

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. 49

TORONTO, APRIL 10, 1941

Whole Number 986

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE GENESIS OF TRUE LOVE

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, March 3rd, 1940

(Stenographically Reported)

"For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead;

"And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."—II. Corinthians 5:14, 15.

As a bank teller needs to know how to distinguish between genuine and counterfeit money, from the note of largest denomination to the smallest coin, if he would avoid being deceived and defrauded by others—and equally, to avoid unwittingly defrauding others—so the Christian must learn to recognize and differentiate between the genuine and the false in religious currency to avoid impoverishing others, or being impoverished himself. For there is much counterfeit religion, even, if I may so say, in the smaller coins of verbal religious exchange.

It is popular, because it is easy and superficial, to conceive of Christianity, of Christian salvation, as an objective something that may be bought as a garment in a store, and possessed and worn as a thing apart from the man himself; and to think of every aspect of the Christian religion as a supplementary adornment, or as an accessory or gadget which may be added piece by piece as an extra, but as never becoming an essential part of the whole.

When in the first creation God made man, He made him complete, breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul. And the new creation is no less radical and complete. It is more than something done for a man: it is equally something done in him. Hence, whether we speak of faith, or hope, or love, it is not an ornament about the neck, or a superficial, sensuous emotion: it is something wrought in the man by the Divine Spirit, and made by grace an essential and inseparable part of the new life in the soul.

So then I propose to show you that even love is a fruit of the Spirit rather than a product of the will; and that in the formation and development of Christian character all the functions of the mind are renewed and employed by the Spirit of God, in the production of the final result. In short, that the new life does no violence to reason or to any natural function of the mind, but rather sublimates them to holy uses and issues.

I propose to reduce my exposition to the simple terms of a logical proposition, and show you the major and minor premises of faith, leading inevitably to love's conclusion.

I.

FAITH'S MAJOR PREMISE. Faith "*judges*", *reasons*, and *appraises the values of life*. Faith is capable of estimating the value of its Object, and considering whether or not the Lord Jesus Christ may be wholly trusted. Faith, as a matter of fact, is as a counsel which assembles all the facts for the judgment of all the faculties of the mind. God does not impose Himself on us, but floods the whole man with light, so that we are able to judge and to distinguish between things that differ.

I know that faith is the gift of God, but how is faith wrought in the soul? How does God give faith? "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent?" "Faith cometh by hearing", and by hearing we receive the word of God;

and on the basis of that which is revealed to us in the Word of God, we are enabled to exercise the functions of the mind, and to believe.

I believe grave injury has been done to the cause of Christ by substituting mere exhortation for exposition, the persuasions of men for the illumination of the Holy Ghost. It is folly for me to exhort you to believe—believe—believe, without explaining what you are to believe, and in Whom you are to believe. Hence this text tells us that faith judges. A man becomes a Christian, under God, by His grace and through the illumination and quickening power of the Spirit, by the exercise of the faculties of the mind.

I say this to emphasize the importance of using our intelligence even in religious matters. You know how commonly to-day the reception of spiritual gifts is supposed to be conditioned upon one's subjection to a kind of aphasia in which the mind is wholly passive. Someone goes off into a swoon, a kind of hysteria where he is no longer responsible for his actions—and in that state of unconsciousness, as though subject to a religious anaesthetic, he becomes the subject of a spiritual operation, and receives the Holy Ghost.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. God never asks us to suspend our reason. He never suppresses the mind. God did not make a machine: He made a man. And, making a man, He made him a thinking animal. He gave man intelligence; He gave him a will; and His method of entering human nature and renewing it and restoring it to its divine quality is by appealing to the intelligence, quickening all the powers of the mind, and enabling a man to say, "Because of so-and-so, I thus judge."

Sometimes people are expected to allow themselves to be sung into a religious frame. I am sure that great injury has been done by that mass psychology. I do not object to large meetings. I do not object to large choirs. I do not object to any kind of music that is worshipful. But I am sure that, at the expense of reason and intelligence, people are sometimes brought into an emotional frame that has led them to call themselves Christians when the mind has been passive; it has not been active; it has not responded to the appeal of the Spirit.

Years ago when I was pastor of a little church—the first church I ever had—I was asked to assist in some evangelistic meetings in the little Methodist church, and I gladly agreed. People went to church in those days, even on week-nights. One week-evening we had a crowded church. It was not a large building, but so far as it could contain people, it was full.

I saw two of the officers of that church walk down the aisle a little while after the service had begun, with a man between them. They looked like private detectives, with a man under arrest. The one officer went in the pew first, quite near the front, the man virtually under arrest next, and the other officer followed. When I had finished preaching the Methodist Pastor gave an invitation; and as he did so, the man on the inside did a little pushing, and the man on the outside a little pulling, and between them they got the arrested man up to the front. They got him down on his knees, and then the minister asked all "the praying brethren and sisters to come up to the front and get around the man who was seeking the Saviour." A few of the brethren prayed after the minister said, "Let us pray him into the kingdom." In a little while they began to sing, and the

preacher said, "Let us sing him into the kingdom." And what with singing and praying, they managed to get him in!

They did not bring him face to face with the Word of God. They did not ask him to judge anything. They prayed and sang, and sang and prayed; and then asked him if he felt better. I suppose he replied, as they say in parliament, in the "affirmative". They seemed to be very happy that they had got this man "into the kingdom". I do not know what time between night and morning he got out again, but he was certainly out the next day!

I have put it in a way that seems almost amusing, but it is a serious matter. I have seen it on scores of occasions since, where appeals have been made exclusively to the emotions, to the sensuous nature, instead of to an enlightened intelligence. A friend wrote me last week, and in his letter expressed something of which I had not thought. He asked, "Did you ever think of this, that four out of five of the senses contributed to Jacob's deception: his smell, his taste, his hearing, his touch. In everything he was deceived."

We can be deceived by all forms of sensuous religions; but "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." It is by revelation from God, through an enlightened mind, that faith is wrought in the soul.

With what facts does the enlightened reason deal? Paul here says, "We thus judge." He thought about it. He considered the record, and said, "I have reached this conclusion, that He died for all." I spoke to you last Sunday evening of the death of Christ: I speak of it again. It must always be the minister's theme, for it is the centre and foundation of our faith. In some mysterious way, Jesus Christ died for all. He did not die for Himself: there was a substitutionary, vicarious, element in His death. It must have been so. And this man says, "We thus judge."

There was a time when Saul of Tarsus did not believe that. He was well aware of the historical fact that one Jesus of Nazareth had been crucified—and he believed that He deserved the death He had died. Moreover, he believed that all who followed after Him were deserving of like treatment. Saul knew of the historical Jesus before he was converted, but he did not understand it. He would have told you that Jesus of Nazareth died; but there came a revelation from Heaven by which he learned that He Who died was not in the grave, but in glory. When Saul answered that Voice and said, "Who art thou, Lord", and Jesus Christ answered, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest", the fact of the resurrection and ascension of Christ threw a flood of light on the assembled facts of which Saul was already appraised; and he saw it in a new light, and learned that the death of Christ was a death in behalf of others, and that He "died for all".

And from that he reasoned, "Then were all dead", as our Version has it; or as the Revised Version gives it, "Then all died." Meaning not only that we were deserving of death, but that the death which we had merited had been executed upon us in the person of our Substitute. Said he, "Now I understand. This is my judgment, the judgment of an illuminated mind, that when Jesus Christ died on the cross, He died for all; and if

that be so, then all must have died in Him." His was an atoning death. Upon that basic fact all that follows in the Christian life depends. We must be right there. That is Faith's major premise. That is the beginning of the argument of faith. Paul sums it up in his first epistle to these Corinthians: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." It is an old, old story. It is not an old story in Toronto. Comparatively few of the pulpits in Toronto preach it. But failing in an apprehension of that great fact, that He died for our sins, we are wrong everywhere.

II.

Let us go a little farther. I have said that is the major premise, that is the beginning of the logic of faith. HERE IS THE MINOR, THAT HE DIED FOR ALL FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE: "And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."

Faith still reasons. We cannot be too particular about that. A mother said to me Thursday evening, "I am ceaselessly thankful that we were brought here, and that our children attend a Sunday School where the Bible is taught. I have known many people, friends who, in their own personal faith, were soundly evangelical; but their children went to a Sunday School where the Word of God was not taught, and they drifted away." Why? There was no basic or rock principle which their faith could rest upon. How could they "hear without a preacher"? "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

All the way through life the same principle holds. This man *not only judged as to the foundation of things, but as to the result of it.* Whatever there is of grace in us becomes part of us. There is a great saying in the Lord's interpretation of the parable of the sower. He described certain people as having "no root in themselves". The seed that fell upon stony ground did not penetrate the soil, did not wrap its roots deeply around the subsoil; its hold upon the soil was superficial. There are some who have "no root in themselves". Their religion is something that is put on; it is a habit of life; it is a form of conduct; it is the pursuit of an ideal; it is the result of a voluntary discipline, something apart from the man himself. When the new life that God gives is imparted to the soul, it becomes a part of the man, an integer, an integral part, something that cannot be wrenched away from him.

As faith begins with an enlightened intelligence, so it is enlarged, and *all the virtues of the Christian life grow out of a fuller knowledge of Christ.* That is why we must go on in our study of the Word of God. It is not enough that I turn to a few passages and say, "I know these; I am launched on the Christian life." We are always to be judging with the judgment of faith. We must always be growing up, and are to have grace and peace "multiplied unto (us) through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord". The death of Christ becomes to the student of divine things, a permanent subject of study. Said Paul, "I saw Him; I learned that He died for me; and, having learned that, I concentrate my attention upon that great fact, that He died; and I am going to discover, as God helps me, the full sig-

nificance of it. I am going to find out what His death accomplished for me, and what benefit resides in that fact, and may be derived from that fact." Then he said, "I judge this further, that He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."

In other words, Paul tells us that Christ did not die merely to bring us out of prison, but *to teach us, and to enable us to live after we get out of prison.* He did not die merely to pay the penalty of our sin, but to make it possible that new powers might be released that would so energize the life He has given that we may be other than we used to be—"That they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves."

Oh my brethren and sisters, how many of us who profess and call ourselves Christians have learned that Christ died in order that from our appreciation of that fact, we should never more live for ourselves? How few there are who do not put self first! How few of those who are called Christians know anything about unselfish service! Said this man, "I have learned that He died that this self-life of mine might be carried to the cross and crucified for Him. I have learned that He died that I should not henceforth"—What a departure! Shall I nurse that for a moment?

I come to the cross, I see its significance, I yield my heart to it—with what result? That I must not henceforth ever be as I was before I saw that cross. On the other side of the cross when the wise men came to Bethlehem and found the Lord Jesus, and worshipped Him, and presented unto Him gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrrh, "being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way." I am sure that if we really see Christ, we are bound to live henceforth "another way".

That is *the logical deduction of faith.* If that substitutionary Sacrifice was really what we believe, then self was crucified at the cross. Faith reasons, summons all the resources of the mind to the reinforcement of its resolution to give itself wholly to Christ. You remember how this same Paul, writing by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, to the Romans, said, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." It is the least that may be expected of us in view of the cross, "that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."

What was the purpose of the cross? To redeem us to Himself. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people", or a people for His own peculiar purpose. That, coming to Him, we might henceforth become His, His exclusively; that we might henceforth not live unto ourselves, but unto Him "which died . . . and rose again."

That is *the objective of the Christian life.* Not to live for other people primarily, but *to live for Him.* And you cannot live for Him without living for others. But we need to learn that, that we were redeemed from iniquity that He might purify unto Himself a people for His own purpose and possession. We are His property. Paul delighted to speak of himself as the bondsman of Christ. He said, "He bought me; He paid for me; I am not my own: I am bought with a price."

III.

What is THE CONCLUSION OF IT? "The love of Christ constraineth us." We have here a definition of love, by implication. *Love is the product of an enlightened reason.* Someone says, "I did not know that love had anything to do with reason." I have seen much sentiment that has no relation to reason! Love at first sight? Love at first sight runs on the rock at the first sight of someone else! That is not, in any true sense, love. "The love of Christ constraineth us; because"—Because! That is a woman's word? Well, it may be. Very often she uses the word but does not proceed with the argument. You can say, "because," and put a dash after it. But "because" is a logician's word, properly.

A man said in the prayer meeting last Saturday with his Bible in his hand, "I love the 'because's' and the 'therefores' of the Scripture." He gave us several substantial passages of Scripture, which had those words in them. "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge." True love is based upon certain reasons. "We love him because he first loved us." True love, even among men and women, must have something more than mere sentiment to support it. That does not last long. It is the outgrowth of knowledge and respect. You know a certain person, and you study him or her; and in due course you come to an appreciation of the person's character. You say, "He is a good man", or, "She is a good woman." Little by little as you come to know that person better, that respect ripens into a genuine affection, until you are able to say, "I love the man because he is worthy of being loved. He is a good man. My love grows out of my knowledge of him."

So of Christian love. We are constrained; not merely impelled or compelled. *We are held together.* The love of Christ makes life coherent. It unifies the whole. It holds us together, makes us "steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as (we) know that our labour is not in vain in the Lord." Hence our love of Christ is enriched by our knowledge and experience of Him.

We are constrained by the love of Christ because all our resources of reason and intelligence contribute to the knowledge that He is worthy to be loved. "Love not in word", says the Scripture, "but in deed." I have heard people address the Majesty of heaven by the use of rather cheap and superficial adjectives. It is not enough to speak of the King of kings, and Lord of lords, the Prince of life, the One Whose name is "called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace;" but they are fond of using such adjectives as "dear", "precious" Jesus. Omit your adjectives! He does not need them. "Love not in word." Your love of Christ, or mine, will not be proved by our words: it will be made evident if and when all there is of us is held together and consecrated and borne forward by the love of Christ. That love of Christ constrains us to live, not for ourselves, but for Him Who "loved us, and gave himself for us".

One of the most influential, dynamic personalities I ever met in my life was the late Dr. Russell Conwell of Philadelphia. I met him first many years ago, and he was not a young man then. At the time I first knew him, he was lecturing over two hundred nights a year; he spent much of his life on the train. I went with him to the station that night, and asked him the number of

his berth. "Unfortunately," he said, "I could not get a berth; I shall have to sit up." That was in London, Ontario. He got on the train at midnight, to sit up all night, and then lecture in New York the next night—he was always on the go.

Dr. Conwell founded in Philadelphia Temple University and the Temple Baptist Church. The church used to be called Grace Baptist Church, and it grew to tremendous proportions under his ministry. He began the Temple University in the basement of his church, and it now has a student enrolment about twice that of Toronto University—growing out of the inspiration of that one life.

I met Dr. Conwell many times after that, and had the honour of having him in my home. He said to me one day when I met him at the station, "I want to see where you live." He came up to the house, and we talked about things of mutual interest. He told me of his experience in the establishment and development of Temple University, which at that time had a faculty of nearly four hundred professors. I do not know what the student body was then. He said to me rather sadly, "There was a time when I needed money, and I tried everywhere to get it, but could not get any. All I had in the world was a house: that represented my total assets. When I could not do anything else, I went to a mortgage company and said I wanted them to give me the biggest mortgage they could on the house. I borrowed all the money they would lend me, and gave it over to the Treasurer of Temple University." He smiled and continued, "That was many years ago—and the Trustees of Temple University have allowed me to pay interest on that mortgage until this day: I am still paying it. I used to think I would have a place where I could retire when the day was done, but I shall never have it."

Dr. Conwell always had a long list of students whom he helped. He would deliver a lecture, deduct his travelling expenses from the last appointment, and then assign what was left to the student next on the list. Once when he was here we gave him one hundred and fifty dollars the night he left. When we had paid the advertising we found we had seventy-five dollars left, and I sent it on to him. He wrote me a letter and said, "I wish you could have seen the student's face to whom that lecture was assigned. You would have enjoyed his expression when I called him in and told him there was another seventy-five dollars coming to him."

Dr. Conwell kept nothing for himself from his tours. One lecture alone earned far more than a million dollars, and he gave every cent of it away. He died with nothing to leave behind. Dr. MacArthur of New York said to me once, "Conwell is the most wonderful man I ever met. He has come into my office just off the train after sitting up all night—and perhaps for two or three nights—when he could scarcely put one foot before another. Yet I have seen him go on to a platform a few hours later and lecture as though he had done nothing for a month but get ready for it—and then get on a train and go off again."

One day when he was here I took him to the station and said, "Doctor, what is your programme?" He told me, and I said, "For the summer?" "Yes; I have extra lectures in the summer, sometimes lecture two or three times a day." "That is a heavy programme." "Yes, but I have always two days' work to do, my own job,

and a day's work to do for the young man who died for me."

This is the story. I can tell it to you, for I have told it once before. Dr. Conwell came to lecture in Jarvis Street on one occasion, and we had to put him to bed in the hotel. The insurance companies, his life was so valuable, sent a nurse with him to keep him on his feet and alive for as long as possible. That night he could not lecture, and this auditorium was packed with expectant hearers. I told them the story of Conwell's life, and took the collection! The next day I gave Dr. Conwell a cheque for two hundred and fifty dollars, and he asked me where I got it. "I took the collection last night." And he replied, "You beat all. The idea of inviting people to hear a lecture, and get two hundred and fifty dollars out of them when they did not hear it." "That was their response when I told them your story," I said. "You have not lost your night, and your student will get his help just the same."

Conwell was a commissioned officer, captain, and later a colonel in the American Civil War. When he was a Captain on leave he went back to the little town where he was born, and was presented with a sword, richly ornamented, an expensive sword that was made not for use so much as for ornament. Conwell used to tell about the presentation—but that is another story.

There was a boy called Johnny Ring in the town who had conceived a great admiration and affection for Captain Conwell. He tried to get into the regular army, but because he was a diminutive little chap, he could not qualify. Their regulations were different from ours, and he was permitted to go as Conwell's batman; and he went with him to the war. He used to look after Conwell, and one of his prized possessions was the Captain's sword, which was hung on the tent pole when they camped. Johnny made it his special care to look after it.

One day they were camping at a bridgehead, and were suddenly surprised by a superior number of the enemy. It was no use to fight: there was nothing for them to do but run, to retire. They retreated across the wooden bridge, an old-fashioned covered bridge, and after they got to the other side they set fire to it so that they might not be pursued by the enemy. Just as Johnny got to the other side of the bridge, he remembered he had left the Captain's sword. He dashed into that blazing tunnel, went through the fire back to the tent, snatched the sword, and re-entered that inferno.

The enemy had approached by this time, and saw what was transpiring. So struck with admiration for the heroism of that lad was the officer of the other side that he commanded, "Cease fire." The opposing companies watched from either side until presently Johnny Ring emerged on the far side, his clothing in flames, but holding in his hand the sword with which his Captain had been honoured. He got to the end of the bridge, staggered and fell over on the river bank. Men of the company went down to help him. He was terribly burned, and all but suffocated. Gripping the sword in his hand he said, "Give the Captain his sword"—and died.

Johnny Ring was a Christian: Conwell was not. Every day as he had opportunity, Johnny, even in the presence of his Captain, would open his Bible and read. Many a time the Captain had made fun of him—not bitterly, pleasantly enough; but still he had taunted him. Yet Johnny had persisted; he had kept his flag flying. When

Conwell knelt at the side of that little boy now dead, he gave himself to Christ, and vowed that, God helping him, for the rest of his life he would reckon it an obligation to do at least two men's work. And so he did until life was ended.

How many thousands were blessed by his ministry, only God knows; but it was all through the inspiration of the consistent testimony of Johnny Ring that made Conwell a Christian through the reception of Christ. And afterward he was constrained by that dual love, the love of the faithful boy's memory, and the still greater love of his Lord.

Something like that, but infinitely more than that, is wrapped up in this text. This man, Saul of Tarsus, who was an enemy of Christ, who thought he "ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth", came at last under His spell, and yielded to His sceptre; and, understanding His sacrifice, became ever afterward His willing slave.

So ought it to be with us. He died for us. Oh, He died for us! He died for us! He died for us, that we "which live should not henceforth live unto (ourselves), but unto him which died for (us), and rose again." So should the love of Christ constrain us to be true to the gospel which we are allowed of God to put in trust with. So should it constrain us to make Him known to others who need Him even as we do. So should it bear us forward in every possible sort of heroic service in His name, so that we may be ourselves the representation of that Love that laid down itself for us.

"O Love, that wilt not let me go,
I rest my weary soul in Thee;
I give Thee back the life I owe,
That in Thine ocean depths its flow
May richer, fuller be.

"O Light, that followest all my way,
I yield my flickering torch to Thee;
My heart restores its borrowed ray,
That in Thy sunshine's blaze its day
May brighter, fairer be.

"O Joy, that seekest me through pain,
I cannot close my heart to Thee;
I trace the rainbow through the rain,
And feel the promise is not vain
That morn shall tearless be.

"O cross, that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from thee;
I lay in dust life's glory dead,
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be."

Dr. Shields Continues to Improve

Dr. Shields is discovering these days that casts are not made for comfort, but nevertheless he continues to improve and is hoping to get out of his cast and get into a coat in time to preach in Jarvis Street on the thirty-first anniversary of the beginning of his ministry at Jarvis Street on Sunday, May 18. In the meantime his many friends of THE GOSPEL WITNESS family will join with the members of Jarvis Street Church and hosts of other friends in wishing him a speedy recovery and in remembering him before the throne of Grace.—W.

The Pope, "The Gospel Witness", and "The Globe and Mail"

By Rev. W. Gordon Brown, M.A.

On the C.B.C. noon broadcast of Wednesday, April 2nd, we were told of the hour's audience (to be exact, 65 minutes) the Japanese Foreign Minister, Matsuoka had with the Roman Pontiff. A later conference of 45 minutes with the Papal Secretary of State is also reported. According to the broadcast, the Pope said:

"I have sent the apostolic blessing to your dear far off country."

Pope Blesses Birds of Prey

Under the title, "Pope Blesses Birds of Prey", and as a last minute article, we changed the make-up of THE GOSPEL WITNESS last week to insert the report of the Pope's benediction. We said, in part:

"Father Lanphier and Father Battle are constantly telling us over the Catholic Hour broadcast by the Radio League of St. Michael that Roman Catholics are praying and working for British victory, yet these Reverend Fathers owe supreme allegiance on earth to one whom they call His Holiness and believe to be the vicegerent of Christ.

"Will Father Lanphier or Father Battle, or whatever Father broadcasts next Sunday, please explain the apostolic blessing upon the eastern vulture?"

Pontiff Compliments Matsuoka

THE GOSPEL WITNESS appears on Thursdays, and on Friday morning *The Globe and Mail* had a leading 14-inch editorial beginning:

"MEASURE OF STATESMANSHIP"

"The despatch from Rome attributing highly complimentary remarks by His Holiness to the Japanese Foreign Minister Yosuke Matsuoka, must leave the intelligent world bewildered. Matsuoka went to the Italian capital as the representative of one angle of the Axis, after visiting Moscow and Berlin, a tour manifestly not concerned with the welfare of peoples who believe in liberties, either religious or political. He is reported to have had a sixty-five-minute private audience with the Pope and a later conference lasting three-quarters of an hour with the Papal Secretary of State. The Pontiff is alleged to have expressed pleasure with the audience, called Matsuoka a great statesman and given Japan his blessing.

"The Vatican has not been blessing totalitarian nations and giving cheer to their emissaries."

No reader of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, we presume, at least no regular reader, would be "bewildered" by the "highly complimentary remarks by His Holiness".

The editorial continues:

"The Vatican has not been blessing totalitarian nations and giving cheer to their emissaries."

This, of course, has not been the position taken by THE GOSPEL WITNESS. See such editions as the following:

- "The Pope's 'Fine Italian Hand' in Petain's Treachery"
- "The Pope's Fifth Column—Everywhere"
- "Why Should the Pope Help Hitler?"
- "How Hitlerism and the Papal Inquisition Confirm the Historical Truth of Scripture"
- "The Religious Significance of the Rout of the Papacy's Italian Allies"
- "Can We Believe the Pope?"

We shall not here repeat all that was said there, but shall be glad to supply back copies, as far as possible, to those desiring them.

Romanism and Freedom

Further on in this editorial, *The Globe and Mail* remarks:

"The Pope is respected by fair-minded people of all creeds, Protestant as well as Catholic. As the head of a great Church his word is final with millions around the earth. There are more than 20,000,000 faithful Catholics in the United States, a country insulted right and left by Japanese statesmanship. There are millions of devout followers in Canada. What effect is such valuation likely to have on them?"

"We cannot think of freedom to worship apart from democracy".

Let no one suppose that Catholicism and democracy are synonymous. Far closer cousins are Catholicism and totalitarianism. In its very nature Roman Catholicism is corporative; in fact, an article by a member of the Society of Jesus, so-called, that is a Jesuit, in the March number of *The Catholic Digest*, appeared under the heading "Corporative Democracy"—whatever that is!

Does the writer in *The Globe and Mail* pretend to think that freedom of worship has ever been, or is being, or ever will be, fostered by the Roman Catholic Church? All history belies any such implication or hope. We need democracy for freedom of worship, but we cannot have freedom of worship if we have the domination of Rome. There have been too many martyrs who laid down their lives for religious freedom, for us ever to believe that the way to freedom is the power of Rome.

Father Battle's Explanation to "The Globe"

But last Sunday Father Battle devoted a considerable portion of the Catholic noon hour on the radio to answering *The Globe's* editorial, and, of course, incidentally, we say modestly, to answering THE GOSPEL WITNESS, whose remarks preceded those of *The Globe and Mail*. The general impression we got from the reverend Father's words was that he really had quite a hard time, and that the Pope's action required a great deal of explaining, and the explanation required pressing, and the pressing required some more explaining. Altogether, in our opinion, the Father went round in circles. However, this is only our opinion.

Can Holiness Be Neutral?

He said:

"While the Pope must remain neutral to pleas and opinions, there can be no question of his position in regard to Nazism and Fascism."

If the Pope is against Nazism and Fascism, as Father Battle wants us to think, why should he be neutral? Our outcry against it, our sweat and tears and blood, are not mere "opinions", though they may be "pleas". This is a war for righteousness. The issue is perfectly clear. If one whom they call "His Holiness" is half as holy as he

claims to be, how can he remain neutral? The Pope poses as the world's infallible teacher of faith and morals. Here is a moral question, and no one can be moral and remain neutral on moral questions.

Let it not be objected that this is a political struggle. We suppose it is, though it is morally political, and politically moral; but even Father Battle has to admit that

"as sovereign of the Vatican City, he (the Pope) has temporal relations with every nation on the face of the globe."

The Pope is admittedly a political power; his political state has political "relations with every nation on the face of the globe." Then why does he not fight? How noble a spectacle it would be for the little Vatican City to declare war on Mussolini and Fascism, and Hitler and Nazism, and the whole totalitarian evil—including Matsuoka and Nipponism!

Fascist Delegate at Ottawa

But we are not at all sure that the Pope is neutral. The *Osservatore Romano*, back in February, said:

"The Church cannot be called upon to favour one (contrasting system) more than the other".

This is supposed to mean that the Pope is neutral. But as we said in THE GOSPEL WITNESS of February 27th, for instance:

The Pope is neutral! Therefore his ambassadors must be neutral! The papal ambassador to Canada, whose official title is Apostolic Delegate, resides in Ottawa. His name is Monsignor Antoniutti. His Fascist allegiance is known at least to the Italian public, and there are well over one hundred thousand Italians in Canada. Before he came to this country, he was Papal Delegate to Franco's Spain. It is not usual, we understand, for the Apostolic Delegate to act as a bishop in visiting local parishes, but Mgr. Antoniutti has done this in Quebec. The neutrality of the Pope is hardly demonstrated by this his official emissary in Canada.

But to return to Father Battle. He tried to hide behind the idea that the reports about the Pope might be wrong. Indeed, *The Globe and Mail* editorial says:

"Surely the despatch from Rome needs re-checking!"

Father Battle put it this way:

"We do not know whether these reports about the Pope's blessing are true or false."

He then went on to refer to the reports of the bishops at Fulda, who, according to Father Battle, were reported by Nazi press agents to have said things they did not say, in favour of Nazism.

Niemöller and Catholicism

Just here, then, we should like to remind Father Battle and his confrere, Father Lanphier, that it is good for a man to be consistent, and for reverend fathers, and more particularly for those reverend fathers who declare their views to the public in broadcasts over Canadian Broadcasting Corporation stations. Recently this Catholic Hour gave us the report that the martyr Niemöller desired to enter the Catholic Church. Of course, we were told that this was just a report; but it was put out with evident avidity by the broadcast to which we refer. This report has since been denied again and again. We published one denial last week. Here is another from *Time*, of April 7th:

"TRIPLE DENIAL

"Catholic, Protestant and Nazi officials in Berlin all issued denials last week that Protestantism's martyr, Pastor Martin Niemöller had turned Catholic in prison.

"Said the head of the Evangelical Church: 'I have never heard any word of Niemöller wanting to leave Lutheranism.' Said a high Catholic prelate: 'Niemöller has not applied through any channel for Catholic membership.' Said a Government official: 'Again that question? Well, again we must say nonsense'."

We may add that Dr. Adolph Keller of Geneva, General Secretary of the European Central Office of Inter-church Aid, visited Pastor Niemöller, and, according to the Washington (D.C.) *Star* of February 11th, said that the Lutheran pastor did speak about a "catholic" faith, but he meant the word in the sense of "general". His mind has been agitated with the idea of Christian reunion, but, said the authoritative reporter, the one church which Pastor Niemöller would probably exclude from any system of reunion would be the Roman Catholic Church. We strongly, but respectfully suggest to the reverend fathers of the Radio League of St. Michael that they publish this next Sunday, especially in view of the fact that we are not allowed to carry on controversy over the C.B.C. stations, and so to refute such reports as the reverend fathers fostered about the anti-Nazi Niemöller.

Tell It to the Marines!

Father Battle also said last Sunday:

"No political significance is ever attached to any blessing upon any country."

He said that all kinds of people were very cordially received by the Pope at all times, and he prays for the spiritual welfare of all peoples.

Even *The Globe and Mail* attached some political significance to the blessing given Japan, and, according to the reports, "His Holiness" said "Mr. Matsuoka is a great statesman." To reply that

"no political significance is ever attached to any blessing upon any country"

is quite inadequate. Tell that to the marines!

Who Are the Bigots?

Here is Father Battle again, and this paragraph is what led us to assume, though wrongly, according to our later information, that he was speaking against *The Gospel Witness*, for surely he would not accuse *The Globe and Mail* of bigotry! Judge for yourself!

"We are sorry that religious bigotry did not pass away with the horse and buggy To me bigotry has always been not only an evil thing, but the silliest of things. The relations between Catholics and Protestants have improved during the last sixty years. Only some come along to upset the applecart."

Talk about religious bigotry always comes strangely from a Roman Catholic priest. Rome is the most bigoted church in the world. They believe they are the only church; that all who are not members of that church will be eternally lost. Through the ages they have burned millions of people for daring to differ. The doctrine of intolerance, the right to burn heretics, is still part of Rome's doctrine. And yet they talk to us Protestants about bigotry! Father Battle may be a very fine man, and may have had amicable relations with Protestants, and may desire to continue them, but for someone to point out the way in which Rome is not only failing to stand against evil, but is taking sides with evil, is surely not bigotry.

Civil and Ecclesiastical Threats

Father Battle continued:

"The civil authorities don't desire any friction."

Is this a threat? Rome has a habit of calling in the civil arm. She would do it again to-day if she could. Witness the recent speech of Mr. MacDonald in the House of Commons, Ottawa, and two speeches of Mr. Belanger in the Parliament of Ontario, in which these men desire the banning of THE GOSPEL WITNESS and the silencing of its Editor, the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church.

The Northwest Review, in an editorial of April 3rd, complains because Magistrate A. C. Campbell in a provincial police court, in sentencing a member of Jehovah's Witnesses for selling their literature, said

"he was inclined to leniency because he thought the defendant had acted according to his conscience."

This Roman Catholic weekly is very cross, and threatens "muscular Christianity" by Catholics. It is altogether unfortunate that the advocates of Rome should so constantly, both directly and indirectly, refer to the prohibition of the one religious organization which has been banned by the Defence of Canada Regulations, as a worthy example for the authorities, and as a precedent to be followed in the case of all who speak against the Roman Catholic Church. As Dr. Shields said:

"We are quite sure that the Government will recognize that there is nothing that would tend to disgrace it so much as an attempt to make the Defence of Canada Regulations serve the purpose of the Roman Catholic propaganda department."

Surfeited and Hurt

We quote Father Battle again:

"Catholics and Protestants of good will are about surfeited with such stuff."

Of course, the Roman Catholics have never liked anything said against them, and we do not suppose they do now. It is unfortunate, however, that they are "surfeited" already for THE GOSPEL WITNESS still has a lot to say!

Now listen to Father Battle:

"There is no question at all but that Catholics are hurt when matters like this crop up."

Catholics are hurt! Starved? Beaten? Killed? No;—just "hurt"! The reason we call attention to the Pope's remarks in praise of Matsuoka and his blessing upon Japan is because the Japanese have plundered, tortured, starved, slaughtered, Chinese by the thousands. Why should not the Catholics of this country, and Father Battle in particular, be hurt over *their* plight to such an extent as to stand up like men, as Britishers, not to say professed Christians, and denounce anyone who praises a man, or invokes God's blessing upon a country, guilty of such atrocities?

FRENCH TRACTS

Some thousands of attractively printed Gospel tracts were published by the Union last week, and the stock is exhausted already. We are ordering five thousand more which should be off the press next week. If any of our readers have French-speaking friends or neighbours we should be glad to send them copies. The ministry of the printed page is a powerful one, but it is also costly and we especially ask all our churches to remember the ministry of these tracts in prayer and the cost of them in their givings to our treasury.

"Mr. Matsuoka Is a Great Statesman" —Pius XII.

"Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."—Romans 1:32.

"For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."—2 John 11.

When we read that the Pope had not only received the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs in special audience but had also sent his pontifical blessing to that "dear, far off country" of Japan, we were not surprised. It had already been reported that the one who arrogates to himself the title of "His Holiness" had given his blessing to both Italian and German soldiers. But the two verses of Scripture printed at the head of this article came to our mind, and we suggest that our readers ponder them in connection with the commendatory statements "His Holiness" made regarding one of the leaders of Japan, a nation whose hands are red with the blood of countless thousands of helpless and hapless peaceful and peace-loving Chinese.

Two proverbs also suggested themselves to us in this connection: "A man is known by the company he keeps", and "Birds of a feather flock together". The latter proverb recalls the remark of one of our professors who used to like to quote it as he looked up at a certain row where the dunces congregated, "And," he used to add, "sometimes they get plucked". In students' slang, "plucked" is the word for "failed". And some day these Axis birds are going to be plucked—one has already lost much plumage. In that day the Pope will look for new friends. Will he find them in the company of heretical England that his successors have so often and so cordially cursed?

But will someone object that the pontifical blessing of Japan had a religious and not a political significance; that it was really a prayer for the conversion of the Japanese people to Roman Catholicism? But that is merely another way of saying that the Pope used language to conceal his thought; not to reveal it. That would be nothing less than casuistry, trickery, deceit. Is that what the "Holy Father" meant to do?

And again, if the Papal blessing of "dear, far off" Japan was in reality no more than a prayer for its conversion, then pray tell what might be the meaning of the Victory Mass and the prayer composed by the Canadian Cardinal and recited by Hon. Ernest Lapointe in Notre Dame? In such a case, all that mummery was nothing else than a prayer for the victory of the Roman Church over its enemies, including, of course, Protestant Britain. And for anything that was said in the prayer recited by Mr. Lapointe, that may well be its real meaning.

With respect to the Pope's statement that "Mr. Matsuoka is a great Statesman", *The Globe and Mail* of Toronto asked the following question in a leading editorial: "There are more than 20,000,000 faithful Catholics in the United States, a country insulted right and left by Japanese statesmanship. There are millions of devout followers in Canada. What effect is such valuation likely to have on them?"

And again *The Globe and Mail* asks, "We have no religious or racial prejudices, but cannot avoid asking on what basis a Japanese Foreign Secretary touring in be-

(Continued on page 10)

Another Arbitrary Assumption Exploded

Arbitrary assumptions are of as much value in erecting a solid governmental structure as quicksand is in laying the foundation of a house. Yet with a brutally amazing frankness, or should we say with ingenuousness, the learned Royal Commissioners responsible for the Sirois Report calmly made a huge assumption on which to base some of the sweeping recommendations of their report, and then brazenly labelled it as "arbitrary". On page 125 Volume II of that report we read the following words:

"... no province would receive a payment to enable it to improve inferior services if it had chosen to have inferior services in order to tax its residents less severely than the average. The only exception to this general method was in the case of Quebec where the notable work of the Church in the fields of education and public welfare could neither be ignored nor measured in monetary terms. Consequently, in the case of Quebec it was necessary to make the arbitrary assumption that the contribution of the Church brought education and welfare service standards up to the national average." (Emphasis ours).

When the editor of this paper ventured to suggest that this assumption was not only arbitrary but utterly unwarranted a storm of criticism broke upon him. But the truth will out. And this time it has come from a somewhat unexpected source: a French-Canadian Roman Catholic member of the Quebec legislature. Of course, Dr. Shields was biased against Roman Catholicism, the friends of that Church say. But Mr. Chaloult, the member of the Quebec legislature is also biased—but in his case the bias runs in the other direction, in favour of the racial and religious groups to which he, together with four-fifths of the people in Quebec, belongs. Nevertheless he has been forced by the stern logic of facts not only to recognize but to speak the truth. And his speech in the Quebec legislature makes Dr. Shields' criticism of our neighbouring province look mild.

Mr. Chaloult has exploded the "arbitrary assumption" of the Sirois Commissioners. And yet for some inexplicable reason, the brief reports of the speech were buried in the inside pages of our English language press. Or is the reason inexplicable? Mr. Chaloult's statements were a poor advertisement for Roman Catholicism, and their propagandist agents exploit an Anglo-Protestant indifference and suppress news which is contrary to the interest of their Church.

A columnist in *The Globe and Mail* commented on the speech as follows:

"We find what Mr. Chaloult said interesting not because what he said was new to us, but because it was probably new to most of his hearers. He is the first French-Canadian of his time who has spoken so frankly of matters which concern the very future of the French-Canadian people, and who labours passionately for their survival."

We venture to suggest to this encyclopaedic columnist that he ought to revise that statement. What Mr. Chaloult said was not new to his hearers or to scarcely any one in the province of Quebec, except perhaps to the members of the clergy. It is common knowledge in English Protestant circles in Quebec that the French Catholic schools are inferior to English schools in every way except in the teaching of the Roman Catholic catechism. French Catholics themselves generally recognize that fact. But what everybody knows, few dare to say, and fewer still

have the courage to say in public. *The Globe and Mail* used to quote much from a French language paper in Montreal that was established for the express purpose of waging a crusade for school reform in Quebec, and that paper, *Le Jour*, has been saying every week many of the things that this French member at last ventured to say in the House.

Ignorance of the true state of affairs in Quebec is not nearly so dense in that province as *The Globe and Mail* columnist appears to believe, but the grossest ignorance of these matters is to be found in Ontario. The cry of "fanatic" at once greets any Protestant in Ontario who ventures to say in English what is common knowledge in our neighbouring French Roman Catholic province. THE GOSPEL WITNESS knows this by personal experience, for it has been doing its bit to enlighten Anglo-Protestants who prefer, in the name of tolerance, to enjoy their own illusions about Quebec rather than know the unpleasant facts.

We give here some of the disclosures of Mr. Chaloult's speech, as translated from the French language press:

Mr. René Chaloult, Liberal member for Lotbinière, requested the government yesterday afternoon to give a more realistic and practical direction to the system of education of the province of Quebec. He pled for numerous reforms, but insisted especially on the necessity of giving an important place to physical culture in our school programmes; on the importance of adopting classical studies to the needs of the hour and the exigencies of the situation; on the danger of imposing on our children the teaching of a second language before they had a sufficient knowledge of their mother tongue, and on the necessity of a national education.

Here is a résumé of the speech of Mr. Chaloult.

After having said that there is a unanimous opinion in the province on the necessity of improving our system of education, Mr. Chaloult defined his attitude and added: "It is because I am careful to maintain the threatened influence of the church and to avoid the final ruin of our people that I shall not cease to reclaim the reformation of education."

"In a country like ours," he said, "where the initiative of the parents is microscopic, the state cannot withdraw from its imperious duties in these matters. That is why we ought to come to the aid of the Honourable Prime Minister who wishes to give to the government the exercises of its prerogatives and stimulate education in Quebec."

Mr. Chaloult invoked as proof of our physical decadence the spectacle of the Saint John the Baptist Society parade at Montreal: "How many wretched undisciplined persons go along with arms dangling," he said, "hump shouldered, with uncertain step, too often in the greatest disorder. Compare a battalion of French-Canadians to a battalion of Highlanders, for example; the contrast is striking. One would say, added the speaker, that the blood in our veins was impoverished. Nevertheless our fathers were robust because they led a more hygienic life in the countryside. Tuberculosis, cancer, heart disease, the three principal causes of mortality among us, are they not the consequences of our own negligence? The medical examinations which our conscripts undergo at the present time, affirmed Mr. Chaloult, reveal a general decay of the French-Canadian people."

The member from Lotbinière declared that in his opinion a realistic and practical system of education will not be realized so much by a modification of programmes as

by an adaptation of the mentality of the teaching body. "Several of its members," he added, "are eminent educators and possess an undoubted competence, but are they gifted with the special qualities required for the formation of French-Canadian youth?"

Mr. Chaloult made clear that it is not a question of deserting classical studies, but of adapting them to the needs of the hour and to the requirements of our situation. Is there not reason, moreover, he said, to make a distinction between those who are destined for the world and those who aspire to the priesthood?

"Moreover," continued the orator, "Are not our classical colleges too numerous? Would not the transformation of some of them into technical schools, industrial schools, mark an appreciable progress?"

Finally, Mr. Chaloult recommended a strong national education. "We suffer," he said, "from an inferiority complex. Morally we remain a vanquished race. We have heard much more of loyalty towards England than of faithfulness towards our fatherland. Evidently, he continued, such an education can only engender a state of debility. Our young people are convinced that with a few bits of English they can conquer the world."

Mr. Chaloult deplored the fashion in which the history of Canada has been taught. "Often," he said, "we have been dogmatically taught of the providential role of the conquest; the generosity of English governors has been exalted, certain of whom had the delicacy not to crush us completely." He remarked that our youth reads five times less than the people of Ontario.

In closing Mr. Chaloult expressed the hope that "a Pétain would arise to reinvigorate us, to restore to us that confidence that we have lost. Small peoples more decadent, more humiliated than we have risen again. We can regenerate ourselves with a vigorous national education," he said.

In the light of this revelation of the sad state of Quebec's educational system, we ask our readers to contemplate the fact that according to the terms of the Sirois Report it was this school system which was to be yardstick to measure all the other provinces. Prime Minister Aberhart of Alberta summed up the matter at the Inter-Provincial Conference in the following words:

"Working under such a semi-independent financial commission we would not be able to have the educational system we have at the present time. We would not be able to have such a system, unless Quebec had a similar educational system."

In a discreet and somewhat roundabout way the French-Canadian member referred to the fact that the Quebec school system is under the control of the Roman Catholic Church.

"In a country like ours," he said, "where the *initiative of the parents is microscopic*, the state cannot withdraw from its imperious duties in these matters. That is why we ought to come to the aid of the Honourable Prime Minister who wishes to *give to the government the exercises of its prerogatives* and stimulate education in Quebec." (Emphases in above quotation are ours).

For good or for evil, the educational system in Quebec has been planned, executed, and controlled by the hierarchy. The Roman Catholic Bishops direct its policies through the Department of Education; the taxes are handed over to Roman Catholic school boards controlled by priests; members of religious orders (nuns and priests) perform much of the actual work of teaching, and every member of the teaching profession is formed in Roman Catholic schools with the grand purpose of producing loyal Roman Catholic citizens in their schools in which a large part of the time is given up to Roman Catholic religious instruction. If Jean Baptiste is

ignorant, if he doesn't read or can't read, the fault lies with the Roman Catholic Church which has had an entirely free hand in education for the last three centuries.

To criticize the school system is therefore, very close to criticising the Church which is responsible for it. That is the reason it is so unhealthy for one's political health to agitate for reforms in French Canada. All honour to those who take their political lives in their hands in this crusade. That some dare to do so is another example of the schism between the average French-Canadian and the hierarchy, a schism that is deep though not obvious to the casual observer.—W.S.W.

"MR. MATSUOKA IS A GREAT STATESMAN"

(Continued from page 8)

half of a totalitarian axis, is entitled to a tribute for statesmanship. If Japanese statescraft deserves praise, where do other leaders stand—those like Churchill, Roosevelt, Wilkie, whose sympathies go out to oppressed peoples everywhere? What is the standard by which statesmanship is to be judged? What hope for the world's future?"

We congratulate *The Globe and Mail* on having caught up to THE GOSPEL WITNESS and on having its eyes opened, partially at least, to the menace of Roman Catholicism.

But we do suggest that its editorial writers ought to be required to follow the news closely. The need of this is apparent from the following statement in the editorial referred to above; *The Globe and Mail* says: "The Vatican has not been blessing totalitarian nations and giving cheer to their emissaries." It is unfortunate for the accuracy of this assertion that the following British United Press dispatch escaped the attention of the newspaper's editorial staff. We quote from the *London Daily Mirror*:

Pope Blesses 200 Italian Officers

The pope gave an audience to 200 Italian army officers yesterday, and said to them:—"We bless all you who serve the beloved Fatherland with fealty and love."

—British United Press.

The press also reported recently, if we are not mistaken, that the Pope had blessed some Nazi soldiers. And if *The Globe and Mail* doubts our word for it, then we hope it will be convinced by the statement that appeared in the official organ of the Jesuits in Rome *La Civiltà Cattolica*. Only a year ago this paper spoke of Italy as being "assured pledge of the particular blessing of heaven". And perhaps even more amazing than that was the brazen effrontery of the French-Canadian Catholic Action *Le Devoir* of Montreal which republished the article *in toto* last February! If Mussolini's Italy is assured of the particular blessing of heaven, on the authority of the Pope of course, then why should anyone be surprised that he add another international gangster to the list of unholy associates?—W.S.W.

**Subscribe for The
Gospel Witness**

“The Assured Pledge of the Particular Protection of Heaven”

Of whom were these words spoken? Of Italy, less than a year ago! By whom was the “assured pledge” given? By the Roman Catholic Church, in the pages of the official Jesuit paper *La Civiltà Cattolica*. But when was it given? Certainly not at that epoch when Papal Zouaves enlisted from loyal French-Canadian Roman Catholics went to Italy to fight for the Pope against brave Italians dying for their liberty. No, there was no papal blessing for Italy then. But last year, in February, 1940, the Jesuit Catholic paper extended “the assured pledge of the particular protection of heaven” to that cowardly bandit Mussolini, his hands still dripping with the blood of wretched Ethiopians slain by aerial bombs and poison gas in the onward course of his victorious “civilizing” and catholicizing armies.

Little wonder those who know these things were not in the least surprised when “His Holiness”, so-called, extended his pontifical blessing to Japan!

We should also like our readers to note that the excerpts below were translated from a Montreal Catholic Action paper, *Le Devoir*, in its issue of February 15, 1941. This paper in turn copied the article from *La Documentation Catholique* of Paris which had taken it from the official Jesuit organ.

What tragic reading this business about “the assured pledge of the particular protection of heaven” must have made to Frenchmen when their treacherous neighbours stabbed them in the back, after they were already down. How comic “the assured pledge of particular protection of heaven” seems now, though it was written just one short year ago! And we venture to think “l'esprit gaulique”, even among French Catholics, will not fail to see the comic side. And there is in French a proverb very similar to our English “Who laughs last, laughs best”.

The following paragraph is a translation of the Jesuit priest's introduction to his article entitled “Twelve Years After the Conciliation”:

“The Accords happily concluded between the Holy See and the Italian state on the 11th of February, 1929, and ratified on the 7th of June in the same year doubtless constitute one of the greatest events of the century, either as regards their historical and political importance or, above all, because of their legal, moral and religious importance. In fact they have put an end to the conflict between Italy and the Papacy, which ceaselessly tortured millions and millions of citizens and Catholics; they create a new legal order instituted between the ecclesiastical power and the civil power, a peaceful system of mutual relations that the religious conscience of the Italian people besought with anguish; they sanction publicly and solemnly the Conciliation between state and church, a conciliation which is a certain principle of immense advantages for the fatherland and religion; which is also the unshakable basis of the true greatness and prosperity of the nation and the assured pledge of the particular protection of heaven.”

The following paragraphs from the priestly pen will also be of interest:

“The practical and solemn recognition of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion as the sole religion of the

state is the fundamental point and the inestimable fruit of the Conciliation. It is from this recognition which springs, in fact, a profound change in spirits, the renovation of Italy which has once more become Christian in its legislation, in its domestic, civil and private life. the reformation of the family society, thanks to the judicial recognition of Christian marriage; the whole series of opportune measures concerning religious teaching in the schools, the free exercise of the spiritual power and of the Catholic worship; the nominations to benefices, the effective functioning of different ecclesiastical institutions and organizations.”

“By reason of the Accords of the 11th of February, 1929, the Italian state is and must call itself *Catholic* (Est et doit se dire *catholique*), as we have written on another occasion, and the Catholic religion enjoys a position of *special prestige, a peculiar judicial situation and truly of a pre-eminence which is proper to it alone* with respect to other religions or cults which are admitted or tolerated, to employ the exact expression of eminent jurists and politicians.

“We have thought it timely to insist on this point which is of the highest interest because the official recognition of the Catholic religion on the part of the state is a manifest condemnation of the so-called separatism and atheism of the state, a grave lesson to other nations and a salutary reminder which a sovereign influence exercises on the conscience of the people and on the whole public and social life of the nation.” (Emphasis in above quotations ours.)

Will our readers believe us when we say that the glowing praise of the above paragraphs was written in an official Italian Jesuit paper in Rome in the year 1940 A.D., during the month of February at a time when the Italian banditti were sharpening their stilettos for the moment when they could stab prostrate France in the back, as they supposed, with impunity? After the Italian conquest of Ethiopia a Jesuit priest wrote: “Italy . . . has once more become Christian in its legislation, in its domestic, civil and private life.” The Italy of Mussolini is held up by the official Jesuit Catholic paper published in Rome in the year 1940 as “a manifest condemnation” of those states in which the Roman Church does not enjoy the privileges of a State Church. Mussolini's Italy a “manifest condemnation” of England! Was that why Italian pilots were used to bomb her a few months after this article was written?

Mussolini's Italy of February 1940 “a grave lesson to other nations”. Yes, that is true in the light of intervening events, but not in the way in which this Jesuit meant the prophecy. Mussolini's Italy in February 1940 “a salutary reminder which a sovereign influence exercises on the conscience of a people and on the whole public and social life of the nation.” Yes, we agree again, most heartily, but again events have given a somewhat different interpretation to the words of the Jesuit from what he then meant. The cowardly action of Mussolini's Italy is, we cordially assent, a fine example of what a nation will do when “the conscience of the people . . . and the whole public and social life of the nation” . . . is under “the sovereign influence” of the Pope of Rome and his Jesuit spies.—W.S.W.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 5 Second Quarter Lesson 16 April 20, 1941

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

A DAY OF QUESTIONS

Lesson Text: Mark 12.

Golden Text: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength"—Mark 12:30.

I. The Question of Attitude—verses 1 to 12.

Parallel passages: Matt. 21:33-46; Lk. 20:9-19.

The priests, elders and scribes had been challenging the authority of Christ (Mk. 11:27-33). By way of rebuke He uttered this parable, which would indicate to them that He detected their perfidy. At the same time He warned them of the judgment which was sure to follow unless they should mend their ways (Matt. 13:10-13).

The vineyard is a familiar illustration in Scripture of the Jewish nation (Isa. 5:1-7; Hosea 10:1; Matt. 20:1-16; 21:28). The Master had bestowed care upon the Israelites, but they had proved unfruitful and unfaithful (Mk. 11:12-14, 20; Lk. 13:6-10).

While it is unwise to press the meaning of the details of a parable, the main principles of the comparison are clear. The leaders of Israel had not tended the vines that they might bring forth fruit. They had mistreated and persecuted the prophets sent to them by their Lord (Jer. 2:30; Matt. 23:29-36; Lk. 20:9-15; Acts 7:51-53). Instead of reverencing the Father's well-beloved Son (Matt. 3:17), they would put Him to death. In due time those husbandmen would be deprived of their office (Jer. 23:1-4; 25:34-38; Ezek. 34:1-10), and faithful Christian husbandmen would care for the people of God (Matt. 21:43; 1 Cor. 3:9).

Christ identified Himself as their Messiah; the Stone rejected by the unbelieving, but precious to the saved (Psa. 118:22, 23; Isa. 8:14, 15; Matt. 21:44; 1 Pet. 2:6-8).

II. The Question of Tribute—verses 13 to 17.

Parallel passages: Matt. 22:15-22; Lk. 20:20-26.

Roman law had reached a high degree of excellence and efficiency. No charge against Christ would be considered unless it could be substantiated. Since the Jews could find no fault with His works (John 10:32, 33), they sought to entrap Him in His words (Lk. 20:20).

Students of the Pharisees and followers of Herod went together to Christ in the expectation that He would make a statement involving disloyalty either to the Jewish traditions as represented by the Pharisees, or to the Roman regulations as represented by the Herodians. If He should approve the tribute, He would be renouncing the national ideals of the Jews, but if He should repudiate the tribute, He would be disobeying the civil authorities.

The Saviour exposed their hypocrisy and acknowledged the claims of the Lord and of the State. It is possible to be a good Christian and a good citizen at the same time; to do our duty to God and also to our country (Matt. 17:25-27; Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:17). The Pharisees were effectively silenced (Matt. 22:22; Lk. 20:26).

III. The Question of the Resurrection—verses 18 to 27.

Parallel passages: Matt. 22:23-33; Lk. 20:27-38.

The Sadducees were a group of Jews who denied the existence of angels, spirits or miracles, and especially the resurrection (Acts 4:1, 2; 23:6-9). They asked a question which they thought would confound the Master and justify their own skepticism about the resurrection, on the ground that to them it appeared impossible and impracticable. The hypothetical case they cited was a most exaggerated one, but like other false teachers they began with Scripture (Deut. 25:5), then wrested it to their own destruction (2 Pet. 3:16).

Our Lord did not answer the question propounded by the Sadducees but proceeded to point out the errors of their system with its false views of the after-life and disbelief in the resurrection. Most errors in doctrine, like those of the Sadducees, can be traced to ignorance of the Scriptures and of the power of God.

IV. The Question of Commandments—verses 28 to 34.

Parallel passage: Matt. 22:34-40.

The scribes were theorists. They admired the way in which Christ had escaped the snare set by the Sadducees and considered this the opportune time and way to have the controversy settled as to the relative importance of the commandments. There were some who considered duty to God as being of prime importance (Deut. 6:4, 5), but they neglected their obligations to their fellow-men. Others laid stress upon duty to man (Lev. 19:18), but failed to give due honour and obedience to God. Our Lord emphasized the importance of both commandments (Rom. 13:8-10; Jas. 2:10), since together they summarize the Christian's duty (John 13:34; 1 John 3:23).

This lawyer of the Pharisees was convinced by the words of Christ. He may have been the lawyer to whom our Lord addressed the incident or parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10:25-37).

V. The Question of the Messiah—verses 35 to 44.

Parallel passages: Matt. 22:41-46; Lk. 20:41-44; 21:1-4.

The critics of Christ were silenced (Matt. 22:46), but the Questioned became the Questioner. The Lord searched their hearts when He touched upon the matter of their attitude to the Messiah, Whom the scribes described as David's descendant only (Rom. 1:3, 4), but Whom David himself described as his Lord (Psa. 110:1; Lk. 1:32, 33). What we think of Christ is a question of supreme importance (Matt. 16:13-16; 22:42).

It is not surprising that our Lord once more warned the people against the pride, duplicity and hypocrisy of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 23:13-33; Mk. 7:6-13; 8:15; Lk. 12:1). Because of their greater privileges and louder profession these leaders would receive more severe condemnation (Lk. 10:12-14; Jas. 3:1).

The poor widows, preyed upon by the Pharisees, were noticed by the Saviour. The humble offering of two mites, or about three cents in our money, represented all that the widow possessed. Her generosity was praised by the Saviour, Who still sits by the treasury. Gifts to Him are measured by the love which prompts them.

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

63 SERMONS ON THE WAR

preached in Jarvis St., from August, 1939, to January 30, 1941.
Five cents each single sermon or any 25 for \$1.00 postpaid.
Other addresses and articles on "The Pope's Fifth Column".
Send to The Gospel Witness office for list.
The Gospel Witness, published weekly, per annum \$2.00

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.