

THE DENOMINATIONAL PRESS ON THE NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

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 East, Toronto.

Vol. 4

TORONTO, AUGUST 6, 1925

No. 13

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"SIGNS OF THE TIMES IN THE RELIGIOUS WORLD"

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, August 2nd, 1925
(Stenographically reported).

"I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me. Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he."—John 13: 18, 19.



SPEAK not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me"—now observe this principle—"Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass"—what does He say? He has predicted His own betrayal; and He has told them that His own betrayal will be a fulfilment of Scripture—"Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass"—ye may be filled with consternation? No! that when this dark prophecy is fulfilled—"when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he." What a strange saying that is! Let me give you a verse of the lesson we read this evening; "Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness."

There are people who seem to imagine that the prophecies of Scripture are given us to make us wiser than our fellows in respect to the future, as though the Lord had taken us specially into His confidence so that we may know what is to come to pass in the ages beyond. But these scriptures describe the purpose of prophecy: it is given to us for the nourishment of our faith, for the confirmation of our trust in the hour of its fulfilment. I believe there are many prophecies in Scripture, both in the Old and New Testaments, which no mortal man has ever yet understood, that is, in respect to their ultimate significance. Peter tells us that the prophets of the Old Testament enquired and searched diligently, "searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto

you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven". That absolutely destroys the theory that the writers and not the writings were inspired. These writers of the Old Testament were inspired to such a degree that they actually could not understand the things they themselves had written. The Spirit that was in them spoke of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. And when they had written they searched, they enquired diligently, trying to understand their own writings; and all they learned was this: that they were ministering to another age; and it was revealed to them that it was not unto themselves "but unto us they did minister"—what?—"the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven."

A brother came into our prayer meeting a few months ago, and told us exactly what something in the book of Revelation meant. He was absolutely sure that his interpretation was the one and only possible interpretation. At the close of the service I took him aside quietly, and said, "My brother, I am inclined to think that you know too much to be comfortable with us." "Well," he said, "that is absolutely the only interpretation of that passage." To which I replied, "That is exactly what I say, you know too much. We do not know as much as that here. We know it is the Word of God; we know that there are great principles that have a present-day application. But I can find you one thousand other people who also have the one and only interpretation of that Scripture, and they do not agree with you a bit."

I think, dear friends, that we get into a great deal of trouble—make trouble for ourselves and for other people—when we try to project ourselves into the future, and to elaborate a detailed programme of all that God is going to do. Broad and general principles are there; but the purpose of prophecy, ultimately, is that when we are passing through the terrible times predicted, we shall hear the Spirit of God saying, "I told you so." And in the light of the fulfilment of these scriptures we shall be established in the truth, and believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the Saviour of the world.

This prophecy related to a very dark event, even the betrayal of Christ. And yet He says the very fulfilment of that scripture which prophesies that "he that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me", proves the inspiration of Scripture, proves that God knows what is going to come to pass, proves that His Word was the very Word of God; and when you see it come to pass, you will be able to say, "That is exactly what the Master said; and now we can believe that He is Christ."

[We are living in dark days to-day. We may as well face the fact that there is an appalling departure that is all but universal, at least in its extent from the word of the truth of the gospel. Wherever you go, you find it. Christian pulpits occupied by men who employ their time in seeking to undermine the faith of their hearers in the Bible as the Word of God. Every essential of the Christian faith is being denied and repudiated everywhere, the supernaturalism of the Christian religion is all too generally mocked at: the virgin birth, the resurrection and coming again of Christ,—all these things are being very generally denied. Go to great religious assemblies, and men who boldly profess either their agnosticism or something worse, are hailed as heroes; while those who dare to say that they still believe the Bible to be God's Word, are almost laughed out of court.

What shall we do about this? Is it possible that we are all wrong? Is the truth of the world, after all, a lie? Are all the people who say they have been saved by the blood, regenerated by the Holy Ghost, and made partakers of the divine nature—are they all mistaken? What shall we say of the history of the Christian Church? A glorious history we have called it, a glowing record of heroic men, of innumerable martyrs who counted it a high honour to seal their testimony with their blood, and who believed all that this Book contains,—can it be possible that they were all wrong? that it remained for the wise men of this age to discover their error? What shall we say of the apostles? Were they mistaken in their assumption that they had received a divine commission? Were they wrong in their teaching when they told us they wrote by inspiration of the Holy Ghost? Were all the New Testament writers mistaken in their estimate of Jesus Christ? Were Matthew and Mark

and Luke and John and Paul and Peter and Jude and the author of Hebrews, whoever he was,—were they all wrong in their estimate of Christ? Did they really know so much less than Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, or some other of the modernists? What shall we say of our Lord, was He mistaken,—mistaken as to His origin, as to His pre-existence, as to His memory of the glory which He had with the Father before the world was? Was He mistaken as to the character of His mission? Was He without divine authority when He said He was so clothed? Was He, after all, nothing more than a man? Was His estimate of the Old Testament Scriptures all wrong, as the modernists tell us it was? Was He wrong in saying that the betrayal of Judas was to be the fulfilment of Scripture; that it had been anticipated; it had all been written down by the inspiration of that Spirit with Whom a thousand years are as a day, and a day as a thousand years? Is all this history, then, of revealed religion but a record of a great delusion to be dissipated by the scholarship of to-day?

What shall we say about it? We are very foolish, of course, not to keep up with the procession! What is a young student to say when his professor tells him that you cannot find a text book on biology that does not teach evolution? What is he to do when he is told that all the educational institutions, in effect, deny the supernaturalism of the Christian religion? The poor boy does not know. He does not want to be altogether out of step with the learned men of his day. He is very likely to be influenced by that kind of thing unless he knows his Bible. Ah, if he knows his Bible—that is another thing. Remember how Paul, once when preaching, said, "They that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him." They proved the truth of Scripture by their very rejection of Christ. Thus if you know your New Testament you will not be surprised by the present situation: it fulfils that which the New Testament predicts. The Lord has told us before it comes to pass, that when it does come to pass, in the midst of the prevailing darkness, we shall still hear His voice; we shall still see His star; and believe that He is the Son of God.

I.

I read to you a Scripture to-night which gives us some of the signs of the times. What are they? Well, Peter says there will be scoffers. I suppose there always have been scoffers; but he said that in the last day, THEY WILL SINGLE OUT CERTAIN SPECIAL TRUTHS OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION FOR THEIR OPPOSITION. He said they will hate the doctrine of the Lord's coming; they will laugh everyone to scorn who believes it; they will say, "Where is the promise of His coming?" That scripture is fulfilled down in the Methodist Book Room by its publications; that scripture is fulfilled in practically every book that Harry Emerson Fosdick has published; or Faunce, or Shailer Matthews, or almost any modernist you may name. They gnash their teeth at the very mention of the coming of our Lord. They do not want Him to come; they deny that He is coming. And so, because it is unpopular, shall we put it aside? Nay, let us rather look into the Scripture, when we find that the Scripture itself tells us to expect this very thing.

II.

I must hasten. I would like to dwell upon that for a little while, but I want to show you THE BASIS OF THIS OPPOSITION TO THE LORD'S RETURN. You see, the coming of Christ is a supernatural event, "on the literal clouds of the sky"; and with that rejection comes the rejection of every other element of supernaturalism in religion: His miraculous advent into the world, as well as his supernatural return. And this apostle says that they will hate that doctrine because they have a false view of the universe, a false philosophy of the origin of things: "All things continue as from the beginning of the creation"—I am inclined to think that there is a prediction in that very passage of that strange delusion which lies at the basis of all other opposition to a supernatural religion, that thing which is not science, but science only falsely so-called, the doctrine of Evolution. That philosophy has no place for the manger, no place for the miraculous advent, either the first or the second—"For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and

the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." They are willingly ignorant of the origin of things, and, of necessity, must be ignorant of the consummation of things, for the Alpha and the Omega are one. He who would know the end must know the beginning; for "the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." I am inclined to believe that that passage does not refer to the deluge, but to a great cataclysm of some sort that belongs between the first and second verses of the first chapter of Genesis. But whether or no, he tells us that men being willingly ignorant of the origin of things, are, of necessity, ignorant of their consummation; and because they rejected the divine testimony of the Word of God, they mock at the promise of His coming.

Evolution is a *human attempt to establish a divine alibi in the work of creation*. Somebody has said that it is the function of science to push the great First Cause back as far as possible: Evolution pushes Him so far back that you cannot find Him at all. But I repeat, that whole philosophy is an attempt to establish a divine alibi, to prove that God was not there. It is the very opposite of the Bible.

It is very interesting to me, and very instructive, to observe that the report of that Evolution trial in an obscure town in Tennessee should have covered the face of the earth; and that even a Russian society in Soviet Russia, known as "The Society of the Godless", had volunteered to pay that high school teacher's fine. A man is known by the company he keeps; a doctrine may be known by the type of mind it attracts. And it is most instructive to note the kind of people who have rallied to the support of the doctrine of Evolution: all the atheists of America, all the agnostics of America, all the communists, and anarchists,—they are all on the side of Evolution. When the experts testify, they bring a number of professors from a so-called Baptist university—and the Dean of the Divinity School of Chicago University is one of the experts!

I want to read to you a few short extracts from Mr. Bryan's undelivered speech. I count it an honour to have known him; I shared with other brethren of the World's Christian Fundamentals Conference when it met in Memphis, in sending him a telegram asking him to assume the responsibility of assisting in the case against Evolution in Tennessee, a task which, we fear was largely responsible for bringing his extraordinary life to a close.

Some years ago when crossing the sea, Mr. Clarence Darrow was a passenger on the same ship. We sat on the top deck as we went through the war zone; and I talked with him a long time about the things of Christ. He declared he had no knowledge of God; he insisted that religion was "just dope,"—a good thing, maybe, for those who can take it, but he said, "There is nothing in it, it is just dope." And so he argued against the Bible in Dayton; and in support of his arguments, he quoted from these experts.

I hope you will read Mr. Bryan's speech. If it is not published in pamphlet form by anyone else, I will publish it myself, so that you can all have it.

Do you know that there are more murders committed in Chicago in any year than in the entire British Empire? I read an editorial in the Chicago Tribune only this week which said that all the lawless element of the Continent was coming to Chicago, because they could not hang anyone in Chicago, they could not punish anyone for their crimes in that city. How can they, after the decision in the Loeb-Leopold case? Mr. Darrow was responsible for that: and he laid the blame for the crime upon Evolution, and upon Chicago University. I am going to quote from Mr. Darrow's speech as quoted by Mr. Bryan:

"The superman, a creation of Nietzsche, has permeated every college and university in the civilized world.

"There is not any university in the world where the professor is not familiar with Nietzsche, not one. . . . Some believe it and some do not believe it. Some read it as I do and take it as a theory, a dream, a vision mixed with good and bad, but not in any way related to human life. Some take it seriously. . . . There is not a university in the world of any high standing where the professors do not tell you about Nietzsche and discuss him; or where the books are not there.

"If this boy is to blame for this where did he get it? Is there any blame attached because some one took Nietzsche's philosophy seriously? There is no question in this case but what that is true. Then who is to blame? The university would be more to blame than he is; the scholars of the world would be more to blame than he is. The parents of the world are more to blame than he is. Your honor, it is hardly fair to hang a 19-year-old boy for the philosophy that was taught him at the university. It does not meet my ideas of justice and fairness to visit upon his head the philosophy that has been taught by university men for twenty-five years."

And then Mr. Bryan says:

"In fairness to Mr. Darrow I think I ought to quote two more paragraphs. After this bold attempt to excuse the students on the ground that he was transformed from a well-meaning youth into a murderer by the philosophy of an atheist and on the further ground that his philosophies were in the libraries of all the colleges, some adopting the philosophy and some rejecting it, on these grounds, he denied that the boy should be held responsible for the taking of human life. He charged that the scholars in the university were more responsible than the boy, because they furnished such books to the students, and then he proceeds to exonerate the universities and scholars, leaving nobody responsible.

"Here is Mr. Darrow's language"—(Mr. Bryan quotes again)—"Now I do not want to be misunderstood about this. Even for the sake of saving the lives of my clients I do not want to be dishonest and tell the court something I do not honestly think in this case. I do not think the universities are to blame. I do not think they should be held responsible. I do think, however, that they are too large, and that they should keep a closer watch on the individual.

"But you can not destroy thought, because forsooth, some brain may be deranged by thought. It is the duty of the university, as I conceive it, to be the greatest storehouse of the wisdom of the ages, and to have its students come there and learn and choose. I have no doubt but what it has meant the death of many, but that we can not help."

Mr. Bryan comments:

"This is damnable philosophy, and yet it is the flower that blossoms on the stalk of evolution."

And then later this is what Mr. Darrow says:

"I say to you seriously that the parents of Dickey Loeb are more responsible than he, and yet few boys had better parents.

Again he says: "I know one of two things that happened to this boy: that this terrible crime was inherent in his organism and came from an ancestor, or that it came through his education and his training after he was born."

This boy was not responsible for anything; his guilt was due, according to this philosophy, either to heredity or environment. Then he continues:

"I don't know what ancestor may have sent down the seed that corrupted him and I do not know through how many ancestors it may have passed until it reached Dickey Loeb. All I know, it is true, and there is not a biologist in the world who will not say I am right."

What a day we have come to when in a court of law the teaching of a university is set forth as a defence for murder because murder was the inevitable result of that philosophy! And yet the university is not to blame—the individual who committed murder is not to blame, because he inherited his instinct to kill from the jungles. This means the absolute destruction of all moral responsibility, turning men into the beasts of the jungle. That learned counsel says that there is not a biologist in all the world that will not say that he is right. If that is so all the biologists ought to be put into the penitentiary to-morrow morning! Whence all this error, this philosophy of lawlessness, of absolute anarchy? Why this: "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water."

Oh, how satisfactory to turn from all that to the clear teaching of the book of Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was, without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face

of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." And God said—and God said—and God said;—and it was so—and it was so—and it was so. It is always so when God says it!

My friends, we need not be discouraged because the days are dark, for the Bible tells us to expect it: "Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he." Oh, men and women, a study of the tendencies of the day will only confirm you in your faith in the Bible as the Word of God. I was talking to a young fellow on the train who was first of all astonished that I was not an evolutionist. And he began to talk about the "missing link." I knew a little more about the missing link than he did. I mean the links that are alleged to have been found. And I told him, "It is not a missing link we must look for, but millions of missing links; because science will tell you there are from two to three million different species, and no solitary case has ever been proved where one specie passed into another. Professor Bateson at Toronto University, former President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, declared when he was here two years ago last December, that it would have to be admitted that science had absolutely failed to discover one solitary instance of the transmutation of species; and that until it was discovered, it would have to be admitted that the whole evolutionary hypothesis stood absolutely without proof. Of course! "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion." If we refuse to receive the truth and ask for a lie, we may have what we want after a while.

III.

But, oh, let me turn to men and women here who are not converted. You say, "Why, sir, I have almost lost interest in religion because I have found that half the ministers are tearing God's Book to pieces. I have not cared to go to church. If the Bible is not true, then what is the use of my going? I don't go to hear doubt, and get more doubts in my mind, I have come to believe there is no salvation, and no Saviour."

I have tried to tell you that everything that has happened is what He said would happen, and it is coming to pass exactly as He said it would. These are only signs of the day in which we live. We have many proofs in the book. Will you not believe that He is the Saviour, Who is this who is able to look down through all the ages? What Spirit wrote this Book so as to make it up-to-date, up-to-the-minute? For when science takes the fastest express train—I mean true science—and makes real progress and discovers truth, it always finds that the Bible is there ahead of it, saying, "Good morning, I am glad you are getting abreast of me." The Bible is always there ahead of us. And I venture the assertion that there is no established fact of science—there are many theories—but there is no established fact of science that will ever be found contrary to that which is revealed in God's holy Word. Truth never contradicts itself; and God will not write in the rocks or in the stars, anything contrary to what is written in His holy Word. There is no confusion in the Godhead; He is not the author of confusion, but is Himself the centre and source of all the truth, and He is the Saviour.

Well, my brother, you had better get back to the old Bible, and believe exactly what it says, that you are a terrible sinner, and that these evil instincts within are not derived from the beasts of the jungle, but that they are derived from the garden. "By one man sin entered the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Believe the old story that Jesus came from the glory, that He was born in Bethlehem's manger, was born of a virgin, begotten of the Holy Ghost, the very son of God; that when He died at the place called Calvary, He died for a poor sinner like you. All your sins were laid upon Him, and as you saw in symbol to-night, He went down into the grave on your behalf, passed through the grave with resurrection power, was raised by the power of God, ascended into heaven, and is now interceding for you, ready to confess you the moment you confess Him. Will you confess Him, to-night? Will you believe that He is the Saviour? Turn aside from all these false philosophies, and get back to God's holy Word. It is the only thing that works, it is the only philosophy of the universe that is true.

I believe in the inspiration of the Bible, and I believe in the inspiration of the teaching of Fosdick, and all these other men: the difference being this: I know that God inspired this Book because it takes men from the depths of the bottomless pit and lifts them up to glory. And I know that the Devil himself inspired these damnable philosophies, because they destroy faith, and send men down to hell. That is the difference. Which inspiration will you have, the inspiration of God the Spirit, or of the spirit of evil? Blessed be God, we have our choice this evening. We can trust the sinner's Saviour and as we trust Him, He will open our eyes, and we shall enter into rest, and will pillow our heads, as Mr. Bryan did when he said in the court, "I have religion enough to live by, and I have religion enough to die by."

I came on the train in company with his son this last week from California as he was going to his father's funeral; and he said to me, "It was a beautiful way to go, it was just the way he would have desired to go; he never did anything without putting his heart into it. But of all the things he ever did, he never put so much of himself into any task as into that last effort to vindicate the Word of God." Oh, I would like to die like that, would you not? What is that verse:

"Happy, if with my latest breath,
I may but gasp His name;
Preach Him to all, and cry in death,
'Behold! behold the Lamb!'"

Who of you will yield to Him now? We have the Communion service following, and I shall preach in the open air after that, but I must press for a decision for a moment before I close. Who will confess Christ to-night? (Several responded to the invitation.)

THE LATE DR. A. C. DIXON.

By T. T. Shields.

When the news reached me that this great servant of God had laid down his sword and had been translated, I was travelling, and found it impossible to write what I then desired to write.

I knew Dr. Dixon quite intimately for nearly twenty years. I preached for him on several occasions when he was Pastor of the Moody Church, Chicago; and supplied the pulpit of Spurgeon's Tabernacle, London, while he was Pastor in 1913, 1916, 1917, 1918, and the summer after he had returned to United States in 1919. Dr. Dixon also preached on many occasions in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, since I became its Pastor. He joined with Dr. Riley and myself in signing the call which was sent out for the first meeting of the Baptist Bible Union of North America. Until a short time before his death he was a member of the Executive Committee of the Bible Union, and was one of our principal speakers at nearly every Baptist Bible Union Conference. I have mentioned these matters to show that we were frequently brought into very close contact with each other.

I saw much of him in England, and made a long journey to visit him and Mrs. Dixon once in the north of Scotland. When I arrived in Kansas City in May, 1923, I found Dr. Dixon was there in advance; and when I registered at the hotel, was informed that he had requested that we should room together.

One could not know this great-souled disciple of Christ without being impressed with the genuineness of his own faith in Christ. Of all his acquaintances, none were more real to A. C. Dixon than his Saviour; and none were half so precious. In him the saint was never lost in the preacher. He never became professional; he never lost the bloom of his first experience of the pardoning grace of God—and this because he never lost the wonder of it. Dr. Dixon's faith was vastly more than an intellectual attitude: it was experimental; it was rooted and grounded in a daily experience of God's saving grace. He could have as easily been persuaded that he had on heart in his body, or no blood in his veins, as that the presence of the Spirit of God within him was not real. The genuineness of Dr. Dixon's religion made him a genuine man. We have known many men who, in their general character, were good

men, but whose desire to please others—generally in their own interests—and their reluctance to offend, had formed in them the habit of soft speech which had a touch of insincerity about it. And this always gave to those who knew them best a feeling that they were at least a fraction less than one hundred per cent. genuine. No one ever had that feeling about Dr. Dixon. His character was transparent. He was always straightforward in word and action: he was ingenuousness itself. This quality inspired confidence; one always felt safe with Dr. Dixon. He could be trusted to the end of the road.

We have never known a man who was so manifestly absolutely free from that too common ministerial vice, jealousy. Dr. Dixon was an unsparing though kindly critic where, in his judgment, criticism was deserved. He did not hesitate to censure where censure was merited; but he loved to speak well of his brethren in the ministry. It was abundantly evident that he loved to hear of their prosperity. I never heard him attempt to discount the results of another man's ministry, but always he praised the Lord for spiritual fruit no matter in what vineyard it was found.

As a preacher, Dr. Dixon had few equals; and in these later days, no superiors. What a splendid physique he had! I never observed him without feeling how appropriately God had tabernacled that great soul. I remember once sitting across the table from him in Old London while his guest at dinner; and as he glowingly related some choice experience of the things of God, and I looked at his radiant countenance, his flashing eyes, and his well-poised head, I said to myself, "If God ever made a handsomer man, I never saw him". Yet he remained to the end as humble as a little child.

In his preaching, Dr. Dixon always kept to the central things. He was never side-tracked, or carried away with a hobby. Dr. Dixon's chief strength was his heart power. Sometimes he laid siege to the reason with great effectiveness; and judged by their intellectual quality, Dr. Dixon's sermons were of a high order. Notwithstanding, his principal appeal was always to the heart, and this because the Spirit had taught him that it is with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.

To the end of his ministry, Dr. Dixon's sermons never lacked an evangelistic appeal. He loved the souls of men, and was consumed with a desire for their salvation. Dr. Dixon was a warrior; and for many years was recognized as one of America's most valiant defenders of the faith. His ministry in London was greatly appreciated by vast multitudes of people. Little men there were who affected to despise his orthodoxy and his evangelistic fervor; but their scorn constituted his highest honour, and gave him rank among the great prophets of God.

Recently a letter has reached me from England, from an official of the Bible League, informing me of the circulation in England of a report to the effect that before his death Dr. Dixon had weakened in his attitude toward the fundamentals of the faith. Nothing more untruthful was ever stated, and no more wicked a slander was ever circulated. It is true that for reasons known to himself a few months before his death, Dr. Dixon wrote me resigning from the Baptist Bible Union. But that was not because he had in any way changed his views of the great fundamentals of the faith. During the Great War, generals in the field, cabinet ministers, and premiers, resigned or changed from one position to another; but that did not indicate that their zeal for the prosecution of the war itself had cooled; nor did it imply any disloyalty to the great principles of free government for whose preservation the war was being waged. We all regretted Dr. Dixon's retirement from the Baptist Bible Union; but no one for a moment questioned his loyalty to the cause. I write these words in response to an enquiry from England which says my name is there being associated with this wicked and untruthful report.

Did space permit, I should like to write much more about this great man of God. While many years my senior, he treated me always as a brother; and in his passing I feel a profound personal loss. Only a little over a year ago it was my privilege to speak for him in his church at Baltimore, and on the occasion of that visit I enjoyed my last day of earthly fellowship with him.

Before closing this article, I venture to relate a story which perhaps has never been told to others. Of that, I cannot be sure. While sharing the same

room in the hotel in Kansas City, praying together and talking together about the great conflict for the truth in which we were both engaged, Dr. Dixon told me a story of the last hours of Mrs. Dixon in China. He said, "As soon as I can control myself sufficiently to do it, I am going to preach a sermon on these two words, 'Not yet'. They are suggested," he said, "by one of the last things my dear wife said to me before she went home. She was very poorly, and lay upon the bed when I came into her room and told her I had just received some letters from the children. I asked her if I should read them to her, and she said, 'Yes, after a little while; but not yet'." He said he left her to go to a service, and she went home without reading the letters. And then with eyes full of tears, he turned to me and said, "It is a wonderfully suggestive word, 'Not yet': 'It doth not appear what we shall be'; 'the end is not yet'; 'the time of figs was not yet'; 'we see not yet all things put under him'."

By this time, however, the letters will have been read, and the sermon will have been preached, and the mysteries will be all understood.

Dr. Dixon was one of God's best gifts to the church as of this generation.

A CORRECTION.

We have received the following letter from Dr. F. L. Anderson, Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board of the Northern Baptist Convention, which we very gladly print. Dr. Anderson is quite right in assuming that we supposed Mr. Milliken had taken his place. We very gladly make this correction.

Dr. Anderson's Letter.

Jackson, N.H.,

August 1st, 1925.

"My dear Dr. Shields:

I was much interested in reading your account of the Seattle Convention in *The Gospel Witness*, although I did not altogether agree. Allow me to correct one error. You evidently thought Milliken superseded me in my official position. That is a mistake.

Milliken was elected President of the Foreign Mission Society in place of Mr. Fred T. Field, of Boston. I am Chairman of the Foreign Board and was elected as such by the Board at Seattle.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed), Frederick L. Anderson."

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION CONFERENCE IN JARVIS STREET.

At the Seattle meeting of the Baptist Bible Union the Executive of the Union was authorized to taken into consideration the launching of a new Foreign Mission Movement, because hundreds of the pastors and churches of the Northern Baptist Convention have lost all confidence in the Foreign Mission Board of that Convention. After a good deal of consideration and planning to find a convenient time and place, it has been decided that the Executive will meet in Jarvis Street Church, beginning August 30th. The actual sessions of the Executive will probably not be held until Tuesday, September 1st.

The members of the Executive Committee will come to Toronto for the discussion of business; but while here, there will be evening meetings which will be addressed by the visiting members. It is expected that the whole Executive will be in attendance, including Dr. W. B. Hinson, the great preacher of Portland, Oregon; Dr. W. B. Riley, Minneapolis; Dr. J. Frank Norris, of Fort Worth; Dr. O. W. Van Osdel, of Grand Rapids; Dr. W. L. Pettingill, of Philadelphia; Rev. H. O. Myers, of Des Moines; Rev. Arthur Fowler, of Hamburg, N.Y.; and while we are not yet certain, we are hoping to be favoured with the presence of that great scholar and preacher, beloved of all his brethren, Dr. F. W. Farr, of Los Angeles.

These evening meetings will be held during the first week of Toronto Exhibition when thousands of visitors will be in Toronto. This notice is sent out at this time in the hope that many visitors will plan their trip to Toronto for that week so as to have the advantage of the ministry of these mighty giants of the faith.

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

THE DENOMINATIONAL PRESS ON THE NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION AT SEATTLE.

"The Watchman-Examiner"

The July 16th issue of *The Watchman-Examiner* publishes an article on the Seattle Convention, by Dr. Frank M. Goodchild. Dr. Goodchild must henceforth rank as the champion optimist of Baptist fundamentalists. All who know Dr. Goodchild know how absolutely genuine he is. He is theologically sound to the core; and no one who knows him would ever charge him with having the slightest degree of sympathy with Modernism. For years he has hoped against hope for better things in the Northern Baptist Convention—and he is still hoping. We confess to a very great admiration for Dr. Goodchild's long patience. He is slow to believe that people called "Baptists" can do anything wrong. We fear, however, that a great awakening awaits him. The time is not far distant when Dr. Goodchild, and others who have shared his long patience, will discover how utterly their patience and hope have been betrayed. The only difference between Dr. Goodchild and the brethren who formed the Baptist Bible Union is that the latter were a little quicker to discern the anti-Christian character of Modernism; and therefore more clearly saw the impossibility of negotiating a peace with a movement which crucifies the Son of God afresh. We believe the day is not far distant when Dr. Goodchild, and others who share his gracious spirit, will be fighting with us in the Baptist Bible Union.

Dr. Goodchild says that the Seattle Convention "was thoroughly Baptist". He mocks at the possibility of anyone's being able to "put something over" in a Baptist assembly. Referring to the action of the Convention on the Park Avenue Church matter, he says, "The Convention proved itself true"; and again, "The Convention has spoken"; and once more, "Now let us regard the question as settled, and set ourselves diligently to doing our denominational task."

Let us examine the matter a little more carefully. The Park Avenue Baptist Church has called to its pastorate the champion modernist of America. To refresh the minds of our readers, we will put down once again three or four of Dr. Fosdick's sayings. He refers to the virgin birth of Christ as being phrased in the New Testament "in terms of a biological miracle that our modern minds cannot use". In his latest book he says: "I find some of the miracle narratives of Scripture historically incredible"; "I do not believe in the resurrection of the flesh"; "I do not believe in the physical return of Jesus." With a full knowledge of Dr. Fosdick's position, the Park Avenue Church called him as their pastor. He accepted the call on condition that neither immersion, nor sprinkling, nor any form called baptism, should be made a prerequisite to church membership. The Park Avenue Church accepted his terms; and in a circular broadcast throughout the Continent, announced its action in the "Statement on Behalf of the Joint Board of Deacons and Trustees, read to the Congregational Meeting of the Park Avenue Baptist Church". In reciting the difficulty experienced in finding a suitable pastor, these words occur: "Advice and suggestions were sought from men holding responsible positions in institutions affiliated with the denomination. Dr. Fosdick was the outstanding figure, and was recommended to your officers by practically everyone con-

sulted"; thus showing that many holding responsible positions in the Denomination advised the Park Avenue Baptist Church to call to its pastorate one whose teaching was known to be destructive of everything for which Baptists have historically stood.

All this will show, that the action of the Park Avenue Church was not taken without full consideration of all that action involved in its relation to the Northern Baptist Convention.

Again, we would remind Dr. Goodchild that the official group controlling the Convention, were so determined that the Fosdick delegates should be seated, that they proposed to invoke that clause of the constitution of the Convention which provides for voting by states; and that it was under the threat of that action, and on the specious plea that the Park Avenue Church had not yet put into effect its new policy, they secured the seating of the delegates of the Park Avenue Church.

Moreover, the Park Avenue apologists were so determined that they opposed a motion proposed by Dr. Gravett, and supported by Judge Freeman and other influential members of the Convention, and by their action deliberately and willingly incurred the risk of splitting the Convention. Upon what, then, does Dr. Goodchild base his assertion that the matter is now settled? Upon a resolution that was passed at the Saturday morning session? That resolution was passed with the consent of the modernist group; and as a result of almost pathetic overtures made to the enemy. There was only one clause in that resolution which had real value. That clause is printed in black type in the resolution which follows; and that clause, by amendment, was struck out:

"RESOLVED, Therefore, that we do hereby express our keen regret and emphatic disapproval of the course announced by said church, which has given and will continue to give, much pain and disquietude to large numbers of the churches, associations and conventions affiliated or associated with this Convention and its denominational program and thereby tends to defeat and destroy unity, efficiency and co-operation, and we hereby express to said church our keen and fraternal hope that it will not pursue the course it has announced, which in the opinion of this Convention would result in making this church thereafter ineligible to accredit delegates to this Convention. That this expression is the more necessary in view of the action of this Convention heretofore taken in holding valid the credentials of the delegates because the church has not yet put into effect and operation the plans announced and that therefore the status of the church at this time in relation to this Convention was unchanged."

If the modernists allowed that resolution to pass in good faith, and had any intention of giving heed to its admonitions, why did they strike out that clause? The proverbially thick hide of a rhinoceros is as the flimsiest gossamer in comparison with the sensibilities of a modernist.

The Editor Prophesies.

We venture therefore, to utter a prophecy, and ask our readers to preserve this article and mark it and see whether its prophecy comes true. Our prophecy is that this resolution will prove to be absolutely valueless; and that at the meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention in 1927 Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick will be selected to give the key-note address; or, in some other way, will be honoured by the Convention. We have a vision of the whole Convention rising to its feet amid tumultuous applause as Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick appears on the platform. The delegates from Dr. Fosdick's church will be seated in 1927 in the Northern Convention as they were in 1925. Dr. Goodchild and others who have imagined that the battle against Modernism can be won by negotiating with the enemy, will discover that their policy has sold out the Denomination to Unitarianism; and they will have no recourse but to withdraw from its fellowship, or surrender their principles.

"Dr." Cornelius Woelfkin.

Let us give a further reason for this conviction. Dr. Cornelius Woelfkin asked one of the moderate fundamentalists what they would do about the

millions of dollars the Park Avenue Church had given to the Ministers' and Missionaries' Benefit Fund if the Park Avenue Church were turned out of the Denomination? He asked whether that money would be paid back? Can anything more diabolical be imagined than such an attempt to intimidate men who are getting toward the evening-time in their ministry, than the suggestion that the money given to lighten the burdens of ministerial old age, might be required to be repaid? That there was a real menace in Dr. Woelfkin's attitude is proved by the fact that when he was renominated for election to the Board of the Ministers' and Missionaries' Benefit Fund, and opposition to his election was expressed, he made a speech in his own behalf, with the result that he was re-elected.

What is "Settled"?

Once again: Dr. Godochild says, "Let us regard the question as settled." But there was another question at the Northern Convention vitally related to Baptist life and service, and that the question of Foreign Missions. The damning confessions made by missionaries on the field as reported by the Committee of Investigation, show beyond peradventure that Baptist money was being used on foreign fields for the propagation of anti-Christian principles. One missionary confessed to having no conviction of there being a future life, he had no conviction that death was not the end of all. Another said: "But the unique element of Jesus' nature does not lie in His being the 'only begotten' Son of God. He is not that by his own teaching. Rather, he is the only perfect one among the countless millions of sons of God who have been born into our heavenly Father's earthly home." Still another said: "Surely it is clear that the Bible, part for part, is not an infallible book . . . There is many a book, many a sermon, many a poem of our day as God-inspired and as God-filled and helpful as many of the Books of the Bible and more so than some. God is still speaking to his children through the voice of his prophets." The Committee did not have to go to India or China to obtain this information: this information was already in the possession of the Foreign Mission Board. But the Convention, through the balance of power held and exercised by its salaried secretaries, voted down a resolution which was destined to instruct the Foreign Mission Board to recall these heretical missionaries.

Professor F. L. Anderson, D.D.

In *The Watchman-Examiner* of July 30th, Professor F. L. Anderson, D.D., issued a statement on behalf of the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society in the following terms:

"On account of the fact that certain brethren have requested, in view of certain statements, that the Foreign Mission Board should make plain its position, the Board of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society begs to say to the Convention again that it considers itself the servant of the whole denomination, and that it will appoint and maintain as missionary representatives of any of the groups represented in the denomination only those who have the proper qualifications as missionaries, provided—and this provision is essential—that they are evangelical. By an evangelical we mean one who believes in the gospel; and by the gospel we mean "the good news of the free forgiveness of sin and eternal life (beginning now and going on forever) through a vital union with the crucified and risen Christ, which brings men into union and fellowship with God. This salvation is graciously offered on the sole condition of repentance and faith in Christ, and has in it the divine power of regeneration and sanctification through the Spirit. The only reason we have for accepting this gospel is our belief in the deity of Christ in whom we see the Father, a faith founded on the trustworthiness of the Scriptures and the fact that we have experienced this salvation in our own hearts." Secretaries Franklin, Robbins and Lerrigo heartily unite with the board in thus reaffirming this statement made by the board at Milwaukee, to which reference is hereby made.

This statement, if it means anything at all, means that the Foreign Mission Board will continue its policy of sending out modernist missionaries. The

only stipulation is "that they are evangelical". But what is an "evangelical"? Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick calls himself an evangelical: Thus the sentiment of true Baptists is defied; and the Convention at Seattle, as will be found, accomplished nothing for Fundamentalism, except to unmask the deadliness of Modernism.

"The Baptist" of Chicago.

(Presumably edited by a modern Baron Munchausen).

We have read no more interesting comment on the Northern Baptist Convention than that which occurs in *The Baptist*, of Chicago. The first editorial is devoted entirely to the Baptist Bible Union. For some time *The Baptist*, and some other papers, refrained from even mentioning the name of the Baptist Bible Union; but when an organization has a ministerial membership of nearly two thousand, with many other thousands of Baptists enrolled who are not ministers, as well as some hundreds of churches who have adopted the Baptist Bible Union Confession of Faith, it becomes an organization to be reckoned with. The editorial says: "The Bible Union group is organized dissent and reaction against any and all actions and policies of the denomination as expressed in the Northern Baptist Convention and in its co-operating agencies which do not square with the beliefs and methods of the Bible Union."

The fact is, the Bible Union does not differ in any respect from what Baptists as a whole stood for twenty or twenty-five years ago. The Confession of Faith of the Baptist Bible Union differs in no essential particular from the New Hampshire Confession of Faith which has been the standard of American Baptists for many years. The main difference between the New Hampshire Confession and the Baptist Bible Union Confession is that the Bible Union Confession states its position negatively as well as positively—not only what is believed, but what is not believed.

The editorial refers to the action of the Baptist Bible Union in holding a meeting to consider the organization of another Foreign Mission Society, and says, "This may be but the beginning of the organization of another denomination." What the initial step taken at Seattle may lead to, no one can now say. How far the apostasy in the Northern and other Baptist Conventions may spread, it is impossible for anyone to predict. There is, of course, always the possibility of its developing to such an extent that nothing but absolute separation would be possible. The Park Avenue Church, so far as we are able to judge, by its own pronouncement, differs in no essential particular from a Unitarian or Universalist church. If what is now called the Northern Baptist Convention continues to give the hand of fellowship to this Christ-denying organization, Evangelical Baptists may be forced absolutely to withdraw; but as far as Baptist Bible Unionists are concerned, that will be a last resort. The Bible Union has no intention of withdrawing from any Convention to which its membership belongs. Those who belong to the Northern Baptist Convention have no intention of withdrawing. They will almost certainly form, or endorse, another Foreign Mission Society; for at Seattle there were hundreds of pastors who solemnly vowed that they would not encourage the churches they served to give another dollar to the Foreign Mission Society of the Northern Baptist Convention. But Bible Unionists will support some funds of the Convention, and will retain their membership in the Convention; and will do their utmost to prevent the modernists now in control of the Convention from prostituting the missionary and educational agencies of the Convention to anti-Christian ends.

The amusing part of the comment of *The Baptist* is to be found in the third editorial entitled, "Daily Newspapers and the Truth". When Baron Munchausen undertakes to tell the truth, all the world should take a holiday and listen. This, in part, is what *The Baptist* says: "There never was any controversy on in the convention between modernists and fundamentalists. If modernists were present as delegates they were so few as to be negligible. This talk of modernists in the Baptist denomination, if by the word 'modernist' is meant men who deny the evangelical faith, is pure bunk." Munchausen himself could not have surpassed that sentence!

A paragraph from the report of the Committee on Affairs of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society reads as follows:

"This same missionary when later questioned before the Board is quoted as saying in response to the question as to whether or not he believed in the Virgin Birth: 'I think not.' His reply when asked if he believed in miracles, 'I think not.' When asked if he believed in the bodily resurrection, his final answer was 'I think not', and when asked if he believed in the inspiration of the Scriptures he said, 'I think not'."

Yet the Convention, by a vote of seven hundred and forty-two to five hundred and seventy-four refused to instruct the Foreign Mission Board to recall such missionaries. *The Baptist* says there were no modernists in the Convention!

A church belonging to the Convention calls to its pastorate a man who denies the authority of the Scriptures, the virgin birth of Christ, the miracles of the New Testament, the physical resurrection, and Christ's personal and physical return to the earth; and, in order to secure him, sets aside everything for which Baptists have stood; and the Convention votes to receive delegates from this Unitarian, Universalist, church,— and *The Baptist* says there were no modernists in the Convention!

Some will contend that this action was taken because Dr. Fosdick has not yet begun his pastorate, and the church will not change its polity until that time. Even if this were so, if the New Testament teaching, which judges a man for his thoughts as well as for his actions, be accepted, the Park Avenue Church is just as unbaptistic to-day as it will be when Dr. Fosdick begins his pastorate. Rev. Russell M. Brougher wisely pointed out that if it comes to the knowledge of the police that a company of men have conspired to commit robbery or murder, they do not wait until the crime is actually committed before apprehending them; but that the law takes cognizance of a known intention. And everybody of any sense must know that the Park Avenue Church has already set aside every Baptist principle for which it ever stood, and is just as ineligible for membership in an evangelical denomination to-day as it ever will be. Yet the *Munchausen Baptist* says there were no modernists at Seattle!

But what if some liberally disposed admirer of Dr. Fosdick should apply for membership in the Park Avenue Baptist Church between now and the autumn of 1926, does anyone suppose that the Park Avenue Church will say, "We are receiving no one without immersion on profession of faith until Dr. Fosdick becomes our pastor"? The principles announced as governing the polity of the church in the fall of 1926 will inevitably become immediately operative. Dr. Cornelius Woelfkin is still the Pastor of Park Avenue Church. He has announced that he is in step with Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick; he has publicly approved of Dr. Fosdick as his successor. And Dr. Cornelius Woelfkin was re-elected to the Board of Ministers' and Missionaries' Benefit Fund at Seattle; yet the *Munchausen Baptist* says there were no modernists at Seattle.

At the close of the editorial under review, *The Baptist* speaks as follows:

"But there was a serious difference of attitude between the loyal Baptists of the convention and a group of irreconcilables led in part by two men, one from Texas and the other from Canada, who have enough to do at home to keep their doorstep clean without coming to the Northern Convention to stir up trouble."

Our *Baptist Munchausen* did, in this paragraph, stumble on the truth for once in his life when he stubbed his toe against our doorstep. It is quite true that the Baptist Bible Union is composed of "a group of irreconcilables" in this sense, that they cannot and will not be reconciled to an acceptance of Dr. Fosdick's anti-Christian position.

Again our *Baptist Munchausen* hit upon the truth when he referred to one man from Texas and another from Canada as having "enough to do at home to keep their own doorstep clean". Any decent housewife will agree that more of her trouble in keeping her doorstep clean is due to the dirt that is outside of her own house. The man from Texas and the man from Canada each belong to a Convention whose front door opens upon the Northern Baptist Convention territory, and the protoplasmic mud of that Convention has kept our

doorstep muddy for a long time. We not only have enough to do, we have more than enough to do to keep that doorstep clean. We have stood upon that doorstep with broom and pail and several boxes of ecclesiastical "old dutch", which chases dirt, for a long time. It then occurred to us that we might wisely, in our own interests, join hands with our brethren who desire to see a clean house in the Northern Convention, in an effort to drain off the Northern Convention's evolutionary mud-puddle. We think we have already met with some degree of success; and until this muddy pool is drained, we hope to have on each of the afore-mentioned doorsteps a good Baptist Bible Union cocoanut mat (made by men who repudiate any sort of blood relationship to monkeys that threw the cocoanuts), so that anyone coming from the educational ameba swamps of the Northern Baptist Convention will be able to wipe their feet before they come into our ecclesiastical house.

From a careful reading of *The Baptist's* review of the Seattle Convention we should not be surprised if the editor were soon to write an article demonstrating to his own entire satisfaction that Judas Iscariot was the saintliest of all the apostles.

"The Western Recorder".

The Western Recorder, in our judgment, is one of the best of our Baptist papers. But even *The Western Recorder* needs an alarm-clock occasionally. In the issue of July 16th it has an editorial entitled, "Gratifying Action Taken by Northern Baptists". In this editorial the following paragraph occurs:

"The view taken by the President in ruling they would be seated was that, though the announced Fosdick inclusion program would do away with the Scriptural baptism and practically every other New Testament requirement of church membership, and has been trumpeted to the world, yet the Fosdick pastorate is not yet operative, nor has the program actually been put into effect. The action of the Convention in adopting the Freeman resolution is tantamount to telling this church that, when it or any other church actually seeks to put this boastful bolshevistic program into operation, it will automatically cease to have fellowship in the Northern Baptist Convention. All of which is fine."

But in the next issue *The Western Recorder* takes it all back, and strongly condemns the action of the Convention in striking out from the resolution the only words of real force in it. *The Western Recorder* can be depended upon at any time to take back any misleading statement as soon as it discovers it is contrary to fact.

The Canadian Baptist tries to recover that which *The Western Recorder* takes back; *The Illinois Baptist* publishes *The Western Recorder's* second editorial, and comments upon *The Watchman-Examiner's* position as being very easily satisfied. All this is exceedingly interesting to us, for the change of attitude in *The Western Recorder*, which gives the light also to *The Illinois Baptist*, came through *The Gospel Witness'* report of the Northern Convention, published in this paper and in *The Searchlight*, of Fort Worth. All of which goes to show that these two papers have been able to throw a flood of light upon the Northern Convention, enabling a number of our Baptist editors to get a clear view of the situation. We shall be glad to render them similar assistance on other occasions. The moral is, if you want to know what really happens at a Baptist convention on this Continent, read *The Gospel Witness* or *The Searchlight!*

The Strange Taste of the Watchman-Examiner.

The Watchman-Examiner is a great paper, and is very ably edited; but in an editorial in the issue of July 30th is to be found this extraordinary paragraph:

"And as to Dr. Fosdick we should think that the resolutions passed at Seattle would cause him to pause and consider. He cannot help but feel that he is doing a vast amount of harm, a harm that even his brilliant ministry cannot undo or balance. We all love him and are proud of him

but we love still more our historic denomination and we are prouder still of what it has done for the world."

The editor said of Dr. Fosdick, "We all love him and are proud of him." What does the editor mean when he says that he loves Dr. Fosdick? Does he love him as a poor guilty sinner in need of the cleansing blood of Christ; or, does he mean that he loves him as a Christian brother? What does he mean when he says he is proud of him? Proud of a man who denies that the Bible is the Word of God, and surpasses Paine, and Ingerson, and Voltaire, in his efforts to destroy it? Proud of the man who denies the virgin birth of Christ, the miracles of the New Testament, the physical resurrection, and the return of the Lord? Proud of the man who turns his back upon his Baptist heritage and repudiates everything for which Baptists have stood? Proud of the man who has nearly rent the Presbyterian body in twain, and whose Unitarianism threatens the disruption of the Baptist denomination? Frankly, the only love we feel for Dr. Fosdick is the compassion which ought to beat in every Christian heart for those whose minds have been blinded by the god of this world. But we are not proud of him: we are ashamed that any man who ever bore the Baptist name should, by his teaching, so dishonour the Lord Jesus Christ and cast such a blight over the religious life of a Continent. We think *The Watchman-Examiner* ought to revise its judgment.

LAST SUNDAY.

Great congregations greeted the Pastor on his return from his Western trip last Sunday. In the morning the Sunday School had an attendance of eight hundred and eighty-one, now double the attendance, in the middle of summer, of that of any other Baptist Sunday School in the city for the whole year. The morning congregation filled the entire building downstairs, with very few seats vacant in the gallery. In the evening the church was crowded in every part. Four were baptized at the evening service, and a good number confessed Christ for the first time. The Communion Service followed, when the Pastor gave the hand of fellowship to ten new members. Following the Communion Service, the Pastor preached on the church grounds out-of-doors to a multitude, when again many hands were raised in confession of Christ. The aggregate congregations for the whole day must have been well over four thousand.

THE PASTOR VISITS NOVA SCOTIA.

After the open air preaching service Sunday night the Pastor will leave by late train for Truro, Nova Scotia, where he will arrive Tuesday afternoon, returning to the city at the end of the week in time for his Sunday's duties. He is going to Truro in response to the invitation of the Baptist Laymen's Fundamentalist League of the Maritime Provinces. In some parts of these provinces there have been revivals which have given rise to prayer circles; and out of these prayer circles the Baptist Laymen's Fundamentalist League has been formed. The brethren write to say that Modernism is making tremendous strides in the Maritime Provinces; and that the laymen have felt led of the Lord to band themselves together to contend earnestly for the faith. This is said to be the first fundamentalist conference held in the Maritime Provinces and the Editor of this paper has been invited to address the two great evening meetings which will be held August 12th and 13th. He earnestly requests the prayers of all *Witness* readers that the blessing of God may attend this, his first visit to the Maritime Provinces.

THE OMISSION OF THE LESSON.

For want of space we have omitted the S. S. Lesson this week from *The Witness*, but it will be printed as the usual Leaflet for the use of our own school. We have felt free to do this because we do not know that anyone is using our lesson exposition outside of our own school.

This week we begin the study of *The Song of Solomon*, the title of the first lesson being "The First Notes of Love's Music." If any of our readers miss the lesson exposition, please drop us a card to let us know. Otherwise we may in future make room for other matter by omitting it altogether.