

A Reply to Mr. Arthur Jones.....	Page 9
Dr. Bingham Has Long Distance Chat With The Editor.....	" 10
Dr. Riley on Canadian Affairs.....	" 19
Opening of the New Seminary.....	" 23

# 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, *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. 35. TORONTO, JANUARY 6th, 1927. Whole No. 245.

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

### Modernism---An Enemy in the Evangelical Camp

An Address by Dr. W. B. Riley

Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minn., delivered in Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto, Wednesday Evening, January 5th, 1927.

"But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false prophets among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not."—(II Peter 2: 1-3).

Jude provided us the first text in this series. To-night we appeal to that marvellous apostle of the Christian faith, Peter, and remind you that he discussed our subject nearly 2,000 years since, and said things that were so fully inspired that time requires no change in them. His words are still fit and their study should prove fruitful. They present The Rise of False Prophets, make mention of The Mark of the False Prophets, and reveal The Work of the False Prophets.

#### THE RISE OF FALSE PROPHETS.

"But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you."—(II Peter 2: 1).

False prophets, then, rise within the fold.

Modernism is not a barnacle born outside the ship of Zion, but fastening itself upon her hulk and keel to sap the life and strength from the same; it is rather a carbuncle or cancer hatched from some germ of infidelity within the body of Christ, the Church: irritating, weakening, and even threatening the life of the body itself.

Bob Ingersoll, having the decency to remain outside of the church, was never its dangerous foe. We have no objection whatever to the unbeliever without the body of Christ. He has as much right to his opinion as I have to mine. He has a perfect right both to enjoy and proclaim it, no matter to what depths of atheism he descends. But he has no right to bore his way into the evangelical "church, the body of Christ", and feed upon its very vitals. A tick may have a right to live, but when he proposes to live on my body and suck my life-blood, it is hardly worth while for some mild-mannered preacher of a small and dwindling parish to advise me to be "genteel", "considerate", and "slow" in dealing with that blood-sucker.

It is a strange and interesting fact that the man of the world is so often clearer in thought; deeper in conviction, and more logical in mental processes, than the compromising minister. When Professor George Foster's book, "The Finality of the Christian Religion", was written (and, by the way, Foster was a Canadian importation), the editor of Chicago's greatest daily, commenting upon its bold infidelity, said: "We are struck with the hypocrisy and treachery of these attacks on Christianity. This is a free country and a free age, and men can say what they choose about religion; but this is not what we arraign these Divinity professors for. Is there no place in which to assail Christianity but a Divinity school? Is there no one to write infidel books except professors of Christian theology? Is a theological seminary an appropriate place for a general massacre of Christian doctrines? We are not championing either Christianity or infidelity, but only condemning infidels masquerading as men of God and Christian teachers."

How pertinent, then, the language of Peter—"There shall be false teachers among you."

Their propaganda prefers great privacy: "'Who, privily, shall bring in damnable heresies.'"—(II Peter 2: 1).

Moderns have not fought in the open. Like the Germans in the late war, they have dug trenches and hid themselves out of sight. They have burrowed under our State institutions, under our great Christian Trinitarian movements, organizations, and even churches. They have boasted themselves as representatives of the secret method. They quietly originated the Interchurch movement. Most diplomatically did they organize the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America. They have for years had their representatives in the Y.M.C.A. and in the Y.W.C.A., who, with every talent at their command, have tried to break down the evangelical church membership test, and here again their success has been considerable. In fact, for many years, only men with strong modernist leanings have been acceptable speakers or teachers in the Y.M.C.A. college at Springfield; while the course of study there is nothing short of a plunge into the literature of Darwinian infidelity. The Association College, at Chicago, cultures its coming secretaries at the feet of men of kindred mind, including not alone Modernist Baptists, Congregationalists, and so-called Christian church men, but even the agnostic, Clarence Darrow; while the Southern Y.M.C.A. college regales its students with such reference books as Starbuck, Pratt, Coe, and James. What is this but boring from within? Is it any wonder that the Y.W.C.A. in the colleges has already abolished the evangelical test, and that the Y.M.C.A. has only retained it because of great outstanding leaders of Trinitarian thought who have eloquently championed the Portland basis, and because of fear, by that money-grabbing movement, of its eventual pauperization should it openly declare for Unitarianism—a religion that has never generously sustained anything?

Dr. Diffenbach, the editorial mouthpiece of American Unitarianism, entertains the hope that "the last days of evangelical test in the Y.M.C.A. are with us", and asserts, "I have spoken to men who are now making the Association history. They know."

It is my candid judgment that the spirit of Modernism is properly voiced by that Western leader in this Society, who said, "Ten years ago we set out to capture every large University in the land, and we have practically done that; and now we are setting about to capture the Y.M.C.A.'s and Y.W.C.A.'s." If he spoke to-night, he would say, "We have practically done that, also."

But they have not done it in a fair way. They have not done it in an open

fight. Their method has been the disordering method of the disease germ. They have wrought within the body.

Their work in connection with the International Sunday School Lessons is of the same sort. For years their influence has been positively and increasingly felt. Their representatives, guised as evangelicals, have sought and secured positions as text book writers, conference speakers, and Sunday School counsellors. We are told that Massachusetts has already seen the Sunday School Association vote to admit Unitarian schools, and that in the report of the American Unitarian Association for 1918, there is a congratulation of its constituency on "the admission, for the first time, of a Unitarian delegate to the meeting of the International Sunday School Association." But liberals with less faith and far less honesty had long been in control of that association.

It begins to appear, therefore, that liberalism is parasitic in nature. Its inability to live and flourish of itself has a hundred years of illustration, but it really fattens in the flesh of an evangelical body.

New England Congregationalism was once so strong that Baptists had to beg for the privilege of preaching the Gospel as they interpreted it. But the Unitarian society sucked itself into some considerable proportions and at the same time sapped the strength of that Congregationalism to such an extent that in spite of its early occupation of American soil, its magnificent string of colleges and even its favor from the Government itself, it has had to take a somewhat minor place in the comparative scale of Christian bodies. Do you wonder that I feel led to defend my great Baptist brotherhood against the insidious enemy of God and Christ, the Bible and His body—the Church?

This secret propaganda is of the most hurtful sort.

I have already shown you what it has done for the Modernists themselves. They began by doubting the authority of the Bible; they proceeded to the denial of the deity of Christ; they came to reject the personality of the Holy Ghost, and now many of them are disputing the existence of a personal God. In consequence of this fact, their influence has been a negligible quantity in America. It has never been largely felt concerning any of the great moral and ethical questions, and now the evil fruit of this unfaith is being increasingly seen in its deleterious effect upon those great denominational bodies that have made the most virile contribution to American civilization.

It would seem well to follow some of the apostles of Modernism to their eventual fate and learn whether Peter's language is justifiable. Is their heresy "a damnable one"? What does it do for a minister's professional life? Let Crapsey, "the last of the heretics", tell us: "I am as bad off as a nameless man. I cannot do business in the religious world. Apparently I am nothing and belong nowhere. One who has not this isolation can have no notion of what it means." Professor Toy, once an honoured Professor in Louisville Baptist Seminary, became an avowed unbeliever, through modernism.

If one cares to do so, let him follow one of its greatest apostles to the edge of the grave! Dr. Samuel G. Howe, was, we are told, a man of wide sympathies, helping hand, and one who actually made great sacrifices, personal and professional, for the social amelioration of the people. His human merit measured up to high demands, and yet when he came to die, this is from one of his last letters: "It was very dark during the week. I saw no light nor hope for this world, and was uneasy and unhappy about the next." It would seem then that the language of Peter is defensible, yea, even demanded by inspiration, "It is a damnable heresy."

But I pass from The Rise of False Prophets, to

#### THE MARK OF THE FALSE PROPHETS.

I give you herewith a replica of the Carleton students' notes, presented a few days since to the Minnesota Baptist State Convention. I should add that these students were faithful, competent, and extremely friendly toward every member of the Carleton faculty, and were animated only by the desire to save their fellow-students from the skepticism of the Carleton classroom.

Dr. Fitch who first destroyed Andover, and then attempted to turn its remains over to Harvard, is now head of religion in our Minnesota Baptist College. Notes from Dr. Fitch's class:

- "1. Facts explode the theory of the Bible's errorlessness.
- "2. A myth is a story of the origins of heroes of people in which they tell what they think is true about them. The Paradise myth is one of the greatest.
- "3. Jacob's ladder is a common kind of myth.
- "4. Abrahamic myths are obviously not historical. Story too advanced for that early stage.
- "5. Daniel in the lion's den is a William Tell kind of story.
- "6. I infer that Elijah was a project of syncretism, because it is the only explanation, and because all around to-day the same thing is happening.
- "7. Amos starts the vision of monotheism. He was the initial discoverer of the sovereignty of One.
- "8. It is impossible to explain the origin of evil.
- "9. It is an intellectual perversity if you do not believe in evolution. It is immoral not to.
- "10. 'The faith once for all' and limited to the Saints doesn't stand the test of investigation.
- "11. Damnation, salvation, and rewards are genuine speculations.
- "12. According to modern thinking, religions differ in degree and not in kind.
- "13. The Christian religion began with a savage's scale of values.
- "14. There isn't a single first-rate thinking person in history who identified Jesus with God. There never was any first-rate thinker who identified Jesus with God.
- "15. A doctrine is a formulation of experience. A dogma is a formulation which has forgotten that it ever had a history. It is the dogma of the virgin birth, not doctrine.
- "16. There are at least ten doctrines of atonement, all of which with one exception are dogmas. The substitutionary one is a dogma because the mind rejects it.
- "17. Reasons for the rejection of the virgin birth: Peter knows nothing of it in Markine Gospel. Paul made statements against it. Not found in what is thought to be the oldest manuscripts.
- "18. Jesus used the technique of a modern faith-healer. He was able to arouse in people an acute expectancy of cure.
- "19. Explanations for disappearance of Jesus' body: Jews had taken him away for fear of a riot. Wrong tomb. Physical body arose. Paul was the last man on earth to write a disingenuous statement. I Corin. 15, 'It is sown a natural body and rose a spiritual', explicitly denies a physical resurrection.
- "20. The miracle as regards Lazarus, as it now stands, cannot be accepted."

The notebook of a mature student, a full graduate, and an ardent friend of the institution, reveals that Dr. A. W. Vernon, a former instructor of Carleton, taught that:

"Jesus never said that he was the only son of God—theology brought that in. He taught that all men are sons of God.

"Deuteronomy was written about 600 years after David lived, by a group of men.

"The Law is ascribed to Moses, and it is doubtful if he saw any of them (The Ten Commandments)."

On September 29th, 1923, the notebook contains these notes on Dr. Vernon:

"Attacked book of Jeremiah as poetry. Exalted Dumas' work on Jeremiah as the greatest. (It reduces the book of Jeremiah to about one-fourth the present size.)

"The text of Jeremiah is a maze of interpolations.

"I do not believe that Jeremiah wrote the universal knowledge chapter attributed to him.

"We would have taken Elijah as a character for study, but his historicity is so very much in doubt. It seems as if there was legend at work in all these stories of Elijah."

And on October 13, 1923:

"It is better to be a good Buddhist than a nominal Christian.  
 "He (Buddhist author) admits the miracles are legendary.

"Observe how much more rational a view of God the Brahmins had than, for instance, Jeremiah or Jesus." (Speaking of the Buddhists and Brahmins.)

On November 7, 1924:

"There are other accomplishments of Augustine which we would not regard as beneficial. One of these is that he exalted the authority of the Scriptures. An infallible authority tends to bigotry. It is strange that Augustine had practically no knowledge of the historic Jesus."

Under date of March 8, 1924, the notebook contained this notation:

"Mark says that Jesus said, 'I speak in parables that seeing they may see and not perceive.' I don't believe that Jesus said that."

There are certain distinguishing marks suggested by Peter that are unmistakable. Let me call your attention to them!

False prophets deny the deity of our Lord—the Christ. The language of this apostle is *denying the Lord that bought them*. That is the exact basis of my recent charges against the Carleton College deliverances. They could not come from the lips of true prophets.

According to the students' notes, Dr. Albert Parker Fitch denies the deity of Jesus Christ, saying, "There isn't a single first-rate thinking person in history who ever identified Jesus with God. There never was any first-rate thinker who identified Jesus with God." The Virgin birth—"a non-historical dogma!" Miracle and substitutionary atonement rejected. Does anybody doubt that that is infidel teaching? If so, let me give you a few examples of confessed Unitarianism. *Emerton's Unitarian Thought* expresses the following, "Jesus was not the first. He will not be the last." In John W. Chadwick's, *Old and New Unitarian Belief*, he speaks of "the impiety of specializing and exalting Jesus as He had been specialized and exalted in the theology and worship of the Christian church", while the catechism of Unitarian Sunday Schools, provided by Dr. Dole asked, "Did Jesus ever claim to be more than a true man?" and answers, "There is no evidence that he ever made such a claim."

It would take one with a discriminating mind, indeed, to determine the difference between the teaching at Carleton and these authors. It will be remembered that in my recent resolution before the Minnesota Baptist State Convention, I called attention to the statement of Dr. A. W. Vernon, former instructor in Carleton, "Jesus never said He was the only Son of God—theology brought that in. He taught that all men are sons of God."

That is Unitarianism! Dr. Vernon is confessedly Unitarian!

Ernest Gordon, in his recent book entitled, *The Leaven of the Sadducees*, says, "Dr. A. W. Vernon said ten years ago, 'I hope that I shall live to see the day when it shall be as hard to distinguish our two branches of Congregationalism (the Unitarian and the Trinitarian) from each other, as it is to tell twin daughters apart who have forgotten to tie up their braids with a blue and a red ribbon. I fear that our extremists will discover that in spite of their violent efforts to divide us there is one who is our Master and all we are brethren.'" That remark, doubtless, had to do with his exaltation to a Carleton professorship!

We would like Carleton College, or Dr. Vernon himself, if he pleases, to tell us who that one is. Does he want to make idolators of us, and have us call a mere man "our Master" when "theology brought that in"? To defend a school that employs and approves such teachers, as evangelical, is to indulge in words without meaning, in rhetoric with low objective, in oratory in defense of false prophets. Whenever a man denies the deity of Christ, common decency demands that he depart from evangelical bodies, and any sort of honesty would compel that action.

There are scores of preachers and professors in evangelical churches and colleges, drawing salaries from fundamentalist sources, who know that they are sucking the life-blood of fundamentalism in order to sustain their own false-

prophet and parasitic existence. But the man who will "deny the Lord that bought him" bothers little over having traduced the men that trust him.

Such prophets savagely decry Christ's sacrificial atonement.

Here, again, let Carleton speak. Professor Fitch, head of religion, mark you, in this evangelical, fundamentally-founded school, says, "There are at least ten doctrines of the atonement, all of which, with one exception, are dogmas. The substitutionary one is a dogma, because the mind rejects it." The Atonement is the heart of Christianity. McMaster University may live and permit it to be repudiated, but if so, only as another infidel institution. When Professor Marshall questions, "Who wants to wallow in blood?" and repudiates Luther's substitutionary theory, the world knows that he is not evangelical.

Listen, now, to the honest Unitarian—the Unitarian who has the courage to associate himself with the society that entertains similar convictions, and hear what he has to say. Rev. George Kent, Unitarian, remarks, "You cannot think of a Unitarian congregation singing, 'Jesus paid it all!'" while Dr. A. M. Ribbany writes, "We do not call him the Saviour", and Edward Everett Hale remarks, "We do not believe it possible for any substituted being to take the consequences of man's sin", and our neighbour, Dr. Dietrich, tells us, "Another thing which has been taken away is the theory that Jesus is Saviour alone of humanity," and Mr. Weil, another Unitarian preacher, calls the doctrine of the atonement "a medieval gospel of blood and the devil, a hydra-headed monster that has crawled out of the Dark Ages."

But we are not objecting to such deliverances from Unitarianism. That is to be expected! They no longer claim to be of the Church, nor of Christ; nor do they call themselves Christians. But when this same sort of teaching accepts support from fundamentalists and sits in the professor's chair of an evangelical college or stands in the pulpit of an evangelical church, it becomes thoroughly reprehensible.

Dr. Diefenbach, editor of *The Christian Register*, in a recent article, maintained that common honesty required all such Unitarians and Liberals to withdraw from all evangelical institutions and fellowship and maintain either an individual position or join with Unitarian or Liberal organizations.

Is Peter unjust in his vigorous denunciation? "They bring in damnable heresies." "They bring upon themselves swift destruction." Can men coddle a venomous serpent and not be bitten? Can truth-lovers take to their bosoms falsehood and escape its poison? Let us not forget that original skepticism was the breath of a serpent. Dr. Bryn-Jones, ex-Carleton professor, charges me with "lack of Christian courtesy", in my treatment of Carleton teaching. Possibly our definitions of Christian courtesy might differ. I "honour all men", but I have no respect for false teaching and no compliments for skepticism. Dr. Bryn-Jones contributed four days to Unitarian fellowship during the early days of his pastorate in Minneapolis, speaking to that body, and was advertised as their chief orator for the year. Believing that John was inspired, I could not, under any conceivable circumstances, occupy their platform or participate in their Christ-denying conventions; for John wrote, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (II John 1: 10, 11).

The sad fact is that many ministers and professors who are still drawing support from evangelical bodies are one in sentiment with the western secretary of a liberal conference, who said, "We stand for nothing but liberty."

Judging from the remarks quoted from two of the present members of Carleton Board, and the teaching of its professors, they are in line with the degenerating drift that has struck your own McMaster, and they stand for nothing but skeptical license! Certainly if Cross, Parsons, Vichert, Matthews, Holman, and Professor Newman are samples, McMaster has long majored on "license"!

But, in conclusion, let us follow the text and see

#### THE WORK OF THE FALSE PROPHETS.

"Many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they, with

feigned words, make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not." (II Peter 2: 2, 3).

The object of Modernism is to turn the thoughtless from God's truth. "Many do follow their pernicious ways." They have learned what section of society is most easily seduced, and their attack is almost entirely at the point of youth. That is why they have craved and secured school positions. As professors they deal with the immature and can easily take advantage. It is not once in a thousand times that mature men adopt either the evolutionary hypothesis or the modern infidelity.

In hundreds of addresses in America and Europe, before great church bodies in secular halls, at business men's clubs, I have found but one assembly of mature men, in mind and age, a majority of whom were convinced of the reasonableness of either. Liberals recognize this fact, and fear to trust their philosophies in such assemblies. There is not on the American continent, at this moment, one advocate of evolution who holds any reputable position, and yet dares to attempt its defense in open debate. If there is an exception to this statement, it is the field secretary of the Science League of America, and since he has gone down to signal defeat seven successive times in our seven debates, he only serves as an emphatic illustration of what I here affirm. They are effective only with babes!

Take, for instance, Dr. Slaten, recently ejected from the faculty of William Jewell College, Baptist college of Missouri, as an illustration. In the twenty-one years of his public life, he was Baptist pastor at the University of Michigan, in touch with young and immature people; professor in the Y.M.C.A. College in Chicago, a kindred company, and Bible instructor in William Jewell College—daily associate of youth, and in all these places he spread his skepticism and brought "many to follow his pernicious ways", so much so that when at last he was uncovered and summarily dismissed by the board of trustees—mature and seasoned men—his dismissal was stoutly resented by the college *infanti*. He is one of the men who defended his conscienceless conduct by saying, "It is strategic to remain and work from the inside. Many others are doing it successfully and the gradual permeation of the orthodox denominations with liberal ideas, disseminated by trusted leaders of their own, appears to them the best procedure." And then he adds a remark that gives pith to my resolution in Minnesota Convention, and Shields' contention in Canada, namely, "Until recently this has been a procedure that was comparatively easy to follow. Now it is uncertain and dangerous." Some of us are determined (God helping us) to make that conscienceless method still more uncertain and vastly more dangerous.

Their method is by the way of well-turned words.

"Through covetousness shall they with feigned (or well-turned), words make merchandise of you." Here again, let Unitarians speak.

Rev. W. S. Morgan tells us his advice to a liberal brother from a neighboring town. "Don't label your heresy. Do as I do. 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." Rev. Thos. Clayton, who also went out of an evangelical body, says, "I was advised to stay where I was and keep some of my opinions to myself, gradually to sow the seeds of liberalism and wait until the time was ripe for more aggressive agitation."

It will be remembered that the Northern Baptist Convention at Milwaukee in 1925, appointed a commission of seven to investigate the teachings of missionaries on Baptist foreign mission fields, and that in their report they quoted the words of Missionary Cecil G. Fielder, in which he denied the inspiration of the Bible, the banefulness of sin, the atoning sacrifice, the redeeming death, and, of course, the deity of Jesus. The Foreign Board in New York, instead of dismissing such a man, called him home, continued his salary, put him into Newton Theological Seminary—a school saturated with Unitarianism—and now, at the end of a year, have ordained him by a bare majority of thirteen against eleven, with many members of the ordaining council refusing to vote at all. In other words, at the urgency of Professors Vaughn, of Newton, and Anderson, of the same Seminary, and President of the Baptist Foreign Board, the first step is taken toward Fielder's return to the foreign field by a vote

of 13 delegates out of 30 odd present, at Baptist expense. The year's education, then, was not a time of correction, but of coaching; and this man is expected to go back to his foreign post to preach the gospel of liberalism, "which is another gospel and no gospel", but to do it in language that will excite less suspicion, and after a manner, if possible, that will not eventuate in controversy. It is the identical ruse of that liberal, who, finding himself in what he described as "hide-bound Nashville", instead of announcing his Unitarian allegiance, advertised to speak on "Truth, Worship and Service", thereby escaping what he designated "unnecessary antagonism", and easily securing access for three addresses at the Y.M.C.A., at Vanderbilt University and a local Methodist church which furnished the entering wedge for further work. No wonder Rev. F. A. Farley, an apostle of this society, said, "The name 'Unitarian' I care little for in itself; so long as I can see the thing which it denotes doing its work and leaving the mass, I am content."

Finally, the purpose of Modernism is a merchandised ministry. "Through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you."

There is but one reason why any liberal remains in an evangelical body, or two at most. If obsessed with the idea that he holds the truth, he is there to create defection, secure a following, and, if possible, eventually bring his disciples to be like himself. But a more potent reason for his persistence in evangelical pulpits and professors' chairs, is the financial one. The liberal body, as we have already seen, is dead to the sacrificial spirit that Christ always generates in His own. Their pulpits are few and inconspicuous; their schools are small in number and almost uniformly the appropriated products of theft, while the evangelical bodies are big, healthy, expanding, and even generous toward their servants. What a chance to make merchandise of them! It is far more profitable to be the head of religion in William Jewell or in Carleton, both from the standpoint of a possible following and a fruitful purse, than to vainly seek for a Unitarian pulpit or professorship. The appeal, therefore, has been a potent one and will remain so, as long as evangelical Christians sleep, complaining of those who seek to arouse them to the realization of the theological marauder's work, or as long as doting parents resent having the teaching, in the particular school in which their sons and daughters are being educated, subjected to the light of God's truth. We admit that it is uncomfortable to be awakened. There are times when any noise is an annoyance, and it is still more harassing to have any word uttered or action taken that could cast aspersions upon the education given our own children.

But, is it not better to be awakened even in the first watch of the night than to sleep 'til the end of the fourth, if, in the interval, the thief has come and has snatched our jewels? And is it not better for every Christian parent on earth to discover, early in the student's course, whether his child is being corrupted theologically, than to receive him back, a full graduate in infidelity? I have seen no more pertinent illustration than that which Ernest Gordon employs. "Alexandre Morel, in his studies of butterfly life, tells how he searched for cocoons of a magnificent and rare butterfly in the Haut Valais, hoping to raise some of the purple and silver beauties. He finally succeeded in finding five chrysalides in perfect health on a certain Alpine plant which attracts them. But when the time of birth came, out of the first crawled an ichneumon; out of the second another; out of the third still another. Only the fifth and last produced a butterfly.

What had happened? The ichneumon fly had deposited its egg in each of the living caterpillars. The ichneumonized caterpillar lived as if nothing had happened—ate, grew, constructed its cocoon. The unfortunate caterpillar did not realize it was possessed, that under its skin it carried a perfidious enemy, which, after letting it live, transformed its destiny altogether. In fact, this mysterious substance, which should have given birth to a butterfly, passed altogether into the body of a little larva and became an ichneumon."

If you want an agnostic or an atheist, then permit the ichneumon liberal professor, plying his insectivorous art, to deposit the egg of infidelity in the brain of your boy, your girl; but if you would like to receive back from college that beautiful boy, that darling daughter, developed into a Christian of firm faith and fine character, then smoke from our schools every teacher of skepticism who is guising as a Christian instructor.



## Editorial

### A REPLY TO MR. ARTHUR JONES.

We have read with interest a front page letter from Mr. Arthur Jones, of Montreal, in *The Canadian Baptist* of this week, in which he protests against the formation of a new missionary society. It was our great privilege to serve as a member of the Home Mission Board for a much longer period than Mr. Jones has served; and we believe that with one exception we have had as intimate acquaintance with its work as any man now on the Board.

We have a very high regard for Mr. Jones and rejoice in his unswerving loyalty to the gospel. But we cannot agree with his judgment in this case. The Chairman of the Board is a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University. He is a very excellent gentleman but has never been in any true sense a Baptist. His summer home has long been in Oakville, not more than a short five miles from the Home Mission Church at Bronte. Notwithstanding, while in residence at Oakville, he did not attend the Bronte church to which his motor car would have carried him in a few minutes, but attended rather the Presbyterian church. Within the last year or so a Baptist Mission has been opened in Oakville itself. In our day the Chairman of the Home Mission Board was unfavourable to opening a Baptist Mission in Oakville, and now that it is opened, he does not attend, but we have been informed, attends the United church instead. Aside from theological questions altogether, what hope is there of aggressive Baptist work being done under such leadership?

Again, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of McMaster University is a member of the Home Mission Board, and was, for some time and perhaps is still, Chairman of the Finance Committee. He has supported Professor Marshall to the limit of his influence, and is officially responsible for the policy of the University. Other members of the Home Mission Board are the blind partisans of McMaster. Whether some of them hope to earn an honorary degree by their partisanship or not we do not know, but they out-Herod Herod (which in this case is McMaster) in their cruelty to the innocents.

We are unable to understand what strange change could have come over Mr. Jones' grey matter, when he consented to the passing of the most vicious resolution ever spread upon a Baptist minute book. Nothing more outrageous has ever disgraced the Baptists of this or any other land than the resolution which practically forbade the missionaries of the Board to discuss the fundamentals of the faith. It was un-British, unmanly, un-Christian, and positively wicked. Having muzzled the missionaries, members of the Board themselves became the open advocates of McMaster and Marshallism. Superintendent Schutt went out of his way to defend McMaster on the specious plea that only one professor was under suspicion! Other members of the Board were just as bad.

Having contrived to keep the weaker churches in ignorance of the facts, the agents of McMaster, either by letter or in person, went everywhere preying and presuming upon the ignorance they had effected, and secured a proxy vote made up of people so filled to the lips with McMaster poison that they could not open their mouths without spilling it.

We would remind Mr. Jones that the Home Mission Board needs no outside influence—it is a mere extension of the McMaster Senate, and is its servile, though perhaps in respect to one or two of its members, unconscious tool.

Money entrusted to the Home Mission Board as at present constituted, only puts a club into the hands of McMaster's agents with which to beat Home Missionaries into submission to its modernistic will.

Mr. Jones is solicitous for the Home Missionaries lest they be made to suffer. We believe we are akin to all other humans, and we declare that the loss of all worldly goods and reduction to starvation could not inflict such suffering upon us as would be caused by being deprived of liberty of conscience and robbed of self-respect. The Home Mission Board has resorted to threats, even vaguely suggesting that place and position and bread and butter

depend upon submission. This is intolerable to men with a spark of manhood in their breasts.

While the Home Mission Board is under the dominance of McMaster influence, the more its work is curtailed the better. We regret the necessity of dissenting from Mr. Jones, of whose personal loyalty to Christ all who know him will be assured, but his judgment in this case, we believe, is utterly astray.

### THE MISSIONARY CONVENTION.

**Date:** Tuesday and Wednesday, Jan. 11 and 12. **Place:** Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto. **Persons invited to attend and vote:** Every member of a Baptist church in Ontario and Quebec who will subscribe to the articles of faith set out in the proposed constitution. **Persons invited:** All such Baptists as are described above.

**Billeting:** All subscribing Baptists as above will be provided with bed and breakfast, and those from out of town with supper Tuesday, and dinner and supper Wednesday in Jarvis St. Dining Hall without charge.

Please send notice of intention to attend and whether billet is desired or not to Rev. Alex. Thomson, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto.

### MORE ABOUT DR. H. H. BINGHAM.

We are glad to give space to the following letter from Dr. H. H. Bingham of Calgary. *The Gospel Witness* is always ready to print both sides of any question, reserving always its right of editorial comment. Once again we have pleasure in stating that anyone who is criticized in these pages will always be accorded full right to reply.

#### Dr. Bingham's Letter.

First Baptist Church,  
Calgary, Alta.,

December 28th, 1926.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,  
Jarvis Street Baptist Church,  
Toronto, Ontario.

My dear Dr. Shields:

Having read with some care your reply to a letter from the Deacons' Board of First Church re your Portland telegram concerning me, may I be granted a little space in *The Gospel Witness* to make two or three comments.

First re the fundamentalist meetings held a few years ago in First Church. It is true my opinion was asked of a Toronto brother in view of special meetings the Toronto brethren had in mind. My criticism of the meetings to my Toronto correspondent was that there was too much emphasis on extreme premillennialism and not enough emphasis on evangelism. The meetings lasted four days and four nights. They cost from \$1,300 to \$1,600 and there was not one direct appeal to the unsaved. As one of my good deacons remarked: "Think of it, over \$1,300, four nights' meetings, and not one appeal to a soul to come to Christ!" The evening meetings, in my judgment, should have been thoroughly evangelistic, reaching out to the unconverted.

I had no thought of disparaging the great fundamentals. I do most sincerely believe in the Bible as the inspired word of God from Genesis to Revelation. I do believe in the personal and visible return of our Lord. Many of the messages were good, and were deeply appreciated. But amid all that I maintain the conference should have been better balanced to have made it more effectively evangelistic.

Secondly, concerning Prof. MacNeill of Brandon College, and my attitude on the Brandon College Commission. You will agree with me it is heart-breaking business when any body of people seek to drive a minister out of a church. Ministers as a whole greatly resent it. It is equally so when attempted on a college professor. One needs to be very

sure of his ground. If there is doubt he is usually willing to give it in favor of the accused. I feel sure, Dr. Shields, this was your attitude, when at the Bloor St. Convention in 1910 you seconded the resolution which retained Prof. I. G. Matthews in McMaster University, to many even then, conceded as an avowed modernist.

I am quite sincere in assuming that at the Bloor Street Convention you acted according to your best judgment, after hearing Prof. Matthews' own statements. Will you accord to those who signed the Brandon Commission's Report the same courtesy?

We heard Dr. MacNeill for two hours. He was closely questioned by the most conservative men on the Commission. We heard his concise statement of faith. He himself asserted he was not a modernist. He did not deny any fundamental of the faith. It is true he held one or two mental reservations as to the Virgin Birth, but which did not in the judgment of the Commission constitute a denial.

It is only fair to say the Commission's decision was influenced more by Dr. MacNeill's statements, rather than by the philosophical evaluation (not Dr. MacNeill's) found in the Report on pages 19 to 20, which you so severely criticize. I believe Dr. MacNeill should be judged by his own statements made on pages 17 and 18 of the Report. Not that I endorse everything in that statement. It would not be my statement of faith. But it could scarcely be called a statement of a destructive critic. Nor did Dr. MacNeill so class himself, when in sending his statement of faith to the Greater Vancouver Ministerial Association, he concluded his letter by saying:

"May I briefly add that through either misrepresentation or misunderstanding or both, the Vancouver Baptist Ministerial Association seems to have been placing me in a wrong category, viz., in the number of these destructive critics who either deliberately or through religious indifference seek to undermine the fundamentals of Christianity. Doubtless there are some such critics, but I refuse to be associated with them."

Nor did the Greater Vancouver Baptist Ministerial Association so consider him when after examining the statement submitted to them, they unanimously passed the following resolution:

"Having heard the answers to the questions sent by this Association, the Board of Governors of Brandon College, re the character of the theological teaching of Professor MacNeill, it is resolved that we, The Baptist Ministerial Association of Greater Vancouver, hereby express our satisfaction with the same, and, in view of the assurance they give us, declare our purpose to do what we can to restore the full confidence of our people in our work at Brandon, and to lead them to its hearty and generous support."

These men were strong fundamentalists, and even if they later regretted their action, they certainly passed the Resolution on the evidence before them. If Dr. MacNeill denied any fundamental of the faith I would be compelled to register my opposition, as you later felt compelled to register yours against Prof. Matthews.

You call Rev. John Linton to witness against Dr. MacNeill. May I call one equally conservative, equally sacrificial in the ministry, for he is giving his life to India, and one who remained in Brandon College more years than Mr. Linton, being a Brandon graduate. Rev. John Hart, of India, writes under August 10th, 1925, these extracts:

"I never heard Dr. MacNeill deny in class a single doctrine of the evangelical faith. My sole criticism of Dr. MacNeill was one which concerned his method of teaching 'Bible 2'. I felt throughout this class that he appealed too much to the head and not enough to the heart.

"Dr. MacNeill is one of my best friends, and no one has helped me so much in my spiritual life, especially after the war, as he did. The fact that I am in India to-day is due in some measure to his

sympathetic and helpful guidance at a critical period of my life. I owe a personal debt of gratitude to Dr. MacNeill which far exceeds that which I owe to any other member of the faculty of Brandon College."

Some years ago when I was holding evangelistic meetings at the College, Dr. MacNeill never missed a service. No one in the College gave me more loyal support in soul-winning. Such an attitude is in full keeping with his record.

I have written at greater length than I intended, but hope you will do me the courtesy of giving these explanations a place in your columns.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) H. H. BINGHAM.

#### The Editor's Comments on Dr. Bingham's Letter.

Dr. Bingham's second paragraph contains an interesting admission. In our reply to the Calgary deacons, published in *The Gospel Witness* of December 16th, we referred to a letter from Dr. H. H. Bingham quoted by "a certain McMaster professor". We did not then name the professor, for, while absolutely certain of the accuracy of the report, we thought it possible the incident might not be remembered by the professor in question, in which event our statement would be challenged and cited as a sample of the inaccuracy of this paper. Nor did we state that Dr. Bingham's letter was a reply to an enquiry made by the professor in question. Dr. Bingham frankly acknowledges having written such a letter and says: "My opinion was asked of a Toronto brother in view of special meetings the Toronto brethren had in mind."

It was evident from such an enquiry that the "Toronto brother" had some misgivings about the Calgary meetings, and therefore enquired of Dr. Bingham.

Three of the brethren named by the Calgary deacons were Drs. J. C. Masee, A. C. Dixon, and W. B. Riley. These names were well known to the Baptist world: Dr. Masee was then pastor of the Baptist Temple, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Dr. Dixon had just returned from England where for some years he had been pastor of Spurgeon's Tabernacle; while Dr. Riley's position was, of course, known to all the American continent. But the "Toronto brother" seems to have had some doubt of the character of the Calgary meeting. The "Toronto brother" was himself supposed to be a thoroughly orthodox man.

The meetings which were in prospect had not been planned by the Baptist Bible Union—for that organization was not yet born. Nor were they planned by the much-hated Pastor of Jarvis Street Church—for he had nothing to do with them: they were meetings which were to be held under the official auspices of the Toronto Baptist Association, and had been arranged by the Executive Committee of that organization. Why then should the ministry of these outstanding men, who were thus officially invited by Toronto Baptists, be called in question by this "Toronto brother"? That they were called in question is established by the fact that Dr. Bingham's letter quoted by this brother was referred to for purposes of criticism of the Calgary meetings.

We observe Dr. Bingham says his criticism was "that there was too much emphasis on extreme premillennialism and not enough emphasis on evangelism". That being so, the "Toronto brother" was not quite fair to Dr. Bingham in what he quoted from his letter; for we have no recollection of any reference being made to a lack of the evangelistic note; we distinctly recall the criticism was to the effect that the meetings were obviously designed to propagate the theories of verbal inspiration and premillennialism. This portion of Dr. Bingham's letter has been sufficiently answered by Dr. W. B. Riley in an article appearing elsewhere in this issue.

We refer to this matter here that our readers may be informed that there was a "Toronto brother" who was but half-hearted—if not actually in opposition—respecting the coming of these three great preachers to Toronto; and who assumed this attitude before there was any Baptist Bible Union to blame, and before it had become the McMaster habit to ascribe everybody's sins to the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church. And here it may be in place to state that the "certain McMaster professor" to whom we referred in our letter to the Calgary deacons was none other than Dean J. H. Farmer.

We are not surprised that Dr. Bingham should say, "I do most sincerely believe in the Bible as the inspired word of God from Genesis to Revelation. I do believe in the personal and visible return of our Lord." We always supposed that to be his position.

We agree entirely with Dr. Bingham in the suggestion of his fourth paragraph, that every man should be accounted innocent until he is proved guilty, and that where there is a doubt the accused should be given the benefit of the doubt. That, however, does not account for the position we took at the Bloor Street Convention in 1910. The amendment which we seconded, and which had been moved by Rev. John MacNeill, was in the following terms:

"The Convention approves of the statement touching the attitude of the University to the Bible presented to the Senate on the 15th November, 1909, by the members of the Theological Faculty and relies on the Senate and Board of Governors to see that the teaching in the Institution is maintained in harmony therewith."

In the speech delivered in that connection we expressed our entire dissent from Dr. MacNeill's speech while seconding his motion. His address had been a plea for compromise. We seconded the motion because we understood it threw the matter back to the Senate and Board with instructions to maintain the teaching of the Institution in harmony with the standards of the statement of the Theological Faculty. Notwithstanding, we have ever since regretted that action, though, at that time, we had no idea that men would sign a statement saying they believed one thing, and teach the very opposite in their classes the next morning. And we seconded Dr. MacNeill's motion in the confidence that the Board of Governors would quietly deal with the matter, and that Professor Matthews would be allowed to withdraw, hoping thus to save the Convention from disruption. That was our thought and hope, but we plead guilty to having been, on that occasion, the innocent cause of the defeat of the protest made by that noble saint, Dr. Elmore Harris. Had the issue come before another Convention, even a week later, when we had had time to acquaint ourselves with the facts, we should have opposed Dr. MacNeill's motion to the last ditch. But we frankly acknowledge that our action on that occasion was a mistake, and as we have said before, we have tried to "bring forth fruit meet for repentance" ever since.

There is no parallel between our action on that occasion and that of Dr. Bingham. We had never had opportunity of personally examining the professor; nor, having made the mistake, did we in the face of overwhelming evidence attempt to maintain a position wrongly taken.

In Dr. Bingham's fifth paragraph he tells us that Professor MacNeill asserted that he was not a modernist, that he did not deny any fundamental of the faith—the most extreme modernist in America will say precisely the same thing! The difficulty is, however, they deny that the fundamentals are fundamentals. This is true both of Fosdick and Faunce.

Dr. Bingham says it is true Professor MacNeill held one or two mental reservations as to the Virgin Birth, but which did not, in the judgment of the Commission, constitute a denial. Why should a man hold reservations respecting the Virgin Birth? The fact is, the Scripture plainly teaches it,—as Dr. MacNeill readily admits, and even declares that he taught that the Scriptures taught it. But if language means anything, his reservations implied that he did not believe it. Professor MacNeill's reservations, beyond the shadow of a doubt, involve the rejection of the authority of Holy Scripture.

We now come to paragraph six, in which Dr. Bingham says, "It is only fair to say the Commission's decision was influenced more by Dr. MacNeill's statements, rather than by the philosophical evaluation (not Dr. MacNeill's) found in the Report on pages 19 and 20, which you so severely criticize."

But what is the "philosophical evaluation" of which Dr. Bingham speaks? It is simply the official report of the Commission of which Dr. Bingham himself was a member. The report concludes:

"This report is unanimous, with the exception of one paragraph marked with an asterisk, from which Mr. Maguire dissents, and three paragraphs marked with an 'x', from which Messrs. Maguire and Baker dissent.

Signed by the members of the Commission, D. R. Sharpe, W. E. Matthews, N. Wolverton, Archibald Ward, H. H. Bingham, A. F. Baker, Gabriel Reid Maguire, Wm. C. Smalley, Edgar J. Tarr, W. G. Carpenter, Chairman."

We have read Professor MacNeill's statements, and so far as we are able to judge, the "philosophical evaluation" of his statements made in the report, and unanimously approved with the exceptions named, is an accurate representation of the case. BUT WHETHER IT BE SO OR NOT, THAT WAS THE COMMISSION'S FINDING, AND THAT WAS WHAT DR. BINGHAM SIGNED, AND THAT WAS WHAT THE CONVENTION WAS ASKED TO APPROVE,—AND NOW DR. BINGHAM TELLS US, OR AT LEAST IMPLIES, THAT IT IS NOT FAIR TO JUDGE PROFESSOR MACNEILL BY DR. BINGHAM'S OWN REPORT!

But in this discussion we are not considering Professor MacNeill primarily: we are considering Dr. Bingham; and surely any man was justified in forming an opinion of Dr. Bingham's attitude by a study of the report for which Dr. Bingham's own signature made him responsible. And if that report does not overwhelmingly convict Professor MacNeill of being, not only a modernist, but an extreme modernist, then language has no meaning at all. The Commission's "philosophical evaluation" is contained in six paragraphs, in every one of which the Commission itself admits the Professor had some mental reservations respecting every single fundamental of the faith.

We published the questionnaire submitted to Professor MacNeill by the Greater Vancouver Ministerial Association, with Professor MacNeill's answers, in our issue of December 16th. However that body of ministers were persuaded, even for one moment, to accept Professor MacNeill's answers, we confess it is difficult for us to understand; but we think it is distinctly to their credit, that "they later regretted their action", as Dr. Bingham tells us. OUR CRITICISM OF DR. BINGHAM CONSISTS IN THIS, THAT, HAVING ENDORSED SO PRONOUNCED A MODERNIST AS PROFESSOR MACNEILL, HE HAS NEVER SINCE REGRETTED HIS ACTION, AND EVEN IN THE LETTER ABOVE, DEFENDS HIS COURSE AND THE PROFESSOR!

It is of no value to be informed by Professor MacNeill that he refuses to be classed with the destructive critics: his teaching puts him in the class of such critics just as surely as the black skin of a negro proclaims him to be an Ethiopian. We are frankly of the opinion that if, with the evidence only of the Commission's report before him, without the direct statements of Dr. MacNeill to which Dr. Bingham says he listened, Dr. Bingham can approve of Professor MacNeill as an evangelical, we respectfully suggest that Dr. Bingham himself is in urgent need of a further course of instruction in Evangelical Theology.

The character reference submitted by the Rev. John Hart, of India, in our judgment, is far from constituting a certificate of orthodoxy. A man must be very hard up indeed when he can get no one to speak well of him! We have never met Professor MacNeill, we have nothing in the world against him as a man, we are prepared to take at face value all that is said about the attractiveness of his personality; but foreign mission fields under the Northern Baptist Convention, at least in some parts, are reeking with Modernism—and we have no doubt that many of those who are being supported by foreign mission money, while they deny the faith of Christ in foreign lands, would enthusiastically tell us that they were in that foreign country because of the influence of certain professors. In our humble judgment, though we know nothing of Mr. Hart, his defense of such teaching as Dr. MacNeill's is less a certification of Professor MacNeill's soundness than a revelation of his own attitude toward evangelical truth.

We are greatly indebted to Dr. Bingham for his letter. Inadvertently, he pleads guilty to everything we said about him. We knew Dr. Hinson, we knew his position; and, with the report of the Brandon Commission before us, and Dr. Bingham's full endorsement at this late date of his own and his fellow-commissioners' action in approving Professor MacNeill, we declare with greater emphasis than ever our profound conviction that we were justified in our opinion that Dr. Bingham's attitude in this instance proves him to be utterly lacking in such heroic qualities as would be necessary in one who would gird on the armour which the great and noble Hinson had put off.

## LETTER FROM WAVERLEY ROAD PASTOR.

Toronto, January 4th, 1927.

Editor, *The Gospel Witness*,  
130 Gerrard St. East,  
Toronto.

Dear Dr. Shields:

The enclosed letter was sent on December fifteenth, to the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist*, for the purpose of self-defence against the indictment as stated therein. The letter was returned with the following explanation:

"The time to do any discussing of these issues was at the Convention. The Convention has registered its decision and I am not giving any space now to any further explanation. Everyone had his opportunity to say anything he wanted to say at that public gathering."

To this explanation I reply by quoting Rev. Walter Hughes of Forward Baptist Church, in his Convention report, as printed in *Breakers Ahead*, a pamphlet sent out by Rev. John Linton, page 9:

"I sat quietly and listened for hours while men spoke in favour of McMaster and its policy. I interrupted in no way. Might I also say that those not favouring McMaster's policy gave a fair hearing to every speaker. I wish the same could be said of the other side. No sooner would a speaker come to the platform representing the minority than the church would be filled with shouts and heckling and cat-calls that would have disgraced a political gathering. The chairman, who was very fair in his control of the debate, found it necessary to repeatedly arise and demand that the speakers on the minority side be given a fair hearing. I have never heard such unfair howling and hissing, even at a rugby game.

It was only after repeated requests that Mr. Linton was allowed a hearing at all and then a time limit of four minutes was set. It was stated that the hour was too late to hear more. Mr. Linton spoke for a few minutes amid constant interruptions and some demands to be brief, and finally with Mr. McDiarmid of Stratford on his feet demanding that he be heard no longer, the speaker walked from the platform with his message undelivered."

As your paper reaches many of my brethren in the territory of the Northern Convention, I wonder if you might not give me the opportunity of defence denied me by *The Canadian Baptist*, and at the same time, an opportunity to inform my brethren over there what one of their Canadian brethren has to say about them. That such bitter indictment against such men as the late Dr. W. B. Hanson, Drs. Matthews, Farr, Riley, Rake, and hundreds of other Baptist pastors should go unchallenged, is unthinkable. The letter enclosed is the identical copy as returned to me. Trusting it may be acceptable for publication in your paper, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

DAVID ALEXANDER.

"Waverley Road Baptist Church,  
129 Waverley Road, Toronto 8, Ont.,  
Dec. 15, 1926.

Editor, *The Canadian Baptist*,  
223 Church Street,  
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Sir:

I have waited until now before sending this letter for publication, as I considered that the Convention reports and decisions should have preference of time and space in a paper which serves our Baptist people.

Though a citizen of the United States, I was British born, and that reference to 'British love of fair play', so often made on the Convention platform, appealed to me.

This letter is a request, in the interest of fair play, for the opportunity.

through *The Canadian Baptist*, to refute a statement made by one of the speakers during the Education Session of the Convention.

Here is the statement (found on page 18, *Proceedings of the Educational Session*, published under instructions of the Convention by the executive committee of the Convention):

"Take the North. Thoroughgoing fundamentalists like Dr. Brougher, President of the Northern Convention, Dr. Francis, and Dr. J. C. Massee of Tremont Temple, not one of them is willing to identify himself with the Baptist Bible Union. And is it any wonder that Dr. A. C. Dixon, shortly before he died, repudiated publicly his membership in it and all connection with it, for the simple reason that the spirit and method of the movement could not be tolerated by any man who wanted to retain his self-respect?"

I sat under the ministry of Dr. A. C. Dixon for over two years, while a student in Chicago, and I know that such a reason as that given in the statement above never came from his lips; therefore these words 'the spirit and method of the movement could not be tolerated by any man who wanted to retain his self-respect' were the speaker's own.

Then let me here say that the above was an indictment against every member of the Baptist Bible Union, having special reference to the Northern Convention territory as the next sentence begins, 'Then take our own Convention'. As a believer in British fair play, I trust you will grant me the privilege, through *The Canadian Baptist*, to defend myself and many of my brethren of the Baptist Bible Union of the Northern Convention, who, if they had opportunity, would defend themselves.

I have had the honour to hold the office of President of the 'Iowa Christian Fundamentals Association' (succeeding Dr. J. R. Macartney, brother of Dr. Clarence, late Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly), also the honour to have been president of 'The Baptist Bible Union of Iowa', the strongest State organization in the North, yet I claim the privilege of saying that I have not lost my self-respect. Nor did my much loved friend and brother, the late Dr. W. B. Hinson of Portland, ever lose his self-respect, though a leader with us in the Bible Union movement in our Convention.

And further: I want to brand the said statement of Dr. John MacNeill as bitterly unkind, totally un-Christian, and absolutely untrue.

I am willing to be counted as one having 'no reputation' without protest; but to be condemned as one who has lost his self-respect, I protest against such an indictment as one which falls little short of character assassination.

As the statement was so publicly made, and now in the *Proceedings* become more public, I trust a sense of fair play will open your pages to as public a protest.

Yours in Christian Service,

(Sgd.) DAVID ALEXANDER."

P.S.—Since sending this letter, I have been reading the sermon delivered in Walmer Road Church, "The Ongoings of God", by Dr. MacNeill, as printed in *The Canadian Baptist* of November 11th, on page 7. Why are the words "could not be tolerated by any man who wanted to retain his self-respect" omitted? Why the change? Would the original have been too strong for Walmer Road? Let Dr. MacNeill answer.

#### FLYING DEFENDERS OF FUNDAMENTALISM.

Dr. W. B. Riley, Pastor of the First Baptist Church, and President of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, is ready to launch a new movement in connection with the fight that Association has been putting up for the old faith. He is holding a conference in the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, January 9th to 16th, at which time there will be organized what will be known as the Flying Defenders of Fundamentalism. This organization will be much like the Flying Squadron of the prohibition cause. Dr. Riley says that Gerald B. Winrod, of Wichita, Kansas, editor of the magazine, *The Defender*, will head up this company and that among the speakers will be Dr. Arthur I. Brown,



the famous Vancouver surgeon, who played so conspicuous a part in the Florida and Mississippi campaigns against Evolution; Harry Rimmer, of Los Angeles, California, the President of the Science Research Bureau; Dr. Douthitt, of Kansas City, the widely-known evangelist, and Rev. W. E. Hawkins, Jr., of Fort Worth, Texas—a man whose fight for the faith in that State has given him a large reputation. Dr. Riley says that these are all young men—University graduates in every instance, and men thoroughly capable of holding their ground in any educational circle.

The President of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association also affirms that there will be presented during the year an anti-evolution bill in the State legislatures of Minnesota, Montana, Kansas, Arkansas, and other states are under advisement. Dr. Riley affirms that fundamentalism has won its battles in Tennessee, Mississippi, Florida and Oklahoma, and will, in all probability, force the conflict in Kentucky again this coming year. Up to the present our victories have largely been in the South, but he adds, "We are confident that the Northern territory, which has suffered still more from this false philosophy, is even a better ground for our warfare than is the Southland. Minnesota is overwhelmingly against the evolutionary hypothesis. The battle will be between the common people and a certain professor contingent in our colleges. Martin Luther's movement was looked upon as folly at the first, but in the course of time it triumphed. The twentieth century reformation is as sorely needed as was that of the sixteenth."

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 2.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 1.

Lesson 6.

First Quarter.

February 6th, 1927.

### SIGNS AND WONDERS.

Lesson Text: Acts, chapter 5: 1-16.

Golden Text—"And believers were the more added to the Lord" (Acts 5:14).

#### I. THE SIN OF ANANIAS AND SAPPHIRA.

1. Partnership in sin brings bitter consequences, even though it be done in a good cause. 2. Men may succeed in deceiving one another, but God is never deceived. 3. The temptation to lie, even in an indirect way, is here clearly seen to be a "giving place to Satan", who is the father of lies. 4. Perhaps there is scarcely any phase of Christian life in which there is greater temptation to deception than in this matter of giving. Men deceive themselves and others. 5. The presence of God is not always revealed in dispensations of mercy; still He may make His presence felt by terrible things in righteousness. 6. Such examples should teach us to be afraid of treating sin lightly. We cannot trifle with God: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the Living God". 7. Judgment is often the precursor of blessing. The death of Ananias and Sapphira was as truly a sign and a wonder as the healing of the cripple at the Beautiful Gate. 8. A holy fear fell upon the people because of this judgment. It is one of the marks of the wicked that they have no fear of God before their eyes. 9. Yet grace triumphed, and multitudes were added to the Lord, and great miracles of healing were wrought in the Name of the Lord.

#### II. SPIRITUAL REVIVAL IS ALWAYS ACCOMPANIED BY A PROCESS OF SEARCHING AND SIFTING.

1. Revival power invariably discovers the false professor as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira. 2. When the false professor is separated from the company of believers, conversions are multiplied. 3. When men are visited by God, they are invariably inspired with a desire to bring others within reach of blessing.

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 686.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

## A SUGGESTIVE LETTER.

A pastor of Allegheny, N.Y., writes:

"Pastor's Study, Allegheny, N.Y.

"Dear Sir:

"Now that the smoke of battle has cleared away, concerning the 'Brougner Resolution,' please permit an interested pastor to ask some pertinent questions, and to state the views and opinions of the pastor of one of the 'small churches' of the Northern Convention

"Was the freedom of the 'local church' assured by the passing of the resolution, or was the ANARCHY OF A LOCAL CHURCH protected?

"In America we are often told that liberty is assured ONLY within the law; and those who disregard our laws and desire to overthrow them are ANARCHISTS.

"Why does not the same ruling apply to certain Baptist (?) brethren who after voting that the 'New Testament is our only rule of faith and practice, and aside from it we need no other,' have deliberately set it aside and are now taking the position of the anarchist, in seeking to overthrow all authority in the affairs of the local church.

"Was not the 'Baptist liberty' argument more of a smoke screen, than anything else? I say yet, YES, INDEED! For on the one hand it allows the liberalist to accept into 'full membership' unbaptized folks, and then denies those once accepted into FULL MEMBERSHIP, the privilege of FULL MEMBERSHIP, in being appointed as delegates to the N. B. C. as representatives of their own church.

"It certainly seems to me that instead of protecting and assuring the liberty of the local church, that the resolution has decidedly denied the local church the liberty it promises them.

"And then consider the 'EQUALITY OF ALL BAPTIST BRETHREN' that we have boasted about so much; when one will be able to say to another, in future days, 'I am better than you, for I have been baptized and you have not, and I am eligible to become a delegate and you are not.'

"It seems that the resolution is entirely inconsistent, for any Baptist body, and altogether contrary to Baptist principles.

"It takes the nature of a clever CAMOUFLAGE on the part of its advocates, for instead of exercising the part of true Baptist leaders, in advising the local church as to what is truly Baptist and what is not it DICTATES TO THE LOCAL CHURCH WHAT IT CAN AND CANNOT DO IN THE LOCAL ASSEMBLY IN ITS OWN GOVERNMENT, APPOINTMENTS, ETC., thus becoming an EXTREME DICTATOR, instead of a friendly advisor.

"I have been telling our folks that all members before the convention are 'born free and equal,' am I right or am I not?

"In other words, can anyone be a member of a Baptist church without being immersed, or does the Baptist church believe in degrees of members, or have they a system of 'probation' which makes them 'respectors of persons?'

"It seems to me that the only true Baptist position would be to adopt the 'Riley Amendment' and then 'we could go home and tell our people, WE ARE still BAPTISTS.'

"Yours and His for 'THE faith once held by Baptists.'

(Signed) "WALTER GROGN."

## Facts and Fancies in the Canadian Controversy

By W. B. Riley.

I am at this moment a guest of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church delivering a series of four addresses on "The Blight of Unitarianism"; and am also being privileged a part in the opening of the Toronto Baptist Seminary. This absence from my own desk, and presence on the field of controversy, gives me an opportunity to study these Canadian incidents in which my name has been mentioned; and to give to the readers of both *The Canadian Baptist*, and *The Gospel Witness*, the facts involved in the fallacies that have been uttered concerning me.

### THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION INCIDENT.

I hold in my hand the Proceedings of the Educational Session of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, held in First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, October 19th, 1926, and named an "official stenographic report", "Published under instructions of the Convention by the Executive Committee of the Convention". I take it, therefore, that this publication carries an accurate and dependable record of what was said. If so, let me call attention to certain facts involved, and fallacies that found expression on the lips of one Mr. Warner. On page forty of these Proceedings, he is reported to have said,

"Two years ago the Baptist Bible Union in Convention, fearing the modernistic tendencies of the studies that our young men on this continent were following in certain colleges and seminaries, and stating that the texts that they studied were modernistic in their influence, suggested that instead of that they would have a series of books that they would commend, and if the young men pursuing the ministry would compass that reading course, they would undertake to guarantee to them ordination when they came before ordination councils."

Now this statement carries with it more than one fallacy. First of all it assigns to the Baptist Bible Union, the origin and adoption of this substitute reading course. That reading course did not originate with the Baptist Bible Union, but with me as an individual; and while it was approved by the Baptist Bible Union, their approval had nothing whatever to do with its appearance, or its adoption by the Convention as such, for a large proportion of the Baptist Bible Union are not even members of the Convention, and the organization has never asked recognition from the Convention in any form. That fact must have been known to Mr. Warner, since his claim to have gotten from the Northern Baptist Convention Minutes the basis of his statement makes it perfectly clear. The name of the Baptist Bible Union is not shown in the Northern Baptist Convention Minutes, nor is there any hint that they had aught to do with this matter, in fact the Convention had no such knowledge. The members of the committee appointed were three, and two of these members are not in the Baptist Bible Union, nor even sympathetic with it. As the author of the substitute reading course, I was put on the committee which is wholly a proper parliamentary procedure, as I happen to be a life member of the Northern Baptist Convention, and my church contributes many thousands *per annum* to its causes, and through its channels; and my standing in the Convention has never been called into question by any living man.

But an equally serious misstatement, and one that on its face looks like a deliberate intent to deceive is Mr. Warner's phrase:

"If the young men pursuing the ministry would compass that reading course, they would undertake to guarantee to them ordination when they came before ordination councils."

It would be foolish for any company of men, and particularly a company made up largely of people not members of the Convention itself, to attempt "to guarantee ordination" to every young man seeking the same. What we did agree to do was "to defend in ordination councils the course and conduct of every young man seeking ordination, who had compassed this course as having met the actual requirements of the Convention, and as being better fitted for the ministry by having substituted sound teaching for a modernistic course."

That applied not to the limits of the Northern Convention, but to our actual influence in every Convention. Could less be expected of any men than that they should defend their own convictions of right, and are they open to charges of inconsistency on that account? Either Mr. Warner had all the proofs in this matter before he made his statement, which would leave him without justification, or else he did not have them, which would leave him easily open to error. At any rate the printed records give to the interested public the facts, and reveal the fallacies of which Mr. Warner was guilty in that statement.

#### HIS ATTACK UPON DR. SHIELDS WAS MOST UNWARRANTED.

The truth is that when I brought this matter of the alternate reading course before the Baptist Bible Union for consideration, Dr. Shields opposed certain names in the course. This had passed from my memory until I had my attention called to *The Baptist Beacon* record made at the time, and that revived the whole, particularly did he object to having Vedder's name occur in the list. I reminded him that this book of Vedder's that we were recommending was sound, and he said, "No matter, if you use the name of a man in recommending a sound book, it will be accepted by your friends as a commendation of him, and they will read his unsound ones; and will be used by your enemies to show your inconsistency." He seems to have known Mr. Warner's spirit, and that of other brethren, better than I did, for I answered, "In my extensive readings of modernists I find no indication whatever that they ever peruse the pages of a fundamentalist volume. Dr. L. S. Keyser, the greatest book reviewer in the States, says that he never sees any evidence in their books that they read orthodox literature. Should we not be broader than that, and if a man writes a sound book, commend it even though he should speak unsoundly in others?" Not only so, but I remember distinctly to have added, "In commending these books of Vedder's, we commend the volumes of a virile man in middle life as against the skepticism of his senility, and a discerning reader will appreciate that fact." Of course since it was a matter that was to come before the Northern Baptist Convention and Dr. Shields was an outsider, he yielded, and my judgment obtained, and the course I had prescribed went before the Northern Baptist Convention without a change. I affirm again that I believe it to be a fact that Mr. Warner has not found in the books which we adopted, the sentences that he himself employed in the Convention to discredit our course, but that he has taken them from other writings of these authors. A man who is suddenly called upon to explain and defend historic incidents, and who does not have the written record of events before his face, may easily blunder in memory, and be wholly sincere. But when a man appears before a Convention with documents in hand, as Mr. Warner did, and then deliberately distorts or misinterprets them, he is not guiltless. An instance of this sort is Mr. Warner's statement when his former declaration was challenged to this effect, "It appears in the records of the Northern Baptist Convention as having been presented by the Baptist Bible Union." We now call upon Mr. Warner to present any such records, and we herewith declare that they are not in existence, and in the nature of the case could not be in existence. Up to this present hour, we have a habit in the States that I am trusting will obtain. We are doing our best to keep this controversy on a theological basis, and save it from the degradation of personal slurs or abuse. I find also that I am involved in the

#### BINGHAM AFFAIR.

In this matter I have been helpless, as my name has been introduced a number of times without any word from me. But now that it has become the subject of discussion both in Canada and in the States, I deem it wise to speak.

The facts of the Calgary meeting are also misrepresented, perhaps not intentionally. Following the organization of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association in Philadelphia in nineteen hundred and nineteen, I engaged a company of fourteen brethren and made a cross-continent trip, holding meetings in New York City; Buffalo, N.Y.; Minneapolis; St. Paul; Des Moines; Denver; Great Falls; Calgary; Edmonton; Vancouver; Seattle; Tacoma; Portland; Los Angeles, and Colorado Springs. It was a difficult and daring undertaking. I had not a single dollar with which to commence this campaign.

but in the conviction of the dire need, I dared risk an expenditure of above twenty thousand dollars in order to put over this programme. There was not a man in the party who had a pass; for every man railroad fare must be paid, also, hotel bills and incidentals. The printing bill was a large one, with constant advertisements in the papers in the cities in which we appeared; great amount of secretarial service, and I sought to give these men such salaries as they could command in each instance, and represented their respective abilities. In all the larger cities the meetings were eight days in length, and in Calgary they were exactly that length, eight days, beginning with Sunday, and concluding on Sunday, for I concluded the meeting myself there. In a few of the cities such as Great Falls, Montana, and Vancouver, we held meetings but four days, but in Calgary eight, including two Sundays. When it is known that I had in my party Henry Ostrom, President Charles Blanchard, Dr. J. C. Masee, Dr. A. C. Dixon, Dr. Leon Tucker, Dr. W. L. Pettingill, Rev. B. L. Fallman the singer, and advance man, Coutts, the great English pianist and McKee the great tenor singer, and a portion of the way, W. B. Hinson, Mark Matthews and others, you will recognize the fact that I was not putting on any ordinary programme in any of these towns. The result was that great crowds came, and the money was willingly contributed without the least high-pressure method. I know, since I attended to the financial part of it myself. And in Calgary it was in no sense an offering from First Baptist people, but it was a city offering instead, as it was in every city in which we appeared. In Calgary, I am happy to say, I exceeded my expense account. My memory is that my expense account there was one thousand dollars, and they gave twelve hundred dollars. In other cities they fell sadly behind to the extent of five hundred dollars, and such cities as Calgary, Seattle, and Portland, made up what was lacking in the less responsive places. I appreciated it, and did not imagine for one moment that I would ever have a criticism in that connection, and in fact, I waited for eight years before I heard it.

The criticism of the men and the sermons surprise me yet more. If there ever was a company of outstanding evangelists known to the American continent, certainly these men represent them. It is a bit difficult for me to imagine Dr. A. C. Dixon preaching a sermon without an evangelistic note in it. I have heard him scores of times, and I have never heard such a sermon from his lips. I have been pastor of my church for thirty years and my people have a statement that "with Riley all roads lead to Rome; it makes no difference what his subject, it will end in an evangelistic appeal"; and I did not know that I had ever departed from that. Now to expect a series of soul-winning sermons distinctively from men who appeared but a single night each, or at most two, is to look for the impossible; evangelism cannot be done in that way; and to expect a soul-winning campaign from a company of men who have declared their distinct purpose to go into one's church and city to defend the Christian fundamentals, also strikes us as a bit strange. I had been in this church on two previous occasions; I take it, therefore, that my ministry was acceptable or I should not have been so cordially welcomed on this third. And I am very glad to report that I have had invitations back to this same city of Calgary that I was compelled to decline, since that time. It is my clear conviction, therefore, that Calgary itself never had any regrets concerning the campaign of Christian Fundamentalism that was put on, and held in part in the First Baptist Church.

#### THE BRANDON DISTURBANCE.

This is outside my realm of personal knowledge. I did not know Professor MacNeill personally. There used to be a statement, however, that always seemed to me philosophically sound, "There is never a smoke without some fire". I have been head of a school for twenty-four consecutive years. In that time we have had hundreds of students enter our halls, and, with graduation, pass from them. Not one single charge, or even a criticism of teaching on the ground that "it was false to the faith", has occurred in the twenty-four years. I attribute this to the fact that we have not permitted such teaching. As a rule, students love their professors, and never speak against them in such matters if they can conscientiously refrain; in fact, their common mistake is on the other side, as in the instance of Slaten in William Jewell College, Mis-

souri. They keep still until the matter leaks to the outside, and even then when it is flagrantly foul, they commonly come to the defense of the false teacher. Such is the loyalty of youth. I have naturally supposed, therefore, that there must have been occasion at Brandon, or the criticisms would not have occurred.

Again, the whole matter impresses me as a part of present customs. I heard the President of the theological seminary in the University of Chicago, defend George B. Foster as a sound man, after his book, *The Finality of the Higher Criticism* was written. I witnessed, as all the world did, the defense of the faculty and student body of Slates at a time when his theology unfitted him to be even a conscientious pastor of a Unitarian church. I was in the vicinity of Shurtcliffe, Ill., when the head of religion in their school was refused ordination by the council called for that purpose, because of his false views, and I saw him defended by students and members of the faculty. And when certain other conscientious members of the faculty protested against his teaching, I saw them summarily dismissed to seek a living as best they could. In fact, I can not recall an instance in which a board of regents, or a faculty had taken the initial steps in trying heretics; they uniformly white-wash and pronounce them sound.

In truth, destructive modernism is only a mental mirage, so modernists would have us believe. They will deny the inspiration of the Scriptures and every essential feature of Deity; they will scoff the blood atonement, and hold to contempt the second coming; and then turn around and blandly affirm, "We also are fundamentalists". The Marshall affair that is disrupting the Ontario and Quebec Convention has recently brought to the surface the statement that there are no critics in Canada, they are all fundamentalists. Have we not recently had it authoritatively stated through the pages of the Ontario and Quebec official Baptist press that there are no modernists in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec; and, notwithstanding the circumstances that the Northern Convention includes Evans, Matthews, Parsons, Vichert, Cross, Faunce, Vedder, Shailer Mathews, and Harry Emerson Fosdick, our official paper, *The Baptist*, following the Convention in Seattle said,

"There never was any controversy on in the convention between modernists and fundamentalists. If modernists were present as delegates they were so few as to be negligible. This talk of modernists in the Baptist denomination, if by the word 'modernist' is meant men who deny the evangelical faith, is pure bunk".

Can you beat it?

#### "WITNESS" NEWS.

The following letter has been sent us from the Chicago Office of the Baptist Bible Union. Enclosed with this letter was a list of three hundred and fifty names, to which copies of the Northern Baptist Convention number of *The Gospel Witness* will, by this time, have been sent. It is extraordinary the demand which still continues for this number; already the issue for this number equals the combined circulation of *The Watchman-Examiner*, of New York, and *The Baptist*, of Chicago, and, like Oliver Twist, they are still asking for more!

\_\_\_\_\_, November 16th, 1926.

Baptist Bible Union of N.A.,  
Monon Bldg.,  
Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed please find list of names. Send to these names, without delay, the copy of *The Gospel Witness* which contained the story of the last Northern Baptist Convention. I want these people to read that.

If you haven't enough of these copies left, send as far as you can, and let me know.

I will send you the money for this right away, or as soon as you send me the bill.

Yours very truly,  
(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_

**THREE GREAT OPENING DAYS.**

The Toronto Baptist Seminary opened its doors for classes Tuesday morning, January 4th. The course proposed for the twenty-one weeks is published elsewhere. The morning classes began with fourteen full-time students enrolled. Most of the forenoon of the first day, however, was spent in earnest prayer to God for His blessing upon the institution; and it was an occasion which those present will never forget. Tuesday evening was spent in another concert of prayer, three to four hundred people assembling in the church auditorium for this purpose.

Dr. W. B. Riley, of Minneapolis, came to us for Wednesday and Thursday, speaking briefly to the students Wednesday morning, and afternoon and evening of the two days in the auditorium of the church. His messages were great deliverances on, "The Blight of Unitarianism, or Modernism", one of which is published in this issue.

We were rejoiced to see Dr. Riley in such splendid health, as full of vigour and of fire as ever.

Thursday at 6 o'clock nearly three hundred gathered at the usual Dorcas Tea which was especially arranged to afford opportunity to many to meet Dr. Riley. Among the ministers present were: Revs. W. E. Atkinson, A. H. Peer, W. F. Mesley, G. W. Allen, J. G. Conners of Hamilton, W. F. Roadhouse, W. J. Thomson of Long Branch, Alex. Thomson, W. J. H. Brown, W. J. Millar, W. G. Brown, David Alexander, B. Klochkoff, John Currie; Pastors Oscar Boomer, Hooper of Bromte, Jas. McGinlay, and others.

Mr. Thos. Urquhart, for thirty years or thereabout solicitor of the Home Mission Board, was present and spoke a few words of greeting.

At the evening meeting on Thursday, Rev. David Alexander read the letter which appears over his signature elsewhere in this issue.

Dean McMar announced that up to Thursday evening, eighteen morning students, and twenty-eight evening students, had registered; while many other applications had been received.

For this auspicious opening we give God thanks. Anyone who desires information respecting the Seminary will please write: Rev. W. J. Millar, Toronto Baptist Seminary, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto.

We ask our interested friends to join us in prayer for three things: first, that God will send us the right students, men and women of His own choice; secondly, that the teachers may teach in the power of the Holy Spirit; and thirdly, that the Lord will send us the necessary funds to carry on the work. Dr. Riley predicted we were likely to be poor, but said he would be most happy to hear that someone had left us a million dollars. Our need is great, and we can use all the money we may receive in equipment and in strengthening our courses. Dr. Riley called attention to the significant fact that his own institution, Moody Bible Institute, and several other now large and prosperous colleges, began with only seven students; and expressed the fear only that we were starting on too large a scale!

**SINCE OUR LAST ISSUE IN JARVIS STREET.**

A great Watch-night Service was held Friday night until past the midnight hour, and perhaps the largest New Year's morning meeting, Saturday morning, at 10 o'clock we have ever seen. The prayer room was crowded again on Saturday night, and on Sunday there was much blessing at both services, a number responding to the invitation on each occasion. Seven candidates were baptized, and twenty-eight received the hand of fellowship at the Communion service which followed, which was attended by a little over seven hundred people.

**TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY—CURRICULUM.**

**MONDAY:** 1:00, Devotional Study, Rev. W. J. Miller; 2:00, The Work of the Ministry, Rev. T. T. Shields; 3:00, Prayer and Fellowship, Ministers and Students; 9:00, Exposition of S. S. Lesson, Rev. T. T. Shields; **TUESDAY:** 8:30, Students' Prayer Meeting; 9:00, Bible Doctrine, Rev. W. J. Miller; 10:00, The Epistle to the Hebrews, Rev. W. J. H. Brown; 11:00, Old and New Testament Introduction, Rev. A. Thomson; 7:30, English I, Miss J. Watson; 8:15, Old and New Testament Introduction, Rev. A. Thomson; 9:00, The Epistle to the Hebrews, Rev. W. J. H. Brown; **WEDNESDAY:** 8:30, Students' Prayer Meeting; 9:00, Bible Doctrine, Rev. W. J. Miller; 10:00, Evangelism, Rev. W. J. Miller; 11:00, Homiletics, Rev. T. T. Shields; 7:30, English I, Miss J. Watson; English II, Miss E. Fuller; 8:15, English I, Miss E. Fuller; English II; Miss J. Watson; Greek I, Rev. W. Gordon Brown; 9:00, Greek I, Rev. W. Gordon Brown; **THURSDAY:** 8:30, Students' Prayer Meeting; 9:00, Bible Doctrine, Rev. W. J. Miller; 10:00, Greek I, Rev. W. Gordon Brown; 11:00, Old and New Testament Introduction, Rev. A. Thomson; 2:00, Hebrew, Rev. W. Gordon Brown; 7:30, Old and New Testament Introduction, Rev. A. Thomson; 8:15, English I, Miss E. Fuller; Hebrew, Rev. W. Gordon Brown; 9:00, Bible Lecture, Rev. T. T. Shields; **FRIDAY:** 8:30, Students' Prayer Meeting; 9:00, Bible Doctrine, Rev. W. J. Miller; 10:00, The Epistle to the Hebrews, Rev. W. J. H. Brown; 11:00, Pastoral Theology, Rev. T. T. Shields; 7:30, Bible Doctrine, Rev. W. J. Miller; 8:15, The Epistle to the Hebrews, Rev. W. J. H. Brown; 9:00, Preachers and Preaching, Rev. T. T. Shields.

**BAPTIST BIBLE UNION CONFERENCE, COLUMBUS, OHIO.**

A Baptist Bible Union Conference will be held in the Central Baptist Church, 27 East Russell Street, Columbus, Ohio, January nineteenth to twenty-first. Following is the programme:

**WEDNESDAY:** 7:45, Dr. T. T. Shields, Toronto, Canada, "The Need of a Great Revival." **THURSDAY:** 10:00, Prayer; 10:30, Rev. Earl Griffith, Toledo, Ohio, "Healing the Baptist Breach"; 11:15, Open Forum, led by Rev. H. O. Vanilder, State President; 2:45, Rev. C. E. Tulga, Niles, Ohio, "Spiritual Pacifism"; 4:00, Rev. R. E. Ketcham, Elyria, Ohio, "The Pre-eminent Christ"; 7:45, Dr. T. T. Shields, Toronto, Canada, "Was the Washington Decision a Victory for Fundamentalism or Modernism?" **FRIDAY:** 10:00, Prayer; 10:30, Rev. H. S. Tillis, Portsmouth, Ohio, "The Place of Prayer in the Defense of the Faith"; 11:15, Open Forum, led by Dr. T. T. Shields, National President; 2:45, Rev. W. E. Atkinson, Field Secretary, "Is There any Organization within the Northern Baptist Convention which is Loyal to the Christian Faith and to Baptist Principles?"; 4:00, Rev. G. W. Supplee, Kohima, Assam, India, "The Missionary and His Message"; 7:45, Dr. T. T. Shields, Toronto, Canada, "The Consecration of Aaron and His Sons".

**BORROWING IS GOOD  
BUYING IS BETTER!**

Have a "Witness" of your own.  
Two Dollars per Year.