

WORLD'S CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS CONVENTION.....	Page 18
S. S. LESSON	22
BAPTIST BIBLE UNION CONFERENCE	24

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, APRIL 29th, 1926

No. 53

Dr. T. T. Shields Analyses Dr. Mullins' Memphis Speech

(The following article was printed in "The Searchlight," of Fort Worth, two or three weeks ago. It is reprinted here for the benefit of our Canadian readers. As Dr. Mullins is President of the World's Baptist Alliance which, we understand, is to meet in Toronto in 1928, his position is of great interest to our Canadian readers. Once upon a time the all-important question among Baptists was, What think ye of Christ? but the revised version of McMaster University and "The Canadian Baptist" is rather, What think ye of Dr. Mullins and Dr. Farmer? We have tried to answer that question in this article.)

For nearly a year I have had before me the request of Dr. Norris that I should write an article analyzing Dr. E. Y. Mullins' speech at Memphis, in support of his Committee's report on the Statement of Faith. The matter was of such grave importance that I postponed my response to Dr. Norris' request in the hope of finding a period of comparative leisure to devote to this interesting task. But that period has never come, and this is written merely in explanation of the long delay in the appearance of this article. Now, a telegram urges me to send it at once, and there is nothing for it but to get to work. Why should any of us wait for leisure? It will never come. How little any of us would do if circumstances did not whip us to our task!

There is a tendency in some quarters to assume that theological discussion can be confined within clearly defined geographical or ecclesiastical limits, and that anyone living beyond that area who ventures an opinion is indulging in "alien censorship". The fact is, of course, truth cannot be monopolized, but is everybody's property. As I write, Toronto is suffering from the effects of the most disastrous ice-storm on record—and the weather man says it came from the South, even from the Gulf region. It may not have produced ice in the South, the disturbance may not have done much damage there; but the man of science says that that is where it originated. We know where it arrived. Telegraph poles by the hundred have been levelled; trees have been destroyed, and yesterday communication with the rest of the world was almost entirely broken. The elements are no respectors of international boundaries. Who owns the oceans? Nations claim a certain control of a narrow strip about their shores—but the trackless deep is nobody's preserve; "the freedom of the seas" for the law-abiding is a principle internationally recognized.

And in the religious realm there are principles which are of universal interest and concern. No denomination can live to itself; and no part of the host of believers who call themselves "Baptist" can take a position, theologically, without challenging the attention of the whole Baptist world.

There are many reasons why Canadian Baptists should be interested in the Baptists of the South. We have had many visitors from the Southland, and they are always welcome; they cannot come too often, nor stay too long. The great numbers of Southern Baptists command a special interest in all they do. Then there is a loose organization known as The World's Baptist Alliance. I confess to being a little afraid of it. With such a man as Dr. Shakespeare so long its secretary, it would be folly to expect that it would harmonize with the position taken by Baptists in the South, or in Canada. The open membership and open Communion practices of the English Baptists, to say nothing of their almost general surrender to Modernism, lessen my enthusiasm for such an Alliance. But whether we like it or not, there is such an organization which claims to be an alliance of all the Baptists of the world; and in view of this no Baptist can be wholly indifferent toward it.

Of this Alliance Dr. Mullins is the President, and therefore, from a Baptist standpoint, he is a world figure. What he says, in the nature of the case, will be widely quoted; and he will be looked upon as one of the highest authorities among Baptists. The position he takes, therefore, in any discussion of theological questions, is a matter of practical concern even to Canadian Baptists. But Baptists are individualists; they must do their own thinking; they believe they must give an account of themselves to God, and that they are responsible to Him alone. Therefore, if Dr. Mullins should take a wrong step, and if other Baptists believe that he has made a mistake, it is the privilege of every Baptist to say so. And I venture to exercise that privilege. This is my further apology for discussing Dr. Mullins' speech delivered before a Convention to which I do not belong.

Following the Memphis Convention I wrote my impressions of the Southern Baptist Convention, and I have been informed that what I wrote about Dr. Mullins' course gave offence to many. I freely acknowledge that I used strong language in discussing the impression which Dr. Mullins' speech had made upon me. It may have been, however, that the fault was with me rather than with Dr. Mullins' speech; it may have been that I was not competent to follow him in his fine distinctions, and that I ought rather to have magnified him as a great harmonizer. I have before me a stenographic report of Dr. Mullins' speech which he himself approved as an accurate report of what he said. I propose in this article to examine that speech with the utmost care. My readers will then be able to judge whether the impressions of Dr. Mullins' speech, recorded in my report of the Southern Convention last June, were due to Dr. Mullins' method of presenting his case, or to my incapacity properly to appraise its value.

Dr. Mullins' Plea for Fair Play.

Dr. Mullins began with an appeal "to the sense of fair play of a Baptist body." What did Dr. Mullins mean by "fair play"? He referred to the fact that there were several parties in the Convention. I quote his words:

"We felt that if it were possible we ought to find a common standing ground for all Southern Baptists, in this doctrinal statement. It would imperil our work if we were to divide over this question, and we looked to the east and to the west, and to the north and to the south, to find out how we could do it. What did we find? We found the divisions of our people to be in two or three directions; first of all, there was a group of brethren who opposed any Confession of any kind; any doctrinal statement whatsoever by Baptist people, on the ground that Baptists have an aversion to all creeds but the Bible, and I want to tell you—(Applause).

"Now, you have right here now a demonstration showing that that group of people is no insignificant group, and has been led by no insignificant brethren.

"All about us are men who say that Baptists ought not to have any creed at all. Of course, that isn't my own view. I have said that Baptists ought to do that! ought to put forth a doctrinal statement—confession, now and then, but they are dangerous weapons at times, and we ought to be careful in fixing them; dangerous to our unity, not dangerous because of the proclamation of what we believe. That was one group we found.

"There was another group that took this view—back in Nashville a few years ago—I don't recall the year, possibly 1912, certain Baptists put forth a certain doctrinal statement. In 1920, or rather 1919, the Convention appointed a committee, I happened to be chairman of that committee, along with Dr. Gambrell and four or five other brethren. They instructed us to prepare a Confession of Faith, which was adopted by the Baptist brethren all over the world. That doctrinal statement was sent abroad. It did a great deal of good. Dr. Gambrell and I found it everywhere in Europe. At Kansas City, in 1923, the Kansas City Convention was kind enough to adopt all of my address, dealing with these fundamentals. A great many people have said that we don't, at this time, need any doctrinal statement whatever. The committee had to consider this group of brethren, and see what they would say.

"There was a third group who believed there ought to be a statement, because of the terrible menace of naturalism. The brethren continued to agitate from year to year, and we were appointed as a committee at the Convention last year. There was a great number who were with them.

"The committee finally waived their own personal judgment about it, and decided that they would revise the old New Hampshire Confession of Faith. That is what is before you to-day. Very well, if that was the duty of the committee, how was the committee to state these matters on which there was a difference of opinion? All of us agreed on one point: That, if possible, we wanted to get unity of action; if possible we ought not to divide; if possible we ought not to let a division form in the great work of the Kingdom of God."

"Fair Play" for the Several Groups.

With this quotation from Dr. Mullins' speech before us, we should remember that he was discussing a Confession of Faith; and Dr. Mullins pleads for fair play in relation to these opposing groups—and that, let it not be forgotten, in connection with a Confession of Faith. What is a confession for? Is it to tell the world what we believe? Is it, in any sense, to be a real confession of faith, or is it to be a statement of compromise so phrased as to avoid saying anything to which men believing opposite principles could object? Dr. Mullins says the committee felt that if it were possible they ought to find "common standing ground for all Southern Baptists, in this doctrinal statement." That attitude assumes one of two things: either that all Southern Baptists are orthodox; or, that the committee aimed to frame a statement which would be sufficiently elastic to include everybody.

Dr. Mullins says: "All of us agreed on one point: That if possible we wanted to get unity of action; if possible we ought not to divide; if possible we ought not to let a division form in the great work of the Kingdom of God." This can mean only one thing: that nothing must be said to cause division. But the subject under discussion was the faith, in other words, an attitude toward truth, that is, an attitude toward truth revealed. If we know the truth as revealed in Christ, if we have a faith to confess, can it ever be wrong to confess the faith that is in us, even if it does divide? On the other hand, if there are elements in a religious body so diverse from each other that a statement of truth held by some would divide the body, it follows inevitably that any statement framed to avoid division is framed at the expense of the principle upon which the elements of the body are not, in heart, agreed. In that case, such a statement might well be a political platform aimed to secure "unity of action"; but it could not, in any true sense, be a confession of faith. Therefore the approach of Dr. Mullins and his associates to this question, by Dr. Mullins' own statement, was the approach of politicians rather than of convinced believers who were determined to witness to the truth at all costs.

Baptists profess that the Bible is their only rule of faith and practice, therefore to the law and to the testimony. We may assume that the apostolic preachers were as solicitous for the work of the Lord as we are and were just as careful to avoid unnecessary division. That there are divisions which are the result of carnal judgments, the third chapter of the First Corinthians teaches us, and the apostolic mind was always set against such unnecessary strife. In the second of Galatians Paul refers to a controversy which raged in the church at Jerusalem and elsewhere, and he tells us how they settled their differences in order that the work of the Lord should not be hindered (vss. 7 to 10). But where the truth, and consistency with the truth, became an issue, Paul did not fear division. Let us hear what he says: "But when Peter was come to Anti-

ooh, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles, but when they were come he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him, insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles. Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even when we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified". In this instance Paul did not hesitate to confess his faith even though it involved the risk of division. But everywhere to-day Baptists face the same problem. In too many instances worldly standards and methods of raising money and prosecuting the work of the Lord have been adopted. The churches have become heavily involved in debt, and the getting of money, which ought always to be relegated to a subordinate place, has become the dominating and determining purpose. Anything, therefore, that might affect the flow of money by offending some of the principal givers, must be avoided, even though such avoidance involves a compromise with error. Thus the material is exalted above the spiritual, and policy is substituted for principle, and the wisdom of man for the Word of God.

I am of the opinion that Dr. Mullins' speech is to be judged and understood by his approach to the subject under discussion, and by his own confession he approached the subject, not to ascertain what saith the Scriptures, not with a view to writing a confession which would express, in clearest terms, the Denomination's unswerving and uncompromising loyalty to the truth, but rather with a view to finding a common ground upon which men of opposing views could meet in order to secure "unity of action" and to avoid a division that might hamper the prosecution of the work. That, let us keep in mind, was Dr. Mullins' attitude of mind, both in preparing the confession of faith and presenting it to the Convention.

The next point one needs to consider is the approach of Dr. Stealey, who represented the position which Dr. Mullins, in this speech, undertook to oppose. What was Dr. Stealey's position? Obviously he approached the question with a conviction that a deadly heresy was menacing the spiritual health of Southern Baptists and that error, he believed, was the doctrine of evolution. He evidently believed that that lay at the basis of the doctrinal defection which was blighting individual Baptists and Baptist institutions. It would appear, therefore, that he conceived of the confession of faith as a means whereby the Baptists of the South should reach an understanding on the basis of the truth commonly believed among them; and that as many of them as really believed that evolution was unscriptural, should come together and in plain speech say so, and therefore with the bluntness and directness of an honest man, he dissented from the majority of his brethren on the committee on the statement of faith, and asked the Convention to put into its confession respecting the creation of man, the simple words that he came "not by evolution." Dr. Stealey was equally aware with Dr. Mullins that the Baptists of the South were not absolutely agreed respecting some matters. He did not frame his amendment with a view to making it possible for men of opposite religious convictions to vote for the same thing. Apparently he believed that if Southern Baptists did not believe in Evolution, as honest people they ought to say so. Dr. Stealey made the mistake of supposing that Southern Baptists were about to vote on a confession of faith, whereas Dr. Mullins plainly intimates that his purpose was to provide a political platform. I do not wonder that these two brethren failed to agree.

Dr. Stealey's Own Words.

In this connection let us hear Dr. Stealey's own words:

"There is much speculation in the world of scholarship and the higher you go in education, the more speculative it is. Let us remember that. It is all right to go into the heights, but let the balloon that carries us be anchored to Genesis. If we need a hypothesis, make Genesis the basis. If we are not anchored there, there will be a crash and ruin.

"The Scriptures certainly warrant a plain declaration against evolution. Paul says: 'Man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man,' thus fitting in with the Genesis account of man's creation. Again he speaks of one kind of flesh of men, another of beasts, another of birds, etc. Christ referred to the creation of man as though it were a historic fact. Certainly then we do not need any other evidence, when the scriptures have spoken, to declare a scripture-denying theory false.

"Was Christ mistaken? If so, He was not what He claimed to be. He was not what we need as a Saviour. If He was mistaken, we are yet in our sins and God is the author of sin, evolution is true, and man's fall is simply a failure to be evolved. Evolution is the foundation of various heresies and shades of Modernism. The great question that I bring to this Convention is, 'Are Southern Baptists for evolution in any form?' No! No! No! Ten thousand times, No! (Applause.)

"They do not stand for evolution anywhere. The issue is right here, my brethren. Not that I would accuse my brethren of shielding the evolutionists to work comfortably under that pronouncement. Southern Baptists should not stand for that heresy, that makes a new Christ, a new Heaven, a new Bible and no hell."

So that there may be no mistake and lest the exact terms of the clause of the confession in dispute may have escaped the memory of my readers, I will set them out again in full:

Statement on "The Fall of Man" as Recommended in the Majority Report Which Dr. Mullins Supported.

"Man was created by the special act of God, as recorded in Genesis, 'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them.' (Gen. 1:27.) 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.' (Gen. 2:7.) He was created in a state of holiness under the law of his maker, but, through the temptation of Satan he transgressed the command of God and fell from his original holiness and righteousness; whereby his posterity inherit a nature corrupt and in bondage to sin, and are under condemnation, and as soon as they are capable of moral action, become actual transgressors."

Statement on "The Creation and Fall of Man" as Contained in Dr. Stealey's Minority Report and Advocated by Him.

"We believe that man came into this world by direct creation of God and not by evolution. This creative act was separate and distinct from any other work of God and was not conditioned upon antecedent changes in previously created forms of life. Gen. 1:27: 'God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him.' Gen. 2:7: 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.'

"Man was at first in a state of holiness under the law of his Maker, but through the temptation of Satan, he transgressed the command of God, and fell from his original holiness and righteousness, whereby his posterity inherit a nature corrupt and in bondage to sin, are under condemnation, and as soon as they are capable of moral action, become actual transgressors."

Now that we have a clear statement of Dr. Mullins' and Dr. Stealey's positions, made in their own language, before us, we are in a position carefully to examine their respective arguments.

Dr. Mullins' Evolution Statement.

Having entered a plea for fair play, Dr. Mullins said he wanted "to correct a matter of fact." He then deals with a statement in the morning paper and he says Dr. Stealey had said the same thing before, that there was nothing about evolution in this (Dr. Mullins') report. Dr. Mullins of course acquits Dr. Stealey of any intention to misrepresent the facts. Then Dr. Mullins quotes the statement attached to the end of the report on "Faith and Message," which was in the following terms:

"Science and Religion."

"We recognize the greatness and value of the service which modern science is rendering to the cause of truth in uncovering the facts of the natural world. We believe that loyalty to fact is a common ground of genuine science and

the Christian religion. We have no interest or desire in covering up any fact in any realm of research. But we do protest against certain unwarranted procedures on the part of some so-called scientists. First, in making discoveries, or alleged discoveries, in physical nature, a convenient weapon of attack upon the facts of religion; second, using the particular sciences, such as psychology, biology, geology and various others as if they necessarily contained knowledge pertaining to the realm of the Christian religion, setting aside the supernatural; third, teaching as facts what are merely hypotheses. The evolution doctrine has long been a working hypothesis of science, and will probably continue to be, because of its apparent simplicity in explaining the universe. But its best exponents freely admit that the causes of the origin of species have not been traced, nor has any proof been forthcoming that man is not the direct creation of God as recorded in Genesis. We protest against the imposition of this theory upon the minds of our children in denominational or public schools as if it were a definite and established truth of science. We insist that this and all other theories be dealt with in a truly scientific way; that is, in careful conformity to established facts."

Dr. Mullins says that the statement on "Science and Religion" which is embodied in the report "is just as explicit as anything in Brother Stealey's amendment. So, let us get the facts right before we begin to reason about them." He was surely correct in insisting that "we get the facts right before we begin to reason about them"; but I beg respectfully to say to Dr. Mullins that at that point he did not get his "facts right" before reasoning about them. Between Dr. Stealey's amendment and Dr. Mullins' statement on "Science and Religion" there is a very wide difference. Dr. Stealey's amendment says that "man came into this world by direct creation of God and not by evolution." Even a child can understand that: he may not know what evolution means, but whatever it means he will know that Dr. Stealey says man did not come by evolution. But what does Dr. Mullins' statement say? Only this: "The best exponents freely admit that the causes of the origin of species have not been traced, nor has any proof been forthcoming that man is not the direct creation of God as regarded in Genesis." On the face of it, then, Dr. Mullins is authority for the statement that the "best exponents" freely admit that they are unable to account for the origin of species; and to this he adds that no proof has yet been adduced to show that Genesis is untrue. What he really says in that paragraph to the evolutionists is, "Gentlemen, as yet you have not proved your case, and until you do, be good enough to refrain from speaking of evolution as an established fact."

Were the Two Statements Alike?

But Dr. Mullins says that the "best exponents" of evolution agree with him on this point. He tells us that they agree that they have not proved their case. I can see nothing at all in the statement of "Science and Religion" that would exclude an evolutionist from Baptist fellowship. There is nothing to say that those who adopted this statement at the Kansas City Convention were so sure that Genesis is the Word of God, and that, being the Word of God, is absolutely true; and that therefore inasmuch as evolution is contrary to the Word of God it must be false, and should be rejected as an error.

Dr. Stealey, on the other hand, says that man came "not by evolution," and is done with it: Dr. Mullins leaves the door on the latch for all the evolutionists of the world to walk in at their pleasure. Of course, they must not be too dogmatic unless they bring their proofs with them!—but they are permitted to hold fellowship with people who profess their belief in Genesis as the Word of God; while, at the same time, they busy themselves in endeavoring to find proof "that man is not the direct creation of God as recorded in Genesis." The man who can see no difference between the statement of "Science and Religion" and Dr. Stealey's amendment, it would appear to me, can see no difference between black and white.

What Was the Issue?

But now let me proceed further. Dr. Mullins says that the whole difference between himself and Dr. Stealey "boils itself down to one issue only, and that is simply this: Where shall we put the reference to Evolution? Shall we put it in the doctrinal statement, in a Confession of Faith, or shall we put it in a general statement of the relation between Science and Religion. (Applause.) That is worth applauding; for that is all there is to it. It is just

simply a question of a difference as to where we shall put it. Brother Stealey says it ought to go in the doctrinal statement; the other group says it ought to go in the other statement. That is the issue, and that is where I believe in giving place for fair play. Is it fair to divide this great body over any such question?"

I have to confess that it was at this point I began to receive the impression which I described in my report of the Southern Convention last Summer. Dr. Mullins says there is no difference of conviction respecting evolution; he says there is no essential difference between his statement and Dr. Stealey's statement; and that the only difference between them is as to whether it is put in a Confession of Faith or in a separate statement. And then he says, "Is it fair to divide this great body over any such question" as that! If Dr. Mullins' statement be a statement of fact, and that was the only issue at Memphis last May; and if the difference was so small as to lead Dr. Mullins to imply that it was negligible, why did he divide the Convention on such an issue?

Let us assume that Dr. Stealey, was a very stubborn man, add to that the further assumption that he was a very ignorant man—blindly prejudiced against the new learning—but on Dr. Mullins' own statement, he said no more than Dr. Mullins said, nor than Dr. Mullins believed—why then should not some little concession have been made to him? It is a poor rule that does not work both ways. If Dr. Stealey's conviction respecting evolution led him to determine that a repudiation of evolution should go into the statement of faith, what was it that made Dr. Mullins equally determined to keep it out? But I remember to have read that when Dr. J. B. Leavell expressed his view of the unsatisfactory character of Dr. Mullins' statement, saying that he, Dr. Leavell, was so sure of Genesis that he was positive that it could never be disproved, Dr. Mullins dissented from that position. Somewhere I have read that Dr. Mullins lays some modest claim to scholarship. Is he so jealous of his reputation as a scholar as to fear that some day science may demonstrate evolution to be a fact, and therefore disprove the truth of the Genesis account of creation? Is that Dr. Mullins' attitude toward the Bible? Can he go no further than to say, "No one has as yet proved Genesis to be untrue"? Is that the kind of confidence upon which, in human relationships, a mutual trust can be built? Could any marriage be happy if the parties to it were to assume the attitude of saying that we believe in each other only because as yet sufficient evidence has not been forthcoming to show that either is untrustworthy? Surely this is not Evangelical Faith; not thus have the mighty heroes of the Gospel regarded the Word of God.

As I think of that great assembly at Memphis, of the tremendous responsibilities resting upon the Boards of that Convention, of their great financial obligations, and of the necessity, according to Dr. Mullins' own statement, of keeping them all together, so as to secure unity of action—in view of the fact that there was one stubborn man, in the person of the Editor of *The Baptist Messenger*, who would not compromise and insisted upon putting in the statement the three simple words, "not by evolution," I cannot help asking myself, For what reason did Dr. Mullins jeopardize the unity of the whole Southern Baptist Convention by refusing to accept an amendment which he himself declares means the same thing as his own statement?

I quote now another paragraph from Dr. Mullins' speech:

"Now, another fact is this—will you bear it in mind: This Committee is not a committee of Evolutionists. There isn't a man on it that believes in it. There isn't a modernist on it. Every man on there believes in the supernatural; believes in the virgin birth; believes in the deity of Jesus; and there are a score of things in that doctrinal statement that no evolutionist would accept. He wouldn't accept that statement; he wouldn't accept the statement of the virgin birth; he wouldn't accept the statement of the miracles of Jesus; he wouldn't accept the statement of the deity of Jesus! he wouldn't accept the statement of the resurrection of Jesus; he wouldn't accept the statement of the present return of Jesus to this earth. There are any number of things there that kill Evolution dead the moment they touch it."

In this paragraph Dr. Mullins tells us that there was not an evolutionist on his Committee, nor a modernist; and he commits himself and his committee in the most positive way to the supernaturalism of the Christian revelation.

And this is glorious. Nobody who has any acquaintance with Dr. Mullins' writings would charge him with being a modernist. If Modernism, when it is finished, is synonymous with naturalism, Dr. Mullins is certainly no modernist; and I know of no one who has contended more earnestly and faithfully for the supernaturalism of the Christian revelation than Dr. Mullins. He says rightly that "there are a score of things in that doctrinal statement that no evolutionist would accept," but I would remind my readers that there is not a word in the doctrinal statement that names evolution as an error; and Dr. Mullins is sufficiently versed in psychology to know that it is the specific naming of errors to which special objection is taken always. Does not Dr. Mullins' argument react upon himself? If "there are a score of things in that doctrinal statement that no evolutionist would accept," what reasonable objection could there be to adding one more? Why should the naming of evolution as a thing untrue be especially objectionable if the doctrinal statement contains a "score" of implications to the same effect? By what means has evolution acquired this special immunity? Why is evolution singled out among the errors of the day as the one enemy upon which the guns of the Confession of Faith must not be trained?

Not Principle But Location?

Dr. Mullins reiterates his statement that the question at issue is not a principle but merely the location of a statement on a printed page:

"Now, if it were reduced to a question of where you are going to put it; whether in the general statement of the relation between science and religion, on the one side, or incorporate it in the doctrinal statement, you have got a question so simple that it ought not to divide the brethren."

Dr. Mullins rightly insists upon a proper use of the term "evolution," explaining that variation of the species is not evolution in the technical sense; and plainly implies his own belief that evolution is as yet unproved.

Then Dr. Mullins reaches the place where he contends that common ground should be sought upon which all the groups could agree, and he says that letters had been received in which it was insisted that no article on evolution should be included in the doctrinal statement, because it had the appearance of introducing science into a religious confession.

Dr. Mullins says that Dr. Stealey's statement "was open to criticism in the language itself:"

"Now, as far as Dr. Stealey's statement is concerned, it is open to criticism in the language itself. I won't go into that—I mean to say, that in his amendment he doesn't express himself clearly. I mean to say furthermore, brethren, what is absolutely true! It is absolutely true, that you can't phrase language so that scientific men, if they want to and have no conscience, can't evade it. I know to-day of one writer, I think it is Mr. Patten, in his book, 'The Grand Strategy of Evolution,' takes possession of the Bible idea that is used so much against the doctrine of Evolution. 'Bring forth after its kind,' is adopted by him as one of the grand strategies of Evolution: that the species arrive at a certain static or definite state in their development and remain that way a long time, in order to create the necessary conditions, and then spring on to new development in other species. In other words, he had adopted that language that species produce only after their kind. You can't beat them when you come to remodeling scientific language; you needn't try. But you can do something else: you can define what you believe in clear terms, and state your doctrinal views in terms that anyone can understand."

Let us examine this paragraph: Delivered from a public platform, to many who have not trained themselves carefully to weigh a speaker's language, Dr. Mullins' speech may have sounded plausible enough. But observe: without telling us the ground of his objection, he says that Dr. Stealey's amendment was open to criticism in the language itself; and all he tells us is that Dr. Stealey does not express himself clearly. In my view Dr. Stealey's amendment is clarity itself. What could be plainer than this, "not by evolution"? But Dr. Mullins then tells us that it is impossible to "phrase language so that scientific men, if they want to and have no conscience, can't evade it." But at the end of the paragraph under review he says, "But you can do something else: you can define what you believe in clear terms, and state your doctrinal views in terms that anyone can understand." Why should language be so effective in one direction, and so impotent in another? Of course, Dr.

Mullins must be aware that his principle applies to religion quite as emphatically as to science. Modernism has appropriated the language of orthodoxy in which to wrap up its heresies; every modernist says he believes in inspiration, in the vicarious sufferings of Christ, in the new birth, and all the rest of it; but these terms usually mean the opposite in the lips of a modernist to that which they signify when used by evangelical believers.

Of course, if Dr. Mullins' argument is to be carried to its logical conclusion, we may as well remain dumb and use no language at all. But why should it be impossible to state in clear terms that we do not believe that man came by evolution, while, according to Dr. Mullins, it is possible to state our doctrinal views "in terms that anyone can understand"? Perhaps it is due to my own mental infirmity that the paragraph before us does not appear to be argument, but mere sophistry.

Following this, Dr. Mullins asks for the adoption of his statement without Dr. Stealey's amendment, and names as his first reason for asking this, the language of his article itself, with that of the supplementary statement, the supplementary statement being that "no proof has been forthcoming that man is not the direct creation of God, according to Genesis."

His next reason is "the current opinion of the brethren." Dr. Mullins then quotes at length from several of the Southern papers, in one of which reference is made with approval to another quotation from the statement on "Science and Religion" as follows: "The evolution doctrine has long been a working hypothesis of science, and will probably continue to be, because of its apparent simplicity in explaining the universe." No one disputes the fact that evolution has been a working hypothesis; but Dr. Mullins undertakes to give a reason why it will "continue" to be so, and his reason is this: because of "its apparent simplicity in explaining the universe." What do Southern Baptists mean by adopting such a statement? Do they really believe that the evolutionary hypothesis is an apparently simple explanation of the universe? Some of us, at all events, believe that to accept it at all requires such credulity as can only be found in those whose minds the god of this world hath blinded "lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine upon them."

If this statement does not give evolution a certificate of character, we do not know what it does; if it is not a veiled plea for the toleration of evolution, we do not know what it is. Here is a body of people who adopted a statement declaring their belief in the Genesis account of creation, and, at the same time, the body implicitly approve of the statement that evolution, which is directly contrary to Genesis, is apparently "a simple explanation of the universe." I may be very dull and stupid, but I confess that such strange reasoning as this is too much for me.

I come now to Dr. Mullins' argument that science and religion would be wise to each mind their own business and keep off each other's territories. There is much to be said in favor of this view, with certain limitations. We quote a definition of science, quoted by Dr. Mullins from the Encyclopaedia Britannica, in an article entitled, "Fellow Workers With God," appearing in *The Western Recorder*, February 18th, 1926, page 6:

"The definition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica is very clear. 'Science is a word which in its broadest sense, is synonymous with learning and knowledge. Accordingly it can be used in connection with any qualifying adjective which shows what branch of knowledge is meant. But in general usage a more restricted meaning has been adopted which differentiates science from other branches of accurate knowledge. For our purpose science may be defined as ordered knowledge of natural phenomena and of the relations between them; that is it is a short term for natural science, and as such is used here technically in conformity with a general modern convention'."

Some time ago I wrote an article in criticism of an editorial in *The Baptist* of Chicago, in which the writer contended that President Mullins and Dean Shaller Mathews of Chicago University occupied substantially the same position. I venture here to quote that article as it deals with the principle of the question before us.

Dr. Mullins and Dr. Shaller Mathews

Let us examine President Mullins' words first, of which *The Baptist* says: "Every fundamentalist who has spoken of the subject is in accord with

this statement of President Mullins. And between his statement and that of Dean Mathews as they stand, there is not a shade of essential difference."

Let us see. We have not always agreed with President Mullins, but we believe in the "fair play" for which he so vainly pleaded at the Memphis Convention.

From the quotation before us it would appear that Dr. Mullins is discussing the relation of Christianity to modern science, and expresses his conviction "that there is a common standing ground for Christianity and modern science. That standing ground may be summed up in three words: Loyalty to fact." That, of course, is only another way of saying that Christianity is supremely loyal to truth, i. e., to demonstrated truth, and is never afraid of truth, but welcomes all truth in all realms.

Out of this, however, the question naturally arises, What is fact? By what means is fact to be identified as fact, and proved to be fact? There are facts of Christian revelation and experience which do not disclose their identity nor reveal their secrets to microscope nor telescope, and which cannot be classified nor valued by laboratory methods. Notwithstanding, they are facts; and to these principles of fact the true believer must and will be loyal.

But Christianity must insist that it deals with facts beyond the reach of science; that it deals with spiritual realities which are not less real because they are undiscoverable to those who are without the spiritual equipment requisite to their identification and appreciation and appraisal: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God."

We believe President Mullins means something like that; and that, in saying "loyalty to fact" is a common standing ground for Christianity and science, he would include in the realm of indisputable fact many things of which mere science has neither knowledge nor consciousness, because it has no faculty for their perception.

Let us now look at Dean Shailer Mathews' statement of the case for Modernism:

"It is the use of the methods of modern science to find, state and use the permanent and central values of inherited orthodoxy in meeting the needs of a modern world."

The subject upon which the modernist will use his wisdom is "inherited orthodoxy." Here Dr. Shailer Mathews flings Modernism's unflinching sneer at orthodoxy: it is "inherited." Orthodoxy, according to the modernists, is devoid of any intellectual quality worthy a modern man's respect. Orthodox believers "inherited" their religion as they did the color of their skin or of their hair. It is the mission of modernists to open schools for the orthodox (more often, they steal schools from the orthodox and convert them to their own purpose).

Rightly understood, of course, orthodoxy is "inherited"—it is the spiritual birthright of such as are born again of the Holy Spirit. But Dean Mathews intends no such meaning in his use of the word "inherited."

It is, however, with "the permanent and central values of inherited orthodoxy" Modernism is concerned. But what are "the permanent and central values"? Who is to distinguish and differentiate between "the permanent" and that which is not permanent in Christianity? Who is to identify "the central values"? Modernism will do this for us. Its mission is "to find, state and use" these elements of our holy Faith. Modernism will come into the house of orthodoxy without so much as a by-your-leave, and make an inventory of its contents. It will "find" the permanent—what is neither "permanent" nor "central" it will pile in the backyard for the collector of religious garbage to carry to the Sanitary Scholastic Incinerator for obsolete religious ideas.

In this process Modernism will "find" and tell us how much of the Bible has "permanent" value, and what doctrines of the gospel are "permanent and central," and will give us back a Bible marked as our letters used to be marked during the war, "Passed the censor."

But Modernism will not only "find" these "permanent and central values" for us: it will also "state" them. In what language will these "permanent" things be "stated"? They will be stated in the language of orthodoxy. It

will tell us that it "finds" the Bible "inspired," and that inspiration is a permanent value. Later we shall learn that the inspiration of the Bible is of the same quality as that of all good literature. Modernism will "find" the virgin birth is not subject to proof by "the methods of modern science," and it will "state" that "the permanent and central value" of the doctrine of the virgin birth consists in the truth of the incarnation—spelled without a capital to encourage us to believe that we also may become incarnations of truth. It will "find" the "vicarious sufferings of Jesus" have a "permanent" value, explaining that His example affords inspiration for the "vicarious" sufferings of a mother for her child, the soldier for his country, and, generally, for everyone who will serve his neighbor at the cost of self-sacrifice.

Thus, Modernism, ignoring and implicitly denying the Holy Spirit's ministry, will "find" and "state" what is "permanent" in "inherited orthodoxy" in such a way that many of the orthodox will not know that their inheritance has been filched away from them.

But having "found" and "stated" these "permanent and central values," Modernism will also "use" them "in meeting the needs of a modern world." Yes, Modernism knows how to "use" them deceptively to establish itself in orthodox institutions and organizations, and steal them for their own "use." It will apply these alleged "permanent" values to the mass instead of to the individual; to a man's circumstances instead of to his soul; to his mind to the neglect of his spirit. Thus Modernism will "use" what it is pleased to regard as having "permanent" value in Evangelical Christianity, by substituting education for evangelization, and social betterment for personal salvation.

And all this is to be brought about by the use of "the methods of modern science." We are sure we have done no violence to Dean Shaller Mathews' intended programme in what we have written. But who that knows anything about President Mullins' theological position will believe, as *The Baptist* says, that "Between his (Dr. Mullins') statements and that of Dean Mathews as they stand, there is not a shade of essential difference?"

It is true the orthodox believer, as Dr. Mullins says, is supremely loyal to fact, and that "the defender of the faith . . . is willing to apply every criterion and test which the field of investigation permits" (the blackface is ours). But when "the field of investigation" is the spiritual realm in which the facts of divine revelation find their verification in Christian experience, "the field" does not "permit" the application of "the criteria and tests" employed in "the methods of modern science."

The believing heart must say to modern science respecting these deepest and most real experiences of the spirit: "Thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep." True faith is so sure of the fact of Christ; of the fact of His substitutionary death and literal physical resurrection; of the fact of the divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures, and hence of the falsity of everything that is contrary thereto; and is so loyal to these incontrovertibly demonstrated facts of Christian experience, that she is undisturbed by all the subtle attempts of a science falsely-so-called to destroy men's faith in the essential facts of the Christian religion.

We have regretted Dr. Mullins' tolerant attitude toward certain aspects of Modernism, but such mistakes of his as we have observed—and may we, without immodesty, say we greatly fear even so great a man as Dr. Mullins may make mistakes—have been mistakes of policy, and we may add, mistakes of expression. By mistakes of expression we mean his almost habitual ambiguity of speech.

An example of Dr. Mullins' ambiguity is contained in the quotation we have under review. Discussing the common standing ground for Christianity and modern science, among other things he describes it as being a "willingness to accept evidence of an unusual kind, provided it seems genuine; unwillingness to prejudge the evidence, even when it tends against one's convictions."

Here Dr. Mullins tells us that both Christianity and science should be willing to accept evidence providing "it seems genuine." Evidence that only "seems" genuine would not be accepted in any court of law. Unless we are sure the evidence is genuine, and in strict accord with fact, an honest man ought to be unwilling to accept it. But Dr. Mullins continues "unwilling to prejudge the evidence (presumably the evidence which 'seems genuine') even when it tends against one's convictions." If language means anything, this would

imply that we should be willing to suspend our "convictions" in favor of evidence which only "seems" genuine.

This illustrates what we mean by Dr. Mullins' mistakes of expression. If the word "seems" is used carelessly, we must submit that the subject Dr. Mullins discusses is too serious to permit of the careless use of language. If, on the other hand, the word is used advisedly, it opens the way to every kind of hypothesis including that of evolution; and suggests that one's convictions may be set aside in favor of that which only "seems."

Whatever be the meaning of Dr. Mullins' language in this particular instance, we think it is unfortunate that he does not use language so clear and unmistakable as to render such an attempt as is made by *The Baptist* to include him in Dr. Shaller Mathews' school of thought so absurd as to be instantly recognized as impossible.

The Alleged Mutual Trespass of Religion and Science.

The foregoing discussion deals with the danger Dr. Mullins anticipates, that of making the religion of Christ a subject for telescope, microscope and test tube. I do not believe that the Bible was ever designed to teach science, but on the other hand I am convinced there is not a single statement of the Scripture that is contrary to true science, which is but another way of saying, which is contrary to fact. I can imagine a great scientist, who is also the simple father of a family, who one day takes his little boy for a walk. The little boy is full of questions and interrogates his father respecting everything he sees. But in his relation to that child he is not a great man of science so much as he is a father, and he answers the child's questions in simple language without indulging in technicalities. He may talk of the rocks and of the trees and of the clouds and of the stars beyond, but what information he gives is expressed in language which a little boy can understand. But behind that simple speech there is a background of scientific knowledge. While the father would not use the language of science, it is inconceivable that there would be anything in his speech opposed to the store of knowledge which the childish mind had no capacity to receive, and which was therefore not communicated. We may suppose that the child follows in the father's footsteps, and in due course becomes a distinguished scientist himself, and as he recalls his ramblings with his father in the woods and by the water-course, and brings his recollections into the light of his present scientific knowledge, I can imagine his saying to himself, "While in those pleasure walks we had together among the wonders of nature, my father explained to me in language suited to my understanding, the phenomena about me, I can see now that simple as was the language he used, it was in full accord with the greater scientific lore that was treasured in his mind."

So surely Baptists believe the Bible to be the Word of God, the word of the Infinite Father to His little children. Had He expressed the wonders recorded in Genesis in the language of established scientific fact, it could be understood by only a few in our day, while to those of ancient times it must have proved an unknown tongue. But if the Bible be the Word of the God Who created all things, it is inconceivable that God should speak a single word that is not absolutely, finally, true.

But the mistake we believe Dr. Mullins makes is in dignifying the theory of evolution by the name of science. Let us quote from the definition Dr. Mullins uses from the Encyclopaedia Britannica. "For our purpose science may be defined as ordered knowledge of natural phenomena and of the relations between them." What is knowledge? Let us quote Tennyson:

"We have but faith, we cannot know,
For knowledge is of things we see."

If that be true, does evolution fall within the definition of knowledge? What does any man know of the origin of species? Is evolution more than a mere guess that has not passed beyond the range of the hypothetical? Evolution is a philosophy rather than a science. Moreover it is a religious philosophy. It presumes to account for origins. It trespasses upon the well defined preserves of Genesis and plainly comes into conflict with religion. No one knows better than Dr. Mullins that the principles of Modernism have their foundation in the evolutionary hypothesis. Or, to change the figure, evolution is the root

of the upas tree of Modernism. We agree that it should be recognized that the raw material of the physical sciences belongs to that which is visible or ponderable, and that there is a sphere in which science may ascertain and demonstrate facts by rational processes. It should be kept in mind also that there is another realm of reality in which religion is supreme. It does not deal primarily with things which are seen and temporal but with things which are unseen and eternal.

Yet it must be admitted that truth never contradicts itself and if religion, by spiritual processes, comes to a knowledge of fact in its own special sphere; and if science, presuming to pronounce upon matters which, in the nature of the case, lie beyond its special province, and in that pronouncement dares to contradict what religion knows to be a fact, then surely religion is not going beyond its legitimate reach when it says that what science, or "science-falsely-so-called," affirms, is contrary to what religion has proved experimentally to be a fact. In other words, religion ought to have the courage to say, what it knows to be a fact—"not by evolution."

Why a Confession of Faith?

The situation which so loudly called in the Southern Convention for a confession of faith, consisted in the fact that the reptile of Evolution in so many quarters was lifting its head and hissing its defiance of Revealed Religion. To issue a confession of faith designed to meet that situation and omit from the confession an anti-evolution statement, was like what David would have done had he taken the field against Goliath with a sling in his hand but no stone to bring the giant low. It was like going on a lion hunt and taking to one's heels as soon as the lion roared.

Confessions of faith have usually been made to meet some special doctrinal defection; and the circumstances which called for a confession of faith in the Southern Convention surely required that that confession should deal with that one error which more than any other single thing is destroying the foundations of the faith.

Dr. Mullins a Super-Naturalist.

I return to the position taken earlier in this article, namely, that no one can doubt that Dr. Mullins is committed to the supernaturalism of Christianity. But I am forced to the conclusion that the course he took at Memphis failed to effect the unity at which he aimed, and accomplished the division he sought to avoid. If he succeeded in pleasing anyone, he pleased chiefly the enemies of the truth which he professes, and grieved, and in some cases offended, those who believe the great principles of which he has been so able an exponent. Dr. Mullins therefore has become to many a psychological study, a conundrum, hard to explain but not difficult to parallel. His attitude at Memphis is typical of many school men. It represents a mentality so dangerous to the faith that one wonders sometimes if the conditions responsible for such an attitude of mind must not themselves be out of harmony with the principles of God's Word. How does it come to pass that so many men who have long professed the orthodoxy of Dr. Mullins, while still holding fast their orthodox profession, yet in practical matters ally themselves with the enemies of the Gospel they profess?

Dr. J. R. Sampey's Attitude.

About December of last year I was in Lexington, assisting Dr. George Ragland. A certain meeting of ministers was held in which one of the Kentucky pastors criticized the position of Dr. J. R. Sampey of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. At another meeting largely made up of the same company held a few days later, Dr. Sampey appeared, a welcome but uninvited guest. I had been asked to address the brethren on the present war being waged by Modernism upon evangelical faith. As soon as I concluded my address Dr. Sampey took the floor. I had never seen him before and felt no prejudice either for or against him. I had known of him only as a man who was reputed to be a great Hebrew scholar. Dr. Sampey began his remarks with a very ungentlemanly reflection upon the Chairman of the meeting, Dr. Ragland. He followed with a similar slur upon the church in which the meeting was being held, and upon the special services then being conducted. After a while he divulged the reason for his presence. It appeared that he had heard that he had been criticized and came to Lexington to take care of his reputation. I need not here

occupy my readers with all of Dr. Sampey's remarks. It is sufficient to say that in an attempt to refute an alleged aspersion upon his orthodoxy, Dr. Sampey made one of the finest statements respecting the Old Testament Scriptures I, at least, have ever heard. He declared: there were many things in the Old Testament which he could not and would not believe if they were found in any other book, because they were contrary to anything of which secular history had preserved a record, or of which any living man had had experience or opportunity to observe. He instanced the record of the longevity of the patriarchs, and said that if he read such a record in any other book, he simply would not believe it, but finding it in the Bible he accepted it without question, and I distinctly remember his saying: "I believe it because my Lord approved it." He then went on to tell us that Jesus Christ was his supreme authority; and that His certification to the accuracy and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures was to him an end of all argument, intimating that so far as he was concerned, when the Lord Jesus Christ has spoken there remains nothing but to believe. Then he told us of his view of the creation of man when a child. When he was a boy, he said, he thought of God as making man out of the dust of the earth, much as children make figures of the sand on the seashore. He conceived of God as shaping the form of man out of the dust of the earth and then of God as a kind of super-man bending over the form that he had fashioned and breathing into the new made nostrils the breath of life, so that man became a living soul. And then he said something to this effect: "And I confess it is pretty hard for me to get away from that yet."

So far as I am concerned, I should be disposed to quarrel with the orthodoxy that demanded a fuller or more satisfying statement of belief in the divine inspiration and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures than Dr. Sampey gave. I found my heart responding and rejoicing and I almost became an old fashioned Methodist. I was ready to shout "Hallelujah." And all that Dr. Sampey had said in the beginning of his address, his attack, the matters to which I have referred, and his complaint that fundamentalists generally were fighting friends instead of foes and producing confusion in the ranks of the army of the Lord, all that I was prepared to forgive and forget in the light of his magnificent confession of faith.

But, having made his confession, he paused a moment and began with a word that so often is like the steel flange that turns a train from one track to another and far distant terminus. Dr. Sampey said "but." And then he described certain other excellent men of vast erudition who did not agree with that view of the Bible or of creation; but who believed that in the dim and distant unmeasured and immeasurable past, a vital principle was somehow and by someone released—yes, by God, and that through incalculable ages and by innumerable changes and transmigrations, it arrived at a stage where it ceased to be an animal and became a living soul. And then in a most solemn way he asserted that we must make room in our thought and fellowship for that man.

Thus Dr. Sampey gave a great testimony to the Old Testament Scriptures, but had only harsh words and bitter accusations for fundamentalists and all who contended for the faith. Apparently his only consideration and concern was for the poor evolutionist who might be excommunicated by intolerant fundamentalists! In Dr. Sampey I heard an echo, I saw a reproduction, of the attitude of Dr. Mullins.

In an article on "Evolution and Special Creation," published in *The Western Recorder*, August 6th, 1925, page 8, Dr. Mullins says:

"It is evident to any reader of the denominational papers during the last few weeks that there is need on the part of some of going back to the A B C of clear thinking. The main reasons for leaving out from article three in 'The Baptist Faith and Message' the phrase 'and not by evolution' have been given."

Dr. Mullins then proceeds to give other reasons.

In the same paper (October 1st, 1925; page 16) in an article entitled, "Dr. Mullins and the Committee on Baptist Faith and Message," Dr. C. P. Stealey says:

"Now, in closing, Dr. Mullins was so kind as to refer me to Stanley's 'Ethics of Controversy.' We do not believe any other member of the committee would have thought of making the kind of argument before the convention that he did, declaring that the only issue was where in the report to put the reference to evolution, and he makes it very clear that the Kansas City statement was that

reference. Now I say without any fear of contradiction that never was the issue in the committee, and where to put the Kansas City statement never was an issue. As evidence of that, I have before me a letter dated March 6th, 1925, from Dr. Mullins, in which he says: "The following is a revision of the New Hampshire Confession of Faith in accordance with the vote of the committee at Nashville." In this draft of the articles the Kansas City statement was not included, nor even mentioned. Also I have before me a copy of a letter from Dr. Brown to Dr. Mullins of March 11th, 1925, in which he says: "I was disappointed, however, in not finding at the end OR TOWARD the end of the document an article containing in substance at least the excerpt from your address which the convention adopted at Kansas City."

From this it would appear that what never was an issue between the members of the committee Dr. Mullins ingeniously makes the main issue in his speech before the convention, viz., as to whether the reference to evolution should be included in the doctrinal statement, or set out as a separate and supplementary article. It appears therefore that what Dr. Mullins set before the convention as the main issue was his own interpretation of the differing points of view as developed in the committee's discussions as those points of view revealed themselves in the perspective of his later consideration after the committee had risen.

The same principle of mental reaction appears in the article we have referred to, "Evolution and Special Creation"; it is an attempt to justify his rejection of Dr. Stealey's amendment, an attempt which is more ingenious than ingenuous. Dr. Mullins put a severe strain upon both the charity and the candor of his readers who were present at the Southern Convention, when he asks them to believe that he rejected Dr. Stealey's phrase "not by evolution" to avoid the confusion which would arise in the mind of one who, on searching The Century or other dictionary, should find a subordinate definition of evolution which might be shown not to be excluded from the divine processes as described in Genesis! Dr. Mullins applies his six subordinate definitions of evolution to the first chapter of Genesis, and discovers "process," "unfolding or development" in the production of light, grass, seed, animal life. He says, "God uses means, that is the dust, to create man. Breathing into man's nostrils is a process. So that definition No. (5) is clearly seen." (And this is definition number five referred to: "Evolution is a 'turning or shifting movement; a passing back and forth; change and interchange of position, especially for the working out of a plan'.") Dr. Mullins explains: "That is; it was 'a change and interchange of position for the working out of a purpose or plan.' The change was in the dust. The 'purpose or plan' was the making of man. 'Now God could have made man without means and without process, but He chose not to do so. The whole story of creation shows development or unfolding of God's plan and purpose. Thus definition No. (2) is clearly seen in the unfolding." (Definition number two as quoted by Dr. Mullins is: "The process of evolving or becoming developed; an unfolding or growth from, or as if from, a germ or latent state, or from a plan; development; as the evolution of history or of a dramatic plot.")

Dr. Mullins adds:

"Now it is of course true that all these are perfectly innocent and harmless forms of evolution. But they are forms of evolution nevertheless, set in the very heart of the Genesis account of creation. Some are so obsessed with the meaning of one form of evolution that they seem to forget every other form. And to insert in an article of faith on the subject of creation the phrase 'not by evolution' is to introduce confusion because Genesis presents four or five meanings of the word in the very heart of the creation story itself.

"None of the six preceding definitions present the idea of evolution in its dangerous form."

What are we to make of all this? Dr. Stealey's amendment related to the creation of man only. Dr. Mullins rejected his phrase, "not by evolution," because he sees some "innocent and harmless forms of evolution" in the command to the earth to "bring forth grass," and "the herb yielding seed after its kind!" Dr. Mullins rejected Dr. Stealey's phrase "not by evolution" because he discerns a "process" in man's creation which comes within the scope of a definition of one of the "perfectly innocent and harmless forms of evolution" given in The Century Dictionary! The believer in theistic evolution will be grateful to Dr. Mullins for discovering in the Genesis account of man's creation a "process"

which falls within the scope of one of the definitions of evolution given in The Century Dictionary. This does not imply that Dr. Mullins personally believes in evolution, as the following quotations will show:

Dr. Mullins Quoted in the Scopes Case.

Dr. Shailer Mathews in the last paragraph of the affidavit given in the Scopes case said:

"This view that evolution is not contrary to Genesis is held by many conservative evangelical theologians such as Strong, Hall, Harris and Johnson. Mullins also holds to a theistic evolution."

Rev. T. W. Callaway, *Chattanooga Times* Special Correspondent, telegraphed Dr. Mullins inquiring whether the report was true, to which Dr. Mullins replied, "Dr. Mathews is mistaken. I am not a theistic, nor any other kind of evolutionist."

In an article in the *Alabama Baptist*, July 26th, 1925, page 5, entitled, "The Statement of Science and Religion," Dr. Mullins says:

"Personally I reject the evolutionary hypothesis. I do not believe it has been or ever will be proved. Nothing which biology can ever prove will shake my confidence in the inspiration and authority of the Bible. But, if, in order to be a Baptist and a Christian it requires the denial of facts, the closing of the windows to the light, the putting of the head in the sand, like the ostrich, in order to hide, then I am neither a Baptist nor a Christian. If we are going to save our children and our generation from the evils of Modernism, it will only be by an intelligent and discriminating recognition of the real situation and shaping our course accordingly. The situation can be met. But it will never be done by stuffing cotton in our ears and putting a blindfold over our eyes, and seizing a club and mauling the heads of people who merely differ with us in insisting on recognizing facts:

"Finally, everyone familiar with history knows that every great menace to the faith has been met and destroyed in the court of reasonable discussion. The Christian reason must meet the unchristian reason. Religious scholarship must meet the irreligious. True science must meet the false. Radical Fundamentalists are saying to Christian scholars: "Keep still. Don't discriminate. Don't recognize facts. Don't investigate. Don't prove all things, according to the New Testament. Instead of doing these things, call names. Shut your eyes to facts. Be disloyal to facts. And thus you shall glorify Him who was the way, the truth, and the life." Meantime the devil, whose lie they inveigh against, is capturing thousands of young people because he knows that the spirit of such radicalism will drive them into his arms. Such Fundamentalism is the best ally of Modernism, because Modernism rejoices in nothing so much as in silencing the voice and stifling the pen of the Christian scholar and thinker."

The Greatest Menace to the Faith.

These paragraphs from Dr. Mullins disclose an attitude of mind which constitutes the greatest menace to evangelical faith to-day. Dr. Mullins categorically declares, "I reject the evolutionary hypothesis. I do not believe it has been or ever will be proved." Dr. Stealey in the *Western Recorder*, October 1st, 1925, page 16, reports a conversation between Dr. Mullins and Dr. J. B. Leavell in which, among other things, Dr. Leavell said: "Would not Baptists go as far as the legislature of Tennessee and pass directly on this question?" Dr. Mullins replied, "They did wrong." Dr. Leavell said, "The difference between us, then, is that you are in an attitude to see the theory proven, and I would say anywhere that it will not be proven, and that it is a false theory." Dr. Mullins replied, "You would make a fool of yourself."

I leave my readers to reconcile these two statements, and for the sake of fairness base my argument upon Dr. Mullins' written word that he rejects evolution.

What then? Dr. Mullins says, "Every one familiar with history knows that every great menace to the faith has been met and destroyed in the court of reasonable discussion. The Christian reason must meet the unchristian reason. Religious scholarship must meet the irreligious. True science must meet the false." I should be the last to object to "reasonable discussion," or to underestimate the value of "Christian reason," or "religious scholarship," or "true science"; but is there no place here for the ministry of the Holy Spirit? Have we abandoned the idea that God can take care of His own Word? Will not the Word of God still suffice as the seed for the sower to sow? Ought not a Confes-

sion of Faith to be a confession of the believer's faith in the Word of God, and in the God of the Word. What if there be some things which are hidden from the wise and prudent—shall believers therefore hesitate to confess them? Does not Dr. Mullins display an attitude of conciliation, and even of toleration, toward "the unchristian reason" and "the irreligious scholarship" and "the false science?" Does it not suggest that the Confession of Faith was framed with a greater regard for what the wise and prudent of this world might think than for what God has plainly said?

Dr. Mullins says: "Radical Fundamentalists are saying to Christian scholars: 'Keep still. Don't discriminate. Don't recognize facts. Don't investigate. Don't prove all things, according to the New Testament. Instead of doing these things, call names. Shut your eyes to facts. Be disloyal to facts. And thus you shall glorify Him who was the way, the truth, and the life.'"

Is not this an inexcusable caricature? What fundamentalist in all the world did ever talk such nonsense? Dr. Mullins talks much of "loyalty to fact"; but in this paragraph absolutely ignores facts. What are the "facts" about evolution? By Dr. Mullins' own confession it is absolutely unproved; and he expresses his own conviction that it never will be proved. To any thinking man the evolutionary hypothesis is contrary to all the facts of human history, observation, and experience, as well as being absolutely opposed to all the facts of divine revelation. Why does not Dr. Mullins open his eyes to these "facts?" I do not know who the "radical Fundamentalists" are. I have met some very ignorant people who claim to be fundamentalists, I have met some such who are very unreasonable; but I have never yet met one who comes within measurable distance of Dr. Mullins' wretched and inexcusable caricature. Fundamentalists reject evolution because they do "discriminate," because they do "recognize facts," because they have "investigated," because, measured by both the New Testament and the Old, evolution is demonstrated to be absolutely contrary to fact. Why then, in the name of common sense and of plain Christian honesty, should those who believe God's Word to be true, hesitate to say that man came "not by evolution?"

I repeat: Dr. Mullins' attitude is perplexing multitudes of people with whose theological position he professes to be in full accord. One wonders whether Dr. Mullins' attitude is typical of most school men (by the way, why do Southern Baptists so discount their pastors? In the committee on "Baptist Faith and Message," so far as I am aware, not a single pastor, face to face with the practical problems of life, was given a place), Dr. J. R. Sampey is another man of the same type—orthodox in belief and profession, with a clenched fist for fundamentalists and a hand of fraternal greeting for the greatly maligned evolutionist! Our own Dr. J. H. Farmer is another man of the same type. I have said it publicly from my own pulpit. I have written it in my own paper—I see no reason why I should not say it again in this article—Dr. Farmer is as orthodox in his personal belief as Dr. Mullins or Dr. Sampey; but when the battle is joined, he is always found fighting on the side of the modernists against the fundamentalists.

Many other names will occur to my readers of men who occupy a similar position, and who constitute the greatest weakness of the cause of Evangelical Truth today.

Is there any Scripture which can throw light upon this strange mental attitude? Our Lord warned His disciples, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees." The Pharisees were the orthodox people of their day. It is true that they were charged with having made the Word of God of none effect by their traditions, yet our Lord Himself said, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they did you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not." The Pharisees, theoretically, believed in the divine inspiration and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures: they were not naturalists, but supernaturalists. The Sadducees, on the other hand, were the naturalists of that day. They said there was no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit. The Pharisees and Sadducees therefore had nothing in common with each other; their religious views were directly opposed to each other; and yet we find them again and again joining hands in their opposition to Christ the Incarnate Word, and our Lord linked them together and bade His disciples beware of the doctrine of both of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

I observe the same strange spectacle today: professed supernaturalists joining hands with the avowed naturalists in opposition to those who contend for the supernaturalism of the Christian religion. Does it mean that a merely theoretical supernaturalism, that is a coldly intellectual supernaturalism, ignoring the Spirit whose power makes the supernatural real, has more in common with the philosophies and practices of religious naturalism than with a spiritual orthodoxy?

The battle must go on! We must contend for the faith. We must refuse to compromise. We must be willing to be called "radical Fundamentalists" and even "fools" for Christ's sake; but notwithstanding the great reputation and official prestige of Dr. E. Y. Mullins, the great multitude of experimental believers in the supernaturalism of the Bible, as one by one they come to a clear understanding of the issues involved, will join hands in this conflict, and will avow their adherence to the principle expressed in Dr. Stealey's rejected phrase, until their testimony, like the sound of many waters, shall be thundered into the ears of a generation of compromising school men, "NOT BY EVOLUTION!"

Editorial

THE WORLD'S CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS CONVENTION

Jarvis Street Church has been blessed with a very rich fellowship during recent days. In addition to the great Baptist Bible Union Conference, we are favoured at this writing (Wednesday afternoon) with having the World's Christian Fundamentals Association Annual Convention still in session in Jarvis Street. Delegates are here from all parts of the continent, from far south, and extreme west, and from the east. Our space will not permit us to refer in detail to the various addresses except to say that they have all been of a very high order. It is unspeakable joy and privilege for brethren of all denominations to come together in this fashion. The writer is a convinced Baptist, and those who know him know he is not ashamed to let the world know it. But in this day we have such a variety of Baptists of the Dr. Shaller Mathews type, and the Dr. Fosdick type, that the mere name of Baptist nowadays is a wholly inadequate basis of fellowship. We should like to see all our pedobaptist brethren become Baptists, but we do rejoice in the opportunity which this Conference affords for brethren of all denominations, still true to the great principles of evangelical faith, to come together and join heart and hand in the defence of the faith.

Thus far the outstanding feature of the Convention has been the adoption of a resolution looking to the establishment of a foundation for the advancement of Christian fundamentalist education. By this resolution it is proposed to endeavour to raise the huge sum of twenty five million dollars to be under the direction of a board of trustees elected by the World's Christian Fundamentalist Association, the funds to be administered in the interests of Christian fundamentalist education. This is a great forward step.

The report of the Sunday school committee was important, endorsing the arranging of the completion of Matthew and John for this year, and suggesting for the year following, 1927, the book of the Acts and the Pauline epistles. The following were named on this committee for the year to come: Dr. Marion McH. Hull, Chairman, Dr. J. Frank Norris, Dr. T. T. Shields, Rev. Paul W. Rood and Prof. George W. Riddout.

The committee on text books have done admirable work and have provided a pamphlet that will suggest sound text books to any institution in the land that really desires to change from speculation to sanity and science. Dr. Leander S. Keyser, the chairman of this text book committee, is one of the most capable of present-day professors and writers.

The anti-evolution note has been strong in the entire convention. There seems to be an increasing conviction that the hypothesis of evolution, reducing everything to a naturalistic and material basis, has brought about that division

which is now distressing all evangelical bodies, and more and more it is becoming evident that fundamentalism stands with Christ and the apostles, and modernism with Darwin and his doubting disciples.

The convention at this writing is growing in attendance and deepening in interest. It was decided on Wednesday that the next convention would be held in Atlanta, Georgia, the following invitation having been received from that city:

Rev. W. B. Riley,

World's Christian Fundamentals Assn., in Convention assembled,

Greetings:—

The State of Georgia and the City of Atlanta, together with your Atlanta and Georgia members, extend to you a cordial invitation to hold your next meeting here.

Atlanta has become famous as a convention city through her splendid hotels, their reasonable rates and excellent service; through her abundant auditorium facilities, all of which are free to conventions; through her wonderful climate, and through her unbounded hospitality to convention guests.

You will enjoy Atlanta; and in anticipation of your coming, we extend you in advance a sincere welcome to "The Convention City of Dixie."

Cordially,

Clifford Walker, Governor of Georgia.

Walter A. Sims, Mayor of Atlanta.

F. J. Paxon, President, Atlanta Convention Bureau.

W. C. Royer, President, Atlanta Hotel Men's Association."

THE GRACIOUS SPIRIT OF "THE CANADIAN BAPTIST".

Our amiable contemporary this week quotes from our editorial of last week on the situation in the Northern Baptist Convention respecting the Chicago compromise agreed upon by seventy-five prominent Baptists called together by Dr. J. Whitcomb Brouger. *The Canadian Baptist* comments as follows:

"The Editor of *The Gospel Witness* is left speechless by the seeming desertion of such fundamentalist leaders as Doctors Masee, Straton and Hoyt, who are really but following the lead of the late Dr. A. C. Dixon, who nearly a year before his death, resigned from the Baptist Bible Union. Such men are apparently separating themselves from the divisive type of fundamentalist represented by Drs. Shields, Riley and Norris. The un-Christian campaign of misrepresentation and slander carried on by these latter leaders is beginning to bear its fruit. Fair-minded fundamentalists are deserting the Baptist Bible Union's ship. Members of our denomination in Canada will do well to mark carefully the importance of standing true to the real Baptist fundamentals."

Dr. J. C. Masee was never a member of the Baptist Bible Union, neither was Dr. J. W. Hoyt. We expressed surprise that these brethren, with Dr. John Roach Straton, should have agreed upon such a compromise. But *The Canadian Baptist* wilfully and deliberately misrepresents the facts by saying, "Fair-minded fundamentalists are deserting the Baptist Bible Union's ship." It is true that Dr. A. C. Dixon withdrew from the Baptist Bible Union expressing the view that having made its protest it had served its day. We are convinced Dr. Dixon was mistaken; but we are sure his withdrawal was not due to any disagreement with either Dr. Riley or Dr. Norris, to whom he was most cordially related to the end. It was the writer's privilege to preach for Dr. Dixon by invitation of himself and his deacons many times in Spurgeon's Tabernacle. While Dr. Dixon went to England on the occasion of his marriage he very urgently invited the Editor of this paper to preach for him in Baltimore. This invitation was accepted, but when later we were urged to take the place of Dr. E. Y. Mullins in Richmond, on the date we were to preach in Baltimore, Dr. Dixon's church very kindly released us; but later, and only a few months before his death, at Dr. Dixon's own insistence, we preached in Baltimore in

the University Baptist Church to a congregation that filled the church. We regretted Dr. Dixon's withdrawal from the Baptist Bible Union, but we insist it was not due to any breach in the happy fellowship the three men mentioned enjoyed with Dr. Dixon for years.

We refer to this matter at length to call attention to the bitter spirit of *The Canadian Baptist*. That paper never discusses an issue, but loses no opportunity to vent its venom on the men who turn on the light. We do not know who writes in the editorial columns of our denominational paper, but we do know that its editorial office has chloroformed its conscience and has sent truth on a long vacation as being quite unnecessary to its editorial equipment.

Just before we read this week's *Baptist* we received the following telegram from Dr. Straton:

"New York, April 27.

"Rev. T. T. Shields,

"Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto.

"Your fears about me entirely groundless. Mailing statement to you and other papers showing that my temporary acceptance of resolution was conditional and intended to leave us in better strategic position at Washington if it should prove as now seems possible that Chicago Conference was another Modernist trick, and that the leaders of it will not keep faith with what we understood as a tacit gentleman's agreement, that because of action taken at Chicago the Park Avenue Church would not embarrass the denomination by attempting to hold membership in Northern Convention.

"JOHN ROACH STRATON."

Thus it will be seen that Dr. Straton has not deserted the Baptist Bible Union ship. We expressed the opinion last week that he with others had been deceived. We know Dr. Straton too well to believe that he would ever compromise on matters of principle. The same is true of Dr. J. W. Hoyt. We have never known two truer men.

Dr. Straton's telegram explains what we could not understand. We read the resolution, but did not hear the discussion. Evidently the whole proposal was "understood as a tacit gentleman's agreement." We hope it will prove so, but we have our doubts. We fear the Chicago Conference will turn out to be "a Modernist trick," and that Dr. Straton will discover that "a gentleman's agreement" with Modernists is impossible. However, we must wait and see. Meanwhile we gratefully bear this testimony, borne orally on another occasion, that when Dr. Straton at the Atlantic City Convention in 1923, protested against Dr. W. H. P. Faunce's having a place on the programme of the Northern Convention, he bore a faithful witness to the truth such as no other member of the Fundamentalists Committee did. We are certain we shall hear more of the Chicago Conference.

The Canadian Baptist must take what comfort it can from its habit of personal abuse. Every issue of the paper proclaims that house-cleaning time is drawing near.

DR. DAYFOOT'S LETTER.

In our issue of April 8th we published a letter by Dr. P. K. Dayfoot which appeared in *The Toronto Globe* of April 7th, and made some comments thereon. Learning through a note from Dr. Dayfoot that he was displeased with our criticism we wrote him offering to print anything he desired to say through the columns of *The Gospel Witness*. (In this connection we desire to announce that anyone who is criticized in the columns of *The Witness* will be given space to reply. It would be eminently unfair to criticize anyone without, at the same time, opening our columns to them for their defense).

The Canadian Baptist criticized us for our failure to give Dr. Dayfoot his title of "Doctor". For this we offer our sincere apology. It was entirely an oversight. We are not sure whether the oversight was in the copy or the proof-reading; but it was an error, and we offer Dr. Dayfoot our sincere apology.

We very cheerfully publish the following letter, and ask our readers to ponder it carefully and to read our comments following the letter:

"Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.

"Dear Dr. Shields:

"In response to your offer of space for reply to your criticism of my letter in the *Globe*, permit me to make two statements.

"1. There is nothing in the theory of Evolution properly defined and taught, to disturb the faith of any one, nor to deny any doctrine of Christianity. There is a theory that does this, as taught, in certain quarters, but it is Naturalism, not Evolution; and against that, all Christians will protest. Christian Evolution as I remember it in Woodstock College days, was sane, reverent, and scriptural. I can even now hear the lecturer say, "this is the Lord's doings and it is wonderful in our eyes." This Christian Evolution is being taught in our high schools and collegiate institutes by devout men whose names I could give, and it is also taught in McMaster by the professor of biology. It is unfortunate, to say the least, that in the wholesale denunciation indulged by leading Fundamentalists, no distinction is made between Naturalism and Evolution.

"2. There are many devoted Christian men and women who do not believe that the salvation of souls and the authority of Scripture depend on any theory of the historicity of Jonah, or the number of hours our Lord's body lay in the tomb. They think it quite possible that Jesus quoted Jonah as one might quote the Pilgrim's Progress, without expressing any opinion as to the character of the book; and they are willing to interpret the entombment of Christ according to the Oriental method of computing time, rather than our more exact manner. They have no quarrel with those who take another view of these questions, but they strenuously protest against being excommunicated by the others.

"This is not Modernism. It in no way denies the supernatural, nor does it belittle the inspiration and authority of God's Word.

"All I ask is that my letter should be read in the light of these two statements, to which no reasonable person should object.

"Thanking you for this space, I am,

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) P. K. Dayfoot."

We do not want to criticize Dr. Dayfoot's letter too severely. We observe that his knowledge of evolution was obtained "in Woodstock College days". We wonder whether Dr. Dayfoot wishes us to understand that he has read little or nothing on evolution since? But we must, in all kindness, say, that his letter suggests that such is the case. We should be glad to afford Dr. Dayfoot further space to distinguish between Naturalism and Evolution. We should be glad to have him tell us what he means by "Christian Evolution". If the paragraph in the foregoing letter relating to Evolution represents what Dr. Dayfoot knows of the subject, we fear there would be little profit in discussing it with him further.

The suggestion in the second paragraph that our Lord could be a party to deception, and refer to what was really no more than an allegory as literal history, and solemnly tell His hearers that the Ninewites would rise in the judgment with the men of His generation and condemn them because they had repented under lesser privileges, would, in the view of any reasonable person, reduce our Lord to the level of a literary trickster. And further, in view of the fact that Christ referred to the Jonah incident as to "the sign of the prophet Jonas" as being itself a miracle prophetic of the greater miracle of His own literal, physical resurrection, it will appear to any logical mind that the denial of the historicity of this incident tends to call the whole doctrine of the resurrection in question.

But we need say nothing more. If anything were wanting to justify our comments upon Dr. Dayfoot's letter in *The Globe*, the letter from Dr. Dayfoot, printed above, overwhelmingly supplies that justification.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1. T. T. SHIELDS, D.D., Editor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada No. 2.

Lesson 8 SECOND QUARTER May 23, 1926.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE PARABLE OF THE LABOURERS.

LESSON TEXT: Twentieth chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: Mark 10: 32-52.

Luke 18: 31-43; 19: 1.

GOLDEN TEXT.—“For the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost” (Luke 19:10).

1. THE PARABLE OF THE LABOURERS.

This parable is a lesson on the sovereignty of God. Again and again in the Old Testament God announces His purpose of doing certain things, and says, “And they shall know that I am the Lord”. And we must learn that He is God, and beside Him there is none else, if we would learn how to think of God at all. The truth of the Divine sovereignty is very unpalatable to men who “would be gods” themselves.

1. The lord of the parable agreed with the labourers who were hired “early in the morning” for a penny a day. He went out at the third, the sixth, and the ninth hours, and engaged others, promising them, “Whatsoever is right I will give you”. About the eleventh hour, still others were engaged; and to them also he promised “whatsoever is right”. Thus, too, men are called into the service of God at all ages, and at every hour of the day. Some bear the burden and heat of the day, and spend a long life in God’s service; others enter His service only at the eleventh hour. But God deals with all His creatures on this principle. “Whatsoever is right, ye shall receive”. 2. The rewards were distributed at evening time. It will comfort us to remember that the cooling hours of evening will surely come. The burden and heat of the day are sometimes hard to bear; but we must be content to fulfil our day, and in the evening we shall receive our penny. What a picture is here; what a commonplace; and yet what a comfort! The hours of school for those younger in years, the hours of arduous service for those upon whom the burdens of life now rest,—these must be spent. But how the workman looks forward to the time when the day shall be finished!

3. The remarkable feature about this distribution of rewards, however, was that each of the labourers received the same amount. When those who had been engaged early in the morning knew that the laborers of the eleventh, ninth and sixth hours, had received a penny, they supposed they would receive more. But when their turn came and they received only the penny, they murmured; and to their complaints, the householder replied that he had agreed with them for a penny, and he had kept his promise, and that it was his right to do what he would with his own. It is thus God throughout His revealed Word insists upon a place apart for Himself. He will do as He will with His own: “I will have mercy upon whom I will have mercy; I will have compassion upon whom I will have compassion”. When we say “Amen” to that great principle, we shall have laid in our hearts the foundation for a true understanding of God. 4. The sovereignty described in the parable was exercised in grace. The lord’s promise was fulfilled to the letter. To everyone of the laborers from those who began at the eleventh hour to those who entered his service early in the morning,—not one of them received less than was his due. He chose to exercise his sovereignty by giving to the labourers of the later hours more than he had promised. And that is grace. The truth is, not one of us deserves any good thing at the hand of God. Everything short of hell itself is mercy. God gives to no one less than they are entitled to; but to His believing people He gives more. To the child who in the tender years of life yields himself to Christ, and to the hardened sinner, who like the thief upon the cross at the eleventh hour cries, “Lord, remember me”, He gives eternal life,—and all on the same condition: “By grace are ye saved”.

II. THE CLEARER OUTLINE OF THE CROSS.

We all read the Word of God backwards,—and that is the proper way to

read it. We read it in the light of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ; and we so read it because the New Testament itself was written in the light of that great truth. For we must remember that not a word of the New Testament was written until long after Jesus had ascended into Heaven. It is well, therefore, to train ourselves to take the point of view of those to whom these words of Scripture were spoken, that we may observe the gradual unfolding of the purpose of the Cross. We have already seen in earlier lessons that it was in Caesarea Philippi (Matt. 16:21-23) that Christ began to talk to His disciples about His death. The second instance is on the Mount of Transfiguration, when in the hearing of Peter, James and John, Moses and Elias talked with Jesus about His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem (Matt. 17:1-3). Still later in Galilee (Matt. 17:22-23) Christ speaks of His approaching death, and leaving Galilee (Matt. 19:1) He came into the coast of Judea beyond Jordan: "And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart in the way", and for the fourth time announced to them that He was going to Jerusalem to die. But Luke 18:33 says: "And they understood none of these things: and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken". This, therefore, is the third time He has directly predicted His own death to His disciples; while the fourth time He talked of it on the Mount of Transfiguration. We should use these verses once more to emphasize the fact that with a full knowledge of the Cross before Him, our Lord Jesus came into the world to die. His death was predicted, it was planned for a purpose; and even the time and manner of His death His own sovereign will determined.

III. THE PRICE OF ADVANCEMENT IN THE KINGDOM OF GOD—Vss. 20-29.

1. A mother's ambition for her sons. Who Zebedee was, we do not know, except that he gave his name to his wife and his children. It would appear that he was somewhat insignificant. Not infrequently young people are ruined by others' ambitions for them. We have in mind a man who might have been a very useful man but for the insatiable ambition of his wife, who insisted upon thrusting him into positions for which he had no fitness. Sometimes children are ruined by their parents who desire for them the chief places. In this particular case, however, from the account of the other evangelists, we know that the sons of Zebedee were of one mind with their mother in their desire to have the chief seats in the coming Kingdom. 2. This passion for pre-eminence is the bane of human life. In the family, in business, in the state, and even in the church and the Sunday School, Diotrephes, who loved to have the pre-eminence, is always making trouble. 3. It is suggested that we may pray without understanding: "Ye know not what ye ask". We are as one going into a store and seeing something upon which his eyes have fastened, orders it without stopping to ask the price. So do we all sometimes pray, without an understanding of what an answer to our prayer would cost us. If some of our prayers were answered, we should be ruined. 4. Our Lord implies that advancement in spiritual things does not come by arbitrary promotion; but that moral and spiritual perfection can be reached only through suffering; whereas we pray for the chief seats without understanding that an answer to our prayer would put to our lips the cup of the Saviour's sorrow, and would lead us through His baptism of infinite pain. The prayer of Zebedee's children was answered thus far: they were promised the cup and the baptism, with a further insistence that the seats on the right hand and the left were gifts of the sovereign grace of God. 5. The two were no worse than the ten. Because Peter denied the Lord, we are accustomed to blame him, sometimes forgetting that "all the disciples forsook Him and fled". And the ten were filled with indignation at the two, not because they repudiated the principle of their ambition so much, as that they were displeased that they desired to be advanced beyond them. So ambition may be outspoken and aggressive, as with the sons of Zebedee; or it may be latent as in the hearts of the ten. 6. The principle which leads to true greatness (vss. 25-27). This is another paradox: it is more noble to serve than to command. 7. The supreme example of this principle of service is our Lord Himself. We must be careful always to keep in mind that He is both our Substitute and our Example (vs. 28).

IV. THE HEALING OF TWO BLIND MEN—Vss. 30-34.

1. They heard that Jesus was passing by. So ought we to let men know that Jesus is within their reach. 2. They cried aloud for mercy. When men

are in desperate need and know it, they rise above their native timidity in seeking help, and care not who hears them when they pray. 3. The multitude rebuked them. There is always some one to make it hard for the needy to get to Christ. The attitude of a boy or girl in a class at school may make it difficult for some one to make known his desire toward the Lord. 4. But an urgent need will not be silenced when there is a strong confidence in the practicability of prayer. "They cried the more". 5. How direct their petition! When a man stops at a garage with a punctured tire, he does not quote poetry, but asks for a man to repair a tire. When one comes to the door hungry, he is not careful of his rhetoric, but merely asks for bread. Thus when we know our need, we shall know how to pray. 6. At the touch of Jesus, the blind men were introduced to a new world. Their eyes were opened, and they received their sight.

THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION CONFERENCE IN JARVIS ST.

Editorial note: The following report by order of the Conference of the Baptist Bible Union, has been printed in pamphlet form, and is ready for distribution. By the courtesy of the Union we are permitted to print this report as a supplement to The Gospel Witness.

It appeared to be the verdict of all who attended the Baptist Bible Union Conference held in Jarvis Street, Thursday to Saturday, April 22nd to 24th, that it exceeded everybody's expectations. In the first place the attendance was large. It must be remembered that many brethren who stand for the things for which the Baptist Bible Union stands, are so conditioned in relation to denominational affairs as to make it exceedingly difficult for them to attend. It is possible that some lacked the courage to come, but many others, we have reason to know, who are with us, felt that their churches had not yet received sufficient information on the issues involved for them to take a united stand on the matter. We are therefore sure that in a very short time the Union will receive large accessions to its membership.

We have not sufficient space even to summarize the addresses given. The programme was carried out as advertised, except for some adjustments in the matter of time. The presence of the Rev. T. I. Stockley, late of West Croydon, England, and Dr. W. B. Riley, proved a benediction to everyone. We believe that those present will never forget the opening afternoon when Mr. Stockley gave an address on the ministry of intercession, which was followed by an address by Dr. Riley on the same subject. The Spirit of God came mightily upon the meeting, and we were all melted down together. The whole Conference from beginning to end was an experience of the heavenly places to all.

It may be interesting to our readers to know that the offerings at the services were sufficiently generous to meet the travelling expenses of the out of town delegates. We were also able to provide free billets for all who came, and free meals, lunch and supper, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.

The presence of the Spirit of God was manifested in the liberty which everyone felt. Men spoke without reservation. They spoke as those who were among friends. The Conference was abundantly worth while for the delightful three days of fellowship which it offered even if nothing else had been accomplished.

The present issues in the Denomination were freely discussed and an Ontario and Quebec branch of the Baptist Bible Union of North America was organized. The Constitution adopted by most of the branches of the Baptist Bible Union on this continent, and first put forward by the Baptist Bible Union of Iowa with such changes as were necessary to adapt it to our Canadian situation, was adopted. An article embodied in the Constitution provides that the annual meeting of the Ontario and Quebec branch of the Baptist Bible Union shall be held immediately preceding the annual meeting of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. The reason for this is perfectly obvious. It is difficult to get brethren together from such great distances as separate us in these two provinces; and it was decided to hold the annual meeting a few days preceding the Ontario and Quebec Convention, so that the same railway fares will bring men to both meetings.

The following officers were elected:

Honorary President: Rev. A. T. Sowerby, LL.D.; President: Rev. C. J. Loney, Pastor of the Stanley Avenue Baptist Church, Hamilton; First Vice-President: Mr. J. F. Schultz, a deacon of the First Baptist Church, Brantford; Second Vice-President: Rev. A. P. Wilson, B.A., Pembroke; Secretary-Treasurer: Rev. W. E. Atkinson, Pastor of Christie St. Baptist Church, Toronto. An Executive was elected consisting of the foregoing officers, and Revs. W. J. H. Brown, Annette Street Baptist Church, Toronto; Sidney Lawrence, Freelon; George W. Allen, Pastor, Grace Baptist Church, Toronto; R. E. Jones, Oxford Street Baptist Church, Woodstock; W. Fleischer, Stouffville Baptist Church, Stouffville. Several other brethren were named who were not present, and their names were voted upon; but we refrain from publishing their names until their written consent has been received. In addition to the foregoing, associational groups were formed from many, and we think the majority, of the Associations of the Convention. These will organize branches of the Ontario and Quebec Baptist Bible Union in their several Associations. The general Executive will undertake the organization of branches and associations which were not represented at the Conference. The general council of the Union of Ontario and Quebec will consist of the officers and Executive Committee, together with ex officio the chairman of each associational branch of the Union.

The address delivered by Mr. Thomas Urquhart, a lawyer, and for three years a member of the Home Mission Board, was recognized as containing information which should be widely distributed. It was therefore ordered to be printed, together with this report, in pamphlet form for general distribution among the churches of Ontario and Quebec. Mr. Urquhart's address is therefore printed as a part of this report, together with two resolutions which were passed by the Conference.

A RESOLUTION RESPECTING PROF. L. H. MARSHALL.

Be it resolved that this Baptist Bible Union of Ontario and Quebec, while deploring the present condition of distrust and unrest in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, declares that the distrust and unrest has been brought about by repeated acts of defiance of denominational conviction by the Board of Governors and Senate of McMaster University; that we further declare that a system of choosing representatives to the governing bodies of the University, which enables representatives from two churches to control the educational policy of our Denomination, is not in accordance with the principles of our Denomination, and of itself is bound to lead to further unrest and distrust.

And we do further resolve and declare that the explanations of Professor Marshall and his friends, in view of the evidence already published, and the additional evidence presented at this conference, is altogether unsatisfactory; and we believe his teaching to be subversive of the faith distinctively held by our Baptist people, and therefore a menace to the spiritual life of our churches, and to the integrity of our Denomination. And we declare our conviction that Professor Marshall, by his own utterances, has demonstrated that he is without qualification for the work of preparing young men for the future ministry of our Canadian Baptist Churches;

And that we further declare that the appointment of Professor Marshall was in contravention of the act incorporating the University, which enacts that every professor appointed to the theological faculty of the University shall be a member of a Regular Baptist Church; and Professor Marshall was not a member of a church of the standard which has been approved by the Convention; and

That we further desire to enter our protest against any unscriptural ecclesiasticism exercised either by leading representatives of our University or by the Home Mission Board of our Denomination, and call upon all our Baptist churches and pastors to assert their independence and to resist to the utmost any and every attempt to interfere with the independence of the local church or the liberty of its members;

And we do further declare that it is our conviction that nothing short of a radical change in the governing bodies of the University can restore peace and confidence to the Convention.

And therefore we declare and resolve that this organization shall use all legitimate means to bring about such changes, and shall support every proper effort to this end, and shall further promote such activities as will ensure that the Baptist testimony to the faith in Ontario and Quebec shall continue to be strong, evangelical, and scriptural, based upon the sure foundation that the Bible is the inerrant Word of God.

A RESOLUTION RESPECTING THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION.

Be it resolved that this Baptist Bible Union of Ontario and Quebec, Ontario and Quebec is not for the purpose of bringing about separation or division in the ranks of the Regular Baptist Convention in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec; but is for the purpose of maintaining in their integrity the fundamental principles for which the Denomination has always stood, against the inroads of modernism and liberalism which have been so apparent in recent years and which, we believe, have been tolerated and supported by the Governing Bodies of our University through the toleration and support of the views of Professor I. G. Matthews, and more recently, L. H. Marshall; and this Union further recognizes that there are a number of pastors and others in the Denomination who, while in full sympathy with the principles of the Baptist Bible Union, are not as yet members thereof, but who are prepared to aid in supporting the Union in all matters which tend to the maintaining in full effect the great fundamental principles for which the Denomination stands. While this Union would urge them to join as early as possible with the organization, this Union will heartily welcome their support in such other ways as they are able to give it until such time as they shall become active members of the Union.

And we do further recognize that there is likely to be opposition and some suffering by pastors, students and others who declare themselves in full accord with, and support the objects of the Union, in view of which we hereby declare our readiness as members of the Baptist Bible Union to support, strengthen and help those who suffer for their principles, so that they may realize that their brethren in the Union are with them and will aid them in overcoming the difficulties or opposition which they may encounter.

AN ADDRESS BY MR. THOMAS URQUHART.

Delivered in Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto, at the Baptist Bible Union Conference, April 23rd, 1926.

In dealing with the subject which has been allotted to me I think there should be first, some reference to the formation and incorporation of McMaster University as well as to the various boards which are appointed by the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

The Canadian Literary Institute which had been established at Woodstock, was incorporated in 1857. There were amendments from time to time to its charter and in the year 1881 application was made to the Legislature of the Province of Ontario for the passing of an act to incorporate the Toronto Baptist College; and in the preamble of the said act it is recited that the Honourable William McMaster has purchased from the Crown certain lands, particularly described in the conveyance thereof from the bursar of the university and colleges at Toronto, to the said the Honourable William McMaster, which conveyance bears date the twenty-third day of March, one thousand eight hundred and eighty, for the purpose of erecting thereon suitable buildings for a theological college for the education and training of students preparing for the ministry of the Regular Baptist denomination, which buildings are now in course of erection; and whereas by deed bearing date the first day of December, one thousand eight hundred and eighty, the said the Honourable William McMaster, has transferred the said lands to the trustees named in the act upon the trusts in the said deed set out, and the trusts in the said deed regarding said lands 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 in 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 Spirit, 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."

By that act the Honourable William McMaster, the Honourable Alexander Mackenzie, and the Reverend John Harvard Castle, and seventeen others, being the trustees named in the trust deed, were, with such other persons as might afterwards become trustees, constituted and declared to be a body corporate by the name, style and title of "The Trustees of the Toronto Baptist College." The said trustees and their successors were to be the controlling body of the said college and have full and exclusive power and authority as to the appointment and dismissal of all professors and the trustees were to have full power and authority to appoint, dismiss or remove trustees and appoint new trustees from time to time in accordance with the terms of the trust deed.

By Chapter 68 of the Statutes of the Province of Ontario 1883, the name of the Canadian Literary Institute was changed to Woodstock College. By Chapter 96 of the Statutes of Ontario 1885, the act incorporating the Toronto Baptist College was amended. This act provided for the appointment of a college senate to be formed in the manner set out in the act, it being a provision that no person should at any time be eligible for election to a position in said senate who is not then a member in good standing of some Regular Baptist Church in Canada, and all persons accepting a position in said senate, shall be understood by such acceptance to give an unqualified assent to the same abstract of doctrines as that to which the professors of the college are required to assent.

By Chapter 95 of the Statutes of Ontario 1887, it is recited in the preamble "that it would conduce to the success of the educational work of the said denomination to have the property and control of the said colleges vested in a board of governors, subject to the powers and rights of a senate as hereinafter provided, and to have the usual powers and privileges of a university conferred upon such board and senate" and by this act the Toronto Baptist College and Woodstock College were united to form one corporation under the name of McMaster University, and the university was to be under the management and administration of a Board of Governors which should consist of sixteen members and the chancellor of the university, the said sixteen members to be elected as follows: twelve members by the Regular Baptist (Missionary Society of Ontario, and four members by the Regular Baptist Missionary Convention East, and the persons so appointed and their successors in office were by said act, constituted a body corporate and politic under the name of McMaster University, and by Section 4 of said act it is provided as follows:

"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. And no person shall be eligible to the position of chancellor, principal, professor, tutor, or master, who is not a member in good standing of an Evangelical Christian Church; and no person shall be eligible for the position of principal, professor, tutor, or master in the faculty of theology who is not a member in good standing of a Regular Baptist church, and the said board of governors shall have the right to require such further or other test as to religious belief, as a qualification for any such position in the faculty of theology, as to the said board of governors may seem proper; but no compulsory religious qualification, or examination of a denominational character shall be required

from, or imposed upon any student whatever, other than in the faculty of theology.

I desire to call attention to the declaration in the act of incorporation that "no person shall be eligible for the position of professor in the faculty of theology who is not a member in good standing of a Regular Baptist Church." In my address at the Protest Meeting held in Jarvis St. Church, January 14th, 1926, I stated that I could not see how a man who was a member of a Church that did not require its membership to be baptized could be said to be a member "in good standing of a Regular Baptist Church" and I am satisfied that this would be held to be a violation of the act of incorporation and I am glad to see that my friend, Dr. C. J. Holman, who of all living men is best fitted to speak regarding the principles on which McMaster was founded, in a recent letter in *The Canadian Baptist* also takes the same position that Mr. Marshall from this standpoint alone, was not a proper appointment. Further regarding Professor Marshall's belief, on Dr. J. H. Farmer's testimony (and he cannot be said to harbor any antipathy to Professor Marshall) Prof. Marshall's "general view was in sympathy with the Driver view, the moderate critical view that has to deal with dates and authorship and so on." I cannot see how any man who has read the principles embodied in the trust deed can harmonize even what is called the "moderate critical view" with these principles. The moderate critical view is Dr. Driver's view and that view, even in regard to dates and authorship, is certainly modernistic and anyone who accepts this Driver view is driving a "coach and four" through the principles for which Our Denomination has been supposed to stand and on which our university is founded.

It is provided in Section 5 of said act of incorporation that "The Board of Governors shall have full power and authority to fix the number, residence, duties, salary, provision, and emolument of the chancellor, principals, professors, tutors, masters, officers, agents, and servants of the said university, including any preparatory or academical department, and may from time to time remove the chancellor, principals, professors, tutors, masters, and all other officers, agents, and servants of the university, and of all departments thereof, including any preparatory or academical department, and may also appoint the chancellor, principals, professors, tutors, masters, and all other officers, agents, and servants, provided that such power of appointment as to the chancellor, principals, professors, tutors, and masters shall be exercised only upon the recommendation of the senate" in the manner set out in the act. By Section 8 it was provided: "All real and personal property, rights, franchises, and privileges of Toronto Baptist College, and Woodstock College shall, from the coming into effect of this Act, be held and vested in the corporation hereby constituted, subject to all trusts attaching hereto respectively," and by Section 9 it is further provided; "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 Honourable William McMaster, by deed bearing date the first day of December, 1880, for any other purposes than those set out in said deed, nor 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." This makes it clear that the property is held upon the trusts set out in the deed from Honourable William McMaster to the Trustees of Toronto Baptist College.

Section 11 of the said act as amended by Chapter 114 Statutes of Ontario 1893, constitute the senate with the powers set out in Section 12 as follows:

"The senate shall have the control of the system and course of education pursued in the said university, and of all matters pertaining to the management and discipline thereof, and of the examinations of all departments thereof; and shall have the power to confer degrees in theology now vested in the Toronto Baptist College, together with the power to confer the degrees of Bachelor, Master, and Doctor, in the several arts, sciences, and faculties, and any and all other degrees which may properly be conferred by a university" and further "the senate shall have the power to settle, subject to ratification by the Board (meaning the Board of Governors) the terms upon which other colleges and schools may become affiliated with the said university, but no such affiliation shall take effect unless and until the same shall have been approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council; provided, however, that the

said university shall not have the power or right to establish, maintain, or be connected with any school or college in theology other than Toronto Baptist College, nor the right to affiliate under any conditions with any other school or college in theology."

In 1889 application was made to the Parliament of Canada for the passing of an act incorporating the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec and by this act which is published each year in the year book, the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec was brought into existence, provision was made for the holding of a convention and the appointment of delegates thereto, as by said act provided—and by the said act and amendments thereto seven boards have been constituted known as (a) The Home Mission Board of the Baptist Convention, (b) The Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention, (c) The Ministerial Superannuation Board of the Baptist Convention, (d) The Church Edifice Board of the Baptist Convention, (e) The Publication Board of the Baptist Convention, (f) The Western Mission Board of the Baptist Convention, (g) The Board of Religious Education of the Baptist Convention. By a more recent Dominion statute the section constituting the Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention was repealed and a new act was passed constituting the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board, to which the Convention appoints 12 members, 4 each year. In the same year 1889 application was made to the Legislature of Ontario for an act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec and by Chapter 91 Ontario Statutes 1889, the first five boards above named incorporated under the Act of the Parliament of Canada, were given the right to hold lands. The Western Mission Board and Board of Religious Education were incorporated later and no Ontario act has been applied for granting these Boards the power to hold lands. By Section 2 of said act of the Province of Ontario the 16 members of the Board of Governors of McMaster University which were to be elected by the regular Baptist Missionary Society of Ontario and the Regular Baptist Missionary Convention East, were thereafter to be elected by the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec and from 1889 down to the present time the appointment of these various boards and of the Board of Governors have been made at the Annual Convention by the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

In dealing more directly with the subject "The influence of McMaster University upon our denominational boards and organizations" I would first wish to point out as follows: Professor J. H. Farmer, Dean of McMaster University is President of the Convention; Mr. James Rylie, a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University, is Chairman of the Home Mission Board, and Mr. Albert Mathews, Chairman of the Board of Governors, is Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Home Mission Board, the most important committee of that Board. Mr. S. J. Moore, President of the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board is also a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University; Mr. Harry L. Stark, Chairman of the Board of Religious Education, is also a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University; Mr. George S. Mathews, of Brantford, Chairman of the Board of Publication, is also a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University; Professor C. W. New, Chairman of the Ministerial Superannuation Board of the Baptist Convention is a Professor in McMaster University; Rev. W. T. Graham, D.D., Chairman of the Western Mission Board of the Baptist Convention is a member of the senate of McMaster University, and Mr. R. D. Warren, the General Treasurer of the Boards, is a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University. The only one of our general boards which is not headed by a member of the Board of Governors or by a professor or official, is the Church Edifice Board, of which Rev. H. B. Coumans is Chairman. I do not think it can be conceived that all these appointments just happened by accident. It seems to clearly show that there have been guiding hands planning and directing so that the University should have its hand upon practically all Boards of our denomination. When this control of our denominational organizations began I am not prepared to say, but there have been indications of it which I have personally noticed in connection with the Convention for a number of years. It has been specially evident to me in reference to the appointment of the President of the Convention. In 1919-1920 Rev. John McNeill was elected President, a member of the Board of Governors; in 1920-1921 Mr. S. J. Moore was elected president, a member of the Board of Governors; in 1921-1922 Professor A. L. McCrim-

mon was elected President,—at that time I think he was Chancellor of the University, in any event he was a professor thereof. At the Convention in Walmer Road Church, October, 1922, a little bird whispered to me that there was a nice little plan made to elect Dr. W. T. Graham, one of the close friends of McMaster University and now a member of the senate, to that position, and Mr. S. J. Moore, in his usual happy and magnificent way of dealing with matters of this kind, nominated with great praise Dr. W. T. Graham for President of the Convention. I immediately afterwards went to the front and without having consulted with any person and not even with Mr. Coumans, I nominated Rev. H. B. Coumans, then of Collingwood, for President, pointing out that for some years the President of the Convention resided in Toronto, and that it was about time that a man outside Toronto should be elected to the position. Mr. Coumans was elected by the Convention. It was interesting to note the stirring around of McMaster officials and some of their close friends almost immediately after the announcement of the election. It looked to me for a little while as if they thought that all their plans regarding that historical convention might be set aside as their nominee for President had been. If we should go back for thirteen years in the Presidency of the Convention, 1913-14, we will find that of the twelve Presidents during that time, ten were or had been or are now closely identified with McMaster University, namely: Rev. W. E. Norton (a member of the Board of Governors for the preceding year), Mr. James Ryrie, Rev. J. G. Brown, Mr. Jos. N. Shenstone, Rev. O. C. S. Wallace, former Chancellor, Rev. John MacNeill, Mr. S. J. Moore, Dr. A. L. McCrimmon, Mr. Albert Matthews, Dr. J. H. Farmer.

It is well to enquire where these men who seem to have such a controlling influence in our denomination, come from, and whom do they represent. The Board of Governors consists of 16 members and the chancellor. Of these 17 members five came from Walmer Road Church, namely: Messrs. MacNeill, Shenstone, Sanderson, Robertson and Warren. Four came from Bloor St. Church: Messrs. Cameron, Whidden, Fox and Stark, these representatives from two Churches, represent a majority of the Board of Governors. Messrs. Ryrie and A. Matthews came from Central Church and Mr. Moore from Parkdale Church, Rev. R. R. MacKay from Sarnia Church, Mr. Reynolds from Brockville Church, Mr. George Matthews from First Brantford Church, Mr. Edwards from First Ottawa Church, and Rev. T. T. Shields from Jarvis St. Church, Toronto. It is clear that the representatives of two Churches control the Board of Governors and as such control our Educational policy. Let us consider another sphere wherein McMaster has practical control of Denominational activities, namely, in the Executive Committee of the Convention. According to the year book there are 30 names given as members of the committee, made up as follows:—President, 1st and 2nd Vice President, Secretary-Treasurer, 3 each from McMaster University, Western Missions Board, Church Edifice Board, Ministerial Superannuation Board, Religious Education Board and Publication Board, 4 each from Home Mission Board and Foreign Mission Board. Of these 30 members the name of Mr. R. D. Warren, the general Treasurer, appears 6 times (and he would probably be entitled to six votes) as a member of the Committee, and Mr. McLeod's name appears twice but I presume that they really only exercise one vote each on the Committee, hence the Committee consists of 24 members—of whom 11 are directly connected with McMaster University, either as members of the Board or Senate or as Professors therein, namely: Messrs. Farmer, Whidden, A. Matthews, Ryrie, Warren, Moore, Graham, New, Stark, Geo. S. Matthews, Bengough, and I do not need to intimate how closely identified several of the others named on that Executive Committee are with McMaster University. Some of them have been considered as such close camp followers that you could not distinguish them from those wearing the real uniform. It seems clear to me that our Educational institution has full control of all the plans for the annual convention—time, programme, place of meeting, arrangement of details, so as to make the setting as easy as possible for their plans to materialize, and as difficult as possible for any criticism to have adequate opportunity to present its case.

If we examine into the constitution of the Senate which according to the 1925 year book consists of the Chancellor and thirty-three other members, there are seventeen members named other than the Chancellor and the elected

Board of Governors. From the information which I have secured these 17 members came from the following Churches; Messrs. Farmer, Gray, Merrill and Smith, from Walmer Road Church; Messrs. McLay, Ten-Broeke and Cranston, Mrs. Zavitz and Miss Whiteside, from Bloor St. Church; Messrs. Firstbrook and McArthur from Central Church; Mr. Wilcock from Woodstock Church; Mr. McDonald from Brampton Church; Mr. McKechnie from Belleville; Mr. Imrie from Kitchener Church; Dr. Graham from First Avenue Toronto and Dr. Brown from St. Clair Ave., Toronto. It will be noted that nine of these seventeen members of the Senate come from Walmer Road and Bloor St. Toronto Churches, thus showing that these two churches have control, not only of the Board of Governors as hereinbefore set out, but of the Senate of the University as well, with 9 representatives on the Board of Governors and 9 representatives among the other members of the Senate. I do not think it can be conceived that all these things just happened so, but as already stated there has been a power directing and guiding these appointments so that the hand of McMaster, whether modernistic, evolutionist or otherwise, should be at the head in every important place in our denomination and further that everything was so directed that two churches, strong no doubt numerically—should have through their representatives, the power to control our educational work.

Might we just look at it in another way. For the various regular boards of our denomination the Convention elects altogether 100 members, 16 being elected for the Board of Governors of McMaster University and 12 for each of the other Boards. According to our last year book the membership of Baptist Churches in Ontario and Quebec was 62,234. Therefore we have a representative on a Board for each 622 members of the Denomination. Walmer Road with its 1,600 or 1,700 members, has 11 members with 16 memberships on various boards as follows: Rev. John McNeill on three boards, McMaster, Foreign Missions, Western Missions; Mr. Shenstone on two boards, McMaster and Foreign Missions; Mr. Farmer, Foreign Missions; Mr. McTavish, Foreign Missions; Mr. Merrill, on two boards, Publication Board and Religious Education Board; Mr. Warren, McMaster Board; Mr. Robertson, McMaster Board; Mr. Sanderson, McMaster Board; Mr. Gray, Ministerial Superannuation Board; Mr. Foster, Ministerial Superannuation Board; Mr. Clark, Western Board, or one representative for a little over 100 members. Bloor St. with a membership of 1,200 has 6 members with 10 memberships on Board as follows; Rev. W. A. Cameron, McMaster Board; Mr. Craig, Foreign Missions and Ministerial Superannuation; Mr. Ratcliffe, Publication Board; Mr. Stark, McMaster Board and Board of Religious Education; Mr. Fox, McMaster Board; Mr. M. W. Houlding, Religious Education; Mr. C. W. New, Ministerial Superannuation; Mr. Wright, Religious Education Board.

The result of the analysis is that McMaster University not only has its hand upon practically all our denominational Boards but that two churches, Walmer Road and Bloor Street, have a dominating influence to a very great extent in the affairs of the Convention, educational and otherwise. I have always felt that it is not good policy to find fault unless you have a remedy for the matter with which you are dealing and I think I am safe in saying that under present conditions those elected to the most important offices in the Convention and to the important Boards thereof, are usually those who keep themselves in evidence before the delegates, the very active brethren who might be called the moving pictures of the Convention, because they are always moving on or off the platform, who keep themselves continuously in the light and at the hour of election men and women coming from all parts of the province do not seem to have any knowledge that there are others who modestly keep in the background, who would be just as able representatives as those who are ever on the alert to keep themselves before the people. Now what is the remedy? I am of the opinion that our constitution should be amended so that the various Associations of our constituency at their annual meetings, held usually in the spring or early summer, should have the right to nominate and should make nominations for positions on the various Boards of our denomination and for the officers of the Convention, and that any ten members in good standing in any Church of the denomination might hand in at any time at least 30 days before the meeting of the Convention, the names of any person or persons whom they might desire to nominate for the various boards of the Convention and officers of the Convention, and that the Secretary should pre-

pare a printed ballot which should be placed in the hands of every delegate of the Convention upon registration together with all the reports of the various boards and that these ballots after being marked should be handed to an election committee, to be appointed by the Convention. Every member elected to have a majority of the votes of those voting. It might be necessary at times to take a second or even a third ballot but this is also the case today. I do not think that there would be any difficulty in having this vote taken in the way I have suggested. Officers of the convention should also be nominated in the same way. As at present constituted since 1912 there has been only three men outside of Toronto elected as President of the Convention, namely: Rev. O. C. S. Wallace, D.D., then in Montreal, Rev. B. D. Thomas, D.D., and Rev. H. B. Coumans, then in Collingwood, and who later removed to Toronto during his year of office, and one of these three, Dr. Thomas was to all intents and purposes, a Toronto man. There are many in our denomination who are quite as well fitted to hold office as Toronto men or even McMaster officials, and there should be some plan for an expression of the opinion of the denomination through their delegates, not as at present often at the close of a busy session when every person is tired and desirous often of getting away, but with a ballot as suggested, everyone could properly mark his ballot and deposit it at the proper time with the election committee after prayer and careful consideration.

It should be noted here that under the Act incorporating McMaster University it was set out that the University should not have the power or right to establish, maintain or be connected with any school of theology other than the Toronto Baptist College nor have the right to affiliate with any other school or college in theology. The Board of Governors applied to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario in 1916 and by Chapter 109 of the Statutes of that year the following powers were granted to the Senate:

"And the senate shall have the power to settle, subject to ratification by the board, the terms upon which other colleges and schools may become affiliated with the said university, but no such affiliation other than an affiliation in theology shall take effect unless and until the same has been approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council."

The effect of the above Act is that, the senate subject to the ratification of the Board of Governors (and the Board are members of the Senate) may without the consent of the Convention affiliate the University with any theological college wherever situate, and I am advised, have affiliated with Brandon College under the said Act. I do not see anything to hinder the University affiliating with Chicago University, with Rochester University or any other of the Colleges which are admittedly modernistic and evolutionist.

It is my opinion that no amendment should be made to the Act constituting the University without submitting the amendment to and receiving the approval of the Convention and the University should not affiliate with any college without the same approval.

Regarding the election of the members of the Senate (other than the Board of Governors) some reference should be made. There appears to be five or six members chosen from the Faculty; five are elected by the Graduates in Arts, and five by the Graduates in Theology. The effect of this is that graduates in Arts who may be Jews, Unitarians, holders of any faith, or without faith, have the right to vote for members of the Senate who have such large powers controlling the University and no matter where the graduate in Arts or Theology resides and without reference to his religious beliefs he has the right to vote in the election for members of the Senate. He may have no interest whatever in the work of the Denomination and may be adverse entirely to the principles held by the Denomination and upon which the University was established and yet he has the right to vote.

In our churches only members of the church are permitted to vote for the election of officers, while for the election of members of the Senate the only qualification required is that he be a graduate. His manner of living, his faith or lack of faith, even though he be a criminal, has no consideration, he has the right to vote.