

"Giants and Their Conquerors"

Page 38

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES AND
IN DEFENSE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.

\$2.00 Per Year, Postpaid, to any address. 5c. Per Single Copy.

Editor: T. T. SHIELDS.

Associate Editors: T. I. STOCKLEY, ALEXANDER THOMSON, W. GORDON BROWN.

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."—Romans 1:16.

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto.

Vol. 8. No. 1.

TORONTO, MAY 23rd, 1929.

Whole No. 367.

Des Moines University Riots

Why Faculty and Other Positions Declared Vacant

Question of Dr. H. C. Wayman's Degrees

The press of the entire Continent of America carried reports of the students' riots at Des Moines University, Iowa, Saturday, May 11th. A riot of any sort is a matter of commanding interest, but a riot in a university—and in a university that has advertised itself as standing for the fundamentals of the Christian faith—is such an extraordinary occurrence that it is not surprising that it should have occupied the front page of the newspapers of America for nearly a week. But with all respect to the daily press, the greater part of what has been published was immeasurably removed from the facts of the case.

Before we attempt to give any reason for it, let us tell the story itself. The Board of Trustees of the University had come together for a special meeting on the 10th and 11th of May. The reason for that meeting we shall give later in the story, but certain resolutions had been passed by the Board of Trustees and a meeting of the Faculty had been called to hear the Trustees' decisions, following which there was to be a meeting of the students. But when the time for the students' meeting came it was evident that they were bent on violence. The Board had sat late, and rose for a brief recess to take lunch. The students assembled on the campus apparently in an ugly mood.

Students Plan Kidnapping

The President of the Board, with others, left the administration building to go to a restaurant for lunch, but he was somewhat in advance of the others down the pathway, across the campus, when whistles sounded from all directions, and

the students began to converge upon this path. A yellow taxi was drawn up beside the campus, and a very heavy-set taxi-driver was among the rioters. One of the Trustees divined that a kidnapping of the President of the Board was planned; rushing from the building he overtook him and conducted him back to safety. The students then began throwing rotten eggs at the building, and showed such an ugly disposition that we telephoned to the police and asked for protection. In due course a couple of policemen arrived, who seemed to take it as a huge joke. We told them to inform the students that the students' meeting had been cancelled. The police fraternized with the students, and after a while apparently persuaded them to disperse.

Stones Crash Through Windows

The Board resumed its sessions and sat through the afternoon and on into the evening. When darkness had fallen, probably about seven-thirty, the Board was sitting about the table in the President's office when a barrage of rotten eggs splashed against the windows. The windows were partly up, and were speedily closed and the blinds drawn. As soon as this was done, stones began to fly. They came through both windows and shades, and in a moment or two the glass in both the office windows was gone, and the office was at the mercy of the mob. The Board moved from that into the next room, the window of which was attacked in a similar way. In a few moments the mob had surrounded the whole business office. Stones crashed through all the windows; and following that, hundreds of rotten eggs reduced the office in a

few minutes to a filthy condition. In addition to that, they threw some kind of gas bombs whose stench was very much like that of the eggs.

The Mob Calls for "Shields"

The mob then began to call for "Shields", with cries of "Beat him up", "Get him", and soon stormed the doors of the administration building. The Trustees, desiring to avoid any collision with the infuriated mob, which might have resulted in mutual acts of violence, retired into a washroom off the office. We cannot at this writing describe the geography of the place. It was dark, and we moved from one place to another, and pushed through a door into a storeroom of considerable size. But just as we did this, one of the Trustees listened at an outer door, and when he stepped back, found that his colleagues had disappeared, but where he did not know. On the other hand, they only knew that he had become separated from them, and did not know for a while what had become of him.

When the mob broke into the office, perhaps a hundred strong, they swarmed through the place. Opening the washroom door they found the one Trustee standing. With the cry of, "Here is one of them", they pulled him out into the crowd. But as soon as the cry was raised, it was answered with cries of, "Beat him up", "Beat him up", "Get Shields". When they found this particular Trustee was not the President of the Board, they said, "He is not the man we want", and he was conducted outside to safety.

For forty minutes after a call had been sent for the police the rioters had the administration building at their mercy. The Trustee who stepped from the room into the office where the mob was swarming, reports that he has seen angry mobs in heathen lands, but never saw a company of men who gave more evidence of murderous intent.

Student Boasts Would Have Murdered

And at this point we may report that only to-day a certain man read to us a letter from one of the students who had participated in the riot—and who boasted of having done so—in which he said that if the mob could have got their hands upon Dr. Shields that night, they would undoubtedly have murdered him.

At length the police arrived, and as nearly as we could understand, the first contingent feared to tackle the mob, and had to send for reinforcements; and it was not until two or three other squads of police arrived that they actually stepped in and stopped the riot. Even then the administration building was swarmed with rioters when the police walked in, and though they had broken the windows and forced the doors and were in a place where they had no legal right to be at such an hour, not a single arrest was made.

"Prayer Was Made of The Church"

We are not in a position to say whether the student who declared the mob was on murder bent, exaggerated their temper or not, but at this point we should like to record to the praise of God that a little news of the trouble had come through the press reports, and a company of people gathered in Jarvis Street Saturday afternoon, under the leadership of Dr. T. I. Stockley, and continued in prayer for their Pastor's safety until nearly six in the evening, which would be four by Des Moines time. That afternoon prayer meeting covered the time of the afternoon attempt at kidnapping. The great Saturday night prayer meeting convened at eight o'clock, which would be six o'clock Des Moines time, and the

Jarvis Street people were actually in prayer at the time. God wrought the miracle in Des Moines,—for those of us who were in that room knew nothing about the doors which we passed; and the separation of the one Trustee from the rest, while it did him no injury, saved the rest of us from harm. Who should say that God does not answer prayer to-day?

Police Protection Refused

But returning to the story of the riot: when we emerged from our refuge we found the office floors, desks, and filing-cabinets, plastered with rotten eggs, and, we should say, hundreds of unhatched chickens strewn all over the floor. We then asked the police if they would give protection to the building. We pointed out that the windows were gone, the doors were broken, valuable records were strewn over the floor, and all the contents of the office were at the mercy of any prowlers who cared to come in, and we asked if an officer might be put in charge for the building's protection, only to be told that no such officer was available, and that if we ourselves wanted to be safe we had better come down to the police station. The Board for a few moments resumed session and passed a resolution ordering the University closed until further notice.

At this point it should be said that the Board was perfectly competent to do this. The meeting of the Board had not adjourned since its convening the morning of the tenth; no new record of members present had been taken: it was the same meeting, and a full quorum was present.

Following this, the members of the Board went in police cars to the police station. While there we wrote a letter communicating the Board's decision to President Wayman, and later spoke to him over the telephone informing him of the situation. The President of the Board then asked the chief officer in charge at the police station if they would guarantee him protection in the hotel at which he was staying; whereupon the police officer said that he would guarantee protection nowhere outside of the police station. This double refusal to protect either property or life by the police of the Capital of the State of Iowa surely needs no comment. We therefore hastened away to the hotel, packed our bags, and left by the eleven o'clock train.

HOW DES MOINES UNIVERSITY CAME UNDER BIBLE UNION CONTROL.

Having stated the case thus far it is necessary to rehearse a bit of history, and from this forward the Editor will drop the editorial "we" and use the simpler form of "I". My readers will bear with me as I tell the story of how Des Moines University came under the control of the Baptist Bible Union of North America. Many who read these words have heard the story again and again, but this issue of *The Witness* will go to scores of thousands of people who have never heard the story before. I tell the story in order that my readers may understand the sense of responsibility I have felt for that institution.

Some time prior to the Annual Meeting of the Baptist Bible Union which was held in Chicago, May, 1927, I had advised the Executive Committee of the Baptist Bible Union that, owing to my ever-multiplying responsibilities, it would be necessary for me to retire from the Presidency of the Union at the next meeting. Quite unknown to me, and equally without knowledge of my action, the Secretary of the Baptist Bible Union, Miss Edith Rebman, had reached a similar conclusion respecting herself. The work of the Union was becoming increasingly heavy, and the labour of financing it rested largely with the office in Chicago.

On arrival in Chicago to attend the Annual Meeting, May, 1927, before I had time to breakfast, the proposal that the Baptist Bible Union should assume responsibility for Des Moines University was laid before me. When the Executive of the Bible Union met to consider it, before there was any discussion of the proposal itself, spontaneously, several members of the Executive Committee said something to this effect: "Before we proceed to discuss this question we want to know whether the President is determined to pursue the course announced and retire from the Presidency. If he is, we will not consider this proposal for one minute, for someone must lead in this great enterprise." A somewhat similar statement was made in reference to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Board.

I felt at the time that while I appreciated the kindly sentiment of the Committee, it was scarcely fair to lay the responsibility of deciding whether we should attempt to establish a genuinely Christian institution or not upon my shoulders. For years we had protested against the false teaching in the universities of the Continent, and now we were asked to put in practice the principles we had recommended for others' adoption; and when the matter was thus submitted, I feared to take the responsibility of refusal. I told the brethren that I could not see how it was possible for flesh and blood to carry more than I had carried, but that I would cast myself afresh upon the Lord and trust that He would provide strength equal to the need.

Negotiations Begin

On this assurance the negotiations with representatives of the University were begun, with the result that in less than three weeks from that time the Trustee Board of Des Moines University had voted itself out, and had voted representatives of the Baptist Bible Union in. We agreed to assume the University's liabilities, and, of course, its assets as well. The liabilities amounted to a mortgage of \$225,000.00, plus approximately \$100,000.00 unsecured by any mortgage and which represented accrued liabilities on current account, including arrears in professors' salaries amounting to somewhere around \$25,000.00. The net assets above all liabilities appeared to be in round figures about \$700,000.00.

When we went to Des Moines to assume control, we carried money with us practically sufficient to pay up the arrears in professors' salaries, so that the first act of the new Board was to pay the old Board's debt to the Faculty.

Dealing With The Faculty

I was made Chairman of the Board of Trustees and Chairman of the Faculty Committee. We met the Faculty and put our Baptist Bible Union Confession of Faith into their hands, told them the University would be conducted according to these standards, and if any could not accept these standards, they would be expected to say so, and retire. Des Moines University up to this time supposedly had been a Baptist institution. It comprised Colleges of Liberal Arts, Education, Engineering, Pharmacy, and Music. We gave the Faculty the Confession of Faith, and asked them to think it through during the night, and we would meet them individually the next day.

Dean Bennett

At the close of that meeting Dean Arthur Bennett came to me and said something to this effect: "I have no right to ask for special treatment, but I have received a telegram from another institution which I must answer to-night. I thought if you could give me a few minutes it might be pos-

sible to settle the question here and now." He then told me that he was in full sympathy with the religious standards of the new Board, and while he was not a Baptist, he was an immersed believer and could work heartily in accord with us. I liked Dean Bennett, I confess, at once, as did the rest of the Committee; his personality was pleasing. The Faculty Committee was present; so we told him that he might consider himself elected to the new Faculty.

Other Faculty Members Remain

The following day we met with other members, and about twenty-five of them approximately accepted our standards and promised to sign our statement and to work in full accord with the new order of things.

One Dean a Unitarian

We found that the Dean of the College of Pharmacy was a member of the First Unitarian Church of Des Moines. Of course we were unable to retain him. After he had left, we found his desk full of Unitarian literature which he had apparently been distributing to his students. The retiring Dean told me that he had made an inventory of the utensils and general equipment of the College of Pharmacy, and estimated these things at \$15,000.00. When it was found that we could not employ him, one of his old students, a wealthy man of Des Moines, came to us and offered \$6,000.00 for the College of Pharmacy. We told him it was unthinkable, and there the matter ended. But he and some others established a new College of Pharmacy with the Unitarian President at its head, and took eighty-five of the students from Des Moines, to the new college. After the new Dean was established in the College of Pharmacy at Des Moines University, he informed us that he had found large baskets of expensive glassware and other things hidden away in cupboards and stored in places apparently where we were not expected to see them. It looked as though we were expected to sell out the College of Pharmacy for \$6,000.00, without knowing really what we were selling.

President of Trustees Acting-President

For purposes of reorganization I was elected by the Board of Trustees, Acting-President, because someone had to be in authority. The Secretary-Treasurer of the Baptist Bible Union was elected as a member of the Trustee Board, the office was moved from Chicago to Des Moines, and the Secretary was charged by the Board as a resident Trustee to see that its policies were carried out.

Engaging a New Faculty

During the summer of 1927 I had to spend much time at Des Moines engaging a new Faculty. A Council of Deans was organized, and as often as I visited Des Moines I met the Council of Deans, and we conferred on problems of administration. We had not been many months in operation before I discovered that among the Deans there was a tendency to oppose the new administration, and policies that were laid down by the Board, through its President, were executed most indifferently or not at all. It was the duty of the Secretary of the Board to see that the new policies were carried out, and naturally in calling the attention of the Deans to many matters they began to resent, not openly then but among themselves, what they regarded as the Secretary's "interference", but what was really the execution of

Fraternities and Sororities

In all this our most serious difficulties arose over questions of discipline and in relation to the fraternities and sororities, the Board's policies.

It must be said, however, that openly the Deans acquiesced in the new Board's policies; but I fear did not heartily enter into their execution. In the very beginning of our administration the Board forbade the pledging of any Freshman by any fraternity or sorority, and at the end of the first year notified all fraternities and sororities that they would be abolished in Des Moines University as of June 1st, 1929. We gave them time in order that we might not be unjust to them in respect to obligations they had assumed in connection with the fraternity houses and other matters in which they might have become involved.

Forty-Seven Thousand Miles

From June, 1927, to June, 1928, I travelled in all about forty-seven thousand miles in the interests of Des Moines University. For all this I neither received nor expected one cent of remuneration. Having a large church of twenty-three hundred members or thereabout, a Seminary with approximately one hundred students in attendance, a weekly paper, and my own local denominational responsibilities, I was unable to give such attention to Des Moines University as the interests of that institution required. But the Trustees, with two or three exceptions, did the best possible, and at the end of the first year we had managed to pay all operating expenses and reduce our total indebtedness by many thousands of dollars.

President Wayman of William Jewell College

Last summer my attention was called to Dr. H. C. Wayman, then President of William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. There was much discussion in the press about him, as he was reported to have secured the dismissal of three professors from William Jewell College Faculty on the ground of their modernistic teaching. Such action seemed, to me at least, to suggest rather an heroic character, for I knew of no other college president in America who had the courage to deal with Modernism in his own school.

Dr. Wayman Resigned William Jewell

A little while after, I heard that Dr. Wayman had resigned. I therefore telegraphed him asking him to come to Des Moines. The election of professors to the new Faculty had been largely left in my hands by the Trustee Board as a matter of economy, for the reason that we could not afford to pay the expenses of Board members coming to Des Moines to attend Board and Committee meetings. I therefore telegraphed Dr. Wayman in order that I might have something to suggest to the Trustee Board. Dr. Wayman came to Des Moines, and I was personally pleased with his personality; he seemed to be a likely man for the Presidency. In discussing the matter with him I said something to this effect: "I am, of course, glad that you have resigned from William Jewell, and that you are open to receive overtures from us; but I frankly say to you that were I a Trustee of William Jewell College, and if I had stood by you in your endeavours to purge the College of modernistic teaching, I should then expect you to stand by the Trustee Board." To which he replied that some of the Trustees felt that way about it, but that he felt that if he were quietly to withdraw now that the victory was won, and eliminate himself from the school, the disturbance would likely settle down, and it would serve the interests of all concerned.

Baptist Bible Union Meeting in Toronto

The Annual Meeting of the Baptist Bible Union last year was held in Toronto, and the Trustees met in that city. The

Charter prevents the holding of the Annual Meeting of the Trustees of the University outside of Iowa; other meetings may be held anywhere. Dr. Wayman appeared before the Trustees, and the Presidency of the University was offered him. This he accepted at a salary of \$6,500 per year, and a house. We then drew up a memorandum to the effect that this meeting of the Trustees was an informal one, and that we had agreed to elect Dr. Wayman to the Presidency of the University, and that this would be done in a legal way at a subsequent meeting of the Trustees in Des Moines. This memorandum was signed by all the Trustees present and handed to Dr. Wayman as a guarantee of his later legal election. Dr. Wayman moved to Des Moines not long afterwards, and assumed his duties as President of the University.

Dr. Wayman's Degrees Questioned

At the time of Dr. Wayman's election some rumours had reached us alleging certain irregularities in connection with Dr. Wayman's academic degrees. I spoke to Dr. Wayman about it. He passed the matter off lightly by saying that the report that he had claimed an Oxford degree was due to the accident that he had no gown with him available for the inaugural ceremonies, and that a gown was borrowed with a hood with Oxford colors, and that out of this had grown the charge that he had used an Oxford degree to which he was not entitled:

Later, other communications reached me about Dr. Wayman's degrees which led me to write for a statement from him of the case. I print below his letter on that subject:

LETTER FROM WAYMAN RE DEGREES.

WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

H. C. Wayman, President

Liberty, Missouri, July 15.

My dear Dr. Shields:

I just now have a telegram from Miss Rebman asking me to send you, special delivery, some data about the degree controversy. I am enclosing what I could quickly lay my hands upon, but I fear I will not get it to you before you leave for Des Moines.

It is too bad that the enemy has determined to carry the fight on me to Des Moines. There is nothing that they will not do.

It would be my desire that you publish as little as possible—emphasize the fact that the Board exonerated me, and Baptist preachers of K.C. and hundreds from Mo. as well did the same.

I am planning to meet you in Des Moines Tuesday and Wednesday of next week.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) H. C. WAYMAN.

Accompanying this letter from Dr. Wayman there was a Statement by the Trustees of William Jewell College which seemed to exonerate Dr. Wayman from any intention to deceive by the use of degrees to which he was not entitled, although any candid reader would, of course, recognize that there had been a great deal of carelessness.

Dr. Wayman Did Not Inform Des Moines Trustees.

One thing at this point should be made perfectly clear, namely, that Dr. Wayman gave no hint to the Trustees of Des Moines University that he had been guilty of any conduct academically which might react unfavorably upon the reputation of Des Moines University should he become its President. As soon, however, as the announcement of Dr. Wayman's election was made, letters began to pour in upon me, and upon other Trustees, and from many quarters there

were sent to me copies of a certain "Open Letter" by the Rev. Lewis M. Hale, asking me if I knew what sort of man we had appointed to the Presidency of Des Moines.

In order that my readers may have the whole case clearly before them I shall now set out in full Mr. Hale's "Open Letter":

REV. L. M. HALE'S OPEN LETTER.

AN OPEN LETTER to Missouri Baptists and Friends of William Jewell College Concerning a Situation Which Exists at William Jewell College, and My Connection With the Same

By Lewis M. Hale, First Baptist Church,
Springfield, Missouri.

PREFACE

Most likely the great majority who receive this communication will understand the occasion of it. For those who are not familiar with the circumstances an explanation is necessary.

For several years past, rumors have been afloat to the effect that President H. C. Wayman was claiming and making use of scholastic degrees to which he had no scholastic right, and for which there is no moral justification. Not until I was fully convinced that these reports were having a demoralizing effect on the college did I put forth an effort to find out the facts and stop the evil influences and effects of them.

I am now of the opinion that a thorough investigation would reveal, unmistakably, that a knowledge of the facts set forth in this brochure, and others well known to the student body, has had the most demoralizing effect on the student body of anything which has affected a William Jewell student body in many, many years. Hence, I bespeak on the part of all friends of William Jewell College to whom my open letter may come an earnest and thoughtful consideration.

L. M. H.

THE LETTER

A sense of duty compels me to give this presentation of facts to Missouri Baptists and friends of William Jewell College. To my certain knowledge, some have had their attitude completely changed by a revelation of such facts as I shall herein set forth. My duty to this great Baptist institution and to its constituency is the primary consideration. I confess, however, to a secondary consideration; namely, putting myself in what I believe is the right light in the eyes of Missouri Baptists. My stand has been widely misunderstood, and I am quite sure that this misunderstanding is due to the fact that Missouri Baptists are not familiar with the things with which I am familiar; consequently this effort is made to set forth my position.

Two Issues.

There is confusion in the minds of many as to the issues which are involved. It would seem that the great majority cherish the idea that the thing of primary interest is the orthodoxy of certain members of the faculty. The other issue is that of the right or wrong, true or false claim and use of degrees by President H. C. Wayman.

Here and now I disclaim all charges of an effort on my part to give to William Jewell College a modernistic tendency. For about a quarter of a century I have tried in my humble manner to preach the gospel in Missouri. I have yet to find any man who claims to have heard, at any time, a disloyal word from my lips. For nearly six years I was a trustee of William Jewell College. I did not seek the position, but accepted the responsibility when it was laid upon me, with a serious mind and a sincere purpose to render the best possible service in this capacity. In this connection I sought to put forth every possible effort to promote the best interests of the college, and to conserve the honored traditions of my alma mater. I do not claim to have been infallible, or even faultless, but I do most humbly and sincerely claim to have been honest and sincere in all my effort.

The Question of Degrees.

It is not difficult for anyone to understand the tremendous importance attached to the matter of degrees issued by educational institutions. Requirements for degrees are most exacting, and must be, else college degrees would have no meaning. If men were permitted, by the ordinary standard of ethics and honor, to attach promiscuously degrees to their

names, this would cause all college degrees to lose their significance, and for the most part would result in our colleges being depopulated, because no student would toil, as they must toil in order to receive a college degree, if it were permissible for them to merely make use of them at their pleasure. Hence we can understand why, in educational circles, the false use of a scholastic degree is reckoned none other than an unpardonable sin.

In keeping with this standard, it has been for many years the practice of William Jewell College, and every other college of similar standing, to exercise most rigid discipline in matters of scholastic honor. Ever since I have known William Jewell College, it has been the practice of the faculty to expel any and every student who was caught cheating on examination. For years the trustees have known and supported this practice in William Jewell College.

As early as July, 1926, Mr. W. W. Martin, a fellow trustee of William Jewell College, came to me with the information that rumors were widely afloat that Dr. Wayman did not have a degree from Oxford University, which at that time was attributed to him and has been ever since his connection with William Jewell College. Mr. Martin insisted that since I was better acquainted with Dr. Wayman, having been a fellow student with him in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, it was my duty to inform him of these rumors, that he might take such steps as he deemed wise in order to avoid the terrible consequence of them. Soon after this information was brought to me by Mr. Martin, I attended a meeting of the Executive Board of the Missouri Baptist General Association held in Kansas City. At this meeting I conferred with two other trustees, Mr. Ministry Jones of St. Joseph, and Mr. J. P. Graham of St. Louis. Each of these trustees, like Mr. Martin, advised that I should inform Dr. Wayman of these rumors. From this meeting I went to Liberty to attend for a few days the meeting of the William Jewell Assembly. It was my purpose while there to have a personal conference with Dr. Wayman and inform him of the going of these rumors. When I reached Liberty I learned that Dr. Wayman had left, the day before my arrival, on his summer vacation. Consequently I did not have the personal conference; and for the reason that I was loath to cause Dr. Wayman any undue anxiety, and in the hope that nothing of a serious nature would come from such rumors, I dismissed the matter so far as giving him the information was concerned.

About the first of December, 1926, word reached me that a professor in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary of Fort Worth, Texas, had recently returned from a course of study in Oxford University, and on his return he had told friends of his that the Oxford people knew of Dr. Wayman's false claim and were horrified to think that an American institution would let a man get by with such a thing. On receiving this report the situation seemed so threatening that on December 8, 1926, I wrote to Dr. Wayman, telling him that such rumors were afloat.

Conferences and Revelations.

I have in my possession two letters written by Dr. Wayman in reply to my letter informing him of these rumors. At his request, on the morning of Dec. 13, 1926, I met him at the Baltimore Hotel, Kansas City, for a conference on the situation. At this first conference it developed that Dr. Wayman was desirous of bringing into conference with ourselves Dr. F. M. Powell of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary of Louisville, Kentucky. He wired Dr. Powell to come, and at his request I followed his wire with one from myself urging the importance of his coming. On the evening of the 14th of December, 1926, the three of us were in conference together. It developed, in the course of these conferences, that the Oxford degree was not the only degree in question, but that he did not have at that time the Th. D. from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, though it had appeared after his name in seminary catalogs, in "Who's Who in America," in William Jewell literature, and in fact in every relation where the matter of his scholastic standing was in question. Dr. Wayman claimed also the Litt. D. degree from Georgetown College, Georgetown, Kentucky. It was revealed in this conference that the sole foundation for this claim was a news item from the "Western Recorder," of Louisville, Kentucky.

In the spring of 1927, when the 1927-1928 William Jewell catalog appeared, three degrees which had previously been carried in connection with Dr. Wayman's name were dropped—A. M., Th. D., and D. Litt. The fact that the A. M. was dropped from the catalog published after Dr. Wayman's attention had been called to these rumors raised the question as to whether he had an A. M. or not. Up to this time there had been no question of his A. M. degree. But if he had an A. M., why should he have caused it to be dropped from the official publication of the college of which he was president? Thus you see how a situation was revealed which has caused some of us so great concern. At no time and, so far as I know, with no individual, has it ever been a question of whether or no Dr. Wayman has sufficient degrees to justify his position. That has never been questioned. The sole question is a question of dishonorable conduct in the use of degrees which were absolutely unnecessary, and to which he had no legal or moral right under the shining sun.

A Course Agreed Upon.

As a result of our conferences on December 13 and 14, 1926, a course of procedure was agreed upon:

First, Dr. Wayman claimed that he could, and promised that he would, in course of a few weeks, submit adequate proof that he was entitled to a D. Litt. degree from Oxford University; that while he had not actually received the degree, he had done the required work and the only thing that remained was for him to go to convocation and the degree would be publicly conferred.

Second, he agreed to get the records of the action of Georgetown College conferring the Litt. D. degree upon him.

Third, he agreed to submit a thesis which was necessary before he could receive the Th. D. degree from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. (The Th. D. degree is a scholastic degree, conferred on merit of work. The work is in two parts—an oral examination of two hours given by at least four members of the faculty, and the submission of a thesis on some corresponding subject which must be passed upon by at least four members of the faculty. In previous years Dr. Wayman had passed the oral examination with credit, but did not submit the thesis until the spring of 1927.)

Based on these promises which Dr. Wayman gave us, I personally agreed to put forth every possible effort to stop the going of the rumors and to stay their evil effects, pending the time that would be necessary before Dr. Wayman could open the records to the world. Immediately on my return home, I wrote, at Dr. Wayman's request, several letters to men who knew of the rumors, assuring them that in the course of time Dr. Wayman would have the records concerning these degrees and put them in shape that he would be glad to open them to the whole world. Three of these letters were to the three trustees with whom I had had conference, and one to a prominent pastor in the state. As late as April 27, 1927, in response to a letter of inquiry from Editor S. M. Brown of the Word and Way, I wrote a letter defending Dr. Wayman and assuring Dr. Brown that the matter would be cleared up. Carbon copy of this letter, and of others, are in my files.

A Change of Attitude.

The first of May, 1927, I went to Louisville, Kentucky, to attend a meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention. During this time conferences with Dr. Wayman began again. On the way to Louisville my attention was called by a fellow alumnus of William Jewell, to the fact that this year's catalog had dropped three of the degrees which had previously been carried. This amazed me beyond measure, because the understanding which we had had, and which I had announced in letters which I had written, was that claims to the degrees were to be justified, rather than to simply drop the degrees after years of use.

In a conference with Dr. Wayman, which took place soon after I reached Louisville, in the presence of Dr. F. M. Powell, Rev. T. H. Wiles, and myself, he repudiated every promise he had made, declared he had made no effort to get the records and never intended to, and assumed an attitude of utter defiance. Thus I was left to play false with

those of whom I had written letters assuring them that the matter would be cleared up, and false to what I believed was the best interests of William Jewell College and our Baptist cause, or demand that adequate explanation be made to the Board of Trustees of William Jewell College. The case was such and the responsibility such that I could not bear it alone. I explained this situation to President Wayman, and told him under the circumstances there would be nothing left for me to do but to resign as a trustee of William Jewell College with an explanation of my resignation to the Board.

I left Louisville, after several unpleasant conferences, with the avowed purpose to offer my resignation as a trustee of William Jewell College at a meeting which was to be held on May 24, 1927. On May 14—ten days before the spring meeting of the Board of Trustees I received a letter from President Wayman, asking me if I would meet him in Kansas City for conference. On Monday morning, May 16, I met Dr. Wayman at the Baltimore Hotel, Kansas City. In the conference there I assured him that the matter could not remain in the dark, that it was too widely known, and that I could not suffer myself to rest under the charge of being "particeps criminis" in such an affair. I advised him strongly—and, I still think, wisely—to give the Board a full and complete statement of facts and conditions relative to these degrees. I went to the meeting of the Board on May 24 confidently expecting that President Wayman would do this, and in consequence I had not prepared the resignation which I had anticipated. But, to my great surprise, at this meeting Dr. Wayman read a president's report which could not possibly have raised a question concerning his degrees.

Issue No. 2.

Up to this time the question of modernism had not so much as been heard of. At the meeting of the Board on May 24, 1927, the Reynolds gift, with the conditions attached, was offered to the Board. Dr. Wayman, himself, read the proposal and made the motion that the gift be accepted. Personally I was then and am now opposed to William Jewell College accepting conditional gifts—not that I had any opposition to the conditions from a doctrinal viewpoint. I stated most emphatically that I was in agreement with the conditions, raised absolutely no objection to them as such but I was uncompromisingly opposed to William Jewell College accepting conditional gifts.

Literally thousands of men have made gifts to William Jewell College, and some of them in as great proportion as the Reynolds gift. Yet, after 75 years of confidence in the college, manifest through the giving of these many gifts, no one had ever before attempted to attach a condition. I contended then, and contend now, that I had as much right to condition the small gifts which I made to William Jewell College as Mr. Reynolds or any other man who could give \$100,000.00 had to put conditions on their gift; for, in all probability, measured by a standard of sacrifice, many small gifts are just as significant as the large ones. Yet, had I offered my last subscription of \$300.00 with conditions attached, I am still of the opinion that the Board of Trustees would have treated it as a joke.

It was at this time that the question of modernism began to be pushed to the front; and, in my humble judgment, when conditions are rightly understood it will be unmistakably plain that the primary purpose of flaunting the question of modernistic tendency was that by this means the question in which Dr. Wayman's personal interests were involved might be obscured. Many will recall that in February, 1923, William Jewell College issued a doctrinal statement which was subscribed to by every member of the faculty and all the trustees. This statement had wide publicity, and so far as I know was 100 per cent. satisfactory to everybody who knew about it. It would seem to me that there is no adequate justification for all the stir that has been made in the past few months.

Soon after this meeting, word came to me from different sources that I was being branded a modernist or the henchman of a modernist, WHEREAS, THE ONLY ISSUE, SO FAR AS I WAS THEN CONCERNED OR AM NOW CONCERNED, IS NOT AN ISSUE OF FUNDAMENTALISM OR MODERNISM, BUT THE VITAL QUESTION OF VERACITY, INTEGRITY AND HONOR.

Further Developments.

After the conference with Dr. Wayman ten days before the meeting of the Trustees in May, 1927, I cherished the hope that the matter would be cleared up after the Board met on May 24, and for this reason I did not prepare my resignation at that time. The next meeting of the Board was held in Kansas City just previous to the meeting of the General Association in October, 1927. Previous to this meeting I wrote my resignation, giving a brief historical statement of my activities in connection with Dr. Wayman's false use of degrees and setting forth four reasons why I could no longer serve as a trustee of William Jewell College. The reasons set forth were as follows:

"First, To me it is unthinkable that I should continue to serve as a trustee with a president whose attitude toward me is such as President Wayman's.

"Second, My conscience forbids that I should give my support as a trustee to a president of William Jewell College whose conduct has destroyed in me every vestige of faith in his integrity.

"Third, As a trustee, I have felt honor bound to safeguard all the Christian interest of the College. I was a trustee at the time that Mr. Slaten was released as a member of the faculty, and voted for his release. Such a condition as arose in his case may arise at any time. In the light of my understanding of Christian ethics, I could not think of voting to release a member of the faculty on the ground of unorthodoxy, and chance to have such a one fling back into my face that to his certain knowledge I had supported as president a man who had proven to me that he was unethical.

"Fourth, As a trustee it would behoove me to support the faculty in the discipline of students. So far as I have known the history of William Jewell College, it has been the practice of the faculty to expel any student who was caught cheating on examination. I cannot be party to the operation of a Christian institution with a president who might be compelled sometime to cast his vote to expel a boy or girl for cheating on examination, the same boy or girl knowing of the president's false use of degrees and chancing to fling it into his face that he had, for years, made use of degrees which did not belong to him."

In the afternoon before the trustees met in the evening, the president of the Board, Mr. W. D. Johnson, and the secretary of the Board, Mr. John S. Major, came to the Baltimore Hotel and requested that I withdraw my resignation for fear that the stirring of this matter at this time might prove injurious to President Wayman's health, since Dr. Wayman was at Mayo's for examination, and was thought to be in a critical condition—a thing which I did not know. I gladly withdrew the resignation and awaited further developments. The matter rested there, so far as I was concerned, pending another meeting of the Board of Trustees, which was not held until March 15, 1928. Previous to the meeting of March 15, 1928, another member of the Board had served written notice on Dr. Wayman that these rumours could no longer go unexplained, and that he would be called upon at the meeting of March 15, 1928, to give explanation. I therefore withheld my resignation, pending the action of the Board at this meeting.

At the meeting of the Board on March 15, 1928, Dr. Wayman, under direct questioning, confessed

First: That the Th. D. degree of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, which he had used for years, was not conferred until May 4, 1927;

Second: That the Litt. D. degree which he had claimed from Georgetown College, Georgetown, Kentucky, was not conferred until the summer of 1927;

Third: That he did not have and never had had, from any institution whatsoever, an A.M. degree;

Fourth: He made denial of the fact that he had ever claimed a D. Litt. degree from Oxford University.

During the course of the meeting, opportunity was given me, and I presented much of the evidence at my disposal. Following this presentation, Dr. Wayman made a speech in which he made serious charges against me and other members of the Board. When the matter came finally to a vote, the

trustees, by a good majority, adopted a report which declared in effect: "We find that Dr. Wayman HAS" (note present tense) "all of the degrees that he claimed when he came to the college." Following this vote, I felt that there was nothing for me to do but to offer my resignation. This I did, in exactly the form that I had prepared it months before the orthodoxy of any member of the faculty was questioned.

Some Facts.

When it became apparent to me that I had been placed in a false light in the matter of my activity in the effort to clear up the degree situation, and that there was increasing confusion in the minds of many folk relative to the issues involved, I began every reasonable effort to secure all possible evidence, that I might be in a position to show sufficient reason for my stand. I corresponded with authorities at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; Georgetown College, Georgetown, Kentucky; and Oxford University, Oxford, England. Dr. E. Y. Mullins, president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, readily complied with my request, naming the degrees which the seminary had conferred upon Dr. Wayman, and the time of the conferring. President M. B. Adams, of Georgetown College, Georgetown, Kentucky, declined to give me any information concerning degrees which Georgetown College had conferred. This, of course, was a mystery and a shock, but I felt that President Adams' attitude was probably adequately explained when in the meeting on March 15 Dr. Wayman confessed, in response to direct questioning, that he had not received the Litt. D. degree from Georgetown College until the summer of 1927. It was manifest then that Georgetown College had conferred upon President Wayman the Litt. D. degree (honorary) when President Adams knew that Dr. Wayman was under fire concerning false use of degrees. I say President Adams knew, for the reason that President Adams stated in a letter to me that previous to my letter he had received letters from two men making inquiry as to Dr. Wayman's degrees, and that he had refused to give the information for the reason that he knew of an attack that was being made on Dr. Wayman. It remains for President Adams to explain this action of Georgetown College. That is not my affair.

Registrar E. S. Craig of Oxford University readily complied with my request for information by writing, under date of January 5, 1928, as follows:

"Dear Sir:

"I cannot find any record of Mr. H. C. Wayman having been a member of this University. I am afraid I do not know anything of the work which he did with Dr. Gray; but as Professor S. Langdon is still alive and at Oxford (Jesus College) any one who is interested in the matter could write to him for information.

"I am,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) p. p. E. S. CRAIG,

W. M. G."

The Oxford Degree.

Since Dr. Wayman has admitted that he did not have the Th. D. from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, or the D. Litt. from Georgetown College, until the summer of 1927, and has confessed that he never has had at any time from any institution an A.M. degree, the only question that remains is: Did he or did he not claim the degree from Oxford University?

In a letter from Dr. Wayman, under date of February 3, 1928, and addressed to me, he wrote: "As I said in my previous letter, and wish again to emphasize, you know every degree I have, and you know that I have not represented myself as having any distinction that I have not."

In reply to this letter, I wrote: "You say, 'As I said in my previous letter, and wish again to emphasize, you know every degree I have, and you know that I have not represented myself as having any distinction that I have not.' In this statement is the crux of the matter, so far as I am concerned, and to clarify the situation I want to ask you some pointed questions, and I trust you will give me frank and honest answers. They are questions which need to be answered from some source before my mind is clear."

I omit here questions asked about other degrees than the Oxford degree, for the reason that Dr. Wayman's confessions

clear them up. The questions which I asked concerning the Oxford degree were as follows:

- "5. Did you ever claim a D. Litt. degree from Oxford University?"
- "6. If you ever claimed a D. Litt. degree from Oxford, on what did you base your claim?"
- "7. If you have never claimed a D. Litt. from Oxford, why did you not say so in the first letters that you wrote in reply to mine notifying you that rumors were afloat that you were making such claims?"
- "8. Why did you write the two letters dated December 9, 1926, and December 10, 1926, one supplementing the other, justifying your claim of a D. Litt. from Oxford University?"
- "9. How do you account for the impression that got out in this country that you had a D. Litt. degree from Oxford University?"
- "10. Where did the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary get such information concerning this degree as they passed on to William Jewell College in compliance with Dean Fleet's request for your degrees to be published in the William Jewell Catalog?"

My letter from which this quotation is taken was dated February 8, 1928. And having received no reply, on February 27, 1928, I sent by registered mail a carbon copy of this letter, accompanied by the following letter, with request for a receipt:

"My Dear Dr. Wayman:

I am sending, by registered mail, a copy of a letter which I addressed to you on February 8. I am doing it in the fear that you might not have received the original copy, and feeling that it would be unfair to you not to have ample opportunity to consider and reply to the same.

I am hoping that I may have an early reply, and I am sure I shall if you feel the importance of the matter in question as seriously as I do.

Very sincerely yours,"

I received a government receipt, with Dr. Wayman's signature on it, indicating that this letter reached, unmistakably, its destination, but no reply to my questions has been written to this day.

The Evidence.

It seems to me that there is abundant and unmistakable evidence that Dr. Wayman has claimed the D. Litt. degree from Oxford University, in spite of the fact that he now persists in denying such a claim. I present here only a bit of much available evidence. There is no denying that there was a widespread impression that Dr. Wayman received from Oxford University a D. Litt. degree. This impression had its origin while Dr. Wayman was yet a teacher in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. I have it over the signature of two men who are now teachers in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary that they are responsible for registering this information with the secretary of the seminary, and for the purpose of having it entered in the seminary catalog; that this information was prepared in Dr. Wayman's office, with Dr. Wayman present, and taken from his office to the office of the secretary. The only reason that the "Oxford" did not appear in the seminary catalog was that on their arrival they were informed by the secretary that the catalog had already gone to print. Then, when the Seminary was asked for information concerning Dr. Wayman's degrees, in order that this information might appear in the William Jewell College catalog, they gave, along with other degrees, the D. Litt. from Oxford University.

The "William Jewell Student" of November 22, 1923, was given almost wholly to the matter of Dr. Wayman's inauguration as president of William Jewell College. In this issue of the "Student" appears a biographical sketch in which intimate details of Dr. Wayman's life history appear. It says:

"The years of 1920, and 1921, he spent on leave of absence studying in Oxford University, England. At the conclusion of his work there, Dr. Wayman received from this most famous of English Universities the degree of D. Litt."

Another quotation from the same sketch says:

"During the course of his studies he has made three trips to Palestine in the interest of archaeology. It was this study which was his chief interest while at Oxford. His work there was directed especially to the study of Assyrian monuments, and upon his return to Louisville he was recognized as the only outstanding Assyrian scholar of the Southern Baptist Convention. His thesis for his Oxford degree was, 'The Code of Hammurabi.' This was the code contemporary with the time of Abraham."

It is my understanding that the original notes made from a personal interview with Dr. Wayman, from which came all the information of this biographical sketch, are still in existence.

I previously called attention to the fact that on December 8, 1926, I wrote Dr. Wayman, calling his attention to the fact that rumors were afloat that he did not have the degree which he claimed from Oxford University. I furthermore called attention to the fact that Dr. Wayman, in these two letters not only failed to say that he never had claimed his degree, but sets forth a full and complete justification of his claim instead.

In his letter of December 9, 1926, he says:

"Well, now, I want to give you some facts: While I was in Oxford, Georgetown College conferred on me the Litt. D. degree without my knowledge, and of course I was not present. I had my work so arranged at Oxford that I could not work for Ph. D. I was learning Assyrian and studying Old Testament and Geography under Dr. G. Buchanan Gray. When it came out in the paper that Georgetown had conferred degree on me, Dr. Gray wrote to some of my friends in America that he was going to have Oxford do the same when I completed my book which I was writing under his direction and that of Dr. S. Langdon. I wrote the book, and it was accepted, but was to make some additional first hand studies in Palestine. This I did on my second trip, which was immediately before I came to Missouri, as you remember. I incorporated some additional material, and thought I could immediately send my manuscript to printer. But, my! How could I? Or how can I? I had to lock my library on coming here. My book in manuscript form is used here and elsewhere. But in the midst of all this received word that Dr. Gray had died. So, because of press of time, I decided I would not take the matter up with Dr. Gray's successor until I could go to him with my manuscript, grades, and letters. I therefore took off the 'Oxford,' and agreed to wear only the Georgetown Litt. D., with the D.D. I have.

"Now if the truth hurts me and gets me in bad, here goes. I can't help it. Next summer, or if not then the next, I will take my manuscript and show somebody that I have not lied."

In concluding the letter of December 9, he writes:

"Now, Hale, here it is: Harry Clifford Wayman, A.B., A.M., Th. B., Th.M., Th. D., Litt. D., D.D. How's that? Silly, isn't it? But it's so, and you can tell the devil and hisimps."

From the letter of December 10, supplementing the letter which he had written the day before, he says:

"Dr. Gray, with whom I did my major work, was one of the university heads. They called them regents, I think. Anyway along in the spring of the year I was there, he urged me to go with Mr. Hobbling to Egypt and Palestine for some first hand information and study. I decided to go, and he told me, after O. King my manuscript, that my degree had been granted, and for me to get back by convocation for the conferring of the same. He likewise in an news item to some of our denominational papers made mention of the same, which was copied. I, too, wrote to some of my friends about it. While I was in Palestine, we were delayed and did not get back to England, but came straight home to America. Later Dr. Gray wrote me that when I returned to England he would arrange for publicly conferring same."

If these statements—from his own handwriting—would not lead one to believe that he claimed a degree from Oxford University, then I do not know how to interpret plain English.

When writing to Registrar E. S. Craig for information concerning the honor that Oxford University had conferred upon President Wayman, I sent to him transcripts of the letters from which I have quoted above, in order that Mr. Craig, who is unknown to me personally, might know that there was some basis for my request.

Letter From Dr. Langdon.

Here let me call special attention to the fact that in Dr. Wayman's letter of December 9, 1926, as above quoted, he refers to work done under Dr. S. Langdon. You will also note that in the letter from Registrar E. S. Craig, he states that "Professor S. Langdon is still alive and at Oxford (Jesus College). Anyone who is interested in the matter could write to him for information." After receiving the letter from Mr. Craig, on January 20, 1928, I addressed a letter to Professor Langdon, quoting Mr. Craig as referring me to him, also giving the quotation from Dr. Wayman's letter in which he claimed to have done work for the D. Litt. degree under Dr. Langdon, and requested that Professor Langdon give me a statement concerning the work of Dr. Wayman and also concerning the requirements for the D. Litt. degree from Oxford University. I give Dr. Langdon's reply in full, and let it speak for itself:

"16, Lathbury Road,
OXFORD.
February 7, 1928.

"To the Rev. Lewis M. Hale,
Springfield, Missouri.

Dear Sir:

I do remember Mr. Wayman, who came here to study from Louisville, Kentucky. His preparation was so inferior that he attended few lectures and disappeared without becoming a member of the University. It is impossible to obtain our D. Litt. degree without first becoming an M. A. or B. Litt. of the University, and we never give this degree until the member is of considerable academic standing, and has attained an international reputation. We do give this degree, *honouris causa*, to distinguished scholars, such as President Lowell of Harvard, President Butler of Columbia, and some others, but few living men have attained it. Foreign students can enter here for the D. Phil. degree, but Mr. Wayman had not the remotest chance of getting any degree in a University of our standards. For the D. Phil., after presenting qualifications to enter the graduate school, the candidate must study here at least three years. I do not think that Mr. Wayman would have been admitted as a candidate if he had applied. Professor Gray was teaching at Mansfield College, which is not a corporate part of this University and has no degrees to give of academic nature. The matter is, therefore, entirely clear. Mr. Wayman never entered the University and attended few lectures in the University itself. He was here only a few weeks, and was found to be so badly prepared that his chance of securing a degree, either D. Phil. or even B. Litt. (Bachelor of Letters) was remote.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) S. LANGDON,

Professor of Assyriology and Comparative Semitic Philology. Director of the Oxford Field Museum Expedition in Mesopotamia.

P. S.: I am certain that Professor Gray could never have written any letter to say that our D. Litt. would be conferred on anybody. That is a serious matter to get through the University, and not possible in case of one who has not our M. A. or B. Litt."

Things That Are Evident

The evidence submitted is but little of much that could be submitted, but in my judgment is abundantly sufficient to show, relative to the Oxford degree, that Dr. Wayman made claim to this degree up to such time as that his false claim was discovered. The letter from Registrar E. S. Craig reveals unmistakably the fact that Dr. Wayman was never a matriculated student at Oxford. Dr. Langdon's letter reveals the utter groundlessness of any such claim as Dr. Wayman makes in his letters to me of December 9 and 10, 1926, and his many other similar claims. It also clearly reveals the estimate that Dr. Langdon and others, of Ox-

ford, put on him, in spite of the fact that he was responsible for the "William Jewell Student" declaring that he was "the only outstanding Assyrian scholar of the Southern Baptist Convention."

In the light of this, four things are evident:

First: That Dr. Wayman has claimed and made use of degrees which he did not have, and which he had not a semblance of scholastic or moral right to claim;

Second: That when called in question concerning these rumours, he resorted to false statements for the apparent reason of trying to stop the rumours without revealing the facts, sufficient evidence of which is found in the letters which he wrote to me personally;

Third: That in the last analysis, when his false claims were disproven, he has resorted to flat denial of things which he had written in his own hand, and about which there are competent witnesses other than his own handwriting."

Fourth: That in dire extremity, after the failure of all other efforts, he has persistently and determinedly made every possible effort to obscure the real issue--

(a) By confusing the minds of Missouri Baptists and friends of William Jewell College as to what is the real issue. I am of the opinion that a thorough investigation will reveal that Dr. Wayman is primarily responsible for the present storm of criticism being made of members of the faculty, as well as of some of the trustees, and that this has been inspired for no other reason than to obscure the first and fundamental issue, which is the question of veracity, integrity and honour.

(b) By a deliberate and purposeful attempt not only to misrepresent the facts, but to destroy the confidence of friends of William Jewell College in the men to whom these facts are known, and who have refused to be manipulated in such a way as to keep the facts from Missouri Baptists and friends of William Jewell College. It has been interesting and possibly quite significant to discover that in every case known to me where Dr. Wayman has made an attack on a man, either from the standpoint of orthodoxy, or character, without a single exception the man whom he has attacked has had in his possession—to Dr. Wayman's certain knowledge—facts which, when known, would completely discredit Dr. Wayman.

In the light of these facts, I am willing to be judged, and willing to leave the issue, so far as Dr. Wayman is concerned, in the hands of those who believe that a profession of Christian faith and the occupying of the honoured position of president of William Jewell College demands adequate emphasis on the fundamental virtues of character; namely, veracity, integrity and honour.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I want to reassert that I have not at any time been party to any effort to turn William Jewell College over to the modernists, nor do I believe that such a charge can rightly be made against any trustee or member of the faculty. I understand that charges of modernistic tendency have been made against at least three members of the faculty. I have also been informed that in the early part of this year such charges were circulated purportedly "to the trustees of William Jewell College." I here and now declare that these charges, made in one form and another, and sent to some of the trustees of William Jewell College, were not sent to me; consequently I know nothing of their virtue or lack of virtue, as the case may be.

With reference to two of the men, I have only this to say: Doctors Fleet and Parker were members of the faculty of William Jewell College when I was a student. I studied under each of them. At different times I was also a member of a Sunday School class taught by each of them. At no time do I ever recall hearing what would seem to me even a questionable assertion from them. Through all the years I have held them in high esteem as the finest of Christian gentlemen. Their influence on my life has been both effective and wholesome. I could not do other, were I called upon, than bear testimony to this fact.

With reference to their present beliefs, I have made no inquiry, and have had no reference with them on these matters. I was a member of the Board of Trustees at the time that Mr. Slaten was let out, and voted for his release. If

I were at present a member of the Board of Trustees, I would feel honour bound to make an honest effort to discover the real facts concerning the views of any faculty member when such views were questioned, and then govern myself according to what was revealed by a thorough investigation, as I did in the case of Mr. Slaten. On the other hand, I most assuredly would not give undue weight to questionable statements and seeming deliberate attempts to misrepresent and discredit men who have consecrated the major portion of their life to the ongoing of William Jewell College.

The facts which I have set forth are sufficient, I think, to justify my conviction and my stand in these matters. The letters which are quoted are in my possession, and I stand ready to reveal them to anyone who will call on me personally. I do not anticipate that anyone would question my veracity to this extent, but I most sincerely assure you of my willingness to submit not only the evidence which is set forth in this letter, but much that could not be set forth due to the limits of this letter.

This statement of facts is set forth in the hope that it may be the means of clearing up an ugly and threatening situation, and thus making possible a better understanding of the things which are involved, and through this understanding a hearty co-operation toward the making of William Jewell College all that its founders and the Heavenly Father would have it be."

After having read the above "Open Letter"—carefully I wrote Mr. Hale asking him for copies of certain letters. I confess I was now prejudiced in Dr. Wayman's favour, and endeavoured to defend him against what I feared might be an unjust attack upon him on account of his removal of the three professors from William Jewell College. I therefore wrote Rev. Lewis M. Hale the following letter:

LETTER TO REV. LEWIS M. HALE.

Des Moines, Iowa,
July 20th, 1928.

Rev. Lewis M. Hale,
First Baptist Church,
Springfield, Missouri.

My dear Bro. Hale:

I am writing you as President of the Board of Trustees of Des Moines University. Some weeks ago, Dr. H. C. Wayman, formerly President of William Jewell College, was elected President of Des Moines University. So far as I am aware, the Trustees of Des Moines University had no knowledge of the general situation in respect to the discussion which has been going on about Dr. Wayman's degrees. The only member of the Trustee Board who had any knowledge of this matter was Rev. R. F. Jaudon of Kansas City, but he was not present at the meeting at which Dr. Wayman was elected. Nor have I had any conversation with him on the subject since, except to be assured by him that the Baptist Ministerial Association of Kansas City had passed a resolution expressive of their confidence in Dr. Wayman.

Only last week a copy of your "Open Letter to Missouri Baptists and Friends of William Jewell College" came into my hands. I must frankly confess that I have read your letter with deep interest. You inform your readers in the opening paragraph that, "A sense of duty compels you to give this presentation of facts". I may safely assume, therefore, that you desire the full light of day to be shed upon this whole question.

I am writing you now to ask your further assistance in getting to the bottom of this question. In the last paragraph but one of your letter you say: "The letters which are quoted are in my possession, and I stand ready to reveal them to any one who will call on me personally. I do not anticipate that any one would question my veracity to this extent, but I most sincerely assure you of my willingness to submit not only the evidence which is set forth in this letter, but such that could not be set forth due to the limitations of this letter.

I write you now to ask that you put all the evidence in your possession at my disposal. I beg to request that you

will be good enough to give me a complete copy of the following letters:

Your letter to Register E. S. Craig, of Oxford University, whose letter is printed on page nine of your pamphlet.

Dr. Wayman's letter to you under date of February 3, 1928, and of your reply dated February 8, 1928, to each of which reference is made on pages nine and ten of your pamphlet.

A copy of your letter to Dr. Wayman dated December 8, 1926, and a complete copy of Dr. Wayman's letter to you dated December 9, 1926, to each of which you refer at the bottom of page eleven of your pamphlet.

A complete copy of Dr. Wayman's letter to you dated December 10, 1926, to which you refer on page twelve of your pamphlet.

A copy also of your letter to Professor S. Langdon, 16 Lathbury Road, Oxford, a reply to which you publish in full on page thirteen of your pamphlet.

A copy of the letter received by you from Editor S. M. Brown, of *The Word and Way*, and a copy of your reply thereto, both of which are referred to at the top of page six of your pamphlet.

Compliance with the foregoing requests may involve you in some expense. Will you please, therefore, have all these copies made at my expense, and I will gladly pay any bills you may send me. If any of the letters, of which I have asked copies, were written by hand, I beg to ask that you be good enough to have them reproduced for me photographically at my expense.

On page thirteen of your pamphlet, the last paragraph, you say that "Evidence submitted is but little of much that could be submitted", etc., and in the paragraph I have before quoted, you practically repeat the same statement and announce your readiness to produce all the letters in your possession. My one desire in this whole matter is to get at the facts of the case. We are entire strangers to each other—your name to me is only a name; and I feel sure if you have ever heard of me at all, my name is nothing more than a name to you. We neither of us, I hope, have any end but the cause of truth to serve. The Management of Des Moines University is profoundly interested in the matter you discuss; and from the assurance given in your pamphlet, I assume your readiness to supply us with all the information on this subject you possess.

You have a right to ask what use I intend to make of these letters, for the copies of which I have asked. My answer is that, in the first place, I want all the evidence in the case. When we have gone to the bottom and ascertained all the facts, they will be published in *The Gospel Witness*, and in addition to the regular circulation of the paper, we shall send a copy to every Baptist pastor and Baptist official whose name we can obtain in the states of Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, and Illinois, and to the entire membership of the Baptist Bible Union of North America. I enclose a copy of *The Gospel Witness* for July 5th, on pages thirty-one and thirty-two of which you will find an article which will afford you some idea of the extent of the circulation of *The Gospel Witness*.

As I am hoping to leave for Europe early in August, I should be greatly obliged if you will let me have an immediate reply, informing me how soon you will be able to send the material for which I have asked.

Hoping to hear from you immediately, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) T. T. Shields,

President, Board of Trustees.

To this letter I received the following replies:

REV. L. M. HALE'S REPLY.

455 South Avenue,
Springfield, Miss.

July 25th, 1928.

Dr. Thomas T. Shields,

Des Moines University, Des Moines, Iowa.

My dear Dr. Shields:

I am enclosing copy of letter to Judge Frank W. Armstrong, Plattsburg, Missouri, which will be self-explanatory.

A bit of explanation, however, should be made. At a meeting of the Alumni Association of William Jewell College, Wednesday, May 23, a committee was appointed and authorized to make a thorough and unbiased investigation of the situation at William Jewell. Judge Armstrong is the chairman of that committee. I was summoned to appear before this committee in Liberty on Monday, June 25. At that time I surrendered to the Committee all of my correspondence—carbon copies of letters which I had written, and replies which I had received. I think the only letter that was lost at all was the letter which I received from Dr. Brown, asking me what I knew concerning Dr. Wayman's degrees. Somehow that letter was misplaced, but I surrender a copy reply.

I cannot say what the attitude of the Committee will be in this matter. I do know that besides the documentary evidence which I surrendered to them, they collected a good deal more, and of course I surrendered to them a great many letters which I made no direct reference to in the "Open Letter" to which you refer. I do not know whether or not it might be possible for you, or someone appointed by you, to go to Liberty, but it seems to me that under the circumstances the most effective thing by way of getting at the actual facts, would be to meet some member of the committee in Liberty and go over all the matter—not alone my correspondence. Mr. E. H. Norton, cashier of the Citizens' Bank, Liberty, Missouri, is the custodian of all this documentary evidence, and the materials are kept in a lock box in his bank.

I trust this will satisfy you so far as I am concerned, since it is the very best that I can possibly do under the circumstances.

Cordially yours,
(Signed) Lewis M. Hale.

REV. L. M. HALE'S LETTER TO JUDGE ARMSTRONG.

Judge F. W. Armstrong,
Plattsburg, Missouri.

July 25th, 1928.

My dear Judge Armstrong:

I am enclosing a letter which I have just received from Dr. Thomas T. Shields, President of the Board of Trustees of Des Moines University, Des Moines, Iowa. Evidently someone has supplied him with a copy of my "Open Letter". The information which he asks for is, in my judgment, legitimate. I think, with but one exception, the letters for which he asks are in the files which are in the possession of your committee. The letter received by me from Editor S. M. Brown of the *Word and Way* was somehow misplaced, but I surrendered to your committee the copy of my reply. Of course that was written the week before the meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, when I was still counting on Dr. Wayman to fulfill his promise, and was doing everything in the world I could to defend him. But I presume Dr. Shields understands that. He will, at least, by carefully checking dates as mentioned in my "Open Letter".

I do not know what the attitude of your committee will be in this matter, and I feel that the responsibility now belongs to the committee rather than to me personally. However, I sincerely hope that Dr. Shields' request for copies of these letters may be complied with.

Cordially yours,
(Signed) Lewis M. Hale.

I need not here print in full the further correspondence which passed between Mr. Hale and myself beyond the letter and wire, except to say that pending the receipt of letters from Mr. Hale for which I had asked. I had the William Jewell Trustees' Statement mimeographed, and one hundred and twenty-five copies made. Half of these I sent to Des Moines, and half I retained in my own office in Toronto, sending instructions to Des Moines to reply to enquiries respecting the degree matter by sending one of these mimeographed copies; and from my own office in Toronto I did the same. But from this forward, letters began to rain in upon me respecting Dr. Wayman's degrees. I will here print a few of the many received:

LETTER FROM REV. J. D. KERN, IOWA PASTOR.

First Baptist Church,
Osage, Iowa,
August 31, 1928.

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

Dear Dr. Shields:

I was very much interested in *The Gospel Witness* for June 21, 1928. I think your exposure of fake degrees and fake schools is a fine thing. Many ministers succumb to this temptation to vanity. I am constantly receiving material from the Southern School of Divinity, Dallas, Texas, which offers a D.D. degree for \$200 and work equivalent to less than a Teacher's Training Course.

I am enclosing a pamphlet which will give you additional material on the subject. I shall become a subscriber to *The Gospel Witness* when you show that you have enough fairness and honesty by printing the FACTS contained therein.

With all good wishes, I am,

Yours cordially,
(Signed) John D. Kern.

(Enclosure was a copy of Dr. Hale's Open Letter).

LETTER RE WAYMAN DEGREES.

Toronto, June 28th, 1928.

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

Dear Dr. Shields:

Is the Rev. H. C. Wayman who has just been appointed President of Des Moines University the same Rev. H. C. Wayman who, when President of the Jewell College, Liberty, Mo., used certain academic degrees which he did not possess, among them being that of Litt. D. of Oxford? Please reply through *The Gospel Witness*.

Yours faithfully,

REV. T. J. HIND'S LETTER.

Moose Jaw, Sask.,
July 7th, 1928.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Dr. Shields:

I have just arrived home from Chatham, Ont., where I had a delightful visit with my mother. I find on my desk a letter from you asking for help for Des Moines, and also announcing that Dr. Wayman has accepted the position of President. I also find another letter from a minister in Mo. telling me that Dr. Wayman is a man whose record in William Jewell College was far from satisfactory. He tells me that he was very dishonest in the matter of using degrees that he never earned. In order to substantiate his word he has sent me a copy of an open letter to the Baptists of Mo. I have been wondering if you have ever seen a copy of that open letter, written by a Rev. Lewis M. Hale, of Springfield, Mo. He says he was a member of the governing board of William Jewell, and resigned on account of the evil effects that the dishonest claims of President Wayman to educational standing were having on the student body. If his letter is true, a terrible blow has been dealt to Des Moines by the devil in the appointment of Dr. Wayman to the presidency.

I would be glad to hear from you on this matter, and will send you the letter if you have not seen it. I thought that the same person who sent it to me might send you one.

Sincerely yours in the battle for souls,

(Signed) T. J. Hind.

September 18th, 1928.

Rev. T. J. Hind,
106 Stadacona St. West,
Moose Jaw, Sask.

My Dear Brother Hind:

I am sorry your letter of July 7th has remained unanswered. I have been investigating the reports about Dr. Wayman, and his degrees; and all I am able to say on the subject is said in the enclosed report. You may rest assured if there should be found any truth in these allegations, the Trustees of Des Moines will deal with it.

With every good wish,

Yours heartily,
(Signed) T. T. Shields.

DR. GILLON'S LETTER re WAYMAN'S DEGREES.

Shawnee, Okla.
July 7, 1929.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,
Jarvis St. Baptist Church,
Toronto, Canada.

Dear Dr. Shields:

I received *The Gospel Witness* and have read with interest the issue of last week.

I notice you brethren have elected Dr. Wayman President of Des Moines University. Have you seen the tract sent out by Rev. Lewis Hale, Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Springfield, Missouri, relative to the recent trouble in William Jewell? If you have not seen this tract, you ought to secure a copy of it. Hale is one of strongest men in Missouri. He has never been suspected of being modernistic in any way.

I hope Dr. Wayman's relationship to the institution will be wholly a benediction. I am very much interested in the development of your school. I am greatly concerned that it be not merely fundamentalist in name, but fundamentalist in fact and that it will be Baptist fundamentalism.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,
(Signed) J. W. Gillon.

LETTERS FROM REV. H. G. HAMILTON.

Austin, Minn.
July 13th, 1928.

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

My dear Doctor Shields:

Yesterday I was invited to deliver an ordination sermon in Iowa. I brought along a little D.M.U. literature and before eleven churches represented I got in a word for the "U". Of course there were those present who were not friendly to our efforts; that is understood; but my surprise was to be handed a pamphlet written by Lewis M. Hale indicting Dr. H. C. Wayman of making use of scholastic degrees to which he had no scholastic right.

When we were considering Dr. Wayman for the presidency of Des Moines I had heard a little talk about his use of degrees. I recollect the mention of the matter at the Board meeting; it was also stated there that the difficulty in that matter was settled. Of course you have seen the pamphlet and are aware of the controversy. Although I was exceedingly anxious for Des Moines to have Dr. Wayman, but if this indictment is true I believe it would be a great mistake for us to invite him to the presidency.

I am to have a vacation during the month of August, and am planning speaking engagements each night in behalf of D.M.U. If you should care to write or wire me, my address will be Knollwood, St. Charles, Illinois.

The days are dark, beloved, but greater is He that is for us than they that are against us. I am more and more convinced of the necessity of Des Moines.

Loyally in God,
(Signed) H. G. Hamilton.

First Baptist Church,
Austin, Minnesota,
July 28th, 1928.

Dr. T. T. Shields,
Toronto, Ont.

My dear Dr. Shields:

I was exceedingly sorry to receive the bulletin from D.M.U. yesterday and to note that in spite of my information to you by letter a few weeks ago concerning Dr. H. C. Wayman's scandal concerning scholastic degrees, we are going ahead to place him at the head of the University as President.

I do say if Dr. Wayman's scandal is true, as reported by Dr. Hale, Pastor of the First Church of Springfield, Mo., and if he is placed as President of D.M.U., we might as well close the doors and quit, and you will have to apologize to all your brethren in the Ontario Convention for your articles in *The Gospel Witness* on "Degrees".

Monday morning I leave Austin for four weeks and had planned to do much work in that time in the interests of

the University. My address will be: Knollwood, St. Charles, Ill., c-o Mr. C. J. Anderson. If you will be in the vicinity of Chicago during August, I would like to meet you.

Very sincerely,
(Signed) H. G. Hamilton.

These are but a few of a flood of communications which reached me on this subject. Incidentally, I would call my readers' attention to this consideration: the enormous amount of correspondence involved in dealing with a matter of this sort. It was hard enough to have to be away from home, travelling tens of thousands of miles, suffering daily crucifixion, going begging for money for the University (until we took over the University, in all my ministerial life, I had never once personally asked a single man or woman for a dollar. Hence begging for money was an entirely new experience to me), but the discussion about Dr. Wayman's degrees involved voluminous correspondence. In fact, from the time the President took office my duties as President of the Board of Trustees became vastly heavier than when we had no President at all. I think it probable that my correspondence on this degree question alone exceeded in volume Dr. Wayman's correspondence since he became President of Des Moines.

To Rev. Lewis M. Hale I wrote proposing to publish in *The Gospel Witness* the Statement of the Board of Trustees which I had mimeographed. To this proposal Mr. Hale replied in the following terms (the emphasis in the last paragraph but one in this letter is mine, not Mr. Hale's; but Mr. Hale's remarks are certainly very much to the point, and I felt them to be so. Knowing that such a storm had raged around him, surely Dr. Wayman ought to have recognized that by accepting our call without a frank statement of the case he was dragging us into the storm with him):

LETTER FROM MR. HALE.

First Baptist Church,
Springfield, Mo.,
September 17, 1928.

Dr. T. T. Shields,
130 Gerrard St. E.,
Toronto 2, Ontario.

Dear Dr. Shields:

I have no other motive, in writing you this morning according to statement in night letter last night, than to assist you, if I can, in making a final decision as to what you shall do with reference to the situation which you face as chairman of the trustees of Des Moines University.

I assure you that I have at no time been desirous of injuring Dr. Wayman. My activities relative to him as President of William Jewell College were for the sake of the college only. I hold no grudge, and bear to him no ill will. Indeed, one reason for my attitude since you first wrote me concerning the matter, has been the hope that there might be no necessity of doing him further injury. Another reason for referring you to the committee of which Judge Armstrong is chairman, is that if an investigation must be made, and as you have indicated in "A statement by the President of the Board of Trustees of Des Moines University" your purpose to "go to the bottom of everything", you could do that only by going through the committee to which I referred you. As I indicated in my first letter to you, they have gathered no inconsiderable amount of evidence which was not at my disposal at the time of writing my "Open Letter". Then, as I stated before, I had turned all of my documentary evidence over to this committee in all good faith, and have no desire to take it out of their hands.

There is not the shadow of doubt in my mind that the evidence in the hands of the committee is unquestionably conclusive. Consequently, your letter of September 8, indicating that if I did not respond by September 17 with the letters which you had asked for, you would give the entire matter to the public with a wide circulation, did not greatly concern me, for I felt that any such publication could do no

other than call forth a report from this committee as to their findings. And, in my judgment, if they ever give a report, it will be conclusive. I am quite confident that the committee of investigation, as well as the executive committee of the Alumni Association, have cherished the hope that no report would be necessary, since Dr. Wayman is no longer president of William Jewell College. I cannot speak for the committee, as to what their attitude will be. I presume Judge Armstrong in his letter to you will probably indicate something of the committee's attitude.

Evidently, from your statements, you have been led to conclude that the things set forth in my "Open Letter" are false, and that I fear the light. I want to assure you that there is not a single statement in the "Open Letter" that I would not repeat, or that I have a shadow of doubt of sufficient evidence to substantiate if it must come to a showdown.

There are some questions, too, that would seem to me to shed some light on my "Open Letter":

If the things set forth in my open letter are false, and Dr. Wayman knows them to be false, why did Dr. Wayman resign as President of William Jewell College about three weeks after the going out of the open letter?

If the things stated in my open letter are false, why does Dr. Wayman not take refuge in the laws of Missouri, that lay a heavy penalty on the circulation of slanderous statements? I sent out my open letter, knowing that I would be subject to prosecution if any statement in it could be disproved, on the other hand perfectly confident that I could substantiate any statement in the open letter before any court in the land.

Another question that has arisen in my mind: You stated in your first letter that "so far as I am aware, the trustees of Des Moines University had no knowledge of the general situation in respect to the discussion which has been going on about Dr. Wayman's degrees." The question that arises in my mind is: Why did Dr. Wayman suffer himself to be elected president of Des Moines University without making known to the trustees the contents of my open letter, or even the fact that there had been any question about his degrees? His policy from the beginning has been to cover up, suppress, evade—and, I fear, pervert—the real facts in the case. I think the policy he has pursued is by far the most serious mistake he has made. However, it is not my duty, as I see it now, to do more than I have done.

I am sorry that you find yourself in the situation which must inevitably require no little of your time and cause you no little worry. If you are successful in proving Dr. Wayman innocent, I sincerely believe I could rejoice in that, even though it might reflect on me.

With cordial good wishes, I am,

Yours respectfully,

(Sgd.) Lewis M. Hale

"THEY'VE GOT THE GOODS ON ME."

When visiting Des Moines on one occasion—I am not quite clear as to the date, but after these letters began to arrive—sitting in the President's office with the President and the Secretary of the Board, I pointed out to Dr. Wayman that I had taken such strong ground in *The Gospel Witness* against the use of fictitious and bogus degrees that it was impossible for me to pass this matter over. I pressed that as the personal side of the question. In addition to that I pointed out that Des Moines University would be at a discount if these reports continued to circulate, and I told Dr. Wayman that I thought it would be necessary for me to go to the bottom of the thing; to which he replied in effect: "Then I should have to resign". I asked him why. He said, "Because you would ruin me". Again I insisted that no harm could ever come from publishing of the truth; whereupon he said, "Yes, but they have got the goods on me."

I asked him about certain letters quoted by Mr. Hale, and whether he ever wrote such letters, and whether he had the copies of them; to which he replied that these letters had been written in long hand and he had preserved no copies.

In respect to one matter in Mr. Hale's "Open Letter" where he says, referring to a letter from Dr. Wayman, "In con-

cluding the letter of December 9, he writes: 'Now, Hale, here it is: Harry Clifford Wayman, A.B., A.M., Th.B., Th.D., Litt.D., D.D. How's that? Silly, isn't it? But it's so, and you can tell the devil and his imps'."

I called Dr. Wayman's attention to this paragraph, and asked him if he had a copy of the letter; to which he replied that he had not, and further he said, in effect, "If I wrote that and put in the A.M., it was a mistake." But what will anybody say to such an answer as that? When his degrees are being called in question Dr. Wayman deliberately, according to Mr. Hale, writes a letter to give him information on this subject, and actually includes a degree to which he himself admitted to me he had no title! This, surely, was the wrong time to make such a "mistake"!

After Dr. Wayman had said they had the goods on him, I became profoundly concerned. The proposal I had made to print the Trustees' Statement brought me a volume of correspondence, some of which I print herewith:

LETTER FROM W. M. FITCH.

Saint Louis, Mo.,
Sept. 15, 1928.

Rev. Thos. T. Shields,
c-o Jarvis Street Baptist Church,
Toronto, Canada.

My dear Sir:

My attention has just been called to your letter of the 8th inst., addressed to Dr. Lewis M. Hale, Springfield, Mo., together with inclosures therein. I notice that you are President of the Board of Trustees of Des Moines University, Des Moines, Iowa, and that your Board recently employed Dr. H. C. Wayman, formerly President of William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo., as President of the Des Moines University.

I am writing you because I am now and have for many years been a member of the Board of Trustees of William Jewell College. While I cannot give you the specific information you requested from Dr. Hale, I can give you some information that may be of importance, and can suggest to you sources from which you can get many material facts bearing on the question of the charge that Dr. Wayman, while acting as President of William Jewell College, claimed, used and permitted himself to be accredited with, scholastic and honorary degrees which he did not then have; so if you are interested in investigating this question, as a member of our Board, I am glad to write you as President and member of your Board. I am persuaded that by reason of the position you occupy you fully appreciate that you have a great Christian trust resting upon you, and in order to discharge that trust faithfully, honestly and impartially, it becomes your duty to make a full, thorough, complete investigation of the charges above referred to.

I attended the meeting of the Board of Trustees on March 15, 1928, at the time the so-called resolution was passed by a majority of about 15 to 6, claiming to exonerate Dr. Wayman from the wrongful use of degrees. That resolution, however, you will find, if you get the exact resolution that was passed, was rather evasive in that it did not refer to the degrees which Dr. Wayman had been using, or that which he was accredited while President of William Jewell College in the official and unofficial publications of the College; but the persons who drew the resolution contented themselves by saying substantially that Dr. Wayman "has the degrees which he claimed to have when he came to the College".

If you consider the charge made against Dr. Wayman, that while President of the College he had claimed, used and permitted himself to be accredited with, scholastic and honorary degrees which he did not then have, you readily see that the phraseology of the resolution does not touch this issue side, top or bottom. The question then may arise in your mind how it all came about. If that question now arises in your mind, it will prompt you in the discharge of your Christian trust and duty to make a full, thorough and

complete investigation of the facts. I, therefore, as a member of our Board voluntarily submit to you, as a member of your Board, the following suggestions, bearing on his unfortunate and miserable affair:

At the Board meeting of March 15, 1928, after the resolution passed attempting to exonerate Dr. Wayman, Dr. Hale resigned as a member of the Board and refused to sit in on the Board, because, he stated, the Board had failed and neglected to call before them witnesses of material facts, whose claims had been given to the Board, and had refused to follow the investigation so as to make it thorough and complete.

After the letters referred to in Dr. Hale's open letter had been presented to the Board, and after many personal conferences between Dr. Wayman, on the one hand, Dr. Hale and Dr. Frank Powell, Professor in the Southern Theological Seminary at Louisville, Ky., and later at Louisville, Ky., with other persons whose names were given to the Board, and having received the treatment which he had received at the hands of Dr. Wayman, who by a vote of majority of the Board was retained as President of the College), Dr. Hale refused longer to sit with the Board. He not only stated these facts in substance to the Board, before he left a written resignation which had been prepared long before, but he filed it with the Secretary of the Board.

No doubt the Secretary, Mr. John S. Major, Liberty, Mo., will be glad to give you a certified copy of that resignation and the copies of the letters referred to therein, if you would ask it of him. That resignation with copies of letters would contain some of the material letters you may desire.

At the meeting of the Board on or about the last day of May, 1928, during Commencement of the College, the Board, by a vote of some eight or nine for and about twelve or thirteen against, refused to consider cancelling its action in passing the so-called exonerating resolution of President Wayman. At that meeting three of the professors of William Jewell College (one who had been connected with the College for 37 years, and another for nearly 25 years, and another for some 9 or 10 years, all of them outstanding men in their departments), were dropped from the roll of professors. I will not enter into this discussion further than to say to me it seemed wholly unjustified, unreasonable and unchristian to drop men who had served the College, without producing any specific evidence to support any charge whatever against them. Any facts that may have existed in this matter were kept in the control of the majority of the Board of Trustees, and no such facts were disclosed to the Board that would justify the action taken by the Board.

I make this statement fearlessly, and I will defend the truth of it anywhere, before any body or any tribunal anywhere.

You, however, are not interested in this phase of our controversy. I, therefore, will not press it.

I have noticed you quote an extract from what appears to be the first draft of a proposed letter by the Special Committee appointed by the Board at its Commencement meeting, 1928, in reply to Dr. Hale's open letter. The Committee consisted of W. D. Johnson, Fidelity Trust Building, Kansas City, Mo.; Rev. L. M. Proctor, Independence, Mo.; and W. H. Griffith, St. Joseph, Mo. The quotation in that first letter referred to in the inclosures to your letter to Dr. Hale, reads as follows:

"It developed at the hearing that Dr. Hale and Dr. Powell were guilty of gross deception in their dealings with Dr. Wayman, mentioned by Dr. Hale in his pamphlet, at the Baltimore Hotel in Kansas City."

You may be interested in knowing, first, that the first draft of a letter from which the quotation was taken, was sent to the members of the Board for their approval or disapproval. It has been reported to me that the majority of the members disapproved the whole letter, and consequently this statement quoted by you.

You also refer to the report of the Committee consisting of W. D. Johnson, John S. Major, John T. Morris and Hugh Wilhite, dated May 22nd, 1927, which exonerated Dr. Wayman and which report was adopted by the majority of the Board of Trustees, March 15, 1928. At the bottom of this report you have the words, as a part of it, as follows:

"Approved by entire Board, March 15, 1928."

This statement is misleading. The report referred to was not approved by the entire Board, but was approved at a meeting of the entire Board by a vote of 15, as I remember, supporting the resolution as greatly modified, and six voting against that part of the resolution purporting to exonerate Dr. Wayman from the charge of misuse of degrees.

It may be interesting to you to know that Mr. Hugh Wilhite, a member of the Committee, who had signed the above-named report, after reflecting over the evidence in the case, at our commencement meeting of the Board, withdrew his support to said report as a member of said Committee, and stated that he could not conscientiously support that report because he had been deceived and misled as to many material facts in the case. He lives at Excelsior Springs, Mo.

No doubt, if you would write to him, or if you could see him personally, he could give you frankly his conclusions as to the whole matter.

Mr. Earl E. Amick, Vice-President of the First National Bank, Kansas City, Mo., voted in favor of exonerating Dr. Wayman on March 15, 1928. After reflecting, however, he changed his mind completely and opposed such exonerations at the Commencement Meeting of the Board. Mr. Buckner, of Marshall, Mo., supported the resolution exonerating Dr. Wayman on the misuse of degrees at the March 15, 1928, meeting, but at the Commencement meeting, as I remember, he had changed his mind on that question. Unfortunately, he died about two weeks ago, so his lips are closed.

Mr. Com. P. Storts, Slater, Mo., was not present at our March 15, 1928, meeting. At Commencement meeting he was present. I do not remember whether he voted on the question of exonerating Dr. Wayman or not. My impression is that he did not, because he had not heard the evidence.

The six persons opposing the so-called resolution exonerating Dr. Wayman on March 15, 1928, were:

E. S. Pillsbury, President, Century Electric Company, St. Louis, Missouri.

J. P. Graham, President, Graham Lumber Company, St. Louis, Missouri.

W. Martin, Director of Federal Land Bank, St. Louis, Mo.

D. Martin, Chief Owner of Buick Auto Agency, Springfield, Mo.

r. Lewis M. Hale, Springfield, Missouri.

7. M. Fitch, Attorney-at-Law, 1837 Boatman's Bank Building, St. Louis, Mo.

It may also lead to the development of some very material facts if you would follow the proceedings of the Alumni Association of William Jewell College, whose annual meeting was held on the day of the meeting of the Trustees during last Commencement. At that meeting Hon. Maurice H. Singer, 1200 Gloyd Building, Kansas City, Mo., was elected President of the Association. A new Board was elected at that meeting, and that Board was authorized to select a committee to investigate the charges of wrongful use of degrees against Dr. Wayman. Agreeable to the resolution, the Board of the Alumni Association met, selected their Investigating Committee, and the Investigating Committee was to have met on either the first or the second Tuesday in June. If I remember correctly, on the day before the date the Committee was to begin their investigations, Dr. Wayman resigned, handing his resignation to W. D. Johnson, President of the Board. Mr. Johnson presented the President of the Alumni Association with the resignation, saying it would be accepted.

The Committee, however, headed by Judge Frank Armstrong, of Plattsburg, Mo., as Chairman, proceeded to collect a great deal of information, data, statements, etc. Those statements are in the custody of the Committee, and as I understand, they are now in the control and possession of Mr. E. H. Norton, Citizens' Bank, Liberty, Mo. I am told that the original letters which Dr. Hale had and many other original letters have been sent to the Investigating Committee of the Association and are now in the custody of Mr. Norton. I have no doubt but what, if any one in your position should apply to the Investigating Committee or to Mr. Norton, that the Committee and Mr. Norton would hold that you have a vital interest in the information, and in my opin-

ion, you could get any information you wanted bearing on this question.

The Alumni Association of St. Louis prepared a letter outlining the degrees accredited to Dr. Wayman in the official and unofficial publications of the College, and after Dr. Hale's open letter was made public, added a postscript to that letter, and the letter and the postscript were addressed to the Trustees. Captain Archie E. Groff, Attorney-at-Law, Paul Brown Building, St. Louis, Mo., was President of the Association, and no doubt if he were requested, a copy of that letter could be forwarded to you.

The first draft of a letter in reply to Dr. Hale's open letter, as prepared by the Committee consisting of Messrs. Johnson, Proctor and Griffith, was sent to the members of Board or the Secretary, that the latter draft of the letter majority of the Board, so I was informed. I was afterwards informed, though not officially from the President of the Board or the Secretary, that the latter draft of the letter was not sent out. I do not know whether it received the approval of a majority of the Board or not. However, it was my understanding that it would not be made public. The enclosures in your letter to Dr. Hale was the first intimation that I had that either draft of the Committee's letter had been made public. This act was entirely contrary to my understanding of the proposed procedure.

I opposed the Board's answering Dr. Hale's letter. Among the reasons for my position may be named the following:

- (1) Dr. Hale's letter was not addressed to the Board.
- (2) Dr. Hale's letter referred to personal acts and doings of Dr. Wayman. Dr. Wayman had personal knowledge of all the essential facts contained in Dr. Hale's letter. He knew what the facts were. The Board did not know except as they could gather their information here and there.
- (3) It was not proper in a controversy of this kind for the Board to assume the responsibility of writing a letter in reply to Dr. Hale's open letter, but if reply should be made, it should come from Dr. Wayman himself.
- (4) I held that Dr. Wayman owed it to the Board of Trustees of William Jewell College; he owed it to the denomination to reply to Dr. Hale's letter personally, and to tell the truth about the facts contained therein. He did not reply.
- (5) I further hold that in the face of the facts presented, the Board could not hold that Dr. Wayman was free from blame under the charges referred to.
- (6) I specifically opposed the proposed letter on several grounds, among which I may state the following:
 - (a) The letter does not give all the facts that were presented to the Board of Trustees on March 15, 1928.
 - (b) The letter of the Committee from the Board includes matters that were not presented to the Board of Trustees on March 15, 1928.
 - (c) The Board had not made a full, complete and exhaustive investigation of all the facts in the matter. Many sources, which, if followed, would have disclosed material facts, were not investigated by the Board. For this failure I cannot believe the Board was blameless.

It was in evidence before the Board that Dr. Wayman had given L. M. Hale a letter dated Dec. 9, 1926, in which Dr. Wayman claimed that he had the degrees in question, to wit: A.M., Th.D., and D. Litt. In that letter Dr. Wayman justified his claim of D. Litt. from Oxford University.

The Trustees had before them the official catalogue publications of the College, during President Wayman's presidency. All of those publications, until March 15, 1927, accredited Dr. Wayman with the three degrees in question, and the degree of D.D. The catalogue issue of March 15, 1927, omitted the three degrees in question.

Dr. Wayman admitted to the Board, concerning these degrees as follows:

- (a) He never at any time had received the degree of A.M.
- (b) He received the degree of Th.D. on May 4, 1927, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, the day after Commencement.
- (c) He received the degree of D. Litt. from Georgetown College, after Commencement, 1927.
- (d) He denied all claim of a right to a degree from Oxford

University, and denied that he had ever applied for a degree therein, or had ever become a student or applicant for any degree therefrom.

These matters were all presented to the Board on March 15, 1928.

None of these important matters are referred to in the letter of the Committee.

I, therefore, felt that to approve that letter would be nothing short of an utter disregard of the great Christian trust that is resting upon me, as a Trustee of the College, and would stultify myself as a man.

Dr. Hale in his open letter has not attempted to give all of the facts then before the Board of Trustees; and of course he has not attempted to give the facts that have since that board meeting in March last, been brought to the surface. I can say to you, however, that I have read the open letter of Dr. Hale, and so far as he attempts to give the facts, and the copies of letters therein referred to and set out, he is substantially correct.

You may be interested in ascertaining if the report be true, that while a professor at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary for eight or ten years, Dr. Wayman was accredited with the degree of Th.D. He stated to the Board that this was a fact; he also stated that he did not authorize that publication in the official catalogue of the Seminary; he stated that he knew that he was not then entitled to that degree; he knew it was being published in the official catalogue, so he said, but he did not call the error to the attention of anyone.

Now concerning the credit claimed for the D. Litt. from Oxford:

(1) In addition to the matter thereon in Dr. Hale's letter, *The Student*, unofficial publication, Nov. 22, 1923, contained a detailed biographical account of Dr. Wayman, his family, his studies, attainments, etc. This gave intimate information. The article was by Mr. Hill, then in the senior class. This was before the Board. Since then, other information has been suggested on this question as follows:

(a) Professor P. Casper Harvey, Liberty, Mo., was given by Dr. Wayman, for publicity matters, a statement of Dr. Wayman's attendance at Oxford University, and matters concerning the D. Litt. degree from that University.

(b) We had caps and gowns at the inaugural services for Dr. Wayman, Nov. 22, 1923; Dr. Wayman requested Dr. John P. Fruit, Liberty, Mo., to procure for him cap and gown with Oxford colours.

(c) While in the College Library, being dressed out with caps and gowns, making ready for the march to the Baptist Church, Dr. Wayman stated to Professor P. Casper Harvey, and one or two others, that he has much trouble in getting appropriate Oxford colours for his cap and gown.

(d) Dr. Wayman spoke to other persons about having his Oxford degree; the two professors above mentioned can give you the names of such persons if you desire to pursue investigation.

I will not burden this letter further on this line.

Dr. Hale and others gave information and the names of persons who would be able to give other material and important information bearing on this question, but a majority of the Board did not want to extend the investigation.

Dr. Wayman stated that he did not know that he was being accredited with the three degrees he did not have, in the official catalogues of the College. I could not accept that statement. I desired to get the full information and facts on this point. The majority decided otherwise.

The fact that this investigation was not full, exhaustive and complete, was humiliating to me. I realized full well that many facts had been said to exist, and the names of the persons who could give information thereon had been given us, and I also realized that by following our investigation, we could ascertain definitely whether or not Dr. Wayman actually knew he was being credited with actually having the degrees of A.M., Th.D., and D. Litt., which he was being credited with in the OFFICIAL CATALOGUES, published after Dr. Wayman came to Liberty as President. But the Board did not see fit to extend its investigation.

Since the meeting of the Board in March, 1928, it has been reported to me that evidence exists which does show that Dr.

Wayman actually approved the lists of the Faculty and their degrees, which list was headed by the name of Dr. Wayman, followed by the three which Dr. Wayman admitted to the Board on March 15, 1928, he did not have at the times of such publications of the official catalogues.

I was fully aware at the time of the existence and of the force of a very wholesome rule concerning the discovery of facts supposed to exist, and was grieved not to continue the investigation. To give it in homely words it may be stated thus:

If a person has actual or constructive notice of the probable existence of a fact, which would, or may bear upon the matter under consideration, and thereafter such person fails, neglects or refuses to make an investigation, such as the case may require, as to the existence of such facts, then such person is chargeable with knowledge of the existence of all facts that such investigation would have disclosed, as fully as he actually knew those facts.

I believed then, and I am convinced now, that if we had followed the leads to information that were before us, and extended our investigation, and if an honest motive to know the facts had been moving each of us to ascertain the truth in the matter, the Board would have reached an entirely different conclusion.

This letter is now too long; as a fair and impartial man, as one who in the discharge of a sacred Christian trust, what do you think of the letter prepared by W. D. Johnson, W. H. Griffith and Rev. L. M. Proctor replying to the Open Letter of Dr. L. M. Hale, where in it he condemns Dr. Hale in the strong words it applies to him and to Dr. Frank Powell, and that letter is SILENT AS TO THE ACTUAL ADMISSIONS OF DR. WAYMAN THAT HE DID NOT HAVE THE THREE DEGREES WHICH HIS LETTER OF Dec. 9, 1926, to Dr. Hale says he had, which degrees had been accredited to Dr. Wayman in the official catalogues published under his personal supervision, except the first issue thereof published before he went to Liberty? You may answer this question when you publish your report.

As before stated, I am giving you this information and am pointing you to sources that will reveal the facts, if you will follow these sources of information, and will make an investigation with an honest desire to ascertain the facts and to know the truth.

Yours truly,
(Signed) W. M. Fitch.

To the forgoing letter I replied in part as follows:

EXTRACT FROM REPLY TO MR. W. M. FITCH.

September 16th, 1928.

Mr. Wm. M. Fitch,
c-o Moore and Fitch,
Boatman's Bank Building,
Saint Louis, Mo.

My dear Mr. Fitch:

I am in receipt of your letter of September 15th, which I have read with some care.

As President of the Board of Trustees of Des Moines University I am, of course, vitally interested in the question raised by Dr. Hale's pamphlet respecting Dr. H. C. Wayman, now President of Des Moines University.

I beg to assure you, first of all, that the Trustees of Des Moines University have no interest to serve but the cause of truth. Dr. Wayman enjoys the full confidence of the Trustees. That confidence is based upon such evidence as has been submitted to us respecting the question at issue. I hope it is unnecessary for me to assure you that if the Trustees had believed Dr. Wayman to be guilty of the deception Dr. Hale charges against him, he would never have been elected as President of Des Moines University. Or if the evidence were now produced which could unquestionably establish the truth of Dr. Hale's contentions, Dr. Wayman would not be retained. I should like it to be clearly understood that the Trustees of Des Moines University would not condone such conduct as that of which Dr. Wayman is accused by Dr. Hale.

(Signed) Thomas T. Shields.

Later I received the following:

LETTER FROM JUDGE ARMSTRONG.

September 17, 1928.

Dr. T. T. Shields,
130 Gerrard St. E.,
Toronto 2, Ontario.

My Dear Dr. Shields:

Your recent correspondence with Dr. L. M. Hale has been forwarded to me. The committee appointed by the Alumni Association of William Jewell College has received a mass of evidence in addition to that turned over by Dr. Hale. Since Dr. Wayman's relation to William Jewell College has been severed the committee felt that publication of this evidence should be withheld since no interest would be served thereby. Your correspondence with Dr. Hale leads me to say to you that the interest of common justice may force the publication of this evidence.

If, before you publish the purported report from the William Jewell College trustees, you desire to examine all this evidence a time and place for such examination may be arranged between us.

Most sincerely,
Frank W. Armstrong.

—No. 32—

SECOND LETTER FROM MR. W. M. FITCH.

St. Louis, Mo.,
September 25, 1928.

Dr. T. T. Shields,
130 Gerrard St. E.,
Toronto 2, Ontario.

Dear Dr. Shields:

Your favour of the 17th inst., in reply to my letter to you of the 15th inst. is received.

I trust the opportunity may present itself so that you may meet me face to face, and discuss the matters referred to in your letters as well as other matters. I assure you it will be a pleasure to me to extend to you all the time that may be necessary for such a conference at any time you are in the city.

In reading your letter of the 17th inst., it appears that you have entirely misconstrued the purport of my letter of the 15th inst. You have assumed that I have filed a charge with you against Dr. Wayman, and have also assumed that I am trying to support such a charge with evidence, and that you are called upon to decide the competency and relevancy and materiality of such evidence. In this matter you are wholly mistaken.

As Dr. Wayman is no longer connected with William Jewell College, I, as a Trustee of that College, have no concern whatever in pressing any public charge against him. On this point, it is sufficient to say that when our Alumni Association empowered its Executive Committee to select an Investigating Committee, and empowered the Association and its committees to investigate the charges concerning Dr. Wayman, and when Dr. Wayman was advised that such investigation was imminent, and the Committee would meet on the following day for organization and to begin its investigation, Dr. Wayman, rather than face the public investigation of such charges, resigned as President of William Jewell College. His resignation under such circumstances may or may not be a matter that you care to investigate. It is wholly immaterial to me whether you do or do not investigate, or are concerned with such matters, however, there may be a reason for his resignation. (Emphasis ours.—G.W.)

I made it clear in my letter of the 15th inst. to you why it was written. In your letter to Dr. Lewis M. Hale, on the 8th inst., you enclosed him certain letters which you proposed to make public, through *The Witness*, a publication under your supervision, if Dr. Hale did not give you certain other information by the 17th inst., notwithstanding Dr. Hale had written you that the information you desired was no longer in his possession, but had been delivered by him to the Investigating Committee appointed by the Alumni Association of William Jewell College. You proposed to give wide publicity to those letters; and in your letter of the 17th inst., you state you have already given publicity to them by sending them to inquiring persons: I notice two important communications, viz., the two letters from which you quote, and to which you refer as being letters written by a

Committee appointed by the Trustees of William Jewell College, as the reply of the Trustees to the open letter of Lewis M. Hale, addressed to Baptists of Missouri and friends of William Jewell College.

The first letter of that Committee was disapproved by a majority of the Board of Trustees, and no publicity was to be given thereto; and likewise, after the second letter was written by the Committee, it was determined to give no publicity to it. I am told that the President of our Board of Trustees has so advised you; notwithstanding these facts, you have already given publicity to these letters, as being authorized or approved by our Trustees, when the fact is otherwise. I am not a little surprised that you have taken such action in this matter.

You seem to wonder why a minority report has not been filed, etc. It may be interesting to you to know that I served notice on our Board of Trustees that a minority report would be filed by me on behalf of those who agreed with my views, if either of the above-mentioned letters, in reply to the open letter of Lewis M. Hale, were made public. Inasmuch as neither of these letters were made public by authority of our Board, there has been no occasion so far for a minority report to be filed, or made public.

Inasmuch as Dr. Wayman's relation to William Jewell College has terminated, then, manifestly, so far as he is concerned, and so far as our Board of Trustees are concerned, we should treat his former relations with us as a closed book. I feel that we ought to give all possible attention and consideration to supporting the work of our new president, and to continue to develop the great ideals for which our College has stood, and for which it now stands. I am only too glad to wash my hands of the dirty mess that existed under the administration of Dr. Wayman.

But be assured of another fact—I will not sit idly by and permit damaging reports that reflect upon the honour, the integrity and the Christian standing of any of the Alumni of William Jewell College, or of any present or former member of its Board of Trustees, when such proceeding is carried on for the purpose of making it appear that Dr. Wayman's record was faultless while at William Jewell College. Others must not be traduced in order to cover up his fault. Any publicity of the nature referred to, would of necessity call for the facts in relation thereto from William Jewell College, from its Board of Trustees, from its Alumni Association, and from any one else who may be interested.

From my investigation of the facts, I am convinced of certain things concerning the administration of Dr. Wayman while President of William Jewell College. I suggested these things to you. I have investigated the facts and their sources to my satisfaction. Believing that you desire to know the truth in relation to these matters, and believing that if you would follow the sources of information that I have followed, you would be greatly assisted in arriving at the truth by investigating these matters, I voluntarily gave you a suggestion of what you might expect to find from such investigation; I gave you the names and addresses of the parties and the sources that you may follow in carrying on such investigation. I thought possibly you desired to have this information to enable you to deal wisely and honestly as the President of the Board of Trustees of Des Moines University. I did not write you with the idea of, first, preferring charges against Dr. Wayman, and, secondly, of substantiating those charges by legal evidence. As I stated, I attempted to give you nothing more than a suggestion of what you may ascertain by making an investigation along the lines suggested. You may not deem such an investigation of importance, or necessary. That is a matter for you to decide. You may think the suggestions made by me are immaterial. That, also, is a matter for you to decide. But where the President of a College has used, or has permitted the use of three major degrees, to wit, the degrees of A.M., Th.D., and D. Litt., to be used after his name in the official publication of the College for four years, and then suddenly drops these three degrees and at a hearing before the Board of Trustees admits that during the time of such official publications he did not have those degrees; and when it appears that such official publications were made under the supervision of such President, and where he writes a personal letter to one of our Trustees—as he wrote to Lewis M. Hale on December 9th, 1926, when the matter of only one of those degrees had been called to his attention—and not only justifies his claim to that one degree but also claims

then to have all three of the degrees now in question, when as a matter of fact he admits he had neither one of them—then it seems to me that such suggestions made to one in your position are worthy of the most careful and earnest investigation. I thought this a matter of concern for our Board. However, you may deem otherwise as to your Board.

I also suggest to you that I have read the open letter of Lewis M. Hale, and that I also saw the original letters referred to in that open letter, when Dr. Hale presented those original letters to the Board of Trustees on March 15, 1928. An investigation will show that every letter referred to by Lewis M. Hale in his open letter was correctly reported in the open letter; in addition to that, I do not hesitate to suggest to you that a personal investigation of this matter on your part, so far as the documents and papers and other evidence in the hands of the Investigating Committee of the Alumni Association is concerned, will not only reveal the fact that the letters referred to by Lewis M. Hale are correctly reported, but also would reveal other material facts that bear directly on Dr. Wayman's administration of affairs of William Jewell College. These things may or may not explain to you the reason for Dr. Wayman's sudden resignation.

I am advised that the Investigating Committee of the Alumni Association would give you, if you so desire, the information in their possession bearing on these questions.

I wrote you in the first instance because I felt the information you had in hand and had already given to individuals who had written you—which information you proposed to publish in *The Witness*, your newspaper—did not agree with the facts. I felt it my duty as a member of our Board, which had formerly employed Dr. Wayman, to write you my impression of some of the pertinent facts and to tell you where you could ascertain the facts at first hand, if you desired to know the truth. I think this should have assisted you in the discharge of your duty to your College and to your Board. Again, I did not want to see you placed in the position of giving to the people statements that were not supported by any fact whatever. Such statements may cover things for a while, but I am persuaded that you know that any perversion of facts of this character could not be long concealed. I felt that you would be helped if you knew the names of persons to whom you could go for information, and whom, you were assured, had possession of information that would be material in aiding you to arrive at the facts. In giving you the suggestions that I have offered, I have only desired to place some of the material things in this matter before you for your consideration. I do not know how these things I have suggested may appeal to you. You may deem my suggestions worthy of investigation, or otherwise. That, of course, is not so much a concern of mine as it is of yours. Publicity given to half truths and wrongful impressions drawn therefrom, will not answer in the place of the full truth on this or on any other question. I am glad these matters were called to my attention before you gave broad publicity to them, and I am glad that I have been able to write you some things that seem to me to be worthy of investigation by you.

These things have come from me not with the idea of preferring charges or prosecuting any charges, but with the sole purpose of enabling you to be in possession of certain facts which, I am assured, exist, and also which, I am equally sure, will be material in aiding you to arrive at the truth in the matter.

I trust you will take my suggestions in this spirit.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) William M. Fitch.

On the 17th of September I received the following telegram jointly signed by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of William Jewell College and the President of the Alumni Association:

WIRE FROM WINGER AND JOHNSON.

Kansas City, Mo.,
September 17th, 1928.

Thomas T. Shields,
130 Gerrard St. E.,
Toronto, Ont.

Your correspondence with Hale has come to us through Judge Armstrong. We take the liberty of suggesting that further publicity regarding the Wayman controversy will do

no good for anyone, but will be injurious to both William Jewell and Des Moines University as well as Dr. Wayman. We therefore request that the matter be dropped.

W. D. JOHNSON, Chairman Board of Trustees;
MAURICE H. WINGER, President Alumni Association, William Jewell College.

To this telegram I replied as follows:

TELEGRAM.

September 18th, 1928.

Mr. Maurice H. Winger,
(Reply Telegram),
Kansas City, Mo.

Thanks for your wire. Will gladly withhold all public reference to matter until I hear from you. As I leave for England Friday, this will postpone matter until return. Lacking other matter, compelled to use Trustees' report. Privately answer enquirers. Des Moines must ultimately free herself all suspicion.

T. T. SHIELDS.

GOING TO ENGLAND.

I left Toronto for Montreal on the 21st of September on my way to England. Other correspondence came just about the time of my leaving or immediately after, but my telegram to Mr. Winger closed the matter until I should return from England.

I ought here perhaps to explain that for eight years I had not taken a day's holiday. Duties and responsibilities had multiplied so that summer and winter every day, and usually far into the night, I had to work on. But in September my splendid Deacons came into my office in a body one day and said, "Pastor, we are beginning to feel deep concern for you. We have been glad to have you go abroad and serve other interests than those immediately connected with this church, but there is a limit to human endurance, and unless you stop we greatly fear that Jarvis Street Church may suddenly be deprived of its Pastor. We think you owe it to this church, as well as to yourself, to take care of yourself; and we have come to present you with this cheque for \$1,500.00, and to insist that you drop everything and get across the sea where no one can get at you, that you may take a good long rest." I had begun to feel the need of it, and therefore acceded to the request of my beloved brethren, and made preparations to go to England. It will thus be seen that it was impossible for me to carry on my correspondence about Dr. Wayman's degrees. But I now print the correspondence which reached my office either too late for me to consider it, or actually after I had left:

(Copy)

LETTER FROM MR. H. WINGER.

Gloyd Building,
Kansas, Mo.,
September 18th, 1928.

Dr. T. T. Shields,
130 Gerrard St. E.
Toronto 2.

Dear Sir:

I had an interview with Judge Frank W. Armstrong on Saturday. Judge Armstrong is the Chairman of the Investigating Committee which was authorized by the Alumni Association of William Jewell College at a meeting of the Association held in June. At that time I was elected as President of the Association. Shortly after the appointment of the Investigating Committee I had a conference with Dr. Wayman, in which he assured me that if the Investigating Committee would not begin open hearings within one week he would present his resignation as President of William Jewell College and insist on having it accepted.

At that time we were planning to have hearings before the Committee and have the testimony taken in shorthand and reported, to be attached to the report of the Committee. I told Dr. Wayman that I did not believe the Investigating Committee could get started on its work within the week.

I then had a talk with Mr. Johnson, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the College, and told him of my conversation with Dr. Wayman.

Mr. Johnson stated that he believed that Dr. Wayman's usefulness at the College was probably at an end, and that if his resignation should be presented, he would favor accepting it, and believed that it would be accepted. Before the end of the week Dr. Wayman presented his resignation, and it was subsequently accepted.

When this was done, I urged the Executive Committee of the Alumni Association and the Investigating Committee to have no open hearings, and none were ever had. The Committee did, however, ask all parties who had any information in regard to the controversy concerning Dr. Wayman's degrees to submit the information to them. Dr. Lewis M. Hale gave them all of the documentary evidence which he had. They also collected other evidence of a documentary character, all of which is preserved in a safe deposit box in Liberty, Mo. They invited Dr. Wayman and the Trustees to submit any evidence which they desired, but nothing was submitted either by the Trustees or Dr. Wayman.

This Investigating Committee has never published any report and has personally opposed the publication of any report. I have been primarily interested in the good of William Jewell College, and have sought to injure no one. I have consistently taken the position that the sooner the talk about this entire controversy concerning Dr. Wayman and Drs. Fleet and Parker could be stopped, the better it would be for all parties concerned. I am still convinced that further publicity would not only do no good, but would be injurious to William Jewell College, to Dr. Wayman, and I believe now it would be injurious to Des Moines University.

In my talk with Judge Armstrong I suggested that he write you a letter inviting you to review everything that has been filed with our Investigating Committee. I see no reason why you should not see everything that has been submitted to the Committee if you desire. I hope, however, that you will reach the conclusion that any further publicity about this whole unfortunate affair will be useless and will only aggravate what has already been a most disastrous affair.

The statement which you sent to Dr. Hale contains matters which I understand the Board of Trustees has never authorized to be made public. A committee of the Trustees did prepare a report and submit it to the Trustees with the idea of subsequently publishing it. When I learned of this, I had a conference with Mr. W. D. Johnson, Chairman of the Trustees of William Jewell College, and told him that in my opinion to publish this report would be most unfortunate, as it would stir up both sides of the controversy and merely "open up an old sore". He finally agreed with me that nothing further should be published, and both Mr. Johnson and myself are working together to get all parties concerned to drop the entire controversy and forget it. I am persuaded that the sooner this is done, the better it will be for everybody concerned. Mr. Johnson joined me in a telegram to this effect, which was sent to you yesterday, and which I trust you will have received before this letter reaches you.

I am not trying to protect anyone, neither am I trying to injure anyone. I am merely endeavoring to bring a most unfortunate controversy to a close and permit everybody to forget about it.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) MAURICE H. WINGER.

LETTER FROM W. H. WINGER TO W. D. JOHNSON.

Mr. W. D. Johnson,
406 Fidelity Trust Bldg.,
Kansas City, Mo.

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Without having studied the statement extensively, I desire to take exception to two points and recommend its distribution in a corrected form.

1st. The report of the committee to the March 15th Trustees' meeting seems to have been practically transferred to this report with inadequate explanation. This older report may have its place as a historical document, but to incorporate it as a statement of present day fact, as is done, seems absurd. Take this line for example: "There is a good spirit of co-operation between the President, the Faculty, and the Students." In view of commencement week's record, what could be further from a candid and accurate statement of

fact? This document should be brought up to date and inserted as a report of our present committee, or left out, or introduced as history. As used, it is absurd, and such statements will clarify nothing, but rather add to the confusion.

2nd. The last two paragraphs seem to me to contain a libel. I find this: "Dr. Hale and Dr. Powell were guilty of gross deception in their dealings with Dr. Wayman." I take it this language carries an accusation of, or at least implies, dishonourable dealings or conduct on the part of these gentlemen. The facts developed at the hearing were these: A three party conference had been arranged by wire. Dr. Hale and Dr. Wayman arrived first. Dr. Hale was anxious to meet Dr. Powell before entering the conference. He therefore excused himself on the plea of another engagement. He met Dr. Powell at his train, talked things over, and thereafter withheld the fact of this prior meeting from Wayman upon returning to the place of the conference. What is wrong here? Dr. Hale had a perfect right to meet his friend before the conference, and he was under absolutely no obligation to disclose the fact. If an excuse or subterfuge was invented to make an opening for this meeting, Dr. Hale claimed that experience with the third party justified such, and the fact that Dr. Wayman berated Dr. Hale at the March Trustees' meeting, and here again reverts to the subject, goes far toward convincing me that he may have been right. You cannot always deal with one keen as a Damascus blade to find an opening in his opponent's armour just as frankly as you would like to do. Reference to this matter ought to be cut out of this report, or else the facts ought to be set forth as I have done. As it reads now, the statements are misleading, if not libelous. The references to the scurrilous letter that Dr. Hale had, may throw some heat on the subject, but no light. It were better to leave those out also.

In general I wish to endorse the efforts to prepare this statement, and especially to express my thanks for the assistance that it has already been to me in clarifying my own understanding of the situation.

The two letters from Dr. Wayman of February 14th and April 11th, 1923, respectively, which are now for the first time opened up before us, have been especially helpful.

The difficulty that I have had in appraising Wayman's character has been to reconcile the following facts:

For several years while at the Seminary prior to coming to William Jewell, Wayman was wrongfully accredited in the Seminary publications with the degree of Doctor of Theology, Th.D. This fact was discovered after some years, and he was required to get into line to make good his claim to this distinction; however, before completing the necessary work, he was called to William Jewell. This enabled him to sidestep the immediate consequence of this error or wrong doing, whichever it may have been, and he had every reason for coming clean in his new job and none for not doing so, so far as I could determine from the information at hand. I therefore judged him to be a loose thinker, a man without moral or even prudent aspirations or standards, since in his new job he from the start erroneously claimed three degrees that he was not entitled to, instead of the one of the old job. These letters have enabled me to get a better line on the situation, and I think to do justice to Dr. Wayman.

The February letter was written while he was trying to land the new job. In it he claims the D.Litt. degree, and promises to bring the Th.D. with him if he comes, as he says he has done the work and can have it granted. The April letter was written after he had landed the new job, and reveals an inspiration to get back on terra firma. It calls attention to the error in the Seminary catalogue that he had supplied. It makes no other reference to either of the degrees in question (Th.D. and D.Litt.), and asks that he be accredited with only the degrees that had been actually conferred upon him, A.B., Th.M. and D.D., clearly indicating, to my mind, an aspiration to come clean in this new job. The next question naturally is, feeling that way about it, why didn't he actually straighten out? The answer to this question probably is that the erroneous credits of the old and questionable claims resorted to land the new job, had started something that it was not easy to head off. It is the old, old story, "What a tangled net we weave when first we assay to deceive."

While he was in Europe, the erroneous degrees had gotten into the William Jewell publications, and evidently he did not have the courage to take them out until the mischief had been done and he could not help it, some three or four years

later. These letters enable me to understand the case, and I think do justice to all parties. Of course, there is much more to it, but I have set forth here the crux of the problem that Dr. Wayman had to face soon after taking up the duties of his new position.

There is little chance to draw any rational conclusion from the facts here related other than that I have set forth, nevertheless, at the risk of repetition, I will go over the matter again somewhat more in detail, quoting parts of the letters in parallel columns.

Wayman's Letter of Feb. 14, 1923, While Negotiating for the William Jewell Position.

"_____ It is kind of you to think of me in connection with your College _____." "Concerning my educational qualifications, I have a Bachelor's and Master's degree from the Seminary, and have completed my work for the Doctor's degree, but the degree has not been conferred. In the event I should leave here, I will have the degree conferred. I have the Honorary Doctor of Divinity degree, conferred several years ago, and while I was abroad Georgetown College also granted me the Doctor of Literature degree. . . ."

(This Dr. Litt. degree was actually conferred in 1927.)

Wayman's Letter of Apr. 11, 1923, Written Soon After Landing the William Jewell Position.

"_____ I received both your letter and telegram. Of course you know I am sorry not to be able to come now _____." "The data for which you ask, I gave you in a letter some time ago, I think. I sent you a catalogue of the Seminary. The degrees A.B. (Georgetown), Th.M. (Seminary), D.D. (Georgetown), are sufficient. In the catalogue I sent you there is a mistake _____."

Here in this April 11, 1923, letter is conclusive evidence of an aspiration to cut loose from claiming any degree which had not been actually conferred upon him. As has been noted, neither the D. Litt. nor the Th. D. degrees are mentioned in this letter. Of course this immediately brings us face to face with the fact, after thus writing to Mr. Jones, Dr. Wayman for four years allowed three degrees to appear after his name in the William Jewell Catalogue which had never been conferred upon him and to which he had no title whatever.

The only rational explanation of this that I have been able to discover, is that the instructions to Mr. Jones in this matter, in this April letter, not having been obeyed, Wayman found when he returned from Europe that he had already been accredited with the degree he had wrongfully claimed in his February letter, also with that which he had been erroneously accredited with in the Seminary catalogue, and finally with an A.M., the source of which, as far as I know, no one has yet pointed out. Whether putting these in the catalogue was a trap laid to catch Wayman, for which he fell, or whether it came about in the ordinary course of events, is beyond my investigation. The fact that he wrote or published a note disclaiming one or more of these is not sufficient explanation, at least such reasons do not appeal to me as having substantial merit, the more so since the publication (also reproduced in the committee's statement) only disclaims one of the three wrongfully claimed degrees of the William Jewell catalogue, but lays claim to a second of them and fails altogether to mention the third, and, as before stated, all three remained undisturbed in the catalogue for some four years.

There are, of course, many other points and facts having a bearing on the question, but we have to stop somewhere, so we will consider the above gives a fairly comprehensive line on the situation. The question is, what ought to be done next?

First, let us look at this sentence from the proposed statement: "If Dr. Wayman was inclined to claim any degrees that he did not possess, this was the time to do it, etc." Such sort of argument ought to be left out. It gets you nowhere. The fact that one did right, or did not do wrong on one occasion, is no proof that he did not do differently at another. Most of the argument of this report seems to be along some such lines.

Instead of this sort of thing, let me suggest that Dr. Wayman make a clean-cut confession of the facts, dodging no

responsibility whatever. Then let the Committee endorse and send that out. This will place matters where all of us can respect and sympathize with him, for where is there a man who has not done things for which he was afterward sorry and ashamed? I believe this is the only thing to do under the circumstances. It may not fix things so that Dr. Wayman can remain at the head of the College. I do not believe it will, but it will secure for him the sympathy and respect of the entire State, and I know of no other way to secure it.

If this action is taken, after a few weeks the Trustees ought to get together and decide on the future policy.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) E. S. PILLSBURY.

SAILED FOR ENGLAND

I sailed from Montreal for England, September 22nd, but on the ship I received a telegram from Des Moines stating that a campaign for funds was an urgent necessity, and in order to inaugurate it, it would be necessary to have a Conference, and asking if I could possibly be in Des Moines by October 31st. This, of course, would have made my going to England useless, and I replied that it was absolutely impossible, and that the earliest date at which I could reach Des Moines would be November 13th. For a few weeks I rested quietly in England, taking few public engagements, and knowing practically nothing about Des Moines University except that I was advised that arrangements were being made for a Bible Conference in Des Moines beginning November 13th, in connection with which the new President was to be publicly installed.

I was filled with perplexity respecting this matter. Dr. Wayman had become President. He had been elected without our having any real knowledge of the degree controversy. Now it had been thrust upon us from all over the land, and the whole institution which we had desired to place above reproach, was under criticism. Hours I spent turning the matter over in my mind: If now we refuse to go forward with the installation and ask the President to retire, that would do him great injury; on the other hand, I had been requested both by the Chairman of the William Jewell Trustees and the President of the William Jewell Alumni to drop the whole matter, as further discussion would do injury to all concerned, including Dr. Wayman.

My readers will readily understand my perplexity. It would be unjust for me to pass this responsibility on to the members of the Board, for the reason that the correspondence had come to me chiefly, and such investigation as had been made, had been made by myself. Trustee Hamilton had issued a faithful warning, but even that did not come until we had elected President Wayman, because Mr. Hamilton, like the rest of us, had no certain knowledge of the facts until attention was called to them.

I arrived in Toronto on my return from England Sunday morning, November 11th, and left Toronto, accompanied by Rev. E. A. Brownlee, the night of the 12th, arriving in Des Moines the evening of the 13th less than an hour before the time for the inaugural ceremonies in connection with the installation of the new President. What was I to do about the degree matter? I had no time for further investigation. I concluded, as it had gone so far, that there was nothing to do but go through with the ceremonies.

Then followed the Bible Conference, concluding with the great meeting at which Dr. Riley spoke when we seemed to have a real visitation from Heaven, and as a result of which I wrote the article, "A University on Its Knees". I began to think that possibly the degree matter might be regarded as a blunder, as, perhaps, a "flagrant indiscretion", but that

perhaps the Lord would visit us with a gracious revival that would swallow it all up.

"A University On Its Knees"

I left Des Moines at the conclusion of that conference feeling that I had left a University on its knees, but it was not very long thereafter that I received disquieting reports of conditions in the University. These did not come from the Secretary of the Board of Trustees, but from students and the friends of students.

Dean Bennett Opposes.

It would be altogether wrong to hold Dr. Wayman responsible for such conditions as then obtained. Some months before Dr. Wayman came to the University I became conscious of a very distinct and pronounced opposition to our administration on the part of Dean Bennett. In connection with the Commencement Exercises of last year, June, 1928, following the baccalaureate sermon preached Sunday morning, there was a vesper service held in the afternoon under the auspices of the University Christian Fellowship. A certain Methodist Bishop was announced as the special speaker for that occasion. The Bishop, I was informed, had, in earlier years, been one of Dr. Bennett's students, and Dr. Bennett had recommended that the Bishop be invited as a speaker that afternoon. I sat on the platform next to Dean Chaffee, who was to offer the closing prayer. The meeting was under the presidency of Mr. John Leedy, Jr., and Dr. Bennett introduced the speaker. The Bishop had not been speaking long before I recognized his distinctive rationalistic attitude. He told the company that "the heart of humanity", whatever that may be, was steadily moving forward toward God. He admitted that the movement was so slow as to be imperceptible to the ordinary observer. As an illustration he said that no ordinary observer would think of a glacier as a moving body, but that by driving down stakes at certain points and observing the body over an extended period of time it would be discovered that even a glacier was fluent, and if we had the right historical perspective we should see that "the heart of humanity" was steadily moving Godward. To make a long story short his address was an out-and-out pronouncement on Social Evolution. There was not a line of gospel, or a suggestion of supernaturalism in the whole discourse.

Repudiating the Bishop's Teaching

Before the Bishop finished I had reached the conclusion that loyalty to the Trustees and to the supporters of Des Moines University, as well as to the students, demanded that I repudiate such teaching. I therefore rose at the conclusion of the Bishop's address, and told the company that I was sorry to have to dissent from such teaching, but that the Lord Jesus Christ was the one person to be considered and pleased in classroom and platform, and that we in Des Moines University believed that the worst sinner in the world could come into that chapel and by the touch of the regenerating Spirit of God "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye", become a new creature in Christ Jesus. I said that though the minds of Fundamentalists were supposed to be "static", the movement of the glacier was a bit too slow for us, and that we were not at all interested in the millennium of the evolutionists.

The service over, I turned to the Bishop and apologized for being unable to show him the courtesy which I should have desired to show him as our guest, but I told him that Jesus Christ was Lord in every classroom, and on every platform, and that we could not permit any word that was

opposed to His gospel to pass unchallenged. I concluded by saying, "I want you to understand, sir, that this University exists to combat everything that you have taught to-day. We do not believe a word of it."

Dean Bennett Fails to Detect Poison

Dean Bennett was white with indignation, and speaking to me he said, "That man is no Modernist; he is perfectly sound." I remember distinctly taking the Dean by the lapels of his coat, and saying something to this effect, "Dr. Bennett, I am not troubled about the Bishop. He is a passing stranger, but I am profoundly concerned to discover that you are unable to detect such rank poison as was served to the students to-day." That evening we had a further service attended by a number of the professors, and I spoke most strongly on the subject, assuring them that the Trustees would not compromise, and that we would not permit Des Moines University at any time to be used for the propagation of such principles as had been enunciated in the afternoon. It was quite evident to me that many members of the Faculty were very angry. Of course Dr. Bennett did not attend the evening service. From that time forward Dr. Bennett's opposition became more pronounced. But when I heard that Dr. Wayman had dismissed three heterodox professors from William Jewell, it occurred to me that perhaps the simplest solution of our difficulties would be to get the right man in the presidency, and then all would be well. But the Fall Semester had not been long in operation before it became evident that Dr. Wayman had thrown himself into the hands of that section of the Faculty that were opposed to the new regime.

Mistake of Pouring New Wine into Old Bottles

It is always easier to be wise after-the event, and I see clearly now that our great mistake in Des Moines was in retaining any member of the old Faculty. We ought to have known that anyone who could have been comfortable under the old regime, with a rank agnostic evolutionist in the department of Biology, with a Unitarian Dean at the head of the College of Pharmacy, with a pure rationalist at the head of the Bible Department, could not possibly fit in with a biblical and spiritual order of things. However, we retained only such members of the Faculty as professed at least to be in harmony with our Confession of Faith. Our mistake was in trying to put new wine in old bottles. The old Faculty, like old wine skins, had been stretched to the dimensions of a non-biblical, and non-spiritual type of academic life. When we endeavoured to put into that old bottle the new wine of the gospel of a divinely inspired and authoritative Book, of salvation through the blood, of the necessity of regeneration with its implications, of a life separated from the maxims and motives and pleasures of the world, the new wine broke the bottle, and the wine was spilled. That, in the main, is the explanation for the present upheaval in Des Moines. As indicative of conditions in Des Moines under the administration of the Deans before Dr. Wayman came, I print the following letter:

STUDENT HALVORSEN'S LETTER.

Des Moines University,
Des Moines, Iowa,
March 1, 1928.

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

Dear Brother:

I would like to take this opportunity to express my protest as to the way men are allowed to conduct themselves in Johnson Hall Dormitory. I feel that, in a school that does not claim to be Christian, Freshman initiation may be all right; but in an institution which claims as its principles

the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith as Des Moines University now does, such a thing is not excusable. We have Freshmen here who have come from Christian homes in order that they may be spiritually strengthened at D. M. U. I fear that they come to an atmosphere, which, in many ways, is not above that found in a state institution. Our Lord's name, so dear to us, is used with the vilest of language. This is not something that takes place once in a great while, but every day.

I would like to make special mention of Monday evening of this week. At eleven o'clock there was a gathering in the hall to punish the Freshmen. Upon refusal voluntarily to be paddled, a regular hand-to-hand fight ensued. The language was not lawful to recall. No one was seriously injured, but many were badly bruised. God surely cannot bless us until such cruelty is done away.

Our daily chapel has been very heart sickening. Last semester we had two chapels each week, allowing a good deal of time to class meetings, etc. This semester we are having five chapels a week and about five or ten minutes of each are given to devotion, after which we can expect most anything that is not uplifting. We go there to worship God and some of us come from there angry because of the time wasted. I feel that it is selfishness, to say the least, that people should want every day now in which to hold meetings. And such are not restricted. From the beginning of each week to the end our hearts ache for something besides the husks.

Sundays there is but one service; morning worship and Sunday School. At night young people are too free to do as they please. It seems as though we are failing in our task of training young people as Christian parents would have them trained. May the Holy Spirit guide you in the consideration of these facts.

Your brother in Christ,

(Signed) Philip R. Halvorsen.

The article entitled, "A University on Its Knees", reported a meeting of the 17th of November. On the 29th of November the following petition was drawn up by certain students, whose names are attached thereto. This petition, for some reason, on second thought, was not delivered to the President:

STUDENTS' PETITION.

(Not delivered to President.)

President H. C. Wayman, November 29, 1928.
Chairman of the Chapel Committee,
Des Moines University, Des Moines, Iowa.

Dear Dr. Wayman:

We, the undersigned, wish to express our sincere desire for a spiritual Chapel service.

Inasmuch as we believe that our wish represents the general desire of all of the Christian students, we earnestly petition that definite action be taken in this matter as soon as possible.

You may rest assured that our most hearty, Christian cooperation will be with you in any steps taken to deepen the spiritual life on the campus.

Yours in Christ Jesus,

(Signed) Phil R. Halvorsen,	Curtis Lugg,
R. C. Zundel,	J. F. Dempster,
R. L. Reichter,	Andrew H. Wheeler,
Elmer Wayne Grafft,	C. Daniel Anderson,
L. L. Lewis,	Robt. Schwyhart,
James G. Bayner,	Maurice E. Rose,
Earl E. Church,	Ernest E. Lott,
R. Kenneth Kinney,	Chas. E. Bradley,
George S. Sharpe,	Norman J. Lewis,
Basid B. Thompson,	Ottis L. Priddy,
G. Arthur Chamberlain, Jr.	Edward C. Knechtel,
Frank Smith,	Arthur Sengpiehl,
F. A. Johnson,	Aaron A. Stackhouse.

Hearing of these conditions in Des Moines, a letter from Colorado, dated September 19th, obtained new significance.

Following is an extract from that letter:

EXTRACT FROM COLORADO LETTER.

376 E. Mt. Ave.,
Fort Collins, Colo.

Dear Dr. Shields:

The only family in our church whom I was able to per-

suade to take *The Witness* for a time has one only son, who feels called to the ministry, now a Sophomore in William Jewell. He was disappointed in that college last year, there was so much of cigarette smoking on the campus and dancing and card parties among the students. He told that this had existed since three years ago—which was during Dr. Wayman's presidency. He told me that had Dr. Wayman not left when he did, he would "have been kicked out"—and the students did not know him very well or receive any special religious influence from him, and that he was useful chiefly in raising money. (Of course I understand the propaganda that might lead a freshman to form this judgment.)

In spite of all this he would have gone to Des Moines this year, so anxious is he (and his parents as well) to attend a really Fundamentalist college, but Dr. Arthur F. Colvin, our new pastor from Des Moines (twenty-five years ago) told his parents that he did not like the changes that are taking place in Des Moines—and a minister who belonged to our church recently wrote a thirteen-page letter to the parents to say that his old class-mate, Wm. Jewell's new president, is thoroughly Christian, and Dr. Wayman is a modernist.

Hoping soon to see again our brave *Witness*.
Yours for the faith,
(Signed) Charlotte E. Chester.

Just as I returned from Des Moines following the Bible Conference, I received a letter which was actually written while the Bible Conference was in progress. The letter follows:

LETTER FROM ANNIS GATES.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
Nov. 15th, 1928.

Dr. T. T. Shields,
Pastor, Jarvis St. Baptist Church,
Toronto, Canada.

Dear Dr. Shields:

The purpose of this letter will be seen after reading the enclosed excerpt from a letter which we have received from Harriet to-day. Whether her remark is justified or not we do not know, but should know in a very short time were we there, I am quite sure. Neither do we know the name of the professor involved, but we are quite sure that she would not say such a thing if she were not disappointed in his teaching. I think from what she says that the boys are of the same opinion, and they need and want instruction of a definite, positive nature as much as anyone; in fact, that was their chief reason for going to D. M. U. They do not want "mum" professors. Bob got all the evolution he wanted at U. S. C. here, and he wanted and expected to get something positive against it there in his science courses, as did the rest of the boys. If Ward and Frances Aktig are to become Christian physicians, as is their intention at present, they certainly need a solid foundation, and they are laying that foundation now.

Perhaps this is "much ado about nothing", but we are trusting solely in your judgment and it may be that you were satisfied with the statement made by this professor when you examined him. If so, he evidently is not teaching, we believe, according to his "profession", nor to your desires. We believe Harriet's ideas of the truth about evolution are very clear, and we think she ought to know what she is talking about after having listened to a man for two or three months. We believe Harriet knows more about evolution, pro and con, than the majority of young folks her age, and that she is disappointed that her professor does not "bolster her up" a little more than he does.

I hope you won't think me presumptuous in writing to you on such a matter, but we feel that your interest is ours, and that now is the time to give D. M. U. a good start that it may become all that we hope for it in the future.

I never mentioned the "write-up" you gave the boys, nor the publishing of my letter to you, but you may know we were very surprised, for such a thing was miles beyond our thoughts. However, you may rest assured that you are forgiven, and we shall try to be more worthy of all your kind thoughts and words.

We hope you had as enjoyable and profitable a trip to England as you had anticipated, and that you are greatly rested, as you deserve to be.

Knowing that you will treat this letter and the excerpt from Harriet's as you so well know how to handle such matters, I am,

Sincerely yours,
(Sgd.) Annis M. Gates

Excerpt: We wish that our zoology teacher were stronger against evolution and such. He is "mum" on the subject. (Sgd.) Harriet.

PRESIDENT WAYMAN'S CHAPEL ADDRESS.

In January Dr. Wayman sent me a chapel address relating to the pronouncement of The American Association for the Advancement of Science. I replied to him under date of January 19th, and the two paragraphs relating to this address here follow:

EXTRACT FROM DR. SHIELDS' LETTER TO DR. WAYMAN.

"I shall publish your address probably next week. I believe this is the very best sort of advertising, and I would suggest to you that whenever great matters such as the deliverance of the Association for the Advancement of Science are before the public mind, you take advantage of the opportunity to bring our distinctive principles before the people in the form of an address at chapel, and then send me the manuscript and let me publish it. Even if you could do this as frequently as once a month, I believe it would be of great service. At other times, if there were no great question before the public, you could give them a strong biblical message on some fundamental of the faith—the authority of the Scripture, the Atonement, the necessity of the new birth, or some such kindred subject, and show what is being taught in Des Moines.

"Furthermore (and privately), I am of the opinion that many of our professors are greatly in need of instruction, and if I were you I would use the chapel services at least once a month for some great deliverance on the fundamentals of the faith. Then, by publishing it in *The Witness*, it will reach a fairly large constituency, and will move people to pray and to give."

I did not, however, receive from Dr. Wayman any such articles for publication as I had suggested. And it will be noted that I said to him, I believed the Faculty themselves needed biblical instruction.

Under date of February 8th I received a letter from one of the students in the University complaining about the chapel services. I recognized the danger of holding correspondence with students, and I replied to that student in the following terms:

REPLY TO HALVORSEN.

Mr. Phil. R. Halvorsen,
Des Moines University,
Des Moines, Iowa.

February 25th, 1929.

Dear Mr. Halvorsen:

I am sorry your letter of the 8th inst. has remained unanswered for so long. I wrote the University incorporating your letter without giving your name, saying merely that it was a letter from a student, and making some suggestions as to the improvement of the chapel services.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very heartily,
T. T. Shields.

Under date of February 12th I wrote Dr. Wayman. The first two paragraphs of the letter related to financial matters, and the letter continued as follows:

DR. SHIELDS' LETTER TO DR. WAYMAN.

February 12th, 1929.

Dr. H. C. Wayman,
President, Des Moines University,
Des Moines, Iowa.

Dear Dr. Wayman:

I am going to Detroit Friday of this week to speak in another interest, but shall take advantage of the opportunity while there to enquire whether there is any possibility of my breaking in upon that city. If I can get money at some place which will not require me to be away over Sundays, it would serve my convenience better. However, I shall await your letter.

Meanwhile let me transmit this letter received yesterday:

Des Moines University,
Des Moines, Iowa,
Feb. 8, 1929.

Dr. T. T. Shields,
Pres., Board of Trustees of D. M. U.,
Toronto, Canada.

Dear Dr. Shields:

Surely you must grow weary from hearing complaints and criticisms. This letter is written by one who loves you and who feels that you must be grieved upon hearing and reading some things. From hearing you speak and from reading the messages in *The Gospel Witness*, it is evident that you love the Lord Jesus Christ. You are not ashamed of the gospel of Jesus Christ, for you know that it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

The reason for the writing of this letter is that a few questions may be asked of you as the President of the Board of Trustees of Des Moines University. Do Christian students expect too much when they ask that, in the majority of Des Moines University Chapel services, a plain gospel message be given? Furthermore, does seeming opposition of some students to 'too much religion' justify recognition above the requests of those who love the Lord? Can you conceive of the Lord prospering D. M. U. when the periods when He should be given honour are filled with other things?

Students are crying for bread, and being fed stones. I have in my possession a list of names of several young men who have been dissatisfied with our chapel services. A very few of the chapel services are worth the time required to attend.

The question hinges around one point, namely, Is the policy of Des Moines University to cater to the Christian student, or to him who says, 'Away with Christ'?

Dr. Shields, I know that you will give this your thoughtful and prayerful attention. May the Lord bless you and strengthen you for the tasks that continually lie before you.

Your brother in Christ,

This is from one of the students, and as it was sent to me in confidence, for his sake, at the moment, I thought it better not to send you his name. You will know what importance to attach to this letter. But confidentially, I have had this fear that among the older members of the Faculty there may be several who merely acquiesced in the new order of things, and who, in their hearts, do not stand very positively for the things we believe. I know a daily service must be a great tax, but so far as it is possible I think it would pay to use that service to give both atmosphere and temperature to the whole institution. I had a fear before your coming that Dr. Bennett was too disposed to use the occasion for announcements and for emphasizing the athletic activities of the college, rather than giving it its proper bent as a religious service. I dare say you will discover the necessity for some Faculty changes if we are going to make the University a real soul-trap for the students who come there.

With warmest regards,

Yours heartily,

(Signed) Thomas T. Shields.

Up to this date I have received no acknowledgment from the President of the receipt of that letter, but I was informed that at a somewhat later date the President, from the chapel platform, scathingly denounced the student for having written to the President of the Board of Trustees. Surely my readers will begin to understand the difficulties with which I found myself surrounded.

Recrudescence of Degree Question

About this time there was a recrudescence of the degree question. In December I received an enquiry from a Toronto minister who was a writer for a Toronto paper with a large circulation, to whom someone had written about Dr. Wayman's degrees. He very considerably, instead of going into a discussion of the matter in the press, enquired of me privately. I sent him a mimeographed copy of the statement issued by the Trustees. I refrain from publishing his letter for the reason that this is wholly a matter for the United

States, and I do not wish to drag any other Canadian into it. In his letter of acknowledgment he said: "I recall, however, a conversation with Dr., of St. Louis, who, I think, is a member of the Board of William Jewell College. He did not feel that Dr. Wayman was entirely faultless in the affair." A little later I received a marked copy of an editorial from a paper published in far-off India, or at least the envelope containing the editorial was mailed in India. The name of the paper was cut off, and it may have been published in the United States. I quote from the editorial as follows:

"Shall Christian Colleges Be Honest?"

A curious complex of doctrinal and personal problems constitutes the material out of which William Jewell College, Baptist institution of Liberty, Mo., has constructed a quarrel that is both depressing and instructive. The personal issue seems to be the primary one, and if the cause of it seems trivial, it illustrates all the better how much bitterness can grow out of an episode of such unimpressive proportions. It is alleged that when President H. C. Wayman came to the college five years ago he claimed to possess certain academic degrees which, as a matter of fact, he did not have: a Th.D. from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, an M.A. from an institution not specified, and—best of all—a Litt.D. from Oxford University. An imposing list of degrees was published after the President's name in the college catalogue until about a year ago, when, after there had been much criticism and calls for the evidence that these scholastic honours had actually been received, three degrees were dropped from the President's pedigree in the catalogue for 1927-28. The case in regard to the degrees cannot, of course, be tried in these editorial pages, and there is no reason why it should be. The relevant evidence points to the conclusion that here was a president of a church college, allowing himself to be announced, in the catalogue of his own school, as the possessor of degrees which he had never received, and permitting this matter, which could have been cleared up in an hour by either submitting proofs or making a correction, to become a ground for contention which has nearly wrecked the morale of the school.

Having degrees or not having them is not a matter of first rate importance. It was a doctor of philosophy who coined the aphorism that the chief advantage in having that degree, if one works in a university, is that it saves the trouble of explaining why one does not have it. But claiming degrees that one does not have is a serious matter. It has to do with academic technicalities, but with simple and elementary morality. It ranks with any other false statement of assets. The extent to which a degree is an asset, or whether it is one at all in the minds of the most intelligent people, is of no consequence in this connection. One would not claim it if he did not believe it to be an asset, and a false claim of that sort is therefore, in intention, as much a misrepresentation as a falsification of one's ledger or a fraudulent bankruptcy. Because college presidents and professors are commonly supposed to be gentlemen, and because gentlemen do not boast about what they have—much less about what they haven't—the public does not ordinarily demand of them the documentary proofs of the academic honours to which they lay claim. Deception of this sort is therefore relatively easy, for a while. But when it is discovered, the back-lash is terrific. It tells as much about the character and personality of the perpetrator of the deception as though the subject-matter of the misrepresentation had been something of much more intrinsic importance. Students, who know what happens to a student who is caught cheating in an examination in a course leading to a degree, and who generally approve the utmost rigour of punishment in such cases, cannot see that appropriating the whole degree at a single stroke is any less dishonourable.

And so, the constituency of William Jewell, its student body, its alumni and some of its trustees, are considerably wrought up about the present situation. It is not for us to estimate the degree of justification for their indignation, but there has been documentary evidence circulated to which no adequate or convincing reply has come to our attention.

But the situation is complicated by the addition of another element. While the trustees seem disposed to stand by the President with his challenged degrees, and while another Baptist institution, Georgetown College, rushes to his aid

by granting a degree which is said to have been claimed and advertised before it was granted, three veteran members of the Faculty of William Jewell have been dismissed—"not reappointed" is the official terminology—because of "modernistic tendencies."

If there is any connection between these two episodes, it is not the first time the red herring of heresy has been dragged across the path to distract attention from personal and moral issues. The Baptist Ministerial Alliance of Kansas City deplores the "impropriety and injustice" of "seeking to exploit distinctly Baptist administration matters in the public press." But these are not matters of distinctly Baptist administration. We venture to believe, for the sake of the honour of a great denomination, that there is something very "unbaptistic" about the whole discreditable episode. And whether there is or not, a case which is certain to bring so much discredit upon Christian educational policies is no private family matter. Everyone who believes that personal honesty is not unrelated to religious leadership, and that freedom of teaching within the bounds of evangelical faith is the right of a scientific teacher in a Christian college, is entitled to an opinion on such a case. The trustees of William Jewell may close their eyes if they will, but they cannot wholly close their ears to the comments which their action inevitably provokes.

FROM AN ENGLISH PERIODICAL

Again in *The Baptist Times*, of London, under date of March 21st, the Editor, Dr. John C. Carlile, had an article entitled, "D.D. Rating." In this article he deals with the traffic in degrees in certain American institutions. Among other things, the writer says: "It would be extremely difficult for any small Committee to rate at their proper value the educational institutions of America. There are forty-eight States, each a law unto itself. Quite recently a little University with a Degree-conferring Charter was bought up by Dr. Shields and his friends in Toronto. A number of these bodies are quite equal to any educational institutions in this country, while others are so questionable that only the ignorant would accept their honours."

When I read that I with a few friends had bought a university, whose total assets are, conservatively, estimated at a million dollars, or over, I was reminded of a story of someone who, when he had his boots polished, offered the little coloured boy, who had polished them, a twenty-dollar bill in payment. The little fellow opened his eyes wide, and grinned broadly as he said, "No, sir, I can't change it; but all the same, sir, I thank you for the compliment."

The present regime in Des Moines University in the appointment of professors have made every effort to comply with the high academic requirements of the North Central College Association, within whose territory Des Moines is situated, and in practically every particular, but that of endowment, we had met their requirements. As a matter of fact, the University was a much larger university than the Canadian university to which Dr. Carlile refers. It had a larger staff, and a larger student body, and buildings and equipment two or three times as great; and I have reason to believe that the academic standing of the professors of Des Moines was equal to that of any professor in McMaster University. But how was I to reply to a slur upon Des Moines' honour, such as is implied in Dr. Carlile's article? How was I to reply to the editorial forwarded me from India? How was I to answer what seemed to be the ever-multiplying number of critics of Dr. Wayman's academic standing? The logic of the argument of the editorial I have quoted is inexorable. How is it possible to maintain discipline in a school, and to correct the common tendency to dishonesty in examinations when the head of the institution is openly charged with having, for years, used three degrees to which he had no legitimate claim? Before I have concluded this article I shall prove to a demonstration that the deception alleged

against Dr. Wayman, while President of William Jewell College, and perpetuated by him in withholding from the Trustees of Des Moines a full statement of the case, is indicative of the character of the man, and in proof of it, it is possible to put every member of the Trustee Board into the witness box that the truth may be established. But just now we are not concerned with arguing the case, but merely with presenting the evidence.

The Trustees In Difficult Position

From the foregoing it will be seen that the Trustees of Des Moines University were in a very difficult situation. From coast to coast we had appealed to our Baptist Bible Unionists and other Bible-believing people who were not members of our organization, to support Des Moines University as a distinctively Christian school, by which we mean, in this instance, distinctively evangelical. At the same time we had informed our constituents that we were not lowering the academic standards, but endeavouring with every new appointment, rather to elevate the standards. On two accounts, therefore, we were embarrassed. Christian students who had come to Des Moines expecting a Christian atmosphere, were complaining of their bitter disappointment. The chapel services, instead of being times of spiritual refreshing, had become occasions for announcements of athletic and other college activities, while the devotional part of the service was almost entirely devoid of any spiritual tone. This view of the Christian students did not reach me from Canadian students. As a matter of fact, the Canadian students never wrote me so much as a postcard, and from the 17th of November to the 27th of April, I did not visit Des Moines. My only "interference" with the administration during that period of absence was the letter I addressed to President Wayman, incorporating the student's letter, and to which to this hour President Wayman has never seen fit to reply. Dr. Wayman, to anticipate a later period of discussion before the Board, said that he would like to have all the correspondence by letter and telegram which had passed between Miss Rebman, the Secretary, and the President of the Board, laid on the table. The fact is Miss Rebman wrote nothing to me about the conditions in Des Moines. I think now she ought to have done so. And such correspondence as passed between the President and Secretary, whether by letter or telegram, dealt almost exclusively with financial matters.

Des Moines, April 27th.

I left Toronto for California the night of the 25th of April, arriving in Des Moines the morning of the 27th of April. At twenty minutes to nine that morning I reached the University, and there met a company of students who desired an interview. There were six in all, two of whom were from Canada, and four from different parts of the United States.

Interview With Students.

Two of these students, both from the United States, had written me, one directly and the other through his pastor. These six students now told me a very sad story of how bitterly they had been disappointed in the school. Their description of the chapel services was most disquieting. Their recital of their experiences throughout the term served only to confirm my fears that things were anything but right in Des Moines University. My attitude throughout was non-committal. I was there to hear all these young men had to say.

MORE ABOUT "A UNIVERSITY ON ITS KNEES."

Among other things they told me that I had grossly misrepresented the University in my article, "A University on Its Knees." They said it was on its knees when I was there,

and everything apparently was staged for my benefit; but that as soon as I departed there was very little of the spiritual apparent. They declared that the Des Moines University Bulletin, issued monthly, also misrepresented the school; that while it talked of prayer and spiritual things, and represented the school as an out-and-out, one hundred per cent. Christian organization, actually the daily life of the University was far enough removed from these ideals.

They further gave corroborative testimony of certain interviews some of them had had with the President, and of how he had assured them that whatever they said in the President's office was strictly confidential, but that almost invariably sooner or later what had been said in confidence would be thrown back at them by the President from the chapel platform.

From the conversation of these boys it appeared to be evident that there was practically no discipline maintained among the students. I was informed that the girls during the senior year could obtain permission to go out with an escort to a show or elsewhere any evening. On hearing this there came before my mind the hundreds of people to whom I had appealed for money, and to whom I had given a solemn promise that that money should be spent in the propagation of the principles of the gospel. But so far as I could judge from the description that the students gave—and they impressed me as being young men of spiritual purpose who were not mere fault-finders—Des Moines University was anything but what I had promised its supporters it should be.

THE PRESIDENT AND AMUSEMENTS.

At this moment I recall that these students informed me that the President had at least on one occasion been seen by students in the theatre; the head of the Bible Department, whom Dr. Wayman had brought to the University, himself confessed that he had attended a theatre since coming to Des Moines; and these students seemed to feel that it was folly to expect any kind of spiritual development of the college under such leadership. The President's daughter admittedly attended a dance, and both son and daughter on several occasions, the theatre. We readily grant that a man cannot be held wholly responsible for the doings of his children, but both these children were members of the Highland Park Baptist Church; and the scriptural rule applying to deacons should also apply to a college president, which is to the effect that it is useless to expect stricter discipline in the church than is exercised in the home. All this had a most injurious effect upon the student life of the University.

Other cases of want of discipline were reported to the effect that two of the students had taken out two young ladies in a motor car, and that the two young men had become very drunk. One of them was expelled from the school; the other was suspended on the Friday, and on Monday was permitted to take his examinations and is still a regular student in the school.

All these things, in the mouths of not less than six witnesses, seemed clearly to prove that discipline was at loose ends at Des Moines.

PRESIDENT SAID COULD BE NO BAPTIST TEACHING.

This student deputation also informed me that the President had called a meeting early in the year of students who had come to Des Moines from other institutions such as Moody Institute, Wheaton, Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, and other schools. To these students the President said that he was aware that

some of them had come from spiritual churches, Bible Institutes, and institutions of that sort, and that they must not expect quite the same spiritual tone in Des Moines, for this was no Bible Institute, but a university. He further said that the University was catering to all classes of students, to representatives of all denominations, and of no denomination at all, and that it was therefore impossible for him to preach or teach Baptist doctrine in Des Moines; that if he did so, or had it done by others, students would be offended, and if he was to build up a great student body he had to cater to the majority. He told these students from these spiritual institutions that they were in the minority, and must not expect to be able to shape the life of the University.

INTERVIEW WITH PROFESSORS.

After lunch on April 27th I had an extended interview with one of the professors. I must here state that a little more than a year before we had asked "the University Church," as it was called, which worshipped in the University Chapel, to find other quarters for its service. The reason for this was that the students were finding no spiritual help whatever from the ministry. It was thought we might then organize a Highland Park Baptist Church which would embody our own University standards, which we believe to be the standards of the New Testament.

Such a church was in due time organized. The professor with whom I held this interview was a deacon of that church, and in consideration of the policies of the church the question of the church's attitude toward worldly amusements had been discussed. A Committee, consisting of a student and two professors, had been appointed to draw a resolution on this subject. The resolution was a simple one. It embodied no legalistic or compulsory principle, but was merely a statement of the church's attitude toward worldliness, saying that certain things, in the judgment of the church, were not conducive to the spiritual life of the members.

PRESIDENT AND DEAN OPPOSE RESOLUTION.

When it came to presenting this resolution to the church the professor-deacon in question was surprised that the resolution should be opposed by the President of the University and the Dean of the College of Pharmacy, both of whom were deacons. This news was a great surprise to me because it meant a complete reversal of Dean Callaway's position as I had known him a year before. In this connection the President said on the 26th of November that he was "tired of hearing about Jarvis Street," that apparently there was a coterie bent upon modelling the church life after the pattern of Jarvis Street. The interesting part of this is that there was not a member of Jarvis Street engaged in the discussion; and the proposal to make a pronouncement upon the church's attitude toward worldliness was surely one which any New Testament church might be expected to make. But this resolution was strenuously opposed by the President and Dean Callaway.

Thus it appeared that the church which had been especially organized with a view to meeting the spiritual needs of the students was utterly to fail in setting up any spiritual standards for their guidance.

As typical of the President's attitude: referring to the head of the Bible Department, whom he had brought to the institution, President Wayman said, "Dr. Pearson has doctrinal ideals about the Scriptures, only he allows them to be discovered instead of talking about them."

INTERVIEW WITH ANOTHER PROFESSOR.

Later in the day I had an interview with another professor. He was exceedingly careful in his statements, expressing himself as being fairly well satisfied with the work being done from an academic point of view; but deploring the lack of definite spiritual life and activity in the University.

It must have been nearly four o'clock before I got through with these several interviews, none of which I had asked for; but as President of the Board of Trustees, in view of the fact that the President of the University was out of town, and I had no opportunity of seeing him, and should not have another opportunity of visiting Des Moines for some time, and had really had no direct contact with the University since the preceding November, I felt it was due that I should learn as much about the conditions of life on the campus as was possible in the short time at my command.

LETTERS WRITTEN DES MOINES, APRIL 27th.

Following these interviews I sat down in the general office to dictate a number of letters. I have given my readers the background by carrying them with me through the intervening months, and sharing with them some of the criticisms which had poured in upon me respecting the President of the University. On examining the records I found that the College of Pharmacy had only about sixteen students, and without charging up the proportion of University overhead to the College of Pharmacy, but basing the estimate upon salaries alone, we had lost about \$3,500.00 on the College of Pharmacy. This meant that it had cost us nearly \$220.00 per student over and above his tuition, not counting the proportion of overhead, which certainly would have brought the cost of each student far beyond \$250.00. Personally I felt that I could not go over the continent begging people to give me money to spend \$250.00 or more on each Pharmacy student per year. It was for this reason I wrote what I did about the College of Pharmacy in the letter which is reproduced below.

It ought to be said, however, that I supposed at that time that of all men on the campus there was no man more loyal to the principles for which the University stood than Dean E. C. Callaway. The Secretary of the Board, however, knew that he had not been as loyal to the Trustees as formerly, but believed it was only a passing phase, and remarked that he was so good a man that if the College of Pharmacy were discontinued he ought to be retained in the Chemistry Department as he was an able professor of Chemistry. Here I set out my letter to Dr. Wayman, and also my letter to the Trustees dictated at Des Moines April 17th:

DR. SHIELDS' LETTER TO DR. WAYMAN

April 27, 1929.

Dear Dr. Wayman:

I was greatly disappointed to find you were not in the city when I arrived this morning. I found it impossible to get here earlier. I have been looking into some things to-day, and leave you this note covering the ground surveyed.

First of all, I wish you would send me your recommendations for the faculty this coming year. I am of the opinion that some changes might be made with profit; but I should like to have your mind. Practically the entire trustee board will be at Buffalo, and we shall have to go into the work pretty thoroughly there, even though we have a later meeting in Des Moines legally to ratify our decisions. For this reason I should like to have your recommendations as early as possible. Please address me, Hotel Alexandria, Los Angeles.

I have examined the statement Miss Rebman has prepared on the College of Pharmacy, and I must say that it is very

disappointing. It seems to me we are not justified in carrying this burden of expense another year, and some new arrangement, therefore, I think will have to be made. This, however, would be a matter for Board action, and we should probably have to discuss that at Buffalo.

I have noticed that the Des Moines papers have been at their old tricks again, representing Des Moines University as being "in desperate need". There is nothing succeeds like success, and nothing fails like failure. We are in urgent need, as we have always been, but the case is simple as compared with what it was two years ago when we assumed control. After canvassing the whole situation, the Board adopted as a settled policy the principle that it would make no appeal for funds in Des Moines until the last dollar of the University's indebtedness to Des Moines people is paid; by that I mean until such time as we can say that we do not owe a dollar in this city. After that we shall be able with good grace to appeal to Des Moines for help, if on no other ground, on the ground that we are spending approximately a quarter of a million dollars a year in the city. To make any sort of appeal to Des Moines people, until that obtains, is only to afford those who have no sympathy with our work an opportunity to show their antagonism.

There is another matter which has given me more concern than all other things put together. Just before going to England I was challenged by the representatives of the Alumni Association of William Jewell and others, to come to Kansas City and investigate the whole question of your degrees. I had formerly thought they feared an investigation, inasmuch as I had received a telegram jointly signed by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, and the President of the Alumni Association, saying that it would be better to drop the whole discussion. Then later these other letters came, and I was unable to take the matter up then as I was just about to leave for England. Since that time, as you know, my hands have been fully occupied with other matters; but I find that in many directions this is being used against us. So far as I am concerned, it is impossible for me to take middle ground on such a matter. Before ever I had the privilege of your acquaintance, I had taken the strongest possible ground in opposition to the very matter that is alleged against you, in respect to _____; and before I knew anything about the discussion anent your degrees, I had published my article on the bogus degrees of the People's National University of Georgia.

Apparently the thing will not down. I think there is scarcely a week passes that I do not meet it either by correspondence or in some other way. Great capital is being made of it in Canada; and in a recent issue of *The Baptist Times*, in London, there is an article by the editor dealing with bogus degrees, in the course of which he says something to the effect that Dr. Shields and his followers in Toronto had bought a little university somewhere in the United States, the implication being that we too trafficked in degrees.

All this has led me to this conclusion: there is nothing left for us to do but to go to the very bottom of it and publish the facts. We cannot have a question mark put after the sincerity and straight-forwardness of any member of our faculty. It will be necessary for us to take this matter up at Buffalo, and authorize the appointment of a committee of investigation that we may sift matters to the bottom. I feel that that is just as necessary in your interests as in the interests of the institution—and, of course, as you are President of Des Moines, the interests of yourself and the University are identical. In view of my own public committal to an attitude of opposition to the thing which they allege against you, if my own word is to have any influence with anybody in the future, it is necessary that I shall go to the bottom of it, even if the Trustee Board did not feel disposed so to do.

I hope you will agree heartily with this course, for it seems to me there is no other course open to us; and I have every confidence that if this is done, we shall be able to clear the air on this matter.

I should be glad to hear from you at Los Angeles.

Heartily yours,

(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS.

DR. SHIELDS' LETTER TO THE TRUSTEES

To the Board of Trustees:

April 29, 1929.

Dear Brethren:

I am just passing through Des Moines having a few hours here. I write first to urge the importance of every member of the Trustee Board being at the annual meeting in Buffalo. While we shall have to have a meeting of the Board in June to ratify what is done at Buffalo, I have discovered that there are some matters which will require very serious consideration. We are, of course, still in great need of money; but at the moment there are other matters to me equally serious. We have certainly not got to the end of our faculty reorganization yet; and it will be necessary to make some radical changes this year. I am sure we all feel that when we appeal to spiritual people for the support of the institution, we must keep faith with them, and be in a position to assure them that their money is being spent for the purpose to which they have given it.

The outlook on the whole is extremely encouraging, and I am not at all disturbed by the fact that further changes will be necessary because that was to be expected. For this reason I urge the importance of every member of the Trustee Board being at Buffalo. We hoped, of course, that every one who can possibly do so will relieve the University of any expense in this connection.

I write also about another matter. I believe it would be to our advantage again this year to recognize some outstanding men by conferring upon them an honorary degree; and I venture to suggest the following:

Dr. W. B. Riley, for the degree of LL.D.

Rev. T. C. Horton, the father of the Bible Institute of L.A., for the degree of D.D.

and for the same degree, the Rev. J. W. Kemp, Pastor of the Baptist Tabernacle, Auckland, N.Z., and President of the Baptist Union of that country.

Mr. Kemp is known the world over as an outstanding evangelical, and is doing beyond question the greatest work that is being done in New Zealand at the present time. I know that he is standing absolutely with us in respect to the principles of the faith for which we contend; and I think it would be a good thing for us to have an adopted alumnus in far-off New Zealand.

I mention this now because if you should approve we could then pass it on to the faculty, and diplomas could be prepared against the date of Commencement. Will you please write Miss Rebman with respect to this last proposal at your earliest convenience?

It may have come to your knowledge that when recently in California I was asked to sit with the Board of Directors of the Bible Institute and counsel with them; and the statement they issued, with the exception of the first two paragraphs, it was my privilege to write. (This, of course, is not for publication.) They thereupon invited me to go to Los Angeles to reorganize that institution in harmony with fundamentalist principles. I have since had two conferences in Chicago with Dr. Gray of the Moody Institute; Dr. Trumbull of the Sunday School Times; Dr. Riley; and at one of these conferences, two of the directors from Los Angeles were present. The result is that at their invitation I am now on the way to Los Angeles, but shall be back in Toronto on the 13th to be present at the Bible Union meetings in Buffalo. It seems to me that this is one little indication of the working out of that to which I have called attention several times, that if we are able to manage Des Moines University successfully, it will have a healthy reaction upon the educational life of the country.

We still need about \$40,000.00 to come out clearly at the end of May. I hope every trustee will do his utmost to that end. It is my hope that by going to Los Angeles now, I shall be able to serve Des Moines; and certainly if I am able to do what is asked of me, it will give us the ear of the evangelicals of the coast, and will do great good to Des Moines. Please bear the Los Angeles matter in mind when you pray.

With warmest regards, I am

Heartily yours,
(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS.

Here I would call attention to the fact that respecting the

Faculty I say in the second paragraph, "I think some changes might be made with profit." And in the letter to the Trustees the first paragraph, "We have certainly not got to the end of our faculty reorganization yet; and it will be necessary to make some radical changes this year. I am sure we all feel that when we appeal to spiritual people for the support of the institution, we must keep faith with them, and be in a position to assure them that their money is being spent for the purpose to which they have given it."

The Students' Chapel Service.

Here we may anticipate later events by remarking that while the Board was in session in Des Moines University, May 10th, chapel service was given into the hands of the students. Dean Bennett and other professors were in the gallery, and the students were harangued by a certain student who came from Wisconsin to the University only last February. Having been there three or four months, he of course knew all there was to know. He told the students, according to the report in the papers of next day, that the President of the Board of Trustees had written the President of the University a letter demanding the dismissal of seven or eight professors, and stirred up the student body to a great pitch of antagonism over this alleged injustice. Of course the fact is no such letter was ever written, and here and now we issue this challenge, if Mr. Peterson, or Dr. Wayman, can produce a document bearing my signature making any such proposal, I will ask the Committee of which I am Chairman, and which is clothed with the full power of the Trustee Board, to re-elect every member of the Faculty without question. I may, however, perhaps more effectively deal with this aspect of the question by re-printing an article given to the press in Buffalo last Friday evening. The article follows:

"Mr. Peterson was reported in the Des Moines papers of last week as having said before students at the chapel service on Friday that the President had written a letter to Dr. Wayman demanding that he dismiss a certain number of professors—seven or eight. This is utterly contrary to fact.

"I never sent the President any such communication. The only communication I addressed to him on the subject was a letter which I dictated in Des Moines, Saturday, April 27th, on my way to California. In that letter I spoke as follows:

"First of all, I wish you would send me your recommendations for the Faculty this coming year. I am of the opinion that some changes might be made with profit; but I should like to have your mind. Practically the entire Trustee Board will be at Buffalo, and we shall have to go into the work pretty thoroughly there. For this reason I should like to have your recommendations as early as possible."

In a letter to the Trustees I said some radical changes might be necessary. But that had to do with the question of continuing the college of pharmacy.

"I distinctly recall that Miss Rebman said, when taking my letter, 'If the College of Pharmacy be closed, it seems to me we ought by all means to retain Professor Callaway.' In my letter to Dr. Wayman, I asked him for his recommendation in the following words:

"I have examined the statement Miss Rebman has prepared on the College of Pharmacy, and I must say that it is very disappointing. It seems to me we are not justified in carrying this burden of expense another year, and some new arrangements therefore, I think, will have to be made. This, however, would be a matter for Board action, and we should probably have to discuss that at Buffalo."

Dr. Wayman had been absolutely silent respecting the organization of the Faculty for the ensuing year. So far as I was concerned, until I met him at the station in Des Moines as he came in on the train by which I departed, he said he would recommend such changes as would save us \$17,000 in salaries.

These changes were to include the dismissal of the business manager, the dismissal of the registrar, as well as other members of the Faculty. The fact is, the President of the Board had never once suggested the dismissal of anybody. It was Dr. Wayman who was planning such a wholesale exodus.

Furthermore, the Secretary of the Board had on two occasions at least asked Dr. Wayman when he was going to get the contracts for the year signed, reminding him that if it were not soon done most of the efficient professors would be signed up in other institutions. If the advice of the Secretary, who is charged with interfering with the administration, had in this one single instance been taken, practically the entire Faculty would have held each in his or her possession a signed contract for another year. The fact that no contract was signed is due entirely to President Wayman.

I do not ask the students to accept my word for this, I shall produce copies of all correspondence on the subject, which I shall invite the students to read; and I hereby challenge President Wayman to produce one single document, either letter or telegram or any other sort of communication, to disprove what I have said above.

It was only when the enquiry disclosed the fact that among the Deans of the University, under the present leadership, there was a deliberate plot to thwart the purposes of the Trustees that the proposal was made and accepted, that the entire Faculty be reorganized, and in order to do that and to avoid unfairly discriminating against any particular professor, a resolution was framed which specifically stated that no reflection on any professor was intended, and that the act of the Trustees in declaring the positions vacant as of June 4th was taken in order to free the Board for the work of reorganization.

The same resolution requested that any member of the Faculty who desired re-election or any other employee of the institution who desired reappointment to send their application to the Trustees within ten days. Had the Faculty faced the facts in the case, by next Tuesday all desiring to remain in the service would have filed their applications and such as the Trustees approved, which undoubtedly would have included the overwhelming majority of the Faculty, would have been re-elected long before June 4th.

I am confident that when the students know the facts there will be a very general reaction in favor of the position taken by the Trustee Board.

A committee consisting of the President of the Board as Chairman, O. W. Van Osdel, E. A. Roberts, the Rev. H. J. Hamilton, and the Secretary of the Board, Miss Rebman, have by vote of the Board been clothed with all the Board's power, and will function as the Board between now and the Annual Meeting of the Board on June 11th.

That Committee will be in Des Moines at an early date, and we are content to let the matter rest until that time.

We should, of course, be sorry should the students decide not to return to the University, but discipline must be maintained and the Trustees must be supreme, no matter what the cost may be. We have been delighted to receive a considerable number of young people who have been attracted to Des Moines, who had never heard of it before; and already

applications for positions on the Faculty are pouring in upon us, and no less than two proposals have reached us respecting the presidency. We have every confidence that the opening of the fall term will see a greater and better Des Moines University, and we hope a large number of our students will be there to see them."

DR. WAYMAN'S DEGREES ALWAYS THE ISSUE.

My readers, however, will readily recognize the seriousness of paragraphs five to seven in my letter to Dr. Wayman of April 27th. That was the bomb, the explosion of which has been heard all over the Continent. When I had dictated the letter referred to I took a taxi from the University to the station to get the 7.05 Rock Island train to Omaha and California. At the station I had a brief meeting with Dr. Wayman, who came in on the train by which I departed. He greeted me cordially, and in his attitude there was no suggestion of antagonism. I had met him a few weeks before for a brief period in Detroit, and on that occasion also he had appeared to be equally friendly. He told me at the station that he had a plan worked out by which he had expected to save the University about seventeen thousand dollars a year in salaries. He proposed to dismiss Mr. Newcom, the Business Manager. He also proposed the dismissal of the Registrar, and several others. I confess that I heard these suggestions with alarm, because the two persons particularly named, Newcom and the Registrar, had been among our most valued helpers at the University. There had been a tendency, and a very pronounced tendency, on the part of some of the professors to let down on their standards, and to grant credits that were not deserved. I told the Registrar that the Board of Trustees would expect her to stand like a block of granite, and to permit no professor and no Dean to dictate to her in that matter; that I should consider alterations of records, or lowering of credits as indefensible ethically as the doctering of books in a bank, and when I heard the proposal that the two people who had largely been our safeguards in Des Moines, were marked for the slaughter, I felt we had in that another example of the President's utter inability to administer the affairs of a University. However, I had but two or three minutes. I boarded my train and went off to California.

Up to this time no word, nor even the vaguest suggestion of any sort of rumours of a scandalous character had ever reached my ears. But I have since learned that prior to this time the President had called Mr. Schimpf from New York to Toledo to talk to him. He had also discussed the same matter with Dr. Van Osdel, of Grand Rapids. Both these brethren, however, while recognizing the seriousness of the implication, refused to believe in the possibility of its having any foundation in fact. The extraordinary thing, let it be remarked, is that the President meeting me in Detroit and again in Des Moines should not have even mentioned these matters. To that, however, I shall return later.

Arrived California April 30th.

I arrived in Los Angeles the morning of April 30th. That day or the next I received a wire from Dr. Wayman to the effect, "Serious trouble here. Return at once if at all possible." To that I replied to Miss Rebman, "Please inform President regret impossible leave here before time planned next week, and that thereafter every hour is filled until Buffalo Convention." Later I received telegrams both from the Secretary and from the Rev. R. T. Ketcham informing me that three Trustees were calling a special meeting of

the Board at Des Moines, May 10th, to request the resignation of the Secretary and the President of the Board. The actual text of the call was as follows; and was sent to the Trustees over the signature of Miss Rebman, the Secretary:

Call For Board Meeting.

Miss Edith M. Rebman,
Secretary of Board of Trustees
of Des Moines University,
Des Moines, Iowa.

May 2, 1929.

We the undersigned members of the Board of Trustees of Des Moines University, do hereby request that you call a special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Des Moines University to meet at Des Moines University, Friday, May 10, 1929 at 10:00 A.M. The purpose of said meeting to consider requesting the resignations of Dr. T. T. Shields and Miss Edith M. Rebman from all official connections with Des Moines University.

(Signed) MINOR STEVENS
JAMES H. SPERRY
F. E. FOULK

P.S.—We request that you telegraph Trustees at a distance so that they will receive the above notice in due time.

CONSULTATION WITH REV. H. O. MEYER.

I immediately telephoned the Rev. H. O. Meyer, a member of the Board in Pasadena, and he came in to Los Angeles to consult with me. We first of all had a hearty laugh about the matter. One of the names signed to the call for the meeting represented a brother who had but recently come on the Board. He had become a member at my suggestion. I knew that he was a man of solid sense, and that above all things he would be just. And I was persuaded that nothing but the grossest sort of misrepresentation could have been employed to secure his signature to the call for such a meeting. So far as the other two are concerned, Rev. Minor Stevens and Dr. Foulk, I was sure there was nothing vicious in the disposition of Dr. Foulk, and that he had been used as someone's catspaw. As for the Rev. Minor Stevens, I was not surprised because I had openly criticized his do-nothingness in the Board again and again. I am informed that during the last few months Mr. Stevens' church has contributed the magnificent sum of two hundred and seventy-five dollars to Des Moines University, but up to my last meeting with him, prior to the receipt of this notice, he had done absolutely nothing to keep the doors of the University open, but talk. I had several times intimated that in my view the Trustees were there to serve, and that we were not ornaments. But Brother Stevens always had some excuse, and was always "going to" do something. Dr. Foulk, I believe, had given a thousand dollars to the University, for which he was afterwards reimbursed by the Chamber of Commerce. I wondered, therefore, from what new source these two Trustees had suddenly derived energy enough to be able to promise to keep the University open if those who had been chiefly instrumental in providing its revenue should be dismissed.

When Rev. H. O. Meyer and I had got through with our merriment, we sent the following telegram:

"Miss Edith Rebman,
"Des Moines University,
"Des Moines, Iowa.

"Advertised here Sunday to Tuesday, cancellation of which would seriously injure cause I came to help. Stop. I decline to allow such trio upset my programme, therefore Meyer, who is with me, joins requesting you wire every Trustee joint authorization ourselves, yourself and Ketcham if he agrees. as are sure he will, explaining whole situation and recommending each Trustee decline attend any meeting until Annual Meeting, but urging attendance all costs Buffalo Con-

ference preparatory Annual Meeting. Stop. If necessary can put whole matter before Bible Union. Stop. Even if meeting called by three named obtained quorum or even majority they could only request resignation, which request subsequent meeting would reverse, hence absolutely impossible enemy accomplish more than reveal those who ought to be removed from the Board and Faculty. Stop. Make telegram Trustees explicit, strong, imperative, regardless expense. Stop. Ketchman, Rebman, Meyer, and myself, equally entitled with other three issue joint message Trustees, especially as we have borne burdens while they do nothing. Stop. We are under solemn obligation to those who have entrusted us with their money to frustrate this plot. Stop. Personally undisturbed turn events because enemy utterly impotent do anything but reveal his hand. Stop. Write Wayman informing him you are instructed by President Bible Union in view of events to inform him his place on Buffalo programme is hereby cancelled, and if he attends must do so own expense. Stop. Meyer heartily agrees all foregoing and absolutely determined with me see matter to successful conclusion. Stop. Recommend you hold no communication with Wayman but by letter. Stop. Meyer shares my conviction but another divine intervention showing we need further housecleaning.

"T. T. SHIELDS."

RETURNING TO DES MOINES.

A few hours later I received letters from the Secretary of the Board and Rev. R. T. Ketcham, implying that the reputations of two members of the Board were involved in the motion calling the meeting. This, of course, put an entirely new complexion upon the whole matter, and I, therefore, decided to conclude my ministry in Los Angeles and return immediately to Des Moines. Accordingly, the Rev. H. O. Meyer and I left Los Angeles Monday night, May 6th, arriving in Des Moines Thursday morning, May 9th. On arrival there I soon discovered that a radical change had come over the entire University in the few days of my absence. It was very much like any capital of the allied countries the day after war was declared upon Germany. Much has been made in the press of the motion vacating the positions of the members of the Faculty and staff as of June 4th, and this motion has been blamed for the riot. Nothing could be further from the truth. I was engaged in conference with several brethren after my arrival at Des Moines, and did not attend the chapel service, but I was informed that while the President was speaking from the platform, May 9th, students were in the wings armed with rotten eggs, and what are horribly described as "stink bombs," which really mean rotten eggs chemically produced. How many others were in the body of the chapel prepared for the same work I do not know, but I do know that certain of the professors with the students who knew this was in the wind had prepared some means to defend the President of the Board. All this was planned, and had I appeared on the platform the morning of the 9th at chapel service, violence would have broken out then. One of the professors that afternoon gave me the information, and said he greatly feared that violence would be attempted.

A FEW FACTS.

Here let me call my readers' attention to a few facts: from June, 1927, until May 9th, 1929, I had wrought unceasingly to raise funds for Des Moines University. I had been hailed as the saviour of Des Moines, to use their phrase, as the one who had "given life to D.M.U." I had been honoured with a birthday banquet, where covers were laid for five hundred and sixty-five. By the way, perhaps it may not be amiss to quote the account of that banquet from *The Highlander*, the semi-monthly University paper:

"SHIELDS GIVEN SURPRISE PARTY.

"Appreciation for Dr. Shields' Good Work is Shown.

"Organizations, Faculty and Friends Gather for Big Banquet Held in University Commons.

"When Dr. T. T. Shields, acting president of Des Moines University, was on the campus last week a time-worn prank was played on him. With the innocence of a babe he walked into the trap of a birthday surprise party.

"The party was in the form of a banquet, and was held in the University Commons club. Plates were laid for two hundred and sixty-five, and the banquet proved to be the largest ever held in the Commons. The various organizations were seated at specially arranged tables. Each organization was decorated in its own colors, and presented a gala appearance.

"A short speaking program followed the sumptuous dinner, at which Dean Chaffee presided as toastmaster. Those speaking were: Neil Clemens for the Student Council, James Mills for the Inter-Fraternity Council, Kathryn Schoenenberger for the Pan-Hellenic Council, and Dean Miller for the Athletic Association. Dean Bennett was then introduced in behalf of the Faculty, and in his own inimitable style and resourcefulness presented Dr. Shields with a beautiful life-time Sheaffer fountain pen and desk set. Dr. Shields was visibly touched with Dean Bennett's presentation speech, and cordially responded to the reception accorded him.

"The spirit aroused in this little attempt to show appreciation to Dr. Shields for his untiring efforts has gone a long way in fanning the new spark of school spirit newly come to our campus."

Altogether the Trustees of Des Moines University by cooperative action, with the exception of the Rev. Minor Stevens, had raised tens of thousands of dollars to operate the University. Every student who studied within those walls during that period had received, as a result of our efforts, a present of not much less than three hundred dollars a year. By that I mean that what such student paid for tuition fell short of the actual cost by that amount. Not a few had received scholarships, which would require more than \$300 to be made up. All this had been done not only with cheerfulness, but with delight, on the assumption that we were maintaining a school where students could obtain a Christian education. Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Trustees through their chosen representatives, whether the Secretary or the President, had been somewhat arbitrary in their administration, what then? It was a choice between that sort of administration and no administration at all. And surely those who had wrought without a penny of remuneration were entitled to some consideration at the hands both of the Faculty and students. No member of the Faculty had served without salary, nor was it expected that they should; but at least those who had been so largely instrumental in providing the funds should certainly have been afforded an opportunity of presenting their side of the case before judgment was pronounced and sentence executed. The President of the Board had travelled extensively, and his work in the-raising of funds had been of a public character, but it should be remembered that through the years of Bible Union effort a large constituency had been built up and thousands of names had been listed of those who were interested in contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. Personal letters were written to all these again and again by the Secretary, the number of letters running into the thousands. Only a week or two before the outbreak one friend of the University sent to the President of the Board a cheque for five thousand dollars in response to a letter received from the Secretary of the Board asking for that amount. But all this work went for nothing at all, and suddenly, like the flaring up of a great fire when gasoline has been liberally poured over some highly inflammable material the University was found to be ablaze. It was patent

to anyone who had the least discernment that such a conflagration was of incendiary origin.

Who Was the Incendiary?

During that Thursday I had the opportunity to enquire as to how and where the fire, then under way, had originated, and I discovered that so far as the students were concerned it had originated in the senior class. I learned, on indisputable authority, that Miss Edith King, of the senior class, reported to another senior student that she had had a two-hour conference with the President in a room in the Arts and Science building, and that the conference was held there in order that no knowledge of it might come to the ears of the Secretary of the Board. That conference was held with this member of the senior class a few hours after Dr. Wayman had read my letter informing him that I was determined to sift the degree scandal to the bottom. Miss King informed this particular student that the President had enquired of her whether there were other students with whom he could speak, and in his conference referred to the President acquainted this young lady with all the details of the diabolical scandal which was after set in circulation, and with which, in particular, we shall later deal. But we have proof positive that the President was himself responsible for introducing this into the senior class.

The Secretary of the Board, some time before the disturbance manifested itself, invited the senior class to a banquet in the University Commons. On Monday, April 29th, the president of the senior class called at the Secretary's office and accepted the invitation in behalf of the class. The banquet was to be held on the evening of Monday, May 6th.

Setting the Senior Class Ablaze.

On the evening of the day in which the President read my letter, and in which he had the two-hour interview with Miss King, Miss King and another senior class member, Miss Dorothy Moore, visited at least two girls in one room in the women's dormitory, communicating to them what the President had told Miss King in the afternoon. The following morning, while the chapel service was in progress, Miss King, Miss Dorothy Moore, the president of the class, and other students, were called out of chapel for a conference, which was held in room twenty-one. At the chapel service announcement was made that the senior class would meet in room ten following the chapel. The conference in room twenty-one was held for the purpose of deciding how the subject of the President's conversation with Miss King the day before should be brought before the senior class. It was decided that the Secretary-Treasurer's invitation to a banquet for the senior class should be made the occasion for its introduction, and that the invitation should be declined.

Miss King Quotes Dr. Wayman.

Miss King informed the students that Dr. Wayman had told them to decline the invitation because of "rumours of personal indiscretion." Thus it will be seen that President Wayman himself was the incendiary who went about the campus with a lighted torch setting the place on fire.

Where Was The President's Dignity?

Let us for a moment assume that all these diabolical allegations had been true. Will anyone in his senses admit that the President showed an infinitesimal grain of sense in his manner of dealing with the situation? Could anything be less dignified than for a President of a university to take a young girl, a member of a senior class, alone into a room in a distant building for a two-hour conference? Is it not

astonishing that he was not himself afraid of being charged with "flagrant indiscretions" in inspiring such a class member to call a conference, and then a class meeting, in which to spread his diabolical slander?

The Conference in Room Ten.

At the close of the chapel service the senior class assembled in room ten. A resolution was introduced by Miss Dorothy Moore declining the Secretary's invitation to the banquet, on the ground of personal indiscretion. An attempt was made to railroad the motion through, but several of the most influential and reputable members of the class strenuously objected to it, and a committee was appointed to draft a letter which was to be submitted to the class the next day for approval, with a view to sending it to the Secretary declining her invitation. Meanwhile information respecting these matters came to the Secretary's ears, and the class's action was anticipated by the Secretary's withdrawal of the invitation.

The Senior Class and the Old Regime.

But the point at issue here is that the senior class in Des Moines University was a class that belonged to the old regime, and a class with which much difficulty has been experienced. Yet it was this class which the President employed to set the whole campus on fire a few hours after he had received information from the President of the Board of Trustees that the question of his degrees would have to be sifted to the bottom.

It should be emphatically stated that Rev. R. T. Ketchan was in the office of the head of the Bible Department next to room ten and heard the whole conversation as hereinbefore related.

In this connection, for the refreshment of our readers' memory we quote two paragraphs from the "Open Letter" of Rev. Lewis M. Hale:

It was at this time that the question of modernism began to be pushed to the front; and, in my humble judgment, when conditions are rightly understood it will be unmistakably plain that the primary purpose of flaunting the question of modernistic tendency was that by this means the question in which Dr. Wayman's personal interests were involved might be obscured. . . . (Emphasis ours.—Ed. G.W.)

It has been interesting and possibly quite significant to discover that in every case known to me where Dr. Wayman has made an attack on a man, either from the standpoint of orthodoxy, or character, without a single exception that man whom he has attacked has had in his possession—to Dr. Wayman's certain knowledge—facts which, when known, would completely discredit Dr. Wayman. (Emphasis ours.—Ed. G.W.)

A Word to the Students.

And here I venture to address a word to the students of Des Moines. Much has been said about the danger of Des Moines losing its credits, and losing its academic standing. It was because I was concerned for the standing of Des Moines University that I conducted the voluminous correspondence, part of which is published in this paper. It was because this degree question would not down, and also because after I had published the mimeographed statement of the William Jewell Trustees, with my explanatory note in defense of Dr. Wayman, that in personal conversation with Dr. Wayman in the President's office and in the presence of the Secretary of the Board, I told him it was necessary to go to the bottom of the question, and he replied, "If you do you will ruin me". When I asked him why, he said, "Because they have got the goods on me,"—I repeat, because of all these things, and because I knew that when the facts became known it would appear that the President of Des Moines

University was academically utterly discredited, I at last determined to carry the matter to the Board and insist upon a thorough investigation into Dr. Wayman's academic record.

President Threatens Wreck and Ruin.

The Secretary of the Board reports that the hour before chapel the morning of Tuesday, April 30th, President Wayman requested her to come into his office. After discussing many things, as the Secretary was about to withdraw, he said:

"WAIT A MOMENT. I HAVE TWO THINGS TO SAY TO YOU BEFORE YOU LEAVE. FIRST OF ALL, I AM ON MY KNEES BEFORE YOU." TO WHICH THE SECRETARY REPLIED, "DR. WAYMAN, BE A MAN." AND HE ANSWERED, "I KNOW IT IS NOT VERY MANLY, BUT I WANT YOU TO REMEMBER THAT I AM ON MY KNEES BEFORE YOU. BUT, ON THE OTHER HAND, IF I AM COMPELLED TO LEAVE THIS INSTITUTION, I WILL RUIN ANOTHER MAN—YES, I WILL RUIN TWO PEOPLE; AND I WILL WRECK THIS INSTITUTION."

THE TRUSTEE BOARD MEETING, MAY 10

The Board convened at ten o'clock in the President's office, with eighteen members present. After earnest prayer in which all participated the call for the special Board meeting was read, and the Trustees who had signed the call explained their reasons for signing. Mr. Sperry had signed it on the earnest entreaty of Rev. Minor Stevens, and so far as we could judge Dr. Foulk had signed in the same way. When the matter was submitted to the meeting an attempt was made by Mr. Stevens to minimize that part of the question which related to the personal integrity of the President of the Board and the Secretary of the Board. He insisted the meeting was called primarily because of the alleged "interference" with the President's administration.

Letters signed by the Deans addressed to the Trustees, to each of whom a copy was sent except to the President and the Secretary, were submitted; and a letter also signed by certain members of the Faculty. When the Deans were examined, each individually and then together, it became abundantly evident that their chief objection was to the alleged "interference" in administrative matters; and to those who knew the attitude of the old regime toward the Baptist Bible Union, it was quite evident also that it was only because the malcontents knew there was not the shadow of a chance of securing freedom to administer the University as it had been administered without first eliminating the President, and perhaps the Secretary of the Board; and their only hope of accomplishing this was by a diabolical attack upon their characters.

Each Dean was examined separately; three students were examined; Rev. Minor Stevens who, so far as the calling of the Board meeting was concerned, was the prime mover, was examined; and the entire investigation covered a period of sixteen hours. At the end of that period, before a formal vote could be called for, each Trustee spontaneously arose and with the hottest indignation repudiated the suggestion of anything even approaching an indiscretion. The Deans every one admitted that the "rumours", apparently set in circulation with diabolical intent by Warren L. Steeves of Waterloo, were without a vestige of foundation in fact.

It need not be said that the Board acted with perfect freedom. It is not, in any sense, Dr. Shields', "steam roller". It is composed of absolutely free and independent men who have no interest to serve but that of truth and righteousness. The charter of the University would permit every member of the Board to walk out of the University and leave it to its own devices so far as any personal financial obligation is concerned. Therefore they are not fighting for themselves or for their friends. If twelve men can be drawn from all classes to form a judgment respecting the facts of the case, let us say in a capital offence, surely eighteen people drawn from a Continent can be trusted impartially to weigh the evidence in such a case as that before us. When all available evidence was in, with nothing withheld, when every slanderous report since appearing in many newspapers, was submitted, examined and re-examined, without one contrary vote the following resolution was passed:

RESOLUTION RE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF THE BOARD.

The Board of Trustees of Des Moines University in special meeting convened to consider certain complaints and rumours touching the personal integrity of the President of the Board, and of the Secretary-Treasurer, after an exhaustive enquiry of many hours in which documents, the Deans, and certain students were examined, hereby repudiate with the profoundest indignation the very suggestion that either of the said officers of the Board would, in either word or deed, condescend to any course incompatible with the highest standards of Christian integrity and honour.

The examination disclosed that on the part of some, who were not members of the Faculty, there existed a bitter personal antagonism toward the officers of the Board referred to, which antagonism the Board believes is chiefly due to the fact that the said officers had of necessity so largely represented the voice and will of the Board in giving effect to various reforms, and carrying out the present Board's policies in the conduct of the University.

Examination of certain witnesses revealed that the complaints and rumours referred to were the result of evil constructions put upon legitimate and inevitable circumstances, or of positive and palpable falsehood, and that the whole recent ebullition, at least in its inception, was the result of an obviously deliberate and malicious attempt to impair, if not to destroy the usefulness of the said officers of the Board, and of the University.

The Trustees refuse to insult the said officers of the Board by any vote of confidence in their faithful colleagues in a difficult task, but the Board takes pleasure rather in declaring to the world that the said officers of the Board have emerged from the recent furnace of absolutely baseless and malicious criticism without even the smell of fire upon them: and that the President and Secretary of the Board to whose leadership the continuance and support of Des Moines University under the present regime is chiefly due, enjoy the Board's esteem, affection, and trust, to a higher degree than ever before.

The Secretary's "Interference".

Following this, a much shorter time was devoted to the charges of interference on the part of Miss Rebman with the administration of the University. By this time the Trustees had come to see quite clearly that the complaints of interference in the administration of the University were really

due to the opposition of certain members of the Faculty to the whole Baptist Bible Union programme; and, that the Secretary had been the lightning rod to draw the electricity from the clouds, since she was there to see that the Board's policies were executed. The following resolution therefore was passed:

RESOLUTION RESPECTING THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

"That this Board approves of the efforts of the Secretary-Treasurer of the Board to keep this institution in agreement with the declared principles for which the University stands."

AN EXAMPLE OF EFFICIENCY

We venture here to give an example of the Secretary's "interference". It should be remembered that the summer school has long been an important department of the work of Des Moines, and in order to secure a large attendance at the summer school great efforts are usually made to advertise the opportunity and to solicit the attendance of students. Either ten or fifteen thousand announcements of the summer school had been sent out this year. The result was enquiries were made of the University in respect to this matter. The Secretary received almost daily complaints that prospective students could obtain no answer to their letters. Enquiry being made of the Registrar, the Secretary was informed that the President had instructed her to pass all correspondence respecting the summer school to Dean Bennett. Miss Rebman then asked Dean Bennett's secretary to send down all correspondence. Below I publish the memorandum sent to Dr. Wayman by the Secretary on this matter. Let anyone charged with administrative responsibilities, and particularly anyone who has to do with university or college administration, tell us what prospect there could be of success under such loose management as this, letters being allowed to remain unanswered for days, one letter as long as fifty-three days. What hope would there be of a large summer school enrolment under these conditions? If ever interference with an administration were justifiable surely this memorandum is its justification:

MEMORANDUM TO PRESIDENT WAYMAN

Dr. Wayman.

April 24, 1929.

I am bringing to your attention the manner in which our Summer School correspondence is being handled.

For the past ten days we have had complaints from Summer School prospects that they have received no reply to letters mailed ten days or two weeks before. The morning mail brought three such letters. We enquired of Miss Rice, who informed us that you had instructed her to turn over all Summer School correspondence to Dean Bennett. I, therefore, asked Miss Schilling to send all S.S. correspondence—answered and unanswered. To our amazement we discovered that many letters had been held for a month or more before they were acknowledged. Forty-one letters were received, thirty-five of which were answered as follows:

2 letters	4 days after receipt—1 letter	25 days after receipt
2 letters	5 days after receipt—1 letter	27 days after receipt
5 letters	6 days after receipt—1 letter	28 days after receipt
1 letter	9 days after receipt—1 letter	29 days after receipt
1 letter	11 days after receipt—1 letter	31 days after receipt
1 letter	12 days after receipt—1 letter	32 days after receipt
2 letters	13 days after receipt—2 letters	33 days after receipt
1 letter	17 days after receipt—1 letter	35 days after receipt
1 letter	19 days after receipt—1 letter	36 days after receipt
1 letter	20 days after receipt—1 letter	37 days after receipt
1 letter	22 days after receipt—1 letter	40 days after receipt
2 letters	23 days after receipt—1 letter	45 days after receipt
1 letter	24 days after receipt—1 letter	53 days after receipt

This neglect is inexcusable, and if allowed to continue we may as well give up all thought of a Summer School. What

would become of a business concern if prospects were treated in this way?

(Signed) EDITH M. REBMAN.

RESOLUTION VACATING POSITIONS

The same Trustee meeting which convened Friday morning, was in session, the only record being the record taken at the opening session. After a good deal of discussion I myself took the liberty of proposing the following resolution:

"In view of the present situation in the University, and without intending any reflection upon any member of the faculty, or of the office staff, or upon any other employee of the University hereinafter referred to; and expressly for the purpose of enabling the Trustee Board thoroughly to reorganize the entire University as may seem wise, it is hereby resolved that the position of President of the University, the position of every member of the faculty, the position of every member of the office staff, and the position of every other employee of the University be and is hereby declared vacant as of June 4th; and that any member of the faculty who desires re-election to the faculty of the University, and any other employee of the University who desires reappointment to his or her respective or other position in the University, be and is hereby requested to file his or her application for such re-election or reappointment with the Secretary of the Board of Trustees, Miss Edith M. Rebman, at the University within ten days from this date."

My reasons for so doing were as follows: those who had supported the University had given their money for the maintenance of a Baptist Fundamentalist institution. The investigation proved beyond all possibility of doubt that with few exceptions those who had continued with us of the old Faculty when we took over the University had merely said, Amen, to the inevitable. They had acquiesced in our position merely for the sake of retaining their situations. I believe some endeavored loyally to abide by the terms of their contract, but it became abundantly evident that the Deans were, in the main, in opposition to our policy. This was especially true of Dean Bennett. If we had called for the resignations of a few professors they would immediately have been made martyrs, and still greater trouble would have ensued.

An examination of the foregoing resolution will show: first, that it was framed so as to avoid any reflection upon any particular member of the Faculty. Furthermore, the resolution expressly says that the reason for the action was to set the Trustees free to reorganize the University staff. In the third place, the resolution makes clear that while the position of every member of the staff is declared vacant as of June 4th., they are not necessarily dismissed; but they are invited, as many as desire to remain with the University, to apply for re-election or re-appointment. Will any reader who has followed the argument of this paper thus far doubt the necessity for some reorganization of the Faculty? Can anybody suggest any better way to get down to the basic facts of the case than by declaring every position vacant and have everyone who desired to remain with the University re-apply? Personally, I took the ground that while one member of that disturbing element in the Faculty remained on the staff I would not ask anyone for a single dollar to support Des Moines University; and as I write, in the perspective of ten or eleven days, I am more convinced than ever of the wisdom of making a clean sweep of the whole business. If the University is to be continued at all, and the Trustee Board is to keep faith with the supporters of the institution, there was absolutely no other course than to vacate everybody's position, and begin all over again.

Now as to the vote on this question: reports have been circulated respecting this matter that are far from being true to fact. The fact is, Dr. Wayman did not vote. Four voted against the motion, three of whom voted against it, not because they did not believe a thorough reorganization to be necessary, but because they thought it might be done in some other way. The Trustees voting for the resolution numbered eleven. Two of the eleven, Dr. Van Osdel and Rev. R. T. Ketcham, had to leave before the formal vote was taken, but before leaving, when the principle of the resolution had been arrived at, they said that if the resolution were so framed as to cast no reflection upon any particular member of the Faculty they might be counted as voting for it. Thus the vote stood eleven to four instead of eight to four as reported from some quarters; and of the four, three were in full sympathy with the principle of the resolution, and only questioned whether it might not be better accomplished in some other way.

Mr. Stevens and Dr. Wayman have tried to make capital of the fact that four members of the Board dissented from the resolution to vacate all positions as to June 4th. Yet the Board which stood as a unit on the first resolution was "Dr. Shields' Steam Roller"! Of course any discerning person will recognize that the three voting against the vacating resolution only emphasized the intelligent independence of the Board,—standing as a unit in a judgment based on evidence, but differing slightly as to the best way to effect a commonly desired end.

WHY THE RIOT?

We refer our readers back to our early discussion of the contention that the riot was due to the resolution vacating positions. We insisted that this was not true. Dr. Wayman and his fellow-conspirators had so inflamed the student body by personal interviews and by chapel addresses that the riot would have taken place no matter what resolutions were passed. We thus conclude the story of the Trustee meeting at Des Moines, because the later chapters, Saturday afternoon and evening, are written in the beginning.

DR. WAYMAN ASKS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS.

One thing, however, should be added: that following the first and lesser riot of the afternoon, the Board resumed its session, and Dr. Wayman was told that the time was his, and the Board was now ready to listen to all that he had to say about his degree record, about his administration, and any complaints he had to offer. Dr. Wayman declared that he had nothing to say. He told us that he had a wife and family to keep, and would have to earn an honest living, and that therefore he could not afford to part company with members of the Board as bad friends. He hoped *The Gospel Witness* would not say anything against him, and he also hoped that the Trustees would be willing to recommend him to some church. He even especially mentioned the President of the Board, and hoped that I would be willing to say a good word for him to any church desiring his services.

All the members of the Board present, I am sure, would be willing to testify to the accuracy of this report. Our readers will be able to judge of our feelings when we find a University which had been patiently and surely built up, as we fondly supposed, to a point of usefulness, suddenly set on fire and reduced almost to a heap of ashes; and while surveying the wreck, we see the incendiary, with the smoking torch by which the fire was set still in his hand, come to express the hope that we shall be willing to recommend him

to become a minister of a Christian church! Thus endeth the Des Moines chapter of this great tragedy.

A QUESTION TO BE ANSWERED

One great question now remains: when Des Moines University approached the Baptist Bible Union in 1927 the Trustees confessed they were at the end of their financial resources. They had a mortgage of Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars and nearly one hundred thousand dollars of unsecured liabilities on current account. The professors had not had their salaries for two and a half months, and all the financial supplies seemed to have been cut off. It was because of that they came to the Baptist Bible Union. The Bible Union lifted Des Moines University from the status of a local University to an institution of continental interest, inasmuch as money for its support came from all over America. Every member of the Trustee Board, and the whole Bible Union will freely acknowledge that such work as has been done has been accomplished only by the herculean effort of the whole body.

During the seven and a half months of his presidency, President Wayman has gone here and there among the churches, but the final results of his visits have been small. I am sure I am well within the mark when I say that his efforts in money getting during the seven and a half months of his presidency have yielded not much more at the outside than would pay half of his salary.

Up to last Fall the Rev. Minor Stevens and his church had contributed practically nothing to the University. Since that time I believe his church has given something less than three hundred dollars, while he has contributed personally about sixty dollars. Dr. Foulk made a contribution of a thousand dollars to the University, and I am informed secured the reimbursement of that amount from the Chamber of Commerce. Notwithstanding, Des Moines' total indebtedness during the two years has been reduced probably by nearly eighty thousand dollars, in addition to the payment of operating charges.

Who Would Supply The Funds?

Who, then, was, or were, behind President Wayman and Mr. Stevens? What change had come over Iowa Baptists, or the State Convention that now Des Moines University could be supported? Dr. Wayman threatened that he would operate a University "hard by" Des Moines University. We asked him what he meant by "hard by", and he immediately jumped from the geographical to the theological, and said, "I mean by 'hard by' a University of the same type." But who was standing behind Dr. Wayman and Mr. Stevens, with promises of help either in labour or in money to justify them in believing that they could raise the funds necessary to carry on? Or, if Dr. Wayman was equal to the task, why should he so strenuously have insisted that I should leave my work at the most difficult time in the whole year and go to California, to get money?

We are morally certain that this whole upheaval was aided and abetted by influences which have always been the enemies of Fundamentalists. I am personally convinced that though Dr. Wayman accepted our standards, that is our theological position, he is miles removed from that occupied by the Baptist Bible Union of North America, and it is increasingly evident to me that his own sympathies were with that section of the Faculty which reflected the views of the old regime. One thing is true beyond all peradventure, his chapel addresses, and his whole attitude in the Highland Park church, showed him to be utterly incapable of definitely spiritual leadership. We learn by our mistakes, and our

mistakes in Des Moines have been costly. But the greatest mistake we ever made was that we did not, before inviting Dr. Wayman to become President of Des Moines, thoroughly investigate his academic record. I am now positive that had we done so, his name would not have been entertained for the fraction of a moment.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA AT BUFFALO,

May 14th to 17th.

The meeting was held in the First Baptist Church, Buffalo, of which Rev. H. C. Fulton, is the Pastor. The first session was held the evening of the 14th. The President of the Union arrived in time to give a brief address. The Trustee Board of Des Moines University met after the evening meeting in the Hotel Touraine. All the Trustees present in Buffalo were advised of this meeting, and so far as we know all attended, including Rev. Minor Stevens. There was some discussion about general matters, and the following resolution was passed relative to Mr. Stevens' relation to the Board:

"It was voted that this Board record its strong disapproval of the attitude of Trustee Minor Stevens in respect to the present situation in Des Moines University as evidenced by his actual and reported statements; and further, that Mr. Stevens does not in any sense represent the judgment of the Board."

In the afternoon of Wednesday the three resolutions passed by the Trustees of Des Moines were approved by the Baptist Bible Union. The first resolution is that which we have already published dealing with the attack upon the President and Secretary; the second, the resolution approving the efforts of the Secretary of the Board; and the third, the resolution vacating the positions of faculty and staff. The resolution approving of these resolutions was as follows:

APPROVING TRUSTEES' ACTION.

It is moved that the Baptist Bible Union of North America, in annual meeting assembled, hereby expresses its heartiest approval of the way in which the Trustees of the Des Moines University have dealt with the situation in that institution; and that we especially express our approval of their resolution dealing with the dastardly attempt to besmirch the reputations of two of the officers of the Board, and while joining with them in an expression of profound indignation at the aforesaid diabolical attempt, we express our great thankfulness to God that the affairs of the University are in the hands of men who can be so completely trusted, and that this utterly fiendish gesture should have been so completely frustrated.

All the Trustees present with the exception of Mr. Stevens occupied seats on the platform and each, in turn, supported with great enthusiasm the resolutions approving the Trustees' action. The motion was approved by a standing vote, and not a single vote was recorded against it.

Following this certain communications were approved to be sent to the Mayor and Corporation of Des Moines, to the Chamber of Commerce, and to the Governor of the State of Iowa; with the communication sent to the Chamber of Commerce and to the Governor of the State there was enclosed a copy of the letter sent to the Mayor and Corporation of Des Moines University. These communications follow:

LETTER TO THE MAYOR.

May 15, 1929.

To the Mayor and Corporation of the City of Des Moines:
Gentlemen:

The Baptist Bible Union of North America, assembled in annual convention in Buffalo, New York, have received from Des Moines University a report of recent occurrences in that institution, and venture to report to you the following facts:

The Board of Trustees met at the University May 10th and 11th for the transaction of business. It soon became evident

that the efforts of the Trustees to conduct the University in harmony with the religious principles for which the Baptist Bible Union stands had made them unpopular with certain students and with certain members of the Faculty. It is unnecessary to state the character of the decisions reached; but we content ourselves with informing your Honorable Body that the Board was exercised legitimately in administering the affairs of the University under the charter granted by the State of Iowa.

In the afternoon of Saturday students gathered on the campus, provided with a liberal supply of eggs, and in an evidently ugly mood. When the President of the Board of Trustees left the building with others to go to lunch, being a little in advance of the others, at a signal given, students converged from all parts upon the path upon which he was walking, and it became evident that an effort at kidnapping was to be made. A taxicab was drawn up outside the campus, and the taxi-driver was prominent among the rioters. Only the presence of mind of a fellow-trustee prevented the kidnapping by conducting the President of the Board back into the Administration Building. Immediately the Board telephoned the police, asking for protection. After some time two policemen arrived on the scene, and ultimately persuaded the mob to disperse.

Just after dark the Board was in session in the office of the President, when the building was again attacked; eggs and later stones were thrown at the window, and in a few minutes every window in the general offices and the President's office had been broken. The Board again called the police, informing them of what was taking place, and urgently requesting immediate protection. The riot continued until the offices were reduced to a filthy condition. The mob eventually forced their way into the building, and began to shout for the President of the Board. The Board, depending for their safety solely upon police protection, retired from the offices into an ante-room, where the angry mob crowded into the offices. They found in the vestibule of this ante-room one of the Trustees, and with cries of "Beat him up" and "Get Shields" demanded to know the whereabouts of the President of the Board. The Trustee thus discovered and identified as being other than the President of the Board was not molested, but he reports that the evident temper of the mob threatened serious physical injury, if not worse, to the man whom they sought. For not less than forty minutes the riot continued before the police arrived. The building was still full of the rioters, but not one of them was placed under arrest. The condition of the building and the still angry mood of the mob left the Trustees no alternative but to order the University closed. The Board then asked for police protection for the building, and for safe conduct for themselves. The police officer informed us there was no constable available to be put in charge of the building, notwithstanding the windows were broken, the doors had been forced, and it was impossible to protect the valuable records the offices contained.

Members of the Board were taken in police cars to the police station, and there resumed their business. The President of the Board then asked for protection over night in the Chamberlain Hotel, only to be told by the officer in charge that the police of Des Moines could guarantee him no protection outside of the police station, and advised that he leave the city immediately, promising him safe conduct to the train. There appeared, therefore, no alternative but hastily to leave the city. Accordingly the President and three other Trustees went to the station in police cars, and left for Chicago on the eleven o'clock train.

Four Canadian students took refuge in the home of a Lutheran minister, and on Sunday evening this house was surrounded by another mob of students, which has been estimated in the press as being about one hundred. A call for the police was sent in, and this time they immediately responded. Two of the rioters were placed under arrest and taken to the police station. Inasmuch as the police would guarantee no protection to the President of the Board, these four Canadian students remained in hiding until escorted by the police to the train on Monday evening, when they left for their homes in Toronto.

Following the order of the Trustees closing the University, six students obtained an injunction from the Courts, under which authority the University is now continuing its classes.

Des Moines University depends for its support chiefly upon the constituency of the Baptist Bible Union of North America. Its students have been drawn from over twenty States of the Union; and this communication is sent by vote of the annual meeting of the Baptist Bible Union of North America to your Honorable Body to enquire respectfully what you would have us do. Must we announce to the continent and to the world

that security of life and property cannot be guaranteed in the capital city of the State of Iowa? Must we refrain from further efforts to secure students from other States of the Union and from Canada on the ground that we have no guarantee that they will be safe in Des Moines?

It is the desire of the Baptist Bible Union to build in Des Moines a greater University; but we cannot ask our constituents to invest money in property that may be left at the mercy of a mob, nor can we invite students to come from other States to Iowa.

We address your Honourable Body respectfully to request that you will be good enough to inform us whether the recent saying of the great President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover, to the effect that life and property were less secure in the United States than in any civilized country of the world, is to find so unhappy a confirmation in the State which gave him birth.

The convention of the Baptist Bible Union of North America will conclude its sessions Friday evening of this week. I venture to ask that you will be good enough to send us a reply by wire not later than Thursday, in order that we may have time to determine our future policy in respect to Des Moines University.

In behalf of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, and the Trustees of Des Moines University, we beg to subscribe ourselves

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) MAXMILLIAN SCHIMPF,

Vice-President,

Baptist Bible Union of North America.

(Signed) OLIVER W. VAN OSDEL,

Vice-President,

Board of Trustees, Des Moines University.

LETTER TO GOVERNOR

May 15, 1929.

To His Honour, the Governor of the State of Iowa,
Des Moines, Iowa.

Sir:

The Baptist Bible Union of North America, assembled in annual meeting in Buffalo, New York, May 15th, 1929, respectfully calls your attention to the events described in the enclosed letter addressed to the Mayor and Corporation of the City of Des Moines, which letter with this communication is forwarded to you by vote of the Baptist Bible Union annual convention.

We feel assured that you share the Bible Union's astonishment that such events could take place in the capital city of the State of Iowa. In addition to the matters related in the letter to the Mayor and Corporation of Des Moines, we respectfully call your attention to the fact that the indignities heaped upon the Trustees of Des Moines University were especially aimed at the President of the Board, who is a Canadian citizen; and that the four Canadian students in attendance at the University found themselves exposed to somewhat similar treatment; and that they were obliged to leave the city of Des Moines and return to Canada three weeks before the closing of the semester because they could be assured of no protection in Des Moines. And we would therefore respectfully call your attention to the fact that the Court's injunction which protected the interest of American citizens, offered no protection to students of another nationality. We venture also with much respect to call your attention to the fact that if serious bodily injury, which might easily have occurred, had resulted from the riot, a delicate international question would most certainly have been created.

The Baptist Bible Union of North America will be in session until the evening of Friday, May 17th, and at its annual meeting the policy of the body respecting Des Moines University must be determined. We would, therefore, respectfully request that you give us a telegram of assurance not later than Thursday, the 16th, that we may plan for the continuance of the work of the Des Moines University with absolute confidence that we shall be protected by the laws of the State of Iowa.

Awaiting your reply, in behalf of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, and the Trustees of Des Moines University, we beg to subscribe ourselves,

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) MAXMILLIAN SCHIMPF,

Vice-President,

Baptist Bible Union of North America.

(Signed) OLIVER W. VAN OSDEL,

Vice-President,

Board of Trustees, Des Moines University.

LETTER TO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

May 15, 1929.

To the President of the Chamber of Commerce,
Des Moines, Iowa.

Dear Sir:

By vote of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, assembled in annual convention in Buffalo, New York, May 15th, 1929, we forward you herewith a copy of a letter addressed to the Mayor and Corporation of the City of Des Moines.

As we are convinced the business interests of Des Moines are vitally concerned in the matters of which this letter treats, we respectfully ask that it receive the careful consideration of your Body. It would largely assist us in determining our future policy respecting Des Moines University, if we could be favoured with a telegraphic reply, assuring us of your desire that the University be continued in the City of Des Moines.

In behalf of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, and the Trustees of Des Moines University, we beg to subscribe ourselves

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) MAXMILLIAN SCHIMPF,
Vice-President,
Baptist Bible Union of North America.

(Signed) OLIVER W. VAN OSDEL,
Vice-President,
Board of Trustees, Des Moines University.

In due course the following replies were received:

REPLY FROM MAYOR OF DES MOINES

Des Moines, Iowa,
May 16th, 1929.

Baptist Bible Union of North America,
Touraine Hotel, Buffalo, N.Y.

Replying to your letter of yesterday inquiring what we would have the Baptist Bible Union of North America do in the matter of Des Moines University; we trust that you will continue this valuable institution and contribute your share in the betterment of educational conditions in North America. The security of your management and property has our unqualified guaranty. Your continued effort to make Des Moines University a bigger and better institution has our approval. Forty years of protection to University and College life and property is our record. We propose to continue this policy of absolute protection and to perform our full duty under the law.

(Signed) Mayor and City Council of Des Moines.

REPLY FROM GOVERNOR OF IOWA

Des Moines, Iowa,
May 16th, 1929.

Baptist Bible Union of North America,
Touraine Hotel, Buffalo, N.Y.

Replying to the resolutions passed by your organization and letters asking if the Trustees of the Des Moines University can depend upon the protection of the property and persons connected with said institution by the officers of Iowa: will say any interference with the property or persons connected with the University in violation of the laws of our state will be prevented, and whatever force of the state is necessary to accomplish this purpose will be provided (Stop) You need have no fear whatever for the individuals of said institution or the property belonging to said University.

(Signed) JOHN HAMMILL, Governor of Iowa.

REPLY FROM PRESIDENT OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Des Moines, Iowa,

May 16th, 1929.

"Maxmillian Schimpf,

Vice-President of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, Touraine Hotel, Buffalo, N.Y.

"The Chamber of Commerce hopes that it will be possible for Des Moines University to be continued in this city as one of our worthy and highly prized educational institutions.

(Signed) B. F. Williams, President
Des Moines Chamber of Commerce."

DEAN E. C. CALLAWAY AT BUFFALO.

On Thursday, May 16th, Dean E. C. Callaway appeared before the Convention saying that he had come to represent President Wayman, the Faculty, and the students. I claimed the right to ask Professor Callaway some questions. All that Professor Callaway had to say, in effect, was that the academic standing of Des Moines University would be affected by a change of Faculty; that the students would lose their credits; and that the chief complaint which had been made related to administrative affairs. He complained that the Board of Trustees spend all their time in Des Moines "chasing rumors", and reserved no time for the consideration of administrative difficulties! He even took the extraordinary position that the thing that has engaged the attention of a continent, and which he summarized in the word "rumors" was relatively unimportant; and that the big thing was the question of administration! Dean Callaway, in this, ran true to form, for it was the position taken by everyone of those who had helped to circulate these slanders that, after all these matters were unimportant, and that the all-important thing was the alleged interference with Dr. Wayman's administration! Anything more preposterous can scarcely be imagined.

When the Professor said he had been browbeaten, the Chairman of the meeting, Mr. Max Schimpf, asked him what he and his associates had attempted to do to the President and Secretary of the Board.

Here let me say that for the first year of his service in Des Moines University I personally regarded Professor Callaway as one of our greatest Christian men. I was absent from Des Moines most of the time, visiting it occasionally, and therefore was not able personally accurately to estimate the attitude of the different professors and Deans. Whenever I visited Des Moines I heard far more criticism of the Deans and other professors from Dean Callaway than from anyone else. His criticisms were never unkindly, and his objections were always taken on biblical and spiritual grounds; but he did complain that there seemed to be on the part of many of the professors an utter absence of any sort of spiritual perception.

We made one great mistake in appointing one professor, as all institutions will make mistakes. But after he had left us, Professor Callaway remarked that it really seemed to him as though he had been deliberately sent into the institution to try to wreck it, and he rejoiced in his departure.

Not in Des Moines From November to April

It was not until Dr. Wayman came that Dean Callaway entirely changed front. And let it be once more asserted that from the time President Wayman was inaugurated in November until the 27th of April I never once set foot in Des Moines. Going through to California I wired Dr. Wayman to meet me at the train one morning, but there was such a

heavy fall of snow that his car was stalled and he was unable to get to the train. So that it cannot reasonably be charged that the President of the Board of Trustees "interfered" with Dr. Wayman's administration.

Furthermore the only suggestions I ever offered him respecting administrative matters were that which was involved in forwarding him a copy of the letter received from one of the students, and the suggestion that he should deliver a series of addresses on great doctrinal subjects, and send me the manuscript to print. But no man was ever more completely left alone with his job to work out his own will as was Dr. Wayman from November to April.

Nor did the Secretary complain to me by correspondence, and when I met Dr. Wayman in Detroit in February I was blissfully ignorant of conditions in Des Moines. Had I known, I could not have gone to California and with a clear conscience appealed to people to give money for that institution.

All that Dean Callaway was able to suggest when put to the test at the Baptist Bible Union Convention in Buffalo as to the Secretary's interference in administrative affairs was that certain test units were brought from the book store to the general offices to be sold to the students through the Faculty; whereupon the Secretary directed that they should be returned to the book store and obtained by the Faculty there. As to the merits of this astounding act of interference I personally have not had time to enquire. But terrible as it is, it surely scarcely justified the destruction of a university! Beyond this complaint Professor Callaway would not go.

It ought to be emphatically stated that Prof. Callaway was given all the time that he desired, nor was Rev. Minor Stevens denied a hearing on the floor of the Convention or anywhere. Notwithstanding, they printed leaflets announcing a meeting in the dining-room of the Hotel Touraine at 8.15 Thursday night. Between thirty and forty people assembled, including some of the Trustees. So far as we could judge from reports, all attended merely for the sake of hearing what these men had to say. Again emphasis was laid upon the "interference" in administration, and an attempt made utterly to belittle that which every right-thinking person must have recognized was the most serious aspect of the whole controversy.

They were asked whether questions would be permitted, to which they replied in the negative, and threatened to call the police if any attempt were made. When they declared the meeting adjourned someone proposed a continuance of the meeting for the presentation of the Trustees' side, so that there was a further discussion of the matter in a second meeting. But so far as we were able to judge by reports, even in the meeting which they had themselves called, they found no sympathy.

On Friday, among other resolutions, the following were submitted to the body by the Resolutions Committee and carried unanimously:

ON REORGANIZATION OF DES MOINES UNIVERSITY.

Having heard through Professor E. C. Callaway, the chosen representative of the President, Faculty, and students, of Des Moines University, what presumably is the best possible defense of their recent conduct, this Annual Meeting of the Baptist Bible Union of North America is now more deeply convinced than ever of the justice and wisdom of the action of the Board of Trustees in setting themselves free to reorganize the entire University by declaring vacant the positions of the President, the Faculty, and all the other employees of the institution, and therefore hereby reaffirms its hearty approval of the Board's entire course in this controversy.

RESOLUTION re PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY.

RESOLVED that it is impossible adequately to express our deep appreciation of the untiring efforts of our heroic President, Rev. T. T. Shields, to promote the glorious work of Fundamentalism in general and of the Baptist Bible Union in particular, especially in connection with our educational centre in Des Moines University, as seen in his advocacy of these interests in his great periodical, his continent-wide tours, and other numerous activities.

RESOLVED, that this convention express its sense of obligation to Miss Edith M. Rebman, the Secretary-Treasurer of this body and of Des Moines University, for her self-sacrificing and tireless efforts in carrying out the will of the Baptist Bible Union, in raising necessary funds, and generally advancing the cause of Christ.

A Special Committee

The Board of Trustees at Buffalo appointed a special committee consisting of Dr. T. T. Shields, Dr. O. W. Van Osdel, Mr. E. A. Roberts, Rev. H. G. Hamilton, and Miss Edith Rebman, clothed with the full powers of the Board to act in the Board's interest between the adjournment of that meeting and the Annual Meeting of the Trustee Board which will be held in Des Moines on June 11th.

Officers of the Baptist Bible Union of N.A.

At the meeting of the Baptist Bible Union for the election of officers, which this writer did not attend, the following officers were nominated by the Nominating Committee and elected by the body: PRESIDENT: T. T. Shields, Toronto, Canada; VICE-PRESIDENTS: Edward A. Roberts, Cleveland, Ohio and John J. Van Gorder, Butler, Pa.; SECRETARY-TREASURER: Edith M. Rebman, Des Moines University, Des Moines, Iowa. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Maximilian Schimpf, N.Y.; Earl G. Griffith, Toledo, Ohio; Oliver W. Van Osdel, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Arthur B. Fowler, Indiana, Penn.; Clifford J. Loney, Hamilton, Canada; Charles F. Fredman, La Salle, Ill.

Next Meeting of Baptist Bible Union

An invitation was received from the Baptist Church of Mishawaka, Indiana, to hold the Annual Meeting of the Baptist Bible Union in that city in 1930. When a resolution to accept the invitation was proposed, the question was raised as to whether it might prove to be necessary to hold the meeting in Des Moines. The resolution of acceptance, however, carried. Rev. M. E. Hawkins, the Pastor of the church, stated that in such an emergency the church would be quite willing to adjust itself to circumstances.

Our readers will understand why we have not given space to the addresses delivered at this conference. With the exception of that of the President they were all able deliverances. The Union was greatly favoured by the presence of Dr. French E. Oliver of Los Angeles, who spoke Wednesday, Thursday and Friday evenings.

Hospitality of Mr. Fulton and His Church

Mr. Fulton and the First Church were ideal hosts, and nothing necessary to perfect hospitality was lacking.

Never before has the Baptist Bible Union meeting received such newspaper publicity, representing, directly or indirectly, all of the papers of America. A corps of telegraph boys were in attendance carrying the messages to the office and sending them to the ends of the earth.

What of the Future?

Thus we leave this whole matter to the judgment of the people. On the human side, this writer has wished a thousand times that he had never heard of Des Moines University. It has cost him much labour and time and energy. Somehow

(Continued on page 44.)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"GIANTS AND THEIR CONQUERORS".

A Sermon by the Pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, May 19th, 1929.

(Stenographically Reported.)

"And it came to pass after this, that there arose war at Gezer with the Philistines; at which time Sibbechai the Hushathite slew Sippai, that was of the children of the giant, and they were subdued.

"And there was war again with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, whose spear staff was like a weaver's beam.

"And yet again there was war at Gath, where was a man of great stature, whose fingers and toes were four and twenty, six on each hand, and six on each foot; and he also was the son of the giant.

"But when he defied Israel, Jonathan, the son of Shimea, David's brother, slew him.

"These were born unto the giant in Gath; and they fell by the hand of David, and by the hand of his servants." (I Chron. 20:4-8.)

"And it came to pass after this, that there was a picnic at Gezer with the Philistines; at which time Sibbechai the Hushathite highly complimented Sippai, that was of the children of the giant, and they became great friends. And there was a fraternal luncheon again with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair delivered a complimentary speech eulogizing Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, whose spear staff was like a weaver's beam. And yet again there was an elaborate banquet at Gath, where was a man of great stature, whose fingers and toes were four and twenty, six on each hand, and six on each foot; and he also was the son of the giant. But when he praised Israel, Jonathan the son of Shimea, David's brother, made an appropriate reply. These were born unto the giant in Gath; and they were life-long friends of David and of his servants"! That is how it ought to read! But that would be a revised version, would it not?

Here is how it reads in the Book: "And it came to pass after this, that there arose war at Gezer with the Philistines; at which time Sibbechai the Hushathite slew Sippai, that was of the children of the giant, and they were subdued. And there was war again with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, whose spear staff was like a weaver's beam. And yet again there was war at Gath, where was a man of great stature, whose fingers and toes were four and twenty, six on each hand and six on each foot; and he also was the son of the giant. But when he defied Israel, Jonathan the son of Shimea David's brother slew him. These were born unto the giant in Gath; and they fell by the hand of David, and by the hand of his servants."

Times almost innumerable I have reminded you that the fundamental principles of life of which human experience is composed are in all ages precisely the same. You have light battling with the darkness; righteousness at war with unrighteousness; truth combating error; life struggling for the mastery over death; God going forth to war against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, and against spiritual wickedness in high places. These ancient records, written by divine inspiration, are true still to universal human experience, for in every such conflict, or series of conflicts as are here described, every man and woman is enlisted on one side or the other. The whole Bible is a record of the wars of the Lord, and history repeats itself; that is

proverbial. It repeats itself because these fundamental elements of life are evermore the same.

You remember that Abraham had two sons, Isaac and Ishmael, and they contended one with the other; but when Abraham died his sons Isaac and Ishmael met at their father's grave and buried him. And Isaac had two sons, Esau and Jacob, and they too contended against each other. But when Isaac died his sons, Esau and Jacob, buried him. So you will find as the pages of history are turned the same record written over and over again because, as I say, these essential elements of human life are unchanging.

You will recall that at one period of Israel's history the principal enemies of God's people were the Philistines. In Moses' day they were the Egyptians. At a later time they were the Moabites, and the Ammonites, and the children of Mount Seir. At one time they were the Syrians; at another time they were the Assyrians; but during the reign of David and Saul, Israel's chief antagonists were from Philistia.

I.

This is a brief chapter of that history, and it describes A STATE OF PERPETUAL WAR BETWEEN THESE OPPOSITES: "There arose war at Gezer with the Philistines . . . and there was war again with the Philistines . . . and yet again there was war at Gath."

There are moral and spiritual incompatibilities just as there are elements in the material world which are chemically incompatible. There are some things that cannot be mixed, that cannot be blended; they are, in the very nature of the case, opposed to each other; and whenever these principles meet there is always war. You have it here: Israel on the one hand, representative of that higher life which recognized the supreme authority of Jehovah; and Philistia on the other hand, a nation of idolaters who were strangers to the true God. These two, in the nature of the case, had nothing in common with each other, and whenever their paths crossed they came into conflict and war was the result.

It is still true that *God's people are called to a holy warfare*. We are to endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. Dr. Stockley read to you this evening that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places", and we are admonished in that scripture to take unto us the whole armour of God. The New Testament, equally with the Old, abounds with that mili-

tant figure wherein the servant of the Lord is described as a man of conflict. Everyone of you, whether you occupy public and official positions or not, if you are a Christian if you have been made partakers of the grace of life, if indeed Christ has been formed in you the hope of glory, if the Holy Spirit is regnant within, if this holy Book be your guide, if its principles have mastered and moulded your life, it follows as a matter of course that you will and must come into conflict with the ungodly world about you and with the sin within.

First of all, *this succession of battles must be fought within*. Let me speak to you young Christians. Here is your record: "There arose war at Gezer with the Philistines . . . And there was war again with the Philistines . . . And yet again there was war at Gath." We must be always fighting, putting off the old man, and putting on the new. There is no end to the conflict. I remember in the Great War the question asked by everyone when people met was, "How long do you think the war will last?" And when the late Lord Kitchener announced plans to enlist, train, and equip an army over a period of three years, the British Empire was staggered by the magnitude of the war there foreshadowed. "Three years of war! How can the world endure such conflict for three years?" one heard on every hand. But instead of three years, it passed the four-year limit and ran into the fifth. There were a great many people who said, "The war will be over before Christmas, and we shall eat Christmas dinner in Berlin." But there was a great deal of work to do, and many foes to fight; and those rosy predictions were never fulfilled.

You have the same disposition in the Christian life. How long must I fight? When will the war be over? When will the last battle be fought, and the final victory won? I cannot promise you any early termination of the war. I can promise you that as long as you are in this tabernacle you will have to fight in the name of the Lord. "There arose war at Gezer with the Philistines . . . And there was war again with the Philistines . . . And yet again there was war at Gath." The war is so long that we are sometimes tempted to be discouraged because we are so manifestly called to a life of unceasing conflict.

I am aware there are some people who imagine that they have fought the last battle. I am quite aware that there are some people who think they have got rid of the old man; he is crucified, dead, and buried, and they are already in heaven! I have met some perfect people, I really have! But I repeat what I have often quoted from Mr. Spurgeon when he said: "My experience with perfect people has been most unfortunate!" They fought one battle at Gezer, and they thought the war was ended. Oh, my friends, there are sins that ought to be sloughed off immediately, and yet if you will press the battle to the gates you will find that in that heart of yours there are resources of evil, new battles to be fought, new enemies to be met, that will continually surprise you.

I remember sitting in a restaurant in London during the war, and there was a company of Australian soldiers came in and sat at the next table. I recall they offered me a cigarette; I thanked them for their generosity and told them I did not smoke. "Happy man! Happy man!" they said. I said, "I thought you soldiers enjoyed your smokes?" "So we do when we can get them; but it is horrible torture when one wants a smoke and cannot have it." That opened the conversation, and I asked them to tell me some of their experiences at the front. They

were open-hearted, open-minded fellows, and we had a most interesting conversation. I asked them about a certain new army that had joined the Allies. I asked them what they thought of their qualities as fighting men. "They are good men; they are good fighters; they are of the same stock as ourselves. But like everybody else, they have to learn something before they can really fight effectively. We all had to learn it; and some of them, we think, sometimes, are not as willing to profit by our experience as they ought to be; and therefore they pay the price."

They gave me this instance: "Some thousands of this new army went over a certain piece of terrain, and swept the enemy before them—as they thought. They went on to victory with a shout, and without many casualties. When that piece of territory was cleared we were ordered to advance, and we did advance; but in a little while we found the enemy was behind us. These raw soldiers had gone over the surface of things, but they had not mopped up." "What do you mean by 'mopping up'?" I asked. "We go over every dug-out, every foot of ground where there is any possibility of people hiding, and bomb the enemy out. We go forward only when we know the ground is cleared on the surface, and underground as well."

There are a great many Christians who do no "mopping up." They talk about victory, but down in the dug-outs, in the hidden recesses of the soul, there are pride and envy, and many another evil hiding, and it is necessary to have war at Gezer, and war again with the Philistines, and yet again to fight life's battle at Gath.

A friend told me a few years ago about being at Northfield when he heard a certain celebrated man from England who was speaking on the higher Christian life, summoning the people to full and complete surrender to Jesus Christ—as every preacher ought to do. This friend said, "As I listened to him I felt so small, so mean, that I wanted to retire from human society and get away somewhere in the wilds and spend months alone with God. But one morning when the preacher was preaching I stood on the outskirts of the crowd—it was outdoors at Northfield in the summertime—a photographer trained his camera on the preacher. As soon as he noticed it the preacher said, 'Don't do that! Don't do that!' with rather a show of anger. That day at noon I sat at the table with the great preacher, so I said to him, 'Dr. So-and-So, I got the greatest blessing from your sermon this morning I have got yet.' 'I am glad to know that. Just what was there in the message this morning that helped you?' To this the other replied: 'I have wondered during these last days sometimes whether I were a Christian or not. Your messages have been so searching, so penetrating, that I felt I wanted to fly away somewhere and be alone with God. I had a feeling that you had soared away and left us all behind; but when that photographer aimed at you this morning I said, 'Aha, Aha! there is a little bit of the old man in the preacher yet.' When I said that the preacher said, 'Well, did you ever see a photograph taken of a man when he was speaking, with his mouth open? How ugly it is! 'So there was a little bit of pride there, too, was there?'" I replied. War at Gezer, war with the Philistines, and yet again a battle at Gath.

If there is any man or woman here this evening so foolish as to have supposed he or she has reached Eutopia, that there are no more enemies to fight, then I want you to get back to your mopping up. Let the light of God's truth search your motives, the springs of action, the

deeper springs of life, and you will discover there is many a battle yet to be fought.

That is true of the inner life, and *it is equally true of the outer life*. There are many, many battles to be fought.

We have had a few here in this place,—one or two in our time! We have recognized that there are errors to be dealt with, evils to be combatted. Then sometimes there has been a little lull, but behold after the war at Gezer ere long we have had another fight with the Philistines.

Turn back the pages of history, church history, and see what battles God's saints have had to fight in time past. We talk in our day about Modernism, and yet there is not an infinitesimal element that is modern in what we call Modernism. There is not a heresy facing the church to-day that has not faced the church in time past. We are fighting the battle that was fought at Gezer over again with the Philistines, and then carrying the conflict on once more to Gath. There is simply no end to it; there never will be an end to it until the Lord shall come, and until the devil is chained and cast into the bottomless pit. What a world that will be, when there is no devil abroad! What a day that will be when the accuser, the champion slanderer of the universe, by the mighty power of God is cast down and bound in chains! Life will be worth living then, will it not? What a day it will be when there is no devil abroad! But until then we may expect ever-increasing conflict.

There is somebody here who says—and I have heard it so often—"But, sir, I do not like controversy," Nor do I. I have never yet met a soldier who likes fighting. I have met a good many people who thought it was a brave thing before they actually got into the conflict, but you talk to the soldiers who went to the Great War, and they will all tell you that they were very soon cured of that, and the people who do not want war to-day are the people who know best what it means.

It is so in the spiritual life. We do not want war. I would love to be able to say,—

"My willing soul would stay
In such a frame as this;
And sit and sing myself away
To everlasting bliss."

Oh yes, it would be fine if the whole army consisted in the brass band, would it not? I should like to play the drum myself! If that were all there was to do, just to play the trumpets, conflict would be interesting. But there is something vastly more in the Christian life than hymn-singing, glorious exercise as that is. We have all had our moments of rapture, as did Peter, James, and John, when Peter expressed the desire that they might make tabernacles in the mount and abide there. But they had to come from the mount—and there they found a young man possessed with a devil. Everywhere it is the same. So you may as well sharpen your sword, you may as well get ready to put on the whole armour of God; for until God calls you hence I promise you nothing in His name but ceaseless conflict. The battle will never be over until the white horse and his Rider come down the skies.

That is the first principle, that the war between Israel and Philistia is unending in this dispensation, and that some new battle is always on the horizon some new enemy challenging the forces of the Lord.

II.

I should like to talk to you on that principle alone for a month. There is no end of material, but let us

go on to a further suggestion, and it is this: AS OFTEN AS THE PHILISTINES WENT TO WAR THEY WERE CHAMPIONED BY A GIANT. Every time you find there was a giant at their head. It is a great thing properly to estimate the strength of the foe. A great many people have been brought—we all, in fact, have been brought at times to defeat because we did not properly appraise the fearful power of the forces arrayed against us. British conceit has lost as many battles as British valour has won. If you read British history you will find it has been almost invariably the practice of successive British governments when meeting an enemy somewhere to send out a force unequal to the task in hand. They seem to have assumed that one Britisher was equal to a dozen or so of any other nationality. Man for man, he is equal to any. But in the South African War, in India and Afghanistan, Egypt, the Soudan, and many other places, you have the same record: the foe's strength was under-estimated, and it was not until they properly appraised the strength of the enemy that they were able to meet the situation.

The church of Christ is losing to-day in many quarters because she fails to recognize that the armies against which she fights are always officered by giants. Our Lord Jesus said: "The strong man armed keepeth his palace, and his goods are in peace." You will remember how it is said that an archangel disputed with the devil about the body of Moses, and so mighty was that prince of darkness that even an archangel dared not bring against him a railing accusation. An archangel was not a match for the devil but with wisdom divine he said, "The Lord rebuke thee, Satan."

I verily believe that the teaching of Scripture is that apart from God Himself there is no power in the universe that can match the power of the devil. He is the strong man armed. He is the giant of Gath. He and his sons ever command the armies of darkness. So, my dear friends, when you turn your attention to the evil within, however small, however light a thing it may be, remember there is a giant leading the army. Sin is such a little thing! Sin is one of the "vestigial remains," something that is left over from our lower animal existence! We are growing out of it, and if we could live long enough we should grow out of it altogether as we grow out of chicken-pox and measles! It is a little thing! Is it? Is it? Try to deal with any disposition toward evil, toward untruth, toward pride, toward malice, toward anything; say to yourself before the Lord, "That is wrong, and I will put that enemy to the sword." When you do it, remember that behind the smallest sin there is all the power of hell. You are as impotent as a baby in the presence of it. No human power can deal with it. When Goliath assumed that arrogant attitude toward the ruddy-faced David he was not without reason on his side. In fact he had all reason on his side; he was wrong because he had no revelation. But on natural grounds of reason the sinner is defeated from the beginning. Look at him: every time there are: "Sippai, that was of the children of the giant": "Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite"; and the third time, "a man of great stature, whose fingers and toes were four and twenty, six on each hand, and six on each foot: and he also was the son of the giant."

That is true of the evil within, and it is true of the evil without. Yes, it is. Try to combat that spirit

and those principles which are arrayed against this holy Bible, and you will discover that is true. What are they? You say, "It is just a modern trend of thought. It is the result of our larger knowledge. It is due to the progress of science. It is an expression of modern scholarship". Is it? Is it? That is not all in this great conflict between what we now call Modernism and Fundamentalism—which is a conflict between unbelief and faith, and is as old as the first chapter of human history—I say, in this great conflict we are not fighting scholarship and science and modern thought and modern conditions. These are not our enemies. In the fight we have had in this place we have not been fighting primarily McMaster University. We are not fighting Chicago University, or Union Theological Seminary, or Dr. Fosdick, or Shailer Mathews, or Professor Marshall, or anybody else—these are not our real enemies. "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." It is against the whole army of Philistia, with Beelzebub at its head, that we do battle. You cannot settle it by dealing with men; there is always a giant.

For example; three weeks ago yesterday I passed through Des Moines, and, finding the President absent, I wrote him a letter. I told him of my embarrassment through the receipt of letters from all quarters of the earth on the question of his academic standing. I said, "We shall have to go to the bottom of this. We shall have to sift this matter to the bottom." It did not look to be a great task. It seemed a comparatively small thing to hold an investigation to find out whether it was true that a man had appeared before the scholastic world as holding a degree from Oxford University and several other universities to which he was not entitled. That seemed a small matter, but when that man read that he said, "If I am driven from this place I will ruin two people, and I will wreck this institution." He has not done either!

Why do I cite that? A company of students hailed me as the man who had saved the University; by whom, largely, professors' salaries have been paid, yet suddenly (like we have had in our Baptist Convention) overnight, they had become a mob of mad men. A man read me a letter over the telephone last night that he had received from one of the students in which he said, "I am proud to have had part in it; and if the mob could have laid hands on Dr. Shields they would have murdered him." Why? Whence that spirit? This man whose name I read to you to-night, Warren L. Steeves, used to sit in these pews occasionally when he was a student at McMaster University. He is a Canadian. Why murder? When the report of that outlawry appeared in the Chicago papers a professor of Chicago University—I have not his exact words, but there appeared in one of the Chicago papers last Monday a report of his utterances when he publicly congratulated the students of Des Moines University on their attack on their university and their attempt to do bodily injury to the Trustees—said it was the kind of Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec said treatment such trustees deserved. An official of the that the students of McMaster University ought to have done the same thing! I have no doubt they

would have done so, except that we are under the British flag; we do not have that kind of thing here.

Why do I say these things? Just to show that when you do battle against these principles you may expect all hell to be let loose against you, and unless you are ready to fight the devil and all his angels you had better not go to battle. It is no small thing to unsheath the sword against the enemies of this Book.

How shall we do it? *You cannot fight the devil with his own instruments, with his own weapons.* It simply cannot be done, that is all. I have heard of some churches that seem to think they can cast the devil out with music. I like good music, but you cannot meet the devil that way. When Goliath said to David, "Come to me, and I will give thy flesh unto the fowls of the air, and to the beasts of the field", it was no vain boast. And if David had been foolish enough to try to fight Goliath with Saul's big sword and armour, that is exactly what Goliath would have done. No, you cannot do battle with carnal weapons. In the first place, you could not play the devil's music if you tried, no matter how expert you are as a musician. His score is so written that you have not fingers enough to play it! It takes a man whose fingers and toes are four and twenty, six on each hand and six on each toe. Brother Penney would be baffled, so would Brother Hutchinson. They would find a note somewhere that they could not make their fingers reach at all. The devil always has an extra finger and an extra toe—a kick from that foot with six toes may be very severe. I heard Dr. Oliver describe certain types of men when speaking in Buffalo, and he said, "When I meet a man like that I feel like introducing my shoemaker to his tailor"! You could not wear the shoes made in the devil's factories. They are made for twelve-toed people. "Thy shoes shall be iron and brass; and as thy days, so shall thy strength be"; "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.

III.

It is a serious business, this conflict, is it not? It is a real fight. IS THERE ANY CHANCE OF VICTORY? Let me read the old story again. There is a giant every where on the opposite side, but listen: "At which time Sibbechai the Hushathite slew Sippai, that was of the children of the giant: and they were subdued"; in the next instance, "And Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, whose spear staff was like a weaver's beam"—and he went down; and again, there came the man of measure with four and twenty toes and fingers, "but when he defied Israel, Jonathan the son of Shimea, David's brother slew him. These were born unto the giant in Gath; and they fell by the hand of David, and by the hand of his servants." As often as a giant reared his insolent head in Philistia God found a champion in Israel, to subdue him, to lead God's people to victory. Do not misunderstand what I said when I stated that we must fight and fight continually in our inner lives. Praise God, we may have a life of continual victory. It will

not be a life of victory when we shall have no foes to face, but it will be a life of victory when we may tread our foes under our feet. Whatever your temptation, whatever your enemy, whatever your difficulty, God will find an Israelite champion to match with the giants of Gath.

I believe it is true in the general conflict. God never wants for instruments. He will use you and me if we are willing to be used. He will raise up men, He will raise up movements; He will raise up organizations; in His own way He will find Sibbechai, He will find Elhanan, and He will find Jonathan the Son of Shimea David's brother. He is never at a loss to find a man. That is the big task nowadays to find men. I do not know how many people have said to me, "Why do you not do this?" The problem everlastingly is to find somebody to do that thing. But God can always find them. God has resources undreamed of by His creatures, and it has been His way down through the Christian church to find strength and power enough to match the evil of the day. I hope you see this truth: "These were born unto the giant in Gath"; they were all members of the same family. Evil comes from one source, whether it struts around with college cap and gown, or shows its ugly face in some other form, it is all the same; they are all sons of the giant,—and they all "fell by the hand of David, and by the hand of his servants." One family on that side, and one family on this: "the seed of the serpent", and "the Seed of the woman"; Ishmael and Isaac; Esau and Jacob; the devil and our glorious Lord, it is all the same.

That is a parable. The whole story was always most fascinating to me as a boy. I have never outgrown it, and I hope I never shall. I love to read the story of David's conquest with Goliath. Look at the scene; that great Philistine as he struts out to show himself to Israel—to "show" himself, to fill them with fear and terror as he flings down his challenge and says, "Send me a man to fight with me." He is a picture of the devil. That has been his cry all down through the ages, "Send me a man to fight with me." No man did ever go against him in his own strength but was utterly defeated. Yet at last God answered his challenge, and He sent him a Man,—

"Oh, loving wisdom of our God
When all was sin and shame,
A second Adam to the fight,
And to the rescue came.

"Oh, wisest love, that flesh and blood
That did in Adam fail,
Should strive afresh against the foe,
Should strive and should prevail."

David said to him, "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied." You remember how at last he came back with the head of the giant in his hand, when he had brought him low with sling and stone, and had severed the giant's head with his own sword, the king saw him and said, "Whose son art thou, thou young man? How did you

do it? Where did you get strength to do it?" And Israel's maidens sang, "Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands."

And He Who is the Greatest of all champions met the enemy of our souls on the summit of the everlasting hills. He laid him low, and some day—He will take his head from him. We shall tread satan under our feet shortly. When the question is asked in that day, "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?" there will be but one answer, "The Son of David, and the Son of God", for only the Son of God can lay the devil low. There is victory for everyone of us in Christ Jesus the Lord. "They fell by the hand of David, and by the hands of his servants"—"Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Do you know what it is to fight with Him, and in His strength to depend? I pray that God may lead us into that security to-night. I have not time to press the invitation this evening because of the Communion Service which follows, and I have been too long already; but I wonder if there are some who, as we bow in prayer, bruised and beaten and defeated, are there some who will lay hold of this salvation which consists in the mighty power of God and the atoning blood of our Lord Jesus Christ? Shall we look to Him in prayer?

O Lord, Thou hast promised that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. It may be that there are many in this house to-night who have been doing battle with the giants, and have often been wounded in the fray. We pray that we may clearly apprehend that there is complete victory in Him Who is the Head of all principalities and powers. Hear the prayer that rises from many hearts this evening, "God, be merciful to me a sinner." Hear the prayer of many a backslider who would return to the place of fellowship and victory. Hear, we pray Thee, the prayer of any man or woman who has been made to feel by Thy Spirit's voice this evening that he or she has been wanting in courage and initiative. If we have been cowards, if we have failed to press the battle to the gates, we pray that Thou wilt bring us back not only to fellowship but to real conflict for Thee. Help us to rejoice in the incomparable comradeship of Him Who is our Saviour and our Lord. We ask it for His sake, Amen.

The Toronto Baptist Seminary

Courses for students for the Baptist Ministry,
for Missionaries, and Christian workers in general.

REV. T. I. STOCKLEY, D.D., Dean.

REV. T. T. SHIELDS, D.D., President.

Send for prospectus to The Toronto Baptist Seminary, 337 Jarvis St., Toronto, Canada.

The Union Baptist Witness

These pages (43 and 44) are the Authorized Official Organ of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec.

W. GORDON BROWN, Editor.

IS ANY MERE MAN "THE SON OF GOD"?

The leading editorial in *The Canadian Baptist* for May 9th bears the marks of careful writing. Of course, we hardly believe that Editor L. F. Kipp is the author, although the article is unsigned. We think we could name the author, but we forebear. Nevertheless it seems to us that, while the main point of the article is well taken, it breathes throughout a spirit that is not in accord with the teaching of Scripture.

For instance, take this approved quotation: "Search the long annals of proud Greece and Rome; the tombs of war, the chronicles of peace. Ransack the old and modern rolls of fame, to fit the brightest splendour on a name; the name above all names is Mother." We hope that we should be the last to rob any mother of her desired splendour; but the above statement is a direct contradiction of Philipians 2:9: "Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him the name (not "a name," as the A.V.) which is above every name." The name of Jesus, whose full title is the Lord Jesus Christ, has now the dignity which the Jews found in the ineffable name of Jehovah. It is the name of Jesus, not the name of Mother, that is "above all names."

Now listen to this gem: "What an example, a model, an inspiration, and an incentive to every true mother is 'the mother of Jesus'! True motherhood is forever redeemed and hallowed and deified in 'the mother of Jesus'—and surely in that is included true fatherhood and childhood!" Notice the term "deified." To most minds there is but one deity, and that is the deity of God, which dwelt in Christ by the Holy Spirit. But this rather says that motherhood is deified! Surely the writer is not going over to the Mariolatry of Rome! And fatherhood is deified! And so is childhood! This certainly sounds very much like the modernists who teach that God is to be found, not so much in Heaven above, as in the heart of every member of the human race.

Here also is another statement of the writer, which shows the same tendency: "Luke tells us of the Angel Gabriel's God-sent errand and message 'to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph': 'Hail! thou that art graciously accepted . . . blessed art thou among women! . . . The Holy Spirit will descend upon thee, and the power of the Most High will overshadow thee; hence thy son shall be called Holy, even the Son of God' (Rotherham). Is not this the way every child should be born? Is not this the Divine will—even the endowment of every mother ('overshadowed by the Holy Spirit')? Is not this heaven's wish—that every child born into this

world shall be called 'Holy, even the son of God'?" We would not for a moment disparage the need of the power of the Divine Spirit in the home, but when did the birth of Christ descend to the level of the birth of any other man? And where in the Word of God do we find any right to call any other person than the Lord Jesus Christ "the son of God"? It is true that we are sons of God, and by the new birth each one of us is a son of God; but the Scripture never calls any mere man the son of God. That title is reserved for the only begotten Son. The deity of the Lord Jesus Christ is far too sacred for such a writer as this or any other to play fast and loose with it. In fact, we doubt whether there is anything in this article which would not, interpreting one part of the article by another, be acceptable to a Unitarian.

Now that all protests through the columns of *The Canadian Baptist* against this kind of unscriptural teaching have been successfully silenced, the Editor seems to care less and less whether the faith that he proclaims from his pulpit of paper and ink be the strong belief of evangelistic Christianity or the anaemic sophistries of Modernism.

RUNNYMEDE ROAD.

The Lord is gloriously vindicating the stand which the Runnymede Road Baptist Church has uncompromisingly taken. Recently a Roman Catholic was converted in the services, together with another seeker. At the last communion service, Pastor P. B. Loney received fourteen new members, and at the previous communion service, some twelve. We understand that a number who felt that they ought to be with the Regulars, have left one of the churches which preferred to remain outside our Union, and are joining up with Runnymede.

WORTLEY RD.

At the forty-first annual meeting of the Wortley Road Church, London, gratifying reports were given by all organizations, each showing a balance on hand. During the year forty followed Christ in baptism, nine united by letter and two by experience, a total of fifty-one additions. For all purposes there was raised the sum of \$6,436.67, of which \$1,300 was paid on the mortgage and its interest for the new Sunday School room and pipe organ, and \$10.10 was given to missions.

We are not surprised to find that there is a strong spirit of prayer in the church. Three meetings a week are held specially for prayer, and prayer also precedes both the morning and evening services.

At the Gospel appeal on Sunday, May 5th, two married men came forward, one of them seventy years of age and the other a father of a family. At the communion service that evening five mem-

bers were received, two men and three women.

The following Tuesday the Missionary Auxiliary of the church held a special meeting, at which representatives were present from St. Thomas; Fingal; Shedden; Woodstock; and Hope, Central and Wortley Road, London. The speaker for the evening was Rev. D. Fraser, of St. Thomas, whose address was practical and helpful. Mrs. T. J. Mitchell, the president of the local auxiliary, occupied the chair. Musical numbers and refreshments completed the programme of the evening.

CAMPAIGN IN OWEN SOUND.

Rev. Fred Kendall began a series of evangelistic services with the South End Baptist Church on Sunday, May 5th. That evening the church was packed to capacity, and some who could not get into the building listened outside. On that same Sunday evening five young people were baptized by the pastor, Rev. E. Hancox.

ZEOLI IN HAMILTON.

The flaming Italian evangelist, Rev. Anthony Zeoli by name, conducted another campaign in the city of Hamilton, with the Stanley Ave. Baptist Church, lasting from April 21 to May 5th. The attendance was very good; at times the auditorium was packed to capacity. In his usual, scriptural, forceful and personal way, the evangelist preached the Word of God. Mrs. Zeoli sang the message beautifully. During the meetings about forty professed conversion. Among these were a number of particularly remarkable cases, some of them being Catholics, and some others never having heard the Gospel before.

BOSTON.

Nine members of the Sunday School, recently baptized by Pastor A. J. Loveday in the Boston Baptist Church (not in Scotland, as incorrectly stated in these columns), were given the right hand of church fellowship on Sunday, May 5th. The work in this church is encouraging, especially the increased interest in the prayer meeting.

ANNETTE.

On Sunday evening, May 5th, two responded to the invitation at Annette Street Church, one for membership and one for baptism. The ministry of Pastor W. J. H. Brown over radio station CFRB continues to be enjoyed by many. The pastor has spent ten days in Calgary, where he held meetings with the Westbourne Baptist Church. This church was associated with what is known as the Prophetic Conference, of which the leader is Mr. W. Aberhart, but the majority have now withdrawn, and are meeting again in the building which was erected for them some years ago.

CONFERENCE IN CHATHAM.

"The Pastors' and People's Conference of Western Ontario enjoyed a time of great blessing at its recent session held in Chatham on April 25th. In spite of heavy rain, practically every church in the Western District was represented. In the afternoon session splendid messages were delivered by Rev. Jas. Gibson, of Watford, and Rev. Geo. Creagh, of the Shedden and Fingal Churches. Rev. T. J. Mitchell, the President of the Conference and Pastor of the Wortley Road Baptist Church, London, occupied the chair: Brother Mitchell was also the speaker at the evening session, and brought a helpful and inspiring message based on the first verse of Matthew 17. At both the afternoon and evening sessions, Mrs. Gunton, of Windsor, delighted all with her messages in song.

"It was decided that the next Conference would be held in the Wortley Road Church, London, and that the speakers on that occasion would be Rev. Donald Fraser, of St. Thomas; Rev. W. N. Charlton, of Chatham; and Rev. James McGinlay, of London. Watch for further announcement of this coming Conference, and plan to be present."—W. N. Charlton, Secretary.

CHATHAM.

When God takes something from us, He usually gives us something better in return. Recent events in the Regular Baptist work in Chatham, where Rev. W. N. Charlton is pastor, have proved another illustration of this principle. A fire occurred in the hall which our Chatham brethren had been using, on April 24th. Therefore the Princess Theatre

was secured for the Sunday services. Here a temporary baptistry was installed, and five candidates were immersed on Sunday, May 12th. That same Sunday evening a special children's programme, such as has been carried on each of the past weeks, under the title, "The Happy Hour for Boys and Girls," was broadcast by the local radio station, to the great joy of many in the district.

CENTRAL, LONDON.

Our readers are always anxious to hear how the work is progressing in Central Baptist Church, London, where the pastor is Rev. James McGinlay. As usual, it is going gloriously. The Merza Temple is crowded out Sunday morning, and a congregation of people who are becoming deeply interested in the work, greets the preacher at the Capitol Theatre in the evening. Conversions and baptisms continue, as they did in the early church at Jerusalem. On Sunday, May 5th, twenty-three responded to the invitation, and six more did so the following Sunday. Thirteen candidates, immersed on the 12th, made the total baptisms since Easter up to fifty-four. Among these just baptized was a whole household—father, mother, son and daughter. Is not this the book of Acts over again? Among the candidates also were two Sunday School teachers from one of the United Churches, who had been converted at the Theatre some weeks ago. "In word and in power" is the way in which the Gospel ought always to be preached.

CONFERENCE IN DALESVILLE.

The first Annual Conference of the Regular Baptist Churches of Montreal

Ottawa District will meet in the Dalesville Baptist Church, Wednesday, June 26th, at 2 p.m., and continue sessions through the evening of the following day. Among those on the programme are Revs. James McGinlay, Jule Danthony, C. H. Leggett, W. E. Atkinson, Mrs. C. J. Holman and Mrs. Davey. We trust there will be a large attendance from the surrounding district.

HESPELER.

Conversions every Sunday and frequent baptisms, is the record of service which the Lord is giving to Rev. T. Summers in Hespeler. There were three baptisms on May 12th, and five on May 19th.

STUDENT APPOINTMENTS.

The Executive Committee of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec has pleasure in announcing the following student appointments: Bobcaygeon, Mr. M. B. Gillion; Fort William, Mr. G. W. Searle; Islington, Mr. J. Fullard; Miner's Bay, Buller, Head Lake, Moore's Falls, Deep Bay and Norland, Mr. Gordon Mellish and Mr. Chas. Hardie; Maple Grove, Mr. John Garbig; North Bay, Mr. Robert Allen; Orangeville, Mr. F. T. Kennaby; Port Dover, Mr. S. Jeffrey; Scotch Line, Mr. Roy Hisey; St. Amedee, Papineauville and North Nation Mills, Mr. W. Lempriere; Thompson and Blind River, Mr. C. S. McGrath; Lachute, Brownsburg and Dalesville, Mr. Thos. McClure; Shark's Corners and Shawville, Mr. Arthur Wood and Mr. Kingsley Cutler; Westport, Mr. H. C. Slade; Galway, N.Y., Mr. Edward Apps. Other appointments will be announced later.

DES MOINES UNIVERSITY RIOT.

(Continued from page 37.)

we still believe it is a part of God's plan. We cannot, at this writing, say what the future of the University will be. The press has carried all sorts of reports from Dr. Wayman, Faculty, and students; but it should be borne in mind that the Des Moines public have not as yet heard one word from the Trustees. Any one of discernment will recognize that a man in Dr. Wayman's position, if he has the will to do it, with a Faculty of nearly forty people and a student body of nearly four hundred, with no one effectively to "interfere", can easily stir up Faculty and students to say and do anything. We are confident, however, that when the facts contained in this recital of the whole controversy are carefully weighed; when it is considered, as the letters which we have here published show, that when in William Jewell College when first the degree question was raised, Dr. Wayman raised another issue by dismissing three professors, and that when later a committee was appointed by the Alumni Association to investigate the whole matter, when Dr. Wayman heard that such a committee was appointed he agreed to resign if the committee would not push their investigation—I say that when all these things are taken into account, and there is put beside it the fact that Dr. Wayman confessed, as he puts it, that the investigators "had the goods on him", no reasonable person will doubt that this whole regrettable academic controversy, from the sparks kindled by Warren L. Steeves of Waterloo, and Rev. Minor Stevens, of Des Moines, were fanned to the proportions of a great conflagration whose lurid glare has been seen around the world, by the hand of Dr. H. C. Wayman. If someone

should ask why we advised President Wayman of our determination to investigate the degree scandal to the bottom, we reply, We had discovered such conditions in the University as made his continuance as President an absolute impossibility, and we felt that it was necessary to clear the matter up for the honour of the University. We now leave the whole matter to the judgment of Bible-believing Baptists in particular, and of evangelicals in general throughout the world.

Books by Dr. Shields**"THE ADVENTURES OF A MODERN YOUNG MAN."**

A series of sermons on the parable of the prodigal and his brother.

"CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT."

A series of Thursday evening Bible Lectures, from Genesis to II. Samuel.

"THE MOST FAMOUS TRIAL OF HISTORY."

A series of sermons recently preached in Jarvis St. Church on "The Trial of Jesus."

Price Fifty cents a volume postpaid.

Order from The Gospel Witness, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Canada.

Coals for the Altar Fire

By Rev. T. I. Stockley, D.D., Dean of Toronto Baptist Seminary.

Sunday, May 26th.

Personal faith.— *John ix:22-41*

What is needed on our part to make Christ's forgiving love our own? There must be the personal contact of my soul with the loving heart of Christ, the individual act of my own coming to Him, and, as the old Puritans used to say, "my transacting" with Him. Like the ocean of the atmosphere, His love encompasses me, and in it I live, and move, and have my being. But I must let it flow into my spirit, and stir the dormant music of my soul. I can shut it out, sealing my heart love-tight against it. I do shut it out, unless by my own conscious, personal act I yield myself to Him, unless by my own faith I come to Him, and meet Him, secretly and really as did the penitent apostle, whom the message, that proclaimed the love of his Lord, emboldened to meet the Lord who loved, and by His own lips to be assured of forgiveness and friendship. It is possible to stumble at noontide as in the dark. A man may starve outside of barns filled with plenty, and his lips may be parched with thirst though he is within sight of a broad river flowing in the sunshine. So a soul may stiffen into the death of self and sin, even though the voice that wakes the dead to a life of love be calling to it. Christ and His grace are yours if you will, but the invitations and beseechings of His mercy, the constant drawings or His love, the all-embracing offers of His forgiveness, may be all in vain if you do not grasp them, and hold them fast by the hand of faith.

Monday, May 27th.

Faith and righteousness.—

Romans iii:19-31

What is the righteousness of God? What is the matter of it? Is it faith? I am asked by some one, Is it faith, forasmuch as in some of these passages it is called righteousness of faith? I answer No, in no wise; on no account. Faith is an act of man's own mind, whereas the righteousness of God is on a man—faith is the travelling forth of a sinner's emptiness to meet the Saviour's fulness; the Saviour's fulness is one thing, and the sinner's emptiness going forth to meet Him is another thing. Faith and the righteousness of God are not identical, for the text says, "it is on them." I am asked by some, if these good works which flow from the exercise of faith in the Divine influence on the believing man, are the righteousness of God? I answer No! and I give this answer to the question for the same reason that I gave it to the other question—these good works are ours, just as the fruits gathered from the soil are called the fruits of the earth; they are the product of the influence of the sun, and rain, and dew, and a million atmospheric influences acting on the tree and the soul; and the fruits produced upon the tree are called the fruits of the earth; so those good works which are produced in the exercise of faith, as the result of a divine influence on the believing man, are the man's, and he will be judged according to them at the last day; but righteousness is not man's, it is God's.

Tuesday, May 28th.

Faith seen by works.— *James ii:14-26*

A reason why a gospel faith should have a gospel-practice is, because hereby

the beauty of faith appears to others, and our light shines before men, so as they, seeing our good works, do glorify God. The beauty of faith is seen by others, not in faith itself, but in the gospel walk and practice that it produces. If a man would know in the morning whether the sun be risen in the east, he will readily look to the west, and see whether he can notice the reflection of the sunbeams upon the top of a house or the top of a hill; he looks the quite contrary way from the sun; and yet he does it ingeniously enough: even so here, if a man would know you to be a believer, he will not look into your faith, but will look out to your life, or look back to your conversation, and see what marks your faith makes there; hence saith the apostle, "Show me thy faith by thy works." Faith and works are contrary in point of justification, and yet when a man would see your faith, he will look to the contrary part, and see how it appears in your walk and work; and if it appears not there, the beauty of faith is not seen.

Wednesday, May 29th.

Faith leaning on a strong support.—

Luke vii:36-50

A friend complained to Gotthold of the weakness of his faith, and the distress this gave him. Gotthold pointed to a vine which had twined itself around a pole, and was hanging loaded with beautiful clusters, and said: Frail is that plant; but what harm is done by its frailty, specially as the Creator has been pleased to make it what it is? As little will it prejudice your faith, that it is weak, provided only it be sincere and unfeigned. Faith is the work of God, and He bestows it in such measure as He wills and judges right. Let the measure of it which he has given you, be deemed sufficient by you. Take for pole and prop the cross of the Saviour and the Word of God; twine around these with all the power which God vouchsafes. A heart sensible of its weakness, and prostrating itself continually at the feet of the divine mercy, is more acceptable than that which presumes upon the strength of its faith, and falls into security and pride. Can you suppose that the sinful woman who lay and wept at the Lord's feet, was less approved than the swelling and haughty Pharisee? (Luke vii:38.)

Thursday, May 30th.

Faith that looks to God alone.—

Romans iv:13-25

The saint's safety lies in the strength and faithfulness of God who is the promiser; but the present comfort and repose of an afflicted soul is fetched in by faith relying on God as such. Hence it is, though all believers are out of danger, when in the saddest condition that can befall them, yet too many of them, alas, are under fears and dejections of spirit, because their faith acts weakly on a mighty God, timorously and suspiciously on a faithful God: "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" You see the leak at which the water came in to sink their spirits, they had "little faith." It is not what God is in Himself, but what our apprehensions at present are of God, that pacifies and comforts a soul in great straits. How came Abraham not to stagger in his faith, though the promise was so strange? The apostle resolves us, "He did not consider his own body"

(Rom. 4:19). And what made Zacharias reel? He made sense his counsellor, and thought he was too old for such news to be true. This is the bane of faith, and consequently of comfort in affliction. We are too prone to carry our faith with Thomas, at our finger ends; and to trust God no further than our hand of sense can reach: "It is not far that sense can reach, and but little further that reason's purblind eye can see." God is oft on His way to perform a promise, and bring joyful news to His afflicted servants, when sense and reason conclude their case desperate.

Friday, May 31st.

Faith that works on in trial.—

Acts xxvii:21-37

Not many years since a number of workmen were engaged in constructing a railway tunnel. In the midst of their work there was a sudden fall of earth, which completely closed the entrance, and shut them up from the outer world. Their comrades outside, as soon as they discovered what had happened, began digging through the mass of earth. It was many hours before the task was accomplished. They found them quietly pursuing their labour inside the tunnel. Their work had never been interrupted. They had eaten their dinner, and gone on digging and boring. They knew, they said, that their fellow-workmen would rescue them; and so they went on with their labour. Transfer their state of mind to the Christian in his perplexities, and we see exactly what practical faith is. Faith teaches the believer, in the midst of the severest difficulty, not to set about forcing a way out of his trouble, but just to ply his pickaxe and spade in the work which is straight before him, leaving it to the Father above to make a way of escape for him. In the right manner, and at the right moment, the help comes, and the Christian goes on his way once more rejoicing.

Saturday, June 1st.

Faith and assurance.— *Isaiah l:1-11*

How many of the precious saints of God must we shut out from being believers, if there is no faith but what amounts to assurance. We must needs offend against the generation of God's children, among whom some are babes not yet come to the use of their reflect act of faith, so as to own the grace of God in them to be true, upon the review that they take of their own actings; and must not the child be allowed to be a child till he can speak for himself, and say he is so? Others there are in Christ's family, who are of higher stature and greater experience in the ways of God, yet have lost those apprehensions of pardoning mercy, which once they were (through the goodness of God) able to have shown; shall we say their faith went away in the departure of their assurance? How oft then in a year may a believer be no believer? Even as often as God withdraws and leaves the creature in the dark. Assurance is, like the sunflower, which opens with the day and shuts with the night. It follows the motion of God's face; if that looks smilingly on the soul, it lives; if that frowns or hides itself, it dies. But faith is a plant that can grow in the shade, a grace that can find the way to heaven in a dark night. It can "walk in darkness, and yet trust in the name of the Lord."

Last Sunday in Jarvis Street

The Pastor returned from Buffalo Saturday. There was a crowded prayer meeting Saturday evening. The papers had been full of the reports of the Baptist Bible Union Meetings in Buffalo, telling of the overwhelming victory for truth there accomplished. Naturally Jarvis St. people were profoundly interested, and many of them had gone to Buffalo to attend the meetings.

Sunday morning The Pastor preached on "The Glory of the Everlasting Name;" and in the evening the sermon appearing in this issue.

The attendance at School was eleven hundred and forty-three. The Jarvis St. Bible School is a perpetual joy. We know of no other Church in Canada where such a multitude of young people assemble for morning worship. What this will mean to the church even five years from now it would be difficult to forecast; and what the conversion and training of such crowds of young people may mean to the mission fields of the world only the great Head of the church can foresee.

The Church was filled in the morning, and in the evening crowded in every part, so that many were reported to have been turned away.

ADDRESS READ BY MR. BROWNLEE

May 19th, 1929.

Dear Dr. Shields:

We are reminded that this is the nineteenth anniversary of your settlement in the pastorate of Jarvis Street Church. You came to us in those earlier days with rich promise for a long and blessed pastorate. The years, as they have passed, have unfolded an ever-widening ministry in which the Lord has increasingly manifested his presence and power in our midst. Particularly has this been true since our emancipation as a church in 1921.

These later years have been the richest in spiritual blessing and in the more abundant benediction of God upon your ministry, evidenced by the increasing vitality of the church, and by the favour of God upon us in the conversion of souls; until of this place it is very largely true that "the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved".

Moreover, we rejoice in your wider ministry across the Continent and throughout the world. We know of no other prophet's voice that is so far-flung on behalf of the cause of truth and righteousness. May your bow ever abide in strength.

As you begin to-day the twentieth year of your labour among us we wish unitedly to assure you that you occupy a place in our sincere regard and unfeigned affection more secure and steadfast than ever before. Daily we remember you as we speak with Him, beseeching for you the upholding and the enabling that can come from God alone. From the oldest to the youngest among us we pledge to you our fullest loyalty and most hearty co-operation as together we enter upon the twentieth year of your ministry in Jarvis Street Baptist Church.

Signed on behalf of the Deacons' Board, and of the entire church,

(Signed) E. A. BROWNLEE,
Sec'y Deacons' Board.

(Signed) VIOLET STOAKLEY,
Church Clerk.

The platform was decorated with palms and flowers in recognition of the beginning of The Pastor's twentieth year in the pastorate of Jarvis St. Church, which began May 15, 1910.

Rev. E. A. Brownlee, Secretary of the Deacons' Board, read the accompanying address, at which the whole congregation rose and sang heartily "Blest be the Tie that binds." This address was read again in the evening. Dr. Stockley conducted the whole service except the sermon.

Two believers were baptized by the Pastor, and at the great Communion Service following, about forty new members were received.

The annual meeting of Jarvis St., already long overdue, was to have been held Tuesday, May 21st, but on account of the Des Moines University matter it has been postponed until further notice.

At the annual convention of the Fundamental Baptist Young People, to be held in Jarvis St. this week, the 23rd and 24th, Dr. J. W. Gillon of Shawnee, will be the special speaker. Dr. Gillon will also

preach in Jarvis St., Sunday, May 26th, morning and evening. Dr. Gillon is a great favourite in Jarvis St. and will be welcomed by a host of friends.

This Issue of The Gospel Witness

Is made necessary by the Editor's efforts to establish a genuinely Baptist Fundamentalist University. That effort has aroused the ire of professors who professed to accept an evangelical programme only to keep their positions.

It has unmasked a President who never was wholly in accord with the Baptist Bible Union position. As a result of all this the Editor's good name has been attacked.

The Editor appeals to his evangelical friends and supporters throughout the world to help him pay for this great issue of The Gospel Witness. The first edition consists of 75,000 copies, and will use over thirteen tons of paper. A copy of this issue will be sent to every Baptist minister in the English-speaking world whose name is obtainable.

The total cost of this issue, printing, addressing, and mailing, will probably run to over \$8,000. The Editor boldly appeals to friends of the Gospel everywhere to help in defending his good name for the work's sake, by assisting in circulating copies of this number. We may need many thousands of dollars before the battle ends.

SEND IN YOUR GIFT AT ONCE

Anything from \$5,000.00 to \$5.00—even to a dollar.

Circulate This Copy of Witness

Send for copies at once to put one in the hand of every member of your church and into the hand of scores of other Christians you know.

PRICES

10c per single Copy, postpaid.	
25 Copies for	\$1.50
50 Copies for	\$2.75
100 Copies for	\$5.00

This last price is practically printer's price, therefore, even larger quantities would cost us to mail, \$5.00 per hundred. We hope the circulation of this issue will reach at least 150,000.

If you desire papers mailed from our office, send us the names and add two cents per copy postage to above prices.

ABOUT THE GOSPEL WITNESS

Many thousands of people will receive this issue of the Witness who have never seen the paper before. For their information we give the following facts:

The Gospel Witness has grown since its first issue in May, 1922, from a small church paper into a 16-page weekly paper, circulating in 43 different countries, having about 3,000 ministerial readers alone.

The regular weekly issue contains: A Sermon by Dr. T. T. Shields, preached in Jarvis St. Pulpit—usually the preceding Sunday, and stenographically reported.

Hundreds of Preachers find in these sermons wheat from which they grind their own flour and make their own bread. Many find in the illustrations useful windows for sermons.

Each issue also contains An Exposition of Scripture in the Whole Bible Lesson Course, by Rev. Alex. Thomson, B.D., of Mount Pleasant Baptist Church and Toronto Baptist Seminary.

Also a devotional page, "Coals for the Altar Fire", by Dr. T. I. Stockley, Dean of Toronto Baptist Seminary.

Canadians especially will be interested in the two pages The Union Gospel Witness, edited by Rev. Gordon Brown, B.A., Professor of Greek in Toronto Baptist Seminary; and Book Reviews and other occasional contributions by Miss Olive Clark, M.A., Professor of Greek, Toronto Baptist Seminary.

Beside these special features every issue contains many pages of editorial matter by Dr. Shields, dealing with the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy throughout the world, as well as theological, ecclesiastical and devotional matters in general.

The Gospel Witness will be sent weekly, postpaid, for \$2.00 a year, to anywhere in the world. Subscribe at once. Do not send currency, but remit by cheque or P.O. order. If cheque, please add fifteen cents for exchange.