

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES
AND IN DEFENCE 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

"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. 19, No. 9

TORONTO, JULY 4, 1940

Whole Number 946

BRITAIN'S PRINCIPAL DANGER SPOT

Too generally, and for too long a time, it has been assumed that the Empire's foreign relations was a matter that should be delegated exclusively to experts. From that assumption we have been rudely awakened. Anything more short-sighted than the management of Britain's foreign affairs ever since the Armistice could scarcely be imagined. In season and out of season for these more than twenty years we have said so.

It is a pity there is no kind of instrument that could discover the political shortsightedness of statesmen. Countless billions of dollars, millions of lives, and the peace of the world, might have been saved had it been possible to test the ability of so-called statesmen to see these things in advance, just as one can sit in an optician's chair and have his eyes tested. Had that been possible, such men as Sir John Simon, Sir Samuel Hoare, and Lord Halifax, would no more have been trusted with Britain's foreign affairs than a blind man would be licensed to drive a motor-car.

We have a growing conviction—we may be laughed at for saying so—that no one whose mind has not been spiritually enlightened for the understanding of the truth of God's Word, can possibly anticipate and forestall the enemies of righteousness.

We have a vivid recollection of an evening spent as guest at dinner with Lord Carson in his home in London, when for an hour or so we discussed the Irish problem. When, after a tour of Ireland in which we met nearly all the leaders of Irish thought, including de Valera's representative—de Valera himself at that time being in jail—Lord Carson asked us what was the matter with Ireland, we remarked it was folly even to express an opinion to such an expert. He kindly insisted upon an answer, and when we had expressed our view, he was good enough to say, "If your measures could be effected, you would have solved the Irish problem; and you are right in assuming that the one obstacle in the way of its solution is the Roman Catholic Church."

And the Roman Catholic Church never ceased its agitation. In Ireland, as elsewhere, it was an everlasting irritant; and it proceeded on the assumption that if it kept on long enough, resistance would break down. And so it did! And from an Empire point of view, and an ethical point of view also, indeed in view of the interests

of world-peace, the partitioning of Ireland was a stupendous blunder. The British Government partitioned Ireland, and allowed the Roman Catholic Church in Southern Ireland to set up a state antagonistic to Britain right across the Irish Channel.

And now there are voices heard in Britain on this subject that are as dangerous as anything that issues from Berlin. Of course, anyone who dares to say that the most deadly "fifth column" in the whole Empire, and in every part of it, is the Roman Catholic Church, is called a "bigot," a "fanatic," an "extremist," and we know not what else.

Last week, before such fears had been generally expressed, we pointed to Southern Ireland as the most vulnerable spot in Britain's defense. Since that time George Bernard Shaw has said almost the only thing we have ever heard from him with which we agreed. He has said substantially what we said last week, that Britain ought to occupy Southern Ireland.

But what alarms us is such political obtuseness as is expressed in an editorial published in *The News-Chronicle*, criticizing "loyal Ulster" for refusing to end partition even to help save the British Empire. We are greatly mistaken if Britain's safety does not depend in large measure on this partition; that is to say, on the maintenance of loyal Ulster. The only safe ending of a partitioned Ireland would be to bring Southern Ireland, at least for the duration of the war, absolutely under British rule. But to submerge loyal Ulster in the Irish Free State would be suicide. This is how the editorial referred to above concluded:

"Let Craigavon and de Valera meet together at once in person, for their damnable iterations, and agree upon a united Ireland to resist the enemy at our gates. That is the common sense of the matter. That is the way to Irish salvation now and hereafter."

We quote further from a recent press item:

In connection with the problem plaguing the British now how to defend the neutral member of the Commonwealth whose unpreparedness to resist invasion constitutes one of the gravest threats to the security of the United Kingdom, it is slightly ironic that Winston Churchill, who is now at the head of the Government, strongly opposed Neville Chamberlain, the former Premier, in 1938, when under the Anglo-Irish agreement the

treaty ports were evacuated by British forces and were handed over to Eire.

In the debate on the proposal, Mr. Churchill said that in 1921 the Admiralty held that without the ports of Queenstown, Berehaven, and Lough Swilly it would be difficult, if not impossible, to feed the nation in wartime.

He added:

"Now we are to give them up to the Irish Government, led by men whose rise to power is proportioned by the animosity with which they have acted against this country. In the event of war, the first step of a powerful enemy would be to offer immunity to Southern Ireland on condition that she stayed neutral. De Valera might say to Britain, 'Restore the integrity of Ireland and I will then throw in my lot with you.'

"Behind de Valera dark forces have renewed themselves, an organization of secret men holding, as of old, that England's danger is Ireland's opportunity. He has kept them in check only with difficulty. If he proclaimed a friendly policy, they would be in the ascendant."

Mr. Churchill urged postponement of action on the bill pending new agreement about the treaty ports.

Ulster is ready to enter into the closest cooperation with de Valera on matters of defense, provided he abandons his stupid neutrality and agrees to stand at the side of Britain and the Empire, and clear out all German and Italian representatives from Eire; and agrees further not to raise an issue of a constitutional nature.

Then another bright spirit, in order to throw a sop to the incorrigible rebel of the British Commonwealth—the only part of the Empire that calls itself neutral—proposes that an army of at least two hundred thousand should be sent to Ulster in readiness to answer de Valera's call for help; and proposes that the two hundred thousand should be composed of units that are Roman Catholic—Poles, Czechs, and the French Legion. They would indeed send reinforcements to Ireland's fifth column!

Will somebody please build a lunatic asylum for newspaper editors, and alleged statesmen?

Is there a strong delusion coming over public men which makes it possible for them only to believe a lie, "that they all may be damned who believe not the truth"? We agree with those who insist that for the peace of mind of the Empire, the British Cabinet should be freed of all "Munich men", as they are called, particularly of Lord Halifax.

Apropos of the above we reprint an item sent us by Rev. W. J. Thomson of Vancouver. From what publication it is taken, we do not know, but it speaks loudly to-day:

"TOO LATE"

The following passage of Mr. Lloyd George's speech is almost as severe a criticism of Mr. Asquith's Government as Lord Randolph Churchill's bitter condemnation of Mr. Gladstone's in 1884, when Gordon was abandoned at Khartoum. We print the two historic utterances.

1915: Mr. Lloyd George

Too late—the fatal words in this war. Too late in moving here, too late in arriving there.

Too late in coming to this decision; too late in starting that enterprise; too late in preparing.

The footsteps of the Allied forces have been dogged by the mocking spectre of "Too late"; and unless we quicken our movements damnation will fall on the sacred cause for which so much gallant blood has flowed. And I beg employers and workmen not to let "Too late!" be inscribed on the portals of their workshops.

Everything in the course of the next few months depends upon this.

1884: Lord Randolph Churchill

"Too late!" "Too late!" is an awful cry. From time immemorial it has heralded and proclaimed the slaughter

of routed armies, the flight of dethroned monarchs, the crash of falling empires.

Wherever human blood has been poured out in torrents, wherever human misery has accumulated in mountains, wherever disasters have occurred which have shaken the world to its very centre, there straight and swift up to heaven or down to hell has always gone the appalling cry, "Too late! Too late!"

The Opposition cannot but move a vote of censure upon a Government whose motto is "Too late." The Liberals should be chary of giving support to a Government whose motto is "Too late!" and the people of this country will undoubtedly repudiate a Government whose motto is invariably "Too late!"

Lord Randolph Churchill was the father of Premier Winston Churchill. It is an unspeakable comfort to discerning men that we have not today in Britain as Premier a blind Samson grinding a Philistine mill. Let all who pray, pray for Mr. Churchill not alone for divine direction for him, but that he may be preserved in life and health. And surely such supplication can be made "with thanksgiving"!

THURSDAY EVENING SERVICES

Our midweek preaching service has always been largely attended, but of recent weeks it has filled Greenway Hall. Last Thursday the Hall was completely crowded out. Each Thursday we endeavour to review the world situation in the light of Scripture; not in the way of attempting the interpretation of particular prophecies by essaying the identification of events and characters of our day as their fulfilment, but rather by the exposition of the predictive principles of the Word of God, and the promises which assure us of His presence and power.

It is evident the Lord has been pleased to use these services for the encouragement of many. In view of the number attending last Thursday, in future and until further notice, the Thursday evening service will be held in the main auditorium.

CIRCULATION OF THE WAR SERMONS

The title of the sermon in last week's issue was, "The Pope's fine Italian hand in Petain's treachery." Although a larger edition was printed, the supply was exhausted Thursday evening, and a second edition was published in readiness for Sunday. This also was largely taken up. We shall endeavour to have a reserve of all war sermons, and we shall appreciate the cooperation of our readers in helping to give them circulation. Send 5c to THE GOSPEL WITNESS office for single copies, postpaid, 25c for six, \$1.00 for twenty-five copies.

Bible School Lesson Outline

OLIVE L. CLARK, Ph.D. (Tor.)

Vol. 4 Third Quarter Lesson 28 July 14th, 1940

CHRIST BEFORE PILATE

Lesson Text: Matthew 27:1-32.

Golden Text: "What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ?"—Matthew 27:22.

I. The Suicide of Judas—verses 1 to 10. Read also Acts 1:18, 19.

There is a vast difference between repentance and remorse. When Peter realized his sin "he went out, and wept bitterly" (Matt. 26:75); but of Judas it is said that he "went out and hanged himself." Peter was a true believer who had lapsed into sin, but Judas, "the son of perdition" (John 17:12) had sold himself to Satan to perform his will. Peter displayed a contrite spirit which led to his restoration (Psa.

(Continued on page 8 column 1)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

BRITAIN AT BAY — UNDAUNTED AND INVINCIBLE!

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, June 30th, 1940

(Stenographically Reported)

"And the Philistine said unto David, Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves? And the Philistine cursed David by his gods.

"And the Philistine 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.

"Then said David to the Philistine, Thou comest to me 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.

"This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand; and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee; and I will give the carcasses of the host of the Philistines this day unto the fowls of the air, and to the wild beasts of the earth; that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel.

"And all this assembly shall know that the Lord saveth not with sword and spear: for the battle is the Lord's, and he will give you into our hands."—I. Samuel 17:43-47.

This passage might have relatively little value were it taken from the pages of profane history, but inasmuch as it is part of the divinely inspired and ageless word of the Eternal, it is just as potent to-day as it ever was. The children know this story of David and Goliath; it never fails in its interest for young and old; yet I think we may see it in this late day in a somewhat fresh light.

It has long been commonly assumed that ours is a "new" era; that the world of our day is what we are pleased to call a "modern" world; a world which is so advanced beyond all that earlier ages knew that practically everything belonging to the past has become obsolete. That general modernistic attitude, that assumption that we are the people, that we have arrived at something no-one else ever knew,—it is scarcely hyperbolic to say, that that modernistic attitude that is by no means remarkable for its modesty, assumes that mathematics can dispense with the multiplication table, that literature can do without an alphabet, that religion may profitably do away with the Decalogue.

Such views are called "radical." I do not speak now exclusively of views of religious life. There is a general modernistic tendency to radical experimentation. Radicalism generally signifies something that would destroy the roots of things; although, conversely, there may be a conservative radicalism that is to be commended and highly valued.

Such attitudes as applied to science—and I use that term not in the restricted but in the broader and generic sense as representing the whole scope and substance of human knowledge, I say, that attitude assumes that all former bases or hypotheses or presuppositions were wrong; that the premises of life's earlier arguments upon which human history proceeded were erroneous, and therefore must be rooted up; and that we must begin all over again, and with new assumptions. Hence the radical philosophy of Evolution, with all its evil brood, the evolutionary modernistic attitude as applied to religion, assumes that we have no objective divine revelation, finally authoritative, but we must spin our own theories out of our own "religious consciousness", whatever that may be. Alas! such spiders are found even in kings' palaces.

Against such concepts of Radicalism there is an attitude of conservatism, a disposition, which, while neither

denying nor despising human progress anywhere, nevertheless endeavours to conserve the proved and established values of life. Such a mind believes that some things which are fundamentally true may be recognized and identified as such, and therefore may be wisely and tenaciously held. I have never called myself a "Fundamentalist" because much that goes by the name, *Fundamentalism*, signifies nothing more than a castle in the air that has no foundations. Yet fundamentalism as applied to any realm of human thought, is a good word. It has to do with the foundation of things. "If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?"

Nothing is more deceptive than what is called Modernism. That, I have sometimes thought, is the "strong delusion" that has come upon the world that men should believe a lie. I do not mean as applied to religion only; but that general assumption that we live in a wholly new and radically different world. I have read with disgust very often, and sometimes with contempt, the programmes of religious gatherings, on, "The church in a changing order"; "Christianity and the modern world." As though we had surprised God, and had brought about something for which God was ill-prepared! That view learns nothing from history. It is typical of the young man of twenty or twenty-one whose father can teach him nothing: when he gets to be forty, he thinks his father may have been rather a wise man. The attitude which is so ready to divorce the present from the past, and to assume that we have begun on new and sounder foundations will learn nothing from the world's yesterdays. "There arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph." Because his mind was closed to the testimony of an important part of the history of his own country, he led his people to disaster. That is like Henry Ford who said "history is bunk"—so it is to him. While he is a great industrialist, he has little appreciation of international responsibility. I suppose he really controls the companies that bear his name. If you have a Ford car, drive it as long as you can, and thereafter help to teach Mr. Ford what isolationism really involves. The man who so separates himself from the whole world as a practical "isolationist" ought to be made to feel what isolation means. That by the way: nothing extra for that!

The attitude I have described throws away the Bible. Why not? You threw last year's telephone directory

into the waste-basket, if the company missed its collection, because it was out of date. And the Bible is almost equally out of date with many. I say it again and again, for I should like to drive it home: that has been the curse of the church here, in England, and everywhere, that they have thrown away the one Book of abiding principles.

This is a "modern" war. We learned very little from the last war? It was a terrible experience, but this is a still more "modern" war. Tanks and airplanes make all the difference. *All* the difference? Are you quite sure, they make *all* the difference? Hence the disappointment of the Maginot Line. We do not hear much about it now. Napoleon won many of his victories largely by the mobility of his army. He could strike here, and then yonder so quickly, that before his enemy could reform his front, he had him down. Of course; you do not need to move quickly nowadays; this is a "modern" war, and the Maginot Line is a surer defense than a mobile army! So it was said two—"two" what?—generations ago? No: only two months ago!

The principles of which we ought to have been cognizant are all in our text. Dare I say this? A certain professor, a godly man, one of the keenest men I ever knew, used to attend here quite frequently. He was the father-in-law of the late Minister of Defense. He was many years my senior, and he used to speak to me in a very familiar way. One day he said, "You know, Shields, I like the way you always lay down a philosophic basis for your argument." I hope he was correct. We must have emplacements for our guns. We must have a place to begin: that is what I have been trying to do, to pour concrete, to prepare a place to fire from.

It was the assumption that this modern war was entirely different from any other war that defeated France. It was their defensive policy which defeated them. If Britain had not been conservative, if she had listened to all the military experts and had not maintained her fleet, she would have been defeated long before this. The experts went to the other extreme in their appraisal of the naval future, and said the swifter airplanes would render battleships obsolete. At that one point, it was British conservatism that saved her from immediate overthrow. Tanks and airplanes make *all* the difference? No! They make *some* difference; but *that other something, that changeless residue is the thing that will determine the issue of the battle.* Not tanks, and not airplanes, in the ultimate analysis of things, though we shall have to use them, will finish the war.

One of the most ancient of wars was this of our text; yet it is the same in its essential ingredients, it is exactly parallel to the conflict in which we are now engaged. The fundamentals of body and mind and spirit are always the same. Men could be killed in David's day as they are killed now. They could be killed now as they were killed then. A man was a thing of the flesh: that element had to be considered. They were, too, men of mind, men capable of varying moods and emotions. They could be influenced then as they are influenced now, and now as then. There are the same indispensable elements of morals and religion—and that means of war morale as well as morals; and of war materials too. The record of the conflict between David and Goliath is a thrilling story; it never wears out; and never in all the world's history were the determinative principles which decided the issue then, more potent than they are today.

I.

What was it all about? WHAT WAS THE *Causus Belli*, THE CAUSE OF THIS WAR OF HISTORY? Not lack of territory, or want of room. The Philistines were not fighting for territory. There was a deeper reason for their antagonism toward Israel.

Hitler has contended he was fighting for "living room". But he is not. That is not the reason for the war. If it were, he might conclude it now, for he seems to have got a good bit of it. It is not "living room" he will have at last, but dying room! I have been wearied to the point of impatience and indignation by these little ministerial midgets who have never read the Treaty of Versailles, who talk about the severe terms imposed upon Germany in the last war. If there are any such preachers here to-night, let me resort to a colloquialism and advise you to "shut up"! The Versailles Treaty did not cause this war. There was no Versailles Treaty in nineteen-fourteen, and still Germany fought. No injustice had been imposed upon them then—and still they went to war. It will help us to refresh our minds if we come to the underlying causes that have driven us into war.

Germany is not fighting, as Philistia did not fight, for any economic reason. "We want raw materials"! Turn back the pages of history, and you will find Germany fought when, if they had had all the raw materials they now ask for, they would not have known what to do with them; they would have had no use for them. That was not the reason for the war.

Growing out of this, they are not fighting for larger markets. This war is not like a bargain day crowd when women are willing to fight to save two cents—to compensate themselves for the two car fares they used to take them to the sale! Germany is not fighting for larger markets. Before the last war she had broken into all the markets of the world, and free trade England was flooded with goods "made in Germany". There was no let or hindrance to their selling whatever they wanted to sell. Still they went to war.

Philistia was *fundamentally incompatible with Israel.* "The Philistine cursed David by his gods"—in the plural. The orientation of life was fundamentally different from that which characterized Israel. It is everlastingly true that the temple of God hath no agreement with idols. Paganism and Christianity—even if you regard only its by-product, what we call "Christian civilization", in contrast with Prussianized life—are essentially incompatible, they are like chemical elements which cannot come together without war. The German way of life, the German conception of life, the German idea of the function of the state, and of the relation of government to the individual, are all entirely foreign to our ideas. There is no possibility of living at peace with a nation that knows no moral restraint.

This armed colossus of the text was a symbol of pagan philosophy. He had an helmet of brass—and that has not altogether gone out of fashion. "He was armed with a coat of mail; and the weight of the coat was five thousand shekels of brass. And he had greaves of brass upon his legs, and a target of brass between his shoulders. And the staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam; and his spear's head weighed six hundred shekels of iron: and one bearing a shield went before him." "A coat of mail"—"the weight of the coat"—"his spear's head weighed"! He strutted out before the world and said, "I will beat you all." He had *the weight* of metal! But

thank God, the unerring Measurer Who will not count men pure with wicked balances, and a bag of deceitful weights, has weighed the weightiest of men and of nations in His balances and found them wanting.

That whole conception is a pagan philosophy of life—and it is Germany's conception. Not in Hitler's day only, but from the days of Frederick the Great until now the German theory of life has been the same, a great armed colossus that can trample the world under its feet, and crush everyone who will not submit to its domination. Why? That is the question. And that is Germany to-day. It is therefore utterly impossible for us for a moment to consider anything but victory. German present armed might is formidable, it is terrible—but it is not half so evil as the spirit of which it is the symbol. Were you to rob Germany of her armaments, that demonizing view of life would still remain; and life would be impossible to free peoples anywhere were it permitted to continue.

It is an old, old story. Picture Goliath with his great armour and let him represent to you, as he does, the same conception of life which Germany represents to-day. If that is permitted to abide, can you tell me where or when there could be security and peace and happiness in the world?

The Philistines put small value upon the life of a man. Man had no value in the Philistine concept: Israel reckoned him the nation's greatest asset. In the last analysis, the war in which the world is now engaged, for the whole world is engaged whether it likes it or not—is a battle between collectivism and individualism. You have read of the massed Germans going up to the slaughter, wave upon wave, against the French fortified positions, until the men whose duty it was to mow them down, sickened at their task. They came on and on until at last, over the bodies of thousands of their comrades, they broke through. That is collectivism. It is the inevitable outgrowth of a general anti-Christian view of life.

I do not say all Britons are Christians, that we are free from a thousand faults; but the general prevailing view that has affected our jurisprudence, that has shaped our whole social structure, puts a special value upon the individual. Why? Because that is Christian. God said in the beginning, "Let us make man." He did not make a mass of men: He made an individual. When Jesus Christ came, He came to destroy the work of the devil, and to recreate a man. Let me speak to you United Church people, Roman Catholics, and all the other religious collectivists: do you think God is interested in building up a great church? That is totalitarianism, that is religious collectivism. Its tendency is to regard the institution as of greater importance than the individual. No. God is supremely concerned in the production of men. That is His task. Wherever and so long as Christian principles guide a nation's thinking and its life, against the philosophy of collectivism there is bound to be long war. Philistia and Israel can never be at peace: Philistia served many gods, and Israel the One God beside Whom there is none else.

Yet let me show you a paradox. We have a proverb to the effect that extremes meet. If you go far enough east, you will reach the west; far enough west, you will be in the east. Extremes do meet. The individualism of Christianity produces a multitude of individuals: collectivism submerges all individuals in one. Philistia is represented by a single leader, a champion, a giant, a

dictator. That principle is illustrated in Stalin, in Mussolini, and in Hitler: individualism survives only in the person of the dictator. The difference between their philosophy and ours is that collectivism heads up at last in a dictator who is a human devil: Christian individualism leads to personal submission to one Individual Who is God. In the ultimate analysis, therefore it is a battle between God and the devil, Philistia representing the powers of darkness, Israel the people of God.

II.

Look now at THE ARMAMENTS OF EVIL. This, we are told is a new kind of war. But is it? What, *fundamentally*, was the proposal of Philistia? Their fuerher said, "We will settle our differences by force, only by force. If anyone representing you can overcome me, we will be your servants. If we overcome you, you will be our servants. We have no resort to reason, to moral considerations, to questions of right and wrong. It is wholly a question of force."

That is what the world is facing to-day. Not in Europe only. Japan does not consider whether she has a right to Indo-China—even as she did not ask whether she had a right to attempt to subjugate China itself. Her only instrument is force. If now France cannot resist her attacks upon Indo-China, or the Dutch Government cannot resist her designs upon the Dutch East Indies, Japan will say, "The doors are unlocked; we will go in and help ourselves." The rule of force is challenging the rule of right and of reason throughout the world to-day.

It is to be observed that Philistia's force was displayed for the inspiration of fear. Have you read Hitler's book? It is a hellish philosophy of things. You had better not read it too late at night! He lays it down as a cardinal principle of his system that every factory, every office, every home, shall be subject to fear. He speaks of mass psychology, and of inspiring great multitudes with terror. The civilian population is to be terrorized; everyone is to tremble at sight of the weapons of this great giant.

That was Goliath. He put on his helmet, and all his armament, and strutted out before Israel: "Send me a man to fight with me." And they all began to shake at the knees. He terrorized even the soldiers in Israel. At last they said, "We have had enough of this; we will set the battle in array"; they were all ready for the attack—when out walked the champion with his booming voice. He must have spoken something like Hitler! Hitler speaks of the power of oratory, of the superiority of the spoken over the written word; he says the great leader must be an orator, a man who can impress his personality upon others by personal oratorical force. Philistia's was a psychological war just as truly as is the present. When Israel was come out to set the battle in array, suddenly the giant appeared, and all Israel fled. They retired to "prepared positions"!

Will you note where the line of demarcation falls, and where the principle of force reaches its end. What have you here?—What could Goliath do? Our Lord once said: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." That is the limit of physical force: it can kill the body, after that it can do nothing. That is the limit of its power. Goliath could see nothing beyond that. He said, "Come to me, and I will give thy flesh unto the fowls of the air, and to the beasts of the field." Goliath foolishly supposed that it was just a battle of might with might, of the ponderables of life, the things

that can be weighed and measured and estimated—that these were the determining factors. "On the balance sheet," he seemed to say, "I have beaten you already; look at me."

Goliath came out forty successive days, strutting back and forth, calling from mountain to mountain, as by a broadcasting station, a great voice, with great armour, a human tank. Showing his armed might to Israel, he said, "Dare you fight so great a power?" Do not be too much concerned about the tanks. Of course, we need tanks; but there is something more than tanks. After all, what can Hitler do? Read the story of the Antichrist—whichever he is, or whatever he is. We sang to-night,

"Crown Him, ye martyrs of our God,
Who from His altar call;
Extol the stem of Jesse's rod,
And crown Him Lord of all!"

Who are "the martyrs of our God"? The men and women whose bodies have been killed. But they still live! Even Antichrist cannot destroy their souls.

III.

Think a moment of the other side of the ledger, "THE ARMOUR OF RIGHTEOUSNESS" of which we read this evening, which also is called "THE ARMOUR OF LIGHT." A young man came up to the camp of Israel, not much more than a lad, "ruddy, and of a fair countenance". He was not a soldier; he had never worn a uniform. He went up to see his brothers, and to carry them some provisions. You can imagine someone's going up to Camp Borden, and talking with the soldiers, and hearing the camp gossip. This young fellow heard of the great champion of Philistia, and even while he was there, Goliath came forth. The lad listened, and he heard his voice; and, keen of eye, he saw him. "Oh", said he, "what shall be done to the man that killeth this Philistine, and taketh away the reproach from Israel? for who is this uncircumcised Philistine, that he should defy the armies of the living God?" He went on to another part of the camp, and asked the same question. By and by someone ran to Saul and said, "There is a lad in the camp, and he is not like the rest; he is not afraid of the giant; he is enquiring the terms of the reward for killing him and delivering Israel."

There was something about this lad that distinguished him from others. When the giant shouted, he did not run away; nor quail before him. David, I think, said, "The bigger you are, the easier the mark." Saul heard of him and sent for him.

Here was something new, and quite contrary to the defeatist spirit which had pervaded the army and the court. Here was a *divine fearlessness*. We speak of an army's *morale*. The armies of Israel needed someone to stimulate their morale just then. Whatever the cause, before they were overwhelmed numerically and materially, the brave French army lost its morale. Thousands threw away their guns and ceased to fight. Israel also were ready to flee. But this young man began by saying, "Let no man's heart fail because of him." Obedience to that counsel was indispensable to victory. It was so in that day: it is so in ours. The people who talk about failure,—who even contemplate the possibility of the failure of our cause, constitute a real danger. However dark it may be now, or tomorrow, I cannot conceive of the possibility of failure. Let us believe rather, "There'll always be an England." Though Hitler roar, and the jackal Mussolini howl his "Me-too," and Stalin's swift

and stealthy foot-fall sound like Death's' approach, we must say of each, "Let no man's heart fail because of him."

But how is that fearlessness engendered? One says, "That is folly. Flesh and blood cannot oppose tanks." Yes, it can. "Flesh and blood cannot oppose shot and shell." Yes, it can. "Let no man's heart fail because of him." The great essential in Canada, and Britain, and throughout the Empire, is that we should come to the settled and unwavering conviction and determination that no matter what the cost, or how long it takes, we will never sheath the sword until it has been sheathed in the heart of Hitler and his fellow-murderers (Applause). We are not to consider much less ask whether we can do it,—our undaunted and buoyant spirits must exclaim, "Let no man's heart fail because of him." That must be the watchword in the home, in the school, in the office, on the street, in the factory, in the pulpit, in the pew, in the newspaper, in Parliament, in Cabinet Council, in the camp, on the battle-field, on the sea, and in the air, "Let no man's heart fail because of him." We must answer the propaganda of Goebbels, who seeks to make us afraid, with a divinely inspired fearlessness.

"Let no man's heart fail because of him." That must be our war-cry.

But one says, "How can we develop that spirit of fearlessness?" Not by mere shouting. David said unto Saul, "I will go and fight the Philistine." The king answered, "Thou art not able to go against this Philistine to fight with him: for thou art but a youth, and he is a man of war from his youth. Do you not know that it takes muscle, that it takes physical force to overcome a man like that?" What was this young man's ground for feeling such "solid assurance", to use Mr. Churchill's phrase? Said the young man, "Thy servant kept his father's sheep, and there came a lion, and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock: and I went out after him, and smote him, and delivered it out of his mouth: and when he arose against me, I caught him by his beard, and smote him, and slew him. Thy servant slew both the lion and the bear: and this uncircumcised Philistine shall be as one of them, seeing he hath defied the armies of the living God . . . The Lord—THE LORD—that delivered me out of the paw of the lion, and out of the paw of the bear, he will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine." In effect he said, "I have, sir, an illustrious history behind me, a record of miracle, an experience of divine intervention, a tale of answered prayer. I am not alone."

My dear friends, the history of Britain, notwithstanding all her faults, and all her blemishes, surely shows that God has never forsaken us. I have said it before, let me say it more strongly: it was God who delivered us at Dunkirk. I say, it was God Who accomplished the impossible at Dunkirk; and He did it *because it was designed to be the beginning of miracles*. The God Who sent the storm east of Dunkirk, Who sent the fog, Who calmed the waters of the Channel so that the smallest skiff could navigate it safely; the God Who brought three hundred and thirty-five thousand souls out of the jaws of Death, that God will deliver us out of the hands of this pagan power!

Such trusting fearlessness is not the impractical fancy of an idle dreamer, who impotently lies beside a tranquil pool waiting for an angel to trouble the waters, and for

someone else to put him into the pool for his healing. It is not the speech of one who offers to sell weapons of offence to one who will jeopardize his life by obtaining the weapons and using them. Some one may say, "That is brave talk; and religion, and faith, and prayer may have their place; but think of the tanks, and of the airplanes, and the vast military machine in its totality. You must match metal with metal, and weight with weight, and numbers with numbers." That is exactly what Saul essayed to do. And I do not say we should not do the same; that we should be content only to pray. David did more than pray. Indeed it is not recorded that on this occasion he prayed at all in any definite or formal way. I say emphatically there are occasions when one can better pray the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man on his feet than on his knees; when, our pacifist friends to the contrary notwithstanding, one can evidence one's prayerfulness more by going up in a fighting plane, than by mounting up with wings as eagles.

What was the distinguishing characteristic of this man? He had not been converted into a machine out of which the soul had been crushed. He was very much of an individual, and was not wanting in initiative. Alone in the wilderness he had left theory behind, and had reduced his religious faith to a very practical test. All their encounters with the enemy prove that man for man, our British soldiers, our British sailors, and our British airmen, are inestimably superior to the enemy. Often outnumbered, they have demonstrated that there is such a thing as an unconquerable spirit, and especially is the spirit unconquerable when it is inspired by faith in God.

In the valley of Elah it was *the superiority of individual skill which won the battle*. And still, individual skill at last determines the issue. "Tin hats" are not new. Goliath had one—only his was made of brass. He was armed and protected from head to toe—nearly so! But there is always a vulnerable spot in every giant's armour. This young shepherd knew how to fight. You know the story of his putting off the armour in which Saul clad him. They said he must meet armed men with arms. "No", said he, "I will use the method to which I am accustomed."

David was a Benjamite, and, no doubt, could sling a stone to a hair's breadth and not miss, like some other famous Benjamites. Israel had been in camp marking time for forty days. The giant fuerher had made himself visible and audible for a like period; and Israel had been so frightened she could not answer him. There they were until this young shepherd came. David was not unprepared, although he was differently prepared. When David came within ear-shot the Philistine cursed him by his gods. David, in effect, replied, "You have challenged my God, and in His name I will lift the gauntlet; I accept the challenge; I will be God's instrument for your destruction." Never in all history has a nation so daringly and blasphemously challenged God as Germany has now done. Germany's war is not an undeclared war: *she has declared war upon God Himself*. As His instruments of reply we may be assured of victory.

But that is not the best of the story. This Philistine Hitler said, "Come to me"; and David answered, "Never fear; I am coming." He put a stone in his sling—and the record says?—He stood on the defensive, in the Maginot Line! No, he did not. David "ran to meet the

Philistine," and even as he ran, throwing I suppose the momentum of his body into the fray, swiftly he swung that sling around his head—and the giant fell! Why? Because God was behind that stone. It was the hand of God that slang it, and the stone found the vulnerable spot. "So David prevailed over the Philistine with a sling and with a stone, and smote the Philistine and slew him; but there was no sword in David's hand."

And now, saith one, "Do you mean to tell me that God can bring giants down?" Of course He can. David said, "Thou comest to me with a sword and with a spear: but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied." In all the world's long history, was it ever more possible for the soldiers of righteousness to say to any foe that ever challenged the kingdom of God on earth than we can say to Germany, "We come to you in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God Whom thou hast defied"?

And when the giant fell, *the Philistines took to their heels!* They always do. It is the weakness of states or armies which depend chiefly upon one giant personality that when the giant falls the rest flee. We shall need a great many men to help clean the Germans out of France, and Belgium, and Holland, one of these days. But, inevitably, it is going to be done.

Observe that our hero insisted that *all that he did was for the glory of God*. He said, "All the earth (shall) know that there is a God in Israel. And all this assembly shall know that the Lord saveth not with sword and spear: for the battle is the Lord's and he will give you into our hands." God used instrumentalities. He used David, and a sling, and a stone; but David recognized that the victory was the Lord's, even as the battle also was His. I would detract nothing from the glory of the heroes of the past, but those who today prophesy ultimate triumph give us little to lean upon who speak only of the valour of Drake, and Nelson, and Wellington, and others, and neglect to give glory to God Whose instruments they were.

"For heathen heart that puts its trust
In reeking tube and iron shard;
All valiant dust, that builds on dust,
And, guarding, calls not Thee to guard;
For frantic boast and foolish word,
Thy mercy on Thy people Lord."

Oh, that all the world may yet know that God "saveth not with sword and spear"; nor, in the last analysis, by tanks or airplanes or battleships—though they must be used. He saves for His own name's sake, that all the earth may know that He is God.

David came upon his conquered enemy as he lay prostrate upon the earth. He drew Goliath's great sword from its scabbard, and severed his head; and returned to the king with the head of the giant in his hand. When we get into France, by and by, we may find it full of tanks that have run out of gasoline, and other instruments of war that they could not use to the end; and they may be useful to chop the giant's head off. I think he will ultimately be destroyed by his own weapons. David achieved victory by the use of only one fifth of his offensive resource, while the armed giant, "all out" for the battle, lay beneath the weight of his own armour dead upon the field. So mote it be!

Have not I showed you that this bit of ancient history is in complete harmony with the ponderable and the imponderable elements in the present war. What an argument for trust in God!

IV.

But this is AN HISTORICAL PARABLE. A greater than Goliath has challenged the world saying, "Send me a man to fight with me." And never did the human race produce a man who could do successful combat with the strong man armed who keepeth his palace, with his goods in peace, until One came Whom we know as the God-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."

At the place called Calvary, the great enemy of the race, the prototype of Goliath and Hitler, tried conclusions with great David's greater Son, and our David vanquished the giant:

"He hell in hell laid low;
Made sin, He sin o'erthrew;
Bowed to the grave, destroyed it so,
And death by dying slew."

And by His grace we too shall triumph, and shall tread Satan under our feet shortly. The victory of our Lord Jesus Christ is the assurance that we shall win if we trust Him as individuals, and, God being our Helper, we shall win too as a nation.

Have you, by faith, appropriated the fruits of the victory of the Lord Jesus for yourself? Have you come as a poor defeated sinner, to share the triumph of your glorious Lord? Have you been made strong by His grace? That is our great need to-day. I beg of you not to content yourself with going to church, with bowing the knee and saying prayers. That is well; this ought we to do; but make sure that you have correspondence with Heaven, that you have commerce with God through faith in the Lord Jesus, and that all sins have been washed away by His precious blood. Come to Him, saying,

"My glorious Victor, Prince Divine,
Clasp these surrendered hands in Thine;
At length my will is all Thine own,
Glad vassal of a Saviour's throne."

Then, being saved ourselves, we can with the utmost confidence fight the battle for righteousness and truth.

"He has sounded forth the trumpet
that shall never call retreat;
He is sifting out the hearts of men
before His judgment-seat:
Oh, be swift, my soul, to answer
Him! be jubilant, my feet!
Our God is marching on."

(Continued from page 2 column 2)

51:17; John 21:15-17; 2 Cor. 7:10), but Judas remained hard and rebellious. The betrayer regretted his part of the contract with the Jewish leaders when he saw that Christ had been condemned by the Sanhedrin, but his grief was too late. He could not undo the wicked deed (Heb. 12:17). His terrible end should be a warning to all; sin bringeth forth death (Gal. 6:7; Jas. 1:15).

The thirty shekels (about eighteen dollars in our money) were used to purchase a potter's field, as had been prophesied (Jer. 32:6-15; Zech. 11:13). What a costly field, purchased with the blood of the Son of God!

II. The Sentence of Judgment—verses 11 to 26.

The religious trial of Christ before the Jewish Council, which had ended in a decision of guilt, was followed by the civil trial before the Roman authorities. The Jews held their own courts to try cases concerning their laws and traditions, and they might pass sentence of death upon a prisoner, although they could not carry out such a sentence without the permission of the Roman Governor (John 18:31). That is the reason of the trial before Pilate.

The Roman trial, as also the Jewish trial, took place in three stages: the first appearance of Christ before Pilate (Matt. 27:2, 11-14; Mk. 15:1-5; Lk. 23:1-5; John 18:28-38); the appearance before Herod Antipas (Lk. 23:6-12); and the final appearance before Pilate (Matt. 27:15-26; Mk. 15:6-15).

Pilate would not have listened to a charge of blasphemy (Matt. 26:65, 66), but when the Jewish leaders attempted to accuse Christ of being seditious (Lk. 23:2, 5, 14) and of making himself a King, Pilate saw in Him a rival to his own claims (Compare Matt. 2:2, 3). But Christ explained the spiritual nature of His Kingdom in such a way that the Governor was convinced of His innocence (John 18:36-38).

The Roman Governor marvelled at the patience of Christ. Our Lord gave us an example of patient endurance under persecution (1 Pet. 2:21-23). It is possible for us to witness for Christ by our actions and attitude, as well as by our speech (1 Pet. 2:12; 3:15-18).

How incongruous that the Jews should desire to have Barabbas released rather than the Christ! They were mad with hate. So do evil men love and choose the wicked, but despise and spurn the good.

Pilate was perhaps more weak in action than wicked in thought, but one cannot help despising him for his cruel pride and vacillation. This was a mere mock trial, with no real charge, no true witnesses, no adequate opportunity for defence. The judge was swayed by fear of the people and by the dread of losing his position. He would not stand by his conviction that Christ was without fault, but gave sentence against truth and justice, against the evidence submitted, against the advice of his wife, and against his own conscience (Lk. 23:14, 15, 22; John 18:38). No wonder he attempted to shift upon others the responsibility for the verdict!

All were guilty in the eyes of God—Judas, the crowd, the Sanhedrin Council, Herod and Pilate. In fact, Scripture teaches that all of us who have sinned are considered as having part in the crucifixion of Christ (Acts 2:23). Every sin is primarily against God (2 Sam. 12:13; Psa. 51:4).

Pilate trifled when great issues were at stake (Heb. 2:1-4). Each individual is faced with the decision of his attitude toward the Lord Jesus Christ. Let us encourage those under our influence to crown Him as Saviour and Lord.

III. The Scourging of Jesus—verses 27 to 35. Read also Mk. 15:16-21.

It was for us that the Saviour died on the cross, and it was for us that He endured all the shame and sorrow (1 Pet. 3:18). We bow in adoration, gratitude and love to Him for His suffering on our behalf. Such boundless love and grace call for our whole-hearted surrender to Him.

The Roman soldiers mocked the Saviour's claims as King. How little they knew that their actions foreshadowed the future when they placed upon Him a scarlet robe for a robe of state, a diadem of thorns for a crown, and gave Him a reed for a sceptre (Rev. 19:11-16)! Their hollow plaudits and false obeisance speak to us of the day when every tongue shall confess Him, either willingly or unwillingly, and every knee shall bow before Him as subject or suppliant, in confidence or in fear (Phil. 2:9-11). Those who will not receive Him as Saviour in the day of grace must acknowledge Him as Judge in the day of wrath (Psa. 76:7-9; Rev. 6:15-17).

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man".....	\$1.00
"Other Little Ships"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed" (The story of Jarvis St. Church)	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
25 copies	1.00
Russellism or Rutherfordism, (103 pages)35
"The Papacy—In the Light of Scripture"10
"Why I Believe the Rapture Cannot Precede the Tribulation." Also "The Meaning of the Parousia". In Booklet of 32 pages10
20 copies	1.00
The Gospel Witness, published weekly, per annum.....	2.00

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.