

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 Editor: ALEXANDER THOMSON

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

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada.

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 13, No. 10

TORONTO, JULY 19, 1934

Whole Number 635

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE ACCUSED IS ACQUITTED

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, July 15, 1934

(Stenographically Reported)

Broadcast over CFRB, 690 k.c., as is every Sunday evening service of Jarvis Street Church, from 7 to 8.30 o'clock, Eastern Daylight-Saving Time.

"And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him.

"And the Lord said unto Satan, "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee; is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?"

"Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel."—Zechariah, 3:1-3.

Joshua was the first high priest after the Babylonian captivity; and he is here seen standing in the presence of the Lord as the representative of God's people. He is described as being "clothed with filthy garments". We have also a picture of an adversary standing at his right hand, in the very presence of the Lord, to resist him. And the Angel of the Lord, the Angel of the covenant, none other than Jehovah—Jesus, a manifestation of the Saviour in the Old Testament dispensation—the Angel of the Lord, is represented as pleading the cause of Joshua; and standing between the accusations of the adversary and the judge, saying to him, "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee". Then flinging this challenge into the very teeth of the adversary, with respect to Joshua, he says, "Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?"

This story is illustrative of the methods of divine grace; for in all dispensations human nature is the same; sin is the same; divine grace is the same; the terms of access to the divine presence are always the same; and the opposition to our growth in grace is always the same. We have here the truth of the gospel wrapped up in this striking picture of one who is accused; of one who is the accuser; of one who is an advocate; with the final triumphant scene describing a complete acquittal.

I.

Joshua, therefore, as a representative of the people, appears in the presence of the Lord as ONE ACCUSED

of wrong-doing. It is a picture of the people who have wandered from God in ancient time; but of you and me also; it is a representation of the relationship in which every one of us, by nature, stands to God. We are accused; we are "under the law"; we are "condemned already".

Sin is portrayed by a most striking metaphor. Joshua is likened to "a brand plucked out of the fire". Look at the figure for a moment or two. It is impossible to say what that charred thing was in its original form; whether it was an ornament of the temple, displaying the consummate skill of the sculptor; whether it was designed to represent the cherubim, the palm tree, or the open flower; whether it was one of the implements used in the holy service of worship when the high priest went into the temple with blood; whatever it was originally, its beauty has been marred; its shape destroyed. It is now nothing more than a brand that has been plucked out of the fire; something that has barely escaped utter destruction. But whether it was a part of the pinnacle of the temple, or a support of the hangings that veiled the holy place, or a board upon which the feet of the consecrated priests walked when they performed their holy service: whatever it was, it has been so changed by this devouring element that it is no longer a thing of beauty, but only "a brand plucked out of the fire".

Thus, sin accomplishes its work in us; and there is not one of us here this evening who does not bear the marks of the flame upon him. We have passed through the furnace; our original glory has been completely

changed, the image and likeness of God effaced: "There is none that doeth good, no, not one."

Turn back the pages of history, and glance at the ruin sin has wrought. I remember motoring over the battle-fields of France, following up the armies while still the war was proceeding, and climbing over the ruins of what had been magnificent buildings—the City Hall of a French city, the great mansions of the wealthy, now utterly destroyed. And looking at that plain of death—the region of the Somme, where cities were utterly demolished, and villages reduced to dust, where death reigned supreme—one had a feeling that the very pit itself had been opened, and that the fiends of hell had been busy among the habitations of men. But that is only a picture of human history. Look at the magnificent temples built for the habitation of Deity! There is not one of them that has not been despoiled of its beauty, even the best of them: Moses, with his meekness; Samson, with his strength; David, with his goodness; Solomon, with his wisdom; all blackened with the fire, and some of them reduced utterly to ashes. Call the roll of the names of these great personalities, whose record is preserved in history—Pharaoh, Ahab and Nebuchadnezzar, who walked in his palace and surveyed his city, and said, "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?"—yet all reduced at last to nothing but ashes. Sin is a devouring flame; and there are no fireproof buildings. It fires the passions, and destroys the body; it inflames the imagination, and corrupts the mind; it perverts the highest instincts of the soul, and reduces a man made to be the companion of God to the level of the demons in the pit.

Moreover, *fire does its deadliest work in the secret places*, in the garret, in the cellar, behind closed doors, or where blinds are drawn, and the windows are shuttered, and everything is concealed. There it does its work, until at last it burns its way out, and manifests its terribly destructive might. Such is sin! Though small in its beginning, like a little taper which a child's breath might extinguish, it becomes at last a devouring fury which no human power can stay. How ought we to be afraid of the tiniest spark of evil, when we remember that it was by one sin this world was plunged to destruction!

Fire is sometimes very attractive. Have you not seen in the summer time those delicate creatures flying about the light, those tiny moths with delicate wings, flying into the flame? We were made with wings; but sin lays hold upon the very finest qualities of the mind, the noblest attributes of our human nature; and unless the wind of the Spirit blows strongly heavenward, the highest qualities of the mind are used to fly to hell with! Like silly moths, men fly right into the fire.

But there is another side to this. Joshua is represented by *another figure, which suggests the principle of moral responsibility.* He is "clothed with filthy garments"; and thus arrayed he comes into the presence of the Holy One, bearing witness against himself. What if the murderer came before his judge with the stain of his victim's blood upon his garments? What if the thief rushed madly into court bearing his plunder in his hand? What if Judas should try to excuse himself, while having the price of his infamy fast locked in that covetous fist of his? No further witnesses were required.

When the prodigal came home it was not necessary for him to explain the life in the far country, nor to tell how he had been employed at the menial task of feeding swine; his filthy garments were the proof of it. That is the picture which the word of the Lord gives of every one of us. I read to you this evening that "all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." And we come into His presence with the evidence of our sin clinging to us: we are condemned already in the presence of the divine Judge.

These garments, which are here described as "filthy garments", were also *the vestments of religion.* Joshua is not here represented as a flagrant criminal, as an outlaw, as one who has trampled the decencies of life beneath his feet: he is here as the flower of his people, as the highest product of a specially religious race; and yet even his dress is likened unto "filthy garments". "Brethren," said the Apostle Paul, "my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved". How unpopular the Apostle Paul would be in certain religious assemblies to-day! How he would be cried down if he were to say, "Brethren, there are thousands of religious people who are not saved". But Paul said, "I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge"—the Pharisee with his immaculate robe, the priest with his elaborate ritual, a religious race with all their religious traditions,—"I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."

In years past I have preached on several occasions in asylums for the insane. The patients seemed to be quite sane at times; but one peculiar characteristic which distinguished some of the women was their head-dress. They wore the most grotesque creations. I must admit, however, I have seen people on the outside of insane asylums somewhat similarly distinguished. But I remember in one place there was a woman who was fearfully and wonderfully arrayed; and the attendants told me that she prepared her dress with the most elaborate care. She wore a most wonderful bonnet, and she used to come proudly up at the close of the service and say, "How do you do? I am Queen Victoria. I am going to be married next week. Will you come to my wedding?" I was invited by her repeatedly. You laugh at it; but she thought she was splendidly dressed; she thought she was ready for the royal wedding.

But she was sane in comparison with a great many people who imagine they are ready for the Marriage of the Lamb. When once the light from the Throne shines upon us, we are led to say, "And did I ever dream that I could stand before God like this? Was I ever so ignorant of God's righteousness as to go about to establish my own righteousness, and to refuse to submit myself to the righteousness of God?" Human nature at its best, when it has made its utmost effort to dress itself up, is like Joshua in his priestly robes—clad in filthy garments, accused, condemned in the presence of the Judge.

II.

And then to make matters worse, THERE WAS AN ADVERSARY, an accuser, to give emphasis to every defect, which one might have supposed was sufficiently evident

without argument. There was an adversary "standing at his right hand to resist him," and to forbid his acquittal. That is a doctrine that has largely fallen into desuetude in these days. It is almost out of date to believe in the existence of a personal devil, of an evil intelligence, who is the implacable enemy of humankind. But it is the revelation of Scripture; and I want you who are Christians, while I speak now for a few minutes, to pray; because the devil never likes to be exposed. The worst devil of all is no devil at all. He likes so to disguise himself as to persuade men of his non-existence, that he may have a free hand to accomplish his deadly work.

But the teaching of Scripture is, that there is an evil intelligence whose supreme purpose is to destroy our souls. "Your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." He is described as "the accuser of the brethren". Our Lord Jesus spoke of him as a strong man armed, who keepeth his palace, and whose goods are in peace; and against whom no human power can prevail. Jesus taught the existence of a personal devil. He was led up into the wilderness to be tempted; and He unsheathed the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, against this mighty adversary. In the soft and affectionate tones of one of His own disciples our Lord detected the voice of the tempter; and, by turning sharply to one who would have persuaded Him to turn aside from His purpose, He said, "Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of man."

Our adversary is here to-night. "There was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them." And there are men and women here to-night, I doubt not, who have come to this place, or to some other place, again and again, with a desire to find salvation; but have gone away, and said, "I scarcely know why I did not yield myself to Christ. I wanted to do so. I heard the voice of the Spirit urging me to do it; and yet there seemed to be another power greater than my own which held me back." There was another power; and the choice which every man and woman must make ultimately, for evermore, is between light and darkness, between life and death, between heaven and hell, between Christ and Barabbas, between God and the devil—one or the other. "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey."

We have all had evidence, we have all had proof, of the existence of that terrible adversary. Not alone from my study of the Word of God have I become convinced of the reality of this evil presence: the Word of God has interpreted certain facts of life which, apart from that, would be inexplicable. I know that I am pursued, and have always been pursued by an evil power; that while it has found place within, it is yet objective to myself. If your life's history were written by the pen of inspiration, written by one who sees the philosophy of that life, the reason for things, the springs of life,—if the record of your life were so written, the shadow of that accuser would fall across every page of it; and you would discover that the murderer of souls has been on your track from the beginning.

As I have already said, Jesus believed in the reality of that evil intelligence. He was under no delusion whatever when He essayed the task of man's redemption. He knew that Beelzebub would never be divided against

himself; and He was prepared to face principalities, and powers, and the rulers of this world's darkness, unified, and under the supreme command of an evil personality; which, in his capacities, was second only to God Himself.

And here is a picture of what happens whenever a soul seeks divine grace: Satan comes also into the presence of God, standing at the sinner's right hand to resist him. There is no temple which has not been defiled by his hateful presence; there is no pinnacle to which we may climb, however lofty, from which we may not be tempted to cast ourselves down; there is no wilderness upon whose sands his cloven foot-marks may not be traced: he follows us everywhere; he pursues us into the presence of God Himself. This representative of the people has come where God is; and at his right hand, in the very presence of Deity, this presumptuous accuser stands, as though he had resolved, "I never will surrender him; I will capture him yet; he is my lawful prey." Alas! alas! it is the experience of every one of us! "Bring him hither to me," said Jesus, to the father who had brought his lunatic boy to the disciples that they might cast the devil out, and they had failed;—"Bring him hither to me. And Jesus rebuked the devil; and he departed out of him." Men have shut themselves within stone walls; they have deliberately chosen a monastic career; and they have said, "We will shut evil out; we will bolt and double-bar the doors; and shut ourselves in with God." But even as they bowed to pray in their solitary cell, it has seemed as though a trap-door into the pit were opened, and there swarmed around them and into their minds a million evil thoughts, like the flies and frogs of Egypt. And behold, the devil was there! Indeed, the realm of religion is his chosen sphere: transforming himself into an angel of light, he still does his deadliest work where men bow to pray. Ah, there is the picture!—seared, scarred, fire-marked, arrayed in filthy garments unfit for the presence of God, guilty, utterly defenceless; and at our side the most practised prosecutor, the most terrible adversary in all the universe, who will show no pity, who will demand the utmost penalties of the law!

III.

If my story ended here, you and I were lost men and women. But, behold, there is a third,—the angel of Jehovah! There is the accused, and the accuser; but there is AN ADVOCATE: and the angel of Jehovah answers and says, "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee."

Will you observe that *He speaks in behalf of one who has nothing to say for himself*. No word of Joshua is recorded. He is like the man without the wedding garment,—he is speechless; he has no defence to make whatever. But his Advocate undertakes his cause, and pleads it before the throne of heaven.

My friend, are you going to plead your own cause by and by? If I were to come to you personally this evening, and say, "Are you a sinner?" somebody here would say, "I do not know that I am a very great sinner, sir." You would immediately tell me of somebody who is worse than yourself. He is a very bad man who cannot find somebody worse than himself; and if we proceed in that way, we shall have no difficulty whatever in finding some sort of self defence, or self-justification.

But so long as you have one word to say for yourself, Jesus will have nothing to say for you. Remember! so

long as you cherish a hope in your heart for yourself, on the ground of your own merit, then Jesus Christ will leave you to yourself; and you will have to plead your own cause. Woe be to the man who stands at last before that great White Throne without an advocate! But if here and now we have got to the end of our pleading; and if we have sat down with our Advocate,—or let me rather say, if we are humbled in His presence; and if we have said, "I have no defence to make; look at my filthy garments; look, there are the marks of sin: all things are naked and opened unto Thine eyes with Whom we have to do; look within, I am guilty—guilty—guilty; I have nothing to say;"—then the great Advocate will take up your case. "My little children," said John, "these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." He will plead our cause.

I do not often go to the police courts, or other courts of justice. I would rather preach the gospel than practise law; but I have been there, and I have seen how entirely an accused person leaves his defence in the hands of his advocate. He is absolutely silent; and his advocate appears in his behalf.

What is involved in trusting Jesus. Must we plead guilty, and hand the case over to Him entirely; shall we make Jesus Christ our Advocate before the throne of God, and confess, "I have nothing to say"?

Observe the case proceed. There is the silent Joshua "clothed in filthy garments"; the Advocate arises and turns upon his venomous accuser, and says, "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan". Joshua had no power to do it; his salvation depended entirely upon a greater power than his own.

I would like you to see how to *the weakness of Joshua was reinforced by the might of his Advocate*. Who said, "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee." Ah, but Satan had chosen Jerusalem, too! Satan had said, "I will have Jerusalem"; but God had said, "No, it is a city which I have chosen to set my name there." It is a conflict, of the human and satanic wills, a conflict of hell and heaven. Who is going to win?—"The Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem: I have willed his acquittal; I have willed his deliverance; I have willed his salvation; I am here to give effect to My purpose of grace: The Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee."

Do you want this brought into the New Testament? "I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death." What a heroic figure is Peter! But his Advocate says, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat;—into your life that satanic power has come; Satan has desires concerning you—but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Jesus knew the issue, as when in His great high priestly prayer, He said, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory. Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition. I never was his advocate; and he never engaged me. I have never prayed for him; but for the rest I plead before the throne of heaven: none of them is lost; and I will that they all may behold my glory."

I make this as my confession, that I have no hope toward God at this moment, no hope of my soul's ultimate salvation, apart from this great principle that the Lord,

Who for reasons I have never understood, set His wondrous love upon me, and has chosen me: He brings to bear the might of His will against the will of the enemy; and it is He who is my Advocate.

Observe further: "The Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee." As though He had said to Satan: "I have brought them back. Thou leddest them into sin. The judgment fell upon them. They have been yonder in Babylon for seventy years; but behold they have come back again. Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire? Thou didst kindle the fire; thou didst feed the very flames of hell; but I have plucked him out of the fire. Here he is. Thou art defeated; thy purposes have come to naught; and grace has triumphed."

My brethren, that is salvation. There is fire within, fire about us, fire beneath us; there is enough of hell in your heart to rekindle the fires if they were extinguished at this moment; evil potentialities are in every one of us that would lead us in an everlasting descent away from God; and yet He says concerning the redeemed soul, "Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" There is no place for human glory in that! It is a picture of a fire, and of someone going right into the burning fiery furnace, jeopardizing his own life, and putting his strong arm about the helpless victim in the flames, and bringing him out to safety.

Thus our Lord Jesus came out of the glory down into the pit, into the flames of hell itself: He tasted death for every man; He paid our debt; He cancelled our indebtedness; He balanced the books; He justified us before God—"a brand plucked out of the fire."

May God for ever be praised for a salvation that meets the need of defeated sinners; for a grace that puts,—may I dare to say?—that puts at the disposal of the morally vanquished all the resources of Omnipotence, bringing us out of the fire!

Then the Angel of the Lord "spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment." Here is a significant word! The Advocate was pleading; He has won His case: He says, "Take away the filthy garments; clothe him with clean raiment; let them set a fair mitre upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments." And, hear it! "*The angel of the Lord stood by!*" He always stands by the penitent sinner, taking away the filthy garments, acquitting him, clothing him, justifying him, robing him with garments "for glory and for beauty," restoring him to the divine favour, defeating the purpose of hell, and triumphing over principalities and powers. To secure this "the angel of the Lord stands by!"

Will you dismiss your fears, so far as it is possible to do so, and hand over your case to the Advocate, and be silent before Him? How shall I urge upon you the necessity of this great decision here and now? Guilty every one; the throne of judgment awaiting us; either your case in the hands of the accuser, who is the prosecutor, and will pursue you right up to the great White Throne; or otherwise, your case in the hands of Jesus Christ, your Advocate, who never lost a case;—which shall it be? Is there some one here to-night who will retain—may I use the legal phrase?—who will "retain" Jesus Christ as your Advocate? somebody who will say, "I will"?

DR. J. C. CARLILE AND SPIRITISM

In our issue of March 8th we published a letter from Dr. J. C. Carlile, Editor of *The Baptist Times*, of London, and our reply thereto, together with an article by Dr. Carlile, published in *The Christian Spiritualist*, of October 7th, 1925. Dr. Carlile replied to our letter under date of March 20th. It was quite evident from the letter itself that Dr. Carlile's reply was not intended for THE GOSPEL WITNESS, but for some other medium in which the full statement of the case had not appeared. We, therefore, in our issue of April 5th republished all that we had published in the first instance, with Dr. Carlile's letter of March 20th, so that our readers might have the whole story before them. It will be observed that we offered Dr. Carlile as much space in THE GOSPEL WITNESS as he desired to use for the discussion of this matter.

In *The Baptist Times* of May 10th, Dr. Carlile published the following article, which, it will be seen, contained his letter to the Editor of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, dated March 20th:

Dr. T. T. SHIELDS AND THE EDITOR

Dr. Shields' Apology

Dr. Shields recently printed in "The Gospel Witness" an article in which he criticized the Baptist Union for allowing Dr. Carlile to be in charge of the denominational paper. He gave what he described as a quotation from an article written by Dr. Carlile in the "Christian Spiritualist", and threatened to reprint the article. Dr. Carlile invited him to do so and to verify the quotation. The challenge was accepted, and a photo reproduction appeared in "The Gospel Witness" for March. The Editor devoted nearly four columns to an attempt to explain the uncontrovertible fact that what he gave as a quotation from Dr. Carlile's article was not in the article and was what Dr. Shields described as "an inference which might possibly be entirely wrong."

The whole question, so far as we are concerned, is one of truthfulness. Dr. Shields declared that he was quoting Dr. Carlile's statements from an article which was in print. It was a matter of *fact*, not inference. The article contained no such statement. No amount of argument, though it be as skilful as that which we have learned to expect from Dr. Shields, can get over that.

As an invitation was courteously extended to Dr. Carlile to add anything he wished, the following letter was sent:

"Dear Dr. Shields,

"Thank you for your letter of March 8. It arrived with copies of your publication on March 19. I have read with interest your reply to my previous communication, which you print in small type.

"I recognize your courtesy in offering me space without limit and promising that anything I write to you will be faithfully reproduced. I do not propose to trespass very much upon your kindness. *Let me say at once that I accept your statement of 'sincere apology for having explicitly stated that which, at most, the article to which you refer may only imply.'* Further you say, 'I hope I have made ample amends for my error,' and again, 'This is one instance in which we would far rather discover ourselves to be wrong than right.'

"I do not propose to follow you through the three or four columns of statements and arguments which you too generously devote to me. The facts are clear. A copy of your paper was sent to me, containing the following statement:

"I have a magazine in my files called the "Christian Spiritualist", in which is an article written by a leading Baptist of Great Britain, no less a personage than Dr. J. C. Carlyle, who is to come to Canada, according to "The Canadian Baptist", to assist in some sort of celebra-

tion in connection with the centenary of the birth of the great C. H. Spurgeon. This article written by Dr. Carlile, and published in this Spiritualist magazine, states that, when he was asked to become the Editor of "The Baptist Times" of London, he resorted to this spiritualistic medium to ask her whether he should accept the position. She told him that he was eminently qualified to become a journalist, and strongly advised him to accept the editorial chair of "The Baptist Times", and promised that he would be eminently successful. When a Baptist paper accepts for an Editor someone who is approved by a witch, they are rather hard up! I thought of publishing the article—I may some day.'

"I challenged the accuracy of your statements, and invited you to print the article. This you have done, with the result that any reader can see, as you admit, that what you gave as a quotation from the article was not there. It was your own deduction, not my statement. I do not press the point further. You do not quote me; you quote what you thought about me, a very different thing, for which I have no responsibility.

"Perhaps, without trespassing upon your space unduly, you will let me add: The article says that I was invited to test the capabilities of a medium—an unprofessional person, a member of a Baptist Church. I accepted the invitation and wrote an account of what happened. My questions were not arranged for purposes of eliciting information, but, as stated in the article, as tests of the powers of the medium. The article began with my statement: 'I am not a Spiritualist, neither am I hostile.' The obvious meaning of the sentence is that I do not accept Spiritualism. I never have done so, and I have never said anything that would justify labelling me as a Spiritualist, but I am not hostile to investigation. From your own statements, you were at one time in exactly the same condition of mind. I may add the concluding words of my article, concerning the phenomena: 'There must be some explanation. What is it? I wonder.'

"It may interest you to know that I was editing 'The Baptist Times' nearly two years before I wrote the article in question. The only alteration in my duty was that, by a resolution of the Council of the Baptist Union, the two offices, that of Secretary and Editor, were separated, and I continued the latter office at the unanimous invitation of the Assembly. The question as to literary work, of which you make so much pleasantry, had nothing whatever to do with 'The Baptist Times'. An Editor is usually described as a journalist, which you of course know. I have been a journalist for many years, and the idea of a medium telling me that I was eminently qualified to become a journalist would be rather ludicrous. It would probably be twenty years too late.

"I think it regrettable that you did not consult my article before venturing upon a quotation. Had you done so, there would have been no occasion to write to you. There can be no reflection upon the Baptist Union or upon 'The Baptist Times'. As it is, I am at least indebted to you for giving me the opportunity to satisfy the curiosity of many of my friends in Canada. In this country my views are pretty well known.

"Yours sincerely,

(signed) "J. C. CARLILE."

We would have left our accuser alone but for the notice given to his statements by certain persons in this country who do not seem to be aware of the contents of "The Baptist Times", or of the declaration of principles made in the Constitution of the Baptist Union. Upon the authority of Dr. Shields, they go on quoting definitely untrue statements as though they were gospel. We are not sure that even this extended denial will have any effect. But Dr. Shields having made an apology, there is nothing more to say. No argument can alter the fact that Dr. Shields, on his own admission, gave as true a statement which was entirely false and which he now has withdrawn.

In *The Baptist Times* of March 24th, the following editorial note appeared:

Dr. Shields and the Editor

Several correspondents have written lengthy letters in reference to the Editor's reply to Dr. Shields. One of them naively suggests that *The Baptist Times* should print the whole of the references and articles published by Dr. Shields in his paper. So far as we are concerned, we have nothing more to say. So far as *The Baptist Times* is concerned, the correspondence is at an end. At the same time, the Editor is grateful to the writers who have so readily come to his defence. The question between the Editor and Dr. Shields was entirely a question of fact. Dr. Shields quoted, as he said, from an article by Dr. Carlile. Afterwards Dr. Shields admitted there was no such statement in the article, and did what any gentleman would—he apologized.

As Dr. Carlile's letter of March 20th, included in his editorial in *The Baptist Times*, of May 10th, apart from all that had been published on the subject beforehand, was, to say the least, misleading, it appeared to us the proper course to pursue was to ask Dr. Carlile, inasmuch as he had seen fit to publish his letter in *The Baptist Times*, to be good enough to publish the whole matter in that paper so that his readers would be able to form a judgment for themselves.

We therefore wrote Dr. Carlile as follows:

Toronto, Canada, June 9, 1934.

Dr. J. C. Carlile,
Editor, *The Baptist Times*,
4 Southampton Row,
London, W.C.1.

Dear Dr. Carlile:

I have received *The Baptist Times* of May 10th, containing your letter to me dated March 20th, with your comments thereon.

I am sure you will recognize, and desire to observe, principles of absolute fairness in the discussion of disputed questions. In harmony with such a principle, it is necessary that all sides of a disputed question be presented to the same people. When matters of controversy are introduced to the pages of a periodical, it is fair to assume that the same people, in the main, will read each issue of the publication. When, therefore, a question is raised in such a periodical, it ought to be answered in the same paper.

In one of my lectures to the students of the Seminary I incidentally alluded to yourself as being not opposed to spiritism, and as having consulted a medium in respect to certain matters. The lecture went into print after rather a hasty revision, otherwise I should have deleted that reference to yourself, as I had no desire to enter into controversy with you. But when the matter was thus given to the public, and your attention was called to it, you very properly wrote me in reply, and asked me to publish the entire article under discussion. I had a plate made of your article and reproduced it exactly. I published your letter in full. When you wrote me again—the letter which now appears in *The Baptist Times*, I published that, and republished all that I had published in an earlier issue of THE WITNESS, so that my readers seeing your letter might have the complete story of the controversy.

While here and there *The Baptist Times* and THE GOSPEL WITNESS may overlap, and a few readers of each may read the other, in the main these two papers address entirely different constituencies. The publication of your letter in *The Baptist Times* apart from what has gone before I am sure you will recognize is hardly fair.

I ask for no space in *The Baptist Times*. The letter I now write is not written specially for publication. I write only respectfully to request that as you have seen fit to publish your letter to me in *The Baptist Times*, you will now be absolutely fair and publish the entire matter as it appeared in THE GOSPEL WITNESS. I do not ask for space

to add a single word respecting your comments on your last letter, but merely that you be good enough to reproduce the whole story, as appearing in THE GOSPEL WITNESS, in *The Baptist Times*, in order that your readers may have all the facts before them, and thus be enabled to form their own judgment.

Awaiting your reply, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS.

To the foregoing letter Dr. Carlile replied in the following terms:

"THE BAPTIST TIMES"
The Baptist Church House
4, Southampton Row
London, W.C.1

27th June, 1934.

Dr. T. T. Shields,
130 Gerrard Street East,
Toronto, Canada.

Dear Dr. Shields,

Thank you for your letter. I have not seen your paper and have no idea of what you have published or whether you have published anything since the article concerning which I wrote you. You may be quite sure that the paper for which I am responsible will treat you and everybody else with fairness.

There is no controversy between us so far as I am concerned. We need not argue the matter. You attributed to me statements which I never made. You saw that you were in the wrong and you apologized. So far as I am concerned, there the matter ends.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) J. C. CARLILE.

Thus, while Dr. Carlile says, "You may be quite sure that the paper for which I am responsible will treat you and everybody else with fairness", its columns are closed to any discussion of the matter. Nor does *The Baptist Times* make any reference whatever to my letter of June 9th. We regret that we are obliged to say that Dr. Carlile's letter in his own paper on this matter, and the accompanying article, are a gross misrepresentation of fact, when printed, apart from what had previously been published in THE GOSPEL WITNESS.

While waiting for further light, in our letter to Dr. Carlile, we said:

"I . . . offer you my sincere apology for having explicitly stated that which, at most, the article to which I referred may only imply."

Observe we said, "may only imply."

Dr. Carlile treats the matter as though the question at issue were whether he consulted the medium respecting the invitation to assume the Editorship of *The Baptist Times*, or whether the "literary work" referred to was something else. The major principle at issue, of course, was really not that, but rather the fact that Dr. Carlile had consulted a medium. About that question of fact there is no dispute. Dr. Carlile's letter in *The Christian Spiritualist* proves it.

At the end of the letter we said:

"I hope I have made ample amends for my error. Sincerely and abjectly I apologize for the error of identifying the literary work offered you with the Editorship of *The Baptist Times*, IF INDEED IT WAS AN ERROR."

In the foregoing quotation we have printed in capitals, "If indeed it was an error", for the purpose of emphasis: it was not so emphasized in the original letter. We are strongly of the opinion that it was not an error. But whether or no, *we were absolutely right in our allegation*

that Dr. Carlile consulted a Spiritualist medium. Without any explanation Dr. Carlile sees fit to say, "Dr. Shields Apologises".

We publish now, to conclude this matter, a copy of a letter sent to *The Baptist Times*, dated May 16th, by Rev. John Wilmot, Pastor of Highgate Road Baptist Church, London. This letter, Dr. Carlile did not publish. Mr. Wilmot's letter deals with the whole matter satisfactorily, and our readers will be able to form their own judgment of the journalistic ethics of *The Baptist Times* and its Editor. We borrow a few words from the conclusion of Dr. Carlile's article in *The Christian Spiritualist*, "There must be some explanation. What is it? I wonder"!

Mr. Wilmot's Letter
Highgate Road Chapel,
London, N.W.5.
Minister: John Wilmot.

May 16th, 1934.

Dr. J. C. Carlile,
Editor of "The Baptist Times".

Dear Sir,

"Dr. Shields and the Editor".

Having perused your letter and comments under this heading in "The Baptist Times" of the 10th instant, and previously followed the articles and correspondence in "The Gospel Witness", I beg to write you thereon as follows.

First, in regard to Dr. Shields. No man could possibly have given more liberal publicity to the entire controversy than he has done. "The Gospel Witness" will probably have a fair circulation in this country, but by no means equalling that of "The Baptist Times". You invited Dr. Shields to publish your Spiritualist article and letter in his paper, and he has done so twice. "The Baptist Times" contains your second letter *only* with introductory and concluding comments. At the conclusion of your letter you write, "As it is I am at least indebted to you for giving me the opportunity to satisfy the curiosity of many of my friends in Canada. In this country my views are pretty well known". In the comment below this you add, "Upon the authority of Dr. Shields they ('certain persons') go on quoting definitely untrue statements as though they were gospel".

My remark and request are these: Dr. Shields' "apology" relates to the identifying of the "literary work" with the editorship of "The Baptist Times". That is a technical point only. There are grave matters of holy principle involved in his faithful exposé covered by those "three or four columns of statements and arguments", and these you appear to lightly dismiss or ignore. Dr. Shields has been courteous and generous to you. Will you reciprocate? That is to say, will you as generously and courteously reproduce in "The Baptist Times" all that "The Gospel Witness" has published on this matter? "The whole question", you remark, "is one of truthfulness". Very well, then, let the readers of "The Baptist Times" have before them the entire correspondence, comments, articles, from first to last, and only then will they be able to form a sound judgment. It is little to ask on the score of space as "The Baptist Times" is a far more spacious weekly than "The Gospel Witness".

It is to be regretted that you should speak of Dr. Shields as "our accuser". What is the *accusation*? I have consulted the records at Colindale B.M. Annex just to see what ground there might be for the construction that the "Literary Work" was possibly "The Baptist Times". The following is what I have copied:—

"*Baptist Times*", Sept. 10/1925. "Dr. Carlile has, this week, written to Mr. Aubrey definitely accepting the invitation of the Council of the Union to become Editor of the 'Baptist Times'. Reference is also made to the fact, upon which you remark in your letter and which Dr. Shields had previously intimated, that you had already been editing the paper for eighteen months.

"*British Weekly*", Sept. 17th, 1925. "Dr. J. C. Carlile has acceded to the request of the Council to become the editor of 'The Baptist Times'; and already a marked improvement has been noted in the paper" (referring, doubtless, to your previous editorial management) "It should be stated

that in no way will this new appointment affect Dr. Carlile's relationship to the Church at Folkestone, though it will be necessary for him to reduce his commitments in other directions".

Then, of course, "*The Christian Spiritualist*" article of Oct. 7th, 1925, states that the sitting took place "a few weeks ago". And the medium advised you to accept the "literary work" which your question stated had been "recently offered" you, with the remark that "You will make it a success. It will harmonize with your present activities".

Comparing these statements (italicized) there are these points of similarity or circumstantial agreement:

B.T. & B.W.	"Christian Spiritualist".
Sept. 10 & 17, 1925.	Oct. 7th, 1925.
Invitation accepted "this week".	Sitting "a few weeks ago".
"to become" the editor.	"recently offered".
"a new appointment".	"You will make it a success".
"marked improvement already".	"Well for you to take it".
"Dr. C. has acceded to the request".	"It will harmonize with your present activities".
"No way affect Dr. C. relationship to Folkestone Church".	

No doubt you are aware that a serious criticism of this matter appeared in "The Fundamentalist" from the pen of W. E. Dalling, last April. This was in reply to your comment upon a previous reference in the November, 1933 issue—two months before Dr. Shields' reference appeared! In your comment you said (of Dalling's reference) "Each statement is definitely untrue". It would seem that Mr. Dalling similarly construed the facts, for he wrote: "Dr. C. was advised through a medium to take up *certain literary work* which he was then considering. Such is the man to whom the Baptist Union has entrusted the *sole official journal* of the Union".

You have said that in this country your "views are pretty well known". But is it so? I recall your statement some time ago that you declined to be labelled either modernist or fundamentalist. And at the commencement of your Spiritualist article you wrote, "I am not a spiritualist; neither am I hostile". Your comment now is that you are not hostile to investigation, whereas, your article does not state this. It has been taken to imply that you are not hostile to spiritualism itself. And is that not evident, for had you been hostile to spiritualism, you would surely never even have accepted an invitation to test a medium, or again to write such account for their journal, out of which capital for spiritualism could be, and has been, made? Dr. Shields has emphatically declared his attitude. There is no mistaking which side he stands, or misreading his label! He IS hostile. And so is Holy Scripture, intolerantly hostile. Investigation counts for nothing when God has spoken. The question is, Do you accept the authority of Holy Scripture on this matter? Whether your non-hostility be to spiritualism or to its investigation by attending a seance and consulting a medium, you must be aware that the Scripture prohibits both.

You refer to people in this country "who do not seem to be aware of the contents of 'The Baptist Times', or the Declaration of principles made in the constitution of the Baptist Union". Here, then, is the first principle in that Declaration:—

"That the Lord Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour, is the sole and absolute authority in all matters pertaining to faith and practice, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and that each Church has liberty to interpret and administer His laws".

What consistency is there between that principle and consulting a spiritualist medium, and writing an account thereof for a spiritualist journal, which its editor has made use of for the advance of spiritualism? And might he not do so on good ground, when at the beginning you declare you are not hostile, and that afterwards you went to lurch to talk over possible explanations, and left it undecided, a matter of interrogation and enquiry, without the slightest indication of bringing the whole subject to the bar of Holy Scripture, and accepting the explanation and verdict written therein on the sole and absolute authority of our God and Saviour?

As to the contents of "The Baptist Times", in this very number you have a non-committal recommendation of a book by Mr. Spurr on this subject, whose views on spiritualism before expressed are pretty well known. And not long since you congratulated Sir Oliver Lodge on his broadcast, without even mildly suggesting to him and your readers that final and settled declarations had already been made in Holy Scripture and by our God and Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, on the great subject of the "Hereafter". And are not the views of Sir Oliver Lodge pretty well known? As far back as 1911, during the ministry of my revered predecessor, James Stephens, our Church and Sunday School withdrew from the Sunday School Union, one of the reasons being "the fact that Sir Oliver Lodge, a spiritualist and an upholder of the new theology, is an accepted contributor to the 'Sunday School Chronicle'".

Why, Sir, the nature and "contents" of "The Baptist Times", its latitudinarianism, its policy of comprehension, must be observable to the merely casual reader! Being the official organ of the Union it necessarily reflects the views of the Union. It, again, refuses to be labelled. Rev. Henry Oakley of Trinity Chapel, Upper Tooting, has written a truly weighty and descriptive article in his current magazine, showing the Union in her true colours, past and present. He calls it an "Anythingarian Union". He gives his own account of the City Temple meeting which passed the vote of censure on Spurgeon. He writes as an eye-witness.

If in Mr. Spurgeon's day the theological downgrade of the Union was such as to warrant his taking that courageous stand apart in true scriptural protest, the advanced and entrenched downgrade since his time calls for protest, not less, but correspondingly greater, and in like manner. Alas, there is not a Spurgeon to lead the van! But what Mr. Spurgeon did in England then, Dr. Shields seems raised up of God to do now in the Dominion of Canada. He honours Spurgeon, not in word only but in deed and in truth, by standing where Spurgeon stood, with boldness and without apology.

Mr. Spurgeon said of the Baptist Union: "It has no disciplinary powers, and no doctrinal basis whatsoever, and we see no reason why every form of belief and misbelief should not be comprehended by it. . . . Those who originally formed it made it without form and void, and so it must remain. . . . What is wished for is a Union which will, like Noah's Ark, afford shelter for the clean and the unclean, for creeping things and winged fowls". And the mirror of the Union is "The Baptist Times". Therein you eulogize both C. H. Spurgeon and Reaveley Glover . . . "sweet water and bitter", "figs and thistles"! But "what communion hath light with darkness, righteousness with unrighteousness, believer with unbeliever, Christ with Belial, the temple of God with idols?" "Be not unequally yoked . . . Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the LORD".

I am,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) JOHN WILMOT.

NEWS OF UNION CHURCHES

Seventh Annual Convention

The Seventh Annual Convention of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, will, God willing, be held in the Central Baptist Church, London, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, October 23rd to 25th, 1934. We ask you to reserve these dates, and to begin to plan and pray for these meetings, that we may have the best Convention we have ever had.

Fort William

A recent graduate of the Toronto Baptist Seminary, Mr. Frank Wellington, has taken up the work at the Tabernacle Baptist Church, Fort William, which Mr. Fred Carter was forced to leave on account of ill-health. Since his arrival new interest is being shown in all the services, and they are looking forward to times of spiritual refreshing in their midst.

Medina

A steady and encouraging work is going on at the Medina Regular Baptist Church, under the leadership of Rev. Melchie

Henry. In a recent letter he says, "We had an unusual experience the other day. One who was formerly an Anglican, as well as a qualified school teacher, applied for baptism and church membership. In questioning her she told her experience of the new birth. It is unusual because she is the first school teacher to become a member in the history of this church.

"Yesterday we had the honour of having Mr. and Mrs. Lacy and their son Robert, and Mr. Lacy's sister, Mrs. Jones, to entertain us with their musical talents. The church was packed beyond capacity. A great number had to stand outside. The Jubilee Singers very graciously handed the entire offering to the parsonage building committee. As soon as the haying season is over, they are starting the concrete work. Should anyone feel disposed to help us financially, we shall gladly acknowledge every gift."

Timmins First Baptist Church

For the encouragement of other Churches of the Union, I wish to state that the visit of Rev. A. C. Whitcombe to the Timmins Baptist Church on Sunday, June 17th, proved to be one of true spiritual blessing.

In the morning a message was delivered on the text, 2 Tim. 2:2. It was a timely word, awakening us to our personal responsibilities in the gospel, and to the need of instructing others who shall further its truths.

At the close of the evening service in which the wonders of God's love were clearly unfolded, Brother Whitcombe again addressed the church members and other interested listeners, on the work of the Toronto Baptist Seminary. The liberal offering and pledges received for this cause declared the seriousness with which the believers considered the importance of the Seminary.

A splendid number gathered together Monday evening, and were inspired by an exceedingly interesting lecture given by Mr. Whitcombe on the life of the late Rev. Chas. H. Spurgeon. All who may yet be privileged to listen to Brother Whitcombe on this well-studied theme shall be greatly benefited.

Here and There

During the absence of the pastor, Rev. David Alexander, the Waverley Road Church has been ministered to by various Union pastors. Last Sunday Rev. P. B. Loney, of Runnymede Road, preached very acceptably, and at the evening service, a visitor from Montreal, a young business man, was gloriously saved.

Rev. Gordon and Mrs. Searle, of Edmonton, are visiting friends in Ontario for a few weeks. Mr. Searle will be glad to do supply work for the next few Sundays.

Rev. and Mrs. Howard Philips of Drumheller, Alberta, are also home for a few weeks. We are very glad to see these friends once more, and to hear of the work in the West.

Rev. A. C. Whitcombe of Orangeville, gave his lecture on Spurgeon in Jarvis Street Baptist Church last Thursday evening to a large and appreciative audience.

Our Missionary, Mrs. G. D. Mellish, who recently underwent an operation in the Toronto General Hospital, is much improved, and wishes to thank all who were so kind to her at that time. Mr. and Mrs. Mellish are holidaying in Fenelon Falls at the present time.

Family and Basket Picnic

Of the Members, Adherents, and Friends of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, at

Oaklands Park, Aldershot, Ontario,

Four miles east of Hamilton on No. 2 Highway, Lakeshore Route, between Toronto and Hamilton:

Labour Day, Monday, September 3, 1934.

Bring your own jugs, teapots, dishes, and cutlery.

Picnic Committee:

Rev. James McGinlay, London,
Rev. C. J. Loney, Hamilton,
Rev. W. N. Charlton, Hespeler,
Rev. W. E. Atkinson, Toronto.