what is taught by the Professor of Biology in McMaster University?" and that graduate said, most emphatically, "Yes." Our boys and girls are being taught that they have come from protoplasm and amoeba up through innumerable ages until at last they acquired their human form. I hold that no man can accept that view without throwing the Bible as the Word of God aside. And if the day should ever come, when this Denomination shall say, "That is where we really stand," I am sure there will be found thousands of Baptists who will say, "If that is so, we do not belong to that class of Baptists." (Applause.)

#### Dr. Faunce as a Theologian.

But let me quote again from Dr. Faunce's "What are the Fundamentals?":

"But the literalists, curiously enough, reject the theory (evolution) which so easily lends itself to spiritual interpretation and insist that the Creator did not grow things but made them by fiat. As if creation in a moment were more divine than creation by the increments of a million years."

And Dr. Faunce must know that Fundamentalists and orthodox Baptists never said it was "more divine." Nobody questions that God could have made this universe by gradual processes through millions of years if He had so willed. The question is, What does God say? We do not say that direct creation is "more divine"; but we do say that that theory cannot be squared with the Bible as the Word of God. And McMaster University professes to stand for the inspiration and authority of Scripture; and at the Walmer Road Convention submitted a statement to that effect, which Dr. Frank Sanderson, a member of the Honorary Degree Committee said he put into the report himself; and then that Committee puts the laurel crown upon the brow of a man who does not believe anything of the kind! Is that consistency? ("No!")

To quote further:

"Then to protect Christianity from modern thought and thinkers they have announced a new set of 'fundamentals,' among which they enumerate the Virgin birth, the Deity of Christ and a substitutionary atonement, the inerrancy of the scriptures in science and history as well as in religion, and the imminent physical return of the Lord on the literal clouds in the sky. The question as to the nature of Christ and his death is not directly related to the teaching of science and need not be discussed here. But science and religion do come into touch the moment men affirm that the church must believe in a scientifically inerrant Bible, in the Virgin birth, and in an imminent physical catastrophe which shall wind

up all human history. To the first Apostles of the Christian faith such things were never the fundamentals of Christianity. The writers of the New Testament never ascribe inerrancy to the Old Testament but, on the contrary, often pronounce its teaching defective and preparatory to something better. The Virgin birth, which is related with noble reticence and reverence in two New Testament passages and which has for centuries been accepted by the great majority of the church, is not mentioned in any of the New Testament epistles or in any of the apostolic sermons recorded in the Book of Acts. It apparently formed no part of the preaching of the twelve apostles or the seventy disciples. If that miracle was not considered fundamental in the days of the apostles, can it be made so to-day? But the Fundamentalists affirm that belief in a miraculous inerrant Bible, in a physiological miracle in Bethlehem, and a physical miracle soon to occur in the sky, that these beliefs are the fundamental things in Christianity—which is not only a transformation of the early faith, but a palpable inversion of moral values."

Observe Dr. Faunce says that the Fundamentalists have announced "a new set of 'fundamentals' to protect Christianity from modern thought and thinkers." Well, if Dr. Faunce is a scholar—and I presume he is—I have come to the conclusion that logic is no part of a scholar's equipment. "To protect Christianity from modern thought and thinkers they have announced a new set of 'fundamentals.'" What are the "new set of 'fundamentals'?" Here they are: "Among which they enumerate the Virgin birth, the Deity of Christ and a substitutionary atonement, the inerrancy of the scriptures in science and history as well as in religion, and the imminent physical return of the Lord on the literal clouds in the sky." This is the new set of "fundamentals." There may be more; but these he has enumerated.

"The question as to the nature of Christ and His death is not directly related to the teaching of science." Is it not? Dr. Fosdick says that the Virgin Birth involved a biological miracle that is unthinkable to the modern mind. Ah, it is precisely there the battle is joined: it is because a certain standard of science so-called is set up, and because the revealed truths of the Christian religion do not conform to this science falsely so-called, that objection is taken. Dr. Faunce dismisses the difficult problem, for instance, of how a child born out of wedlock—because that must have been the case, if the record of His Virgin birth is not true—in that distant day emerged from an unknown family and a despised race, and changed the course of all human history, and fills the world's horizon still—I say that fact is an everlasting denial of the doctrine of evolution. The nature of Christ is related to the question of science, Dr. Faunce to the contrary, notwithstanding.

I shall not argue the question of the Virgin birth, or the Deity of Christ, or the substitutionary atonement, or the inerrancy of the Scriptures, or the literal return of the Lord. It is enough to say that the Baptists who compose this Convention profess to believe all these things.

What is the sum of Dr. Faunce's position? He holds evolution to be "as firmly established among scholars as the law of gravitation." The principle of evolution is to him a standard of interpretation more authoritative than the Bible itself—the Bible and everything else, indeed, must be interpreted in the light of evolution. He describes the "amazing" growth of Fundamentalism as "this recrudescence of medieval despair." He pours contempt upon theological conservatism as attempting "to protect Christianity from modern thought and thinkers"; and declares that to insist upon the Virgin birth, the Deity of Christ, the substitutionary atonement, the inerrancy of the scriptures, and the personal return of the Lord, is to "set up a new set of 'funda-

mentals.' " I wish I could lecture to you daily for a month to show you what Baptists have believed respecting these things, and still more, what the Scriptures teach.

But, surely, Dr. Faunce's position is made quite clear by his own words.

### The Impression on the Outside World.

What impression has McMaster's action made on the outside world?

A writer in the Toronto Star in an article entitled, "A Frank Appeal to Militant Fundamentalists," says:

"The clear-cut repudiation and defiance of an intolerant fundamentalism by the Senate of McMaster University, the vindication of Dr. Fosdick from the charge of heresy by the committee of investigation appointed by the Presbyterian General Assembly, the dropping of the prosecution against Rev. Lee W. Heaton, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church, Fort Worth, Texas, have a very clear significance."

Manifestly, in the thought of the public at large, *the action of McMaster University is just as much an endorsement of Dr. Faunce's position as the action of the Presbyterian Committee respecting Dr. Fosdick.* Beyond all question, that is what some members of the Honorary Degree Committee intended McMaster's action should accomplish. It is a matter of record that Dr. Faunce preached the induction sermon of a Unitarian minister who left the Baptist Denomination to become a Unitarian—a man who had formerly been Assistant Pastor of the Fifth Ave. Baptist Church, which is now the Park Ave. Baptist Church, N.Y.

By the Constitution of the Convention in its relation to the University, *such a pronouncement made by the University must be regarded as the latest statement of the Convention's Educational policy in its attitude toward Modernism. It stands before the whole world as having publicly endorsed one of the most extreme modernists of America. I call upon every Baptist church member and upon every Baptist church who believes the Bible to be the Word of God and Jesus Christ to be the Incarnate Saviour, for the honour of the Denomination, but more especially for the honour of our Lord, to repudiate the Senate's action.*

### What Will be the Denomination's Decision?

I come now to ask, *What will the decision of this Denomination be? Is it prepared to nullify all its declarations of allegiance to the faith once for all delivered to the saints by acquiescing in the action of the Senate of McMaster University? Will it continue men in office who are evidently resolved to use the denomination's resources to honour men holding such Unitarian views as are held by Dr. Faunce? Who are the men chiefly responsible? The Honorary Degree Committee, beyond doubt; and the only way by which any one of them can escape the odium of having endorsed Dr. Faunce's position is by openly repudiating it, or by resigning his position. Members of the Senate, who, after their attention had been called to Dr. Faunce's position, voted in support of the Senate's action, cannot be excused from complicity in this betrayal of the denomination's interests; for they ratified the action of the Degree Committee, and then defended it.*

### The Responsibility of the Chiefs.

When the former Chancellor, Dr. A. L. McCrimmon, resigned, a Committee was appointed to nominate a nominating committee. Following the committee's appointment, I spoke with an influential member of the committee appointed

to nominate a nominating committee to select a new Chancellor. In my conversation I pointed out that the difficulty under which loyal Baptists in this Convention had laboured in respect to McMaster University was that we had never received any help from the inside. When I say that we received no help from the inside, I do not mean that none of the professors of McMaster University were true. Many of them are true, and as noble men as can be found anywhere. But where there is an organization the men appointed as chiefs must lead. The men responsible for the University management are, the Chancellor, over the whole institution; the Dean in Arts over the Arts Department; the Dean in Theology, over the Theological Department.

One may have a small fire in his home—a table-cloth or a lace curtain may be set on fire; but if one is present in the room, the burning material may be folded together, and the fire smothered, so as not to disturb even the rest of the household. But if such a fire takes place, and there is no one within to extinguish it, and a blaze is observed from without, the fire alarm is turned in, the fire brigade is called to the scene, and the whole neighborhood is aroused. I pointed out to this gentleman that if a strong man were selected for the Chancellorship, our difficulties would largely be solved. For then, if any professor were to teach that which is contrary to Baptist standards, the evil would be corrected from within, and the peace of the denomination would not be disturbed. On the other hand, if a man of compromise were appointed who had not the courage to face and correct such tendencies, it would then become necessary for someone from without to call attention to the fire. And I expressed the hope that an effort would be made to secure the appointment of a strong man for the Chancellorship, who would restore peace to the denomination, and make it possible for all true Baptists with a clear conscience to co-operate in the work of the institution.

That which I feared has come to pass. What has marked the beginning of the new Chancellor's regime? In connection with his installation as Chancellor of McMaster University, a degree is conferred upon one of the outstanding champions of Modernism in America. *If the Denomination acquiesces in the Senate's action in this matter, it will be construed as a license to proceed further.* One of my friends suggested that it would be charitable to give the Chancellor a chance to prove himself. He has already shown in what direction his sympathies lie, and is one of the chief defenders of the Senate's action in conferring an honorary degree upon Dr. Faunce.

### What Can Loyal Baptists Do?

What can loyal Baptists do in the circumstances? I suggest that every church that disapproves of McMaster's action should formally say so by resolution of the body. There are good men on the Faculty; but I openly declare to all the world that I have no confidence in the governing body of McMaster University. There are some excellent men on the Senate, but apparently they cannot stand against the aggressive group of Modernists. I will not willingly entrust them with another dollar; and I will exert myself to the utmost to cut off all supplies from the Institution, so long as these men are in control. I know that such an attitude is beset with many difficulties. When it becomes a military necessity to lay siege to a city, that action is likely to fall heavily upon many whom it were desirable to spare; but the only way to bring it to submission is to make the isolation of the city complete, even by cutting off supplies of food and water. And I believe this church will stand with me to a

man when I say that we will not contribute another dollar to McMaster University while the governing bodies are constituted as they are to-day; and that we will exert ourselves to the utmost to effect the removal of those men who have disgraced and compromised the whole denomination by the University's action in respect to Dr. Faunce.

### What Will the Ministers Do?

It is time that the ministers of the denomination should speak out. How long will Baptist pastors, who are themselves true to the faith, permit this unscrupulous group to ride rough-shod over them? I appeal to pastors everywhere to come out boldly and declare themselves. You need not fear the denominational machine. They cannot kill you. If they had the power, I should have been gone long ago. It is necessary that those who are true to the faith in the denomination should get together and organize an effective opposition to this thing which threatens to destroy us. We shall have to be firm; we may have to be severe.

I will venture to cite our own experience as a church, to the glory of God. God has raised up in this place a band of people to whom, in some measure, He has given the spirit of prayer; and in answer to our prayer God has been pleased to purge this church from those elements which made spiritual blessing impossible. He has brought to us the atmosphere of the heavenly places. Our spiritual ears have heard a sound from heaven as of a mighty rushing wind. ("Amen!"). Conversions are practically a daily occurrence. God is adding to the church daily such as are being saved. By the same power such change as is needed in McMaster can be accomplished. Let us resolve to put Christ first, and never to give up until the government of McMaster is put into the hands of Christ.

### Three Things.

We must do three things: McMaster University is facing a financial crisis. They have wasted three precious years discussing the question of removal to Hamilton, which, upon any terms which the Denomination could accept, was an impossibility from the beginning. In less than a year and a half it will reach the end of its Forward Movement allowance; and its annual revenue will shrink by about eighteen thousand dollars. It is urgently in need, in addition to this, of another twenty or twenty-one thousand dollars per year to carry on its work without any enlargement, if it is to pay its professors adequate salaries. Under the present management, and with the present Chancellor as leader—I say it with regret; but after this exhibition of his spirit of compromise, under the present management, and with the present Chancellor as leader, it appears to me that there is nothing but utter disaster before her. At the end of twelve months, the University will be compelled to come to the Denomination to ask for more money. It must be the business of all those in the denomination who disapprove of the University's present policy, so to organize true Baptists of the denomination, that they will say, "Not a dollar will we give you while the governing bodies are made up of the men who are now in control." If the churches throughout the denomination who are in opposition to McMaster's flagrant betrayal of her trust will immediately cut off McMaster from their budget, and condition their support upon McMaster's being true to Baptist standards—I do not mean to stop supporting it, but say, We will support you; we will put our heart into it; we will give you our money, if you will be true; but

until you give us unmistakable proof that you are going to be true, we will not give you another dollar. That is what we have got to do. ("Hear!" "Hear!" and applause). I say, if that were done between now and the next Convention we can make such a demonstration as may compel a surrender within six months. But whether it takes six months, or six years, or the rest of my life, I pledge myself to devote my utmost energy to the task of purging the governing bodies of McMaster of those elements which have too long blighted our denominational life.

I come here this evening to ask you, not in any spirit of cant at all, to gather here to-morrow to invoke the power of God in this matter. I know that some of the papers have laughed at the idea of following a discussion of this sort by a prayer-meeting. But in this place we have had people sneer at the prayer-meeting group before, and we have seen God come in here and cleanse this church, and pour blessing upon it as a result. (Applause). What He has done, He can do again.

Our mightiest weapon is prayer. I have nothing against these men as men. There is nothing personal in this controversy, so far as I am concerned. I have hardly exchanged a hundred words, I suppose, with the new Chancellor. I have no quarrel with any of them personally; but I have a quarrel with the principles for which they stand. Some of them are the unconscious tools of those principalities and powers against which the saints of God must always wrestle. And I call upon you, my dear friends, you who are Baptists, that we should dedicate ourselves anew to the task of exalting the Lord Jesus Christ, to put the crown upon His brow, and the sceptre in His hand, and to tolerate nothing that will detract from His honour, or that will question His essential Deity, His absolute infallibility, or the doctrine of His Saviourhood. Let us consecrate ourselves again to that task. Let us prove by our own experience that there is a living God Who can answer prayer. Let us seek to shake this City by a demonstration of the supernatural in which we believe, and commit our trust to Him absolutely, Who triumphantly said: "And upon this Rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." ("Amen!" "Hallelujah!" Applause).

---

### ATTENTION !

For the information of Baptists throughout the Convention we publish herewith the statement of Trusts in the Deed of McMaster, and in the Deed of Jarvis Street Regular Baptist Church. The McMaster Deed expressly states that it is established for the training of certain persons "connected with the Regular Baptist Denomination whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches exclusively composed of persons" holding and maintaining certain doctrines, which are thereafter specifically stated. The Jarvis Street Church Deed also clearly sets forth the doctrinal standards of a "Regular Baptist Church." Jarvis Street Church is still a "Regular Baptist Church." We ask our readers to consider whether any body of men who support Dr. Faunce in his theological position can, by any fair interpretation of language, be called "Regular" Baptists? The time may come when this issue will have to be faced. We ask our Baptist readers to be prepared.

### STATEMENT OF TRUSTS IN DEED OF McMASTER UNIVERSITY.

Toronto Baptist College was incorporated by an act of the Ontario Legislature on the Fourth day of March, 1881 (44 Victoria, Chap. 87), by

which power was given a Board of Trustees to organize and carry on a Theological College for the training of students for the Regular Baptist denomination and by an amending Act assented to Thirtieth March, 1885 (48 Victoria, Chap. 96), it was provided that the Conventions of the Denomination should be represented on the Senate of the College, with a view to securing a more direct voice in the management of the College.

By an Act of the said Legislature assented to on the Twenty-third day of April, 1887 (50 Victoria, Chap. 95), Toronto Baptist College and Woodstock College were united under the name of McMaster University and it was provided in said Act that "McMaster University shall be a Christian School of Learning, and the study of the Bible, or sacred scriptures, shall form a part of the course of study taught by the professors, tutors, or masters appointed by the board of governors."

It was further enacted that "Nothing in this Act contained shall be deemed to authorize the use of the lands and premises conveyed to the trustees of the Toronto Baptist College by the Honorable William McMaster, by deed bearing date the first day of December, 1880, for any other purposes than those set out in the said deed, or to otherwise alter or affect the trusts in said deed contained, otherwise than by vesting the rights and powers of the said trustees in the university hereby created."

The trusts in said deed in so far as they refer to Religious teaching are as follows: "For the education and training of students preparing for and intending to be engaged in Pastoral, Evangelical, missionary or other denominational work in connection with the Regular Baptist Denomination whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches exclusively composed of persons who have been baptized on a personal profession of their Faith in Christ holding and maintaining substantially the following doctrines, that is to say: "The Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice, the existence of one living and true God, sustaining the personal relation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the same in essence and equal attributes, the total and universal depravity of mankind, the election and effectual calling of all God's people, the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ, the free justification of believers in Him by His imputed righteousness, the preservation unto eternal life of the Saints, the necessity and efficacy of the influence of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, the resurrection of the dead, both just and unjust, the general judgment, the everlasting happiness of the righteous and the everlasting misery of the wicked, immersion in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the only gospel baptism, that parties so baptized are alone entitled to Communion at the Lord's Table and that a Gospel Church is a body of baptized believers voluntarily associated together for the service of God."

## STATEMENT OF FAITH

Set Out in the Trust Deed of the Historic Jarvis Street Regular Baptist Church  
of Toronto.

Organized 1829. Present Building Erected 1875.

*The property was conveyed by Deed dated the 30th January, 1874, "To the Trustees of the Jarvis Street Regular Baptist Church of Toronto," upon the trust that the same shall be held . . . .*

"for the use of the members of a Regular Baptist Church, exclusively composed of persons who have been baptized by immersion, on a personal profession of their Faith in Christ; and which Church shall hold and maintain the following doctrines, that is to say: The Divine inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and their absolute sufficiency as the

only authorized guide in matters of religion; The existence of one Living and True God—sustaining the personal relation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the same in Essence and equal in attributes, the total and universal depravity of mankind, the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ; the free justification of believers in Him by His imputed righteousness, the election and effectual calling of all God's true people; the final perseverance of the Saints; the necessity and efficacy of the influence of the Spirit in conversion and sanctification; the supreme and Sole authority of Christ in the Church; the resurrection of the Dead both just and unjust, the General Judgment; The everlasting happiness of the righteous and the everlasting misery of the wicked; Immersion in Water in the name of the Trinity the only Gospel Baptism; That parties so baptized are alone entitled to communion at the Lord's Table; and that a Gospel church is a body of baptized believers, voluntarily associated together to maintain the Worship of God, acknowledging no head but Christ and no authority but His Word."

---

---

## All Baptists

are invited to help to circulate  
this address on

**"McMASTER'S APPROVAL  
OF DR. FAUNCE'S  
INFIDELITY"**

by sending us lists of names of  
bona fide Baptists to whom  
we will mail a copy.

—  
All lists must be accompanied  
by the name and address and  
church connection of the  
sender.

—  
Also by sending us such con-  
tribution as you are able to  
send.

---

---

---

---

## The Gospel Witness

Contains a stenographically  
reported

**Sermon by Dr. Shields**

in every issue.

The subscription price is  
\$2.00 a year. The sermons are  
read by hundreds of ministers  
every week in Canada, the  
United States, Great Britain,  
India, China, The Antipodes.

Our subscription list is grow-  
ing at a marvellous rate. We  
want yours. Address The  
Gospel Witness, 130 Gerrard  
Street East, Toronto.

---

---