

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY. TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS DURING 1926 \$1.00 FOR ONE YEAR. RENEWALS \$2.00.

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. 14. TORONTO, AUGUST 12th, 1926 Whole No. 224

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

HOW TO GROW IN GRACE.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday morning, December 13, 1925.

(Stenographically Reported.)

"And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge;

"And to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness;

"And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity.

"For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins."—II Peter 1: 5-9.



HOW many of you who are in the gallery this morning are members of the church, put up your hands. That is fine,—stand up a minute and let us see you.

I asked you to stand because I want specially to speak to young Christians this morning, to try to show you that it is our privilege to grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Conversion is a new birth: at conversion we are born again, we become children of God. Those of us who are here this morning who have put our trust in Christ, have been admitted to the household of faith; we are God's children. But just as in any family there will be children of various ages,—some of them very young, and some of them more mature; some of them knowing very little, some of them going to high school and college, yet all members of the same family—so the youngest Christian here this morning, the youngest believer, is just as truly a child of God as the oldest grey-haired saint. But you have not had, those of you who are younger, the experience of those who are older; and I shall try to show you this morning in a very simple way how, being Christians, we ought to go to school to Christ, and be learning from Him every day. We should, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, be developing Christian characters, putting off the old man and putting on the new, and growing more and more like Christ every day. There are many people who believe, who come to a knowledge of the truth in Christ, who are really converted, but who do not go to school; they do not grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I am ambitious, as your Pastor, and I am sure your older brothers and sisters in Christ are also ambitious, that all you young Christians, those who are young in years and those who are young in Christian

experience, should become intelligent Christians, knowing the Word of God; instructed Christians, being instructed in the things of God; and that that which we learn from the Word should be translated into conduct and character, doing the things we know we ought to do, and by the doing of them developing as growing children of God.

I.

Our text tells us what we ought to do if we believe: "Giving all diligence add to your faith"—or perhaps more accurately, supply in your faith. Faith is a manifold grace. By manifold, I mean that it is "many fold": there is a great deal wrapped up in faith. And faith is to be developed: we are to discover that when God gave us, by His Spirit, the gift of faith, enabling us to trust in Him, He gave us in that cardinal and comprehensive grace, all other graces which will grow out of our faith. Here we are told to supply, or furnish, in our faith certain things,—"Add to your faith virtue." Now that word "virtue" had, in the day this translation was made, rather a broader meaning than the restricted meaning which we attach to it to-day. It means force, it means strength: "Add to your faith"—strength. The believing man ought to be a strong man, a boy or a girl who really believes in Christ ought to be developing spiritual strength. The believer, the true believer, is not a weakling; he is made strong by the fact that he trusts in the Lord Jesus Christ. A true faith in Christ ministers even to our intellectual strength. It is a mistake to suppose that all the thinking is done by people who do not believe. Believing God, and being sure of God, having a firm foundation for the feet of our faith, we can survey the heavens, we can dig into the earth, we can unroll the scroll of history, we are afraid of nothing because we know God. Faith ought to make us strong.

You had an example of that in your lesson this morning. The three Hebrew children believed in God with all their hearts; and because they believed in God they believed in Christ, they believed in the Messiah Who was to come. But they believed in God; and because they believed in God they did not believe in Nebuchadnezzar's image, and they stood like a rock when other people went down before the storm. They added to their faith virtue, they supplied in their faith, or God furnished to them through their faith, a spiritual strength that enabled them to stand in the evil day.

And so we too are admonished, and you young Christians are admonished, to add to your faith, that faith which appropriates the saving grace of God in Christ and receives the forgiveness of sin. That faith ought to make you morally and spiritually strong, not like a reed shaken by the wind; but being planted in Christ you should grow like a cedar in Lebanon, a strong man, or a strong woman in Christ.

And we are to add to our virtue knowledge. There is a sense in which faith is based upon knowledge: "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" How is it possible for me to believe in anyone of whom I know nothing? A stranger comes to me and asks me to trust him: I do not know where he came from, I do not know what his record is, I do not know anything about him; and because I have no knowledge of him I cannot trust him. So that faith really is based upon a certain knowledge. We hear of Christ, and we trust Him: There is a case in the ninth chapter of John which will illustrate this principle. Somebody referred to it in the prayer-meeting last night. The blind man who met a Stranger, and the Stranger made clay, and anointed his eyes, and said to him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam." He washed and came seeing. And from what he knew of that Stranger he believed in Him; and when the enemies of the Prophet began to criticize him, and to enquire what he knew of Jesus of Nazareth, he told them all he knew: "A man that is called Jesus made clay, and anointed mine eyes, and said unto me, Go to the pool of Siloam, and wash. I did as He told me: I washed, and I received sight." And they said to him, "Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner." And the blind man said, in effect, "Well, I do not know much about Him. Whether He be a sinner or no; one thing I know, whereas I was blind, now I see. That is the limit of my knowledge: He opened mine eyes."

I will show you in a minute how that man added to his faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge. He believed something of Christ; he had to believe be-

cause He had opened his eyes. And what he believed of Christ, based upon his limited knowledge of Christ made him strong, so that when the people said to his parents, "Is this your son, who ye say was born blind?" and his father and mother, afraid of the authorities, said, "We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind: but by what means he now seeth, we know not; or who hath opened his eyes, we know not: he is of age, ask him: he shall speak for himself"—this young believer, for such he was, when they asked him, "What do you know about Jesus?" added to his faith virtue and strength: he stood up before them and said, "I will tell you what I know about Him; I do not know much, but I will tell you all I know: He made clay and opened mine eyes. I do not know anything about the matters you are discussing,—where He came from, Who He is, what He is, I do not know anything about that, I only know He opened my eyes." And when they said He was a sinner, he said, "That is a wonderful thing to me", and he went on to say, "Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence he is and yet he hath opened mine eyes. . . . Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. I never heard of such a miracle, and I have been enquiring about that all my life long, to know whether a man who was born blind could receive his sight, and I never heard of such a case; I am the first case." And that was all he knew about Jesus. But you see, he added to his faith virtue. How he stood up for Christ! And I say to you boys and girls, if you do not know very much about Christ, you know that He saved you, don't you? Well then, if He saved you, stand up for Him wherever you are—in school, in the playground, wherever you are. "Add to your faith virtue", be strong for Christ.

Now let me show you how he added to, his virtue knowledge. "Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him. And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him." He had a little faith, based on a little knowledge, and out of that faith came a great strength which enabled him to stand against the enemies of Christ, and standing up for Him he was cast out of the synagogue. And Jesus found him in the temple, and imparted to him greater knowledge. Then he learned more perfectly that Jesus was the Son of God; and he fell on his face and worshipped Him.

"We have but faith: we cannot know;
For knowledge is of things we see;
And yet we trust it comes from thee,
A beam in darkness: let it grow.

"Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell;
That mind and soul, according well,
May make one music as before.

"But vaster. We are fools and slight;
We mock thee when we do not fear:
But help thy foolish ones to bear;
Help thy vain worlds to bear thy light."

Knowledge ought to be growing from more to more: we know a little today, we ought to know a little more to-morrow. We read, you remember, that Peter prayed that grace and peace might be multiplied through the knowledge of God, and of Christ Jesus our Lord; and the more we know of Christ, the deeper our peace will be, and the fuller measure of grace we shall experience.

"Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance." Now, temperance means self-restraint, self-control. "Add to your knowledge"—find in your fuller knowledge of Christ this new element of power that will enable you to exercise self-control. I have seen some boys driving motor cars who ought never to be allowed to drive a car. Do you know why? Because they did not know the power they had in their hands; they did not know that when they were dashing along at thirty or forty miles an hour where the traffic was more or less congested, that they were going through

space with a weight of a ton or so at that speed, and that they had under their command a power that was sufficient to destroy human life. They did not keep it under control; they had not sufficient knowledge; if they had known what it was, they would have gone more slowly. And as we come to know God better, and know ourselves better, and know the dangers of life more perfectly, we shall realize the necessity for exercising self-control, self-restraint. One of the most important things for a motorist is to have his brakes in order. I remember when I began to drive a car I had not been out an hour before I said to the man who was with me, "I am not half so anxious to know how to start this thing as I am to know how to stop it: that is the main business. I want to know how to stop it; I can take my time starting it, but the problem is to know how to instantly stop. It is sometimes difficult to get people cranked up and to get them moving, some people have no self-starters, and it is hard to get them to work at all; but it is often still more difficult for most people to put the brakes on and know how and when to stop, to have all their powers of mind and body under control. In other words, we are, by our growing knowledge of Christ, to develop the power of will: I do not mean by sheer will-power of our own; but I mean that the Holy Spirit will enfranchise our wills; He will put our brakes in order, so that we may be able to exercise proper restraint over our tongues, and over our hands, and our feet, and our minds, forbidding them to think of the things they ought not to think of; and over our eyes, forbidding them to look where they ought not to look; and over our ears, forbidding them to hear what they ought not to hear—and over all, bringing all under control by the power of God's Spirit.

"Add to your knowledge temperance"—self-control or self-restraint; and to self-restraint, patience. It is characteristic of youth that it is impatient. We cannot wait, can we? I have a very vivid recollection of the leisurely way, as I thought, in which my father fulfilled his promises. He never broke one; but he used to say to me very often, "Just wait until next week." Next week!—why, that was a hundred years away to me; even to-morrow was a long time. I had not learned to measure time, I wanted everything now. I had no patience at all; but I learned in a few years that it does us good to wait. And do you know how you get patience? "We glory in tribulation also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience." Now, that is a paradox; that is a thing you never would expect. You see a very patient man, or a very patient woman, and you will be inclined to say, "Why, there is a man who never had any irritations; or, there is a woman who never was tried in all her life, she has had no anxiety." If you say that, it is because you do not know very much; you will find that behind that patience there is a long record of trouble, and the man had to learn to be patient in the midst of his trials. "Tribulation worketh patience."

Have you ever seen anyone on a sick-bed, just waiting for the passing of the day? and when nightfall comes and other people go to sleep, that one with the pain-racked body is still awake. He hears the clock strike every hour of the night, and when morning comes the eyes have scarcely been closed. And yet how patient the sufferer is! Many of you have been praying for Dr. Gillon's son. I saw him the other day: Brother Hutchinson and I went into his bedroom. He had his desk there, and a radio, and telephone—there he was in bed, just as cheerful as a June morning. He smiled and said, "So glad to see you." You would think he had not a pain in the world as we talked with him. Dr. Ragland was there, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Roberts, and I. We were all in the same room; and he seemed to be perfectly happy. Then we went to dinner, and when we were about to drive back to Lexington, Dr. Gillon said to Mrs. Gillon, "Do you think you can come with us?" She was silent for a moment, and the tears came to her eyes, and a few of them escaped as she said, "No; Harvey is suffering to-day. I dare not leave him." And I went with a new discernment into that room, and I saw that young man smiling—and I can see him now—biting his lips lest he should let the pain that was racking his body express itself. "Tribulation worketh patience." It is the people who are tried and troubled who are patient. I have observed that the woman with half a dozen children is likely to be far more patient than the woman with only one. Do you not wish you had more tribulation? "Tribulation worketh patience",—add to your self-control, patience.

"And to patience godliness"—reverence, piety, godliness; begin to show a little bit of resemblance to Christ. Add to your faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness. We must accept the divine order. You cannot have godliness first. Gold cannot be refined without fire, nor resurrection without death.

"Add to godliness, brotherly kindness." We ought to learn to be brotherly. Let me put these things together, you will always find them together in the Scriptures. "Godliness" is the perpendicular relationship, relationship to God; "brotherly kindness" is the horizontal relationship, relationship to our fellowmen—"The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these." The man who loves God supremely will begin to show brotherly kindness; for the second commandment grows out of the first.

If some people were here this morning they would say, "That is a strange thing for that preacher to talk about." I get many letters that remind me of that Scripture which describes Saul of Tarsus as "breathing out threatenings and slaughter." I received a letter the other day full of vituperation and abuse from beginning to end, and recommending to me that I try to show the spirit of Christ! Let me pause here to say this: when you as young Christians are admonished to show brotherly kindness, that is, to play a brother's part to those who need a brother's help, it does not mean that you are to be tolerant of evil, does it? If you see a boy stealing something, does that mean that you are to love him so much that you will not rebuke him? If you were to see some boy taking a glass like this, and you knew there was poison in it, and you saw that boy just going to drink that glass of poison, what would you do? If you could not stop him any other way, I should expect you to go and knock the glass out of his hand, smashing it to pieces. But then he might say, "That was not a very brotherly thing to do, you were very impolite to do that"! But you would reply, "If you knew what was in that glass you would think I was brotherly." We are to show brotherly kindness—and that is why I want to be brotherly; I should like to be a big brother, or an older brother, to all the students at McMaster; and I should like to smash to pieces that glass of poison that they are being offered just now, that is why I fight as I do: it is not because I do not love people, but because I do. Add to all these other virtues, brotherly kindness, a real love for men; and when you have a real love for men in your heart you will hate everything that would hurt them, and will do everything you possibly can to save a brother from being injured.

Add to all this, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness that all-enveloping grace, that all-embracing grace, charity, or love. Love everybody; never let a day pass, or an hour pass, that you cannot pray, "Forgive me my trespasses as I forgive them that trespass against me." Let us have love in our hearts for everyone; and just because we love him, let us rebuke the sinner, and do everything in our power to save him from his sins.

There is a growing character: faith the foundation, the cardinal virtue; and growing out of that, strength; and added to that a larger knowledge; and out of that fuller knowledge, self-control; and because of that self-control, patience; and being patient, at last we begin to assume some likeness to God, godliness; and being a little bit like Him, and living in contact with Him, brotherly kindness—life itself becomes an opportunity to love people and to love God, or rather, to love God and then our neighbour.

II.

Just a word or two about WHAT HAPPENS IF WE MISS THIS: "He that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins." Some people lack them: some people have no virtue, no strength; they do not grow in knowledge; they do not control themselves, they have no patience, they have no true brotherliness either; and the man or woman who is lacking these things is blind.

But let me take the other first: "If these things be in you—the positive first—"If these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall

neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." I ask you, Are there not multitudes of people who have a knowledge of Christ, who have faith in Him, but who are idle?—they are not doing anything for Him, they are unfruitful, they are not bringing any souls to Christ. You can find hundreds of people, thousands of people, in this city who never have led a soul to Christ.

During the war a certain minister came to me—a man, I suppose of about fifty years of age, he must have been twenty-five years in the ministry—he said to me, "A wonderful thing happened to me last week: one of the soldiers came to me and asked me how to be saved. I never had anyone ask me that question in my life before." I was as kind and diplomatic as I could be with him, but I did feel like asking him, What in the world have you been doing as a minister, spending all these years, and yet never to have moved anyone to ask you what to do to be saved! I could find dozens of people in this congregation who are not ministers to whom people are coming all the time saying, "What shall I do to be saved?" Why? Because some of these things are in them, and they make them that they are neither idle nor unfruitful. If you are a growing Christian, people will want to find out the secret of your growth; if the grace of God is being manifested in your life, they will want to find out who your Saviour is; and they will come to you, and it will "make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ."

But take the opposites: "He that lacketh these things is blind"—without spiritual sight. I want you to notice this very carefully—"he that lacketh these things is blind." Did you ever see a blind Christian, spiritually blind, who cannot see very much, having no spiritual perception? Do you know why some people did not instantly detect the poison that was in Professor Marshall's first address—do you know why? Because they were blind, that is all. If they had known their Bibles, if they had known something of the teaching of God's Word they would instantly have detected the false note, the betrayal of the great fundamentals of the faith. It was because they were blind they did not see it. Why? Because we have been robbed of a teaching ministry; because people have not been drilled, because they have not been given line upon line, precept upon precept, and thus thoroughly taught in the things of God. We have had pretty essays instead of an expository ministry; many ministers have not opened to their people the great treasures of the Word of God. We have sent out a generation of ministers who have been playing at the business of preaching; and we have developed a great host of people unable to distinguish between the true and the false. Why? Because they are blind, that is why, "and cannot see afar off."

Talk to a man without spiritual perception, one who does not live for the future, about the precious truth of the coming of the Lord; quote him a verse like this, "Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him", and he does not know what you are talking about. But you cannot quote that scripture to a growing Christian without thrilling his soul through and through. "My Lord coming!"—and he almost stops and trains his eyes upon the clouds, as he says, "Even so, come Lord Jesus. I want Thee to come." But the blind Christian does not see Christ coming, he cannot see afar off at all, he has no vision of the future glory. Talk to him about the judgment-seat of Christ, and of the great rewards that are to be apportioned to those who have been faithful at the coming of the Lord, and he says, "I am not interested in that; I believe the programme of the church ought to be a programme of social service." "Well", I say, "why are you so enamoured of social service, my brother?" "I can see that, you know, I can see that. I can see a man getting a new coat, I can see a man getting a square meal; but when you talk about a judgment-seat of Christ, about standing before Him and being rewarded, that is very far away." Yes, it is so far away he cannot see it at all, and the reason he cannot see it is because he is not growing up in Christ; He is blind; he cannot see afar off; and he misplaces the emphasis of the gospel, misinterprets it, because he has lost his perspective view of the King in His glory, and the land which is very far off. Not only so, but he has lost his prospective view, and his retrospective view as well: he has forgotten that "he was purged from his old sins".

I remember that verse came to me as a revelation one day. Thinking of certain men I knew, I said to myself, "I have always believed they were Christians; but when I talk to them about the blood of Christ, for some reason I do not get any response; when I talk to them about the joy of sins forgiven, about the happy day when Jesus washed my sins away, they do not know what I am talking about." Yet, I suppose, they did have a real experience once. What is the explanation? They have stopped growing; they cannot look into the future; and they have forgotten the past. The bloom of that early experience of the love of God has left them; they have no joy in the Lord, in the knowledge of His salvation; and they are just like blind men." You have seen a blind man going along with a stick, just feeling his way. How many of the Lord's own children are like that, living a narrow circumscribed life, living for the things they can handle, and touch, and taste!—they cannot see afar off, and they cannot see back to the beginning.

"If these things be in you, and abound" you will never lose the view of the cross of Christ, you will never forget how much you owe Him for washing away all your sins; and the view of the future will ever be present with you as though it were now in the present; and the things of this present time—let me quote it to you, "But though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen"—these things the blind man touches round about us—"are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal"—and it is for that we live if we are in Christ.

May God help us to grow up into Him; may grace and peace be multiplied to you through the knowledge of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1. T. T. SHIELDS, D.D., Editor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. No. 3

Lesson 10

THIRD QUARTER

September 5, 1926

THE BREAD OF LIFE.

LESSON TEXT: John, chapter 6.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: Matt. 14:13-33;
Mark 6:30-52;
Luke 9:10-17.

GOLDEN TEXT.—"All that the Father giveth Me shall come to Me; and him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out."—John 6:37.

I. THE MIRACLE OF THE LOAVES.

1. The resourcefulness of Christ is here suggested. He always knew what He would do (vs. 6). He is equal to every possible emergency in life. He may ask us many questions; He may providentially lead us into difficult situations, but this Shepherd always knows a path by which He can lead His sheep out into a large place. Incidentally this suggests a superhuman knowledge, a knowledge that is beyond that which is natural. He had a view of the resources of Deity which were hidden from impotent men; so that He was never at a loss to meet the exigencies of the hour. 2. Two views of the problem of feeding the multitude are here presented in answer to Christ's question. Philip presents the mathematical view, the purely natural view. Philip would count the multitude, and estimate the capacity of their appetites and the cost of supplying them with bread. Philip is a type. Many of the disciples of Christ never get beyond the mathematical view of life. They know nothing beyond that which can be handled or counted or measured or weighed; they are great at arithmetic; they usually find a place upon the church finance committee, and act as a brake upon the Gospel chariot, not to stop it, but to prevent its ever getting started. Hot-boxes and endless irritations in church life result from Accountant Philip's industrious and painstaking investigations. 3. Andrew had another view of the problem. Instinctively he felt that Christ could make use of little; he looked about to find the little, and so found a lad with five loaves and two fishes. It may be he was a man of little faith, for he said,

"What are they among so many"? but he did at least offer a useful suggestion. And that is all God wants for a miracle at any time. The dedication of the little we have, the putting of our all into His hands. A lad with five loaves and two fishes surrendered to Christ is incalculably more useful to a church than a man with five million dollars in the bank, and a Philip as his associate on the finance committee. 4. How the little became sufficient and left a surplus is told in vs. 10-14. The miracle cannot be explained: no one can tell how the boy's basket of bread in the hands of Jesus grew to the proportions of wagonfuls. No miracle can be explained: if it could it would not be a miracle. A miracle may be that which is wrought for our experience and enjoyment in a realm beyond our understanding.

II. CHRIST'S POWER OVER THE ELEMENTS—Vss. 16-21.

He showed Himself superior to wind and wave, even as He had proved in the miracle of the loaves that the natural powers which multiply the seed sown were subject to His authority. Incidentally this Scripture is opposed to the popular evolutionary theory that God is imprisoned in the cosmic order, and is therefore impotent to answer prayer. Here Christ as a revelation of God shows Himself even in His physical body to be superior to the natural order and sovereign over it.

III. THE EFFECT OF THE MIRACLE OF THE LOAVES UPON THE PEOPLE—Vss. 15, 22-26.

"Jesus perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him a king." The multitudes crossed the sea to follow Him. Thus the religion which ministers to the body and to all material and temporal interests will be popular with natural men. And a religion which grows out of a natural conception of life will always emphasize the material and the temporal: hence the popularity of what is called "social service." When ministers of Christ lose their contact with Him, and fall in spiritual power, it is common for them to turn from the pulpit and seek some official position in some kind of social organization. They are great at boy scouts, and girl guides, and athletics, and banquets, and every other thing that is pleasing to the carnal palate. Judas criticizes the lavish expenditure of ointment devoted wholly to Christ, but offers no objection to the program of Martha in providing a dinner in which he is to share.

IV. CHRIST'S REFUSAL TO SUBORDINATE THE MATERIAL TO THE SPIRITUAL.

1. He laid the emphasis upon eternity rather than time: "Labour not for the meat which perisheth", (vs. 27). This is a much needed lesson to-day. We should bid men lay up treasures in Heaven rather than upon earth, and prepare for the larger life beyond, and for this life only as a preparation for the other. 2. The people asked a sign of Christ as a condition of faith (vss. 28-31). When they had inquired what they should do that they might work the works of God, Jesus answered, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." It was then they asked a sign in order that they might believe. Thus they showed themselves to be still on the natural plane, or at least to be in that carnal state which belongs to babes. 3. Christ insisted that the manna of the wilderness was typical of spiritual bread; and that that manna came from Heaven as the gift of God, a type and promise of His own coming as the true Bread of Life. Thus He ever kept His own work and Person to the fore, knowing that what men needed was Christ Himself. 4. He recognized His message to be spiritual, and to require a spiritual understanding (vss. 37-46). This is always true of spiritual preaching and teaching: the Word of God can be understood only as men are taught of God. 5. In that confidence and dependence He proclaimed His spiritual message and mission without alteration or compromise: though He saw His congregations diminishing and knew that many would reject His message, He refused to change it, and said, "All that the Father giveth Me shall come to Me." A spiritual Gospel will empty a Sunday School class or empty a church unless the teaching and the preaching of it is accompanied by spiritual power. 6. Many of His disciples forsook Him (vss. 60-66). "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master". We cannot hold everybody, but we must not change our message if some forsake us. 7. They only remained with Him who desired eternal life. (vss. 67-71).

Editorial.

WASHINGTON REACTIONS.

On several occasions since the publication of our report of the Northern Baptist Convention *The Canadian Baptist* explicitly or implicitly has suggested that our view of the Brougher Resolution was extreme. In several recent issues we have published reports of action taken by several Baptist bodies such as *The Chicago Association, The Oregon State Convention, The Southern California Convention*, showing that the Brougher Resolution only aggravated a situation it was designed to settle. We publish elsewhere in this issue a report of a debate between Dr. J. Marvin Dean, Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Pasadena, California, and Dr. J. Whitcomb Brougher, President of the Northern Baptist Convention. Dr. Dean is very influential among Northern Baptist Fundamentalists and was the founder of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, at Chicago, Ill. From Dr. Dean's discussion of the question, and in view of the action of the several Baptist bodies before referred to, it would appear that the discussion of Washington is likely to be resumed with still greater vigour at Chicago next year. There are many more than seven thousand or seventy thousand in the Northern Baptist Convention who have not bowed, and will not bow, the knee to the Baal of Mammonised Modernism as represented by the Rockefeller-Fosdick combination. We print below a letter received from Dr. Dean:

Dr. T. T. Shields,
Toronto, Canada.

My Dear Dr. Shields:

A friend handed me a copy of *The Gospel Witness* containing a report of the Northern Baptist Convention. I was greatly interested in the write-up and wish to thank you for it. Dr. Brougher made a pathetic mistake—a mistake that, in essence was a complete surrender to the Park Avenue Church. I was unable to attend the Convention but had wired Curtis Lee Laws that I was opposed to the Brougher Resolution.

I wish to thank you for your own keen analysis of the situation, and say to you that in the main I most heartily agree with you. How dare we set aside a command of the Lord Jesus Christ in a Baptist assembly, or condone the setting aside of that command by any of our constituency?

Yours with sincere appreciation,

JOHN M. DEAN.

THE CANADIAN BAPTIST HITS McMASTER.

The following paragraph appeared in an article on Evangelism in *The Canadian Baptist* of July 22, 1926:

"Fightings among Christian brethren are a disgrace. We have always believed that and the Convention situation only increases our conviction. That men of wonderful intellectual and spiritual capacity should devote their days to persistent and vindictive tirades against their brethren is almost unthinkable; it should not be necessary to spend our Christian strength in self-defence."

We are glad to find something in *The Canadian Baptist* to which we can breathe a fervent "amen". With the above paragraph we are in hearty agreement. The description of those who "devote their days to persistent and vindictive tirades against their brethren" identifies them at once; for no one would suppose that in this Convention "men of wonderful intellectual and spiritual capacity" could be found outside of McMaster or its supporters. Modesty forbids our interpreting the paragraph from our contemporary in any other way. We are truly sorry that these intellectual giants of McMaster should devote their strength in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec to an endeavour to impose upon the members and churches of the Convention a brand of theology, which is obnoxious to all true Baptists. We hope these brethren will heed *The Canadian Baptist's* gentle admonition.

A LIVELY MEETING AT MARKHAM.

On Tuesday evening, August 10th, we had a very interesting meeting with the Second Markham Church, of which Student W. S. Whitcombe, B.A., is the Pastor. The Editor of this paper was announced as the special speaker, and the subject, "The McMaster Controversy". There were good delegations from nearby churches, and these, with the members of the Second Markham Church, nearly filled the building. Rev. W. W. Fleischer, of Stouffville, took the chair. Pastor W. S. Whitcombe was the first speaker, and spoke of his personal knowledge of Professor L. H. Marshall's views. He had been speaking only a few minutes when a man rose in the congregation and inquired if he might be permitted to ask a few questions. This man was an Arts graduate of McMaster, and we believe is a teacher in Toronto. When permission to ask a question was given by the chair, this gentleman began by saying that before going to Toronto he had been a member of the Second Markham Church, and that he was deeply grieved that Mr. Whitcombe should have disgraced the pulpit of this church by inviting "a man of the character of T. T. Shields" to speak in it. We did not know who he was, or whence he came, but by this introductory word immediately identified him as a product of McMaster. One thing some McMaster men have learned to perfection, that is how to substitute vituperative abuse for the discussion of an issue. This particular representative of McMaster was in very bad humour, and found it impossible to control his temper. One might have supposed that he had been trained in Billingsgate rather than in a "Christian" University. Mr. Whitcombe crushingly answered his interrogator by saying that Professor Marshall's attitude toward the Scriptures inevitably impugned the authority of Christ.

Following Mr. Whitcombe the Chairman spoke briefly, and was followed by the Editor of this paper. In the course of our address we dealt with the Driver view of the Old Testament, and turned to this oracular McMasterite to ask him if he were familiar with Canon Driver's books; to which he replied that he had read them. We asked him then if he had ever read Dr. Driver's book on Old Testament Introduction, to which he replied, "I think so". We pressed the question upon him saying, "Is that all you can say; are you not sure; do you only think so?" He was honest enough not to insist that he had read it, but to insist only that he thought he had read it. A farmer deacon at the back of the church who evidently knows as much theology as many professors, rose and said, "Any man who has carefully studied Driver's Old Testament Introduction would be sure to remember it. The man who only thinks he has read it has evidently not read it at all." When shall we be delivered from these upstarts who, because they have a degree from McMaster, imagine they know all that may be known? Somewhere we have read that Professor Marshall said that the present controversy was a battle between ignorance and education. On this point we are glad to find ourselves in perfect agreement with Professor Marshall. Such appalling ignorance of biblical, not to say theological, matters on the part of supposedly educated men as is evidenced in our Convention, mostly among McMaster men, is amazing. The McMaster questioner at Markham was true to type. He seemed to be utterly unconscious of spiritual verities. It is not an unkind judgment to say that his expressions were of the carnal mind, and of a very ignorant carnal mind at that.

The writer endeavoured to show by his address that Dean Farmer was too well informed in biblical matters not to know that the Driver attitude toward the Bible represented an attitude that was poles removed from the attitude of Canadian Baptists; and that when he recommended Professor Marshall for appointment to a chair in McMaster he deliberately threw down the gauntlet to the conscience of the Convention, knowing that he was introducing to the Convention a man who held theological views that were diametrically opposed, for the most part, to the position taken by the Ontario and Quebec Convention.

As we were concluding our address the McMaster interrupter, to whom we have referred, again rose to express his dissent from what we had said, at the same time declaring his great gratification that the people of Second Markham had been given an opportunity to hear Dr. Shields for themselves; for now they would know that he was "a wrecker", and nothing but a wrecker; and he declared that he was perfectly sure that our address had made converts for

his position, and that the whole audience were satisfied with Professor Marshall's statement of belief, which we had read, and upon which we had commented. We thereupon asked those who had been converted to this gentleman's belief by our address to rise; to which there was no response. We asked all those who were satisfied with Professor Marshall's statement to indicate it; but no one responded, except the gentleman who was so sure we had converted the whole audience to his view. We thereupon asked those who were in disagreement with the views expressed by this gentleman in his defence of McMaster to stand, and so far as we could see the entire congregation responded, with the exception of this gentleman and his brothers. After this a resolution of thanks was moved by Deacon Seneca Baker. Mr. Baker said that he did not like controversy, and had endeavoured as far as possible to be neutral, but that these matters under discussion were matters of great moment. He said that it was much more important than any mere discussion of personalities, and while he disagreed with Professor Marshall, he had nothing against him as a man, and only the kindest feelings for him. He said, however, that the speaker of the evening had been maligned all through that countryside, and he was glad that the people had had an opportunity to hear him for themselves. The resolution was seconded by Deacon Hisey, who made a short speech in somewhat the same vein. When the Chairman put the resolution to the meeting the vote was taken by standing, and again the gentleman, who was sure that the whole meeting was on his side, found himself and his brother alone in their opposition. Whereupon he himself rose and said that while he did not agree with what the speaker had said, he had no objection to a vote of thanks.

Altogether we believe the Markham meeting was a most profitable one. Before the meeting closed we announced that we intended to hold many such meetings throughout the Province, and some in the Province of Quebec, and we invited our McMaster questioner on every possible occasion to attend the meeting and behave himself in exactly the same way as he had done on this occasion, as it would greatly aid our cause.

"LET US HAVE PEACE."

(The following article is taken from THE PRESBYTERIAN, published in Philadelphia, of July 1, 1926. This article is good for Baptists as well as Presbyterians.)

There has been a very persistent cry among professedly Christian men, saying, "Stop this conflict in religion and let us have peace." This call for peace is not confined to the sphere of religion; it is a spirit which pervades all relations in modern life. There is a tendency to forget that struggle is a pervading element of the earthly creation, and it cannot be avoided, and the attempt to avoid it is perilous.

A farmer youth said to his father: "The Japanese and potato beetles are very active, and I think we should do something to overcome them." The father replied: "Oh! never mind them; we will fertilize more and cultivate more, and thus overcome them." But when the end of the season came and the time for fruit had arrived, the Japanese beetle had destroyed all foliage, and the fruit had perished. The potato beetle had destroyed the vines, and the hills contained only small sprouts, and in consequence the family faced the winter with scant supply, if not the peril of starvation.

A wife says to her husband: "Dear, I think there is a small gas leak somewhere; I think I smell it." He replied: "You are always scenting trouble; never mind. If there was anything of that kind I think I would detect it. Besides, I'm tired and I want to be quiet and rest." They go to rest and sleep. In the night the force increased the leak. Visit the house in the morning and the father, mother and children are dead.

There is a struggle in civil life. Certain parties are attacking the Constitution and the law of enforcement concerning prohibition. Some loyal citizens propose resistance. The peace-lovers say, "Never mind, let them alone; they cannot change the Constitution. That must stand." While the loyal people are thus lulled to sleep and inactivity which is called peace, the enemies of

prohibition are active, intensely active. The composition and character of the State Legislature and Congress is changed, and with this the Constitution is changed, and the statutes are reversed, and the country is flooded with intemperance, with all the curse that follows.

The same spirit of peace at any cost has entered the Church. Rationalism has attacked the divine Revelation and its precious salvation for body and soul for time and eternity, for eternal life and glory. The Bible enjoins us to fight a good fight of faith, and "take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day; and having done all, to stand."

Within the Church to-day there are these forces which are antagonistic by their very nature, and they cannot intermingle without conflict, as they are mutually destructive. Absolute separation is the only safeguard. These forces are: (1) Rationalism, which makes the individual reason and experience the rule of life, so that each man is to believe and do as he pleases. He is a law unto himself. This means anarchy and breakdown in all morals and truths. (2) Romanism, which ties all life up to the Pope and the hierarchy, and the dire result of this is the loss of liberty and the prevalence of indulgence is written large in the records of history. (3) Evangelicism which recognizes no other authority in faith and practice but the Word of God. Man's life in time and his hope for eternity is revealed only by the infallible, inerrant Word of God. These three can never attempt union save at great expense, hurt and breakdown. So long as they remain organically separate and civilly distinct and free, external quietness may be maintained. But the present attempt to mingle rationalism and evangelicism in the same organization means a struggle and separation, or degeneration and death. The report of the Special Commission of Fifteen absolutely ignored the intrusion of rationalism save to favor those who sought to foster it in the Evangelical Church. One of the great and bitter disappointments connected with this report was the signatures of some men who have hitherto been regarded as faithful to God's Word, but now must be ranked with those who blind testimony with a false peace which ignores the separation between faith and unbelief.

In the natural world, struggle is seen everywhere. Nothing can be secured without it. In the civic sphere we have not a single blessing to-day which was not obtained through great struggle. In the realm of faith, struggle and defence against error and sin has ever been enjoined in the Word of God, and peace is possible only by fellowship with God in truth and righteousness. When Jesus confronted the devils, they asked Him why He came to torment them before the time. Nevertheless, he commanded them to come out of the men and enter no more into them. This conflict between God and sin, and Satan, between death and life, between error and truth, and wrong, is a part of the present dispensation, and whatever attempts to substitute this antagonism by a false peace is degenerating and deadly. As vigilance is the price of liberty, so, too, honest, earnest struggle is the price of prosperity in right and truth. A false peace is deadly to everything. It is folly to cry peace, peace, when there is no peace.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

One Dollar per year to all new subscribers during 1926. (Regular subscription, \$2.00 per year). This paper contains weekly a sermon by the Editor, an exposition of the Whole Bible Sunday School Course, and Editorial matter dealing especially with the battle between Fundamentalism and Modernism. (\$1.50 in Toronto).

SPECIAL OFFER.

A Volume of Sermons by Dr. Shields entitled "The Adventures of a Modern Young Man," being a series of eight sermons on Luke 15, The Prodigal and his Brother, will be sent with *The Gospel Witness* for one year for One Dollar and a Half.

Send your subscription to:

THE GOSPEL WITNESS - 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto 2, Canada:

BROUGHER AND DEAN DEBATE.

At 10.30 o'clock on Tuesday, July 13th, Burdette Hall, in the Temple Baptist Church of Los Angeles, was filled with an audience gathered to listen to a debate between Dr. James Whitcomb Brougher and Dr. John Marvin Dean, on the merits of the so-called Brougher Resolution adopted at the Washington Convention. The debate was held under the auspices of the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Los Angeles and vicinity. The president of the Conference, Dr. H. J. Vosburgh, presided with great fairness and graciousness. He declared that he felt the Brougher Resolution was of such importance that it should be thoroughly discussed.

Although no longer a member of the Los Angeles Baptist Ministers' Conference, Dr. Brougher was invited to be present to explain his position.

The debate opened with a half hour address by Dr. John Marvin Dean attacking the Brougher Resolution. Dr. Dean's address will be printed verbatim in the *Watchman-Examiner*.

Dr. Brougher then followed with a half hour address in which he explained his position in regard to the resolution.

The meeting was then thrown open for discussion, which was however limited to members of the Los Angeles Ministers' Conference, although there were several hundred invited guests present. Among those who took part in the dispute were Drs. W. F. Harper, J. B. Fox, Ira Beckwith, J. A. Francis and B. F. Fellman.

The debate closed by a five-minute rebuttal by Dr. Brougher, followed by an address of equal length by Dr. Dean, who closed the discussion and then moved the following resolution which was carried without a dissenting voice:

"Resolved, That we, the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Los Angeles, in Burdette Hall, July 13, 1926, do most heartily approve of the policy of the Southern California Baptist Convention and the Los Angeles Baptist City Mission Society in organizing regular Baptist churches only—churches composed solely of baptized (immersed) believers; and, that we further endorse the present policy of the Association of Southern California of receiving only such churches into our Baptist fellowship."

The address of Dr. Brougher was extemporaneous and therefore cannot be printed verbatim in this paper, but Dr. Brougher expressed his intention of sending in his statement explaining his position in regard to the so-called Brougher Resolution.

Dr. Dean's Speech in the Dean-Brougher Debate on the So-called "Brougher Resolution," Held in Burdette Hall, Los Angeles, July 13th, 1926.

Brethren, we are here to-day to discuss the so-called Brougher Resolution, passed at the last session of the Northern Baptist Convention. It is hardly just to Dr. Brougher to call it the Brougher Resolution. It is a compromise resolution, recommended by a group of some seventy gentlemen. Had Dr. Brougher felt free to write the resolution and in it express his own personal position, he would have written one perfectly acceptable to me. Our definition of a New Testament church is identical. We both believe that baptism is a pre-requisite to church membership. But Dr. Brougher felt it necessary to advocate the compromise resolution which he calls "the resolution of co-operation." Therefore, for convenience, in this discussion we call it the Brougher Resolution.

Before entering the discussion I remind you that this is a discussion between two personal friends, and it does not touch the question of motive. I am delighted to see Dr. Brougher back in Burdette Hall and regret that he ever left Los Angeles.

May I take occasion, too, before this important body of ministers and laymen, to mention the remarkable book entitled "The Leaven of the Sadduces," by Ernest Gordon? All thoughtful Baptist leaders should read, ponder and circulate this book. It is not the Free Baptists who are making necessary compromise resolutions in the Northern Baptist Convention. It is Unitarianism, that Unitarianism which is the lineal descendant of the 1,282 Unitarians who, ninety years ago, took advantage of the low requirements for voting membership in New England Congregationalism, drove out nearly 4,000 evangelical Congregationalists and pre-empted their church property; that Unitarianism

which Ernest Gordon, a New Englander of New Englanders, discusses with such deadly effect in his terrible expose.

The Brougher Resolution at the Washington Convention was passed in the following form:

"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."

I have no time to discuss the history of this resolution. I wish I had. The question before us, however, is not its history, but the resolution itself. Is it good or bad? Weak or strong? Uniting or divisive? Wise or unwise? Scriptural or unscriptural? Should the sober "second thought" of Baptists reverse or radically modify this resolution?

I am emphatically opposed to the Brougher Resolution for the following reasons:

1. The Brougher Resolution receives into full membership in the Northern Baptist Convention churches which make baptism optional rather than obligatory. So long as these churches recognize immersion as the only Scriptural baptism, they may remit baptism entirely to those who may object to it. Under this resolution you can be a full voting member of a Baptist church without being baptized at all. Dr. Brougher, in a courteous letter to me, says: "I think it will be a long time before the Northern Baptist Convention will say to the 500 Baptist churches who now have 'associate members' that they cannot co-operate with the Northern Baptist Convention if they continue to have such members, even if they are recognized as Baptist churches by the local Baptist Association." But that is exactly the position that the Southern California Baptist Convention does take. Dr. Harper valiantly says in a letter to me:

"The Southern California Baptist Convention has strenuously opposed at all times the practice of Associate Membership."

But the Brougher Resolution does not even touch the question of associate membership. It has absolutely nothing to do with it. For a Baptist church to have associate members is pathetic business. I am opposed to it. But the Brougher Resolution endorses not merely associate membership without baptism but full membership in Baptist churches without baptism. Men are to be permitted to evade an ordinance of Jesus Christ and yet to have a full vote and voice in the affairs of churches in the Northern Baptist Convention constituency.

2. The Brougher Resolution interferes unduly with the local church and with Baptist Associations. It coolly goes into the Baptist Associations and says, "You may recognize as a full Baptist church in good standing a church which makes baptismal optional, but the Northern Baptist Convention will not accept your decision without the proviso that only immersed members of that fully recognized church shall be sent as delegates to the Convention."

The Brougher Resolution goes into the local church and after so defining a constituent local church that it may make baptism optional, it then dares to classify the membership of the local church and demand that out of one class only, the immersed members, delegates shall be selected to the Northern Baptist Convention. What has the independency of the local Baptist church come to when it submits to this kind of interference? If a man is a member of a Baptist church in full standing in a local church, and that church is recognized as a real Baptist church by the Northern Baptist Convention, that man has a right, immersed or unimmersed, to be sent as a delegate to the Northern Baptist Convention. The Brougher Resolution admits the church into fellowship with the Convention and then holds it up and makes a selection from its members. Such a resolution could not stand a moment in law, for observe:

1. The by-laws say that "any Baptist church may send delegates."

2. The Brougher Resolution defines a Baptist church as one that may have full members without baptism.

3. It then attempts to hold up delegates from churches that it has already thus recognized.

There is only one question that the Northern Baptist Convention has the right to ask of its delegated body, and that is this:

"Are you duly accredited delegates of a Baptist church in the United

States which has contributed during the past year to any one of the causes endorsed by the Northern Baptist Convention?"

The only way to keep a delegate out of the Northern Baptist Convention is by the way in which you define a Baptist church. It is not the business of the Northern Baptist Convention to select or help select delegates. That is the business of the local church alone.

4. The Brougher Resolution was unduly influenced by the majority opinion of the Law Committee of the Northern Baptist Convention. There is no time to discuss that report fully. I wish there were. That opinion holds in substance that the Northern Baptist Convention cannot define its own constituency. I personally cannot respect such an opinion. It would, I think, be hard to find a first class legal mind that would hold anything other than this, that if the Northern Baptist Convention so defined its constituency as to exclude any churches from participation which had already been participating in the Convention, those churches would have the right to recover any financial damage or loss that they had sustained, but would not have the legal right to demand that the by-laws of the Convention be set aside on their behalf. That is, the courts will sustain the Northern Baptist Convention in defining its own constituency, for it is a purely ecclesiastical matter, and will not reverse or set aside its by-laws under any circumstances, but will grant to an aggrieved minority full property justice. The majority of the Law Committee failed to bring out this fact and they also make the pathetic mistake of exalting the original "Declaration" of the Northern Baptist Convention adopted in 1907, as equivalent to a constitution. They emphasize the phrase in that Declaration which speaks of the "purely advisory nature of all denominational organizations." Who for a moment believes that the American Baptist Home Mission Society or the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society or the Board of Education of the Northern Baptist Convention are "purely advisory"? They have executive powers and they vigorously use them, and the mould of the churches, particularly their ecclesiology, both at home and abroad, has been largely determined by the influence of these organizations. Any plain Baptist minister knows what the simple Declaration of the Northern Baptist Convention was intended to say and to do. It takes a profound lawyer to get all tangled up in it until he calls it a fixed constitution and one that forbids a Baptist Convention to define its own constituency!

Dr. Brougher in a letter to me says, "To have passed the Seattle amendment over the head of the committee (by this he means the majority opinion of the Law Committee, there being one wise and significant dissenting voice) would have involved us in legal action that would have interrupted and interfered with our denominational progress for several years to come."

I am not so much afraid of a legal action as Dr. Brougher. Baptists have not been afraid of the state in older days; they have had many a legal battle. Why should we be afraid of having a question legally determined by impartial courts? No one knows now whether the majority opinion was sound or unsound legally. My own conviction is that the courts would have upheld Mr. Barker in his minority report. Legal opinion is all right. We should seek it. But it can never be taken by a real Baptist when it leads against a New Testament position. It is legal folly to assert that the Northern Baptist Convention cannot define or determine its own constituency. And it is Baptist folly to assert that it cannot define that constituency in accordance with the Word of God and the will of Christ! I regret that the chairman of the Law Committee of the Northern Baptist Convention, who was largely responsible for the majority report of the Law Committee was made chairman of the special committee of seven at the Chicago Conference called by Dr. Brougher. He had confused the Convention once—why give him another opportunity? Of this special committee of seven which drew up the Brougher Resolution in Chicago in its essential form, with of course assistance from Dr. Brougher, only three of the seven members were known as "conservative" Baptists, according to Dr. Virgin, who was one of the minority of conservative Baptists on the committee. Baptists should read the statement issued by Dr. Virgin, and printed in the *Religious Herald*.

To sum up this legal aspect of the question, I again say that the courts will decide that the Northern Baptist Convention can define its own constituency.

This is a right that every local church, Baptist Association and State Convention now exerts. But whether the courts give us our rights or not, better one Omniscient Christ than six fallible lawyers! His slightest wish weighs more with us than all the legal casuistry under the dome of the Congressional Library! Let us boldly write in to the by-laws of the Northern Baptist Convention the ecclesiology of the New Testament church, and say to Baptist weaklings and near-Baptists and compromising Baptist leaders, what Peter said on the day of Pentecost, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you!" I can imagine a man coming up to Peter and saying, "But, Peter, all of our delegates are already baptized!"

5. The Brougner Resolution loses what the Northern Baptist Convention had already gained by the "gentlemen's agreement" with the Free Baptists. Dr. Goodchild says, "I was a persistent advocate of the union of the Baptists and Free Baptists. I went up and down the land speaking for it. I represented the Home Mission Society in some of the conferences that brought the union about. I was familiar with the whole history and I know of no agreement made that would have been violated by the amendment (the Seattle amendment)." My recollection is in agreement with Dr. Frederick L. Anderson's, that though the unbaptized member in the Free Baptist churches were not disturbed, the habit of receiving them was to be discontinued. It was a gentlemen's agreement. The repeated action of the General Conference of the Free Baptists insisting upon immersion is in agreement with this."

Now, brethren, let us remember that there never was any legal agreement between the Northern Baptist Convention and the Free Baptists. Mr. A. P. Barker states in his minority report of the Law Committee of the Northern Baptist Convention, "I find no agreement of any kind between the Northern Baptist Convention and the Free Baptists. Any arrangement made with that denomination was not made with the Convention." He also says, "I am informed that, as a matter of fact, the churches of that denomination do, with few exceptions, require immersion as a pre-requisite to membership." He further says, "Free Baptist churches, which send delegates to the Convention, came into it since its organization, are bound by its charter and have no greater or more vested rights of membership than any regular Baptist church."

You thus see that we have a right to define a Baptist church as one requiring baptism of all its members. But, someone will ask what about the disfellowshipping of Free Baptist churches which contain unbaptized members and which hitherto have been sending delegates to the Northern Baptist Convention? The answer is this: These churches ought to be ashamed of a hybrid membership and all the influence of the Northern Baptist Convention ought to be used to straighten them out. It might not be necessary to go into past history and require that all these evaders of baptism should submit to the ordinance of the Saviour whom they have disobeyed. It is entirely possible to so define the constituency of the Northern Baptist Convention that it shall be composed only of churches which do now receive by baptism only into full membership. Under the gentlemen's agreement, we were straightening out the small number of freewill churches that had become careless about the ordinance, but under the Brougner Resolution we throw this advantage away. The resolution will encourage weak and unstable pastors to underemphasize the duty and beauty of baptism, and will increase the number of compromised or hybrid churches. I understand that many young ministers of the so-called "liberal wing" of the Baptist denomination are already claiming that the resolution grants liberty for open membership. These young "liberals" are absolutely right. The resolution as it stands frankly recognizes open membership, although I wish we had a different term than "open membership." "Hybrid membership" would be a better term. In this type of church, baptism is no longer an ordinance—it is a mere suggestion or invitation. And what would a mere suggestion or invitation of Christ weigh in the mind of a young "liberal" minister who has received, by the German route, the intimation that the Great Commission with its emphasis upon baptism of all disciples in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, is nothing more than a late interpolation corrupting the original text of the gospel of Matthew? Ah, brethren, it is not a question of baptism, but a question of Trinitarianism versus Unitarianism.

So the Northern Baptist Convention has entered into the business of violating its own gentlemen's agreement. The Free Baptist churches which had become careless were to receive no more unbaptized members, and the Northern Baptist Convention churches on their part were of course not to receive unbaptized members. I am not worrying about the Free Baptist churches as much as I am troubled about the Unitarianizing and rationalizing of some of our "regular" Baptist churches.

In No. 223 of the Official Tracts of the American Unitarian Association, Rev. W. S. Morgan describes his passage to Unitarianism. "A liberal brother from a neighbouring town came to see me. He had said some radical things from his pulpit to which objections had been made '*Don't label your heresy, was my advice; give them heresy in such a fashion that the very saints will not suspect it*' Bad ethics, you say! I say, very bad! But this is the only way in which hundreds of orthodox pulpits can be held." Mr. McMorgan was formerly a Baptist minister.

Dishonest Unitarianism would rejoice to find that the entrance to Baptist churches was possible without a glorious declaration of faith in the Triune God through the ordinance of baptism.

My final word about the Free Baptists is this—When we took over the former Free Baptist mission field in India, the Bengal-Orissa field, what did we find down there? We found that the missionary churches in India would not permit an unbaptized man to unite with the church. Let us stand by the practice of these Indian churches.

A great deal has been made of the careless practice of one wing of the English Baptists. Hitherto we have set them a good example. We are about to borrow one of their weaknesses. Let us hear more about the other wing of the English Baptists, whose churches have refused to compromise. Let us hear about the practice of the Irish Baptists, the Scotch Baptists and the Welsh Baptists who sturdily followed the New Testament in its requirement of baptism as a pre-requisite to church membership. And let us not forget that the Brougner Resolution makes more difficult a full understanding and co-operation with the mighty host of the Southern Baptist Convention who look on us with amazement and hurt surprise as we open the constituency of the Northern Baptist Convention to hybrid churches.

6. The Brougner Resolution constitutes a virtual surrender to the Park Avenue Church of New York City. That church boldly and repeatedly declares that its membership shall be open to unbaptized people. Whatever Dr. Fosdick has rather oratorically said, I do not find that the Park Avenue Church intends to give the least recognition to any form of baptism but immersion. The only baptism they will practice will be immersion, but they will only immerse those who desire to be immersed. They will receive into full voting membership unbaptized people. Dr. Woelfkin says, "We will take baptism from the door of the church and place it at the altar of the church." I fear that Dr. Woelfkin is confused. He does not seem to know where the altar is. The altar of the Catholic Church is inside the church. The altar of the Baptist Church is out in front of the door. In order to get into a New Testament church you must pass by the altar. When a convert applies for membership in a Baptist church the great question we ask him is this, "Have you been at the altar? Have you accepted Christ? Are you willing to follow Christ? Is your all upon the altar?" By all means let us place baptism at the altar, and if we do, no unbaptized person will enter the doors of the Baptist churches.

In a recent correspondence with Dr. Woelfkin, I ventured to write him as follows:

"My dear Dr. Woelfkin:

"Many thanks for your courteous letter. I want you to know that I am heartily in favor of the general expansion program of your church so far as I understand it. It is time our Baptist churches on Manhattan Island equip themselves to meet the situation, and I am glad your church is setting an example of providing adequate facilities. I do believe, with all my heart, however, that you and your people for whom I have a real regard, are making a great mistake in taking the position of the General Baptists of England. That position has weakened, in my judgment, our Baptist cause in England and Europe generally, and has caused unnecessary dissension. I cannot think, for

the life of me, of any reason why we should surrender our initiatory rite or change its form, except as a concession to ignorance, and would it not be much better to enlighten people in regard to the ordinance rather than avoid that privilege and duty by taking the easy course of compromising with the weak general opinions of the uninformed?

"If you and I had deliberately sat down together to make up a rite that would have, when properly administered, the beauty and the meaning that would make entrance into the Baptist church an impressive and holy hour, could we have invented anything better than the New Testament ordinance as practiced by the apostles, and as interpreted by Paul?

"It seems to me that what New York City needs is not less Baptist conviction, but a return to a more intense type of Baptist conviction and a vast amount of publicity of the right sort in regard to real Baptist teachings and positions. It is not too late for you to reverse yourself, and I am convinced that you have the courage to do that if conscience leads you. I beg of you then, as one disciple of Christ of another, to review this matter in your own mind and heart. Are not the convictions of a million Northern Baptists of more importance to you and your people than the careless opinions of outside folk?

"It doesn't seem to me you are leading in a movement of true liberalism. What does New York know about Baptists? Little or nothing! Why not lead a truly liberal movement by a vigorous proclaiming of regeneration and the simple ordinances of Christ and the separation of church and state, and the supreme authority of the Scriptures in matters of faith, and other tremendous and dynamic truths that we have always done our best service under, as against the materialism and Romanism and worldliness and rationalism of New York City?"

Brethren, the First Baptist Church of Pasadena has recently declared as follows:

"We do not believe that the local Baptist church has the right to set aside any ordinance or command of Christ, the Holy Scriptures being the fixed constitution of Baptist churches." We know that Mr. Rockefeller does not believe in baptism as obligatory upon all church members. He believes that at the door of the church we should only ask one question, "Do you desire to love and serve God and humanity?" His ideal church is to be without creed or ritual. Dr. Fosdick's position is well known. He has laid aside baptism as an ordinance of Christ, the duty of all believers. Dr. Woelfkin has also taken that position. He holds that baptism is a fine thing, if you wish to do it. The Brougher Resolution yields to this kind of latitudinarianism. Can any student of church history feel safe for a moment with this kind of leadership? Personally, I have more respect for a pedo-Baptist who clings to a mistaken definition of baptism than for so-called Baptists who dare to set aside entirely a sacred ordinance of Jesus Christ. Such men should receive no comfort from the Northern Baptist Convention. They can lead us nowhere save into fogs and confusion, dissension and debt.

It is not strange that the more we hear of Mr. Rockefeller, the more we seem to hear of missionary debts? Ten millions offered to the government of Egypt for a museum at Cairo (a good thing, too), and our godly women laboring away trying to stimulate in many cases pathetic gifts from the poorest of the poor. My own personal conviction is that if the Baptists had never heard of the Rockefellers we would have been millions of dollars ahead of where we are today. They are good people in their way, no doubt, but for us to look in their direction for prophetic leadership or the financing of the kingdom of God will constitute a tragedy of tragedies in our missionary work. I well remember the words of Dr. Henry Mable, that great secretary of our American Baptist Missionary Union, in which he solemnly said to me, "After the report of the Supreme Court of the United States on the Standard Oil question, I felt sorry I had ever approached the Rockefellers for any missionary money whatsoever."

It will be remembered that it was through Dr. Mable that the first large gifts to our missionary work were announced from that particular source. I am not here raising a question of "tainted money," but I do remind you of that weakness in the American public which gives undue emphasis to the opinions and leadership of the man who has money. If men of money are to be mentioned as counsellors and deferred to in the Northern Baptist Convention, let

us not forget that great soul, the best friend that the Southern California Baptist State Convention ever had, whose loyalty to Christ's gospel and His ordinances was never questioned and who cannot now rise up and speak for himself. Shall we deny our great friend by compromising with the leadership that he so earnestly distrusted?

7. The Brougner Resolution marks the loss of a great opportunity. If Dr. Brougner had maintained the attitude he assumed at Seattle, or had introduced a resolution essentially the same as the present one but changed so as not to raise the question of unbaptized members in Free Baptist churches, while carefully guarding the requirement of baptism of all who unite with any co-operating Baptist churches, in accordance with the unwritten gentlemen's agreement with the Free Baptist churches, his recommendation would have carried at Washington. Later on he could have led us in a revision or addition to our by-laws which would fix the matter once and for all, as to our constituency. He had accumulated great prestige by his noble service in behalf of the missionary budget of the denomination. The Chicago conference was well meant, but no statement that could be signed by men of such diverse views as he invited to the conference could possibly constitute an acceptable action for the great mass of loyal Baptists in our constituency. It is significant that over 1,000 delegates voted against the Brougner Resolution, despite the fact that the resolution had behind it such strong Fundamentalists as Brougner, Boynton and Masee, the majority of the Law Committee and the great bulk of the denominational men. A change of a little over 500 votes would have defeated the Brougner Resolution.

But such matters are not determined by the votes of a single Convention—they are determined for Baptists by the declarations of the Word of God. A Baptist who preaches the requirements of that Word to his congregation and does not insist that the Northern Baptist Convention conform to them is not a real Baptist at all. The message of a Baptist is for all mankind. He boldly demands of the Catholic and the pedo-Baptist that they conform their practice to the New Testament. He should as boldly demand that the Northern Baptist Convention and all of its servants do likewise.

DR. DEAN'S REBUTTAL.

Brethren, in closing this discussion I would suggest:

First: That our churches, our associations and our state conventions take an action similar to that recently taken by the First Baptist Church of Pasadena, the essential feature of which was the demand that all of our Baptist organizations, including the Northern Baptist Convention, reassert the sacred ordinance of baptism as a pre-requisite of church membership.

Second: Let us determine that the Brougner Resolution shall not stand upon the books of the Northern Baptist Convention in its present form. It should be repealed or else it should be amended. There is much good in it, as well as an evil compromise. It reasserts immersion as the only scriptural baptism; it refuses to guard the local churches from unimmersed people, but it does guard the Northern Baptist Convention from unimmersed delegates. The resolution could be amended or added to in such a way that it would read as follows:

"The Northern Baptist Convention recognizes its constituency as consisting solely of those Baptist churches in which members are received into full standing only after confession of their faith in Christ and their immersion in water, in accordance with the commission of our Lord, 'All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.'"

But back behind this matter of resolutions we must reassert the right of the Northern Baptist Convention to define its own constituency in its own by-laws. An amendment to the by-laws insisting that all constituent churches of the Northern Baptist Convention shall receive no unbaptized members should be presented at the next meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention. If the Law Committee wishes to make an issue again of this matter, let us get behind the lawyer to the judge and decide finally whether the Northern Baptist Convention

is an organization entitled to self-respect or a headless and helpless creature entangled in the red tape of "liberal" theology. We need not worry. The American courts will, of course, declare that we have a right to define our own constituency, giving proper redress to any truly aggrieved minority. We will be surprised to find either that there is no such minority, or else that it will be a small and negligible one. But whatever the situation may turn out to be, let us dare to stand by the only constitution which constitutes the supreme law of the Baptist Church and of the Baptist missionary and denominational organizations—namely, the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which confronts every disciple who desires to unite himself with the people of God with the glorious and meaningful ordinance of baptism, in which he may set forth his faith in the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Let us dare to boldly follow the least intimation of the Son of God.

THE WASHINGTON RESOLUTION.

It is very interesting indeed to see different interpretations put upon the Washington Convention. The evident intent is to defend this resolution at any cost. The action has proved thoroughly unpopular over all the Northern Convention. Churches and associations, and even state conventions, have repudiated it and will continue to do so. The Southern Baptists had no sympathy whatever with the action and were amazed that such an action could be taken. This fact has been so evident to our leaders that they are now trying to make it appear different from what it was.

For instance, the *Baptist* said, "Before that action there was a question whether a church could admit for baptism some other order than the immersion of believers, and still be represented in the convention. Now there is no question—no such church can be represented." "Now, as always heretofore, a Baptist Church may receive unimmersed persons and still be recognized as a Baptist church. But now no church may accredit anything as baptism except the immersion of believers and still be recognized by the convention."

This is certainly twisting words, compelling them to serve an end; no matter whether they were ever so intended or not. In one breath, it insists that "no church could admit for baptism any other order than immersion of believers, and still be represented in the convention," and in the next breath, it tells us that "a Baptist church may receive unimmersed people and still be recognized as a Baptist church." Certainly such reasoning is characteristic of the editor of the *Baptist*.

The intention of the action at Washington was to take in the Rockefeller church. That was the main objective. The Free Baptist and the Community Baptist churches were convenient occasions of argument. But the thing that was wanted was Rockefeller and his church; and they were, by that action, told that they were welcome in spite of the fact that they had already declared they would sprinkle, immerse and receive without any baptism whatever, and the future will prove that this church will be retained in the denomination if it desires to stay, and it will always be able to muster the five or eight people, it is entitled on the basis of size to send to the Northern Baptist Convention, who have qualified by being immersed; but that such a church is a Baptist church, no straight thinking man could imagine.

(The above article is from *The Searchlight*.)

REV. W. M. ROBERTSON'S SERVICES.

Great blessing is attending the ministry of Mr. Robertson in Jarvis Street. It is a sign of great appreciation when every succeeding sermon is declared to be the best. Jarvis Street has been honoured by the visit of many great preachers who, as prophets of God, have been channels of blessing to multitudes, but none have been more welcome than Mr. Robertson. Readers of this paper must know the theology of Jarvis Street pulpit very well, and Mr. Robertson's sermons, while searching and practical, have that fine Calvinistic flavour which is ever dear to the believing heart. We wish all America could hear him.

Last Sunday's services were Mount Tabor experiences. A good number were converted. Some came forward even before the great throng at the open-air services. Mr. Robertson is preaching Tuesday and Thursday indoors, and Wednesday and Friday out-of-doors.