

A SOUTHERN EDITOR ON THE CANADIAN BAPTIST SITUATION

Page 10

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.

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. 6. No. 18. TORONTO, SEPT. 8th, 1927. Whole No. 280.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

Shall Fundamentalist Baptists Challenge the Convention to Excommunicate Them, or Withdraw and Form Another Convention in October?

An Address by the Pastor.

Delivered in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, September 4, 1927
(Stenographically Reported.)

"And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:

"To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you."—Galatians 2:4, 5.



O whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." The text refers to a very serious controversy which threatened the unity of the apostolic church. There were certain men who professed to accept the gospel, who believed in the essentials of the Christian faith, but who insisted that the ceremonialism of the law must also be observed. The Apostle Paul took strong grounds against that position, and argued that salvation was of grace through faith, and that men were saved without the deeds of the law. In the text I have read to you the Apostle Paul rehearses the history of that controversy, and tells somewhat of his own part in it, declaring that certain false brethren had been brought in unawares, privily to spy out their liberty in Christ Jesus, and to bring them again into the bondage of mere ceremonialism. Then he says that he did not give place to these Judaizing teachers by subjection even for an hour, but he withstood them, his motive being "that the truth of the gospel might continue with you."

Paul goes further in the chapter which I read, and mentions certain persons of prominence who had taken part in this controversy. He shows that even the Apostle Peter, long after Pentecost, long after his marvellous experience with Cornelius at Cesarea, betrayed the old weakness, and showed that there was an element of cowardice in him that needed always to be kept under by the power of the Spirit of God. He tells us that he withstood Peter to the face: You see, Paul was not unfair: he did not indiscriminately charge everybody with cowardice, but he named the man—as it is fair for anyone

to do. Paul had been associated with Barnabas, Barnabas had been his travelling companion in much of his missionary work; but he tells us that even "Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation"; and he does not spare Barnabas, great and good man as he was, but insists that the truth must be upheld, and he contended for the truth in order that the truth of the gospel might continue with them.

There are many people to-day who profess to be soundly orthodox, truly evangelical in their faith; but they say, "We do not believe in controversy; nothing is ever gained by controversy." A minister called on me one day to give me some advice, and he said, "Whenever I find my ministry unacceptable, I run." I was half-minded to tell him, had that principle been literally applied, he would have been running most of the time! It was true in his case. With an air of authority he presumed to tell me that controversy was not of the Spirit of God! But the truth of the gospel has ever been conserved by this means. Humanly speaking, what would have happened if the Apostle Paul had not stood his ground, even against James, and Cephas, and Barnabas, and all the other leaders of the church? They all weakened, they were all prepared to surrender, to compromise; but this one mighty man of God stood out against them, and said the reason he did not submit for one hour was that "the truth of the gospel might continue with you." And we are indebted to a great host of men who from that day until now have followed in Paul's footsteps.

I remember at the Ottawa Convention the Pastor of Bloor Street Baptist Church told the Convention that the church in time past had prospered just in the measure in which it had avoided religious controversy, and said, "I appeal to the Professor of Church History to say whether or not this be true." When I replied, I could not help saying that when I heard Mr. Cameron make that statement I wondered if he had ever heard of a man called Luther, or John Knox, or Wycliffe? if he had ever read the story of the martyrs of the Christian faith? if he had ever heard of a man called Paul?—if, indeed, he had ever heard of a greater than Paul, the Master Himself? and whether he had ever read the New Testament? and whether it had ever dawned upon him that the New Testament was born in controversy, and that there is scarcely a page of it that was not written to set someone right who was going wrong? On Mr. Cameron's referring to the Professor of Church History, I recommended to him then, and I recommend it to him now, that he consider the advisability of taking a post-graduate course in Church History, at that time, at least, he was badly in need of it! And so are some of the rest of you for that matter. But let it be clearly understood that that principle, the principle of controversy, will be found operating through all the history of the Christian Church; the purity of the gospel and of the Christian church has been maintained because there have been some who refused, even for an hour, to submit to those who would corrupt the truth of God.

In one sense the controversy in which Paul engaged was less serious than that in which we are engaged to-day. If men appeal to divine authority, though they be wrong, there is hope that by and by they may become right; but when men repudiate divine authority, and close their minds against the teaching of the Book, and set aside the Word of God, then there is nothing before such men but hopeless and ever-increasing apostasy. And that is the problem we have to-day. I know there are matters of great moment which have engaged the thought of theologians in time past, and which have been the subject of polemical discussion, and I would not underrate the importance of these lesser matters—the various aspects of the coming of the Lord; and many other matters—but we are face to face in our day with the fundamental question as to whether God has spoken at all, and as to whether God was manifest in Christ Jesus the Lord.

So much for the principle. I desire to discuss this evening the application of it, when I have paused for a moment to say to any of you Baptists that if you are religious pacifists, if you take a neutral position in this great controversy, if you take the position that controversy is wrong, that we have no right to contend for the faith, then I say you had better go back to your Bible, and get down on your knees and ask God to teach you something; for you have the testimony of Scripture and the whole history of the Christian church dead against you; and I greatly suspect, if you carefully analyze your own case, you will find your judgment is being warped by your disinclination to take a posi-

tion which is somewhat unpleasant, and which is likely to disturb your daily fellowships. In other words, at the root of that pacifism there is, I venture to say, in every case, perhaps not consciously,—but at the root of that non-combatant position there is a want of absolute loyalty to Jesus Christ. The man who will put Jesus Christ first, and who will bow absolutely to His authority, is bound to be intolerant of those things which take the crown from His brow and the sceptre from His hand.

What is all the controversy about in our Denomination? I speak to Baptists particularly this evening—and the rest of you may listen in—and not merely to this congregation: I am speaking through the printed page to-night particularly. I believe I am correct in saying that there is scarcely a Baptist church in the entire Convention of Ontario and Quebec that is not represented in the list of our subscribers to *The Gospel Witness*. So I desire to talk to-night to the whole Convention, and every church in the Convention; and I ask those who read these words in remote places where perhaps we have but few representatives, to see that this printed word is passed around so that thousands and tens of thousands may hear the discussion in which we engage this evening.

What is it all about? Fundamentally, it is all about this Book, that is what it is about. Some of us believe that the Bible is the Word of God, that it is supernaturally inspired, that from Genesis to Revelation it is full of Christ Who is the Incarnate God; and that this supernatural revelation—this supernatural record of the supernatural revelation of God in Christ Jesus—promises a supernatural experience, a supernatural salvation, a deliverance that is not human but divine, and, ultimately, perfection before the throne of God. There are those who deny that the Bible is the Word of God, and that is what the controversy is about. Do not let anybody blind your minds, for that is the matter in a nutshell: as to whether we have divine authority in the Scriptures of truth.

There is a determined effort—there has been for many years—to convert the institutions and organizations of our Baptist denomination into instruments of Modernism that will deny the supernatural. I would remind you Baptists, touching it only in passing, of the presence for years of Professor I. G. Matthews in McMaster. His presence was countenanced and defended, by men who are even now in control of that institution. Never have they apologized, never have they anywhere acknowledged that it was wrong to retain him—but there he was. Now that he has gone to Crozer, and has published a book, it is an open secret that all that the late Dr. Elmore Harris said of him was true, and a hundredfold more; but when he was here it was denied by Dr. Farmer and by the whole Faculty of McMaster—he was defended up to the hilt, as they are now defending Professor Marshall.

Prof. Matthews went away. Then they tried to capture *The Canadian Baptist*, and you all remember the controversy we had in Ottawa in 1919.

In 1922, just after we began the publication of *The Gospel Witness*, I said some things about McMaster. I am still a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster, and have a notice of a meeting of the Board next Friday; I am invited to go, but do not know whether I shall go or not. Among other things to come before that Board is an offer from somebody to buy Woodstock College. In 1922 I told the Convention that the Board of Governors were guilty of wasting money in maintaining an institution in Woodstock that was not doing Baptist work, and charging up to the Baptist denomination an average deficit of more than ten thousand dollars a year. I was berated at that time by Dr. Frank Sanderson who spoke to the Convention, and amid great applause, told them that I did not know what I was talking about. But Woodstock College is closed—and they are proposing to sell it! Its closing was announced in 1926, less than four years after the Convention at which I called attention to its mis-management. I just mention that in passing.

You will all remember the Faunce incident, when Dr. Faunce was honoured by being made a Doctor of Laws or Divinity, Doctor of Laws, I think it was. We protested against it. From this pulpit I protested, and I protested personally directly to the Chancellor of the University; and the Senate read me out of the Denomination in January, 1924. And yet in the fall of that year the Convention repudiated the action of the University, and instructed the University never to repeat the blunder. Mind you, only three years ago, for the first

time in the thirty-six years of McMaster's history, the Baptist denomination refused to vote confidence in McMaster University. Dr. Farmer and the rest of them came home from that Convention gnashing their teeth, determined to reverse that judgment; and they deliberately imported Professor Marshall from England, a known Modernist, in order that the controversy might be gathered about a personality instead of around a principle.

You remember the Hamilton and First Avenue Conventions. In both cases the most objectionable political methods were employed. When a ballot vote was taken at Hamilton, a Baptist minister, in taking the ballots from the people, took one from the hand of Professor Keirstead, whose orthodoxy was well known, separated that from the others, and then, going into the scrutineers' room, held up that separate ballot and said, "Keirstead voted against us". What do you think of that for a Baptist minister? If that had occurred in any political election, and it could be proved that it occurred, it would have invalidated the election, and the man guilty of it would have gone to prison. Yet that man is a Baptist minister, and was appointed again the next year to do the same thing. When you are fighting Modernism, you are fighting lawlessness. I know the gentleman's name, I am quite prepared to call him by name; and I warn the Convention that if they dare to appoint him as a scrutineer this year I will call him by name.

What have they done? From the very beginning they have done what Modernism always does: they have refused to discuss the issue, and they have attacked the person. I have got so used to it that it does not concern me at all personally. I suppose while they are doing it with me, some other brethren may escape! But up and down this Convention they have gone everywhere maligning and slandering the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church and the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*. For your information, I may tell you that the Dean in Theology has declared his belief that the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church is insane! I have reminded Dr. Farmer of that several times—he is a man of very short memory, and he needs to be frequently reminded! Well, I do not know that I need to defend myself. I have stood in this pulpit now for seventeen and a half years. Before I came here, under the guidance of one who was then Chairman of the Board of Governors of McMaster University, the Committee, before they invited me—I did not know it then—investigated every church that I had ever served, and every church in which I had held an evangelistic meeting; they turned over every page of my life's history, and with every page open before them, they called me to this church. I was quite respectable for many years! I was looked upon as somewhat of an amiable gentleman! Not so very long ago I was regarded as the champion conciliator of the Convention. For years I was on the Home Mission Board, and whenever there was any difficulty I was always sent to settle it. Just think of sending me to settle trouble! But that is a matter of history. A man cannot very well live in the open as I have done if he is altogether such a bad man. I remember reading a story of an old 'busman who used to drive an omnibus down Newington-Butts in London. One morning as they were going along approaching the Metropolitan Tabernacle, the crowds were going along the sidewalk, and some stranger sitting on the top of the omnibus seeing the sights of the city, asked the man next him where all the people were going. "Oh", he replied, "they are going to hear that fool Spurgeon". The old driver—it was in the days before motor 'buses—turned around and said, "Sir, I have been driving a 'bus on this route for more than twenty years, and every Sunday, rain or shine, summer and winter, about this hour of the morning you will see the thousands thronging to hear Spurgeon, and if Spurgeon were a fool somebody would have found it out before this!" But a man who comes from we scarcely know where, and who has been here a few months, is hailed as an apostle of a new liberty, and those who have served the Denomination, some of us for twenty-five or thirty years, are to be deprived of our reputations, and labelled as outcasts, in favor of his new doctrine.

And so they have taken measures to exclude us from the Convention. You have all heard about the Parliamentary Bill. Our Convention Constitution had been granted by Act of Parliament, and of course it could not be amended without Parliamentary enactment; but the extraordinary thing about this is that the Executive of the Convention has gone to Parliament and has secured the

passage of a measure through Parliament, subject to the approval of the Convention! One might have supposed that the reasonable course would have been for the Convention to take action upon the matter, and when the Convention had approved of it, then Parliament could have granted it; but the object was to get this Bill through Parliament, and introduce it to the Convention with all the prestige of a measure that had passed the Private Bills Committee, the House of Commons, and the Senate of the House, and then say to all the delegates at the Convention, "Who are you to dare to dissent from this Bill which has passed the House of Parliament and the Senate!"

I desire to tell you about that Bill to-night. I shall tell you something of how that Bill was passed. I am going to read a statement by Dr. John MacNeill. It is in *The Canadian Baptist*—and, according to some people, that must be true!

"Dr. Shields says: 'Dr. MacNeill states what is contrary to fact in saying that nearly all the great Baptist Conventions in United States and Canada have such powers', and adds, 'We do not know of one'—(This is Dr. MacNeill's reply, listen to it carefully)—'In reply we name the three largest Conventions in the United States and refer him to section 1 (a) of Article 1 of the by-laws of the Northern Baptist Convention; Article 2, Section 1 of the Constitution of the Baptist General Convention of Texas; Article 3 of the Constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention. For Canada we cite the constitutions of the United Baptist Convention of the Maritime Provinces and of the four Conventions of Western Canada, which permit the adoption and exercise of the power which will be conferred on our Convention under the amending Act.'"

I have here an article which appeared in the last issue of *The Western Recorder*. The Baptists of the South are a great host. There are three and a half millions of white Baptists in the Southern Baptist Convention; and *The Western Recorder* is perhaps the most influential of all the Southern Baptist papers. It is published in Louisville, almost under the eaves of the greatest Baptist Seminary in the world, the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, of which Dr. E. Y. Mullins is President. Dr. Victor I. Masters is the Editor of this paper, and he publishes on the front page of *The Western Recorder* excerpts from the pamphlet issued recently by Dr. C. J. Holman—our own Dr. Holman. (If you have not had a copy, I hope you will get a copy as you leave). I quote two or three paragraphs of Dr. Masters' comments on this article which are in black type for emphasis.

Let me read Dr. MacNeill's statement again:

"We name the three largest Conventions in the United States . . . Article 3 of the Constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention".

Dr. Masters is the Editor of *The Western Recorder*, published in Louisville, which is really, perhaps, more than any other place, the headquarters of the Southern Convention. This is what he says:

"Southern Baptists will be grieved and shocked at the proposal of the majority group in the Canadian Convention to arm themselves with power to exclude from representation in that Convention any minority, however large, wherever the majority can manage to muster a three-fifths vote to put them out. It will be seen that the only requisite to the exclusion of the offenders, as provided in the Acts of Parliament, is that they shall have displeased the three-fifths majority to the extent that the three-fifths majority want to get rid of them. Essentially that is what it means. They can apparently put them out for anything"—(these are the words that are emphasized in black type)—"If any such proposition was ever before seriously made in any Baptist body in the world we have never read of it. In the South where Southern white Baptists and Negro Baptists together number more than seven millions, we have never even heard proposed any such high-handed, ruthless, procedure to give control to a majority either in a church, or within any other Baptist organization—District Association, State Convention, or Southwide Convention."

Dr. MacNeill says that he is asking, and that he asked Parliament, for just what all other Conventions had. Dr. Masters says that if there is any

other Baptist Convention in the world that has it, he has never even heard of it!

Once again: Dr. Masters speaks of the difficulties they have had in the South, and says this, which he prints also in black type:

"But it never once entered the mind of any Baptist in the South that it was possible, or even thinkable, that a majority would fortify themselves against a minority in the Convention by voting itself power to kick out the minority or its leaders, because, forsooth, in its opposition to the judgment of the majority the minority appeared to be 'out of harmony with the aims and objects of the Convention'—that is, out of harmony with what the majority might find it expedient to declare to be 'the aims and objects of the Convention'."

Then he calls attention to something that Dr. Holman has said—this also is in black type:

"Dr. Holman eloquently declares that the proposition to exclude the troublesome minority never arose in connection with worldliness in the churches, or in connection with card playing, theatres, dancing, smoking, etc., in lax churches, or in connection with churches that believe in or practice open communion or the new device for betraying orderliness and faith called 'inclusive membership'. So far as the whole setting of the present action is concerned, messengers from all such churches as these will be warmly welcomed."

And now in capitals Dr. Masters says this:

"BUT—GOD SAVE THE MARK!—A WEAPON IS SOUGHT TO EXCLUDE CHURCHES THAT STAND FOR AN INERRANT GOSPEL, BECAUSE THEY DARE TO OBJECT TO MODERNISTIC TEACHINGS IN THEIR GREAT INFLUENTIAL UNIVERSITY, AND DESPITE ITS GREATNESS AND PRESTIGE DARE TO EXPRESS THEIR OPPOSITION AND ALSO DARE TO REFUSE TO SUPPORT ANY MISSION BOARD THAT DEFENDS OR WINKS AT SUCH TEACHING."

Then the last short paragraph is to this effect:

"If this course is actually put into effect among Baptists—either in Canada or elsewhere—it obviously means the split and wrecking of the denomination. And those who effectuate such a regulation will be in the unbiassed judgment of all Baptists responsible for the wreckage."

That is from the greatest Baptist paper in the South, over against the statement of Dr. John MacNeill. I have gone into that before, and I repeat here that Dr. MacNeill and Chancellor Whidden stood up in the Private Bills Committee in Ottawa and said, in effect, "All we want is that our Constitution shall be made uniform with all the other Baptist Constitutions in Canada and in the United States"; and I affirm that when Chancellor Whidden and Dr. John MacNeill made that statement, they made a statement that was absolutely untrue, and they must have known it was untrue when they made it. That is strong language, is it not? In other words, the men in the Private Bills Committee did not know anything about Baptist usage, and the Bill was carried through by deliberate misrepresentation. That has been the weapon of Modernism all the way through. I am prepared to meet Dr. MacNeill in Massey Hall, or the Coliseum, or any place on earth. Let Dr. MacNeill accept my challenge and meet me anywhere, and I will whip him to a finish. He knows full well that all the facts are against him; yet he dares to make these false statements over his own signature, in order to gain his end.

What does the Bill provide? Two things: first of all, it gives the Convention power to make any by-laws at any time it likes; and again, three-fifths of the Convention can exclude from the Convention any church that, in the opinion of the Convention, is considered to be "out of harmony". It simply means that if it passes by a majority vote,—well, I suppose they will apply it to Jarvis Street Church. I wonder how many members of Jarvis Street would be sorry? It does not give me a moment of anxiety. I frankly declare I have no fellowship with the thing against which I contend to-night; and I contend against it,

staying in the Convention and refusing to submit, only "that the truth of the gospel might continue". There is no other reason for it.

The Bill might be applied to Jarvis Street Church only, but if it is, unless I greatly mistake the temper of Baptists, a great host of people, churches and individuals, will stand with Jarvis Street; that in the day that Jarvis Street Church is excluded from the Convention, Stanley Avenue Church, Hamilton; Grace Church, Toronto; Annette Street Church, Toronto; Willowdale Church, Toronto; Mount Pleasant Road Church, Toronto; Wortley Road Church, London; Long Branch Church; Shenstone Memorial Church, Brantford; and a great many other churches that I cannot name, will take their stand along with us. And in the day that the Convention excludes them from their fellowship simply and solely because they have stood for the Word of God, in that day they will find there will be hundreds, yes, and thousands, who, if the churches to which they belong do not leave as churches, will come out and say, "We have no part nor lot with that principle and spirit". In other words, the passage of that Bill will split the Convention, and the minority—if, indeed, we are a minority—will be a very large one; and I repeat what Dr. Masters has said, that "those who effectuate such a regulation, will be in the unbiased judgment of all Baptists responsible for the wreckage".

But it will not injure the churches that are excluded. Blessed be God! they cannot exclude the Spirit of God; and if we are forced to go without the camp, we shall go gladly bearing His reproach. But the thing I fear is the effect upon those who are left. It will mean the end of free speech. Men will not dare call their souls their own, but this little modernistic group, manipulating the Boards of the Convention, getting control of the organs of the Convention, can, at any time, cut the head off of any pastor who dares to open his mouth. McMaster could call Harry Emerson Fosdick as Chancellor, and there would not be a man who would dare to oppose it, or off would go his head. There would be no liberty of speech at all.

It would be a license to go further. I wonder if there are any neutral Baptists here to-night? I will tell you what would happen: if that Bill is put into effect, within the lifetime of any one now living there will not be another protest raised in the Ontario and Quebec Convention against Modernism; and they will go down the toboggan slide—and I will prove it to you.

There is a church in the city known as Bloor Street Baptist Church, and I desire to tell you something about Bloor Street Baptist Church. I have the Baptist Year Book here, and I find there are at least five members of the Board of Governors of McMaster University who are members of Bloor Street Baptist Church, including the Chancellor of the University. Will you keep that in mind: five members of the Board of Governors of McMaster are members of Bloor Street,—five, including the Chancellor. Five more members of the Senate are members of Bloor Street, and included in the five is the Dean in Arts, Dr. McLay. That is to say, there are no less than ten members of Bloor Street Baptist Church who are members of the Senate of McMaster University. There are only about thirty-three on the Senate altogether, so that practically one-third of the Senate are members of Bloor Street Baptist Church.

Very well, I want to tell you what Ernest Gordon says in *The Leaven of the Sadducees*, page 189, about Rochester Theological Seminary. We shall see the application when I have read it:

"Rochester Theological Seminary was built up into a powerful and useful institution by Dr. Augustus H. Strong, backed by a group of laymen, Messrs. Trevor, Milbank, Hoyt, and the elder Rockefeller. For many years it provided the Baptist churches with loyal pastors and missionaries. But a change has come over its teaching. In his unpublished autobiography, Dr. Strong lays this at the door of Prof. George Cross"—(Professor George Cross is a product of McMaster, and this is Dr. Strong speaking)—"The result of the election of Dr. Cross has been the resignation of some members of the committee and the withdrawal of others from active service. I regard that election as the greatest calamity that has come to the seminary"—(Now listen, mark this)—"It was the entrance of an agnostic, skeptical, and anti-Christian element into its teaching, the results of which will be only evil. The election of Dr. Cross was followed by that of Professors Robins, Parsons"—(Parsons was another product of McMaster

University)—“and Nixon, who sympathized with these views. These men, with Prof. Moehlmann, soon gave evidence in their utterances that a veritable revolution had taken place in the attitude of the seminary towards the fundamentals of the Christian faith.”

Those ten gentlemen in Bloor Street Church know Dr. Cross' position very well, but he is the preacher in Bloor Street Baptist Church this very day! Perhaps he does not speak as long as I, otherwise he would be at it still! I had a report of his sermon taken this morning, and I am having a report taken to-night as well. Dr. Cross was invited to Bloor Street Church, and as he preached this morning the Chancellor was present.

I quote now from Dr. Cross' book, *Creative Christianity*, page 30:

“It is doubtful whether any absolute external authority in matters of faith has been provided or is needed. Similarly, it is doubted whether the series of events recorded as occurring at the beginning of the Christian faith, or at any stage of its progress, are to be considered as supernatural in the sense commonly intended hitherto by that term. Similarly, also, the question whether there was an original supernatural deposit, and, if so, what it was, is now open to perfectly free discussion, without prejudice to the Christian character of him who raises the question.”

Dr. Cross says it is doubted whether there was anything supernatural in the beginning of the Christian faith! And he says you may call in question every supernatural event recorded in the Bible “without prejudice to your Christian character”!

But that is not enough—listen to this from page 75 of the same book:

“The representations which the New Testament writers make of the personality of Jesus must be used with discrimination. The accounts of such scenes as his exorcism of demons, his transfiguration on a mountain top, his stilling of storms, his summoning of deceased persons back to life, his physical ascension into the sky before the eyes of men, picture him as exercising a kind of magical power and as having access to influences of a kind extraneous to our lives. To men of that time these might seem evidences of his high calling, but they make him in a corresponding degree a stranger and an alien to us. In all this our minds are drawn to the region of the mysterious, the unaccountable, the unknowable. With a personality whose native abode is there we can never be at home.”

That last sentence is true! Never—never can these Modernists be “at home” with Jesus Christ my Lord until they bow at His feet and call Him God!

But even that is not enough. Hear this:

“It is even possible . . . that if all the teachings of Jesus were brought together in the exact form in which he gave them, there might be found among them some that would not commend themselves as fixed, and final to the faith of the most intelligent and devout Christians of the present day. Men cannot be called upon to believe things simply because of the name that is attached to them.” (Page 34).

Think of it! a man preaching in Bloor Street Baptist Church to-day, by consent of the Chancellor, the Dean in Arts, and eight others of the Senate of McMaster University, including the Pastor of the church, says that even though we had the very words of Jesus, he would not believe, nor bow to His words, simply because they have the name of Jesus attached to them! If that is not anti-Christian, did you ever read anything anti-Christian?

And as though that were not enough, here is a gem from another of his books, *What is Christianity?*, pages 4 and 5:

“And now after the lapse of all the intervening centuries, it is still an open question whether after all it was not misleading to call Jesus the Christ.”

Shall I read it again:

“AND NOW AFTER THE LAPSE OF ALL THE INTERVENING CENTURIES, IT IS STILL AN OPEN QUESTION WHETHER AFTER ALL IT WAS NOT MISLEADING TO CALL JESUS THE CHRIST.”

If that is not the spirit of anti-christ, will you tell me what it is? "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of anti-christ, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already it is in the world." That is what is in our Baptist denomination! That from the man who this very day, September 4th, 1927, is welcomed to a Baptist pulpit in the City of Toronto with consent of the authorities of McMaster University! "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"

I sometimes wish I were in heaven where time shall be no more! But we shall have no controversy there. I was just about to begin, but I have given you enough surely to show why we should stand against this awful curse of Modernism. If you can tolerate that, you Baptists, then you are not worthy to be called Baptists; if you do not rise up as men and cry out against this apostasy, then you do not deserve to be called Baptists at all.

Last year they put the Convention in the little church on First Avenue. I suppose I offend the dear brethren if I call it a little church, but that is what it is. It is a nice church, a fine building; but there was not room for the comfortable housing of the delegates. I told you this morning that there were crowds of Baptists outside who had a right to hear the discussion, and that the officials of the church called the mounted police to disperse them. A mounted policeman rode through the crowd, forcing them away. Then the doors were locked. When the attention of the police on duty was called to the fact that the doors of a crowded building were locked, he ordered them unfastened, but they were held by gentlemen on the inside. This year the Convention was to have been held in Temple Baptist Church, Windsor, but the Executive Committee were afraid of Western Ontario! They have not forgotten the rebuke they received there in 1924. They were afraid of the temper of Western Ontario Baptists, and have transferred the Convention to Toronto, and have selected Temple Church, unless I am mistaken, a smaller church than First Avenue.

I am indifferent to the result, so far as it can affect me personally. If the Lord allows us to go out, we shall be happy to go out, but, God willing, I am going to be at the Convention when it meets, and I am going to be there all through. It has been the custom of the Convention to open on Thursday or Friday: this year it meets on Wednesday. Does anybody know why? I will tell you why I think the change has been made. This Bill, if passed by a majority vote, does not become effective until it has been published in *The Canada Gazette*. I do not know the exact day *The Canada Gazette* appears, but it is probably the end of the week. The Executive have put the Convention forward that the Bill may be dealt with, and if passed, published in *The Canada Gazette* some time before the Convention closes, that it may be applied in the dying hours of the convention when half the delegates have gone home.

I hope you Baptists are getting ready to fight. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to fight to the last ditch; and if it should be that God permits this iniquitous Bill to pass, we shall fight from the outside as strenuously as we have fought from the inside. We propose to contend for the faith so long as we have breath in our body. If they put us out, there may be some timorous souls left in the Convention of fundamentalist opinions,—I will not say convictions,—but they will not dare to offer any objection; and you will see the Baptist denomination going down the toboggan slide to the malarial Modernistic swamps as fast as it can go. We shall have Faunce, Cross, Matthews, Vedder, and all the rest of their school, preaching in Baptist pulpits. Then some Baptists will wake up, and they will discover that some of us differed from them only in that we could see a little farther. Unless they arise and protest, the Baptist denomination will go down the slide as did the Methodist Church when it endorsed Prof. George Jackson. From the day that that was done, there has not been a Methodist minister who has dared to open his mouth. It will be the same with us. It is high time that Ontario and Quebec Baptists should awake out of sleep!

"WRECKING THE BAPTIST DENOMINATION".

Dr. C. J. Holman's new pamphlet on the above subject is a masterly summary of the present controversy among Canadian Baptists. Copies may be obtained without charge by writing the author, 75 Lowther Avenue, Toronto.

Editorial

AN UNBAPTISTIC PROPOSAL IN CANADA.

The following article is taken from *The Western Recorder*, of Louisville, Ky., of September 1st, and is by the pen of Dr. Victor I. Masters, the Editor. His reference in the first paragraph is to a front-page article consisting of excerpts from a pamphlet by Dr. C. J. Holman entitled "Wrecking the Baptist Denomination". We have quoted from this article in the sermon appearing in this issue. It may be doubted whether anyone knows the history of Southern Baptists particularly, and of the Baptists of the world generally, more thoroughly than Dr. Masters. The article proves beyond peradventure that the passage of the amending Bill for the Constitution of the Ontario and Quebec Convention was secured by the grossest misrepresentation on the part of Drs. H. P. Whidden and John MacNeill in their statements before the Private Bills Committee at Ottawa. This matter is fully discussed in the address of last Sunday evening published elsewhere in this issue.—Editor of *The Gospel Witness*.

A careful perusal of the article by Dr. Holman beginning on page 3 of this paper, will suggest to the reader that the conflict between Modernists and regular Baptists in Canada has reached the point of desperation. Of particular interest, because of its bearing on the traditional Baptist principle of liberty, is the proposition which is being nursed by the present dominant group in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec to exclude from the Convention any of the minority element they desire to get rid of.

The dominant element has obtained from the Parliament an Act empowering a three-fifths majority at the Convention to exclude from the Convention any churches which, in the opinion of the three-fifths majority, "are out of harmony with the aims and objects of the Convention". This act does not become operative, however, until it is made so by a majority vote of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. But, the Act was secured by elements from the dominant group within the Convention with the idea that, properly empowered by the State, they would be able to put their proposition across in the Convention itself.

We have for Canadian Baptists the highest consideration and esteem. We hold them in the same esteem and respect which we have for all other Baptist bodies, and which we all appreciate on the part of Baptists in other bodies for our own great Baptist group in the South. We are discussing the proposed action among Canadian Baptists without any disposition unduly to interfere with their internal life. We would be far from wounding our brethren by unkind remarks. We are discussing it because the present proposition, should it become effective, would destroy a fundamental principle of Baptists. We are discussing it for the further reason that the division out of which this proposition was born as a stratagem of war, is over the question whether or not the traditional faith of regular Baptists is to be sacredly upheld and taught in an educational institution which, by its charter, was given to Baptists to teach and conserve their historic faith.

Concerning both these questions, whether they arise among Baptists in England, or Europe, or Canada, or the Northern organization of the United States, or the Southern organization, there is not only a right, but an obligation on the part of any Baptist publicist who wants to deal fairly and honestly with an intelligent Baptist constituency that trusts him, that he should discuss them in a way to inform his readers of the truth.

Western Recorder readers who study even that small proportion of the pamphlet of Dr. Holman which we reproduce, will, we think, be forced to the conclusion that McMaster University has indeed departed from the faith of Baptists to which it was sacredly committed by its charter. That it might smile upon the new philosophy of Modernism, and give it countenance and harborage, allowing it the privilege of propagandizing through the class rooms of the institution, the institution has betrayed inspired Bible teachings as held

by all true Baptists. There has been a deal of rumor to this effect. As usual in such cases, the rumor has also been heatedly denied. But the direct testimony given by professors in McMaster University, as quoted by Dr. Holman, together with his own highly competent testimony, seems to leave no vestige of doubt.

Southern Baptists will be grieved and shocked at the proposal of the majority group in the Canadian Convention to arm themselves with power to exclude from representation in that Convention any minority, however large, wherever the majority can manage to muster a three-fifths vote to put them out. It will be seen that the only requisite to the exclusion of the offenders, as provided in the Acts of Parliament, is that they shall have displeased the three-fifths majority to the extent that the three-fifths majority want to get rid of them. Essentially that is what it means. They can apparently put them out for anything. If any such proposition was ever before seriously made, in any Baptist body in the world we have never read of it. In the South where Southern white Baptists and Negro Baptists together number more than seven millions, we have never even heard proposed any such high-handed, ruthless, procedure to give control to a majority either in a church, or within any other Baptist organization—District Association, State Convention, or Southwide Convention.

The Southern Baptist Convention has successfully passed certain anxious periods of divisive discussion during the last few years. The division was marked on more than one occasion and in not a few quarters a feeling of partisanship existed. Fellowship and confidence were imperilled. But it never once entered the mind of any Baptist in the South that it was possible, or even thinkable, that a majority would fortify themselves against a minority in the Convention by voting itself power to kick out the minority or its leaders, because, forsooth, in its opposition to the judgment of the majority the minority appeared to be "out of harmony with the aims and objects of the Convention"—that is, out of harmony with what the majority might find it expedient to declare to be "the aims and objects of the Convention".

The reader of Dr. Holman's utterance will have little difficulty in arriving at the real purpose of the proposed action. Dr. Holman declares that the proposition never was thought of until the discussion arose within the Convention pro and con concerning Modernism, this discussion carrying with it on one side the allegation of an unhappy tendency within McMaster University to give comfort to the "new liberty" claim by Modernism.

Dr. Holman eloquently declares that the proposition to exclude the troublesome minority never arose in connection with worldliness in the churches, or in connection with card playing, theatres, dancing, smoking, etc., in lax churches, or in connection with churches that believe in or practice open communion or the new device for betraying orderliness and faith called "inclusive membership". So far as the whole setting of the present action is concerned, messengers from all such churches as these will be warmly welcomed.

BUT—GOD SAVE THE MARK!—A WEAPON IS SOUGHT TO EXCLUDE CHURCHES THAT STAND FOR AN INERRANT GOSPEL, BECAUSE THEY DARE TO OBJECT TO MODERNISTIC TEACHINGS IN THEIR GREAT INFLUENTIAL UNIVERSITY, AND DESPITE ITS GREATNESS AND PRESTIGE DARE TO EXPRESS THEIR OPPOSITION AND ALSO DARE TO REFUSE TO SUPPORT ANY MISSION BOARD THAT DEFENDS OR WINKS AT SUCH TEACHING.

We agree with Dr. Holman that it is a time for deep and heart-searching prayer and meditation. It is hard for us to believe that the majority in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec will be blind enough to the sacred Baptist principle of democracy and of fair play for it to seek to make effective the right given it by the legislative Act which some Canadian Baptists have secured from the State for that purpose. Such a legislative act would not have been necessary in the United States, if any Baptist Convention desired so much to secure a majority victory as to commit hari-kari. But despite the possibility at any time of any Baptist body in the United States voting such an indefensible rule, it has never entered the mind of any Baptist group even in the heat of the bitterest partisanship to make such a mock of the Baptist principle of democracy.

We hope and believe that on sober second thought the friends of McMaster University, and still more the statesmanship of Canadian Baptists at large which looks for the future usefulness of Baptists in Canada, will refuse to effectuate the proposed regulation. Doubtless this legislative instrument can be used to drive out of the Convention churches or individuals whom the drivers find it hard to bend or break to their course. But even if the would-be drivers should be right in their contention on the disputed points and the would-be driven were wrong, for a Baptist Convention to secure the ends desired by those who in a given session may muster a majority vote by a regulation by which a three-fifths vote can silence opposition by throwing it out of the Convention, is an irregular and indefensible procedure among Baptists.

If this course is actually put into effect among Baptists—either in Canada or elsewhere—it obviously means the split and wrecking of the denomination. And those who effectuate such a regulation will be in the unbiased judgment of all Baptists responsible for the wreckage.

BRITISH COLUMBIA BAPTISTS.

We print below an article from *The British Columbia Baptist*, the official organ of the newly-organized and incorporated "Convention of Regular Baptists of British Columbia." It will be observed that the Baptist Convention of British Columbia, a unit of the Baptist Union of Western Canada, adopted a change in the Constitution in the identical terms of the amending Bill which passed the Parliament at Ottawa, and which is to be considered at the next meeting of the Ontario and Quebec Convention. The article speaks for itself.

We have not yet heard with what majority the British Columbia Convention adopted this amendment, but we remember that two or three years ago the Baptist forces of British Columbia were just about evenly divided, the balance of power being held by the largest church in the Convention, the First Church of Vancouver. The First Church, Vancouver, had been served for some years by Dr. J. L. Campbell, one of the ablest preachers Canadian Baptists have produced, and one who to this day stands loyally by the Bible as the Word of God. The First Baptist Church, Vancouver, in the main, was, at that time, believed to be orthodox, and the British Columbia Convention seemed likely to withdraw from the Union of Western Canada on account of the heretical teaching of Brandon College.

About this time Dr. J. J. Ross became Pastor of the First Church, Vancouver. Dr. Ross was supposed to be a Fundamentalist. He was one of the signatories to the call which brought together the first Fundamentalist Conference before the meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention in Buffalo, in 1920. But when Dr. Ross was appointed one of the Vice-Presidents of the Northern Convention at Indianapolis, he immediately became a tool in the hands of the Modernist machine, and from that time betrayed the cause of Fundamentalism. On going to Vancouver he adopted the same tactics. Although Professor Harry MacNeill was still in Brandon College, and was just about as extreme a Modernist as Harry Emerson Fosdick himself, Dr. Ross found no difficulty in supporting Brandon College and the unbaptistic, autocratic, ecclesiastical, machine known as the Baptist Union of Western Canada. He threw the weight of his influence against the Fundamentalists of British Columbia, and took the side of the supporters of Brandon College. The responsibility for division among British Columbia Baptists, beyond all peradventure, must be laid at the door of Dr. J. J. Ross.

We shall secure the fullest possible information about the British Columbia situation, when we shall pass it on to our readers.

THE CONVENTION OF REGULAR BAPTISTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

The above is the new name of the fellowship hitherto known as the Baptist Missionary Council of British Columbia.

After the adoption of the new Constitution by the Baptist Convention that was in session in Vancouver, June 27th to 30th, by which the churches in fellowship with the Missionary Council were automatically excluded from the fel-

lowship, it was deemed necessary to call a meeting for the purpose of waiting upon God for wisdom, concerning steps to be taken as to our future. The meeting convened in Mount Pleasant church Wednesday evening, June 29th. The first part of it was given to prayer. There men and women poured out their hearts to God in supplication for divine guidance. It was a time of real spiritual fellowship, and was richly appreciated after spending the greater part of the day in an atmosphere that savored of division and controversy.

Following the season of prayer, time was given for informal discussion and suggestion. Pastors, and other members of the churches represented, freely expressed themselves. There were notes of sadness because of the severing of ties that had obtained through the years. There were expressions of relief, of hope, of joy as the various aspects were mentioned. Unanimously the meeting was of this mind, that we were in the will of the Lord and that now it was for us to go forth with Him without the camp bearing His reproach; that our business must be to do the will of Him who called us into this fellowship; it must be ours ever to remember too, that if God be for us none can be against us.

The outcome of the meeting was the passing of a motion authorizing the Board to proceed with such steps as it believed necessary for the preservation of our work in British Columbia.

The Board met at the close of the meeting. With one or two exceptions every member of the Board was present, and it was decided that the first step to be taken was in the direction of the incorporation. Consequently a committee was instructed to proceed to this end.

Previous to these meetings a mass meeting had been called for the afternoon of Friday, July 1st. In due time this meeting convened in Mount Pleasant church. It was a well attended and inspiring meeting, at which a new Constitution was considered clause by clause. The statement of faith to be included in the deeds of incorporation was also read. Both were finally adopted and the necessary preliminaries completed for incorporation. And now the Incorporation is registered and complete, and we have passed from being THE BAPTIST MISSIONARY COUNCIL OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, to being THE CONVENTION OF REGULAR BAPTISTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. Space forbids that we should herewith publish a copy of the Constitution with Statement of Faith. These, however, will in due time appear in printed form that all interested may have a copy.

All Out—But Not Down.

As was anticipated, the new Constitution proposed for consideration and adoption at the recent Baptist Convention held in Vancouver, was adopted without vital change or amendment. In it there is a disciplinary clause which reads as follows: "The Convention may from time to time at any annual or special meeting by resolution passed by a vote of three-fifths of the delegates present and voting declare any church, the conduct or attitude of which in the opinion of the said Convention is not in harmony and co-operation with the work and objects of the said Convention, shall cease to be entitled to send delegates to the said Convention and thereupon any and all delegates of any such church in attendance at such meeting shall cease to be delegates, and any such church shall cease to be entitled to send delegates to any meeting of the said Convention. The said Convention may in like manner at any subsequent annual or special meeting revoke any such resolution or resolutions." Art. II, Sec. 3.

Accordingly the churches that enjoyed fellowship in the late Missionary Council are excluded from fellowship or participation in the Convention, because that, in the opinion of the Convention, or a majority of the Convention, they are "not in harmony and co-operation with the work and objects of the Convention." Article II. of this new Constitution states in seven sections what the work and objects of the Convention are. Among them is: "To co-operate with the Conventions of Baptist churches of the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba in forwarding and carrying out the work and objects of the Baptist Union of Western Canada," etc. But the Missionary Council churches cannot see how they can with clear conscience engage in such co-operation.

In the Constitution of the Baptist Union of Western Canada under the

caption of POWERS OF THE UNION, Article 5, in three Sections declares that the Union shall have control in the supervision of Missions in the various Provinces, in the collection of funds, and in matters of policy. There is, however, Article 17, which states that this Article 5 shall not apply to the Convention of British Columbia in these three respects. Or, in other words, the Convention of British Columbia has heretofore not been co-operating with the Conventions of the other Provinces "in forwarding and carrying out the work and objects of the Baptist Union of Western Canada." The passing of the New Constitution, as we see it, must now mean the repealing of Article 17 (for which provision is made in By-law 22) and bringing the Convention of British Columbia along with the other Conventions, under the control of the Baptist Union of Western Canada as regards supervision of Missions; collection of funds, and matters of policy. We do not believe in such control. It is subversive of the great principle of liberty for which Baptists have ever stood, and which is inwrought in the very warp and woof of their beings.

Another Section dealing with the work and objects of the Convention reads: "To carry on and further such educational work and to maintain such Baptist Educational Institutions as may be from time to time inaugurated."

This seems to us to bring the Convention in line with Brandon College, and with whole-hearted support of that institution. If it does not, it at least binds the several members of the Convention on pain of excommunication to the support of every Educational Institution "as may be from time to time inaugurated." It does this, too, without giving the least semblance of assurance that such institution shall, or must be on a true Baptist doctrinal foundation, and shall teach nothing that is subversive of Baptist faith. Already we have an Educational Institution in Brandon where a Professor holds views that are in our estimation a denial of what is taught in the word of God—a denial of what true Baptists hold as a trust of their faith. The Convention has been, and still is, to all appearances, afraid to lift its voice against this one and against having him engaged as a teacher of our young people who may go to Brandon in preparation for the Christian ministry. What guarantee is there that the same tolerance of that which is leaving behind it its wake of blighted faith, and spiritual wreckage will not be practiced in any and all other Institutions that may from time to time be inaugurated? The Convention has refused over and over again to recommend that a statement of Baptist faith be incorporated in the charter of Brandon College. It has refused to ask that the teachers in that Institution be asked to subscribe to such statement of faith. It has refused to make declaration of its faith, and have such incorporated in the new Constitution. And all these refusals at least give evidence of an unwillingness to draw the line clear and clean between present day destructive Modernism and the old-time faith which was once for all delivered. They give evidence of willingness to tolerate the most soul-destroying virus of the times. We cannot fellowship with such looseness, such toleration. God's word to us is such that will not allow of it.

Furthermore, as was pointed out on the floor of the Convention by Brother Rowell of Kamloops, there is such centralization of control under the new Constitution that four members of the Board of Trustees can "decide any question." Indeed, to us it appears that one of the purposes and aims of the Constitution is to centralize control. To put it in the hands of the few as much as possible, and all the while declare an unswerving faith in "the Autonomy of the Local Church."

Thus we find ourselves on the outside so far as the Convention is concerned. We are there because of our convictions concerning these things mentioned and other things not mentioned. But while we are thrust from the privileges of the Convention where many of us have been and have labored for years, it is our privilege to thank and praise our God that we are not out of fellowship with Him, in seeking to do only His will and glorify His name. The present time is one when, like others we have read of, who went forth from the presence of the council rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His name, we, too, should rejoice because of our partnership with Him and His willingness to be with us to the end. And let us ever remember the source of our strength as we ever keep looking unto Jesus.

PROFESSOR GEORGE CROSS IN BLOOR STREET.

Professor George Cross, of Rochester Theological Seminary, New York, preached in Bloor Street Baptist Church morning and evening last Sunday. All that we have heard and read of Dr. Cross was corroborated by his utterances from Bloor St. pulpit. If our space permitted, we should like to publish both sermons verbatim to show how utterly devoid each sermon was of evangelical truth. From the morning sermon we must be content with a brief quotation which is sheer Unitarianism:

"The world means what the human life means. To find what the world means you must learn what humanity means, and to find what humanity means you must have a true man, a human Jesus, living, breathing, talking, dwelling in man in that human personality, you find God; and so when we speak of incarnation in Christ we are not speaking of something that happened in his case alone. It is true, but it is quite true of you and me that God may just as truly dwell in us as he dwelt in him, and that is the salvation of the world."

Below we publish an extensive excerpt from the evening sermon. This also is unadulterated Unitarianism. Dr. Cross' philosophy is purely subjective; there is no objective government or governor. In its logical outworking, it is sheer anarchy. When a preacher of this sort can be welcomed to a Baptist pulpit in Toronto, it affords a clear indication of the direction in which Baptists are drifting.

"Now I will go back to my text: 'I must go on my way.' These are Jesus' words. He was living a very dangerous life, sometimes popular, and sometimes unpopular; often denounced by the people, treated as a dangerous man, pretty likely to be put out of the way some day because he was making trouble for other people who did not want to have their arrangements disturbed, and who felt that they might lose something by what he was saying. He was advised to get out of the way, 'There is trouble awaiting you; you had better get out of here, Herod the king is after you.' 'You go and tell that jackall I go my way, Herod or no Herod. Stand aside.' Bold words, were they not? I wonder if we understand Jesus? We have heard a great deal about him. There are two principle ways in which he has been presented to us. In one he is presented as belonging to a system of things, some order, arrangement of life, a form of government. The whole world is looked upon as under government control of some kind, and you know in government control every man has his place; it is assigned to him; he must keep it, and fulfil it, and you are to be understood in terms of that whole scheme. If you know the scheme of government you know your place there, and people have explained Jesus in that way. They have conceived God in relation to, or after the analogy of human government, a local scheme, and we have been fitted into it, and that is how they explain him. Therefore he stands in a sense by himself. He will be different from us. That is the trouble with so many of the interpretations we have had of Jesus' career, they don't bring him near to us, they put him far away. He goes through experiences no one else does; he does a work that no one else does; he is the exception, an entire exception to the regular course of humanity. He stands there, and not here, you look at him at a distance, but we cannot get near him. You talk to a man who has been taught that, and ask him why he does not do things the way Jesus did, and he says, 'How can I? He was different from me; he was not born as I was born; not subjected to the temptations I have been subjected to; he was not as I was; he knew everything, no one could deceive him; I don't know anything, and can be easily deceived. He had no weaknesses, I yield to my weaknesses. Don't ask me to take him as my example. He is a stranger to all that I have passed through, and I am a stranger to all he passed through. Why talk to me about following his example. He is beyond me. I cannot follow him, I can only subject myself to him, and accept what he gives me.'

"I am speaking of a thing very familiar to you, and I wonder whether in our attempts to exalt him we separate the rest of humanity, by tracing his birth to a different source and calling his life a divine life has not rendered

him in a large degree meaningless to us. How can he sympathise with me in my difficulties and temptations if he had no temptations, if he had no difficulties? How can I go to him for sympathy in my sorrows? I don't know what is coming to-morrow, where I may be, who of my friends may die, what may happen to me. I don't know what is going to happen to me, I am at a loss, I try to feel my way, but I don't know what a day will bring forth. You tell me he knew everything? Well, how could he have any difficulty if it was all prearranged? Is that Jesus? Is that Jesus of Nazareth? Or is it some Christ we have invented to suit our conceptions of things? Have we taken our conception of the world and life, and fitted him into it, and lost sight of the human Jesus? I am afraid in many instances that has been the case.

"Now there is another way of looking at it. When I read my New Testament, read Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, even John, and read the story through and try to imagine to myself what it meant to Jesus to live that life he lived, don't I find this quite different from that picture I have represented him to be? Do I not find he had to feel his way too, that he did not know beforehand just what he was to do? Sometimes he was even in distress, spent nights enquiring what to do, and in prayer; was often down-hearted; and got away from people to be alone and quiet; and when the great issue of his life came, how uncertain he was as to what he had better do, looking now this way, and now that until he finds his way!

"And so I read this text, 'I must go on my way,' and I feel I am reading the utterance of a human being, not less divine because he was human, but all the more so to me because he was human, I feel I am reading the utterance of a man who knew what I know, and who knew about me what I don't know, and who faced experiences like mine; who had to find his way in life as I have to find my way.

"Notice one thing then: there was a definite course he had chosen to take in life. How long it took him to make that choice we do not know. Perhaps he made some tentative choice as a child, was feeling his way then just as you and I did when we were children of eleven, twelve, thirteen, or fourteen; wondering what we would do when we became men and women; wondering if we would do anything worth doing; what would happen to us some day. And life seemed so far away, so long before we would be grown up to do something worth doing. Was he like that? What is the reason why we have only one incident told us of his life up to thirty years of age? Have you not settled your lives by that time? Have you not had terrible struggles by that time with the world and the devil, and perhaps been defeated, and perhaps been victorious? Why, most of your life is in that thirty years. Was it not so with him? I wonder if he did not have just as hard a time as we have, as any of us have in finding our way? and was life not full of mystery to him in those days as it has been to us? I say I hope it was, I hope it was so. It is far more encouraging for me to think it was so, than to think he passed through none of that, was a stranger to all I have passed through, for if he be such a stranger, how can I come to ask him to help me in my struggles?

"Now put away the theories you have heard about him; just read the stories again, read the descriptions by Matthew or Mark or Luke, and mark the words; and you will notice a few things like this: thirty years of age; working at a carpenter trade; loving God with his whole heart; living in peace and happiness with his neighbours; much esteemed by them; cherishing in his heart, no doubt, a deep affection for mankind and for God; a happy man, perhaps. And then something unexpected happens, as it may have happened to you some time in your life, and things became different. That preacher, that young man who was not afraid to speak his mind, no matter who was in his way; that rough man, John the Baptist, who preached before kings, and he goes out to hear him, and he felt that the way for himself was thereby marked out. And he takes his stand; he endorses what John is doing, he is baptized by him, ready to take his place now, leaving that private life of his that no doubt was just as precious as your private life, and mine may be, to give himself to whatever is marked out by this preacher of repentance."