

# A GROWING GIANT: Baptist Bible Union Holds Fourth Annual Meeting, Washington, D. C.

Page 15

## 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. 5. No. 3.

TORONTO, MAY 27, 1926

Whole No. 213.

## Rockefeller-Fosdick Interests Control Northern Baptist Convention

### Convention Approves Open Membership to Please Rockefeller

Reported by T. T. Shields.



WASHINGTON, D.C., May 27th:—The Convention opened Tuesday morning, May 25th. President Edward H. Rhoades reported an enrolment of over thirty-five hundred at the first session, of whom over eight hundred were visitors and the rest delegates. Hundreds more enrolled later, but even thirty-five hundred people when they come together make a great host. The City Auditorium was equipped with loud-speakers, so that even those whose voices were weak might be heard; but the human voice is better unassisted when it is strong enough to make itself heard.

The chief item of the morning was the "Keynote Address" by Rev. J. Whitcomb Brounger, of California. His subject was, "Our Common Denominator"; and having got through an attempt to explain his mathematical figure, he told us the Baptist Common Denominator was Jesus Christ. Making a plea for unity on the basis of their relationship to Christ, he appealed to the Baptists of the Northern Convention to get together. He said they might get together on the Deity, the authority, the life, and the Kingship of Christ. It is well for Dr. Brounger that he knows so well how to tell a story so as to get people to laugh themselves into good humour. We used to hear it said that a travelling salesman was under the necessity of entertaining his prospective customers in order to put them in a humour to buy his goods. In what some regard as "the good old days", such entertainment was often of a rather "wet" variety; and put the mind into a responsive, if rather confused, state.

Dr. Brounger puts a very low estimate upon the intelligence of his audience; for he speaks to the level of the intelligence of the frivolous crowd with whom Douglas Fairbanks and Mary Pickford are so popular; and from among

such he finds his supporters. Was it Dr. Brougher's reputation as one who could regularize the irregular by the marriage of divorcees, which earned for him the honour of being selected to attempt to effect a marriage between Fundamentalism and Modernism within the Baptist denomination? In comparison with this latter, the marriage of Fairbanks and Mary Pickford was a most proper proceeding,—albeit each involved the utter repudiation of the teaching and authority of Christ and the New Testament.

Dr. Brougher's statement upon the Deity of Christ could hardly be palatable to avowed Unitarians; but his omission of any reference to the authority of the Scriptures, or to the atonement by blood, made his address a poorly-concealed attempt to hold together in one fellowship things diametrically opposed to each other and to the Word of God. The Washington press rightly interpreted the address as a piece of straddling and compromise. Dr. Brougher's address was a sacriligious prostitution of holy things to political uses, an attempted rhetorical marriage of half-truths in an endeavour to legitimize the illegitimate offspring of Mammon and Religion.

Following Dr. Brougher's address one of the outstanding modernists of the Convention, Dr. Wallace Petty, of Pittsburgh, asked us what we thought of the address. We said, "You know as well as anyone that Dr. Brougher utterly ignored the matters at issue"; to which Dr. Petty laughingly replied, "He showed himself to be a mighty good skater." To this we agree. As one who, by the deceitful handling of the Word of God, can persuade even good men to a course of action which involves the repudiation of the authority of God's Word and the rejection of the authority of Christ, Dr. Brougher showed himself to be a past-master; but after the Washington Convention of 1926, no intelligent and conscientious Baptist will ever again take Dr. J. Whitcomb Brougher seriously as a prophet of the Lord.

Later in this report we shall have occasion to refer to Brougher the Skater again. Here let it suffice to say that Brougher is a symptom of the disease from which Evangelical Christianity is everywhere suffering. That disease we may call *status quoitis*. It is a disease which so muddles the minds of its victims as to make them think they are doing God service by keeping their denomination in the ditch of compromise and spiritual and financial bankruptcy.

#### REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL DEFEATED.

We were not present Tuesday afternoon when the Convention voted down the proposal to re-organize the Northern Convention after the pattern of the Standard Oil Company. The proposal was perhaps a little premature. But a Convention that can be muddled and confused by such pleading as Dr. Brougher made, may yet be prevailed upon to wear the bridle the Rockefeller interests have prepared for it. A young colt may gallop away into the pasture the first time an attempt is made to put it into harness, but it will be broken and harnessed by and by.

#### THE OPEN MEMBERSHIP QUESTION.

We come now to an account of the great session of Wednesday morning when the issue before the Convention was whether or not the Convention should approve of the principle of open membership, and thereby open the way for the Park Ave. Church, of New York, to maintain its position as a part of the Convention, while repudiating everything for which the Convention stands. And here let us say that we have a growing conviction that Baptist preachers particularly, and Baptists generally, should somehow or another be taught the use of words. At Memphis, Tenn., in 1925, we saw Dr. E. Y. Mullins drug two-thirds of his great audience into a condition of mental incompetency. It took the Baptists of the South a full year to awake from their stupor, but when they did, they utterly repudiated the sophistries with which Dr. Mullins had drugged them the year before. It seems to us that some people who attend Baptist Conventions are as easily victimized as those who suffer from the proverbial lightning-rod salesman.

We shall have occasion in this report to analyze some of the resolutions passed, and to show how completely people allowed themselves to be deluded. This is not a general or unwarranted statement, but in conversation with a

number of men after some of these votes, it transpired that they supposed themselves to have voted for the opposite thing.

### THE PRESIDENT SPLENDIDLY FAIR.

Here we should like to pay tribute to the President of the Convention, Mr. Edward H. Rhoades, Jr. We have attended a good many Conventions, and we have seen presiding officers sometimes shame even the politicians by their conduct; but we have never seen a President more manifestly fair in his every action, nor one who used better sense. At one point in the debate which we are about to discuss, some misguided delegate proposed "the previous question." Technically, it was not the President's duty to dissuade him from pressing his motion; but President Rhoades evidently believed that parliamentary law was intended to facilitate rather than to frustrate free discussion, and when the previous question was moved, the President said something to this effect: "I hope the brother will not insist upon pressing his motion; for I think it is desirable that this matter should be fully and freely discussed." Furthermore, while there was an understanding as to the limitation of speeches, the President had the good sense when he saw a speaker was nearing his conclusion, not to ruin the argument for the sake of keeping each speaker to the tick of the clock. Nobody presumed upon the President's slightly elastic handling of the debate; and the end of the discussion was reached in good spirit. That was due in no small degree to the absolute fairness of the presiding officer.

### TWO PROPOSALS BEFORE THE CONVENTION.

From the programme it appeared that two matters were to come before the Convention. Notice had been given at Seattle that the following would be moved as an amendment to the By-laws of the Convention:

Section 2. A Baptist church, as defined for the purposes of these by-laws, is one accepting the New Testament as its guide and composed only of baptized believers, baptism being by immersion.

The Wednesday bulletin of the Convention contained the following:

The Executive Committee of the Convention publishes the resolution below, for information only, without any expression of its opinion on the matter involved.

### THE CHICAGO CONFERENCE RESOLUTION.

Believing that the Northern Baptist Convention ought to devote its energies more completely to increased efficiency in its efforts for the evangelization of the world, in order that the day may be hastened when the Kingdoms of the world shall become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, we recommend that when the amendment (defining a Baptist Church) proposed at the Convention at Seattle, is presented for consideration at the Washington Convention, it be laid upon the table.

And that the following standing resolution be presented for adoption:

The Northern Baptist Convention recognizes its constituency as consisting solely of those Baptist Churches in which the immersion of believers is recognized and practiced as the only Scriptural Baptism; and the Convention hereby declares that only immersed members will be recognized as delegates to the Convention.

### A GREAT CROWD.

Nearly every seat in the great auditorium was occupied when this item of business was reached. The Executive Committee of the Convention had taken a very unfair advantage of the Convention by publishing the Chicago resolution in the *Bulletin*, and announcing the course of action to be pursued. By their announcement of the proposal to table the proposed amendment, they had really partially debated a subject which was not debatable. The programme, however, was carried out as announced, and the motion to table the amendment was carried by a considerable majority.

### DR. BROUGHER MOVES RESOLUTION.

In moving the Chicago resolution, Dr. Brougher spoke in part as follows:

#### DR. BROUGHER'S SPEECH.

My Brethren: I want to present on behalf of a conference held in Chicago, a resolution, the adoption of the standing resolution. And may I be permitted to say in this connection, that as I travelled over the country, I discovered that the amendment did not seem, at least, to meet the demands of all parties concerned in our denominational life; and I was requested to call a conference, requested entirely by representatives of what I would term the middle-of-the-road Baptists and fundamentalists. I never had a request from any other source, but from those two sources; but in calling the conference representatives of every section of our denominational life were invited, and they were represented, although some thirty out of one hundred did not come—there being about seventy. I wish, therefore, to present, if you will permit me, the resolution, and then to say a few words upon it.

(Here Dr. Brougher read the Chicago resolution printed above; and after it had been seconded, he continued:)

I said a moment ago that this conference was called at the request of brethren from different parts of the country, with the idea that there might be possibly a chance to find a way whereby we could harmonize the various elements of our denomination and unite them in a harmonious adoption of a resolution that would make possible the united action of our people, the enthusiastic action of our denomination the coming year. This resolution was the result of a very careful study and a long discussion, lasting a day, in which different members gave in on some point of contention, and finally the concession of different members from different angles, resulted in the resolution which is presented to you to-day. We believe that this standing resolution is in harmony with the declaration of the Northern Baptist Convention, where it says, "We recognize the independence of the local church". I have here a copy of our declaration: it says, "The Northern Baptist Convention declares its belief in the independence of the local church".

We believe that it comes more nearly being harmony with that declaration than the original amendment, for we all believe that the Convention has no right whatever to legislate for a local Baptist church.

In the second place, we believe that this resolution recognizes and continues the historic and regular practice of our denomination in allowing the local Baptist Association to define a basis for an organization calling itself a Baptist church. This has been our regular plan to allow the local Baptist Association to decide that question; and it would be an unfortunate thing, it seems to me, to have the Northern Baptist Convention become the medium by which we should decide what a Baptist church is or is not. The Northern Baptist Convention has nothing to do with the definition of a Baptist church. When we read the by-laws, we find that it is not the function of the Northern Baptist Convention; that it is not our function to define a Baptist church. The Northern Baptist Convention has never gone behind the decision of a local Baptist Association; and since we have never gone behind it, we do not need the definition of a Baptist church. We have never requested to depart from us churches, doing that. I discovered that in the country small churches have practised open membership, the receiving of members from other denominations by their letters. A great many have had associate members, but there are a few community Baptist churches which have received people in full membership on letters of other denominations. But they have never sent them to the Northern Baptist Convention; they have always sent immersed believers as delegates to the Convention. Heretofore we have not debarred those churches from co-operating with us. When the Free Will Baptist churches were admitted to membership in this Convention, the by-laws were changed at that time from 'any Regular Baptist Church' to read, 'any Baptist Church'; the term was changed to the

broader meaning, though some of them in the past have practised open membership. Now to debar some of them who have already been admitted to co-operation, it seems to me would not be a nice step. It would not change their polity status; it would only debar them from co-operating in the Northern Baptist Convention.

In the next place, the majority of the Law Committee decided against the amendment; and if we should pass it over the decision of the majority of the Law Committee, we might at least be angled in legal matters that would hinder our work for years to come.

In the next place, the amendment did not seem to harmonize our people. As a result of that conference, these resolutions were adopted unanimously. I do not mean to say to you that these resolutions satisfied everybody at that conference. It would be an utter impossibility for us to find an amendment or a resolution that would satisfy every member of our denomination. We have to make some concessions for co-operation's sake, at least, in our denomination.

Now to sum it up briefly. The resolution does not interfere with the autonomy of the local Baptist church; it respects the function of a local Baptist Association; it decides the qualifications of a Baptist church; it declares our conviction that the immersion of the believer is the only Scriptural act of baptism and does not debar from co-operation in the Northern Baptist Convention any church that may adopt any alternative form of baptism. In the next place, it disavows the principle of open membership by debarring any person as a delegate who is not an immersed believer,—a member of a regular Baptist church. We give no sanction to any form of baptism except immersion by this resolution by permitting these churches to continue their co-operation with us; we do not sanction their open membership. I do not sanction, my church does not sanction, sprinkling or pouring when I co-operate in Christian Endeavour work. This denomination of Northern Baptists do not sanction the open membership of some English Baptist churches when we co-operate in the World's Baptist Alliance. We do not sanction sprinkling or pouring when we co-operate in the Church Federation of our great cities. We do not sanction the principle of a Presbyterian in Bible Institutes carried on sometimes by Baptist churches. We do not sanction one of the most orthodox men in this country who was Pastor of the Moody Church in Chicago.

My friends, I think I can claim to be as orthodox as any man or woman in this Convention; and I would like to say the time has come, when, without sacrificing any principle, we should be so united in our campaign that we would not be interrupted in the work we have to do, and in raising the money for the greatest service we can possibly render to the kingdom of God.

The foregoing speech must speak for itself. We should like to deal with its main contention, namely, that his resolution was to be preferred before the amendment because it did not interfere with the autonomy of the local church. It is surprising how jealous some people can become for the autonomy of the local church sometimes. The fact is, of course, that when a local Baptist church decrees that it will receive into its membership none but immersed believers, it does not in any way interfere with the independence of pedo-Baptists and others who stand outside the circle of that church fellowship. It merely lays down the terms upon which persons may become members of that church. And similarly, when a Baptist Convention decrees that it shall consist exclusively of delegates from Baptist churches, and then defines a Baptist church as being composed exclusively of immersed believers, it does not interfere with the autonomy of any church, but merely announces the terms upon which an individual church may become a member of the Convention.

#### DR. BROUGHER TALKS NONSENSE.

Dr. Brougher's contention that the proposed amendment to the by-laws which had been tabled, would have interfered with the autonomy of the local church, was sheer, unmitigated, unadulterated, nonsense; and, if Dr. Brougher

has an infinitesimal grain of common sense,—and we believe he has a good deal of it—*he knows that when he made that plea, he talked nonsense.* Moreover, Dr. Brougner was himself one of the twenty-eight who signed the notice to amend the by-laws at Seattle. Why didn't Dr. Brougner see the implication of that proposal at the time? Surely it was simple enough! The truth is, the tabled amendment would have interfered with the plan and purpose of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick and Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and the Park Ave. Church. And it was abundantly evident that Dr. Brougner set out to find a way, without a flagrant repudiation of what through all his ministry he had professed, by which he could avoid giving undue offence to those who believed what he had professed to believe, while at the same time finding a way to conform to the wishes of Mr. Rockefeller and Dr. Fosdick. As we analyze the Brougner resolution, *we shall show that Brougner and his company have deliberately sold out the principles of the Baptist denomination for Mr. Rockefeller's money.* We find it utterly impossible to believe in the sincerity of men playing the part that Dr. Brougner played.

### DR. BROUGNER ON THE FOREIGN MISSION SITUATION.

Furthermore, we publish elsewhere in this report the report of a committee appointed by the Baptist Bible Union on the Foreign Mission situation. That report contains a letter from Dr. F. L. Anderson, Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board. Rev. R. T. Ketcham, of Niles, Ohio, reported at one of the sessions of the Baptist Bible Union that he had Dr. Anderson's letter in his pocket while attending a meeting held by Dr. Brougner, at which Dr. Brougner informed his hearers that the offending missionaries of the Foreign Mission Board had been recalled. Mr. Ketcham referred then to the case of Mr. Fielder, and asked Dr. Brougner if this offender had been recalled; and if by that he meant that he had been dismissed, and was no longer on the pay-roll of the Foreign Mission Board. To this Dr. Brougner replied in the affirmative. Mr. Ketcham then read Dr. Anderson's letter, which proved that *what Dr. Brougner had said on that occasion was absolutely untrue.* (See article on Foreign Missions in Baptist Bible Union report.) Dr. Goodchild also, speaking before the Baptist Bible Union, declared that the promises made by Dr. Brougner in behalf of the Foreign Mission Board had not been redeemed. When Dr. Brougner's record for the last six months is spread before the denomination, it will be difficult to understand how any intelligent Baptist would ever look to Dr. Brougner for guidance where questions of fact were concerned.

### DR. RILEY'S AMENDMENT.

Following Dr. Brougner's speech, Dr. Riley proposed an amendment in the following terms, which was seconded by Dr. Joshua Gravett of Denver, Col.:

The Northern Baptist Convention recognizes its constituency as consisting solely of those Baptist churches in which the immersion of believers is recognized and practised as a pre-requisite to membership.

In supporting the amendment, Dr. Riley said:

Mr. Chairman: I want to agree absolutely to all that was said by my great and good friend and brother, Dr. Brougner, in his closing address,—every word; even concerning that portion which relates to Baptists who conduct schools wherein Presbyterians are permitted to teach. I am heartily in favour of the fellowship of evangelical people,—always have been, and expect to be as long as I remain active in Christian work. Our interests are in common, and we should co-operate; but I never expected to live to see the day when I should be asked to co-operate with pedo-Baptists as members of a Baptist church. If there is any consistency in that course, then the next needful step will be the merger which has recently been consummated in Canada. I am very happy to say that our Baptist brethren in Canada did not go into the merger. The Brougner resolution, instead of putting us in a merger, asks us to become the merger itself, and to receive men and women into Baptist churches who are not baptized by any manner of baptism, is something in Baptist procedure that I have never found in any book or heard from any platform.

Mr. Chairman, I would not for one moment give my time and thought to a controversy over what men call mere ceremonies; but I want to remind you this morning that this particular ceremony in our denomination, has in the judgment of my brethren, who are not literalists but spiritualists, or something else of the sort, a spiritual significance that cannot be ignored. They are setting aside practically every fundamental of our Baptist and historical faith. The great fundamental of the Baptist denomination, if I have studied Baptist history at all, is not loyalty to Jesus Christ, but loyalty to the Bible. I do not know anything of Jesus Christ outside of what the Bible has taught me, and the consequent experience in my own heart as the result of that belief. If we deny the inspiration of the Bible, we cannot create a Christ thereafter. The Christ that we worship is the Christ of the Bible; and if the Bible is authoritative, it is strange that Baptists should ever come to the point where they should discuss the question of baptism by immersion. I studied Greek in a Presbyterian College at the feet of a Presbyterian Greek professor; yet so clear was the meaning of *baptizo*, that he never sought to coerce another opinion. Therefore, I move this amendment in consequence of my desire to uphold the Word of God as an infallible Book.

I believe in a regenerated church membership. If you strike out of existence your symbol, you will take another step a little later and lose the substance thereof. Baptism is a symbol of death to sin, and resurrection to a new life, if Paul was an inspired writer. You cannot afford to despise that; it is one of the fundamentals of the Baptist faith, and of the Christian faith as well.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to it because another of our great vital truths is involved. Baptism not only symbolizes death to sin, but it is a symbol of the resurrection of Christ and of believing bodies at His coming. In other words, my brethren, I say to you this morning, what we are pleading for, what we desire above all things else, is a Baptist denomination, if we are to continue as a denomination at all. With the idea that this Convention has no right to legislate for the individual church, I agree absolutely. My amendment does not do that. My amendment simply declares that this Convention has a right to determine its own constituency; and on that basis I move this amendment be adopted, if we are to remain Baptists. I am not pleading this to conserve my denomination only; I plead it in behalf of the Bible which I do believe to be the Word of God.

#### DR. J. C. MASSEE, OF BOSTON.

No more pathetic, not to say tragic, figure appeared on the Northern Convention platform than Dr. J. C. Massee, of Boston. Our first acquaintance with Dr. Massee was when, at his invitation, we spoke from the platform of the Fundamentals Committee of the Northern Convention at Des Moines. At that time we thought of him as a valiant defender of the faith, who would put loyalty to Christ and His Word before every other consideration in life. We recognized his ability, and rejoiced in him as one who had come to the kingdom for such a time as this. But alas, alas, "How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle! How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!" If we may dare to make application of a great scripture to this case, we must say:

"The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places: how are the mighty fallen! Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph. Ye Baptist Conventions of the North, let there be no dew, neither let there be rain, upon you, nor fields of offerings: for there the shield of the mighty is vilely cast away, the shield of Massee, as though he had not been anointed with oil".

#### DR. MASSEE JOINS HANDS WITH MODERNISTS.

To see Dr. J. C. Massee joining hands with the modernists, and receiving their congratulations for his betrayal of the interests of the Baptist denomination was a tragedy which, we hope, is absolutely without parallel in American Baptist history. We have heard Dr. Massee when he spoke as a mighty

defender of the faith, we have heard him speak with eloquence and power; but his speech on this occasion was like the efforts of Samson when he had been shorn of his locks: it had nothing of merit in it; it was devoid of argument, but simply served to throw the weight of his personality against the amendment which was designed to conserve Baptist principles in this country.

### STRATON'S MAGNIFICENT STROKE.

Following Dr. Masee, Dr. John Roach Straton, of New York, was recognized by the President. We have heard Dr. Straton on many occasions. We have heard him criticized by not a few; but we have always admired his courageous stand for the truth. On this occasion Dr. Straton not only shot the bull's eye, but he blew the whole target to pieces. We print his speech below. His reference to the over-oiled machine captured the audience as perhaps nothing else during the morning; and if a vote could have been taken at that moment, we feel sure the delegates would have been more evenly divided. Dr. Straton spoke as follows:

Brother President and Members of Convention:

I wish to read first of all the amendment to the resolution, for I shall speak favorably to that amendment. The amendment is:

"Proposed Amendment to this Resolution:

"The Northern Baptist Convention recognizes its constituency as consisting solely of those Baptist Churches in which the immersion of believers is recognized and practiced as a pre-requisite to membership."

Reference was made by Brother Pierce to the "baby" that was born at Chicago; and Dr. Masee expressed his regret that he had to differ with his "twin brother"; Dr. Riley. The differences of opinion that confront us this morning and these references to "babies" have become so painful that it reminds me of the farmer who was asked how he was going to vote. He said "Wall I'm a republican, my wife's a democrat, the cow is a dry, the baby is a wet—and I don't know what to do!"

I wish to say, as one who was at the "Chicago Conference," that I am compelled to vote for the amendment to this resolution, because I voted for the Chicago resolution conditionally, and with a specific limitation, and it has become perfectly evident that the understanding,—at least as I understood that meeting—is not being lived up to. Therefore, I am free to cast my vote against the Chicago resolution and for this amendment to it, as proposed by my Brother, Dr. Riley.

The great question at last at issue here, so far as this convention is concerned, is—who constitute the Northern Baptist Convention? We are not seeking to legislate here for any local church. If a deliberative body, such as this, has not the right to define its own constituent members, then Baptists have reached an unbearable condition, and are headed toward autocracy and tyranny!

The wording of the amendment is exactly the same as the wording of the Chicago resolution, so far as the word "constituency" is concerned, and the amendment to it which we favor simply protects us and makes clear what it is all designed to be and to do.

I wish to say this word as a Northern Baptist and as Pastor of one of our great churches. We must recognize that there are larger issues involved here than the matter of Baptism alone. We must recognize that the matter goes far deeper than the question of so-called "associate membership". This is true because one of our great churches, under the leadership of a brilliant young preacher, who laid down certain terms for a church before he would accept the call as their Pastor, has declared that the time has come when Baptist churches should receive members not only from non-Baptist churches, but that we should receive members who have not been baptised by any sort of Baptism. It is a far larger question, therefore, than the form of baptism.

Now the crux of the whole matter is here in the fact that there are larger issues than Baptism involved in the present situation. We have reached a point of crisis in our beloved brotherhood. We have reached a point of supreme crisis, and the issue is now before us—as to whether we shall longer follow our



great historic Baptist principles. The sole justification of our separate existence and the very foundation of our great brotherhood is the authority of the Bible as truly the word of God. The great question now is whether we shall hold to that or abandon it. That is the question, and I for one take my stand, therefore, in this debate, not upon the opinion of men or the traditions of some so-called Baptists, but upon the eternal Word of God, and I would call you back, my brethren, to the New Testament, as we think upon this question to-day.

What does the Word of God say? As given to us in this Holy Scripture it is written:

"And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.'

'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.'" (Matt 28:18-20.)

Our Master not only set us the example when he himself was baptised in the river Jordan by John the Baptist, but here in this great commission He commands us to make disciples of all nations, to baptise them, and to teach them to observe that He had commanded. Now He had just commanded the baptism. How dare any of us, therefore, claim supreme loyalty to Jesus Christ and loyalty to His holy Word, and fail to obey Him among our churches in a matter so plain and so specific as that of baptism? We have above our heads here over the stage in this hall a large sign with the motto of this convention on it as follows:

"Victory Through Our Lord Jesus Christ".

In the light of the amazing utterances that have come already in this debate from some of our Modernist leaders, we need to add one more word to that motto. It should read:

"Victory Through Obedience to Our Lord Jesus Christ."

Can we not hear Him still asking us: "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?"

Yes it is true that there are larger issues involved in this situation. We have to say with the Psalmist:

"It is time for thee, Lord, to work: for they have made void thy law" (Psalm 119:126).

The brilliant but erratic young preacher before referred to, and the wealthy young layman who seems to have inspired and influenced his views, have departed from God's revealed word. That young preacher has not only abandoned baptism, but he has denied the integrity and authority of the Bible as God's word, he has repudiated the Virgin Birth of our Lord, His true deity, His miraculous life, His vicarious substitutionary atonement, His bodily resurrection and His plainly promised coming again!

All of these things—the very heart of our holy religion—will go down at last in the dust of defeat, if this subtle and sinister leadership is followed much further. This matter of baptism, therefore, is but the entering wedge!

The Baptist denomination will be infinitely better off in the long run to depend upon the gifts of the great mass of an obedient, believing, loyal-hearted people—even though the individual gifts be small—than to lose the enthusiastic devotion of the rank and file or our people for the sake of securing the large gifts of a few self-appointed worldly-minded millionaires!

Money can be a good thing in the Kingdom of God, but too much of it from a single source may work wreck and ruin because of its insidious, stupefying influences on the minds and hearts of our leaders. It is like too much oil in an automobile. It is ruinous—it fouls the spark plugs, interferes with the ignition, causes carbon in the cylinders, and gums up the valves so that they cannot work properly,—thus interfering vitally with the proper operation of the machine, and unless the excess is removed in time, it will finally stop the car and thus destroy its usefulness. That, my friend, is what is happening to us today! There is too much "Standard Oil" in the Baptist machine!

I believe that the time has come when we ought to take some of it out, and I think that this amendment may help. Therefore, I am for it!

### A CHICAGO FIRE-FLY.

A gentleman from Chicago by the name of Virgin spoke in support of the Brougher resolution. The most accurate description we could give of his speech is to say that it was weaker than Dr. Masee's. The fact is, there was nothing in it. Without laboring the matter further, we will pause here to relate the fact that attempting to describe a certain letter that appeared in the press a little while ago, we described it as a "vacuous" epistle; and then desiring not to be unjust to the writer of the letter, we consulted the dictionary with a view to getting an exact definition of the word "vacuous". This is what we found:

"1. Having no contents; especially, containing no matter; being a vacuum; empty; unfilled; void. 2. Lacking intelligence; being without expression; blank. 3. Idle; unoccupied."

### DR. BEAVEN, OF ROCHESTER.

The only out-and-out recognized modernist who spoke in behalf of the Chicago resolution was Dr. A. W. Beaven, of Rochester. Dr. Beaven's speech was the speech of a man who did not conceive the New Testament church to be bound by any objective authority. It was a speech which any modernist might make whose main consideration was how to serve mammon rather than God. Dr. Beaven has a good voice and is able to make himself understood. His argument was the familiar modernist argument, "Let us get on with the work." Of course it does not matter what we do as long as we do something. What we are to preach and teach is of no importance—"Let us get on with the work"—albeit the "work" to the modernist consists in destroying everything which is essentially Christian.

### DR. FRANK M. GOODCHILD THE GREAT.

Another great fundamentalist stalwart who supported Dr. Riley's amendment was Dr. Frank M. Goodchild, the Chairman of the Fundamentals Committee, and a contributing Editor of the *Watchman-Examiner*. And here let us announce that on the Tuesday night preceding this discussion, the Fundamentals Committee met in one room and the Baptist Bible Union in another room in the Raleigh Hotel. Dr. Masee pleaded for the Brougher resolution, but went down to overwhelming defeat in the Committee of which he had been the Chairman, to the everlasting credit of fundamentalists be it said, having we are told only five to support him. The Baptist Bible Union and the Fundamentals Committee, with these five exceptions, were an absolute unit in their judgment and determination upon the course of action to be pursued. It was Dr. Masee's temporizing and compromising attitude which compelled the organization of the Baptist Bible Union; and his action on this occasion will show all fundamentalists what may be expected of him in the time of crisis. Dr. Goodchild, though short of stature, towered head and shoulders in moral courage and spiritual perception above his erstwhile colleague, Masee. His speech in support of Dr. Riley's amendment was as follows:

### DR. GOODCHILD'S SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman and Friends: This is the first time I have ever taken part in any discussion on the platform of the Northern Baptist Convention. I have been in attendance at May Anniversaries, and the Meetings of the Northern Baptist Convention for more than twenty-five years. If all of you had been equally self-restrained, we would never had gone beyond the time of the programme.

Perhaps I do not need to speak to-day. You know where I stand very well. I was not in attendance at the Chicago Conference. Had I been there I should not have signed the resolution. I should have stood where I always stand, on the New Testament; and those resolutions do not take their stand there. Had I been there, I would not have been the only member of that Conference in opposition to the resolution. I should not have had to say, "At my first answer, no man stood with me". Dozens would have opposed it. I am for the amendment; I am opposed to the standing resolutions.

In the first place, because those resolutions are not straightforward. I

like utter frankness. Oh, I have tried them out on people more orthodox than I; I have read the resolutions to them, and the invariable first answer has been, "What more could be asked? The standing resolutions are a double barrier." In a single moment I could show them the one who so approved the standing resolutions proposed, that they open our gates wider than any resolution that any Baptist assembly in America ever adopted before. A church can be in full fellowship with this Convention under those resolutions that has twenty-five baptized members and five hundred who have professed their faith but who at the same time said they had conscientious scruples against being baptized. What sort of a Baptist church is that! What sort of resolutions are they for any Baptist assembly to pass, that allows that! I would a great deal rather adopt a resolution that said straight out what they mean than one that allows a controlling membership in these churches that repudiated the Saviour's command.

That is my first objection to these resolutions, that they do not say on the very surface of them exactly what they mean. We have stood for the New Testament constitution of a church. In adopting the original resolution we do not effect a compromise to meet the present situation; we make a complete surrender of the things for which we have stood. These resolutions of Dr. Brougher are very adroitly worded. Dr. Brougher knows how to state things as takingly as any man in the country. But as I have suggested, they are not altogether straightforward. They look both ways at once. They remind me of a woman of whom I have heard who suffered some financial hardship. She was obliged to practise rigid economy. She began her economies by making her son's clothes at home. The first article she made was what the English call trousers, but what we, with our American instinct for softer speech, call by the gentle name of pants. She did not make them of the most approved pattern, and when they were finished the front and the back were so much alike that when her son was a little distance off, she could not tell whether he was coming toward her or going from her. She could not tell except by looking at the clock whether he was going to school or coming from school.

Some relative of that woman must have given Dr. Brougher the intimation as to how he should write this resolution. They seem to be going toward God and conformity to His demands, and at the same time going toward man and conformity to his traditions. They have referred to the English Baptists, and have found them a parallel to what these resolutions seek. Mr. Hughes has preached in my pulpit, and I would welcome him there any time. I have preached in numerous English Baptist pulpits; but that does not obligate me when the New Testament instructions are clear, to shape the character of my church according to their notions. It means nothing to me that there have been groups of Anabaptists in the middle ages who did not require immersion as baptism. I do not guide myself in this matter by the English Baptists or by the Anabaptists of old. I go farther back than that.—I go straight to the New Testament from Jesus Christ, and take my orders; and His orders are clear. If you will leave a man alone with the New Testament, uninterfered with in any way, without a commentary, he will come out a Baptist. If you send a group of Christian believers to read the New Testament with a desire to find out what kind of a church they should form, they will come out and form a Baptist church. That has been proved again and again in Christian history. They sought for themselves the directions in the New Testament, and were surprised when they organized a church to find that such a church was already in existence. That was the case in the history of the Dutch Baptists and others.

Now I am opposed to the resolution also because it really changes the constituency of our Convention. I know that seems to be very carefully preserved. We are told that none but immersed delegates from these mixed churches will be received. This makes this not a Convention of Baptist churches, but a Convention of Baptist delegates from various sorts of churches. Whom do these delegates represent? Themselves? Oh, no; they represent their churches. And the church they represent ought to measure up to the quality of their representatives.

Men have suffered for these principles; men are suffering still for them. I baptized not long ago a Jewish girl, daughter of a Rabbi. Her family held

a funeral over her because of her baptism. I baptized a boy not long ago, a Roman Catholic. When he went home he found his clothes packed up and set outside the door, and he has never been back to that home since. Men and women suffer for these principles that our fathers suffered for, as Roger Williams suffered for them, being driven out into the wintry wilderness, the Indians being kinder to him than his Congregationalist brethren. Judson suffered for these principles, cutting himself off from the church that he loved, because of his convictions about baptism—cutting himself off from the support in a land of barbarous people, nine thousand miles away. I should rather stand in the line of such heroes as these, than to trim down the principles that the Lord Jesus Christ has given us.

#### OTHER SPEAKERS.

Mr. Corwin S. Shanks, of Seattle, an ex-President of the Convention, spoke in support of the Brougner resolution; and Mr. Max Schimpf, of New York, spoke in support of Dr. Riley's amendment.

One very interesting and moving feature of the debate was the appearance on the platform of Mrs. Day, of Los Angeles, Calif. She was given five minutes and pleaded with passion and power that the delegates stand by the Word of God. Mrs. Day's support of Dr. Riley's amendment was to us most suggestive. In the Great War, while the men went to the front-line trenches, the women turned to every kind of service usually performed by men at home. They worked in munition factories, and even on railways, and cars, and buses, and elevators, as well as in nursing and those special branches of service in which women usually exercise a tender ministry. And in this war against modernism, we shall have to enlist the women; we shall have to form women's organizations; we shall have to get our women instructed in these matters; and we are sure they will become a mighty auxiliary to the rest of the army.

When the vote was taken, the amendment was defeated by 2,020 to 1,084.

#### A FEW REFLECTIONS.

It is our opinion that the fundamentalists of the Northern Baptist Convention made an astonishingly good showing. When it is remembered that every educational institution in the denomination, all the missionary organizations as well as the millions of Rockefeller, were on the side of the Chicago resolution, it is a mighty tribute to our Baptist people that there were found 1,084 who were not afraid to stand up for the right.

#### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VOTE.

What was the question at issue? Properly understood, it was not an issue between the Riley amendment and the Chicago resolution. At Seattle notice to amend the by-laws was deliberately given and signed by twenty-eight men. That amendment would have made the Convention a Convention of representatives of regular Baptist churches; by which is meant, churches composed exclusively of immersed believers. Why did not Dr. Brougner propose that that amendment should be voted down? Because he dared not do it. Few of the 2,020 who voted for the Brougner resolution would have been willing to go on record as deliberately setting aside the divine ordinance of baptism; and proclaiming to the world that they regarded it as of little importance. But because this Joab did not want the Asahel of that amendment to be found lying in a pool of its own blood, it was quietly conducted to the lethal chamber that it might thus quietly be put out of the way. The Brougner resolution, however, was designed to effect exactly the same purpose as the negating of the amendment: it was designed to leave the door wide open to the Fosdick church and its membership. How anybody could read its terms and fail to see it, we are at a loss to understand.

#### THE CHICAGO RESOLUTION.

Let us examine it. "The Northern Baptist Convention recognizes its constituency as consisting solely of those Baptist churches in which the immersion of believers is recognized as the only scriptural Baptism." Let us see how this would apply to the Park Ave. Church. At present it is called a Bap-

tist church, but Dr. Fosdick proposes that members shall be admitted either by immersion, by sprinkling, or pouring, or without any form called baptism at all. Supposing we interrogate Dr. Fosdick, and ask him if his church, under these conditions, is a Baptist church, in which the immersion of believers is recognized and practised as the only Scriptural baptism? Even Dr. Fosdick would acknowledge that there is no baptism that is Scriptural but immersion; and therefore, the only baptism recognized and practised in the Park Ave. Church, when he assumes the pastorate, as Scriptural baptism, will be "the immersion of believers". Of course, there will be other forms called baptism; sprinkling may be practised, and persons received without any baptism at all of any sort; but the only form of baptism which the Park Ave. Church will recognize and practise as being "Scriptural baptism" will be "the immersion of believers". Therefore, this does not exclude the Park Ave. Church.

The second clause of the resolution says, "And the Convention hereby declares that only immersed members will be recognized as delegates to the Convention". What is the meaning of the phrase, "only immersed members will be recognized"? Surely if language means anything at all, it means that there may be other members of the church which are not immersed. Therefore, care will be taken when electing delegates to the Convention to select only such as have been immersed. The resolution, therefore, is an endorsement of open membership; and the only thing the Park Ave. Church need to do to maintain its qualification as a member of the Northern Baptist Convention, is to refrain from calling such other forms as may be named baptism, "Scriptural". Thus the resolution passed by the Northern Convention receives the Park Ave. Church with Dr. Fosdick as its Pastor, and its announced "inclusive" policy as its programme, with open arms.

#### SOME OF THE BENEFITS OF THE DISCUSSION.

##### True Character of Certain Men Revealed.

One of our Southern editors sometimes uses a word which we do not like. Used in the sense in which he employs it, we admit it is a convenient word. But to us it is like dressing a gentleman in overalls. This word puts a good idea in overalls. But for once, and for the sake of convenience, we will use it. The word is "positionize". Well, this discussion has served to "positionize" certain men. From this forward, the Baptists of America will know where to put J. Whitcomb Brouger,—or, at least, they will know where not to put him. Until he repents, he should never be given any commission in the army of the defenders of the faith. We all sin, we all make grievous blunders; but if, and when, we repent, we may be forgiven. Dr. Brouger should never be given the least commission in the fundamentalists' army henceforth, until he repents. The Editor of this paper has far more respect for Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick than for Dr. Brouger. Dr. Fosdick puts on the uniform of the enemy, and everybody knows that he is fighting on the enemy's side. Dr. Brouger has worn the uniform of orthodoxy; and while wearing it, has betrayed the Baptist cause absolutely to the enemy.

The same may be said of Dr. J. C. Masee. Dr. Masee has been in demand all over America in time past as a defender of the faith: he will be known henceforth as an apostle of compromise. We have nothing to do with the motives of either of these brethren; *but we are sure that if there were no more stalwart Baptists than they have proved to be, the Baptist denomination would soon perish from the earth.*

Dr. Virgin, of Chicago, belongs to the same order. His speech was the first we have ever heard from him, and it is the first time we have ever seen him. But it is certain that Baptist orthodoxy has nothing to hope for from him.

Another very interesting figure was the Rev. Mr. Leichliter, formerly Pastor of the Adelaide St. Baptist Church, London, Ont., now of Buffalo. He attended the fundamentalist meeting on Tuesday night, and told some Ontario delegates that he was going to vote with the fundamentalists; but he voted against the Riley amendment and for the Brouger resolution. This was especially interesting for we remember that when Mr. Leichliter was in London, and Dr. L. S. Hughson, then of Stratford, left the Baptists to join the Presbyterians.

Mr. Lechliter, referring to Dr. Hughson's abandonment of Baptist principles, described him as a "poor prune". Brother Lechliter is apparently trying to become a dried prune too.

Some months ago we quoted in *The Gospel Witness* an article by Dr. Taft, President of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, of Chicago, on "What is a Baptist Church?" We thought it to be a very clear statement at the time: We were surprised and disappointed, however, to observe that when the very subject on which he had written was at issue in a Baptist Convention, he did not vote on either side of the question. Are we coming to a day when men will bob their back-bones just as women bob their hair? The neutrality of such a man as Dr. Taft is all the more serious when it is remembered that he is the President of a school that exists for the training of Baptist ministers. Water will never rise higher than its source. Will the Northern Theological Seminary turn out a generation of preachers who will take a comfortable and neutral seat where issues vital to the existence of Baptist churches are at stake? Is Dr. Taft looking for Rockefeller money too?

#### WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

What of the future? It is refreshing to observe that so near to New York, in this eastern part of the country where modernism is more strongly entrenched than anywhere else, there should have been found 1,084 Baptists whom money could not buy. We have no doubt that out of the other 2,020, many were carried away by the sophistries of Brougher and Masee, and really did not know that they were voting for an absolute surrender of a cherished fundamental Baptist principle. We are encouraged when we remember that a year ago this month at Memphis the anti-evolution amendment, moved by Dr. C. P. Stealey, was defeated by a still larger proportion of votes,—the supporters of Dr. Stealey numbering less than a thousand, and the supporters of Dr. Mullins over two thousand. Yet in twelve months from that time, the tables were completely turned, and Dr. Stealey's position was unanimously approved; the Convention going even farther than Dr. Stealey had proposed, and requiring all its salaried servants together with the trustees and members of Boards of the Convention, individually to signify their approval. What was done in the South may easily be done in the North. Meanwhile the action of the Convention in Washington will bring many hundreds of new members into the Bible Union to work together for the propagation of our common principles.

#### THE PRESIDENT OF THE SOUTHERN CONVENTION.

An interesting confirmation of what we have just written was offered in the speech by Dr. Geo. McDaniel, who was presented to the Northern Convention immediately following the vote, as the fraternal delegate from the Southern Convention. Dr. McDaniel spoke in part as follows:

"At Memphis the year preceding, we had a doctrinal question at which the Convention said two and two make four, and some earnest brethren said, "Yes, but we want you to say that it does not make five." At that Convention at Memphis, after a discussion like you had this morning, they refused to say that two and two do not make five, and the amendment was voted down. Throughout the year, there has been some unrest and no little agitation; and in order to quiet all minds, the Convention said this year, two and two make four, and not five, six, or anything else. And their minds seem to be quiet; and we are standing together in brotherly love and striving together for the faith of the Gospel.

"Now quite naturally in a family of many children, there will be a variety of opinion. They will discuss among themselves, and they might have a scrap one brother with another; but they are still brothers. They bear the family name, and if anybody jumps on one of those boys, he jumps on two boys. So, my brethren, we wish you to join with us, and we wish to join with you as a great New Testament people with a peculiar message and a peculiar mission to the world, and everyone of us doing our level best to make known the pure Gospel to the whole world."

**WHERE WILL DRS. BROUGHER AND MASSEE FIND THEIR FELLOWSHIP?**

We cannot help wondering where these two great preachers will arrive? We hope they will find it impossible to go all the way to the modernist camp. Beyond any doubt, they are warming themselves by the enemy's fire,—and that is a dangerous position for anyone to be in. We are informed that Dr. Brougher is to be given the Presidency by the machine for his services. He spent six months touring the Convention making no effort to suppress modernism,—certainly doing nothing to encourage fundamentalism. His whole cry was, "Peace, peace, when there was no peace." We suppose the Presidency of the Northern Convention is looked upon as a high office involving high honor; but to surrender one's conscience for such a prize is a fearful price to pay.

In what fellowship will Dr. Massee find himself? It is difficult to think of his exchanging pulpits with Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick. But where can he go? We have grown accustomed to see men take such courses as Dr. Massee has taken; but we have never before seen one of such prominence go clean over to the enemy in an hour of crisis as Dr. Massee has done. There is no possible explanation. It is useless to search the dictionary for euphemistic adjectives to describe what merits nothing but the severest censure. The plain fact is, that Dr. Brougher and Dr. Massee must stand before the Baptists of America as men who have betrayed the cause. Will they be welcomed by the other side? We remember one who took back the price of his treachery to those who had bought him, and cried, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood", to which the enemies of the Incarnate Word replied, "What is that to us? See thou to that". And even the enemy will require that Drs. Brougher and Massee shall see to that!

## A GROWING GIANT

### Baptist Bible Union Holds Fourth Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.

Washington, D.C., May 27—Great oaks from little acorns grow. In May, 1923, the Baptist Bible Union ship was officially launched in Kansas City, Mo., under a big tent. In 1926, the fourth annual meeting was concluded in the great city auditorium at Washington, D.C., with an enormous audience present, having been in session May 19 to 24.

Only three years ago, the Baptist Bible Union was spoken of, when spoken of at all, by Baptist officialdom as though it were an aggregation of knaves and fools. To-day there is no organization on the American continent which modernism so much fears. From the beginning the Baptist Bible Union has had a clear-cut Confession of Faith; it has mapped out for itself a definite course of action; it has laid it down as a cardinal principle of its operation that there must be no compromise with the enemy. It has been a militant body, absolutely refusing to negotiate with modernism, against which its sword is unsheathed.

At Milwaukee in 1924 the Baptist Bible Union made its influence felt in the Northern Convention by compelling the appointment of a commission to investigate the Foreign Mission situation. In 1925 the Southern Convention adopted the New Hampshire Confession of Faith, largely as a result of the Baptist Bible Union's agitation. In the same year at Seattle, the Baptist Bible Union forced the Northern Convention to take a stand by the Hinson resolution, and thus exposed the utter insincerity of the Foreign Mission Board. The anti-evolution resolution passed at the Southern Baptist Convention two

weeks ago was due in no small measure to the support the Baptist Bible Union gave to the anti-evolution movement. And now in Washington the Baptist Bible Union is recognized as the most influential body of fundamentalists in the Convention.

The large place given to the Baptist Bible Union Convention in Washington in the public press of the country, is an indication of the importance which public opinion attaches to its deliberations. The great city journals do not give front page space to unimportant movements. Some of the New York papers have carried telegraphic reports of the addresses delivered at this Conference on their first page; and the Associated Press has given currency to the utterances of the Union and its speakers all over the continent. The Baptist Bible Union as an organization or a Movement is unimportant; as an organization it is only a means to an end. But we are gratified that it has assumed such proportions that it is commanding a large place in public interest; it is commanding the respect of its foes; and it is rapidly winning its way in the confidence of all those who stand for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

The attendance here was most representative. Delegates were present from Southern California, and from the north-west as far as the State of Washington, as far east as Maine, south as Florida, Louisiana and Texas, and a fair number from Canada. At this writing, we have no analysis of the enrolment; but we believe delegates were present from practically every state in the Union. Without consulting our records, we are able to report from memory having met delegates from every state in the Union with the possible exception of two.

The Convention was held in the Metropolitan Baptist Church, of which Dr. John Compton Ball is the Pastor. Dr. Ball was not a member of the Baptist Bible Union, though standing faithfully for all that the Union represents. When he knew that we desired to hold our annual meeting in Washington, he took the ground that the Union was an organization of Baptist brethren, and that we were entitled to Baptist hospitality.

Washington is a beautiful city—one of the most beautiful in the world; and as the Capital of this great nation, has in it many places of historic interest. But we are sure that one of the happiest memories the Bible Union will take from Washington will be the memory of the graciousness of our host, Dr. Ball. We sincerely regret that he insisted on being excused from addressing the Convention, except in a short address of welcome. We should have been delighted to hear him preach. But the address itself was a gem: racy and humorous and full of good sense, it revealed the Pastor to be a man of ability and strength. The officers of the church were also gracious in their spirit; and the entire church made us feel that we were guests indeed. We can most heartily recommend all fundamentalists coming to Washington to make the Metropolitan Baptist Church their home.

#### DR. GEORGE RAGLAND.

The Union Meeting opened Wednesday evening, May 19th, with an address by Dr. Geo. Ragland, of Lexington, Ky., on "Nothing Beyond What Is Written". It was a most appropriate utterance; and served as a keynote to the whole Convention, magnifying the Word of the Lord. We have no space to summarize the various addresses, other than to say that the programme was carried out as announced. A large number of the Baptist pulpits Sunday the 23rd, were occupied by Bible Union men. All the services of Monday the 24th were held in the city auditorium. The addresses throughout were of a high order. Dr. Frank Goodchild, the Chairman of the Fundamentals Committee, gave an able address on "The Amendment" which will be submitted to the Northern Convention. He took an uncompromising position, and declared that he would have nothing to do with the Brougner resolution.

#### DRS. RILEY AND NORRIS.

At the evening service, before an enormous audience, the speakers were Drs. W. B. Riley and J. Frank Norris. Dr. Riley's address was a terrific in-



dictment of Baptist schools as propagators of infidelity. He produced an array of facts which were absolutely irresistible in a torrential argument which was the truest kind of oratory. The great audience was so completely captured by the speaker that when he sat down amid thunderous applause, the great crowd spontaneously rose to their feet in acknowledgement of the power of the address. Dr. Riley was followed by Dr. J. Frank Norris. Few men could have carried on after Riley's splendid effort without providing an anti-climax; but Norris was equal to the occasion, and as he scathingly exposed the fallacies of modernism and its danger to the Baptist denomination as represented by the Rockefeller Foundation, the great crowd was carried to other heights of enthusiasm for the old Gospel. It was a great night,—a fitting conclusion to a Conference which did much to generate a mighty opposition to the prevailing unbelief.

#### THE DEATH OF DR. W. B. HINSON.

A feeling of deep sorrow and a consciousness of great loss possessed all hearts on account of the fact that one of the greatest of America's preachers, beloved member of the Union and of the Executive Committee, Dr. W. B. Hinson, of Portland, Ore., instead of coming to Washington to speak as we had hoped would be possible, had been called home to be with Christ. The part Dr. Hinson played at the Seattle Convention will never be forgotten. His passing is a loss to the whole Church of Christ on earth; but his memory will abide as an inspiration to heroic service for the Lord.

The following resolution was passed with a standing vote; and the great congregation stood with bowed heads as his associate, Rev. H. L. Kempton, led in prayer:

**RESOLVED:** That the Baptist Bible Union of North America, assembled at its Annual Convention at Washington, D.C., May 19-24, 1926, records its deep sorrow over the vacant places in our program occasioned by the death of Rev. W. B. Hinson, D.D., LL.D. His spoken addresses like his printed sermons, whose pages numbered many millions, were alike a source of inspiration and comfort to men and women in all parts of the continent; and in the case of his sermons, to the uttermost parts of the earth; and

That we place on record our appreciation of his deep spirituality, his charming simplicity, his abounding sympathy, his ever present cheerfulness, his deep discernment of spiritual truth, his loyalty to the Person and work of our divine Christ, his unwavering proclamation and defence of the faith once for all delivered to the saints, and the marvellous union of a great mind and a great heart in his noteworthy life; and

That we cherish the inspiring memory of his able and fearless advocacy at the last meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention held in Seattle in 1925, of those resolutions which have since become known as the Hinson resolutions. Their adoption would at once have placed the operations of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society on a plane where any suspicion of compromise would be impossible and where the continuance in service of any missionary of modernistic tendency would cease. In such advocacy Dr. Hinson pointed out the only way to peace and prosperity and purity. His testimony to the faith once for all delivered to the saints on that memorable occasion remains to us the crowning achievement of an unforgettable career; and

That a copy of these resolutions be furnished to his family in their great sorrow, and that copies be furnished to the press for publication, and that these resolutions become a part of the permanent records of the Baptist Bible Union of North America.

#### AN ANTI-EVOLUTION RESOLUTION.

The action of the Southern Baptist Convention in passing an anti-evolution resolution brought great joy to the assembled brethren, and led everyone to hope for better things even in the Northern Convention. On this subject the following resolution was passed:

**Resolution Concerning the Attitude of Our Denomination to the Doctrine of Evolution and to the Teaching Thereof.**

Whereas the Southern Baptist Convention adopted an excerpt from the address of its President in the following terms:

"This Convention accepts Genesis as teaching that man was the special creation of God and rejects every theory, evolution or otherwise, which teaches that man originated in, or came by way of, a lower animal ancestry";

And whereas at a subsequent time the following resolution was adopted by the said Convention:

"WHEREAS, the Southern Baptist Convention in its session May 12, 1926, by unanimous vote, declared that it 'accepts Genesis as teaching that man was the special creation of God, and rejects every theory, evolution or otherwise, which teaches that man originated in, or came by way of a lower animal ancestry', and

WHEREAS, our great school of the Prophets, the South-western Baptist Seminary, through the Board of Trustees, on May 12th, accepted and incorporated the said action of the Convention in its 'Statement of Faith', and through its honoured President, so announced to this Convention of May 13th, and said President further announced that said 'Statement of Faith' would be made a test of all officers and teachers of said Seminary, and

THEREFORE, the Southern Baptist Convention does now resolve that it commends the Board of Trustees of the South-western Baptist Theological Seminary for its prompt and hearty acceptance of the Convention's action, and

IN ORDER that no unfair comparison arise or unjust accusations be brought against any of our seminaries, schools or other Convention agencies, be it further resolved that this Convention request all its institutions and boards, and their Missionary representatives, to give like assurance to the Convention and to our Baptist Brotherhood in General, of a hearty and individual acceptance of the said action of this Convention to the end that the great cause of our present unrest and agitation over the evolution question be effectively and finally removed in the minds of the constituency of this Convention and all others concerned";

BE IT RESOLVED that this Baptist Bible Union express their gratification that the great body of Baptists declared itself in such unequivocal terms regarding this fundamental error of evolution, and its determination to make application of the principles of its said declaration;

AND THAT we express an earnest hope that similar action may be taken in other Baptist Conventions, that thus the Baptist body may be united on a common basis of faith.

**FOREIGN MISSIONS IN THE NORTHERN CONVENTION.**

A very important matter, which engaged the attention of the Union at Seattle and since, was that of the Foreign Mission situation in the Northern Convention. After some discussion on this subject, a committee consisting of Dr. W. B. Riley, Rev. C. E. Tulga, and Rev. R. T. Ketcham was appointed, and brought in the following report which speaks for itself:

**NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION BOARDS IGNORE REPORTS OF ITS OWN COMMISSIONS.**

It is well known to practically all interested members of churches of the Northern Baptist Convention that

**TWO MOST IMPORTANT COMMISSIONS**

of the Convention's history have been the committee appointed at Buffalo to investigate the teaching in our colleges, and the commission appointed at Milwaukee to investigate the teaching on our foreign fields. The first of these

committees made a report that called attention to certain teachers whose departure from the Baptist faith was such that they should, in all conscience, resign their teaching positions.

This recommendation was utterly ignored by modernist professors. Since that time, a few of the most rabid rationalists known to our professorships have been forced out of office; but uniformly this result has been produced by some local fundamentalists who found and brought before the school board such proofs of infidelity as rendered it impossible for the professor to longer continue, as, for instance, the case of William Jewell College of Missouri, where a Unitarian was discovered to be at the head of religious instruction, and who, in spite of President, Professor and student backing, was retired by the Trustees.

On the whole, the schools of our denomination, instead of being corrected by the work of this commission, were encouraged by the mild treatment of the Convention and have marked prodigious progress in the propagation of these heretical views within the last five years, until now the Board of Education, the educational secretaries, with the rarest exceptions are modernists and openly espouse evolution versus revelation.

The commission for investigation of the views of our foreign representatives rendered a better report, but on dependable information from most outstanding representatives on foreign fields, it should have been more extensive. It is now known that many of those who had intimate knowledge of the teaching taking place in the heathen lands of their location, were never consulted at all by the commission. But there did come into the hands of that commission such irrefutable proofs of apostate teaching as to lead them to recite certain samples of such. Chief among those was one of whom the commission said:

“Of sin he writes:

‘To-day we have come to look upon wrongdoers not so much as sinners as unfortunates.’

“Of atonement he writes:

‘When we see ourselves in our true position as the growing, erring children of God, is it not clear that such a thing as an atonement, a making good for us by another, could not possibly be acceptable to our Father, or even considered by Him? Seeing that we are a family together, not only is it not derogatory of God and Jesus to abandon the idea of the atonement, but it is testifying to the perfect quality of God’s fatherliness.’

‘It is not primarily the death of Jesus that saves us. It would not have been necessary under all circumstances.’

“Of final salvation he writes:

‘But what about those children who desert the Heavenly home? Who, when they know their Father’s desire is otherwise, deliberately turn away and follow the demands of their lower natures? Is there any hope for them? (In a later paragraph his answer is found):

‘Jesus will keep on and never give up until every last one is found. There is no man, no matter how vile, without some solid good, some of the stuff of God in him. There is some invitation of God to which he will respond, although he may have to hear it in the next world. God will never turn His back upon His children, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.’

“Dealing with the subject of the person of Christ he writes:

‘But the unique element of Jesus’ nature does not lie in His being the only begotten Son of God. He is not that by His own teaching. Rather, He is the only perfect one among the countless millions of sons of God who have been born into our Heavenly Father’s earthly home.’

‘Jesus owes many a debt to men who had not obtained the perfection that He had in His relation to God.’

“In dealing with the person of Christ as related to His death he writes:

‘In setting an unbridgable gulf between the glory of Jesus and our own possibilities, it seems to me that men are opposing themselves diametrically to His teaching and desires, and are, to a large degree, rendering His sacrificial life and death vain.’

“On the inspiration of the Scriptures and in arguing to show that they are not infallible he writes:

‘Surely it is clear that the Bible, part for part, is not an infallible book . . .

There is many a book, many a sermon, many a poem of our day as God-inspirer and as God-filled and helpful as many of the Books of the Bible, and more so than some. God is still speaking to his children through the voice of His prophets."

A verbatim copy of the entire communication which was in the hands of the commission appointed by the Northern Baptist Convention reveals many additional statements from this same man that are equally a departure from the Christian faith. As, for instance, when he says, as he does, "It remains for us individually to make all atonement we can for our sins by living the kind of life our Father yearns for."

Again he writes: "Undoubtedly much of the unwillingness to accept the theory of evolution is due to the idea which many faithful Christians have been taught, that the Bible is an infallible Book." Of Peter he wrote: "If there had been enough more of his kind, Jesus would not have had to die."

This long statement was not secured from this man by the commission, nor was it acquired by the foreign board in the commission's behalf.

Documents on hand show that Mr. Fielder mailed this lengthy statement to the Foreign Board on June 3rd, 1924, having been told by a fellow missionary that he would inform the Board of Mr. Fielder's position if he himself did not do so. However, as will be noted below, the Board took no action of any kind in the case until June 10th, 1925, a little over one year later.

When it is remembered that kindred citations were reported by our commission from others on the foreign fields, which were affirmed by members of the commission simply to be samples of what they found, (not at all the sum of the same), yet perhaps no one was more flagrant in his departure from the Christian faith and from all historic Baptist positions than the one above quoted from Mr. Cecil G. Fielder.

It would seem, therefore, that if there could be such an instance of flagrant teaching on the foreign field as to invite speedy and adequate judgment, the Board had the same in this case and could be reasonably trusted to tell such a missionary that his services were no longer desired; that he had misrepresented his own denomination before the heathen world, to which it had sent him, and that he had evidently deceived the foreign committee in securing for himself an appointment, and that his relationship with the Society was terminated once for all.

But, instead of such action, we have had the agents of the entire promotion board preaching, in every state included in the Convention territory, that only six or eight offenders in all had been found (and that in spite of the known modernism of the Shanghai College), and that they had been dealt with summarily and sufficiently. Imagine, therefore, the

### SURPRISE NOW AWAITING THE BAPTIST PUBLIC

to discover that no man has been dealt with summarily, and not even the most grievous offender mentioned in the commission's report has been dismissed from the service of the society, or even chided for his false and anti-Christian teaching.

On the contrary, indisputable documents in hand prove that Mr. Cecil G. Fielder, the offender against Baptist faith and practice, was almost due a furlough, and the same was thoughtfully speeded up for him by our Board. When once at home, he was submitted to a considerate committee made up of Arthur C. Baldwin, W. S. Abernethy and Thos. H. Stacy, who asked him to address the board regarding his work in Assam, and particularly his work among students at Cotton College. On the conclusion of his address, the committee presented the following report, which was adopted unanimously:

"To the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society:

Your committee, appointed to meet Mr. Cecil G. Fielder and inquire into his theological views and message as a missionary, desires to make the following report:

First: Your committee are agreed that in Mr. Fielder's theological statement are declarations which are open to question and which, standing alone, would make it impossible to return him to the work in Assam.

Second: Your committee faces the fact that in his work, Brother Fielder has been signally blessed of God. The testimony of many of his fellow missionaries and of Dr. Witter, his predecessor in the work at Cotton College, speak in such high terms of his Christ-like character, his zeal and usefulness, his success in a position requiring peculiar qualities of spiritual equipment; that we feel he has been used of God to a marked degree.

Nevertheless, the limitations of his theological statement are real in the judgment of your committee, and the criticism which his statement aroused cannot be ignored.

In view of the fact, therefore, that Mr. Fielder has never had a course of theological study, we would recommend that the Board grant Mr. Fielder's request for a year of study at Newton Theological Institution and that the question of his return to Assam be made a special order at some meeting of the Board in 1926.

ARTHUR C. BALDWIN,  
W. S. ABERNETHY,  
THOS. H. STACY,  
J. C. ROBBINS,  
Foreign Secretary.

On behalf of the Board of Managers.  
New York, N.Y., June 10, 1925.

In spite of all attempts to cover this gentle action and keep it from the Baptist public, the information of it leaked, and Mr. R. T. Ketcham, of Niles, Ohio, wrote to the President of the Board after the following manner:

"Niles, Ohio, December 9th, 1925.

"Rev. F. L. Anderson, President, Board of Managers, American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, 276 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Anderson:

Will you kindly inform me if Mr. Cecil G. Fielder is home on a furlough with salary paid, or has he been dismissed from the service of the Society? Also, is Mr. Fielder taking a course in Newton Theological Seminary, and if so, at whose expense?

Thanking you for any information in regard to this matter I remain,

Yours and His,  
R. T. KETCHAM.

On December 15, 1925, from Chicago, Illinois, Dr. Anderson answered:  
"My Dear Dr. Ketcham:

Yours of December 9th received. After Mr. Fielder sent us his theological statement, correspondence was carried on with him in Assam so that we might understand the situation. His statement was voluntarily given by us to the Investigation Commission. He was summoned back from Assam to make his own defence and arrived in May last. At the next Board meeting he met a special committee appointed for that purpose and they reported to the Board that his statement was not satisfactory. He requested the Board to be allowed to study at Newton for a year, since he had never received a theological education. As he was a man of ability and great personal force, with a great zeal for the salvation of men, the Board granted his request, hoping that he would see some things differently after a year of study.

As Mr. Fielder's furlough was nearly due and as we called him home, it was merely in accord with our contract with him to pay home salary during his furlough year. Even if he had been dismissed by the Board we should have been under obligation to have paid his salary for a reasonable time. At the end of the year we shall have another statement from him and shall decide whether he is then an evangelical according to our definition of that term.

If you use this letter in any way, you will please use it as a whole.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK L. ANDERSON."

Is it not evident that a year at Newton is intended to teach him tact in expressing doubt, and then return him?

It will, therefore, be seen that all the money expended on investigating false teaching in our colleges at home, and false, unbiblical and anti-Baptist teaching on our foreign fields, has been worse than wasted. It is increasingly evident that the Boards of Education and of Missions are themselves under the domination of modernism, and that the foreign board is particularly favorable to modernism on foreign fields, and cannot be trusted to remove the rankest Unitarian or Rationalist from official station or salary.

It will be remembered by many attendants at this Convention that at Milwaukee, Dr. Franklin, secretary of the foreign board, disputed Dr. W. B. Riley's statement concerning Mr. Randle, of Suifu, and with a flourish, produced documents to prove that Dr. Riley's informants had falsified the facts.

Immediately upon the conclusion of that meeting, the pastor of the church from which Mr. Randle went to Suifu declared that he had heard him make similar statements, and, on that account, had, together with others, refused to participate in his ordination.

Mr. Russel Brougher, fellow student, affirmed that he had heard him make similar statements at school. But now it occurs that Dr. Franklin held in his hand, at the moment he answered Dr. Riley, a letter from Mr. Randle to the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, in which Mr. Randle said the following: "I am also accused of being unwilling to answer in the affirmative the question, 'Do you believe that Christ is God?' This was a prayer-meeting which I was leading and not a class in theology. Nor was it quite the proper time or place to catechize the leader because he had not expressed his faith in the phraseology which certain individuals were accustomed to use. However, to be perfectly fair to all parties concerned, I must say that I do not wish to ascribe to Jesus any higher position than that which He claimed for Himself. He did not claim to be God, but He did say that He was the Son of God. I was not asked as to my faith in the divinity of Jesus, the deity of Jesus, or His place in the Trinity. I was asked to answer categorically whether Jesus was God. Passages like the following make an affirmative answer to that question rather difficult. I Tim. 2:15; Matt. 27:46; Jno. 23:46; Col. 3:1; Luke 9:48; Matt. 3:17; 19:17; Luke 10:22."

In the same letter, he admits that his statements, later confirmed by two other missionaries who were present at the time under appointment of C. I. M., resulted in breaking the Christian prayer-meeting at Suifu into two sections, which forever afterwards refused to unite. Although a committee was appointed to meet with them and try to persuade a renewal of the relations, Mr. Randle himself asserts that "the interview was unsuccessful." So far as can be learned, this refusal on the part of Mr. Randle to affirm the absolute Godship of Christ, and the statements, whatever they were, that divorce from him and our Baptist workers, the China Inland Mission workers, have not even been the subject of concern at foreign mission headquarters, New York.

When these facts are before the Northern Baptist membership, and it remembers that Reuben Sailens and his loyal Baptist brethren were cut off from Convention aid on their refusal to compromise in matters of Bible doctrines, and that missionaries of the fundamentalist temper of Mrs. W. S. Sweet, of China, were also dropped for the same reason, is it not evident that our Foreign Board is itself non-evangelical, and is deliberately determined to put over the programme of Civilization vs. Christianization, of Social Service vs. Individual Salvation, and of Evolution vs. Revelation?

We, therefore, a committee from the confines of the Northern Baptist Convention, appointed by the Baptist Bible Union of North America, to report on this, the result to the denomination, of foreign mission commission, hereby declare it our conviction that every man and woman in the entire Baptist denomination in the North, who still believes in a personal God, the Jehovah of the Old and New Testament, in the Virgin Birth and essential deity of His Son, Jesus Christ, in the blood atonement, in the High Priesthood of Christ, and in the certainty of His second coming, should band ourselves in united endeavor to bring the denomination back to the faith of our fathers by the repudiation of our present secretarial leadership, and the election to office of men who hold

these biblical and historic Baptist positions, as not only sacred, but as absolutely essential to any spiritual or denominational success. God lives! The Truth can, and will yet triumph!

The following communication just received confirms the charge that not a single missionary under fire has been dealt with summarily:

My Dear Mr. Ketcham:

May 24, 1926.

Responding to your message enquiring as to the action taken by the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society in respect to the missionaries whose names were given us by the Investigating Commission for further study, may I say that of the eight, the resignations of three have been accepted, three have been exonerated, and the cases of two are still pending.

The Board anticipates making a fuller report to the Northern Baptist Convention.

Very sincerely yours,

P. H. J. LERRIGO.

### HOW MODERISM DOES ITS WORK.

The following correspondence has come into our hands: A certain church in Pennsylvania being without a pastor, was somewhat divided on the fundamentalist and modernist issue. The majority in the church seemed to favor the calling of a liberal pastor, but it would appear hoped to win the fundamentalists in the church by calling one who was not generally known as a modernist. Certain brethren feared that he was a modernist in disguise; and a letter was sent to Crozer Theological Seminary asking about his standing,—the writer evidently believing that if he were a modernist, Crozer Theological Seminary would know. His letter was not addressed to the President but to the Institution. The two letters follow.

It will be observed that the President of Crozer thinks it is a tribute to the man in question "that some people cannot locate him". The Mr.-Facing-Both-Ways-Policy is evidently deliberate on the part of modernists; and Dr. Evans says that the preacher in question "has won a great many disposed to be fundamental to the modernist group by his tactfulness". If the letter of the President of Crozer Theological Seminary does not stamp the whole modernist movement as being inspired by the father of lies, while at the same time showing that no modernist, whoever he is, or wherever he is found, can be trusted or his word believed, we do not understand the significance of this letter. Further comment on a letter so manifestly written to credential a man who handles the Word of God deceitfully is unnecessary.

For our Canadian readers, it may be remarked that Dr. Evans is President of the institution where Professor I. G. Matthews, formerly of McMaster, disseminates his poison. The proverb is still true: "Birds of a feather flock together".

\_\_\_\_\_, Pa., May 17, 1926.

Crozer Theological Seminary,  
Chester, Pa.

Dear Sirs:

A church near here is very anxious to secure a pastor and they want a pastor who will not fall in line with the fundamentalists in the association. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, at present a pastor in \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, has been recommended. Some say he is a fundamentalist and some say he isn't. In view of the fact that fundamentalism is on a rampage in this section it becomes an important question.

Could you conscientiously recommend Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ to a church that wants a liberal pastor? Please answer as soon as you can.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) C. E. \_\_\_\_\_

## CROZIER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Chester, Pa., May 18, 1926.

President's Office.

Mr. C. E. \_\_\_\_\_,  
c/o National Hotel,  
6th St. & Pennsylvania Ave.,  
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Sir.—

Yours of May 17th, inquiring about Rev. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, of \_\_\_\_\_, received.

I can conscientiously recommend Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ to any church that wants a liberal pastor. He is thoroughly modern in his approach to the Bible, and to questions of Baptist Church polity. I do not know a more enthusiastic and constructive pastor than Mr. \_\_\_\_\_. He has done good work wherever he has been.

I am wondering if it is not a tribute to him that some people cannot locate him,—they cannot determine whether he is a Fundamentalist or a Modernist. When he has occasion to speak he speaks decidedly against the Fundamentalists, but he is not combative. He wins. He has won a great many disposed to be fundamental to the modernist group by his tactfulness, and by the undoubted Christian devotion to the good of his people.

If I were a member of any church thinking of him for pastor, I would unhesitatingly vote for him as my pastor.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) MILTON G. EVANS.

## BIBLE UNION FINANCES.

The Union was able to report to its Annual Meeting a small balance on hand, but it is necessary that we frankly face the question of finances. A very few have been carrying the greater share of the financial burden. We could do ten times the work if we had ten times the money. No one receives any salary in the Baptist Bible Union outside the Secretary and her assistant. We question whether a little money was ever made to do so much as it has been made to do, with the comparatively small income of the Baptist Bible Union. The investigation of the Foreign Mission situation by the Northern Convention, the Confession of Faith adopted by the Southern Convention last year, and the anti-evolution of this year, and the rallying of great numbers of men in the Northern Baptist Convention to the defence of the faith, may all be attributed to the Baptist Bible Union.

The new situation created in the Northern Baptist Convention is a new challenge to Baptist Bible Unionists to still more heroic endeavors. The resolution presented by Dr. Riley, and which received 1,084 votes or a fraction over one-third of the total vote cast in the Convention, was a Baptist Bible Union resolution, approved by the body, and presented with a pledge of the united support of the Baptist Bible Union and the Fundamentals Committee. We appeal to all our readers and friends to take the Bible Union to heart as the greatest missionary and educational organization standing for Evangelical Truth on this continent to-day.

We ask pastors and churches to give the Union a place in the church budget; and we appeal to the Lord's stewards to whom he has entrusted large means, to let the Union share largely in their benefactions. We shall be grateful for the smaller contributions always, and upon these the Union must depend for its support; but if this should catch the eye of men who can give their hundreds and thousands, we desire to make this note a personal appeal for large contributions. The Bible Union believes prevention is better than cure, and exists to purge out the leaven. Send contributions to the Treasurer, 340 Monon Bldg., 440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.



**THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.**

No document of recent times has been produced surpassing in usefulness the Confession of Faith of the Baptist Bible Union. It is small; it may easily be mailed in an ordinary envelope. It is bound up in a document containing full information of the work of the Union. We are able to supply these Confessions of Faith at the following prices:

- .05 a single copy.
- \$ 3.00 per hundred copies.
- \$10.00 per five hundred copies.
- \$15.00 per thousand copies.

But there may be many individual church members or individual pastors who desire to do missionary work in their own churches, and who have not the means to pay for this Confession of Faith. To all such, as many copies as can be used will be sent free of charge on application to Headquarters, as given in the paragraph above.

We desire to double our work at least this year, if possible; and this can be done by the free use of literature. This is an appeal to every Baptist Bible Unionist to help.

**NEW OFFICERS OF THE UNION.**

The nominating committee was appointed by the various state delegations. The Convention resolved itself into states, and each state delegation elected its own representative on the nominating committee. The same procedure was followed in the election of other committees. The Baptist Bible Union is a truly democratic body. The following is a list of the officers elected for the year 1926-1927:—

- President—T. T. Shields, Toronto, Canada.
- Vice-President for Southern Convention—J. Frank Norris, Fort Worth, Texas.
- Vice-President for Northern Convention—W. B. Riley, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Secretary-Treasurer—Edith M. Rebman, Chicago, Ill.

**Executive Committee:—**

- F. W. Farr, Los Angeles, Cal.
- Arthur Kempton, Portland, Ore.
- J. C. Loney, Hamilton, Ont.
- H. O. Meyer, Des Moines, Ia.
- H. S. Morgan, Cambridge, Mass.
- E. A. Roberts, Lexington, Ky.
- Max Schimpf, New York, N.Y.
- E. H. Swem, Washington, D.C.
- H. O. Van Gilder, Columbus, Ohio.
- J. J. Van Gorder, Butler, Pa.
- O. W. Van Osdel, Grand Rapids, Mich.

**EXTRA COPIES OF THIS ISSUE**

Extra copies of this issue of *The Witness* may be obtained at the following rates:

- Single copies ..... 5c per copy
- In quantities of less than 100 mailed to one address ..... 3c per copy
- In quantities of 100 or over mailed to one address ..... 2c per copy

Write: *The Gospel Witness*, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto 2, Canada.

**THE PASTOR AT HOME.**

Dr. Shields, who has been in Washington, D.C., attending the fourth Annual Meeting of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, and the Annual Meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention, will return home in time for the Saturday evening prayer service. He will teach his class Sunday morning and preach morning and evening. The ordinance of baptism will be administered during the evening service.

During Dr. Shields' absence last Sunday the pulpit was occupied by Dr. R. E. Neighbour, of Chicago. Dr. Neighbour preached with his usual power, and a large number responded to the invitation.

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

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

Lesson 13 SECOND QUARTER. June 20, 1926.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

### THE SECOND COMING

**LESSON TEXT:** Twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: **Mark 13:1-37.**

**Luke 21:5-36.**

**GOLDEN TEXT.**—"Heaven and earth shall pass away: but My words shall not pass away" (Mark 13:31).

This is a prophetic chapter. It predicts the Lord's Return and the conditions precedent to His Coming. Like other prophecies it will probably never be fully understood until read in the light of its own fulfilment. Some indication of its purpose as a preparation for the confirmation of faith amid the tribulation it predicts is given in vs. 25: "Behold, I have told you before".

In this connection we must confess, that while we do not despise prophesyings, we have never been able to feel so sure that we have sufficient discernment dogmatically to elaborate a program for the future, as some brethren seem to feel. We have always felt on safer ground in dealing with great principles, than in attempting the particular identification of times, and persons, and places, in the Divine program. Providing we are all ready, instantly to respond to the call of "All Aboard", we believe the Divine Conductor will forgive us for having found it necessary to abide in our attitude of watchful readiness, because we were unable to obtain a prepared time table.

The opening verses of the chapter prove that we have mention here of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the question of the disciples (vs. 3) suggests the possibility of a threefold answer: The occurrence of "these things"—i.e., the destruction of the Temple, and hence of Jerusalem; the sign of Christ's Coming; and the end of the age. The several warnings through the chapter (vss. 4, 5, 23, 24, 26), indicate that the subject of Christ's Second Coming is one concerning which many will be deceived. This should put us on our guard against any and every ingenious and imaginative attempt to find an interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures which will explain every detail and leave nothing to the understanding of the future.

#### 1. CERTAIN GENERAL PRINCIPLES OBTAINING IN THE PERIOD BETWEEN THE FIRST AND THE SECOND ADVENTS—Vss. 4-14.

1. That many will come in Christ's Name, saying, "I am Christ." There have been such deluded people, but the principle finds ever some new expression. By some, certain reform movements, and anything which seems to make for world betterment, are spoken of as a Coming of Christ.

2. Wars and rumors of wars. This cannot be applied to a particular period. At intervals, longer or shorter, ever since the words were spoken, there have been wars. The recent Great War, it is true, fulfilled this prophecy on an unprecedented scale, but even that world-shaking conflict may be out-classed by greater wars. Here may we remark, that while war is to be deplored, and every effort made to avert it, those who know and believe the Bible will not believe in the success, this side of the Lord's Coming, of any effort to make war impossible.

3. Famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, have periodically occurred. But perhaps these too, will come on an unprecedented scale.

4. Persecution (vss. 9, 10) has been the portion of the Church from the beginning. These experiences, however, may also be intensified in the future. A few years ago, in so-called Christian countries, we supposed persecutions were at an end. But the persecuting spirit has returned; and we find the deniers of the faith filled with a hatred as bitter as that which kindled the martyr-fires.

5. False prophets are by no means a modern affliction of the Church: They have always been with us. But other Scriptures teach us to expect that their number will greatly increase (II Tim. 3; II Peter 2:1-3; 3:1-18), before the Lord's Return.

6. Neither is abounding iniquity a new thing. Our newspapers serve up the world's iniquity for breakfast; still we have scriptural warrant for believing that some day iniquity will burst forth as a flood: The mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way (II Thess. 2:7).

7. A particular time note is struck in vs. 14: "This Gospel of the Kingdom", etc. Some there are who make "the Gospel of the Kingdom" to be the message of the Coming King rather than the Gospel of salvation to lost men. We regard such an interpretation as far-fetched, and prefer to believe the verse to mean that the witness of the Gospel shall be given to all nations before Christ comes. This should afford a mighty incentive to missionary endeavor. But we have called attention to the frequent repetition of the fore-going signs that we may be warned to avoid the folly of dogmatically predicting the end; for

such prediction can be based only upon ignorance of the past. Whether we consider rumors of war, or famines, or pestilences, or persecutions,—there is not a period of the Church's history that has been exempt from these things. Therefore, we do well to exercise a little caution in our interpretation of Scripture.

## II. CONDITIONS IMMEDIATELY PRECEDENT TO THE SECOND ADVENT—Vss. 15-26.

This is a difficult passage which seems to refer to Jerusalem's destruction in part (see Luke 21:20); but also to conditions preceding the Lord's Coming.

1. Verses 15 to 20 seem definitely to refer to what is now history. But verses 21, 22, predict an unprecedented tribulation,—and verse 29 gives that tribulation place "immediately" before the Coming of Christ. Furthermore, it is a tribulation to which the elect are subject, and it is shortened for their sakes (vs. 22).

2. The passage also predicts a great apostasy (vs. 24) when false prophets, and even false christs endued with superhuman—doubtless satanic powers, shall appear. Their deception will be so clever that "even the elect" shall be scarcely immune.

3. Against all these deceptions we are warned and protected by being informed of the character of the Lord's advent: As the lightning—suddenly, everywhere visible, apparently breaking in upon a great darkness. This deals a death-blow to the doctrine that Christ has come already: "Behold He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him," etc.

4. The great tribulation (vs. 21-29) shall "immediately" precede, not follow the Coming of Christ. We believe there is much confusion respecting this matter.

5. The Second Advent will be accompanied by unusual disturbances in the physical universe (vs. 29). See also Acts 2:19, 20. This effectively disproves that the Second Coming will be a spiritual coming.

6. The Coming of Christ will mark the assembling of God's elect from the four winds. The rapture passage in I Thess. 4:13-18 should be studied in this connection; also Matt. 13:36-43.

7. The parable of the fig tree is instructive. Luke adds, "and all the trees." Just as the budding trees proclaim the coming of spring, so the occurrences predicted presage the Advent. Some find in the fig tree a symbol of the Jewish nation: withered away because it produced nothing but leaves, but after a long time showing—in the parable before us, signs of revival. In this connection Romans 9th and 11th chapters should be carefully studied. In one thing we may now well rejoice, that the Jews are everywhere showing a peculiar tenderness toward Christ. It really seems that while the Gentile heart is hardening toward Christ, the Jewish heart is softening. Are the Jews who are now turning toward Christ as early risers who are awakened by the first gray streaks of dawn,—the vanguard of a multitude who will greet the world's bright morning when the Sun of Righteousness shall arise? Is this the interpretation of the parable of the fig tree?

## III. CERTAIN HISTORIC ALLUSIONS WHICH PROPHETICALLY DEFINE THE CONDITION OF THE END—Vss. 36-39.

Luke 17:26-30 refers to Lot as well as Noah.

1. The days of Noah and of Lot were days of great wickedness, from which we may learn that no millennium of righteousness will precede the Lord's Coming.

2. Preceding these two historical judgments, testimony and warning were given; in the one case by Noah, and in the other by the angels, and perhaps, in some small measure, by Lot. We have already seen that the witness of the Gospel must precede the Coming of Christ, that the Gospel must be given all nations as a witness.

3. In each case some were saved out of the overthrow just as God's redeemed people will be raised (such as are dead), and with the living caught up to meet the Lord.

4. In both cases evil prevailed "until the flood came"—"the same day that Lot went out of Sodom".

5. The judgment by water and by fire came with startling suddenness, and in a public and open way, so that it was seen by "every eye".

6. Notwithstanding, we are warned that of the day and the hour knoweth no man. The precious and inspiring truth of the Lord's Return has been discredited and multitudes have been robbed of the comfort it is designed to give, by the foolish and presumptuous attempts of men to foretell the time of Christ's Coming. When our Lord tells us that it is not known to the angels, and (Mark 13:32) that even the Son has put that one event beyond His knowledge,—this one exception only emphasizing His perfect knowledge on other matters,—in view of this, let it be emphatically declared that it is nothing short of wicked presumption for any one to attempt to set the day of Christ's Coming.

7. An interesting light is thrown on the universal visibility of the Lord's Coming in vs. 27, 40, 41; also Luke 17:34-36. Some one, we believe John Urquhart, has called attention to the fact that three different hours of the twenty-four hour day are here referred to: the two in one bed—at midnight; the two grinding at the mill, according to Eastern custom, preparing the meal at day-break; and the two in the field at midday. These three classifications include the whole round globe. And when the Lord shall come, it may be midnight in one part of the earth, and midday in the other; and daybreak between; but His Coming will be as the lightning, and every eye shall see Him.

## IV. A SOLEMN EXHORTATION TO WATCH—Vss. 42-51.

Based on the certainty of His Coming, and also on the impossibility of any one's knowing when He will come, we are admonished to be always watching, and always waiting, that we may be ready, and numbered among those who "love His Appearing".

Published quarterly in weekly parts by the UNION GOSPEL PRESS for the BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA—Publishing office, 2375 Thurman St., Cleveland, Ohio.

TERMS: Each set, a quarter, 4 cents; a year, 16 cents.

ADDRESS UNION GOSPEL PRESS, P. O. Drawer 680, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

# What a Dollar and a Quarter will buy

IN

## The Gospel Witness



- 52 Sermons by the Editor.
- 52 Expositions of the Whole Bible Sunday School Lesson Course.
- 52 Editorials on Fundamentalist-Modernist War.
- 52 Reports of a Week's Work in a Throbbing Evangelistic Church; as well as many items of news of the religious world.

### One Volume of Sermons

containing a series of 8 sermons suggestive to pastors, and setting forth the way of life clearly, entitled, "The Adventures of a Modern Young Man"—8 expositions of Luke 15.

----- ORDER BLANK -----

THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto (2), Canada.

Please find enclosed one dollar and twenty-five cents, for which send to address below, The Gospel Witness for one year and a volume of sermons by Dr. T. T. Shields, "The Adventures of a Modern Young Man".

NAME (Rev., Mr., Mrs., Miss) .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

N.B. If cheque is sent 15c. must be added for exchange.