

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Vo. 25, No. 51A

130 Gerrard Street East, TORRONTO, APRIL 17, 1947

Whole Number 1299A

ROCKWOOD EXTRA EDITION

Explaining the Reason for This "Extra"

THE aggregate circulation of THE GOSPEL WITNESS containing references to the Rev. Perry F. Rockwood matter, has far exceeded one hundred thousand. The publishers did not follow our instructions in holding the type, and with thousands of applications for copies of these special numbers in our office, we discovered that our supplies were completely exhausted; and learned, to our amazement, that the publishers had broken up the forms. This necessitated the re-setting of all this matter, in order to meet the demand.

We are, therefore, publishing this ROCKWOOD EXTRA quite apart from our regular weekly edition; and we are including in one issue the contents of other issues bearing upon the Rockwood matter so that it all may be contained in one copy. This will entail another large expenditure, as our readers will readily understand. But cost what it may, we cannot stop now. We are, therefore, putting a price of twenty-five cents per copy on the Rockwood Extra edition, and informing our friends that we are still in need of a very large sum of money to cover the total expense we have incurred in publicizing the facts respecting Mr. Rockwood. We shall be grateful to all friends who will come to our help.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS is the only paper in Canada giving such full publicity to this matter; and we are grateful for the expressions of appreciation that have come from people of all Denominations who rejoice that there is one paper that is perfectly free to tell the truth.

(All that follows is reprinted from GOSPEL WITNESS issues of March 13th forward).

WHEN religious issues arise involving Modernism or Roman Catholicism, or both, we know of no paper in Canada other than THE GOSPEL WITNESS free to discuss them. At such times we incur the enormous expense and labour involved in sending individual copies to ministers and others whom we think ought to be informed.

For only \$2.00 a year, which is less than 4c a week, THE GOSPEL WITNESS will reach you every week if you are a subscriber; and you will then miss nothing of the important religious news which the paper contains. We trust many who read this issue will subscribe to the paper.

REV. PERRY F. ROCKWOOD EDITION

(March 27th, 1947)

IT may be that some undiscerning people will be disposed to charge us with making "much ado about nothing." Truro, N.S., is not a large city. St. James Presbyterian Church is not a large church. But a real prophet of the Lord does not need a very large platform on which to put his feet; if he is fired by the truly great message of the gospel.

We have carefully read Mr. Rockwood's sermons which we publish in this issue. We publish them so that everyone may have a chance of reading and judging for themselves. The charges made by the Presbytery of Halifax-Lunenburg against Mr. Rockwood, and their resultant verdict following the "trial", finding Mr. Rockwood "guilty" of following a "divisive course", are all based upon these sermons.

The Design of This Edition

The design of this special edition is to set the whole story before the Christian public of Canada, so far as we are able to reach it. We are sending a copy of this issue to every Presbyterian minister and Presbyterian official in Canada, whose name we can obtain. We are doing the same to all Baptists, to all ministers, and officials of the United Church, to all ministers and officials of the Anglican Church, and to ministers of the smaller denominations so far as we are able to obtain their names.

Why do we do this? Because the matter at issue does not concern Presbyterians alone. If that were so, we should not touch it.

Questions Which Concern All Believers

The questions raised by Mr. Rockwood have been matters of discussion in the columns of this paper for twenty-five years. It is Mr. Rockwood's "prosecution" by the Presbytery of Halifax-Lunenburg that gives special significance to his testimony. *It is a revelation of the official attitude of that Presbytery.* We do not say that their action would be endorsed by all other Presbyteries, or by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. We should be delighted to believe that the General Assembly, when it meets, will hasten to repudiate the action of the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery; and that in the meantime Presbyteries throughout the Dominion will clear their skirts by declaring their opposition to the Maritime Presbytery's stand.

Last Sunday evening there were probably scores, if not hundreds of Presbyterian elders present in Jarvis Street. We met a number of them, every one of whom approved of our stand in defending Mr. Rockwood, and spoke in condemnation of the action of the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery. We feel the deepest confidence that there are thousands of solid Presbyterian Evangelicals throughout the Dominion, who will feel just as much shocked and outraged by the action of Rev. F. Lawson and his associates as we do ourselves. We believe, too, that that applies to a very great number, we hope, the great majority, of Presbyterian ministers. But the only way by which Presbyterian ministers, and elders, or Presbyteries, can free themselves from all complicity in the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery's opposition to the gospel is by openly declaring themselves.

WHY WE APPEAL TO THE GOSPEL WITNESS FAMILY FOR HELP

IN the particular case of the Truro controversy the daily papers have done unusually well in publishing full, and clear, and understandable reports.

On the whole, the secular press has done well, and has presented quite fairly both sides of the controversy. But, of course, they could not print Mr. Rockwood's sermons, although some of the papers printed extensive quotations from them.

No Press Reports of Sermons on Romanism

It is noteworthy, however, that the public press practically ignored Mr. Rockwood's sermons on Romanism. For this, and the other reasons named above, we decided to print all of Mr. Rockwood's published sermons for the information of the Christian public. We are sure there will be no other periodical in the entire Dominion of Canada that will do so. When we, ourselves, were misrepresented, and maligned, and so notoriously lied about, more than twenty-six years ago, and for eight to ten years thereafter, there was no publication that came to our help. There was no one to help correct the calumnies which were set in circulation by McMaster University and its affiliates, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have had to live them down by degrees.

We desire that people should know the truth about Mr. Rockwood as widely as possible from the beginning; hence, without consultation with him, and without his knowledge, this special edition is issued. It is our earnest hope that Evangelicals of all denominations, reading this number, will recognize the value of THE GOSPEL WITNESS as a defender of the faith, and a propagator of Protestant Evangelical principles.

This Special Edition of 50,000

We are printing an extra edition of fifty thousand. It will cost us a very great deal of money. Sunday night we asked the crowded congregation for a second offering to help defray the cost of this edition. The offering amounted to about three hundred and twenty-five dollars. For that, we were very grateful; but it is a mere drop in the bucket compared with the expense of this edition. So we ask Evangelicals everywhere, who read this edition, if they agree with us, and recognize the value of the work THE GOSPEL WITNESS is doing, that they will not content themselves with saying, "God bless you", but will immediately send us a substantial contribution toward the expense of our effort.

Readers who are not subscribers may find an interest in the last page of this issue. Remember that an action deferred is very likely to become an action neglected, and ultimately forgotten. *Therefore, do it now!* Send us your cheque, or your bills, by return mail. What a testimony it would be to Evangelical sentiment throughout the Dominion if we were able to announce in our next issue that the full cost of this special edition had been met by contributions from our GOSPEL WITNESS family!

Please help us generously, and at once, toward this end.

MODERN ECCLESIASTICISM MISNAMED — "PROTESTANT"

A CAREFUL study of the address contained in this issue will disclose the fact that Mr. Rockwood was "prosecuted" and brought to "trial" for daring to criticize preachers in the pulpit, and professors in their academic chairs, and for saying that the church, including the Presbyterian Church, was "sick unto death."

Whether Mr. Rockwood's charges were valid or not, in a country where we are supposed to enjoy religious liberty and free speech, that would not appear to us to be a very great offence. But ecclesiastics, who are not prophets, are generally very sensitive individuals. They depend for their influence, not upon their personal worth, nor the value of their message—usually they have none—but upon their place in the church, and their official position.

We did not know, however, that "Protestant" churches regarded their ministers as sacrosanct. They were not so regarded in New Testament times. When the Apostle Paul withstood Peter to the face "because he was to be blamed," and that on a question of doctrinal principle and practice, the apostolic church did not call a special meeting of "Presbytery" in order to censure Paul; nor did they command him to repent of his "divisive course." If Prosecutor Frank Lawson, and his associates in Presbytery had lived in Paul's time, they would probably have insisted that he burn his epistles, and refrain from further publicity, and hand the management, of the churches in Galatia, and elsewhere, over to some Session. The Session, we understand, is a kind of sitting, and most members of Sessions are more inclined to sit than to stand on their feet, and go to work.

But Prosecutor Lawson, and his associates, commanded Mr. Rockwood to hand over the management of his church to the Session. We have evidently greatly misunderstood Presbyterianism. We supposed that in the Presbyterian Church a minister, himself a presbyter, really counted for something!

But reducing this whole matter to first principles, the crux of it all is this: Mr. Rockwood was censured for his anti-clericalism, and, if you like, his anti-ecclesiasticism. We should have expected this sort of thing in a Roman Catholic camp. The Roman Church defines sin in terms of the transgression of canon law, not of the Scriptures; hence, in terms of opposition to the clergy, the "inferior" clergy, and the higher clergy. If this controversy is resolved into its elements, it will be found that, in principle, it is exactly the charge that would be brought against a Roman Catholic for refusing to submit to the priest. Where, and while, the spirit of Prosecutor Lawson obtains, we may expect so-called Presbyterians to flirt with the church of Rome, with whose ecclesiasticism they are in full sympathy.

ARE PROTESTANT CHURCHES ROMEWARD BOUND?

CERTAIN Toronto clergymen vigorously denied that there was any tendency in this direction, and yet Dr. Arnup, ex-Moderator of the United Church of Canada, told the Canadian Council of Churches that the unity of Protestantism, and the world's weal in general, could be secured only by the co-operation of Protestantism with Roman Catholicism.

In answer to the Toronto clergymen's denial we print the following double dispatch from *The Globe and Mail*, of March 4th:

Reunion of Catholics and Protestants Urged By Anglican Bishop of Algoma

Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., March 3 (CP).—A plea for a "united Christian church" was made yesterday and today by Rt. Rev. W. L. Wright, Anglican bishop of Algoma diocese.

Both in a sermon preached on Sunday and in a statement released to-day, Bishop Wright pleaded for "reunion of all Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, in one church."

"The Anglican Communion is both Catholic and Protestant," he said.

"She will throw away her opportunity to serve as a 'bridge-church' if she stresses only a nominal union with Protestants and abandons her position in regard to the apostolic ministry, which she holds in common with the Catholic three-fourths of Christendom."

Sees Ontario Threat

London, Ont., March 3 (CP).—Prof. G. A. Cornish of the University of Toronto declared at a United Church Ministerial Association meeting here to-day that French-Catholics are trying to crush Ontario on every side, and to create a new province called "Laurentia" in Northern Ontario.

He said he had found a large tract between Hearst and Cochrane in which there are about 137 separate schools and only 17 public schools. The former are maintained largely by Ontario Government grants, although "almost all instruction is in French."

LAST SUNDAY EVENING IN JARVIS STREET

JARVIS Street Church was crowded to capacity last Sunday evening. Many extra chairs were used, as well as the gallery steps down to the platform, and the gallery steps in the gallery aisles. A number, too shy to come forward, stood; and there was a fair-sized overflow in Greenway Hall.

So far as we were able to judge, the entire congregation was wholly sympathetic. Swarms of people came forward afterwards—it seemed to us the Presbyterians were vastly in the majority—expressing entire approval of Mr. Rockwood's stand, and of our attempt to stand by him. Among them was one rather timid young lady, at least she was, in her first approach, who said, "I am Perry Rockwood's sister. I came to-night with fear and trembling, not knowing what to expect; but I feel all right now." By a singular coincidence a number of members, three or five, we are not sure which, of St. James Church, Truro, being in Toronto, attended, and they, too, were cordial, and pronouncedly on the side of their pastor. This went to show, in the first place, that there is still a very general concern over the wholesale departure from the faith, so characteristic of all the principal Denominations. And, in the second place, it showed that a great host of people, Presbyterians, Baptists, United Church people, Anglicans, and others, put their loyalty to Christ before loyalty to any Denomination.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

Is Rev. Perry F. Rockwood, Truro, N.S., A Hero of The Faith or a "Fundamentalist" Fanatic?

**Are His Opponents Legitimate Critics or Modernist Persecutors?
If Giving Obedience to Christ Precedence Over Subservience to
Ecclesiastical Denominationalism Proves "Divisive" is it Justifiable?**

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, March 9th, 1947

(Stenographically Reported)

"And Pharaoh called unto Moses, and said, Go ye, serve the Lord; only let your flocks and your herds be stayed: let your little ones also go with you.

"And Moses said, Thou must give us also sacrifices and burnt offerings, that we may sacrifice unto the Lord our God.

"Our cattle also shall go with us; there shall not an hoof be left behind; for thereof must we take to serve the Lord our God; and we know not with what we must serve the Lord, until we come thither."—Exodus 10:24-26.

Prayer Before the Sermon

We draw near to Thee, O Lord, in recognition and happy acknowledgment of Thy sovereign supremacy over us all. Thou art the Lord our God, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. We invoke Thine aid, that we may be enabled to worship Thee in Spirit and in truth. This evening we especially give Thee thanks for all Thy servants in this and every other age, who have been ready to count not their lives dear unto themselves, that they might win Christ, and be found in Him at last, not having their own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Jesus Christ.

We thank Thee that still Thou hast Thine elect people, and Thy faithful ministers in all denominations, and in all lands. Thou dost never leave Thyself without witness. Thou dost ever, in the darkest days, reserve to Thyself a remnant according to the election of grace, the seven thousand who do not, and will not, bow the knee to Baal. For all of these, wherever they may be found, by whatever name they may be called, to whatever fellowship they may belong—for all of these we give Thee thanks, and we pray for Thy blessing upon them all.

We especially pray this evening for our Brother Rockwood. We thank Thee for the grace Thou hast given him, and for the courageous stand he has taken for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. We pray that as to-night he delivers his final message in the church of which he has been Pastor, before he shall go unto Christ without the camp bearing His reproach—we pray that Thou wilt be especially near to him. Give him such a blessing in his pulpit ministry as he has never known before. Make him to know that God is with him, and that when Thou art with him, he needs no other helper.

We pray for his wife. We know something of the difficulties the minister's wife must face in such circumstances. We pray, therefore, that Thou wilt keep up her courage, and nerve her for the conflict. Enable her to be, in the truest sense, the wife of a soldier, a good soldier for Jesus Christ, a comrade in arms, as she has proved, we rejoice to know, hitherto.

We pray for the elders of that church, and for the great majority of the congregation who have been blessed by the ministry, and who, in heart, stand solidly behind their minister.

When the testing time comes give them all grace to put loyalty to Christ before loyalty to any church or denomination. Help them to be true to the gospel at all costs, and

enable them to take the step necessary to free themselves to give a clear testimony to the power of Christ.

Graciously uphold Thy servant Rockwood to-night. And then be with him the day after, when the reaction sets in—to-morrow. As Thou didst send Thine angel to minister to the weary Elijah, send Thine angel to our Brother Rockwood, that he may know that Thou art standing by him in his service to-night, and on the morrow, and in all the days to follow. Give him a token for good that his enemies may see fit, and be ashamed because the Lord has upheld him.

We pray for ourselves to-night. We seek the guidance of the divine Spirit. So speak in this service, and through the printed page that shall issue therefrom, that tens of thousands of people may be influenced for the truth. Oh, revive Thy work in all denominations! — among Presbyterians, and Baptists, and United Churchmen, Anglicans; and all the smaller bodies who have gone out from these many denominations, because they were compelled to do so in order to be faithful to Thee. Bless them all to-night. Hasten the day of Thy coming, the day when all shall know Thee.

So this evening, take complete charge of this service, and in every part of it let Thy name be glorified through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

"There shall not an hoof be left behind."

DURING the recent war many retired and semi-retired generals, and other officers of the army, admirals, and captains, and commanders of the Navy, were recalled to active service, like the great Captain Fogarty Fagan of the ship "Jervis Bay", of which you all read.

Some of us have long been engaged in contention for the faith; so engaged because it became a necessity. But we had begun to hope that some of the battles were over, and that we might still be a soldier of the King, with peace-time duties. But it seems as though there is no discharge in this way, and so "The Lone Ranger" must "ride again". If before I conclude any of you should exclaim, "Heigh Ho, Silver!" I shall not complain that your remark was irrelevant, or irreverent. I would have you to understand that in my discussion this evening, if I mention the names of certain persons, it is because they have named themselves. When a man iden-

tifies himself as an enemy of the truth, he must not expect to be treated as an anonymous opponent.

In my discussions on Romanism I have always been careful on this platform, and throughout the country from coast to coast, to explain that I was opposing erroneous principles, and a vicious system, and not any particular person. I have frequently said that I have met with Roman Catholics, who, in spite of the superstition to which they have been exposed, and much of which they have imbibed, whom I felt confident had come through it all somehow to know the Lord, and they were genuinely Christians, trusting the Lord. I have no doubt that that is true of men of all Denominations. I have never apologized for being a Baptist—I do not intend to begin now. Yet I gladly bear witness that some of the noblest servants of God I have ever met have been Anglican clergymen. Some of the servants of God with whom I have had the fullest and sweetest fellowship, have been Presbyterians, and not a few members of the United Church, and, believe it or not, I still have fellowship with many people called Baptists! (Laughter).

So I am not speaking against any man in particular. When a man identifies himself with a system, and defends it, and acts as its instrument, he must not ask to be exempt from the war. It were vain for a man to go to war unless he expects the enemy will shoot at him. I have known some brave warriors who went into conflict under that delusion, much to their later disillusionment and discomfort.

Graduate of Acadia and Knox Attended Montreal

I do not know Rev. Perry F. Rockwood intimately. I met him last summer. At the time of the General Assembly he was in this congregation one evening, and he made himself known to me after. He told me that he was a graduate of Acadia University, of Wolfville, N.S.—a hot-bed of infidelity, and has been for many years. While at Acadia he said his mind was filled with prejudice against a man called Dr. Shields in Toronto. He did not know anything about me beyond what the professors told him, and according to what he reported, while the professors might doubt the real existence of the devil, some of them seemed to be partly persuaded of their error, when they thought of Dr. Shields. (Laughter) He told me of his experience in the Presbyterian College, in Montreal, and then of his coming to Knox College, Toronto. He said, "While I was at Knox College, I never crossed the threshold of your church. I would not have it known, or said, that I had ever been inside your church. I came with all my Acadia prejudices. I thought you were altogether a very bad man. After my graduation and ordination, I settled down, and at last became Pastor of St. James Presbyterian Church, Truro, N.S. Somehow or other I stumbled upon a copy of THE GOSPEL WITNESS. I read the sermon, and I said, 'Can this be the man I have been taught to hate? Why, he preaches exactly what I believe!'" He became a subscriber to THE GOSPEL WITNESS.

I will not claim, although I should like to believe, that we were entitled to the honour of it—I am afraid not—I should not like to claim that THE GOSPEL WITNESS had had any influence in leading Mr. Rockwood to take the stand he has taken. Unless I am mistaken he would have taken the same position had he been the only man in Canada to do so. But he is one of our subscribers—one of the thousands of ministers of all Denominations

to whom this pulpit is privileged to minister once every week.

Telegram to Mr. Rockwood

As soon as I read his story I sent Mr. Rockwood a telegram of congratulation. Later I wrote him a letter which I hope he will have received to-day, and I sent him another telegram, giving him a most cordial invitation to come from Truro at our expense, as our guest, to preach from this pulpit next Sunday. (Great applause) I did not expect he would be able to come, but I wanted him to know that we were waiting for him. I received a telegram from him yesterday saying that he regretted it was impossible for him to accept the invitation just now because he felt it was necessary for him to stay in Truro to consolidate his work, to find a place to preach, and hold his faithful people together. With that decision we shall all be in full accord. I hope it may be possible at a not very distant date, however, to have Mr. Rockwood in this pulpit. When you see him announced to preach in Jarvis Street, I want you to come with the biggest bill you can find, or with your cheque book. I want this church, and this congregation to have fellowship with Mr. Rockwood "without the camp". I have had too many people say to me, "God bless you, brother. We are praying for you. You are doing a great work"—and then go off and leave me to do it. So I am hoping that it may be our privilege, at an early date, to have fellowship with Mr. Rockwood and his friends, in that matter. I would ask you to do so to-night but for one thing, and I may as well make the announcement now. I have copies of Mr. Rockwood's sermons here—the sermons upon which the charges of the Halifax and Lunenburg Presbytery are based. I propose to print the whole eight sermons *in extenso*, in this week's WITNESS, together with the address that I shall deliver to-night. And that issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS will be sent to every Presbyterian minister in the Dominion of Canada, and to every Presbyterian official of every sort whose name I am able to obtain, so that they may know the kind of church to which they belong. I propose also to send a copy of this issue to every Baptist minister in the Dominion of Canada, because they need it too. If you support me generously enough, I shall send a copy to every Anglican minister, and to every United Church minister, and to all other ministers whose names I can obtain. I propose to send a copy to every member of The Canadian Protestant League, seventeen thousand of them. I am sure that over and above our regular edition this week's WITNESS will run to fifty or seventy-five thousand copies. The Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery plaintively requested that Mr. Rockwood should not seek publicity. He has not sought it. I have had no communication from him until I received his telegram yesterday, in response to mine, asking him to come here. But I am going to see that the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery get such publicity as they never had in their lives before. (Applause) That, for the advantage of true Presbyterians, and not the modern counterfeit kind. For that reason when this sermon is over, and I hope you won't go away before I finish, I am going to ask you for an offering to help me defray the expense of that tremendous issue. It will cost thousands of dollars to print, pay postage, and to get all these thousands of extra names typed. So I want you to give me some money to-night for THE GOSPEL WITNESS. You pay three or four dollars a ticket for a hockey match, but this is far better than any hockey match.

I shall in brief terms, lay a biblical foundation for what I am going to say. That is my only reason for speaking at any time. I speak from the standard of one who believes in the full inspiration and supreme authority of the Bible as the infallible Word of God. Call me ignorant if you like. Perhaps I am not so ignorant as you think, and you had better not challenge me.

I.

My thesis is this: that GOD HAS ALWAYS ACCOMPLISHED HIS PURPOSES OF GRACE THROUGH A SEPARATED PEOPLE. Read the story of Abraham. God said to him: "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee." And Abraham went out, not knowing whither he went. He did not know, but God did. There is a later passage which says he "went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came." But when he went out he did not know where he was going. He knew only that God had called him. Again, God chose a people for Himself, calling the Israelites out of Egypt. They were a nation of slaves, subject to the authority of the greatest political power upon earth. They had no wealth, no learning, no prestige: but God called them, and He called Moeses to lead them. And He sent him to Pharaoh with this message: "Let my people go that they may serve me". From that day until now it has been God's way to raise up a man to call His people out of bondage into liberty. Always the call is answered as Pharaoh answered it: "I know not the Lord; neither will I let Israel go." The Presbytery of Halifax-Lunenburg have advertised themselves, I say it bodily, as men who "know not the Lord". No company of men who really knew Jesus Christ could be guilty of such conduct.

An Egyptian "Fact-Finding Committee"

Now Pharaoh appointed a Commission, like the Fact-Finding Committee of the Halifax Presbytery. They said, "These people are a lot of ignorant people, who don't know what they want. Tell them to get on with their work, neither let them listen to vain words." That is always the cry. When Moses persisted, Pharaoh successively proposed a series of compromises. You know the plagues that succeeded. Pharaoh at first was obdurate, then at last he relented a little. Then he proposed a compromise. God commanded Moses to follow a "divisive" course. He said, "I will put a division between My people, and the Egyptians, and I will separate them from the Egyptians." I suggest to any preachers here to-night, a series of sermons on the attempts to effect a compromise on the part of Pharaoh. To all of which Moses said, "No." Pharaoh then said, "All right, worship the Lord in the land. Why depart? Let us have unity. Stay with us, and worship with us." That is the modern Denominational "inclusive policy" every time. Let the world, the flesh and the devil stay in the church; and let us all be one. But again Moses said, "No." Then Pharaoh said, "Do not go very far away—just a little way." "No," said Moses, "three days' journey away." Then followed the proposal: "Go now ye that are men." The devil very often when a man is converted tries to keep his wife from coming to Christ. He knows the man is going to have a pretty hard time if he has a wife at home still in Egypt. Moses again said, "No." Then follows our text: "Go ye, serve the Lord; only let your flocks and your herds be stayed: let your little ones also go with you. Still support the Denomination. As long

as you make collections to our funds, we won't be particular about what you believe. Sacrifice according to your foolish whims as you like, only let your flocks and your herds be stayed." In the United States, and here, too, the test is not what a man believes, what he is: as a minister of the New Covenant—the question is, Does he co-operate? Does he support the funds of the Denomination? Does he leave his herds, and his flocks for us?"

Another principle germane to the discussion of this evening is this, that GOD INVARIABLY WORKS THROUGH MINORITIES. "Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen; yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence."

Of Abraham. He said, "I called him alone and blessed him, and increased him." He chose the small and despised group of Israelites and called them out of Egypt against the will of the world's mightiest political power. The same principle is operative in the history of Samson and Gideon, of David, Elijah and Elisha, of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, of Daniel, and the three heroes of the furnace, Shadrach, Meschach, and Abednego. Always the principle of the shepherd's sling and the smooth stone from the brook choosing the little one to chase the thousand.

The personal ministry of our Lord is a further example of the same rule; a lonely figure, He set Himself against the world. He gave organized religion its chance by going to the synagogues and the temple, but soon He was cast out, and pathetically exclaimed, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Our Lord carried the Gospel out-of-doors and preached chiefly by the sea and on the mountain-side, in the streets and market-places, and in the meadows.

The Apostolic Church

The same rule of relationship governed the apostolic church. In the beginning our Lord chose twelve "that they might be with him." It was to that little band He gave His command to "go into all the world, and preach the gospel." The one hundred and twenty in the upper room did not drum up the Pharisees and scribes, and chief priests, and propose a union with them. Neither did they call in a "mixed multitude" of publicans and sinners. The New Testament church was a company of people "called out" from the world, as the word church signifies, and "separated unto the gospel of Christ." Nowhere throughout the Acts of the Apostles, nor yet in the Epistles, is there the slightest suggestion that the apostles or the apostolic churches received unconverted people into the fellowship of the church. Some came in privily, as Ananias and Sapphira, as Simon of Samaria would have done if he could. But in the white light of apostolic teaching, and by the "divisive" ministry of the gospel, preached in demonstration of the Spirit and of

power, they were soon discovered, and the churches were admonished to "withdraw themselves" from those who walked disorderly, and not after the apostolic traditions.

There is not one solitary passage in the New Testament that can, by any fair interpretation, be construed to countenance an unregenerate church membership. Moses' chief trouble was not with the Israelites, but with the "mixed multitude," literally, the riff-raff. Trouble is always caused in a church by people who either have never been converted, or else have fallen into a back-slidden state, "having a name to live, but being dead." It is always in the dead wood in the bush lands the fire starts, or in the rubbish retained in the cellar, which ought to have been thrown on the garbage truck.

Similarly, church troubles invariably originate with the worldly elements in the church. A church may swell its numbers by receiving all sorts of people into its membership, but by so doing they make trouble for themselves, and make a free gospel pulpit an impossibility.

The same was true of the *Protestant Reformation*. There never would have been a Reformation through the agency of a "fact finding committee", or any sort of commission or presbytery. The mighty movement which shook Europe and changed the face of the world is identified with the names of a few individuals, the names of men whose work prepared them for it, and of those who executed it, Tyndale and Wycliffe and Luther and Melancthon, Calvin, Knox, and others. Britain had been a perfect culture bed for the seeds of the French Revolution had it not been for its purging and purifying through the agency of Wesley and Whitfield and others; but always by all human standards they were hopelessly outnumbered. It was the minority against the multitude. So could we say of Moody and Booth and Spurgeon and others; and in this country, Fynney and Moody and men of like spirit.

From all this we conclude that *Mr. Rockwood was eminently right in taking his stand boldly against modernism and worldly compromise everywhere*; and he was especially wise to begin at his Jerusalem and within his own church. The majority of religious leaders will probably condemn him because, as Professor Andrews' article in last week's GOSPEL WITNESS put it, "Throughout the history of the Christian church, the ecclesiastics have always outnumbered the prophets". It is easy to be a religious parrot and say that all is well. It is not easy to stand for the right against all the winds that blow.

Perhaps I may without immodesty be allowed to refer to my own experience. I would not boast, but I think there is probably no minister in Canada better able to understand Mr. Rockwood's present position. Wisdom is justified of her children.

"Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood,
For the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new messiah,
Offering each the bloom or blight;
And the choice goes by for ever
'Twixt that darkness and that light.

"Then to side with truth is noble,
When we share her wretched crust,
Ere her cause bring fame and profit,
And 'tis prosperous to be just;

Then it is the brave man chooses,
While the coward stands aside,
Till the multitude make virtue
Of the faith they had denied."

No amount of argument can ever justify or condemn Mr. Rockwood; his course will be justified by the unfolding events of the future.

Our Protest Against McMaster's Modernism Justified by Events

In this place, we protested against the modernism of McMaster University twenty-six years ago. It was denied that there was any such modernism, but now it is apparent to all. The Dean in Theology recommended to the Bible Society that they bind Dr. Fosdick's "Modern Use of the Bible" with every copy of the Scriptures! That alone was proof enough. Then there was Professor McCracken who was put forth as an orthodox man; but he went to his own place when he succeeded Dr. Fosdick in the pagan temple known as Riverside Baptist Church; and a New York friend reported to me that after his settlement there, Professor McCracken said something to the effect that his acceptance of the Riverside Church had identified him theologically, and that the time had come for him to confess that he had always been a theological liberal.

And now McMaster has the unenviable distinction of having the most effective and popular Roman Catholic propagandist in Canada as head of its English department. Professor Kirkconnell is called a Baptist, but he is welcomed by Roman Catholic organizations everywhere and hailed by the Roman Catholic press as an outstanding example of Protestant tolerance! Meanwhile, the hierarchy laugh in their sleeves and despise them in their hearts, unless indeed he has secretly joined the Jesuit order and is really a Roman Catholic in disguise.

The last two issues of THE GOSPEL WITNESS report the "exotic dance" held in McMaster University. A mat of a cut appearing in a Hamilton paper of the half-clad popular dancer was sent to us, but we could not degrade THE GOSPEL WITNESS pages by its publication. We need not be surprised should we hear that Sally Rand has been invited to become guest of honour at some McMaster dancing function of the future.

Of course we were denounced from every quarter by denominational leaders and all our charges were flatly denied. Circumstances have demonstrated that though we endeavoured to be faithful, the half had not been told.

Mr. Rockwood Will Be Denounced But Ultimately Justified

Doubtless the same sort of wholesale and unsparing denunciation will fall upon Mr. Rockwood; and the same emphatic denial of the truth of his charges will be broadcast. We desire to be perfectly fair to Mr. Rockwood and his critics. We have, therefore, decided to print, without deletion of so much as a comma, his eight sermons, four on Protestantism versus Romanism, and four on Modernism in the Church and School. He is of age: we shall let him speak for himself. You may obtain a copy of next week's GOSPEL WITNESS, which will contain a complete record of the statements upon which the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery base their judgment. Then you will be able to judge of the facts for yourselves.

Report of Presbytery Committee

The Presbytery led off by the presentation of its report of the Fact-Finding Committee. It was com-

posed of Rev. F. Lawson, Rev. D. A. MacKinnon, and Rev. T. K. MacLellan. They reported that there were two groups in the church, so far apart as to be irreconcilable. That, we may observe, is too frequently true of many churches. The report said:

"It is not some slight difference that divides them. They differ in thought, in temperament, in outlook and in their total concept of what constitutes a Christian Church."

"We would say that only a very great miracle could bring them together. It is our conviction that they cannot dwell together in peace under the same roof."

The Only Miracle That Would Suffice

From our examination of the report of the facts, it would seem to us that the miracle needed is one of conversion. Obviously there are some of them who need to be born again. Simple and straightforward the words of Scripture are, words which too long, and too generally our friends, known as the Plymouth Brethren, have been allowed to monopolize:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you. And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

And that teaching is not confined to the New Testament:

"Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with divers seeds: lest the fruit of thy seed which thou hast sown, and the fruit of thy vineyard, be defiled. Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together."

It is quite obvious that Mr. Rockwood has already taken note of this ancient wisdom. But the Fact-Finding Committee accused Mr. Rockwood of:

"Bad Manners and Poor Taste"

"Bad manners and poor taste in disbanding the Women's Missionary Society of the church, and of organizing another, after his own pattern, and to do his bidding."

In nothing has Mr. Rockwood shown his courage more than by daring to dissent from a woman's organization. I do not know what any Christian church would do without the ministry of the noble women who in many instances carry most of the burdens, and do most of the work. Notwithstanding, it must be remembered that unto the angel of the church in Thyatira,

"These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire, and his feet . . . like fine brass; I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience, and thy works; and the last to be more than the first. Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel."

It sometimes happens that in the best of churches worldly women may assert themselves. These women in Truro were not of the ultra-spiritual type, for we are told that their missionary meetings were meetings without prayer. It is our opinion that the Pastor stepped in none too soon. But because he did, the Fact-Finding Committee said he was a man of "bad manners, and poor taste."

The "Court" Chairman

The Court Chairman (we abominate that word "Court" as applied to a Christian church) said:

"To cause suspicion to the honesty of fellow-clergy-men is to create division—it is not right to paint criticism that is all negative and not positive. The majority are faithful and honest ministers of the gospel."

Rev. D. A. MacKinnon

Rev. D. A. MacKinnon reported he found very little gospel in Mr. Rockwood's printed sermons. Those who read the report of this sermon in THE GOSPEL WITNESS will read Mr. Rockwood's sermons for themselves, and be the judges. It must be borne in mind that they were controversial deliverances. They were designed so to be. Yet we venture to say they are full of gospel truth.

Rev. D. A. MacKinnon said:

"The church is not sick unto death, but is the very body of Christ. To bring complaints to the congregation and not through the proper channels is hurting the name and authority of the church." He thought Mr. Rockwood was doing a good work in Truro, and "some way should be found to solve the problem."

Here is a rejection of the principle of congregational authority. It is a clerical judgment wholly. The congregation should sit in the pews, and give of their money to support the work, but have nothing to say respecting what shall, or shall not, be taught. This, of course, is akin to Roman Catholic clericalism. The Hierarchy complained that one of the dangers menacing the Roman Catholic Church was the rise of *laicism*. We supposed that the Presbyterian Church was at least semi-congregational in government.

Rev. A. Faraday "Thundered"

Then we are told:

"Rev. A. Faraday thundered: 'How does he know the ministers are not faithful? What presumption! I consider the statements false. Our ministers have proved themselves faithful; one was padre-in-chief of the navy, and another won the V.C.'"

Among Romanists there is no sin quite equal to that of attacking the church, and its elders. They are sacrosanct.

And what piffling nonsense this thundering minister emitted after all! Some of the most useless, worldly-minded, and unbelieving ministers in all the churches became chaplains as an escape from the arduous duties of the pastorate. We say *some*. There were noble chaplains. But the fact that a man was a chaplain is no proof that he was faithful to the gospel. We honour the man who won the V.C. for his bravery; but if it is the man we think, his religious views are no criterion for any minister who would be faithful to the gospel of Christ.

Prosecutor Lawson's Summary

Then we read:

"Summing up, Mr. Lawson as prosecutor, said he believed a middle course was always a right course, but Mr. Rockwood had made vows that he has not lived up to.

"Therefore there is no middle course in this issue." There was no proof adduced that Mr. Rockwood had made vows he had not lived up to. On the contrary it was the fact that he had endeavoured to be true to his vows that had incurred the displeasure of the "Prosecutor" Lawson. We suggest that would be a good name to give Mr. Lawson, "Prosecutor Lawson", or spelled out: "Rev. F. Lawson, P.E. (Prosecutor of Evangelicals)!"

Mr. Rockwood's Defence

It is reported that Mr. Rockwood in his defence said:

"I have sought to be loyal to the Church and it has been very difficult to criticize when criticism had to be made. At any time when the Church departs from the Bible it is up to us to point out the error, irrespective of consequences, to maintain the truth and the purity of the Church.

I am not the only black sheep in the Church. Surely it is in our faith, our loyalty, to speak out against any watering-down of faith. I am not afraid of the pew or that the people will not be able to understand.

There is something drastically wrong with the Church — all has not been well. Our Presbyterian Church leaders have led our Church into an amalgamation in China which has no faith foundation to satisfy the requirements of our Church and which threatens to destroy our unique Presbyterian witness in China.

If I were prevented—as has been intimated in unofficial quarters — from criticizing the Church and teaching the message as I am guided by the Holy Spirit, I could not stop teaching or preaching, and if this Church would not allow me to do so I would continue to preach.

It would be blind for me to accept without challenge the teachings of some professors and leaders of boards of co-operative schemes."

"We Do Not Like You Dr. Fell"

Is there any biblical believer who can find fault with that? The "Court's" decision read in part that of the two groups in the church, the first was composed of people;

"deeply loyal to the faith of their fathers and having many of the characteristics common to Presbyterian people wherever they are found. They are solid, somewhat conservative, fond of the old ways and slow to make changes. That they are devout, deeply religious and God-fearing people, cannot be doubted for a minute.

This group is accustomed to a pattern of church service they have followed from childhood. It was the type of service they wanted. No other. They are rugged and independent in their make-up. They resent dictatorship from above.

This group is violently opposed to the present minister. They don't like him as a minister. They do not like him as a man."

It was said of these "deeply religious and God-fearing people" that they did not take part in public prayer; they did not give their personal testimony, and did not respond to invitations in after meetings."

Mr. Rockwood's Supporters

Those supporting Mr. Rockwood were "damned with faint praise."

Mr. Rockwood reported that a survey of the older group showed that the average givings of fifty-one person to the church was \$2.18 per year, while those of the younger group averaged \$10.00 a year. Frankly, we cannot commend either group. Even the best givers gave less than 20c a Sunday, and the others less than 5c a Sunday. Perhaps it was one of these friends who called in at a drug store on Sunday morning, and asked the druggist to change a dime. He gave him two nickels, and said, "There you are, sir, I hope you will enjoy the sermon."

None But Presbyterians Wanted

Of the second group it was said:

"The second group, who follow the minister, are mainly young people with the highest character and great zeal and qualities of leadership. Some are emotional and unstable, but all true Christians.

.....

This minister is attracting a certain type of people, rather than traditional Presbyterians. These people reflect his thinking.

"They seldom even mention the word Presbyterian."

What an offence that is to attract people who are not Presbyterian! Perhaps this group would like to have a sign put outside St. James Church, "None but Presbyterians are welcomed here."

It was a further offence that the word "Presbyterian" was scarcely mentioned. We cannot believe that there are many Presbyterians, ministers or laymen, modernists or otherwise, who have subscribed to such nonsense as that. It goes to show that there were certain people annoyed by the pastor's teaching, and determined not to surrender the things that that teaching would require to be surrendered, found themselves more Presbyterian than Christian.

No Quarrels With Presbyterians Or Their Church

I have not a word of criticism of the Presbyterian Church. Personally I could never put my neck under the Presbyterian yoke, and be at the mercy of a man like "Prosecutor" Lawson, to be told by such an one what I should, or should not, preach. But any stick will do to beat a dog, and back of all this there were undoubtedly strong personal animosities developed which were not amenable to reason. And it is evident that the Fact-Finding Committee, so-called, listened to the complaints of the minority composed of Presbyterian growlers; and in their judgment condemned the minister for not placating them.

Why So Few Candidates For Ministry

The large denominations are complaining of the scarcity of candidates for the ministry. No wonder! Who that had a spark of manhood, to say nothing of Christianity, in him would submit to such an intolerable yoke as this?

If, and while, Presbyteries and synods and other religious official bodies, are led by men of the type of "Prosecutor" Lawson, candidates for the ministry in the old Denominations will be fewer and fewer; and men who desire to preach the Gospel, and declare the whole counsel of God, will find freer spheres of labour in which they will be able to exclaim, "Thou hast set my feet in a large room."

The Terms of Peace, Unconditional Surrender— To Presbytery

But here is a summary of what this tolerant Presbytery demanded of Mr. Rockwood if he was to continue in the presbytery's favour:

(1) To withdraw all supplies of sermons dealing with the church, which are not sold.

(2) To refrain from printing sermons of a destructive nature which are undermining confidence in the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

(3) To refrain from all publicity in the press.

(4) To show due repentance and humility for statements made against fellow ministers in the printed sermons.

(5) To do all in my power in Truro to bring my people to a new attitude toward the Church and her policies.

(6) To do all in my power to understand the policies of the Presbyterian Church in Canada and approve them if possible. This would mean the missionary policies, advance for Christ, etc.

(7) That the session of St. James give more careful insight over the work and policy of the Church in Truro.

Mr. Rockwood's Reply

What self-respecting man could entertain for one moment the idea of submission to such a policy? It is not surprising to read what Mr. Rockwood said:

When I was taken before the members and asked to accept this I could not do so. Various ways were suggested to make this decision possible but they could not be accepted. I have been given two months to think the matter over and to make a final decision on May 5th.

Why delay? If the matter was one dealing with local problems in St. James there would be hope of reconciliation. The serious problem concerns the pulpit itself. It is my belief that Presbytery has a right to watch over the pulpit, but only so far as the minister is not hindered from preaching with freedom under the spirit. To be refused to criticize the Church and to print such criticism is a very serious rebuke upon the ministry of the word in the Church today.

I wish to state that this is my decision. I have talked to no person either in this church or outside. Mrs. Rockwood and myself stayed in Halifax last night to get away from the crowd and to think through the decisions of Presbytery. We are in complete agreement that this is the only possible course for us to take, and we believe it is God's will for us at this time.

I have written today to the Clerk of Presbytery tendering my resignation, not only as a minister of this church but as a minister of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

The Presbytery is fully aware that an impossible situation has arisen and that deferring the matter to May will not solve the basic problem.

I pointed out to Presbytery that each and every one, except the representatives of St. James, endorsed the findings of the Presbytery committee which visited St. James to investigate the problems. This committee stated that a distressing and deplorable situation was found in St. James. It further pointed out that St. James was a divided church and that the friction there was the result of my ministry and my preaching. This means that I no longer have the confidence of the Presbytery in my ministry here. I must therefore resign as the minister of this church.

I must also resign as a minister of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Yesterday's Presbytery meeting found me guilty of taking a divisive course in the Presbyterian Church in Canada. This means that my preaching not only in this Church but also in the Presbyterian Church in Canada, is no longer in the best interests of that Church.

This decision means that we are unable to criticize departments of the church which do not conform to the word of God. There is little hope of bringing the Church back to its original faith with this attitude. If this was simply the attitude of the Presbytery here there might be hope, but I believe it is the prevalent attitude of the Church as a whole.

I pointed out to Presbytery that I could never accept the terms of the disciplinary action mentioned above. This would simply mean that I would lose my liberty and would be guided by men, not by the Holy Spirit.

I believe I have shown sufficient facts to prove that there is a "falling away" from the foundations of our faith. As long as the courts continue to uphold such falling away or continue to make impossible such criticisms, then there is little hope for a reformation.

The decision I have reached might just as well be reached now as in May, for as long as my liberty is repressed in the Presbyterian Church in Canada, I must take this other course.

Rev. Perry F. Rockwood a Hero of the Faith

In view of all these things, we hail the minister of Truro as a hero of the faith, deserving of the respect and support of all those who believe in the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

Mr. Rockwood reports that headlines in the paper said: "Truro Pastor will Leave the Ministry." Not at

all! By resigning from the Presbyterian Church he has just entered it! (We preached a series of sermons on Church Union at the time of Union, which were printed, as others were, and we had to print extra editions to supply the demand of certain Presbyterian churches, and in several instances their use saved the Presbyterian property for the Presbyterian Church). We are not opposed to the Presbyterian Church as such, nor to Presbyterianism. We go with them just as far as we believe they are in accord with the Scriptures; but we are bound to say this, that if the General Assembly approves the action of the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery, the only conclusion liberty-loving, logical, men may reach is that full freedom to preach the Gospel of the grace of God, including the warning of people against false doctrine by whomsoever it may be taught, is no longer assured to any minister within the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

The Presbytery Not Rockwood Weighed in the Balances—And Found Wanting

Mr. Rockwood was right when he said that it was not he who was on trial, but the Presbyterian Church, and if the Presbytery's verdict is final then that great church has been weighed in the balances and found wanting, and the kingdom will depart from it. But if God grants him health and strength, Mr. Rockwood will go on from strength to strength and will find in his larger freedom a larger ministry. He is the type of man the true church of Christ needs. We pray that his bow may long abide in strength, and that the arms of his hands may be made strong by the mighty God of Jacob.

"Though the cause of evil prosper,
Yet 'tis truth alone is stong;
Though her portion be the scaffold,
And upon the throne be wrong,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow,
Keeping watch above His own."

SEES ROCKWOOD STAND UPHOLD BY SYNOD'S ACT

Halifax, March 31—(CP)—Rev. Gordon S. Vincent, minister at the West End Baptist Church here, said in a sermon last night that the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church had condemned Rev. Perry F. Rockwood for "doing what they themselves did when they voted approval of the Synod's resolution" to disapprove a book written by Prof. William A. Gifford of the Montreal Presbyterian College.

Mr. Rockwood, formerly minister at St. James Presbyterian Church, Truro, N.S., resigned his charge after being found guilty of attempting to split the Presbyterian Church. At his church trial, held here early this month, the Presbytery based its charge, in part, on alleged attacks by Mr. Rockwood against professors of the Montreal college.

Mr. Rockwood had taken exception to a book entitled "The Story of Faith," published by Prof. Gifford on the grounds that it denied the virgin birth of Christ.

Mr. Vincent said the book was the subject of discussion in the Martime Synod last fall and that the Synod had passed a resolution of disapproval and communicated its disapproval to college authorities in Montreal.

Mr. Vincent added: "No member of the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery registered his dissent from the Synod's resolution. Therefore Mr. Rockwood did not lie about Prof. Gifford's teaching. If he did then the Synod and the Presbytery, as a component part of that Synod when it passed the resolution of disapproval unanimously lied."

PROTESTANTS AWAKE!

(This is the substance of a series of sermons preached by the Rev. Perry F. Rockwood, minister of St. James Presbyterian Church, Truro, N.S., beginning on August 25th, 1946. The purpose of these messages is to inform Protestants about the present situation in order that they might be awakened to the need of contending for the faith once and for all delivered unto the saints Jude 3). There is a deep feeling among Evangelical Christians that the word "Protestant" is going to take on more of its old and historic meaning if the present trend continues in our relationship to the Roman Catholic Church. It is the hope and prayer of the preacher of these sermons that our people might be led deeper into the truths of God's love, and surrender themselves to Jesus Christ Who loved them and gave Himself for them.)

THE PROTESTANT - ROMAN CATHOLIC ISSUE TO-DAY

WE are beginning to-night a series of sermons that are greatly needed for the hour in which we are living. There is a tremendous need for Protestants to-day to be awakened and take their stand again on that great text of the Reformation, "The just shall live by faith." But before entering upon our subject to-night I should like to make one or two comments that bear directly on these sermons:

FIRST, I know there are many here who do not wish me to preach these sermons. I should like to point out again that there is no person or group of persons who has any right to seek to influence the minister of God's Word in his weekly messages. I shall not for a moment allow any one to tell me what to preach or what not to preach for that authority belongs to God alone. It is within the right and authority of the people of this Church to tell me when to stop preaching from this pulpit, but that would never prevent me from preaching the truth of God's Gospel which is the only hope for the world to-day.

I should like to say; **SECONDLY**, that in my references to the Roman Catholic Church I am not referring to individual people as such. My purpose in these series of sermons is to prove from Scripture that the whole papal system is in spirit, form and effect wholly anti-Christian. Any interest we might have in the people who are so blindly joined to this anti-Christian papal system would be to help them to see the glorious light of the Gospel message of Jesus Christ, to unloose them from the shackles that bind them so heavily, giving them little freedom in this life, and such a burdensome hope for the life to come.

I would also point out that it is the duty of the Christian minister constantly to warn his people against the evils of the day. Not many weeks ago, a little child became lost, wandering from home, and the whole community became aroused and started an intense search until the child was found. What would have been the reaction of Christian people had the neighbours sought to comfort the mother by telling her not to worry, that although the child was lost in the woods there was a chance that she might find the right road and wander home again; or, should the child have to stay in the woods there was a chance that she might find something to eat and not be molested by the wild animals. How foolish would that comfort have been if no one had sought to find the child and lead her home! It is just as foolish to-day for Christians to tell us not to worry about the Roman Catholic Church for she is minding her own business and it is our duty to mind ours. I shall reveal to you that this Catholic Church is not minding her own

business and that everywhere she is making plans to hold people in fear and ignorance for continued generations to come that her people might take control and at the same time be kept in the woods far away from home.

I should like also to say that I have been definitely led to preach this series of sermons and pray that the Spirit will use them for the enrichment of our faith that we might all grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I make no apology for what will be said.

I should like also to say a word to those who are members of the Orange Lodge. I know something of the background and purpose of your Order and to-day I am ashamed of your weakness and tardiness in the things of the Spirit. You cannot be of any use to God unless you have become a Christian and live that ye might be lights in this darkened world. You have become worldly and weak and your voice is no longer heard to fight the wiles of the Devil because your warfare is too often on the side of the Devil rather than on the side of Christ. I call you all to get back to God and spend more of your time in meetings studying God's Word than in playing cards and talking about worldly things that mean nothing at all in the present fight against darkness, superstition, and fear. I speak with love and concern and pray that the Orangemen of the town might be ready to confess their sins along with many others and put their trust in the saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.

I should like to emphasize to-night that a great struggle is taking place between the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches and that it is primarily an offensive war on the part of the Catholic Church against a sleeping and indifferent Christian Church. Any casual study of history will tell us that the very nature of the Catholic Church is to gain power and to use that power against all who might differ from her or seek to use liberties that might infringe against her plan to rule all.

It would be appropriate for us to-day to make a comparison between this situation and that which existed in Britain in 1939. For a number of years the enemy had been preparing an all-out offensive against the freedom-loving peoples of the world and yet when the time came to strike we were totally unprepared to wage war against a strong enemy. Yet as we look back to that time we must admit that we, the people, were just as anxious to compromise to avoid conflict as were our leaders and therefore the blame must be with ourselves as with our leaders. So it is in the Church to-day. Our people are just as anxious as our leaders to cry, "Hush! Hush!" and allow the Catholic Church to gain victories and to prepare for future assaults while we remain indifferent and self-satisfied with keeping the Church doors open and paying for the current expenses. I pray that before this series of sermons ends we shall

all be reminded again that there can be no more compromise between the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches than there could be between the Nazi and British Governments.

The whole attitude toward the situation to-day is very much like the attitude of so many of us before 1939. Let us try to get a picture of the advances being made by Romanism and let us see clearly that the results of these advances are working towards ignorance rather than truth; for chaos rather than order; for enslavement of people and government rather than liberty and freedom for all; for Rome rather than for Christ and His Kingdom's work upon earth.

Let us see the situation as we have it in Canada to-day. It is impossible to see any clear-cut solutions to many of our problems to-day without seeing that behind these problems is the work and ministry of Rome.

Some weeks ago Rev. Allan S. Reid, Secretary of the Presbyterian French Mission, with headquarters in Montreal, wrote a most interesting booklet entitled *The Quebec Problem*. Dr. Reid speaks with authority for he has lived and worked for many years among the French people there and it is a confirmed conclusion that *There is no Quebec problem apart from religion*. The writer continues in his booklet to give five sound reasons why our Church is carrying on an intense missionary work in Quebec to-day:

(1) The Roman Catholic Religion is responsible for the political isolation in Quebec. Canada is divided because Quebec is dominated by the Papacy and no democratic government works successfully under Catholic domination. We need not emphasize the influence of Quebec and Rome upon our governments to-day and only the knowledge of the Word of God will solve our political problems in Canada to-day.

(2) Romanism is responsible for the economic backwardness of the people of Quebec as compared with Protestants. One has only to drive through the province and compare it with the Province of Ontario and see the influences of the papacy in economic matters. The Church there absorbs far too much of the people's money in taxes and fees and Dr. Reid points out that this money could better be spent in buying fertilizer and farm machinery.

(3) The religion of Quebec is responsible for the backward condition of education among the people of Quebec. Education is a product of Evangelical Protestantism and where Roman rules there is illiteracy for most of the people.

(4) The papacy is responsible for the unsatisfactory health conditions of the province. During the war 41% of all recruits for the services were rejected as physically unfit and the Church is wholly responsible.

(5) The religion of Quebec holds the people under a cloud of superstitious fears. There is the fear of the priest which is not alone confined to Quebec! Just a week ago in Truro we saw how that fear came again to the father of the MacDonald girl who was killed and he brought the priest in to perform the last rites and have her buried from the Church despite the fact she was brought up Baptist and attended the Sunday School regularly, with no connection with the Catholic Church at all. Then even with all that, there is no real assurance of heaven for this fee and that fee must be paid to the priest to buy her way into heaven.

Then, if we had the time we could make a survey of

the Roman influence of Canada through the government, press radio, and other influential sources. I read some time ago an editorial from Cardinal Villeneuve's daily paper, *L'Action Catholique*, of Quebec City, on January 5th, 1946, in which comment is made on MacArthur's occupation of Japan:

"The ideal would be that the administrators of Japan should favour by adequate measures the expansion of Catholicism, that is to say of the truth. The state itself should be Catholic. Because of modern tendencies, the Church gives evidence of tolerance. Let it be given the liberty to lavish its doctrines."

I quote this to prove to you that the underlying reason why Romanism is eating at the very heart of our democracy and taking control at Ottawa is its profound belief that the State must be Catholic. And furthermore, notice that it mentions the word tolerance. The Catholic Church is only tolerant when it is in a minority for when it becomes a majority it shows no tolerance for other religions.

Now I have barely introduced this subject, but I want to conclude by saying that God expects those who know the truth to be active in "contending for the faith once and for all delivered unto the saints." To-night I want to emphasize that unless you know the truth yourselves as individuals you cannot contend for it.

"The just shall live by faith," is the essential truth of our Protestant religion. Let me emphasize that only God can make us just for "It is God that justifieth." It is only God because God alone can forgive sins and make us righteous in His sight. This He has done for us in the person of His Son Jesus Christ, who came into this world to die, the just for the unjust, upon Calvary's tree, shedding His blood for the remission of sins. And whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish but have everlasting life. Are you living by faith in Him? He alone is able to save.

EXAMINING ROMANISM AND JUDGING HER FRUITS

I TRIED to emphasize last Sunday night that a great struggle was taking place between the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches, but that the former was taking the offensive against a weak and sickly Protestant Church. I pointed out further that Romanism in the Province of Quebec was eating at the very heart of the life of the people like cancer, causing problems that could be solved by the Word of God which is quick and powerful like a two-edged sword. To-night I wish to enlarge that picture so that we might see more clearly the influence of this Church upon the people and countries where it is strong and powerful.

I should like to continue our discussion briefly on the deadly influence of Romanism upon the people and government of Canada to-day. I indicated last week that we can never understand the aggressiveness of Rome upon the governments to-day until we understand their belief in regard to Church and State. They believe that the State exists for the welfare and promotion of the Church. Therefore since the Roman Catholic Church is the only true Church the governments should encourage that religion in every way possible. And I need not remind you that our governments have been doing a pretty good job at catering to the Roman Catholic element, both for power and business reasons, and this catering is not absent even with the powers that be in

Truro. Rome teaches that the Church really has control over the State and the State must work and exist for the Church.

Now this will help us to see to-day why the Roman Catholic Church seeks to take everything from the State without trying to give anything back. In recent weeks the matter of Clergy Income Taxes has come to the foreground, thanks to the work of Dr. T. T. Shields in Toronto. Perhaps you are not aware that all Protestant Clergy must pay Income Tax on their salary, to which is added rent for the Manse, all Catholic Priests do not pay one cent for Income Taxes because in their opinion they only make \$659, \$1 less than the minimum salary for income exemption. They do not take into consideration their living expenses, home, food, car, clothes, and a dozen and more fees that drain the pocketbooks of their people without giving them hope in return.

Some weeks ago Dr. Alexander A. Murray of the Presbyterian Church in Sydney refused to pay this year's tax until the Priests were made to do the same. The department wrote back and said that they would hand over his bill to the Receiver General of Canada for payment. Dr. Murray wrote back saying that he would welcome court action on the matter for the time had come for such issues to be clarified in the interests of the public. If that time should come we here in Truro will back him to the limit and raise plenty of money for court expenses and bring the issue to the front.

This is one positive proof of the Church's attitude towards the State, getting and gaining, and giving nothing in return.

Perhaps some of you might remember also the surprise statements made by Senator Bouchard of Quebec in the House of Parliament about two years ago which further illustrate this point. The matter of finding a committee to write a common history book for the Dominion was under consideration when Senator Bouchard pointed out that much of the trouble in Canada to-day was due to the influence of Quebec upon the rest of the Dominion. Disunity there was the result of history books used in Quebec which falsified history so that their people would be prejudiced against everything British. And all this was done with the consent of the Roman Catholic Church. He, himself, is a staunch Catholic, but in the interest of truth revealed these facts. We might remind ourselves that education in that province is really controlled by the Papacy who despise British interests which are contrary to those of French Canada. In 24 hours the Senator was dismissed from his position as Chairman of the Hydro Commission of the Province of Quebec and Romanism again proved that should she get in control that all opposition would be condemned and freedom would be but a memory.

Furthermore, I do not have to remind you all to-night that the Catholic Church of Canada wields the big stick in all departments. In the Province of Quebec to-day it is almost impossible for a Protestant minister to preach the Gospel by way of radio. Where control cannot be brought to bear upon the station management then the radio station itself is purchased and the Papacy to-day is gradually exerting more and more control over this great medium of speech throughout the land.

I could mention the newspapers of the country that cater to every whim of the Catholic Church. I have been associated with newspaper work for a sufficiently long time to know the pressure that is brought to bear upon Protestant papers and even in a place like Truro

or New Glasgow and other Protestant communities the influence is never forgotten.

I could mention the influence of the Roman Catholic Church upon business men of every community. Time and again I have proven to my own satisfaction that just as soon as prominent business men of Truro assume public office they refuse to stand for the things of the Protestant faith lest the Catholic element will be influenced and withdraw business. The Almighty Dollar is still speaking as strongly in Truro to-day as it has always done despite the fact that Romanist influence here during the past two years has almost doubled. The Almighty Dollar is still more important than the faith once and for all delivered unto the saints! And these facts can be multiplied by as many times as there are communities in Canada to-day!

Yes, and I could mention that even many of our Protestant clergy flirt with the heads of the Roman Catholic Church. A year ago in Truro one of Truro's most prominent clergymen gave a most hearty welcome to the new Priest for Truro, in his weekly news letter, success means failure for the true faith of our Lord, wishing him every success in his work, whereas such success means failure for the true faith of our Lord Jesus Christ through the Protestant Churches. And not many months ago, prominent leaders of the Presbyterian, United, Baptist, Anglican Churches and the Salvation Army united together to welcome and congratulate Cardinal McGuigan of Toronto upon his appointment despite the fact that his work will be primarily to undermine the faith once and for all delivered unto the saints. The same tendency is seen among Modernistic Church leaders in the Federal Council of Churches of America, from which the Canadian Council of Churches modernistic leadership derives its inspiration, in which council your Church is a member. These spiritual leaders are constantly telling us that the hope for Christianity is not just a union of all Protestant Churches, but also a union of Protestantism and Romanism.

The fact that Protestants fail to see these days in allowing Romanism to influence us in all walks of life is that Romanism is primarily and essentially anti-Christian. The Roman Catholic Church can only be what it claims to be, the true Church and the only custodian of the truth of God to bring people to the pathway that leads to heaven; or else it is the greatest fraud in history, leading its people in ignorance away from the freedom of the Gospel into the paths where the Devil and his hosts frequent and make merry at the people's expense. The Pope is either what he claims to be—the true vicar of Christ; or else he is the greatest deceiver of mankind and as our Confession states, the anti-Christ in the world to-day. And yet clergy and Church members in business, public office, and seats of authority listen to every whine of this godless institution that they might primarily for business reasons gain their business while at the same time trifling with the Word of God that might easily lead them to lose their souls. "And what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul?" (Mt. 16:26).

If we had the time to-night, we could examine Romanism from history and find that their watchword is intolerance and persecution against all who would dare to differ with her. Not only would we read about her murdering such leaders as John Huss, John Wycliffe, William Tyndale, but we would discover that the Roman Catholic Church slaughtered tens of thousands of the

best people of Europe during the 16th and 17th centuries. In France alone in the reign of Charles IX the Catholic prince boasted that within a few days 70,000 Protestants were slain. The Pope was so rejoiced that he made a new medal inscribed with his name and bearing the words, "The slaughter of the Huguenots."

In Thomas Babington Macaulay's *History of England*, Vol. 1, p. 54, we have the following survey of the Roman Catholic Church during the Middle Ages:

"During the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation, the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise."

And we might now add the situation has remained the same and has grown more intense as we would compare Roman Catholic Countries today with Protestant countries throughout the world!

If it were possible to take a visit to Catholic Spain today we would find there the fruits of Rome. In 1937 General Franco promised religious freedom were he elected but today the Bible is forbidden, Protestant missions are banned, evangelical Churches are closed, and our missionaries not allowed to enter. It was a French writer, Louis Veuillot, by name, who once expressed the Roman Catholic view of liberty: "We ask you for liberty in the name of your principles; we deny it to you in the name of ours." And it was no less an honoured distinguished servant of the same Church, Cardinal Villeneuve, who said that "The Catholic Church does not believe in democracy."

It is unnecessary for us this evening to say anything further about the same condition that exists in South America where filth, illiteracy, and spiritual ignorance reign supreme. You will be more familiar with the efforts of the Roman Catholic Church there to keep out the Protestant missionaries who alone would give the truth that would set the people free.

It was Jesus Himself who told His disciples, "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"—John 8:31, 32. There are many to-day among Protestant people who are still living in the bondage of sin, without peace and freedom which Jesus provides. All of us are born in sin and it is sin that binds us and keeps us in bondage to the Devil. It is because of the reality of sin that there is the reality of Hell. But Christ came into the world to die, the Just for the unjust, to free us from this burden. "Whosoever believeth on Him HATH everlasting life." Will you believe tonight? It is impossible for us to help set others free until we are free ourselves. Only Jesus Christ can set us free. Just listen to Jesus tonight!

"Behold Me standing at the door,
And hear Me pleading evermore,
With gentle voice: Oh, heart of sin,
May I come in? May I come in?"

"I would not plead with thee in vain;
Remember all My grief and pain!
I died to ransom thee from sin:
May I come in? May I come in?"

"I bring thee joy from heaven above,
I bring thee pardon, peace and love;
Say, weary heart, oppressed with sin:
May I come in? May I come in?"

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE BIBLE

DURING the past week I was confronted with the question again as to the minister's right to speak about the Roman Catholic Church. The general feeling is still with us that we should seek to look after our own work without making any reference to this other Church which is caring for her own people with little or no interest in ours. Is this the truth? I have tried to point out that even if Rome and her servants would mind their own business and not thrust their ways upon us at the expense of our liberties we might be able to avoid controversy upon this delicate matter. But this is not the case. The Roman Catholic Church is seeking in every possible way to impose her teachings and beliefs upon the peoples of every community and every nation.

We live in a day of extreme tolerance and our people would like the pulpit to stay away from all controversial subjects even if truth were at stake. The sad fact is that the modern pulpit is doing exactly what the people desire! I want to emphasize to-night that we must be on guard against the Roman Catholic Church which consigns to Hell all who reject her belief. In one of the famous documents handed down from Pope to Pope, called the *In Coena Domini*, and which is published each year on the Thursday before Good Friday, we read the following words taken from one of the paragraphs:

"We do, on the part of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and also by the authority of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own, excommunicate and curse all Hussites, Wycliffites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and Apostles from the faith of Christ, and all and sundry other heretics, by whatsoever sect they may be; and those believe in them, and their receivers, abettors, and in general, all their defenders whatsoever, and those who without our authority and that of the Apostolic See knowingly read, or retain, or print, or in any way defend the books containing their Heresy, or treating of religion!"

Therefore let it be known to the tolerant Protestants today, so sickly and sentimental in their faith, that the Roman Church is not a tolerant Church at all! Rather it is the most intolerant organization in the world to-day and constantly sends forth its curses upon the Protestant Christians and Churches of all lands, which in their sight means that all who reject her doctrines must be eternally damned in the sight of God.

To-night we are going to consider the Roman Catholic's belief towards the Word of God. We shall readily see that Romanism fails to make the Bible the foundation and source of her faith and therefore she makes false in a multitude of ways the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

The Word of God is the fountain of our faith where

we find the revelation of God's Son, Jesus Christ, who came to this world because of sin, and who Himself is the answer to all the problems caused by sin. Without the Bible there is no revelation of Jesus Christ. And without Jesus Christ there is no knowledge of sins forgiven and no fellowship with Almighty God, the Father. Therefore the Bible is essential to our faith. If the Bible is not taken seriously and authoritatively, as it is not even in modernistic pulpits to-day where parts are denied and rejected, then error creeps in and the Church loses its power which comes alone from the Spirit of truth.

When we examine Rome's attitude towards the Bible we see first of all that she fears the Bible. If Romanism captures Canada as it is seeking to do and with considerable success, then the Bible would be taken from us as it is in Spain. (There are many Protestant homes in Truro to-night who would not know if the Bible was taken away or not!) The Roman Church holds that the people have no right to have the Bible; they must still go to the priest for understanding for only the priest can really interpret it. Little wonder she curses the Bible societies calling them "A horrible invention which undermines the foundation of religion!" She also terms the Bible societies "These cunning and infamous societies." Let our sleeping Protestants awake before it is too late to the realization that the right to possess, read, and privately interpret the Bible is the very tap root of all our liberties! If we are concerned for the welfare of God's Kingdom and for the spread of truth let us resist unto blood if need be the pressure of Rome in Québec and New Brunswick and in every Catholic community and Church to ban the Bible that we might hold fast to our faith!

If we turn to John Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book 1, Chapter VII, we find there a helpful summary of the position the Catholic Church takes with regard to the Word of God.

The Catholic Church begins with the assumption that God's Spirit does not reveal the truth of the authority of God's Word to the believers of each generation. Rather it assumes that the books of the Bible can only be determined by the Roman Church which in turn has the sole right of interpretation of the same. Therefore the plan of salvation as given by Almighty God rests with man's interpretation through the hierarchy of the Church rather than with the Holy Spirit who alone reveals the truth. Therefore the Church is taking upon itself the judgment over Holy Scripture rather than being herself judged by Holy Scripture which is God's plan and purpose for Scripture! The Church must grow out of Holy Scripture if it be the true Church of Jesus Christ. The Roman Catholic Church is in the last analysis the efforts of man to assume unto himself the authority and power of God over the things of the Spirit which has its beginning with Satan in the Garden of Eden when man was tempted to take God's place through disobedience.

As over again this belief we Protestants must ever affirm our belief in the right of the Holy Spirit to reveal the truth. The Bible will never speak to the hearts of people until the Spirit is present in the faithful hearts to confirm the truth.

Furthermore, we believe that the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify

and enjoy God. In contrast we have the Roman Catholic Church believing not only that the Bible cannot be rightly understood apart from the Church's understanding of it, but also they affirm that tradition holds an indispensable place beside the Bible and one equally authoritative with it. We shall find out in later messages that the false doctrines of the Church, such as idol worship, the infallibility of the Pope, have their foundation in tradition and not in the Bible, the Word of God. Protestants must constantly affirm that the traditions of men can add nothing to the message and inspiration of Holy Scripture, but must at the same time beware lest they themselves build up a tradition that will take the place of Scripture as a rule to guide us how we may glorify God and enjoy Him forever.

We must, however, observe that the Roman Church is to-day making a special effort to prove that she is anxious for her people to read the Bible even like unto the Protestants. A little pamphlet has been printed by their Church entitled, *Why Catholics Should Read The Bible*. This leaflet states that the Church grants a special indulgence to Catholics for reading the Bible. It also states that

"All God has to say to us He left in the Bible WITH THE CHURCH THAT CAN EXPLAIN AND INTERPRET IT."

Also,

"In the two Testaments we read what God wants us to know in order to serve Him and become happy as THE CATECHISM TEACHES US."

We know of course that the only Bible a Catholic can read is the Douay Version containing the Catholic annotations which are assumed to be divinely inspired. But one thing must be carefully noted: The Roman Catholic Church in all its literature is very careful to keep before her people that the Bible is not its own interpreter but rather the Church itself must be the final judge of God's message for the people.

I have in my possession a book written for use in Catholic High Schools entitled, *Religion: Doctrine and Practice*, Vol. III. In Chapter II on Scripture and Tradition we have the following question which shows the restraint placed upon Catholics in reading the Bible:

5. QUESTION: Are the Scriptures always easy to understand?

ANSWER: No, the Scriptures are frequently very difficult to understand, and many "wrest" them "to their own destruction" (II Peter III:16).

(a) EVIDENCE THAT SCRIPTURE IS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND—All the so-called Christian sects claim to have the authority of the Bible for their contradictory doctrines; this shows how hard it often is to understand the real meaning.

(b) THE OFFICIAL INTERPRETER OF THE BIBLE—The Catholic Church is the guardian and interpreter of the Bible, and no one is allowed to put any interpretation on it contrary to that of the Church.

8. Question: (a) READING THE BIBLE—The question is sometimes asked whether Catholics are allowed to read the Bible. While the Church does not permit the faithful at large to read Protestant Bibles, as they contain errors and false doctrines, it allows and encourages the use of the Bible in editions that are properly authorized and accompanied by explanatory notes. However, it is well to remember that many portions of the Bible, especially of the O.T., were never intended for youthful readers.

This will help us to see why so many Bibles are burned

in New Brunswick and Quebec and other strong Catholic centres where the Gospel is preached and literature distributed. Missionaries in Spain and South America have often been attacked by Catholic mobs headed by priests and their Bibles and property seized. This is further emphasized in their *Larger Catechisms*: "What ought the Christian to do if a Bible should be offered him by a Protestant?" Answer: "He ought immediately to spurn it because it is forbidden by the Church; and if he should accept it without adverting to what it is, he should at once pitch it into the fire or fetch it to his priest." The Catholic Church will do everything possible to keep their control over even the reading of God's Word lest the Spirit light up the ignorance and expose the unscriptural truths held by the Church throughout the centuries.

Then I want to point out also that even in the Catholic Bible the Catholics without restrictions could find the errors of their system. The Bible teaches in Mt. 23:9 that the title "Father" must not be applied to any spiritual leader. The Epistle to the Hebrews shows conclusively that Christ is the only priest between man and God.

Then, if the Bible contains for them all God has to say where do the Catholics get their authority for praying for the dead. The mass was not adopted until 394 A.D. and the doctrine of purgatory got its start in 593. The use of images and relics in the Church began in 709. Where do we read about prayer beads in the Bible which were introduced in 1090? Or confessing one's sins to the priest which came in in 1215? Much of the form of Catholicism has no foundation in the Word of God at all and only the Word of God will reveal the truth so greatly needed in the world today.

But in saying all this I want to say that many a sincere Catholic will find salvation in Christ. It is possible for a Catholic to put his trust in Christ alone but the whole set-up of the Church is to keep the people as far away as possible from the living personal Christ by making these additions and forms that keep Him in the background.

And yet as we look out in the Protestant Church tonight we find the Church as a whole, cold and sleeping, with modernistic preachers denying the Word and modernistic colleges working overtime to undermine the faith. There seem to be more churches today denying the Word and the blood of Christ than there are believing it. But tonight I want to say that there is only one hope for us all and that is in Christ, who is revealed alone in the Bible. Therefore:

Let Us Go Back To The Bible

Man is in darkness, his day turned to night,
Hatred encouraged, and wrong is called right;
How can the world find again freedom's light?
Let us go back to the Bible!

Nations have turned from belief unto doubt,
Blindly are groping and drifting about;
Calling them back to the faith, comes the shout:
Let us go back to the Bible!

Book of all books, that forewarns of God's wrath,
Tells of salvation and sin's aftermath;
Lamp to our feet and light to our path,
Let us go back to the Bible!

Back to the faith of our fathers, indeed!
Back to the cross and its Christ for our creed;
Only by Him can the sinner be freed —
Let us go back to the Bible!

CATHOLIC MASS EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF THE BIBLE

SOME months ago a little booklet was sent to me entitled, *Why the Mass?* written by two priests of the Roman Catholic Church for the instruction of Catholics in the importance of the Mass. It is written in such a way to have an appeal for Protestants also and it was evidently sent to me by some Catholic admirer seeking to help me find the truth as they see it in the Roman Church. I purpose tonight to examine the Catholic Mass in the light of God's Word so that we might see how utterly false their teaching is in the sight of God.

I am speaking about the Mass because it strikes at the heart of the Catholic faith. Father Richard Ginder, in his little booklet, *The Framework of Catholic Beliefs*, tells us on page 18 that

"Our greatest act of adoration is the Mass. When we are at Mass, we are doing the most we could possibly do for God. Once you have been received into the Church, you are bound to assist at Mass every Sunday, any holyday, unless you have a reasonable excuse. The duty binds so that it is seriously sinful to neglect it."

This might be one explanation for the faithful attendance of Catholics at the Sunday morning Masses!

Then to see again the importance of Mass the *Monastery of the Precious Blood, London, Ontario*, has issued a little booklet on the Mass, which contains the following:

"TREMENDOUS VALUE OF HOLY MASS. At the hour of death the Holy Masses you have heard devoutly will be your greatest consolation. By every Mass you can diminish the temporal punishment due to your sins, more or less, according to your fervor. By piously hearing Mass you afford the Souls in Purgatory the greatest possible relief You shorten your Purgatory by every Mass."

Let us examine the Mass as we have it set forth in this Catholic booklet, *Why the Mass?*

The occasion for the institution of the Mass goes back to the Upper Room where our Lord partook of the Lord's Supper with His disciples: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave to the disciples, and said, 'Take, eat; this is my body.' And He took the cup, and gave thanks; and gave to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins' (Mt. 26:26-28). The Roman Churches teaches that "Christ took bread and changed it into His body" and likewise the wine was changed to His blood. Then they point out that Christ gave the Apostles the power to do as He had just done by saying to them, "DO THIS for a commemoration of me" (Lk. 22:19—Catholic N.T.). Therefore the actual sacrifice of Christ took place at the Upper Room and not at Calvary at all!

This same booklet also points out that "Every Mass repeats the holy action performed by Christ at the Last Supper." (p. 8) The Roman Church teaches that the command given to the disciples as priests, and to all true appointed priests that follow them, "DO THIS in remembrance of me," means that Christ is given as a perpetual Victim at the command of the priests. This means that since there are about four masses per second offered up in all Christendom, Christ dies a sacrifice on a Roman altar, four times every tick of the clock, hour by hour, day in, day out, year by year. This is exactly what their teaching means. If this is true then the Church practises cannibalism in the eating of flesh and the drinking of blood.

If we turn to the decision of the *Council of Trent*, where the faith of Romanism was really expressed, we find this further teaching about their belief in relation to the Protestant Church:

"Whoever shall affirm that the sacrifice of the mass is nothing more than an act of praise and thanksgiving, or that it is simply commemorative of the sacrifice offered on the Cross, and not also propitiation, or that it benefits only the person who receives it, nor ought to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and whatever besides may be requisite, let him be accursed" (Sect. XII, Cap. 1).

Now what is the relation of the Cross to this sacrifice instituted in the Upper Room? The Cross is the public manifestation of the sacrifice made in the Upper Room and in reality completes the sacrifice. The Cross also fixed our Lord's state as a sacrificial victim. The Roman Church teaches that the words, "It is finished", mean, not that His sacrifice was finished, but that He had finished His former, normal, earthly life and was now fixed in the state of a Victim. This sacrifice continues every time the Mass is offered.

The practical application simply means that the bread and wine are thus changed into the very flesh and blood of Christ. This is called transubstantiation. This change is wrought every time a priest consecrates bread and wine at the altar. Thus all who partake literally eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ and are therefore like cannibals.

But the strange thing is that they realize that the bread and wine remain, and both taste and look the same. Yet, they claim, the substance is flesh and blood. Thus the Roman Catholic is taught to deny his senses in this matter, and accept that which looks, feels, smells, tastes, like bread and wine as something else, namely, flesh and blood. A curse is pronounced on all who do not receive this by faith. Thus says the Council of Trent:

"If anyone shall say in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine together with the Body and Blood of Christ, and shall deny that marvellous and unique conversion of the entire substance of the bread into His Body, and of the entire substance of wine into His Blood, while the species of bread and wine alone remain, a conversion which the Catholic Church most fittingly terms transubstantiation, let him be anathema."

Now let us see what we Christians believe regarding these views and the Lord's Supper:

(1) The Mass is blasphemy against God and an insult to Christ. Christ was made a High Priest by His Father for all times, and needs no vicar to be His substitute. In Hebrews 7:17 we read that Christ was "A Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." Thus the Catholic priests take all honour away from Christ and rob Him of His right to be an eternal Priest. As Christ brought forth bread and wine so the presumptuous priest does likewise seeking to be a resemblance of Christ. No human has the right to take upon himself the power to appease the wrath of God or obtain the remission of sins. It is blasphemy against God for the priest to repeat such a sacrifice with a view to obtaining the pardon of sins and obtain righteousness from God. Christ is the only Priest and High Priest of the New Testament Who bought us with a great price, His Own Blood. The priest seems too often to grant special dispensations of grace, like Judas of old; the difference being, Judas sold his Lord once, but the Roman Church sells Him as often as they meet a purchaser.

(2) The miracle of transubstantiation at the Mass

is no miracle at all, for it is unlike all other miracles of Christ. When our Lord turned the water into wine, the ruler of the house did not have to explain to the guests that what looked and tasted like water was really wine. When the sick were healed and the blind given sight they did not have to appear to be well. Romanism seeks to blind reason in asking her people to believe the teachings of the church.

(3) God's Word contradicts this whole teaching and if Catholics would read their own Bibles with open minds they would see such contradictions. Let us read from Hebrews 7:26; 27:

"For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did ONCE WHEN HE OFFERED UP HIMSELF."

If Christ offered a ONCE FOR ALL sacrifice, how can it be repeated on Roman altars thousands of times for sins and punishments and satisfactions and the rest?

Then we can find the same truth in Hebrews 9:11-14

"But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"

Also how can anyone read Hebrews 9:24-28 and still believe in the perpetual sacrifice?

"For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

(4) Thus we can see that the full significance of the Cross is thrust into the background. If we believe in the perpetual sacrifice of Christ, He is of little more value than the animal sacrifices of the Old Testament. The apostle Paul teaches clearly that the full work of redemption was finished on Calvary's Cross. Christ once offered up Himself so that the benefit of this sacrifice might be revealed to us through the preaching of the Word. Paul clearly points out that Christ never intended that He should be murdered by the Romanist Church in a thousand separate places at once. "It was not necessary that he should offer himself often; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world." (Heb. 9:23-25, 26.)

(5) Then we must see that the Mass really destroys the full significance of the Lord's Supper. Christ clearly teaches that the Supper is God's gift to Christians of all ages. The Roman Church teaches that the Mass is an offering unto God. As different as giving is from receiving, so much does the sacrifice of the Mass differ from the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Supper tells us that the sacrifice is a past reality and that through remembering this fact at the sacrament we are renewed and strengthened in the faith. The Mass

teaches that Christ must be offered over and over in order to be of advantage to us. Which is right? Says Paul, "God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world was crucified unto me and I unto the world."

Yes, we shall conclude by quoting another portion of God's Word that completely destroys the validity of the Mass: "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him: knowing that Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no dominion over Him. For in that He died, He died unto sin once; but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God." (Romans 6:8-10). If Christ *dieth no more* then how can the Catholic Church continue its blasphemy if it is interested in following the Word of God.

How many of us here to-night know within our own hearts that our redemption was forever won on Calvary's Cross? Unless we truly know that within our hearts, we are still living in trespasses and sins, which means death and eternal separation from God. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." (Romans 3:23). And Jesus bore our sins on Calvary's Cross. He bore your sins. All we need to do is to believe, to trust Him. It is His finished work that saves us. Let us receive Him into our hearts.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF ROME UNSCRIPTURAL

WHILE the spiritual leaders of our day in all Protestant churches are looking forward to a great union, not only among the Protestant churches, but also between Protestantism and Romanism, God's Word makes clear to our hearts that there can be no union and no compromise with the wiles of the devil. We saw last Sunday night how utterly opposed is the Catholic Mass to the Scriptural teaching on the Lord's Supper. To-night we shall see that union and unity are impossible with this anti-Christian church because of the unscriptural Catholic conception of the priesthood.

Let us first examine the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church regarding the priesthood. Let us see their importance as we find it set forth in various Catholic booklets:

"Where there is no priest there is no sacrifice, and where there is no sacrifice there is no religion."

"Without the priest the death and passion of our Lord would be of no avail to us."

"See the power of the priest! By one word from his lips, he changes a piece of bread into a God! A greater feat than the creation of the world."

"Next to God Himself the priest is everything."

How different this order is than that found in Scripture when John the Baptist said, "He must increase but I must decrease!" The Roman Church also reverses the order of Scripture!

The priesthood as Rome conceives it is not only the guardian of divine truth, but the channel of divine grace. We already saw that the church brings Christ down upon the altar for a perpetual sacrifice at every Mass. Let us now see that the power to forgive sins was also given to the priests in the upper room after the resurrection when Jesus said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John 20:22, 23). Also Jesus said to Simon Peter: " whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth

shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. 16:19). These are key verses so let us examine them carefully.

Let us notice that these two passages have reference to the powers of the church in disciplinary polity. The church has a power of jurisdiction. Paul refers to this in 1 Cor. 12:28, "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, . . ." Also in Romans 12:8 he says, "He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence." Now in Matthew 18:15-18 Jesus tells them to settle their differences privately as Christians, but those who despise private admonitions they are to be excluded from the society of believers. (I should like to add here the thought that the church to-day is so interested in getting every Tom, Dick and Harry to join the church, especially if they have a good position and will be good givers and add prestige to the church, that the church will put up with almost anything to keep the peace. A person to-day can drink little or much, can be dishonest in business or work, can run dance halls and promote gambling tournaments of all kinds, and so long as he is respectable in the community he is counted great in the eyes of the church. But let some poor drunkard or outcast seek admittance even to the services to hear the Gospel message, and there are hard looks and much confusion.

Now the church must have some jurisdiction over its people. This text has nothing to do with the authority of the doctrine to be preached by the apostles, but rather it means that the power of the Sanhedrin council has now been transferred to the Church of Christ.

Now the power of binding and loosing is simply the assurance given to the disciples by Christ Himself that their doctrine of the grace of God was confirmed in Heaven by God Himself. Their voice was the voice of God—not a voice issuing from the earth, but descended from heaven. The remission of sins, the promises of eternal life can never be of man for they are of God. Therefore these texts mean that the word of the Gospel preached by the faithful everywhere and anywhere is the very sentence of God Himself, sent forth by Himself and recorded in the Book of Life.

Now then in John 20:22, 23 we have a clear explanation of what Christ intends by *binding and loosing*, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." Now Paul points out that this is truly carried on by the ministers of the Gospel who have received a commission to reconcile men unto God (2 Cor. 5:18). People should feel free to go to their minister and even confess their sins that he might lead them to the saving knowledge of Christ. But it never should be forced. It should not be universal in its application. And the minister can only direct the person to the mercy and love of God in Christ Jesus and wait for the Holy Spirit to enlighten and reveal.

These verses, in conclusion, would tell us three things: (1) That no person can stand before God without remission of sins; (2) That this benefit of sins forgiven comes through the church (when the church minds its own business); (3) This remission is given to us through the ministers of the church through the preaching of the Gospel.

Let us also notice that there is no record of Scripture where the disciples heard confessions and granted absolutions. Did Paul forgive the sins of the Philippian jailor like the priests try to forgive the sins of his

people? The whole practice is foreign to the New Testament.

We would also reject the Confessional on the basis that it was never practised in the Roman church until 1215, under Pope Innocent III. For the first thousand years of church history there is no trace of such a system at all.

Then I would say again that we would reject the Confessional on the grounds of its immoral decency since the time of its inception. A casual reading of Father Chiniquy's book reveals the iniquity of the Confessional. After all, priests are only men, like unto all other men. The very secrecy of the Confessional is loaded with temptation.

Thus we can understand a little the power of the priest over his people. But we can also understand how unscriptural are their practices and can state that God never intended man to undertake so much, when man himself is unable to do anything that will be pleasing in the sight of God apart from the Spirit who reveals the truth of Christ to all who believe.

Then I want to point out also that there is no person in the Bible who corresponds to the Roman priest at all. There were priests in the Old Testament; Christ is called the High Priest, and all believers are called "A Royal Priesthood," but there is no priestly class like unto the Roman priests.

Then the word minister as we know the term is used in various ways. There is one word, *leitourgos*, which meant service rendered to the state. It appears five times and refers to civil rulers, it is applied once to Paul as a minister of Christ, once to Epaphroditus, once to angels, and once to Christ in His priestly character. Only once then has it reference to priests and that is when it is applied to Christ Himself, not to Roman priests.

Another word, *huperetes*, is translated four times with reference to Christians: once of the disciples when Jesus said they would fight if His Kingdom were of this world; once of John Mark; once of Paul; once of Paul, Apollos, and Peter, when Paul was condemning the schism that had arisen in Corinth over their names. There is still no sign of a Roman priesthood.

The third word is *diakonos*, from which we get our word deacon. We read of "deacons of Satan," deacons of men, deacons of God, and deacons of the church. Christ is referred to as a "Deacon of the circumcision." Again there is no reference to the Roman priesthood.

Then there is also another pair of words with reference to ministers of the gospel. They are *elder* and *bishop*. We believe they refer to the same office, for when Paul called together the "elders" of the church at Ephesus, he addressed them as those whom the Holy Spirit had appointed "bishops" of the flock. John and Peter called themselves "elders". Notice this: That Peter, whom the Roman church considers to be the first Pope, addressing the elders, called himself a *sunpresbuteros*, an "elder along with", taking his place therefore along with the other elders, and therefore Rome has no Scriptural assurance for raising Peter above others. Again there is no reference to the Roman priesthood.

There are also other terms like prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, where the emphasis is upon the work to be done, not the office itself. But these do not set forth the Roman priesthood. The whole idea of the Roman priesthood is absent from the Word of God and is therefore of man, and not of God at all.

Why, then, should people go to the priest to confess their sins. John says, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1:9). This does not mean that we are to confess before a fellow sinner who through man-made laws of the church is made to take God's place, but rather we are to come to confess our sins before Christ Himself, Who alone has power to forgive us our sins.

You have heard of the reply made by an elderly woman to the priest who made a last effort to get her back to the church as she was dying. "I have come to forgive your sins," he said to her. "Show me your hands," the aged saint answered. Then when the astonished priest showed his hands, she said: "You cannot forgive my sins. The Man who forgives my sins has the marks of the nails in His hands."

My brethren, have you beheld Christ Who died on Calvary's Cross for your sins? We are all sinners and "the wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23). We are all going to die and it may be soon. Sudden deaths are not unknown. But this one fact is known. That at the hour of death there is only one thing that matters:—not to what lodge you belong, not how many think well of you, not whether you are an important citizen of the town or not, but one thing, what is the condition of your heart and soul in the sight of God. If all is well through the blood of Christ then your soul will go to heaven; but, BUT if all is not well in GOD'S SIGHT, your soul will go to hell and there is no second chance. All must die and then comes the judgement (Hebrews 9:27).

To-night I point you to One Who took our sins upon the Cross, and blotted them out once for all. That One is Christ Jesus. Are you trusting Him to-night? Do you believe that He died for you?

GOD'S WAY OF SALVATION AND ROME'S WAY

ONE of the real causes of the Protestant Reformation was the conception of salvation as found in Scripture and that set forth by the Roman Catholic Church. Does man live by faith alone in the finished work of Christ? Martin Luther one day realized that the just shall live by faith. The Roman Church insisted that man had much to do to save himself. And to-day the same church continues to emphasize works as a necessity to the completion of man's salvation.

Let us examine Rome's way of salvation. I take this information from the book, *Religion, Doctrine and Practice*, Part III, written for use in Catholic High Schools, and written by one of their own priests.

FIRST: THEIR CONCEPTION OF SIN: Adam and Eve, our first parents, committed the sin of disobedience, because they wanted to be like God, knowing good and evil. Adam's sin is called original sin, and it has passed to all his descendants. The consequences of this sin is that Adam lost the supernatural life of the soul, and the life of the body. Furthermore, his mind was darkened and his will weakened. If Adam had not sinned, his descendants would have been born in grace; that is, children of God and heirs of heaven. But now as descendants of Adam, who sinned, they are born in sin, and have no right to heaven. By Adam's sin the doors of heaven were closed.

SECONDLY: THEIR CONCEPTION OF CHRIST: Jesus Christ is the Son of God made man. He is true God manifested in the flesh. On the divinity of Christ depends the truth or falsity of Christianity. (Modernists please notice.) Jesus Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary in order to provide a perfect atonement for the sins of men. God demanded perfect satisfaction for man's sins and only a Divine person could satisfy the infinite God who was offended by sin.

THEN: NOTICE ALSO HIS SUFFERING AND DEATH: Christ suffered death to make satisfaction to the Divine Justice for the sins of the world. He died also to restore to men the grace of God and the right to heaven. He died for each and every person who ever lived or shall live. But because everybody does not receive Christ, all will not be saved.

This is briefly their teaching without going into all the details and off-shoots that spring from tradition and man. It sounds rather orthodox but it is when they begin to put this teaching into practice that their error can be seen.

Let us notice that Rome teaches and believes that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. One is a good Catholic who is baptized, believes all that the church teaches, and fulfills all the obligations it imposes. Now notice this question in the same book:

Will all Catholics be saved? ANSWER: "No, only those Catholics who live up to the teachings of their religion." It will be observed that the moment their belief is practised their faith in Christ disappears.

Since Jesus Christ established the Roman Catholic Church and commanded all to belong to it, therefore any who refuse to obey it cannot enter heaven. BUT NOT ONLY IS THERE A PRECEPT TO JOIN THE CHURCH BUT MEMBERSHIP IN IT IS A NECESSARY MEANS OF SALVATION. If for any reason, it is impossible for a person to join the Church by receiving baptism, he must have the desire, at least implicit, of doing so. And what about Protestants outside this church? Just listen:

"Such persons, if they hold the essentials of Christian belief, and have at least an implicit desire of belonging to the Church, and are in the state of grace, either through baptism or an act of the pure love of God, will be pleasing to Him."

Thus we see that Rome's way of salvation in the last analysis is on the basis of the *sacraments of the church* not on the merits of the finished work of Christ at all, through the Gospel message. Let us mention briefly their teaching more fully in this connection. There are seven sacraments and five of these are instruments to give saving grace to the people through the authority of the church.

The most important is *baptism*. Rome teaches that "By baptism the person is made a member of the true church of Christ, obtaining remission of original sin and of all actual sins, if he has committed any, with all the punishment due to them, and becomes capable of receiving the other sacraments." Baptism is the essential means of washing away the stain of original sin. God's word tells us "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7). But to Rome there is no salvation outside of baptism.

Then there is the *sacrament of confirmation*. The bishop receives the person who has been baptized and instructed, lays his hands on him, makes the sign of the cross and slaps him on the cheek. Then applying the oil he says, "I sign thee with the sign of the Cross,

and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Now this sacrament is not necessary for salvation, but "It is wrong to neglect it, because it is a means for obtaining salvation more easily and fully." Again God's Word teaches "For by grace are ye saved through faith and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8). The Catholic Church does not grant salvation assurance to her people despite the elaborate set-up for applying the means of grace.

There is also the *sacrament of the eucharist* which is like unto the sacrifice of the Mass. The *Council of Trent* tells us that this sacrament "*Remits venial (that is, lesser) sins, it strengthens against temptation, it invigorates and nourishes the soul*". The priest is told to expound the benefits of the eucharist from John VI: (1) He has no life who does not partake of them; (2) He has eternal life who does, and will be raised up in the resurrection of the just; (3) Eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ is the way to realize the mutual indwelling of Christ in the believer.

But despite the fact that *baptism* gives one the benefits of God's grace, and the sacraments of *confirmation* and the *eucharist* forgive further sins and strengthen the people against sin, yet sins still creep in, even mortal sins, that might damn the soul even of the baptized. Therefore the church practises penance. The sinner comes to the priest. There must be the spirit of repentance. Then there is confession to the priest; not to Christ, for he holds the power of the keys to bind and loose sin. Then the priest gives satisfaction through a system of works. Again the way of salvation works and God's word says NOT BY WORKS LEST ANY SHOULD BOAST! (Eph. 2:9).

The final sacrament of grace is *extreme unction*. This is needed for the last moment of death because neither the person nor the priest himself can believe for a moment that works are sufficient for salvation. Here the priest anoints the eyes, ears, mouth, nose, head and feet of the dying, that the Lord may pardon and give mercy through this holy unction. Thus they teach that all remaining sins are blotted out as well as the remains of sin. It also teaches us why the priest exerts such a power over his people even to the last dying moment, a real illustration of the blind leading the blind even unto death.

Yes, and this is not all. Salvation is not yet attained. There is the teaching or *purgatory* where the satisfaction of sins is accomplished. The time spent in purgatory can be shortened through indulgences which come through the church's supply of the blood of Christ, which is drawn upon by the priests in quantities that suit the situation which is often dependent upon the amount of fees paid by the family of the dead. Other helps can be given such as praying for the dead, and having masses said for them.

But having said all this, the sad fact is that despite the cumbersome plan of salvation as outlined by the Church of Rome, the Catholic people still have no real assurance of salvation. After all, they can never be sure until they die. (Even some Protestant leaders would make us believe something like unto this!)

Our question to all Catholics would be something like this: What is the good of such a religion when there is such little hope and assurance like that found in the

Word of God? God's Word is definite. "Whosoever believeth on the Son hath life (John 4:36). We do not need to hope to be saved. We can know right now whether or not we are saved.

Rome teaches salvation by works. Man must do something and continue to do something to be saved. God's Word teaches that salvation is by grace alone as it is revealed in Jesus Christ. "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rome says that salvation is from God in Christ but you cannot receive it except by working for it through the church, the priest, the sacrament, etc.

Thus we can see that Rome corrupts the Gospel through the teachings of men. The Cross is of NO EFFECT in the Catholic Church. The finished work of Christ is pushed into the background while the works of men are emphasized from the beginning to the end. Jesus Christ is not the Lord over this church, and therefore salvation is not through His blood, for the great emphasis is the church, and the priest, and the sacraments.

And yet to-night what is our emphasis in the matter of salvation? "For by grace are ye saved through faith" (Eph. 2:8). This does not say:

For by doing the best ye can ye are saved.
For by following the golden rule ye are saved.
For by taking a chance are ye saved.
For by getting an education are ye saved.
For by joining the church are ye saved.

No, it is God's grace and mercy and love in Christ. My brethren, tonight there are only two classes of people here, the saved and the unsaved. To-night if you are not sure to which class you belong, perhaps, and most probably, you belong to the unsaved class. "He that is not with Me is against Me," said Jesus. We are either with Him or against Him. If you are against Him, will you then behold Him dying on the Cross for you, shedding His Blood for the remission of your sins. The sin question is a settled question for you all tonight. All you need to do is to receive Him by accepting His finished work on Calvary's Cross. Salvation is God's gift for you through Christ. Will you accept Him now?

MARIOLATRY AND IDOL WORSHIP AN OFFENCE TO GOD

WE come to-night to the end of a series of sermons dealing with the teaching of Romanism as over against the teaching of God's Word. I do pray that they might be used of God in some small way to educate our people; to stir Christians from their slumbers; to encourage more to study God's Word so that they might give an account of their faith before men. Much more could be said but just as we have been led to start so we have now been led to stop. From time to time we shall give other messages on the same subject in order to keep this important matter before our people.

We speak to-night on idol worship with special reference to their worship of *Mary, the Mother of Jesus*. We can say first of all that this whole practice of bowing down before images is forbidden by the Second Commandment. The Roman Church tells us that they do not worship the images, but use them as symbols of the object of their worship. The Commandment, however, does not only forbid the worship of images: it

states plainly: "Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." The practice is an offence to God. The Roman Church leaves out this Second Commandment, dividing the Tenth Commandment into two to make the ten.

Albert Henry Newman, in his *Manual of Church History*, Vol. 1, pp. 386-387, points out that during the first three centuries of the Christian church everything was rejected that might betoken image worship:

"The Synod of Elvira (302) decreed that 'Pictures ought not to be in the Churches.' From the time of Constantine onward this practice (the veneration of pictures) developed rapidly. To a very great extent it was transferred immediately from paganism. Men of influence came from paganism to Christianity with little change of views. Such men were in many cases appointed to high offices in the churches, and they devoted their energies to the assimilation of Christian churches to heathen temples."

(This corresponds somewhat to the modern practice of electing the prominent men of the community to places of position. The better the position and the greater contributions, although by no means the greater sacrifice, the more attention is given by the church and the more calls that minister is supposed to make to that home. And the result is like unto the above in that the church has become worldly and seeks to choose its membership like unto the social club and lodge-handpicking her followers.) At any rate at the beginning of the 7th century image worship had increased to such a degree that the Mohammedans and Jews taunted the Christians by saying they had fallen into idolatry.

On the other hand, although most of the Catholic books written for the use of Protestants as propaganda would tell us that no worship is paid to images of any kind, yet St. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa*, which is one of the greatest of all Roman Catholic theological works, points out that "The same reverence should be displayed towards an image of Christ and towards Christ Himself, and seeing that Christ is adored with the adoration of *latría* (that is, supreme religious worship) it follows that His image is to be adored with the adoration of *latría*." And so it follows for other idols according to this great Romanist leader. It will be difficult for the priests of Rome to take away the full significance of these words when they try to tell us that their idols are not worshipped. Such idols are truly an offence to Almighty God!

The greatest and supreme example of idol worship in the Church of Rome is that given to *Mary*. Now let us notice the false reasoning used by Rome to arrive at the conclusion that *Mary* is the *Mother of God*. They say this:

"Since *Mary* was the Mother of The Person Jesus Christ, and as He is a Divine Person and true God, she is rightly called the Mother of God."

The final appeal goes back to 431. Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, began to teach that there were two persons in Christ, and that *Mary* was not the Mother of God, but only the Mother of Christ. The Council of Ephesus (431 A.D.) condemned this heresy and solemnly declared *Mary* to be the Mother of God.

Mary is given several names in the Roman Church: Mother of God, Queen of Heaven, Star of the Sea, Our Lay, etc. Is there any danger of loving and honouring *Mary* too much? Rome says, "No, as long as we do not pay her divine worship; we can never love or honour her as God the Son did in choosing her to be His Mother." Yet, Rome teaches that what *Mary* asks

for, God will grant. She has great persuasion power with God. She intercedes for peoples unto their salvation. Therefore in practice Mary becomes a female god taking honour which is due alone to Jesus Christ.

Then notice their doctrine of the *Immaculate Conception*. In 1854 this church declared that Mary was born sinless. Previous popes had declared that Mary was not born without sin. Thus we see that even the infallible popes disagreed on such an important matter! There is no Scriptural ground for the belief in the sinless Mary. When Elizabeth, filled with the Holy Spirit, pronounced a blessing upon Mary and upon the Son to be born of her, Mary said, "My spirit hath rejoiced in God my SAVIOUR" (Luke 1:47). Only the sinful need a Saviour, and Mary acknowledged her need.

Romanism realizes there is no Scriptural authority for this belief. Various writings point out that the "The lack of Scriptural evidence can be abundantly supplied from the writings of the Fathers." The real appeal of Rome is still to man and authority not to the Word of God.

Then let us also notice the office of Mary in the Roman Church. She is the second Eve; she is the advocate. "Even as Eve brought in sin and death, so Mary brings in obedience and life, and as we owe all our miseries to Eve; so we owe all of the blessings of salvation to Mary." Scripture says, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. 15:22). Who is right? Does our new life and joy come from Mary or from Christ?

My brethren we have said enough to prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that there are to-day hundreds and hundreds of people called Roman Catholics living in spiritual darkness and being guided by those who are themselves blinded by the power of Satan. If God's Word has any authority for us at all, we must surely know that the whole form and worship of the church as well as her doctrines are anti-Christian and contrary to God's revelation to mankind through Holy Scripture.

During this month the Protestant churches will be celebrating the anniversary of the Reformation, for on October 31, 1517, Martin Luther nailed a paper on the door of the church in Wittenberg, Germany. This paper contained ninety-five theses or propositions dealing with the indulgence question which is even not yet settled in Roman spheres. The pope then needed money to complete St. Peter's Church and to raise money he sent men all over Europe selling forgiveness of sins (indulgence), for with each gift the people were freed from penance and from the punishments of God. It was from this that the Reformation came.

The three basic principles of the Protestant Reformation are these:

(1) The Word of God, the Bible, and not the church, is the supreme authority.

(2) In interpreting the Word of God a Christian has the right of private judgment. This does not mean that reason judges the Word, but that the Word was given to be understood and under the Holy Spirit the Christian can understand it for himself and need not defer to pope or council such decisions concerning God's will in His word.

(3) The great fact that God's Word teaches us that "The just shall live by faith alone."

The Christian Church to-day has forgotten the events of 1517 and afterwards. Romanism is with us yet. Its evils are the same and its power just as great. Both in the popular magazines and in the movies the Roman Church obtains her publicity. Both in the press and governments Romanism exerts its influence. It is time for the Christian Church and Christian people to again ask themselves why they are here and what is God's will for them.

But the greatest need for the Christian church and all who profess to follow her is to rediscover the reality of God's plan of salvation, that the just shall live by faith. Luther for many years sought peace of soul through works. He sought heaven on his own merits. No monk worked harder to save himself. One day he was sent a teacher, John Staupitz (and at first little fellowship was found. The time came when the teacher asked Luther: "Why are you so sad, brother Martin?" Luther: "I do not know what will become of me!" "But these temptations are more necessary to you than eating and drinking", came the reply.

And this teaching did not stop. Another day Staupitz said:

"Why do you torture yourself with all these speculations and these high thoughts? Look at the wounds of Jesus Christ, to the blood that He has shed for you; it is there that the grace of God will appear to you. Instead of torturing yourself on account of your sins, throw yourself into the Redeemer's arms. Trust in Him—in the righteousness of His life—in the atonement of His death. Do not shrink back; God is not angry with you, it is you who are angry with God. He became man to give you the assurance of divine favour. He says to you, You are my sheep; you hear my voice; no man shall pluck you out of my hand" (John 10:27, 28).

And so it was that Luther finally saw that salvation and deliverance from sin came through faith in the finished work of Christ. For a long time his religion was that of doing. Now he found that it was already done by Christ on Calvary's Cross.

My brethren, how many of you have been trying to do something to please God or to buy your righteousness through doing this and doing that? After all what is the Gospel? The average person thinks the Gospel is GOOD ADVICE as to how to live; and there is little interest! But the Gospel is GOOD NEWS! Christianity's message for you to-night is not, "Do this or that and you shall be saved"; rather it is, "TRUST IN WHAT CHRIST HAS DONE for sinners on the Cross and you shall be saved". The Gospel tells us not what we must do but what Christ has done. Man cannot save himself by works. The Church cannot save him. It is CHRIST who saves. He does ALL the saving. Man is to RECEIVE salvation from God as a FREE GIFT.

On the Cross Christ died as our substitute. He suffered there the wrath of God that sin deserved. The Gospel now calls you to trust in the work that Christ HAS DONE for you and in that work alone.

As you sit here to-night, or afterwards read these lines, ask yourself this question: "On what hope does my hope of eternal salvation in Heaven rest at this hour?" What is your soul's honest answer? May God lead you by His Spirit to trust no longer in YOUR WORKS but only and altogether in the WORK OF CHRIST!

What Is Wrong With The Protestant Church?

A series of four sermons preached by Rev. Perry F. Rockwood,
minister of St. James Presbyterian Church, Truro, N.S.

THE CHURCH SICK UNTO DEATH DOCTRINALLY

(Preached on November 10, 1946)

THIS series of sermons is the most difficult I have ever prepared for my people. It is difficult because of the truth they contain. It is never easy to present truth in a bold fashion and especially is this so in regard to the church. The moment one begins to speak the truth, there comes the cry from many corners "disloyalty to Christ"; whereas the truth is that it can never be taken for granted that the church as it exists today is necessarily loyal to Christ. (We are using the word church of course with reference to the denominational church as such and not the true church, the redeemed of God by grace in Christ). We are going to see that the Presbyterian Church (and every other church) is today in many ways disloyal to Christ.

This series is difficult to present because I am presenting views, which, although Scripturally accurate, are most unpopular in the pew, pulpit, and church courts. The majority of spiritual leaders today are not facing the problem of the church with reality and honesty. Rather are they seeking to live more by the "tradition of men", (Col. 2:8) to do the work expected of them in the denomination as such and not making their first interest that of obedience to Jesus Christ.

This series of sermons will pay special attention to the prevalent condition of The Presbyterian Church in Canada, but what is true of it is also true of the other three major denominations. Some references will have to be made to these latter, especially in talking about such matters as church union where all are concerned.

We may begin by saying that in the early history of the Christian church the devil sought to destroy the church from without, by persecution. Christians were persecuted and put to death. The blood of the martyrs became the seed of the church. But today the devil is destroying the church from within—perverting the doctrine and Gospel message in our colleges so that today there is preached another gospel which is not the gospel at all. Modernism or liberalism is at the helm and the devil is having a happy time as the church loses its power and becomes little more than a worldly organization for spiritual purposes.

As we look out today and see the church at work we can see that it has lost its grip on the multitudes. Each year an effort is made at court meetings to have the church presented to the public as though it were very much alive. In reality the facts show that the church is not gripping the multitudes at all and each year sees an increase in small faith groups largely composed of people whom the church could not reach or has no interest in. The great interest for the average church today is the number of prominent people of the community it has on her roll, not in the number of people reached for Jesus Christ as such. The church on the whole today also caters to money and the pulpit continually speaks with one ear to the paw and the other to the Lord, seeking to drive a middle course.

Another real evidence of the sickness of the church is seen in the fact that the pulpit is not constantly reaching out under the Holy Spirit to win souls unto God through Jesus Christ. Considerable attention is paid to building up church rolls, but today the church is filled with unconverted members who are no different from the aver-

age person on the street who seldom enters the church doors, although living a good moral life as a citizen of the community.

Many people today tell us that doctrine is not important and that those who criticize doctrineless preaching (if there be such) are narrow in outlook. If we turn to the Apostle Paul we can see that he was interested in doctrine for in Galatians he is much concerned over the false teachers (modernists) who came into preach a "perversion" of the true Gospel of Christ and a moving from the grace of Christ. He was not speaking about these preachers as such, but about their preaching.

On another occasion at Jerusalem, Paul rebuked Peter "before them all" (Gal. 2:11-14). Peter visited the church at Antioch and mingled freely with Gentiles and Jews alike. But some of the brethren came from Jerusalem and Peter became afraid and withdrew from the Gentiles. Peter was confusing the Gospel by making the Jews feel they had to be circumcised and in defence of the Gospel of grace Paul withstood him publicly.

Today there are false doctrines being set forth on every hand, such as the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; the inherent goodness of man; sin is shunned and people are taught to be whitewashed and not washed white by the blood of Christ; the Bible is no longer set forth in our Theological colleges and from many pulpits as the inspired Word of God, but rather higher criticism has seen fit to make many changes and omissions according to their own wisdom and conceits. The church is sick unto death doctrinally, having departed from the true faith once and for all delivered unto the saints. (Jude 3).

It is always interesting to hear the remarks from some quarters today that we are too busy preaching the Gospel to engage in criticism lest our main work might be confused or even set aside. If we turn to Galatians 5:7-12 we see clearly that Paul found time to resist sin and contend for the true faith. Can it be true that it is Paul who writes: "He that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be. . . I would they were cut off which trouble you!" It was a hard, earnest fight for the true Gospel and the fight is just as real today. Christ Himself entered upon controversy after controversy. It might not have been pleasant for Him to do so, but as **THE TRUTH** He laboured to free men from error.

The church today does not want controversy. Loyalty to the denomination is the first consideration today even though such loyalty might be disloyalty to Jesus Christ. There are leaders within our church today who are denying the faith of our church, and yet who call disloyal any who would raise their voice to maintain loyalty to the true faith upon which the church is founded. Whether the church wants to face it or not the controversy has started and all who stand upon the infallible Word of God as the only rule and practice of the faith must make their stand boldly and humbly as unto God.

Another great sickness of the church today is the constant appeal to the flesh and not to the souls of men under the Spirit. "Many desire to make a fair show in the flesh and constrain you to be circumcised (church members through good works); only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ (by preaching the truth of salvation by grace alone to keep people out of Hell). For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law (nor today follow Christ); but desire that you be circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh."—Gal. 6:12, 13.

Here is a real example of the pulpit watering down the

message so that the gospel might be accepted by all. The emphasis seems to be to let men believe they can save themselves through good works, that they can know God by their own choosing, that they are not so bad after all, and a fair show in the flesh is made by bringing them into the church. The Presbyterian Church today, like all other denominations, on the whole is anxious for man to keep his pride and confidence rather than have all men know that they are sinners, without hope, separated from God even from their birth. The church membership today is made up of far too many who have no new birth experience and the sadded fact is that too few spiritual leaders are brave enough to do anything about it.

The plain fact is that the pulpits of our land today are manned by men who are upholding the liberal point of view which is at its best un-Christian, trying at the same time to maintain a conformity with the past, and yet seeking to appeal to the superficial beliefs of the present day. The truth of the situation is that the word "Christian" has lost its New Testament significance. Anybody can be a Christian today. Almost everybody is a Christian according to the standards set forth by the liberal pulpit. As long as a person remains respectable, goes to church, supports the good interests in the community, that person is given a hearty welcome into the fellowship of the church as a Christian.

We have travelled a long ways from Christ's day when a rich, learned, religious man by the name of Nicodemus came by night to learn more of the Christ. Despite the fact that today he would be made the most important leader in any ordinary church and thought himself to be alright, Jesus confronted him and told him he was all wrong for HE MUST BE BORN AGAIN. It is possible for a person to be the most prominent in the community and most respected in the church and still be living in trespasses of sins which is death for the soul. The word Christian no longer carries with it the Bible meaning in the modern church in our land today.

What, after all, is a Christian according to God's testimony in the Bible? He is one who is born again by the Spirit; one who has truly believed in the only begotten Son of God and accepted His blood sacrifice on Calvary's Cross. He is one who believes the Bible from cover to cover as the true record of God concerning His Son and His plan for mankind. He is one who makes Christ Lord over his life and makes his primary interest in life to glorify God and enjoy Him forever. A Christian is glad to obey the commandments of God and stands with assurance upon His many promises regarding this life and the life to come. A Christian is separated unto God, loving not the world and the things thereof, nor finding his chief delight in the world, but in the things of the Spirit.

When the word Christian is used by the average person and pulpit today there is no clear cut meaning such as was found in the New Testament. Modernists in the pulpit today have taken this word and changed its meaning. No person can be a Christian and yet not believe in the full authority of God's Word. No person can be a Christian who does not accept the true doctrines concerning Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, life, death, and bodily resurrection, and His coming again to receive His own. Christians in our midst must surely realize that a vital clash has come within our ranks and we shall not give an inch of ground to those who deny our faith as it is revealed in God's Word that cannot be broken (John 10:35).

Now, my brethren, you must surely believe what I have

said tonight. Next Sunday I shall give you the cause for this doctrinal sickness, for the germ has its beginning in the teaching of our Colleges today.

It is the sacred responsibility of all Christians to stand by the Word of God. Indeed, we must oppose every effort being made to take away its final authority on all matters. It is our great task today to be loyal to Jesus Christ, not to sit back and watch the foundation of the church being taken away. "For if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" Let us confess that we are not doing enough to follow Christ in loving obedience. Let us weep that we have so little knowledge of the doctrines of the church! Let us realize in shame that we are so fearful about the thoughts of men that we have failed to contend earnestly for the faith ONCE and FOR ALL delivered unto the saints!

"On Christ the Solid Rock we stand,
All other ground is sinking sand."

II.

THE CHURCH SICK UNTO DEATH EDUCATIONALLY

(Preached on November 17, 1946)

LAST Sunday night I pointed out that liberalism or modernism had taken control of the pulpits of our church today with few exceptions. There are many spiritual leaders in our midst who are preaching a gospel which is another gospel and is therefore not the Gospel at all. I emphasized that the word Christian has lost its full significance as we compare its meaning today with that of the N. T. and the Early Church. Those who deny God's Word and the important doctrines of the faith are themselves unchristian and their preaching has no relation to the faith ONCE and FOR ALL delivered unto the saints.

Tonight I wish to emphasize that the root cause of this unbelief is found in the teachings of our theological colleges. Our colleges have betrayed our church's faith by their denial of the authority of the Word of God and the consequent denial of many of the essential beliefs of our faith.

Back in 1940 I entered my first year in Presbyterian College, Montreal. I had just come from Acadia where I saw enough of the teachings for students of the ministry to know that God's Word was not believed by many there. I looked forward to going to a Presbyterian College to study further the faith of our church as expressed in the Westminster Confession. I was not there many days when I began to realize that the College was betraying the faith of our church and that with few exceptions the Word of God was not accepted as the "Only rule and practice of our Faith."

Let me try to illustrate what took place. In one particular class, after each lecture was over, one of the young men from Prince Edward Island would say: "Well, boys, there goes another page of the Bible." I became greatly concerned. After a month I went to the Library and started to check with the commentaries widely accepted to see if these lectures should be accepted as such. While engaged in thought, one of the professors came in and asked me why I was so serious. I looked up rather surprised and replied, "Your lectures." He said, "What is the trouble?" I told him that the general impression of the students was that we could not believe what was in the Bible and I was anxious to hear other men speak

on the matter. "Ah!" he replied, "don't take it too seriously. I only try to scare freshmen!" This was his idea of a joke; tearing apart the Bible!

This is by no means an isolated case for throughout the year one could see that for the most part the professors were never anxious to be sure on the important matters of our faith. The whole atmosphere was one foreign to a theological college of our church. I could stand it no longer, and wrote the Principal that I was leaving for reasons clearly set forth in that letter.

For the next two years I studied at Knox and on the whole the situation was little better. Since that time a few new professors have been appointed, but it is very doubtful if the Word of God has yet found its right place in the class-rooms. Dr. W. W. Bryden, Principal, was quoted in the last Presbyterian Record as saying at a banquet given to honour Principal John McNicol of the Toronto Bible College: "His (Dr. McNicol's) home has been in the Bible, his centre has been scriptural. After much wandering our colleges today are returning to the emphasis from which Dr. McNicol has never detoured."

It is very difficult to see just how this return can take place, for Dr. McNicol believes in the full authority of God's Word, in the Genesis account of creation, in the Virgin Birth of Christ, upon which the other doctrines are built. Some of the professors still teaching in our colleges today do not accept this scriptural centre and therefore it will be difficult for the students to return apart from their teachers.

Just last year one of our professors set a paper for the girls taking the deaconess training in which the whole emphasis is off-centre. Indeed it is very difficult to see how the questions could be answered without going against the conservative view of the Genesis account of creation. The following are the most glaring examples of these questions:

3. Must those parts of Genesis which speak of pre-historical times be regarded as literally accurate in every way?

4. How would you describe the difference between the story of creation and early human history in Genesis and similar stories among pagan peoples? What special value does Genesis have?

5. Describe some features of the Garden of Eden story which show that it is meant to be symbolical.

9. Give some account of the evolution of living species.

10. Does the doctrine of biological evolution imply that mankind must progress to perfection?

My point is this: This is a paper on Systematic Theology, which is doctrine based on the Genesis account of creation. It is not easy to know exactly what the examiner would like in reply, but this much is certain: He does hold the views of higher criticism and he certainly went out of his way to ask questions that have little significance to the true meaning of Genesis in relation to mankind, creation, sin, etc. It reveals what knowledge our colleges want our spiritual leaders to possess in their primary task of winning souls to Christ. Jesus and building the Christians up in the faith—a faith that will not be true to our church.

I believe that I can more clearly illustrate the great betrayal of trust in relation to maintaining our faith by telling you that today our Presbyterian students in Montreal are receiving lectures from a professor in the United Theological College, Montreal, who is an outright denier of the faith upon which we stand. Although this is a strong statement, I have with me tonight this book that has just been published within the last few months, entitled *The Story of the Faith*, by William Alva Gifford,

published by The Macmillan Company, price \$5.00. I am going now to quote to you selected statements taken directly from this book and will give you the briefest comment in brackets afterwards. I want you Christians to judge for yourselves whether you would like your sons to study under a professor who holds such views of the Bible and the essentials of our faith. You Christians will have to decide whether you want your money spent by our colleges in hiring such a professor as this for our students.

The following then illustrate his views and his teaching:

"The Fourth Gospel . . . is a philosophy, not a biography; and such narrative as it contains *conflicts* seriously with that of the other Gospels."—P. 60. (There is no evidence that the Gospels conflict at all).

There at a khan, or inn, Mary's eldest Son was born; and a week later He was called Jesus, a Greek form of Joshua, and a name common among the Jews. Long afterwards it was believed in some circles that Jesus was born without a human father, and that His birth was accompanied by miraculous events. There is no mention of these things in Mark, the earliest of the Gospels; nor in the Fourth Gospel. Even Matthew and Luke, which tell of the virgin birth, trace the genealogy of Jesus through Joseph, not Mary." Then notice this foot-note: "The 'virgin birth' appears now to have been the best explanation that simple folk could give, long after the event, of the origin of one who seemed to them to be more than human."—P. 61. (This completely does away with the Virgin Birth and with it goes the essentials of our faith. It is contrary to the Apostles' Creed and Westminster Confession, yet our students are receiving this teaching).

"The so-called 'temptation in the wilderness' was the wrestling of the new leader with the problems of leadership . . . Many days Jesus remained 'with the wild beasts' in the wilderness . . . There Jesus fought through terrific spiritual conflicts. In the language of that day he was 'tempted of Satan,' the superhuman being, the tester of men, imported into late Jewish thought from Persia."—P. 66. (Thus along with the Virgin Birth goes the belief in a personal devil and therefore many more pages of the Bible are taken out). Now the same writer explains away the miracles of the Bible:

"One may properly doubt the raising of Lazarus from the dead because the evidence is not satisfactory. It is reported in the Fourth Gospel as having happened in Bethany, close to Jerusalem, in the family of Mary and Martha, well known to the disciples. It is such an event as would become common knowledge, and indeed is declared to have precipitated a meeting of the Great Sanhedrin and a decision to compass the death of Jesus. Yet no one of the Synoptics mentions the matter. It is either a legend that grew up in the seventy or eighty years before the Fourth Gospel was written, or it is a misunderstood parable."—P. 68.

This professor now teaching Presbyterian students then undermines the Scripture assurance of the death and resurrection and exaltation and return of Jesus:

"The four Gospels do not provide us with materials for a complete doctrine of these four things (mentioned above). Almost no explicit teaching concerning the death survives, for which the authority of Jesus himself can be claimed. Christian theology was to find the explanation in the sacrificial system of Judaism; His death was to be one grand sacrifice that would meet the Divine requirements for ever. It is almost certain that Jesus Himself did not think so."—P. 76.

His final plunge at our faith is with regards to Jesus' last 40 days upon the earth:

"Here also there is no agreement in the Gospels; nor do they agree with Paul's account in I. Corinthians 15. It is clear that when the Gospels were written, Christian communities had different traditions as to the events of the forty days."—P. 86.

The logical question we all would like to ask Professor Gifford is this: "If you, Sir, do not believe the Bible's

testimony to these essentials of our faith, what then is left? What parts of the Bible do you believe? Who are you to take upon yourself the responsibility before God of deciding what is and what is not true in the Word of God? There is one thing we Christians are sure about and it is that we do not want our sons to sit under you, nor, indeed, do we want any of our boys sitting under you in preparing for the ministry. That is especially so when there is not a strong man left on the faculty who can present the true view of God's Word and set forth our true faith with such authority and respect. Our teaching is certainly one-sided and little wonder our students today will be the ministers of tomorrow who will deny the Bible and our faith.

The sad fact is that Professor Gifford honestly believes that this liberal view of the Bible is the only hope for the church today. On page 577, we read: "The answer lies with Christian Liberalism, which is present in varying degrees in all the major Protestant churches and is the prevailing tone of clerical life. Liberalism is, for the present, at a disadvantage. It admits the need of religious change, but is of many minds as to the nature of the change. It has made, however, the essential concessions to the modern mind. Liberals know that which is *discoverable from human nature and history is the real revelation of God in the world.* They know, with Amiel, that "The eternal life is not the future life; it is life in harmony with the true order of things—life in God. They know that Christianity is not the absolute religion. They think Christianity superior to all other religions, and regard Jesus as the central figure in history; but there is little disposition to deny that an authentic religious experience is known, and authentic religious life lived, outside Christianity."

Then notice how proud the writer is with regard to this new liberal view of the Bible, that questions almost every testimony of the essentials of our faith as we have already seen:

"The new view of the Bible is now the common property of Protestant ministers, *having been taught in most theological seminaries.* (To which we can say AMEN) The result was inevitable, and is devastating. Quite ordinary men could preach extraordinarily, so long as they could say, "thus saith the Lord." They spoke not out of their own wisdom but out of a divine revelation, whose custodians and reporters they were. Now they must range the fields of human knowledge, in search of preachable truth. And where the scientist confines himself to one field and has no necessary moral concern about what he finds, the minister gleans in all fields, seeking food for the soul.—Page 581.

One of the highlights of the whole book illustrates for us the result of this higher criticism and liberalism in the pulpits today. What has come over the church today and the spiritual leaders in our midst? Why has the church lost its authority for the multitude? Why are so many of our ministers unbelievers in the Word? What is the foundation of their preaching? Let us now listen to the results of modernism from the pen of the same professor, page 558:

"Biblical criticism has continued, and has produced a vast literature. It is little known to the Christian public, but makes it impossible for most ministers to use the Bible in the old way. They know the Bible is *not the body of wholly self-consistent truth*, but a slow accumulation from many sources, speaking sometimes with conflicting voices on even the central things, like the nature of God and the character of true goodness. Their use of the Bible is consciously selective; and in preaching they are thrown more than formerly upon their own resources. The voice of the pulpit has there-

fore tended to lose its authority, even where it has retained its persuasiveness.

Ministers are aware that changes in religion are inevitable. Their difficulty is to get sure footing in the new intellectual order, to work out a philosophy of life that will also be good news, a Gospel. *Meanwhile they are preaching Christian ethics; giving wise and homely counsel, holding together a fellowship, distributing charitable relief. And Protestant Christians in general, when they now speak of 'Christidnity' seldom have in mind the body of doctrine that constitutes historic orthodoxy (and the faith of our church). They mean only life in harmony with the precepts of Jesus (like following the Golden Rule).*"

Here, my brethren, is conclusive proof that our church today (and with it all other churches of the major denominations) are sick unto death educationally. And the sad fact is that there is little hope of improvement for the balance of power is in the hands of liberal leaders. In choosing professors great emphasis must be placed upon their scholarship, but the primary emphasis should be upon their faith; and the experiences of the last few years in my own observation prove conclusively that the latter consideration "that of conformity to our church's faith" is of minor interest.

Surely our hearts are saddened as we see what has come over the church today. Our church has always stood for the educated ministry, but education in the church always meant conformity to the standards of the faith of our church. Today the emphasis has been changed. As long as men receive degrees it matters not what they believe. Both at Montréal and Knox College we were told definitely that in taking our ordination vows we were to do so with "mental reservation", although the one professor who told us that in Knox is now retired. But "mental reservation" has come to mean that students for the ministry coming to be ordained need not take too seriously their vows and leaves much room for differences of opinion on the ESSENTIALS of our faith.

I can only say tonight that I cannot recommend conscientiously students for the ministry attending such colleges today. The only hope for the church is a return to the belief in the full authority of God's Word and the ESSENTIALS of our faith as expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith. The matter will take much prayer and Christian grace. Our remarks are not personal so far as men are concerned, but they have a direct relation to what these men are saying. It is because of what they are saying that so much is being said today from the pulpits that does not agree with the teachings of Scripture. And because so much is said from the pulpits disagreeable to Scripture the average person on the street has lost confidence in the authority of the church. And because of this fact the average person on the street is going to Hell and live there in torment all his days because "How shall they hear without a preacher?" (Romans 10:14). And what is the good of their hearing the preacher if he preach not the only forgiveness of sins through the blood of Jesus Christ, God's only begotten Son?

III.

THE CHURCH SICK UNTO DEATH ECUMENICALLY AT HOME

(Preached on November 24, 1946)

THE word ecumenical comes from the Greek meaning "The entire inhabited world." In its general and wide use today it refers to the coming together of all

churches into a great world church. The ultimate goal for our spiritual leaders today is "church union" in a universal way, including all the churches of Protestantism, and then ultimately to bring Protestantism back to "mother church," the Roman Catholic Church.

I want to say tonight that I refer to all major denominations when I say that an earnest effort is being made to bring about a world church, beginning at home. The sad fact is that these leaders on the whole are deceiving the people by not laying their cards on the table and telling more definitely what their plans are. Wilbur M. Smith's latest work, *Therefore Stand*, which should be in the hands of every Christian, on page XIII, introduction, says this:

"We have come to the time in American Protestantism when ecclesiastics are not even rebuked for the denial of any of the great fundamentals of the faith, but are allowed to keep their professional chairs, and their pulpits, even though they have long ago abandoned the Christian faith. But let a man stand up and say anything in criticism of denominational boards, of some Theological seminary, or of some sceptical professor, and at once is is pounced upon, and often ex-communicated. This is a tragic hour, when loyalty to a Church is placed above loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ."

This is the situation we find ourselves in today. At the last Maritime Synod the moment that any criticism was made regarding the church and its policy toward church union the cry went up "Disloyal!" I do not hesitate to say that so far as our faith is concerned that loyalty to our church in *everything* would be disloyal to Jesus Christ, and so far as we Christians are concerned, Jesus Christ MUST come first.

The forces behind the ecumenical movement are working carefully, systematically, and often subtly. There is a well-laid plan that seeks to rob the churches of the essentials of our faith in order to bring all "creeds" under "one roof". Its representatives on the whole are those who hold the liberal view of God's Word and often throw out the foundations of our faith without which there is no life.

I want to emphasize tonight the general forces at work today to bring about the ultimate union of all churches while at the same time taking away or making light of the essentials of our faith to accomplish this end. I refer first to the Canadian Council of Churches.

This Council was formed in 1943 as part of the ecumenical movement and has as its ultimate aim "The welding of the whole Christian world into a universal church," according to the words of its General Secretary, Rev. W. J. Gallagher. According to reports given at our own General Assembly and by our own church heads it is simply a getting together of Christian leaders from various churches irrespective of their doctrinal stand. How fellowship can be possible in such instances is difficult to say and it is certainly foreign to the New Testament. From various reports of the leaders in the Council and from such statements already quoted we can easily see what the ultimate aim of the Council is. Dr. William Barclay, one of our own leaders, speaking before the Council in 1945 is reported in the November Record as saying: "I am not so much concerned with Union. We shall not see it today or tomorrow. We have been 400 years coming to the position in which we find ourselves and it may take generations before we come to the position for which our hearts are yearning." The whole tone of the message is that after all doctrinal differences are not the important things of the Church today.

One of the departments of the Council is that of Evangelism. How is evangelism possible with churches and men who deny the doctrinal stand of our church? One of the most pitiful discussions I ever heard on the subject took place last year in Truro under the leadership of Dr. Gallagher who left the impression that anything pertaining to emotionalism in winning souls must be banned. The same tendency is seen in the program for the Week of Prayer prepared by the Council. The whole program does not emphasize the New Testament Teaching on God's plan of salvation for all through the blood of Christ and the reality of Heaven and Hell as it is clearly set forth in the Bible. The great teaching is the social gospel, the need to establish the City of God upon this earth, through "good living."

The ultimate aim of the same Council can also be seen in their desire to flirt with the Roman Catholic Church. In their meeting on November 14th of this year, the Council sent a letter expressing the Council's prayers for the complete recovery of Cardinal Villeneuve, Archbishop of Quebec, suffering a heart attack in New York. No man has done more in Canada to influence the Dominion Government and the people of Quebec to take stands against the best interests of our land than this Catholic leader. The Roman Catholic Church is unchristian in its very essential and Protestants can have no fellowship with them. Dr. J. H. Arnup told the Council that world peace could only become a reality through the co-operation of Protestantism and Catholicism.

For some time the forces behind this Council remained silent and kept our people in silence regarding their plans. The whole scheme has been unfolded by Rev. Jesse M. Arnup, past moderator of the United Church of Canada, in his speech to the General Council on September 15th, 1946. He points out certain significant facts, which are here quoted in part:

"By the organization of the Canadian Council of Churches and its recognition by the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, Canada has now definitely taken her place in the Ecumenical Church. The World Council of Churches, still technically in process of formation, now claims allegiance from more than ninety independent denominations from thirty countries around the world . . . The World Church, long a dream, has become in our day a realized fact . . .

"In harmony with the spirit and ultimate objectives of the ecumenical movement the United Church of Canada should press forward into full organic union with such communions as may be ready to unite. In our constitution it is written that we are not only a united but uniting Church. We only, who have had experience of union, are in a position to refute the current fallacy, "we support unity but not union."

As if Christian unity could be served by denominational independence, with its concomitants (attendants) of denominational rivalry and competition! We who are gathered here have tried both ways of living, and we will be hard to convince that there can be any experience outside of union which will produce the rare and precious Christian fellowship that we have found in The United Church of Canada. Others outside our fellowship are expressing similar views.

"In my opinion the essentials of a Christian world order cannot be achieved without co-operation between ecumenical Protestantism and the Roman Catholic Church . . . A world Church must work to cleanse the world of war by cleaning it of those conditions and attitudes which lead inevitably to war."

(We could add here that wars are not stopped by white-wash. The World Church cannot destroy war in this

sinful world. The Bible tells us "There shall be wars and rumours of wars," because of sin. This social gospel of white-washing will not cover sin. Mankind needs a thorough washing by the blood of Christ.)

Now, my brethren, you can surely see that the church today is heading for a great union movement. The Church of England feels the same way about it. At its last Synod in Winnipeg on September 12th the Canadian Press reported that the Church would take away the word "Sin" in the baptismal formula, changing the words "Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in original sin," to "Seeing that all men of their own nature are inclined to evil." When the report of the union conversations with the United Church was brought up it was felt by many that this change would hasten union between the two churches. Then to our great surprise in the last Record we find that our own church has also entered into conversations with the Anglican Church with the same purpose in view.

This ecumenical sickness can be seen in the relation of the church today towards missions. All the major denominations are now members of The Foreign Mission Conference of North America. The beliefs of this Board can be seen in their 50th Annual Report, published in 1944. Modernism controls the thought of all speakers. Here is told why we should send missionaries to bring about a wordly Christianity: (The message was given by Dr. R. W. Schloerb, pastor of Hyde Park Baptist Church, Chicago.) (1) The Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man; (2) "The ethics of altruism and service to those in need;" (3) "The conviction that our religion begins at home but it does not stay at home." In other words, Jesus Christ is left out, Jesus Christ as He is revealed in Scripture! Another speaker, a missionary of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Rev. A. T. Mosher tells us that the missionary purpose is world fellowship and re-allocation of resources," and in no place does he mention the need for the Gospel. This is the fellowship that our church has today and the pity is that our Board of Missions find such fellowship so pleasing. The greater pity is that our church knows so little about such fellowship.

The same tendency can be seen in our church's entrance into The Church of Christ in China, but this is so important, and so drastic we shall have to spend all our time next Sunday night discussing it.

We should continue and point out instance after instance where our church fellowships with unbelievers and deniers of our faith. We could mention the Religious Education Council of which the Maritime Religious Education Council is a part. This body works in the field of religious education, spending most of its time tearing down the important doctrines and denying the Word of God. Then we could also mention the effort made by the same leaders to include our church in the Divinity Faculty scheme at McGill University which was finally defeated by two or three votes. This indicates again that there are many spiritual leaders ready to depart from the true faith of the church.

Let me point out that this sickness unto death has gripped the church from coast to coast and from North to South. Early in the year the Federal Council of Churches in America held a meeting and invited some spiritual heads from the Greek Catholic Church. The Catholic priests led the devotion and had the Protestant leaders there praying to Mary, the virgin mother of Jesus, and praying for the dead. This denied the whole

teachings of the Reformation which teach us to worship God alone through Jesus Christ. Co-operation and union make strange bed-fellows; *But let us not forget that the ecumenical movement is well entrenched in the churches today and, despite the effort of spiritual leaders to conceal the facts, Christians and all interested in the true church should be alarmed and decide now what is their decision in the matter.*

Now you will ask the question: Are you against Union? Do you object to co-operating with other churches? May I make these comments:

(1) The primary issue in church union is doctrine. There can be no true organic union where sound doctrine is not held. Our problem is that so many of our spiritual leaders tell us they believe the true faith and yet the same doctrines are ignored and contradicted in practice. The second problem is that in order to promote organic union, sound doctrine is watered down to become all-inclusive. Most every one, if not all, who talk so much about union, belong to the Liberal School of theology which means a denial of God's Word and its teachings. Fellowship is not possible in this way.

(2) Church History proves that union does not bring unity. Man seems to be so constituted (even as a Christian) that he wants different denominations. This fact looks to be God's will or else why have denominations existed so long? Surely the last hundred years have shown what the Lord has done through a divided church. Missionary doors would never have been opened as they have if the church was one. By this division of labour over 146 foreign missionary societies have been formed and the Scriptures have been translated into 288 dialects. "Is Christ divided?" asked the apostle Paul, centuries ago. And from hundreds of missionary fields the answer comes today, "Yes, divided, only that He may be the more completely distributed to a starving world!"

(3) Church union never fully unites because it usually increases the number of denominations. The United Church of Canada did not reduce the number of denominations in Canada. At least one new denomination was added—the United Church of Canada. What it did was leave bitterness and division in many places.

What then, is the solution? That is not so easy to see. The one obvious truth is that we have today two irreconcilable forces in the church that can never unite. There can be no church union unless all those taking part accept the essentials of the faith. The only practical way of union today is for all Liberals to get together and sleep together and for all conservatives to unite to carry on the true work of Almighty God for the salvation of all who put their trust in Christ.

The true faith emphasizes the person and work of Christ as revealed in the Word of God, received by sinners through the power of the Holy Spirit, and resulting in souls saved and lives transformed. Modernism teaches universal brotherhood and human welfare, applied to the social order through moral influence and political pressure, resulting in a "better world." The Christian emphasizes that the ills of mankind today are caused by sin, proceeding from the wicked hearts of men and women, and that only the blood of Christ is able to cleanse. The Modernist teaches that the wound is only skin deep and that a good application of salve would heal the wound. The former cures the germ; the latter cares for the symptoms.

Now between these two groups there can be no unity and therefore no union. Both may call themselves

"Christian," but there is a wide gulf between them. "Whoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that hideth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (II. John 9:9-11). Believers are warned to "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." (Eph. 5:11). Paul warns Timothy against those who do not teach the true doctrine of Christ, and adds, "From such withdraw thyself." (I. Tim. 6:5). And we can hear from Amos in III.:3: "Can two walk together except they be agreed."

Therefore, I believe tonight that Christians believe and will practise union when the parties concerned accept God's Word from cover to cover and believe the essential teachings therein. But let us today fight against the present ecumenical sickness in the church, not allowing any to lead us until they declare clearly their stand and acceptance of the infallible truth and divine authority of the Scriptures, and of Christ as very and eternal God, who became man by being born of a virgin, who offered Himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, Who rose from the dead with the same body with which He suffered, and Who will return again to judge the world. Here is our faith, and all who believe are surely united in the great task of preaching Christ and Him crucified as the only hope for the world today! Our blessed bond of union Thou art, O Christ, our Lord!

The rule of our communion is Thine own faithful word.
Thou art our Elder Brother, Who, to redeem us, did;
To Thee, and to none other, our souls we do confide.

IV.

THE CHURCH SICK UNTO DEATH ECUMENICALLY ABROAD

I TRIED to point out last Sunday night that what is taking place among the churches in our land today is an effort to bring about a great world church by denying the essential doctrines of our faith. The picture is something like this: The church leaders are seeking to bring the churches under one roof with one creed. In order to accomplish this, the faith is being watered down to become all-inclusive. The primary interest is in the trimmings of the church, the decorations, the way to take communion, the best way to show a united front against social and moral evils by dressing the churches up in a one coloured suit of clothes, hand-woven and especially designed by our spiritual heads to magnify man rather than to glorify God. The foundation is not being emphasized and the least possible is said about the joists, the timbers, the doctrines, that are dependent for their strength upon the foundation. This faith is being destroyed in our colleges and is being set forth by the modern pulpit in a way that contradicts the foundations of the church.

Some of you may perhaps say that we are being unduly cautious about this matter of church union. People tell us today that what our leaders are seeking to do after all is simply to find some common basis of getting together in a co-operative way. I have shown already in my third sermon that our leaders are definitely seeking to bring about organic union without adhering to the true doctrines of our faith. I plan to show tonight that our leaders have taken us into a union movement in China that is

contrary to the essentials of our faith, and they have done this without giving to you, the people, the full facts behind this union movement and have tried in every way possible to keep the facts back from the people.

Let us consider the background of this union in our church. The Board of Missions ON THEIR OWN INITIATIVE brought the matter before our General Assembly in the dying moments of the meeting in 1943. The Board asked the Assembly for permission to apply to the North America Advisory Committee for admittance. The vote was taken without the realization of what was taking place.

Since that time as information has come regarding this work many throughout the church realize the matter should have been discussed by the church as a whole. At the last General Assembly a motion was put forth to send the matter down to Presbyteries which was the only fair, democratic thing to do, but our Board, interested in keeping peace by concealing information to the public, insisted that the matter be closed. But it will not be closed for those who are interested in remaining true to the faith cannot support a union that denies the faith.

Let us consider the formation of this union. The effort is made by our leaders to make us believe that this church is composed of Bible-believing people. Other facts point to the contrary. According to Rev. E. M. Johnson, the Christian Church in China found itself separated and divided by geographical and denominational areas. The time came when they wanted to get together to make a common expression of their faith. First plans were made in 1918 to come together. In 1922 the first provisional General Assembly was held and five years later the first General Assembly was held in Shanghai.

Now the facts given to us by the Church of Christ in China reveal that this is definitely a church Union and not just a coming together for church unity. In their own booklet, entitled, *Let Us Unite*, as constituted, is explicitly and in reality an organically united Church.

The Second General Assembly, meeting in 1930, set forth the same purpose in these words: "We believe that nothing short of the complete organic unity of the disciples of Christ will satisfy the desire of our Lord who prayed that we might all be one, that the world might believe." Some have deceived us by trying to tell us that we were simply co-operating on the foreign field to further the interests of Christ's work.

But not only is the ultimate goal the complete union of all the Protestant churches there, but also the Catholics are included. On page 31, *Let Us Unite*, we read: "Our ultimate goal should be and is a union of Roman, Greek, Protestant and other-Christian communions. Only then will Christ's prayer, 'That they may be one,' be fully answered. This ultimate goal, we believe, can be approached best by concentrating our immediate mind and will and prayers to securing organic unity of all Protestant evangelical churches." This should surely be sufficient to show the character of this church.

Let us see what our exact relationship is to this church: It simply means that when our missionaries go out under the Church of Christ in China, we lose full control of them. It is set forth by this Church that "Missionaries when assigned to the Church of Christ in China shall for all practical purposes, become fully responsible, as to work and conduct to that church."

Furthermore, "In cases of discipline as to conduct, or dissatisfaction on the part of the Church of Christ in China with the performance of the work assigned to the missionary, after thorough investigation and efforts at

adjustment by the Synod have failed, the Church of Christ in China may dispense with his services."

But we pay the bills: "On personal matters, such as salaries, furloughs, health, language study, housing, foreign missionaries are directly related to their respective mission boards, which assume financial responsibility for them. Their work and assignment, however, are under the General Assembly (The Church of Christ in China) and its duly constituted agencies." THIS SIMPLY MEANS WE LOSE CONTROL OVER OUR MISSIONARIES AND YET PAY THE BILLS FOR SAME.

I should like to say at this point that if we had the assurance that the leaders of this church were standing firm on the Word of God and upholding the faith ONCE and FOR ALL delivered unto the saints, we could be well satisfied with the Chinese union. But there is every reason to believe that THIS CHURCH DOES NOT STAND FOR THE GREAT CONVICTIONS OF THE EVANGELICAL FAITH.

Mrs. R. Moynan, daughter of Dr. Jonathan Goforth, that great pioneer of missionary work in China, points out that her father was opposed to the Church of Christ in China. Part of her views have already been presented in *Bible Christianity*, May, 1946: "I remember very vividly when the Church of Christ in China was first formed in 1922, I was in China then. Father had such high hopes at first, but when he found they were untrue to God's Word he refused to have any association." Thus we can see that Dr. Goforth was opposed to this union of our missionary forces in China that is untrue to God's Word.

One word more should be said in this regard: There are many others who felt the same way Dr. Goforth did. The large Episcopal, Lutheran, Methodist, some Congregational, many Baptist missions as well as 30,000 Presbyterians have not joined. Other groups such as the China Inland Mission will have nothing to do with it. Why is this? The answer is that the leaders there are denying the faith. The plain fact is that our Board of Missions have been responsible in allowing our church to enter a union movement that denies the faith and this action is an open decision against the 30,000 remaining Presbyterians there who are anxious to uphold the faith.

Let Us Examine the Statement of Faith of This Church:

1. We believe in Christ Jesus as Redeemer and Founder of the Church, and our aim is the establishment of His Kingdom throughout the world.
2. We accept the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God and the supreme authority in matters of faith and duty.
3. We acknowledge the Apostles' Creed as a fair expression of (literally 'capable of expressing') important doctrines believed in common by the orthodox church.

Now a superficial viewing of this doctrine might indicate that all is well. But when we know what is taking place today along Modernistic lines we should give careful thought to the above creed.

We should notice first that in 1922 when the basis of union was being drawn up and earnest effort was made to include more definitely the important doctrines of our faith, the deity of Christ, the blood atonement, the infallibility of the Scriptures, etc., but in vain. With the exception of substituting the word "Redeemer" for "Saviour" in article 1 these attempts were defeated. *There was a definite attempt made to emphasize such important doctrines and the Liberal leaders defeated it. Thus we can see that those responsible for the Church of*

Christ in China are not standing upon the Rock and yet we are organically united with them.

Let us notice secondly that this statement is cleverly worded. It makes possible for all ministers and others of Unitarian views to enter into fellowship. Members of this Church are not asked to accept the essential doctrines such as the Trinity and Deity of Christ. The faith has become all-inclusive and therefore everybody can unite with the Church of Christ in China and sleep together in the same bed. The same General Assembly was asked HOW Jesus Christ redeems us and the majority of members refused to give an explanation. *Yet this is the church that we are supporting through our budget givings—a church that was begun by men who deny the faith so subtly and earnestly that unless one has this background we might be led to think that all is well.*

Let us notice one important fact regarding the reference to the Apostles' Creed. When the above article 3 was presented an attempt was made by evangelical leaders to introduce an amendment which would read: "We acknowledge the Apostles' Creed in its entirety as a statement of important doctrines of our faith." But this was not allowed. In other words, it is not necessary to accept personally the various truths taught in the Apostles' Creed. *The plain fact is that this doctrinal statement is not definite enough to prevent the church from accepting modernism that is sweeping the church throughout the world. This is the church that we are supporting today.*

One more word should be said: The information here given has been publicly set forth by Dr. Albert B. Dodd, 40 years a missionary in China, who has first-hand knowledge of the situation. The information is sufficient to prove that our Mission Board has not acted wisely in allowing the church to support such a union without having the matter fully considered by the Presbyteries and Synods.

Sufficient has been said to point out that what our leaders have done in relation to the foreign field they will do at home. The Chinese union has a union which took place through the encouragement of modernistic leaders of America, not the Chinese themselves. Dr. Earl Cressy, in speaking to the Foreign Missions Conference of North America in 1943 (of which our church is a part) in relation to co-operation among the Chinese Christians said this: "I have changed my thinking. You will have to put on the pressure from New York if you are going to get church union or even closer co-operation."

Today pressure is coming from all sides to unite the churches. Our Presbyterian church has lost its democracy. Anyone who criticizes the policy of our leaders is put on the black-books and looked down upon as being disloyal. *Anyone who criticizes the Boards of the Church will not be asked to sit on these Boards.* The great desire on the part of our leaders today is for the ministers to follow in line and to see that sufficient money comes in to pay the bills irrespective of how this money is to be spent. The fact of the Church of Christ in China, with its indefinite and modernistic doctrinal foundation, is conclusive proof that our church is heading in a direction that is contrary to the Reformation and the Westminster Confession of Faith.

May I conclude by saying that these are difficult days for the Church of the living God. It might well be that we have reached the time when God is departing from the denominations. Certainly it is difficult to believe that the full power of the Holy Spirit is working through

the denominational church today. Time and again God called a remnant apart from the large denominational churches to become the living testimony of the Gospel of Grace. One cannot deny that the rise of small sects and faith groups is an indication that the church is not satisfying the common people today. One must also admit that these small faith groups are being used of God greatly for the expansion of His Kingdom throughout the world.

Much is said of the Lord's Prayer, "That they all might be one." In order to be one we must first of all be one in Christ. We must be in Christ. We must be Christian. There are many unconverted ministers who can never become one for they are not in Christ. The Puritans used to say that our Lord prayed that His servants "Might be one in their testimony to Christ." They said that "The harmony of the evangelists and the concurrence of the first preachers of the gospel are due to this prayer. *Let them be not only of one heart, but one mouth, speaking the same thing.* The unity of the gospel-ministers is both the beauty and strength of the gospel-interest."

This is the secret of true union. Any efforts to promote even unity among leaders who deny the truth of God's Word will not be tolerated by Bible-loving Christians today. We shall stand firm and indeed separate ourselves from all unbelief as the church drifts from her faith-moorings. We shall be strong in the Lord and the power of His might. Our first interest must be to preserve the unity of the Holy Spirit, and that unity is lost when our Lord's deity is rejected, when His Blood is spurned, when His bodily resurrection is denied because His Word is not believed.

My one desire in these sermons is to see Christians drawn nearer to the Lord Jesus Christ as He is revealed in God's Word. Some day soon He will be coming back to receive His own. Will He find us faithful in well-doing? Will He find us flirting with the spiritual leaders of our day who preach another gospel, another way of salvation, which is NOT THE WAY at all? God forbid that we should believe that there is any other way to be saved except by the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, which cleanseth us from all sin. Let us stand and stand alone, if need be, in the proclamation of the truth of God's Word and if we cannot do this in a church that has departed from the faith in the college and pulpit we shall do it in the open air and street corner or wherever God does lead.

Glorious things of thee are spoken,
Zion, city of our God;
He Whose word cannot be broken,
Formed thee for His own abode.
On the Rock of Ages founded,
What can shake thy sure repose?
With salvation's walls surrounded,
Thou mayst smile at all thy foes.

Saviour, if of Zion's city
I, through grace, a member am,
Let the world deride or pity,
I will glory in Thy name.
Fading is the worldling's pleasure,
All his boasted pomp and show,
Solid joys and lasting treasure
None but Zion's children know.

Please Note!

The quotation from *Therefore Stand* on page 11, is used by special permission from W. A. Wilde Co., Boston, Mass., and the quotations from *The Story of the Faith* on pages 8-10 are used by special permission from The Macmillan Co., New York.

FROM ANOTHER VETERAN OF THE FIGHT

THE CHURCH OF THE OPEN DOOR

Merril T. MacPherson, D.D., Pastor
5455 York Rd., Philadelphia 41, Pa.

March 28, 1947

Dr. T. T. Shields, Pastor
Jarvis Street Baptist Church,
130 Gerrard Street East,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Dear Dr. Shields:

THE GOSPEL WITNESS issue of March 13, 1947, was just received today, having been sent on by a mutual friend of your city. I felt that I must just drop a line to that dear and faithful warrior of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. How I thank God for you, and for your great message of March 9th, as reported in this issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS.

Someone sent me a clipping of the proceedings and of the resignation of our brother Rockwood as printed in the Truro paper. I immediately wrote to him expressing my congratulations and best wishes and assuring him of our prayers. Yesterday we received his mimeographed reply dated March 7 together with his two farewell sermons. These sermons I think are very, very splendid. I sent him a copy of our little pamphlet entitled, "Why I Left the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A." which I hope will be some encouragement to him.

How vividly these happenings brought back memories of the farcical trials which many of us went through here in the United States some eleven or twelve years ago. With what pomp and pride they convened "The Court of Jesus Christ," controlled entirely by apostate modernists who were set on the ecclesiastical decapitation of true ministers of Christ, who exposed their nefarious schemes and thus "disturbed the peace," of an apostate church. Those were testing times and testing days but how I thank God for them now!

We left the church with all of its comforts, salary, and pension, and with its quarter of a million endowment fund to preach the Gospel in rented halls for some years. But now God has given to us the beautiful property of the Church of the Open Door, all paid for, and we are having the joy of supporting missionaries in various parts of the world. And best of all it seems to me, God is from day to day through the radio and from the pulpit reaching souls for Jesus Christ here in Philadelphia and throughout this section of the East.

Truly God never leaves Himself without a witness and I am glad for this new witness that He has raised up there in Nova Scotia, near where my own father was born and raised. May God bless this sterling young man and his helpmate and may it please the Lord to raise up through him such a testimony as shall be the envying and the undoing of the modernists who have ousted him, and especially such a testimony as shall be used in the salvation of precious souls and in the edifying of the saints until Jesus Christ returns for His own. Praying God to richly bless you in your own heart and soul and all of your people with you, and thanking you for the publicity you are giving to this noteworthy event,

I am,

Very sincerely yours in Christ

(Signed) Merril T. MacPherson.

Dr. Shields Answers Halifax-Lunenburg Presbyter Rev. R. MacLeod

It is the rule of THE GOSPEL WITNESS scrupulously to regard the expressed wish of correspondents who desire that their names should not be published. We never publish a communication, however, without having, for our own information and protection, the name of the writer. And we say now to our correspondents that if they desire their names withheld we shall faithfully regard their wishes.

There are, however, exceptions to all rules. The letter published below is one of those exceptions. The writer, as it will be observed, marked his letter "not to be published"; but pinned to the letter was a newspaper cutting with a two-column headline, containing a statement by the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery, which we have elsewhere described as a malicious attack upon Rev. Perry F. Rockwood. That

newspaper cutting was marked in Mr. MacLeod's own handwriting, "for publication".

Thus, Mr. MacLeod asked us to give publicity to what is almost a libelous statement by the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery, while at the same time behind a proposed veil of silence, he sent us a private, nasty, epistle against Mr. Rockwood, full of uncharitable suggestions, and innuendoes; and this he labelled "for your information only; not to be published".

In our extended answer to Mr. MacLeod, we include a copy of a long telegram we sent him, which he did not see fit to answer. But it will be observed that we gave him due warning of our reserving the right to publish his letter with, or without, his permission.

LETTER OF REV. R. MACLEOD, ELMSDALE, N.S.

Rev. J. S. Shields
Toronto Ont.

Elmsdale.
Hants County.
Nova Scotia.
Mar. 20/47

For your information only, and not to be published.

Dear Sir, I have been supporting the Gospel Witness for some considerable time and I have encouraged others to do likewise. On receiving your last copy I have come to the conclusion that this paper is not serving the cause of Protestantism in this country. It seems to me that the policy of the Gospel Witness is defeat defeating its own purpose by its readiness to display schism and certain fearfulness within the Protestant Church, and by publishing articles of a controversial nature not in harmony with the best interests of the Protestant cause.

(Continuation of Rev. R. MacLeod's Letter)

It seems to me, that the aim and policy of this paper ought to be first of all, to create confidence instead of destroying it among non-Protestant readers who might be looking to THE GOSPEL WITNESS for proof and guidance as to why they should adopt the Protestant faith. This was one of the reasons why I was eager to support the WITNESS. I looked upon your paper not only as a strong defence of Protestantism, but also as a strong "tower of defence" against Romanism.

I am a member of the Halifax Presbytery whose actions you readily condemned in your last issue, in regard to Mr. Rockwood's trial. I fail to see why this publicity is necessary. It has received already more publicity than many of our murder trials in this country. After all is said and done, there is nothing unusual about church discipline, and we as a church reserve the right to discipline without interference from any other church or religious group. Our church always exercised discipline over its members, elders and ministers and we are in a better position to know what is to the best interests of our church and the spiritual well-being of our people. We can do this because we have a standard of doctrine and a principle of church government based on democratic ideals, that is more than some churches can do or say. By these standards, Mr. Rockwood has been judged which he claimed we have forsaken.

I have discovered much of what you published in your last issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS appears somewhat misleading and inaccurate. I don't suppose you would possess all the facts "as there are two sides to every question." However, I would point out that we know Mr. Rockwood

better than those who have been only too ready to condemn our action as a church court. We had to deal with him as a member of that court, and we always found him rather a difficult person to work with. We were always ready to cooperate with him in his work and often commended him on the good work he was doing. We have a right to defend those who were loyal to our church and her standards in the disruption of 1925. Mr. Rockwood was tried on the ground that he accused some of these men for being disloyal to the church and her teaching. He was not tried on all he said in his sermons. There were statements in his sermons with which we were in agreement, but the church has to have some authority to define her position otherwise each and every minister and congregation will become a law unto themselves.

Mr. Rockwood was not persecuted for preaching the Gospel and we rejoice that the Gospel is being preached, besides he is not the only one who preaches the Gospel of grace and salvation. I am the one who claimed the church is not "sick unto death," and not Mr. McKinnon, and I have reason to believe this; of, I believe in the Sovereign Grace of God. To say that the Protestant Church is dying is to sound the familiar note of Romanism and to play the game of the R.C. Church.

I resent very much your attacks on the chaplains. I have met many of these men over in England and on the Continent and believe me they were not there to escape the arduous duties of the pastorate. This can be said of them all, for I know that many of them in this country were disappointed when prevented from going overseas that they might be near the scene of action.

(This letter is continued in the facsimile below)

I would again remind you that the situation in Toronto called for action on the part of the Presbytery & since Mr. Rockwood refused to listen to advice and his Council folds men in the Synod then the Presbytery had to deal with the only course left open to deal with Mr. Rockwood. In any case the door was left open for his return & we were hoping he would see things in the light of Christian humility and common sense. He was free to appeal to the General Assembly if he was anxious to remain faithful to his Church and her Ministry. He is now at liberty to dictate his own policy and that is what he decided most fall.

*Respectfully yours
R. MacLeod*

PITTSBURGH PRESBYTERIAN WRITES:
SHADYSIDE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
Dr. T. T. Shields, Editor
THE GOSPEL WITNESS
Toronto, Canada.

Dear Sir:
Thanks for the special number of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, the "Rockwood Edition". I have read it from cover to cover. I confess that I have been stirred by its revelations, and I certainly congratulate Rev. Perry F. Rockwood upon his courage and loyalty to the Gospel in these dark days.

This puts the Presbyterian Church in Canada "on the spot" in deadly earnest. In a way it forces that church to a decision that may be for her salvation. After the union crisis had passed it looked as though she would lift a banner of loyalty to Christ and the Word of God, for

all of Canada. Now it seems that the infiltration of modernism has been going on within her gates and the foundations are being destroyed. What an opportunity she had! This whole matter will, I take for granted, come before the General Assembly. It will be the duty of all of us to pray nightly that in the hour of trial the Church may stand for "the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

Your stand against the plots of Romanism has been an inspiration to many of us. How blind Protestantism is in Canada and in this country!

I am enclosing a check for TEN DOLLARS; two of which are for a subscription to THE GOSPEL WITNESS; the balance toward the expense of sending this particular edition on its great mission of awakening,

Very sincerely yours,
A. Gordon MacLannan.

A facsimile of the clipping sent by Rev. MacLeod as marked in his own handwriting.

For publication

"Delusions Of Greatness And An Itch For Fame," Laid To Truro Cleric

Halifax, March 20 (CP). — The Halifax-Lunenburg presbytery of the Presbyterian Church said in a statement today that those who knew Rev. Perry F. Rockwood, who resigned his St. James Church at Truro, N.S., after being found guilty of making an attempt to split the Presbyterian Church, "declare that he suffers from delusions of greatness and an itch for fame."

The statement added that Mr. Rockwood "has taken as his master Dr. Joseph Goebbels and works on the principle that if a lie is big enough and told often enough some people will believe it."

Rev. Frank Lawson, moderator of the Halifax-Lunenburg presbytery, announced earlier today that the pulpit of St. James would be declared vacant Sunday, after acceptance of Mr. Rockwood's resignation.

The presbytery said the youthful minister has been tried for his attack on the teachers of the Presbyterian College at Montreal and not for his insistence upon preaching the Bible, expressing his mind freely or criticizing weaknesses of Church government and people.

At Truro, Mr. Rockwood, who preached last Sunday to a large congregation in a hall, said he had no comment to make on the statement at present, other than that he still adhered to what he had said in the four sermons which got him into trouble with his Church.

Termed "Pure Fabrication"

Mr. Rockwood had said in his sermons—and later at his trial here before a Church court—that professors in the college had torn leaves from the Bible and he had cited an alleged conversation with one professor to back up this "chief sport."

WELL DONE, BROCKVILLE! PRESBYTERY

FROM the beginning THE GOSPEL WITNESS expressed its conviction that the Presbyterian Church in Canada would be by no means unanimous in approving the action of the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery respecting Rev. Perry F. Rockwood. To-day, Monday, mail has poured in to THE GOSPEL WITNESS office which has made it impossible, notwithstanding an extensive staff, to tabulate the results. Letters are reaching us from all over Canada from Presbyterian ministers and elders and members of Presbyterian churches, not only approving our stand, but cordially thanking THE GOSPEL WITNESS for giving publicity to a matter which could not otherwise have been publicized. We know of no Presbyterian paper with a continent-wide circulation that could give such space to the Rockwood matter as we have given. This is not a Presbyterian question. Neither Presbyterians, nor Anglicans, nor United Churchmen, nor Baptists, nor anyone else, has a monopoly of the gospel, and, unfortunately, not one of them can claim immunity to the plague of Modernism; and the believer who is truly loyal to Jesus Christ will always put loyalty to the word of God, and to Jesus Christ as Lord, before all denominational considerations.

The presbytery said letters from the professors concerned proved Mr. Rockwood's story was a "pure fabrication," and since it had been thought fit that Mr. Rockwood should leave at the end of his first year in theology, that was his way of trying "to get back at the Montreal college."

Mr. Rockwood also was tried for the specific charge made against Prof. David Hay of Knox College, Toronto, that he (Mr. Hay) "did not believe the Book of Genesis to be a text on science—an infallible book in its commas, dots and dashes," the presbytery said.

The presbytery asked where Mr. Rockwood had acquired his "profound knowledge" to say that the Protestant Church was not preaching the Gospel since his summer holidays "are spent in a seaside cottage in Nova Scotia and his orbit of movement is within a radius of 50 miles of Truro."

Deny "Trumped-Up Charge"

"Alas," the statement added, "he has led astray some few and innocent people in the Maritimes and when their eyes are opened they will see Mr. Rockwood for what he is."

"We hope that the good people of the Maritimes will understand that nothing in the nature of a trumped-up charge has been launched against an innocent man or an attempt made to persecute one who is bold and fearless in preaching unpleasant truths. This is not so."

"We conceded to Mr. Rockwood the right to preach the truth in all its fulness, but not the right to say within a church, enjoy its privileges, while at the same time seek by fifth-column methods to destroy it."

"Outside a church and in a pulpit he has built we concede his right to say whatever he feels like saying."

The Editor of this paper is a Baptist, and he makes no apology for it, and though he may differ from many of his brethren in respect to the ordinance of baptism, and New Testament ecclesiology, he is ready always to extend the hand of fellowship to every man, to whatever Denomination he may belong, who is true to the central verities of Evangelical Christianity. For this reason THE GOSPEL WITNESS considers itself set for the defence of the gospel, of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," not in Baptist churches only, but in all churches, and feels it a solemn duty to expose error wherever it is found.

We have before expressed the opinion that not a few Presbyterians throughout Canada will be found in disagreement with the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery. We say that because we have heard from such a host of Presbyterian ministers commending our support of the stand of Rev. Perry F. Rockwood, of Truro.

We gladly publish the following from *The Prescott Journal*, which reports a meeting of the Brockville Presbytery, and their action in respect to the Rockwood matter.

Here follows the item:

Meeting in Prescott on Tuesday, Brockville Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church in Canada went on

record as disapproving the action of the Presbytery of Halifax and Lunenburg for censuring Rev. Perry Rockwood, of Truro, who was charged with pursuing a divisive course in his congregation. Brockville Presbytery has asked a committee of General Assembly to review the matter as being contrary to Presbyterian tradition.

At this writing, late Monday afternoon, there are such piles of letters before us, which we have not yet had time to read much less digest, from which we hope for this issue to make copious extracts. Without counting, it is enough to say that the requests for individual copies of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, containing Mr. Rockwood's sermons received in two mails today alone cannot be less than a thousand. One good Presbyterian sent us an approving letter, enclosing twenty-five dollars toward the expense of this special issue, and one hundred and eighty-seven names of good solid Presbyterians to whom he desired copies of THE GOSPEL WITNESS sent.

MR. ROCKWOOD RETURNS THE "SOFT ANSWER"

"Itch-for-Fame" Charge Personal, Pastor Says
Truro, N.S., March 21 (CP).—Rev. Perry F. Rockwood, 29-year-old minister who resigned his St. James Church

pulpit here after being found guilty of attempting to split the Presbyterian Church said tonight he regretted that an official court of the Presbyterian Church "should descend to make such personal references and authorize such a statement" as made yesterday by the Halifax-Lunenburg presbytery.

The presbytery said in its statement that those who knew Mr. Rockwood "declare he suffers from delusions of greatness and an itch for fame", and that he "works on the principle that if a lie is big enough and told often enough some people will believe it."

"I am surprised," Mr. Rockwood said tonight, "that the presbytery has set me forth as a liar, as a social climber seeking fame and attention and as a false leader.

"Such remarks are personal and are not based on the real issues at stake. They have to do with my character and my character was not on trial. During the trial (before the Halifax-Lunenburg presbytery at Halifax early this month) no proof was given that my statements were false."

Mr. Rockwood said he had left the church because he "was no longer permitted to criticize where she has departed from the Bible. I wish the blessing of Almighty God in separating from them (the church). I am ready to allow time itself to be the judge of what has been said and in the meantime I shall continue to build up an independent church in Truro where the people shall have a voice and for which the people everywhere may give support."

Dr. Shields' Answer To Halifax - Lunenburg Presbytery Spokesman - Rev. R. MacLeod

The Gospel Witness

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor

130 GERRARD ST. EAST TORONTO 2, CANADA

March 25th, 1947

Rev. R. MacLeod,
Presbyterian Minister,
Elmsdale, Hants, N.S.

Dear Sir:

On receipt, yesterday, of your letter of March 20th, I sent you a telegram direct as follows:

"REV. R. MacLEOD,
Elmsdale, Hants, N.S.

MUST CONFESS AMAZEMENT AT YOUR EXTENDED LETTER RE ROCKWOOD MARKED QUOTE FOR YOUR INFORMATION ONLY AND NOT TO BE PUBLISHED UNQUOTE WHILE INCLUDING A NEWSPAPER CUTTING HEADED QUOTE DELUSIONS OF GREATNESS AND AN ITCH FOR FAME UNQUOTE AND CONTAINING THE SCURRILOUS ATTACK OF YOUR PRESBYTERY UPON MR. ROCKWOOD AND MARKED AS BY YOUR OWN HAND FOR PUBLICATION STOP YOU REQUEST PUBLICATION OF PRESBYTERY'S LIBELOUS ATTACK ON ROCKWOOD AND IN A LETTER WHICH YOU DESIRE NOT PUBLISHED YOU WOULD SERVE ME PRIVATELY WITH FURTHER MALICIOUS ASPERSIONS UPON MR. ROCKWOOD'S INTEGRITY. YOUR ACTION SUGGESTS YOU ARE NOT PROUD OF YOUR PART IN THE PRESBYTERIAN SANHEDRIN'S PERSECUTION OTHERWISE WOULD NOT SEEK TO HIDE YOUR MALICIOUSNESS UNDER A VEIL OF SILENCE STOP HAVE STRONGEST FEELING YOU HAVE NO MORAL RIGHT ADDRESS EDITOR OF PUBLICATION ON SUBJECT OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION ESPECIALLY WHEN INVOLVING A PERSONAL ATTACK UPON A MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL AND REQUEST YOUR LETTER BE WITHHELD FROM PUBLICATION STOP REQUEST YOU WIRE ME OUR EXPENSE YOUR PERMISSION PUBLISH YOUR ENTIRE LETTER WITH SIGNATURE BUT RESERVE TO MYSELF THE RIGHT IN DEFENCE OF ROCKWOOD TO PUBLISH YOUR LETTER IN EXTENSO

WHETHER YOU GIVE PERMISSION OR NOT
SHALL APPRECIATE IMMEDIATE TELEGRAPHIC
REPLY.

T. T. SHIELDS"

No Telegraphic Reply Received

As I have received no reply to my wire, I am assuming you have no intention of replying, and, therefore, I am publishing your letter of March 20th, notwithstanding you marked it "for your information only, and not to be published".

In analyzing your letter I think I shall furnish sufficient justification to all right-minded people for my decision to disregard your request "not to be published".

I am glad to know that you "have been supporting THE GOSPEL WITNESS for some considerable time". We appreciate the goodwill and co-operation of all our readers, and are always exceedingly sorry at any time to find ourselves in their disfavour. For over a somewhat extended period in my pulpit ministry, I have never withheld unpalatable truth because it might be displeasing to some of my hearers. The whole counsel of God must be declared, whatever the cost.

The same principle has governed the editorial policy of THE GOSPEL WITNESS. We have been obliged to champion unpopular causes, and by so doing have often lost valued friends; although we have found that for every friend lost to us by telling the truth, we have gained a dozen new ones of a more enduring quality.

"Protestantism" Defined

Your statement that you have concluded THE GOSPEL WITNESS "is not serving the cause of Protestantism in this country" requires some clarification and definition. You charge THE GOSPEL WITNESS with a readiness to "display schism and certain weaknesses within the Protestant Church, and complain that we publish "articles

of a controversial nature not in harmony with the best interests of the Protestant cause." I am wondering what you mean by "Protestantism", and whether you have learned the necessity of sharply distinguishing between Protestants, and merely non-Romanists. I suppose it would generally be admitted that what is usually called *Protestantism*, that is, that body of truth represented by the doctrines of the Protestant Reformation, is really based upon the principle of justification by faith, upon which Martin Luther so insisted. But behind that doctrine of justification, and underlying it, is the truth of the essential Deity of Jesus Christ, involving His virgin birth, His supernatural life, and death, and resurrection. It involves His expiatory sacrifice as the One and only Sacrifice for sin; and all that rests upon the divine inspiration and supreme authority of Holy Scripture. Surely you must recognize that when all, or any one, of these doctrines are, or is, denied, no Protestantism remains? What you conceive of as "the Protestant Church" is merely an aggregation of organizations of various Denominations, which call themselves, "Christian", many of whom are still true to the faith once for all delivered to the saints; but some of them have wholly departed from the principles upon which any true Protestantism must rest. The denial of the doctrines to which I have alluded, involves the denial of Protestantism; hence the repudiation of its protest against the anti-Christian tenets of Romanism.

Do Mr. Rockwood and Gospel Witness Serve Protestant Interests?

We shall see a little later in this letter whether the stand Mr. Rockwood has taken, and our support of him, tends to the consolidation of real Protestant interest and conviction, or the reverse.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS is not published with the object of making what are usually called "Protestants." The purpose of THE GOSPEL WITNESS is to endeavour to lead its non-Christian readers to a personal acceptance of Christ; and to lead them, and all others, so far as it has any influence, to a recognition of His absolute Lordship over the life of the individual, and over the church; with its inevitable corollary, the acceptance of the divine inspiration and authority of Holy Scripture.

I am sorry you disagree with the policy of THE GOSPEL WITNESS. I think you were quite correct in looking upon our paper "not only as a strong defence of Protestantism, but also as a strong 'tower of defence' against Romanism." What you thought it to be, it really is; but that does not mean that it regards Denominational unity, or the solidarity of so-called Protestant Denominations as necessarily promoting the cause of Protestantism. In the last analysis the only people who can be depended upon to stand uncompromisingly against the Antichrist are those who are born again: "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world".

You identify yourself as a member of the Halifax Presbytery, and say,

"I fail to see why this publicity is necessary."

Who Is Responsible for Rockwood Publicity?

It was not THE GOSPEL WITNESS, neither was it Mr. Rockwood, which gave such publicity to the Rockwood matter. It was the leaders of the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery, who, so unwisely, made Mr. Rockwood's sermons an issue, which brought the matter out into public view. It is evident to any one of pastoral expe-

rience that a disgruntled minority group in St. James Church succeeded in getting the ear of the Presbytery. The Presbytery ought to have known that no plan could have been devised to give greater publicity to Mr. Rockwood than to put him on "trial", and find him "guilty" of following "a divisive course". After having blown the trumpet, and summoned all the news-gatherers to their side, the Presbytery actually advised Mr. Rockwood to shun publicity in the press, and to burn his sermons! Such a decision was like setting fire to prairie grass in a dry season. But seeing that publicity had been given to the matter on the one side, and Mr. Rockwood had been put in an ecclesiastical pillory, it would have been the quintessence of unfairness for men, sharing Mr. Rockwood's convictions, to keep silence.

A Vile Aspersions on Rockwood's Integrity

At this point I may justify the publication of your letter, notwithstanding your request that it "not be published." You deplore the publicity given, and yet you enclose in your letter an official attack upon Mr. Rockwood issued by authority of the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery, and marked the newspaper cutting "for publication". That is to say, you actually ask me to give publicity to the Presbytery's truly vicious statement. That statement said that Mr. Rockwood "suffers from delusions of greatness, and an itch for fame". Technically, a person who has delusions, is mentally unsound. But who and what is your Presbytery to presume to judge of a man's motives? But it went further, and said that Mr. Rockwood,

"has taken as his master Dr. Joseph Goebbels, and works on the principle that if a lie is big enough, and told often enough, some people will believe it."

Can anyone imagine a viler aspersion on the character of a minister than this jibe? It plainly calls Mr. Rockwood a liar, and implies that he deliberately employed a policy of lying to further his own interests. There is more poisonous piffle of the same sort in the Presbytery's statement; and the Presbytery sarcastically asks,

"where Mr. Rockwood had acquired his 'profound knowledge' to say that the Protestant Church was not preaching the Gospel, since his summer holidays 'are spent in a seaside cottage in Nova Scotia, and his orbit of movement is within a radius of fifty miles of Truro.'"

Who Is The Ecclesiastical Yellow-Jacket Scribe?

We wonder what sort of an ecclesiastical yellow-jacket, an insect that stings but makes no honey, wrote those lines? Would the Presbytery charge Mr. Rockwood with inability to read plain English? A man's movements may be confined to a radius of much less than fifty miles from a given spot, while being one of the most thoroughly informed men in the world. The statement continues:

A Wicked Implication

"Alas, he has led astray some few and innocent people in the Maritimes, and when their eyes are opened they will see Mr. Rockwood for what he is."

Very probably the so-called "few innocent" people know Mr. Rockwood for what he is, far better than does the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery. But as a minister of the Gospel, I am ashamed of your Presbytery's venomous innuendoes! You imply that your Presbytery is in possession of some dark secret respecting Mr. Rockwood which some day, when it becomes known, will make his friends ashamed!

Reason For Lengthy Quotations of MacLeod Letter

My reason for quoting at such length from this malicious statement is the fact that a newspaper-cutting containing it, although I had received many other copies,

was attached to your letter, and over the two-column headline in your own hand was written, "For publication". While deploring my defence of Mr. Rockwood in giving further publicity to this matter, you send me his poisonous statement and ask me to publish it, but to keep your letter private!

Nobody questions the right of the Presbyterian Church to exercise discipline; but whether the elders and ministers are in the best position

"to know what is to the best interest of our church and the spiritual wellbeing of our people" must depend wholly upon the spiritual qualities of the elders and ministers concerned. But no church can be a law unto itself; and what any church does is likely to be a matter of public interest; and the public have a perfect right to form their own judgment of the right or wrong of church decisions.

Wherein Is The Gospel Witness Inaccurate?

You say that much of what was published in THE GOSPEL WITNESS

"appears somewhat misleading and inaccurate but you do not inform us of what this 'much' is."

You say that you know Mr. Rockwood better than some others; that you had to deal with him

"As a member of that court, and we always found him rather a difficult person to work with."

Any man of pronounced convictions, possessed of the courage of his convictions, will be found hard to work with by ecclesiastics who, in reference to doctrinal matters, pursue a policy of *laissez faire*.

You say,

"We have a right to defend those who were loyal to our church and her standards in the disruption of 1925."

We Were Not Regarded As Meddler by Presbyterians At Time of Disruption

May I humbly claim that I ought to be included in that list of the elect, for when Church Union was under discussion I preached a series of sermons showing why Baptists could have nothing to do with it; and that no other churches ought to have anything to do with it, who were loyal to the word of God. I was not then criticized by anyone as an enemy of Presbyterians, although I did incur the displeasure of "Unionists" of all sorts. At that time little was being published on the subject apart from the newspaper reports, and when the instrument of incorporation was passed by Parliament, I printed it, and analyzed it, and showed its vicious character. The result was we had to publish special editions of that series of sermons to supply the demand made by many Presbyterian churches, and those sermons were distributed in Presbyterian churches, and I was informed of more than one instance in which my expose saved the Presbyterian church property for the Presbyterian church.

Rockwood Really Best Friend of Presbyterian Church

Again I quote your letter:

"Mr. Rockwood was tried on the ground that he accused some of these men of being disloyal to the church and her teaching."

Rockwood's Charges Proved by Presbyterian Writings

Let us, for a moment, see whether there was any ground for Mr. Rockwood's statement. So far as the Montreal College was concerned, a columnist in *The Globe and Mail*, dealing with the text book which Mr. Rockwood had criticized, that of Professor Gifford, entitled, "The Story of the Faith", says:

Undoubtedly Prof. Gifford does not accept the story of the Virgin birth, for he says: "The 'virgin birth' appears now to have been the best explanation that simple folk could give, long after the event; of the origin of one who seemed to them to be more than human." It will be observed that Prof. Gifford is rather sparing in the use of capital letters. The rebellious Truro pastor believes that the church has lost its authority with the multitude because of the higher criticism and modernism in the pulpits today. He is by no means alone in this belief, and, believing what he does believe, it was not only his right but his duty to protest against the preaching that is popular today.

Quotations from Dr. W. W. Bryden, Principal of Knox College

We have before us a Presbyterian publication published in the Maritime Provinces, and it contains several quotations from a book by the present principal of Knox College, Dr. W. W. Bryden, M.A., D.D. The date of the book entitled, "The Christian's Knowledge of God" is 1940, and we quote as follows:

"Nothing in the form of purely academic insight will ever explain why Scripture remains ever a life-giving source to men of faith, even when criticism can show that it is perhaps replete with numerous discrepancies, is characterized in places with what are said to be dubious moralities, and, when its earlier records seem to present much which does not stand the test of historic or scientific inquiry." (Page 25).

You say, "We have our standards". I always supposed the statement of the Westminster Confession of Faith was the Presbyterian standard. What have you to say of this, as set over against Dr. Bryden's statement?

"We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church to an high and reverent esteem of the Holy Scripture, and, the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole, (which is to give all glory to God); the full discovery it makes of man's salvation, the many incomparable excellencies and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God . . ." (Westminster Confession, Ch. 1, Sec. 5.)

In the same book in his chapter on New Testament Revelation, Dr. Bryden has this to say:

"The New Testament in short, is no place to go if we are in search of religious solutions, if we desire a rationale of things earthly and things heavenly. It is moreover not a place to go if we are desirous of knowing what precisely we must do, or refrain from doing, in this particular concrete situation or that. There is nothing in it to produce a legalism, or to encourage people to look for religious recipes for difficult problems of life and existence. Rather it is a place in which tantalizing riddles, baffling antithesis in thought, obvious contradictions in statement, sharp unresolved and unresolvable paradoxes, things suggested but never completely described, confront us. This book is replete with common sense, yet is just as full of nonsense to the 'practical' mind. It always assumes responsibility, and demands initiative, on the part of man, but at the same time affirms just as emphatically that Salvation is of God's grace alone. It is forever making demands upon men under terms and conditions obviously impossible to those who take them seriously." (Page 97).

"Of course, the religious value of mythology is never to be discounted. Such has its legitimate place even in the Biblical record of the Word of God"—and in the footnote on same page—"Biblical mythology, however, is never to be identified with Biblical revelation. The myth does not reveal—Biblical mythology, however, is man's attempt to point, with the aid of pictorial or symbolic forms to what God's Word signifies in certain concrete contacts it has made with the life of man." (Page 201)

And yet, again, as a final quotation, I give you this:

"Surprising as it may seem to modern church-goers, the New Testament does not stress as we do 'the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men!' In

fact, the stoics and others had constantly spoken of this long before the New Testament was in existence, and indeed had emphasized it in itself as the New Testament never does. This book, of course, does not ignore the truth and the corresponding claim for men expressed therein, but it seems to assume that such can never be truly or profitably understood by the natural affections of man. Only by the revelation which had been made in Jesus Christ could its profound significance be perceived." (Page 92).

Is The Church "Sick Unto Death"?

You object to Mr. Rockwood's saying the church is sick unto death. I agree with you most heartily that the true church, the purchase of the blood of Christ, being part of the Body of Christ, cannot, in the nature of the case, be "sick unto death". But Mr. Rockwood is not speaking of that spiritual entity only, but more particularly of the organizations which profess and call themselves Christian, and bear almost no resemblance to the church of the New Testament. That these organizations are, in a spiritual sense, and by all biblical standards, very largely "sick unto death," "having a name to live and are dead" no one of spiritual discernment can question.

Chaplaincy Included "Quick and Dead"

You say:

"I resent very much your attacks on the chaplains."

I did not attack the chaplains as such. I gladly acknowledge the splendid quality of many of them, and the great work they did for God and the souls of men. I did say that there were not a few who sought the chaplaincy as an escape from the arduous duties of the pastorate, and that, to my certain knowledge, was true. In speaking thus, I am not speaking of those who stayed in this country, but of those who went overseas. Few churches had such a large proportion of its manhood in the Armed Services as Jarvis Street; and it was my pleasure and privilege to keep in regular correspondence with all of these men wherever they were, whether in England, or Africa, or Palestine, or Italy, or France, or other parts of Europe and many of them sent me the most glowing testimonies in respect to some of the chaplains and their spiritual qualities. But there was a vast number of chaplains who, obviously, had never been converted, who were wholly destitute of spiritual life, and utterly useless for the exercise of the duties they were appointed to discharge.

A chaplain who wins a VC is undoubtedly a brave man, and one who prefers service to his men rather than his own freedom, cannot be too highly commended. But all that may be true of one who is ignorant of the essentials of the gospel of grace; indeed, I fear that it may have been true.

"Great Men Are Not Always Wise Neither Do The Aged Understand Judgment"

In your last paragraph you say:

"Mr. Rockwood refused to listen to the advice and wise counsel of older men in the Synod."

How well do I remember such words as these in the early years of my ministry when I was offered the "wise counsel" of older men in the ministry than myself, who rather patronizingly pitied my youthful ardour, and said, "You will know better by and by". Whose advice was:

"Be not righteous over much; neither make thyself over wise; why shouldest thou destroy thyself?"

I must frankly confess that I have seen no evidence of "Christian humility and common sense" on the part of the members of the Presbytery of Halifax-Lunenburg, yourself included.

You terminate your letter by saying:

"He was free to appeal to the General Assembly if he was anxious to remain faithful to his church and her ministry."

I think there is little doubt that Mr. Rockwood earnestly desired to do that very thing, so far as that might be consistent with his primary duty to be faithful to Christ and the truth of the gospel. Whether there was any likelihood of the General Assembly's reversing the decision of your Presbytery I do not know; but I can well understand why, having felt the lash of ecclesiastical tyranny, Mr. Rockwood decided immediately to free himself from further subjection to it.

Your letter ends with this sentence:

"He is now at liberty to dictate his own policy and that is what he desired most of all."

I have little doubt that that is true. Why should not a minister of Christ be absolutely free to "dictate his own policy"? Why should he be subject to any sort of ecclesiastical restraint?

Lawyer With No Case Abuses Witness

It is common practice for a pettifogging lawyer who has just enough sense to know that he has no case, wanting evidence, to abuse, and to try to discredit the witnesses of his opponent. This is exactly what the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery has done. It did not deign to examine the evidence which was open to its inspection in Mr. Rockwood's printed sermons; but instead they first of all patronized Mr. Rockwood; said he was "a nice young man, and no doubt very sincere". And when they had rapped him over the knuckles, they postponed his "sentence": told him to go home; think things over; burn his sermons; avoid publicity; yield the direction of his church to his session; and, generally, to be a quiet, good, little boy. But when they found Mr. Rockwood was not a little boy, but every inch a man, who would stand by his convictions, and defend his rights, and state his position before all the world, then they issued a statement that he fancied himself "a great man"; he had an "itch for fame". He was "a liar like Joseph Goebbels," etc. We have passed through it all. Whenever the written word of God, or its human witnesses are brought to trial for their faithfulness, the trial of the Word Incarnate before the high priest, and Herod, and Pontius Pilate, is re-enacted. History has repeated itself in Mr. Rockwood's case and I do not envy you your position in the train of the high priest, and scribes, and Pharisees.

I have thus commented upon your letter. I have reproduced the first and last paragraphs that I might publish them in facsimile.

No Fellowship With The Unfruitful Works of Darkness

I must frankly confess that your action in marking the Presbytery's scurrilous statement "for publication", and your own letter, so full of veiled suggestion and innuendoes, and marked "not to be published", seems to be to manifest an utterly unChristian, not to say, unethical spirit. For myself, I have no fear whatever of open enemies. I can respect them, and give them a Roland for their Oliver, and gladly receive the same from them; but I can say with the Psalmist, "Whoso privily slandereth his neighbour, him will I cut off". I covet the friendship and fellowship of no man who will work, or speak, or write, in the dark.

I am,

Yours very sincerely,

T. T. SHIELDS

"A Lying Spirit From The Lord"

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

(Stenographically Reported)

Delivered in Jarvis Street-Church, Toronto Evening, June 29th, 1928, (simultaneously with the closing meeting of the Baptist World Alliance

PERSONALLY, I had some misgivings as to the wisdom of attempting to hold extra services here during the progress of the Baptist World Alliance meetings. When men are gathered from all parts of the earth, among them many men of great distinction, it seemed almost absurd to open our doors, especially when it was known that our testimony would not be in agreement with the general trend of things at Exhibition Park. And yet many hundreds have attended our services every evening, and I think we may reasonably hope that the testimony given has not been in vain.

What is the situation? I think it has been demonstrated that many men have occupied positions of prominence in the programme of this Alliance who reject the authority of Holy Scripture. Some of them reject the cardinal doctrines of the gospel: the essential Deity of Christ, carrying with it His virgin birth, and the great central truth of the gospel, His expiatory death, or, the expiatory value of His death, His literal resurrection, and His coming again. I think that is not open to question. No one having any appreciation of the value of language at all will dispute with me when I say that men who deny everything fundamental to evangelical faith have occupied positions of prominence on the Alliance programme; and, so far as I know, no word of public protest has been uttered against her teaching.

I do not believe that the delegates to the Alliance accept that teaching in any general way. I am confident that brethren from Russia, and Germany, and Sweden, and some from England, and many from the United States, and from the Islands of the sea, reject and repudiate these doctrines. Notwithstanding, it is the way of Modernists to obtain positions of prominence in the programmes of large meetings, get themselves and their utterances into the press, and create the general impression that the great company have credentialed their views. But for our protest in this place, nobody would ever have suspected from anything that has appeared in the press, or from any word uttered from the Alliance programme, that the Baptists of the world were not one in their rejection of the authority of Scripture. And it will be published to the ends of the earth that the Baptist World Alliance has approved of these radical views.

Our own papers described the meeting in Yorkminster Church as being under the leadership of Professor Marshall and Dean Shailer Mathews, and the impression goes abroad that these men were the mouthpieces for great multitudes of Baptists, who, if they are driven to a choice between science and the Bible, will accept science. The truth is, there are great multitudes of Baptists, numbered by the million, who still hold to the faith of Christ.

But what is the explanation of this defection here and elsewhere? The very best explanation to be found anywhere is always to be found in the Word of God, and I desire to show you that these heresies are not new. Let

me read you a portion of the eighteenth chapter of the second book of Chronicles, or rather the whole chapter:

"Now Jehoshaphat had riches and honour in abundance, and joined affinity with Ahab. And after certain years he went down to Ahab to Samaria. And Ahab killed sheep and oxen for him in abundance, and for the people that he had with him, and persuaded him to go up with him to Ramoth-gilead. And Ahab king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat king of Judah, Wilt thou go with me to Ramoth-gilead? And he answered him, I am as thou art, and my people as thy people; and we will be with thee in the war.

"And Jehoshaphat said unto the king of Israel, Enquire, I pray thee, at the word of the Lord to-day. Therefore, the king of Israel gathered together of prophets four hundred men, and said unto them, Shall we go to Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall I forbear? And they said, Go up; for God will deliver it into the king's hand. But Jehoshaphat said, Is there not here a prophet of the Lord besides, that we might enquire of him? And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, There is yet one man, by whom we may enquire of the Lord: but I hate him; for he never prophesied good unto me, but always evil: the same is Micaiah the son of Imla. And the king of Israel called for one of his officers, and said, Fetch quickly Micaiah the son of Imla. And the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat king of Judah sat either of them on his throne, clothed in their robes; and they sat in a void place at the entering in of the gate of Samaria; and all the prophets prophesied before them.

"And Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah had made him horns of iron, and said, Thus saith the Lord, With these thou shalt push Syria until they be consumed. And all the prophets prophesied so, saying, Go up to Ramoth-gilead, and prosper: for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king. And the messenger that went to call Micaiah spake to him, saying, Behold, the words of the prophets declare good to the king with one assent; let thy word therefore, I pray thee, be like one of theirs, and speak thou good. And Micaiah said, As the Lord liveth, even what my God saith, that will I speak. And when he was come to the king, the king said unto him, Micaiah, shall we go to Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall I forbear? And he said, Go ye up, and prosper, and they shall be delivered into your hand. And the king said to him, How many times shall I adjure thee that thou say nothing but the truth to me in the name of the Lord? Then he said, I did see all Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep that have no shepherd: and the Lord said, These have no master; let them return therefore every man to his house in peace. And the king of Israel said to Jehoshaphat, Did I not tell thee that he would not prophesy good unto me, but evil? And he said, Therefore hear the word of the Lord; I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne, and all the host of heaven standing on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall entice Ahab king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one spake saying after this manner, and another saying after that manner. Then there came out of a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Where-with? And he said, I will go out, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail: go out, and do even so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil against thee. Then

Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah came near, and smote Micaiah upon the cheek, and said, Which way went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak unto thee? And Micaiah said, Behold, thou shalt see on that day when thou shalt go into an inner chamber to hide thyself. Then the king of Israel said, Take ye Micaiah, and carry him back to Amon the governor of the city, and to Joash the king's son; and say, Thus saith the king, Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with bread of affliction and with water of affliction, until I return in peace; then hath not the Lord spoken by me. And he said, Hearken, all ye people.

"So the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat the king of Judah went up to Ramoth-gilead. And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, I will disguise myself, and will go to the battle; but put thou on thy robes. So the king of Israel disguised himself; and they went to the battle. Now the king of Syria had commanded the captains of the chariots that were with him, saying, Fight ye not with small or great, save only with the king of Israel. And it came to pass, when the captains of the chariots saw Jehoshaphat, that they said, It is the king of Israel. Therefore they compassed about him to fight: but Jehoshaphat cried out, and the Lord helped him; and God moved them to depart from him. For it came to pass that, when the captains of the chariots perceived that it was not the king of Israel, they turned back again from pursuing him. And a certain man drew a bow at a venture, and smote the king of Israel between the joints of the harness: therefore he said to his chariot man, Turn thine hand, that thou mayest carry me out of the host; for I am wounded. And the battle increased that day: howbeit the king of Israel stayed himself up in his chariot against the Syrians until the even: and about the time of the sun going down he died."

You rave in that bit of history an inspired record of present-day apostasy, of every apostasy. It is entirely up-to-date, and I should like you to look at three or four simple elements in this history, and I think it will minister to the strengthening of your faith.

I.

You have in that bit of history an inspired record of NATURAL MAN, an illustration of what human nature really is, and of what human nature will do. The Bible does not concern itself so much with principles in the abstract: the principle of the incarnation is to be found on every page. That is why the Bible is so largely occupied with the biographies of men, good men and evil men, in order that in the characters and destinies of good men we may see the value of the principles of righteousness; and that in the characters and gradual—sometimes gradual, sometimes sudden—destruction of evil men, we may see the great principle that "The wages of sin is death;" exemplified. As a matter of theory some of our Modernist friends deny utterly the old-fashioned doctrine of total depravity, but while they deny it theoretically, they exemplify it almost to perfection. They are themselves the proof of the very doctrines they deny.

Look at Ahab, a man who was wrong at heart. That was the trouble with Ahab. It would be useless to attempt to amend his character from without, to bring to bear upon him any reforming principle. If Ahab was to be changed, if his character was to be developed, and ennobled, and made God-like, then the remedy must be more than an external one, it must be radical, it must go to the root of the trouble; for no one can read Ahab's record without seeing that he was a man who was bad at heart. His desires were of the earth, earthy; he was a fleshly man, a worldly man, a man who lived for time and sense, and who had no conception of spiritual values whatsoever. That is the state of the natural man who has been untouched by the Spirit of God. That is true notwithstanding Professor Marshall's sneer at the scrip-

ture quoted to him respecting the carnal mind, "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing," and his coarse and vulgar rejoinder, "Well, did I say there was any good in the liver? Did I say there was any good in the lights?" That from a professor! But the Scripture is perfectly explicit when it says that "the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

You cannot rightly appraise the value of any religion—and I use that broad and comprehensive term—unless you view it in its relation to human nature as it is; for what is religion for if it is not to help us, to enable us to do what we of ourselves are unable to do? That is our problem to begin with; whatever the professors may say, it is true, for all history, all observation, and all experience, confirm the truth of it, that human nature is hopelessly depraved; and no kind of religion is of value to any of us unless it can remake us at heart, unless it is sufficiently radical to change our whole nature and make us new creatures. That is axiomatic. You cannot walk down the streets of Toronto without seeing that that is what man needs, a religion that will make him, by some means, a new creature.

Ahab was a man whose will was strong in the direction of his own desires. His evil affections determine the course of his will. He wanted things that were wrong; and because he wanted them, he was determined to possess them. The truth is, my friends, that the minds of men and the wills of men are against God. That is what the Scripture says—not that we are at enmity with God, but that human nature in its very essence, in its warp and woof, in its inherent qualities, is a bundle of enmity against God; that its very nature is opposed to God, so that you cannot bring the two together unless you change the carnal mind, and make it like unto the nature of God Himself. That is the miracle, and no other religion is of value to us than that which can thus bring our rebellious natures into agreement with the holy nature of God. Ahab was set against God, against the law of God, against the plans of God, against the purposes of God. He is described as a man who "did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord."

That is true of everybody. Some men get drunk, some men steal, some men wallow in all kinds of iniquity; but there are some people, like Ahab, whose sin is of a very respectable order, for Ahab's sin was that of covetousness. There is nothing especially to indicate that Ahab was given to the grosser sins of the flesh, but he coveted Naboth's vineyard, he coveted Ramoth-gilead—he coveted everything he could get, and was determined to have it at all costs, even at the price of blood. He was determined to have things that were not his own. There are no two people who have identically the same weaknesses, the same besetments, the same temptations; but human nature is alike in this, that sin,—sin that is inherent, finds some expression in the life it finds one expression in one character and another in another; but no man, if he knows his own weakness, can afford to hold in contempt a man whose sin is more apparent than his own. We may be delivered from these grosser sensual sins, and yet be inordinately proud, and envious, and covetous; and all these sins are just as much sins of the flesh as the sins that men reprobate so strongly. But the sin that is in our hearts, will find expression somehow in every one of us, and there is no man here, or up yonder in the Alliance, that, apart from grace of God, does not want to have his own way. Is not that what Scripture says, "All we like sheep have gone astray;

we have turned every one to his own way." That is our state, that was Ahab's state, and that is the state of the carnal mind always. It always wants to have its own way, to map out its own course, to be independent of God, to be itself as God knowing good and evil. It is the age-long temptation, my brother, there is nothing new about it at all.

That is human nature, and the worst of it is that *Ahab sought religious sanction for his own wilfulness.* Ahab wanted no change of heart, no change of character, no change of course, but to do just exactly according to his natural desires. "Yet," said he, "I must, in the doing of it, be a religious man; I must have my own way, approved by religion." Therefore Ahab devised a religion that would let him have his way, and he had four hundred prophets paid to approve of everything he did, to cheer every time he appeared, and to promise him success in the way of his own desires. That is what Ahab did, and that is what men want to-day; men want to be religious—everybody wants to be religious—but they want a religion that will not disturb them overmuch. They want a religion that will permit them to go to their offices from Monday till Saturday and do exactly as they please, make money, get on at anybody's expense—they desire a religion that will not be inconvenient. That is what young people want—some young people, and older people too—a religion that will permit them to find their own pleasure in their own way, and that will require no sort of reformation or repentance on their part. That is a picture of human nature.

Do you think that is true? I know certain people talk much about universal brotherhood, especially when they go to religious meetings, but you do not find it in the business houses of the city. It is all talk. There is no reality in it at all, it is sheer cant. The guiding principle with the natural man is to shape his course with a view to obtaining the greatest good for the greatest number, as I heard someone say, the greatest number always being number one!

II.

This story tells us of **TWO KINDS OF RELIGION.** One was represented by four hundred prophets. A majority is very impressive. It is a great thing to say, The majority are on our side. It may sound very egotistical to say it, but the truth is, in respect to religious matters, the majority are invariably wrong. You cannot determine ethical questions, much less spiritual matters, by a majority vote. And I have the greatest authority for that statement, for He Who is our Master said that there is a wide gate and a broad road, and many there be that go in thereat. If you want to be on the majority side, my friends, you will go by the wide gate and the broad road, for the majority are always there. On the other hand, there is a straight gate and a narrow way, and few there be that find it. But our Lord promised His benediction to the few that find it. "Fear not," notwithstanding the talk about "this great Denomination! This GREAT Denomination! This great Congress!"—"Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

You are not going to get the kingdom by legislative processes, nor by any kind of political manipulations. Ahab had the majority on his side, and they were all prophets, four hundred of them, private chaplains—and when a man needs four hundred preachers to keep him straight, he is naturally pretty crooked. I confess myself to be not without some suspicion of those movements which need so much credentialing. A certificate

of character is a very good thing for those who need it.

What was the outstanding characteristic of this religion that was so popular? What was it? Well, it promised Ahab success in the direction of his own desires. It said to Ahab, "Certainly, certainly; if you want Ramoth-gilead, take it, and God will help you take it. Whatever you want, take it, and the Lord will be with you." I heard a man say once that the natural man is a Roman Catholic. By which he meant that Roman Catholicism was agreeable to the natural man. Whether that be true or not I do not say, but I do know that Modernism is agreeable to the natural man, and that every natural man is naturally a Modernist, in the sense that he wants no restrictions, no heavenly directions, no prohibitions; he wants to do his own way, and his own pleasure, and to prosper in the direction of his own desire and his own will.

In other words, *this religion is the product of evolution!* It comes out of the man himself; it is the kind of religion he wants, and that is evolution. Men can adopt that religion without any revolution of life, or repentance, or reformation, of any kind. Never from the beginning did the devil ever devise anything more popular, more agreeable to the natural mind, than the doctrine of evolution. It nullifies sin, and every element of divine revelation, and comes to congratulate man on his upward progress, and tell him if he keeps on long enough he will arrive at Ramoth-gilead, and it will be his. I do not wonder that Modernism, which rejects the Word of God, which rejects the supernatural character of the Book, which repudiates the doctrine of man's fallen estate, but, on the other hand, magnifies human nature, and tells men we are a fine lot, we are getting on splendidly, and that in ten millions of years from now we shall arrive—I do not wonder that men like that religion; it is the most palatable thing in the world. And while it has a new name, it is exactly the same religion that Ahab had, that every apostate has—it is a religion that is agreeable to the natural man, and is evolved out of man's natural desires. It is a religion of naturalism as opposed to a religion of supernaturalism.

When Ahab asked the judgment of four hundred prophets, and they said, "Go and prosper," what difficulty, what intellectual difficulty, had Ahab in the way of believing the testimony of these prophets? Look at the psychology of the thing. Here he is, his army is all ready, and he says to his neighbour, "I am going to war with the king of Syria, and Ramoth-gilead is the prize. I am going to call the prophets and see what they say." And they said, "Go!" Was there any difficulty with Ahab's believing that message? No, he had nothing to do in order to believe it. He was going that way, and the four hundred prophets came along to give him a push in the direction of his own desire. Sometimes you wonder why it is that the tenets of the times, are so readily imbibed. Why is it that men with intellects can believe in Modernism? Because that nonsense is agreeable to their own minds. When that is planted in the natural man it is planted in a soil that is congenial; in fact, it is indigenous to the natural mind. It requires no repentance, no reformation, no humbling of the heart; man can go on in his own sinful way.

That is what men are asking for to-day, and that is the kind of religion that is being provided, a religion that will never disturb anybody's conscience, a religion that will not keep anybody awake on Sunday because of what happened last week, a religion that will not bring up the records of the past for divine adjustment; but a religion

that says we are all climbing the golden stairs; we have nothing to fear from the past, and everything to hope for the future. We are better than our fathers, we are at the top of the race, the acme of evolution, or, at least, the last product; and we are going on. I do not wonder when people have been flattered after that fashion that they clap one another on the shoulder and say, "You are a fine fellow"—hail fellow, well met. There is no bowing of the head, no breaking of the heart, no humbling of the spirit, before God. "Go up to Ramoth-gilead; for God will deliver it into the king's hand." The only god the Modernists know is the god that promises to reinforce their own wills in the direction of their own carnal desires. It is no wonder men like Fosdick come out in defense of companionate marriage, and proclaim the doctrine of self-expression. That is what Modernism is; disguised with all sorts of scholastic camouflage, at heart it is the upgrowth, the outpouring, of the natural expression of the corrupt hearts of men.

Put beside that *another kind of religion*. Micaiah the son of Imla was its representative. What did he know about Ahab's going up to Ramoth-gilead? What was Micaiah's opinion about the wisdom of Ahab's course? He had no opinion. He expressed no opinion. What he said was, "I do not know what I shall say yet, but as the Lord liveth, whatever he saith unto me that will I speak." They said, "Do not be revolutionary, do not be singular, do not be eccentric, do not be egotistical, do not set up your judgment against the rest. We will tell you something quietly: the king has already asked four hundred prophets, and the majority are on his side. Come on, join the majority." Did you ever hear that? (Laughter.) Join the majority! Why should you stand up and make yourself singular? Everybody else is doing it, therefore you do it. Everybody else believes it.

I remember an old minister once, when that argument was brought forth in a ministerial meeting, "Everybody believes it, everybody is saying it. All the theological seminaries teach it, all the text-books state it—join in with the majority"—the old man said, "That may be good advertising"—by the way, he was a Methodist not a hundred miles from here—"but as I came to this meeting this morning I saw on the billboard, 'Everybody smokes——tobacco' (naming it, but I am not going to advertise it for them). Now that may be good advertising, but it is not true, because I am somebody, and I do not smoke that kind of tobacco—or any other kind. You cannot win me by saying that everybody believes it. Here is one servant of God who testifies against the whole business, for I do not believe a word of it." Modernism carried in McMaster, it carried in our Convention with proxy votes, for that is the trick of Modernism to make it carry always. They did the same thing in the Baptist World Alliance, and are publishing abroad that all the Baptists of the world believe and teach Modernism.

This prophet said in effect, "I do not know a thing about Ramoth-gilead, and I know nothing about Ahab, but I am the mouthpiece of God, and whatever He tells me I will repeat." And when this preacher came—we shall have more to say about him in another connection—when he came, and Ahab asked him exactly the same question that he asked the four hundred, and received from Micaiah exactly the same answer, why did he not turn around to Jehoshaphat and say, "There now, Jehoshaphat, it is unanimous. Four hundred prophets, plus Micaiah. Now we are on safe ground"? Ahab did not expect the same message from Micaiah, and he sud-

denly became possessed of a passionate desire for the truth and said, "How many times shall I adjure thee that thou say nothing but the truth to me, in the name of the Lord?" Why did he not say that to the four hundred prophets? Some people talk about us here in Jarvis Street as though we were seeking prominence. Do you know what? I could put myself on the front page of every city newspaper in the United States and Canada Monday morning. How? By borrowing one of the Modernists's sermons and preaching it, by telling men to go up to Ramoth-gilead and prosper. They do not expect me to say that! They expect it somewhere else. But were a Fundamentalist to say the same thing they would wonder if he were ill! Or if he had suddenly become converted by the Baptist World Alliance! It is a fact. There are fifty pulpits that could preach such a sermon next Sunday without comment, but if it were preached from this pulpit, the whole Continent would hear of it. Why? Because in their heart of hearts they know that they are asking for a religion that will leave them alone in their sins, that is why. That is the philosophy of Modernism.

Then Micaiah delivered his second message. There was a tone of irony in that first one. Ahab knew that was not the final word. But the prophet came as though he would mock him: "I know what you want. You have asked four hundred prophets, and they all said, parrot-like, what you wanted them to say. Let me be a parrot and say the same thing." "But," said Ahab, "I did not expect you to be a parrot. Come on, now, what have you to say?" "Just this: I had a vision. I saw the Lord and I heard Him say, I did see all Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep that have no shepherd: and the Lord said, These have no master; let them return therefore every man to his house in peace. If you go up to Ramoth-gilead, you will never come home again." He spoke the very opposite from that spoken by the four hundred prophets; one man against four hundred. And Ahab said, "I told you so. I never did hear that preacher preach that he did not scold. Did I not tell thee that he would not prophesy good unto me, but evil?" Yes, that is the attitude of the natural man. But, my friends, when the prophet gets a revelation from God, and speaks God's word instead of his own word, it always smites the human conscience, it always breaks the human heart, it always humbles human pride, it always forbids men to do their own wills, and it always tells them that in the way of self-will is death. People do not like it, and because they do not like it they want the testimony of the four hundred. Can you see those two religions?

III.

Then look at HUMAN NATURE, for a moment, IN ITS RELATION TO THESE TWO POSSIBILITIES.

First of all, there are two men concerned, Ahab and Jehoshaphat, and I have spoken only of Ahab, Jehoshaphat was a good man in the main, and *when he was at home he behaved himself*. And here was a proclamation for the Israelitish king—no, the Israel-Judean Alliance! It was an alliance between Israel and Judea, and these two are arranging the programme. Ahab, Chairman of the Committee, put four hundred prophets of Baal on the programme, and if it had not been that Jehoshaphat attended the Convention, Micaiah would not have had a chance to speak at all. Is not that up-to-date? Why is it that there is here and there an evangelical note sounded? Why are a few evangelicals put on the programme? Because Jehoshaphat, who believes God's Word, has no more sense than to join affinity with Ahab who denies it.

Jehoshaphat is a type of the Fundamentalist who is a Fundamentalist at home, and a practical Modernist abroad. When he is at home he worships God: when he attends the Convention down in Samaria, and Ahab makes a complimentary speech, Jehoshaphat replies: "I am as thou art, and my people as thy people; and we will be with thee in the war. We are all one, we enjoy a glorious unity." Do you see it? That is the Baptist World Alliance exactly!

Now look: *Ahab could believe the testimony of the four hundred prophets without repentance or reformation*, but here is a psychological principle, and it is a profound doctrinal principle, because the doctrinal principles of the Word of God inhere in the nature of things. What had Ahab to do in order to believe the message of the Fundamentalist Micaiah? What had he to do? What was it? It was this: Ahab, demobilize your army. Set aside your ambition, go home, and stay home, and desist from the course upon which your heart is set.

That was the message. What had he to do in order to believe it? He had first of all to repent, and without repentance he could not believe. What is the psychology of saving faith? That no man can possibly believe until he has first repented. Do you see that? The gospel challenges you. It lays the axe at the root of the tree, and unless you are ready to have the whole tree down and cast into the fire you cannot believe. But if you are willing to give up your old life, the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof, and nail it to the cross of Christ, then it is possible to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and be saved. "Repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ" always go together, and you cannot have saving faith without heart repentance. The reason some men do not believe is because they will not repent. The secret of evangelical faith is just there: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." With the head you can believe anything! But with the heart you can believe that which is akin to the nature of the heart, and while the heart is deceitful you can believe only that which is not true. If you have a heart that is quickened by the Divine Spirit and made like unto God, then with the heart you can believe unto righteousness; you can receive the truth "in the love of it". But "faith and a good conscience" go together. Part company with a good conscience, and you part company with faith. If you set your heart upon Ramoth-gilead, and resolve, "I will have it no matter what the prophets say, I will have it no matter what the Bible says," you will never be able to believe the Bible while in that attitude, but you will find it easy to say, men, to whatever the prophets of Baal declare.

IV.

I come now to the MOST SOLEMN PART OF ALL. I have touched upon this principle before perhaps, but I tell you frankly that for years I was afraid to read in public the scripture I read to-night. I did not understand it. I believed it, but I did not understand it. If anybody had asked me to explain it, I could not have done so. What is it? Micaiah said, "I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne, and all the hosts of heaven standing on his right hand and on his left hand. And the Lord said, Who shall entice Ahab king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead"—the day of judgment for hab had arrived, and the Lord said, "Who shall entice Ahab king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one spake saying after this manner, and another saying after that manner. Then there came out a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said,

I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Where-with? And he said, I will go out, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail: go out, and do even so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil against them."

I wonder Professor Marshall did not stumble on that passage and give it as one of his objections to the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture. That is one of the profoundest passages in the Scripture, and it proves the inspiration of Scripture. No man would have dared to write that who wanted to magnify the Lord. Listen: left to himself, wanting to exalt Jehovah, without divine inspiration, no man would ever have represented God as releasing a lying spirit to go into the mouths of all Ahab's prophets.

What is the explanation? It is just this. What was Ahab's record? Read it, and you will find that *the one thing against which Ahab had set himself was the hearing of the word of the Lord*. Ahab did not want to hear the truth, and he destroyed the men who dared to tell him the truth. And if—now mark this well—if Ahab had had his own way up to this hour there would not have been left on earth a single man who would have dared to tell him the truth. He cut off the head of every witness to the truth so far as he had power to do so. He spent his whole life saying to God in a thousand ways, "I hate the truth. I will not hear the truth. I want a lie, give me a lie, let me live a lie. Let me live after the bent of my own deceitful heart." And at last *God let Ahab have what he wanted!* Hear this solemn truth: If God were to let you and me, any one of us, have what we want, we should be in hell. The worst judgment that can fall upon any man is for God to withdraw all restraint, and to allow the man to gallop headlong to the precipice. He will go to Ramoth-gilead every time. And four hundred prophets will encourage him in his going!

Is there anything in the New Testament like that—Oh yes—"For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Ask God for a lie, and you may get what you want. I believe sometimes judgment falls upon a church like that, a church that resists every true prophet that is sent to it. There are modern Jerusalems to whom it might be said, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee: how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." God withdraws His Spirit from some churches; He removes, to use the New Testament phrase, the candle-stick out of its place, and the church dies. Instead of witnessing for Christ, it is given a prophet possessed of a lying spirit. The people ask for it, and at last they get it.

A denomination may do the same thing. A denomination may reject the truth of God's Word and say, "We do not want prophets to preach the truth to us. Give us a lie"; and the Lord will let them have their own way at last. I believe the Lord has allowed the Convention of Ontario and Quebec to have its own way, and while they supposed they were getting victory, the judgment and the withering curse of Modernism, fell upon

them; and with accelerated speed they have been going down the hill ever since, and where they will be five years from now only the Lord can tell. Individuals, churches, educational institutions, denominations, are all parts of the great movement, and the general principle will operate, so that at last when this sinful world has utterly rejected the gospel, they shall have a strong delusion, and believe a lie, and they shall not see the Judge until He rends the heavens and comes down to take "vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Do not be disturbed, my dear friends, by the present apostasy. It cannot last forever. Our God is a consuming fire: let us take heed to be always on His side of every controversy.

Let us look at the situation as a whole for a few minutes. Here are Jehoshaphat and Ahab and the four hundred prophets; and "Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah had made him horns of iron, and said, Thus saith the Lord, With these thou shalt push Syria until they be consumed." What a big man he was! Afterward when Micaiah had borne his testimony, "Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah came near, and smote Micaiah upon the cheek, and said, Which way went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak unto thee?" Yes, this is the day of Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah. What an important man he is! Yes, he is a little bit of a McMaster student, two by four, who votes with the hierarchy, and thereby suddenly becomes a big man! Micaiah was alone, but I think he looked and said, "Oh Jehoshaphat, oh Jehoshaphat, in the camp of the enemy, fighting on the side of the enemies of the Lord. I came to speak because you asked for me, and when I had given my testimony in the presence of Ahab, you had not the courage to say, 'That is the truth. Let us listen to Micaiah.'" Ahab said, "We will dismiss this Fundamentalist." So he called the captain of the guard and said, "Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with the bread of affliction and with water of affliction, until I return in peace. I shall be back, and will attend to you, Micaiah." And the loyal preacher simply lifted up his voice and said, "If thou certainly return in peace, then hath not the Lord spoken by me." So they took him away.

The battle started, and Ahab said to Jehoshaphat—the Modernist said to the Fundamentalist—"I will disguise myself, and will go to the battle; but put thou on thy robes, and everybody will think that the whole battle is being led by the Fundamentalist. Nobody will know where I am." So Jehoshaphat, with all his royal robes, got into his chariot and went to the battle. The king of Syria had given commandment to the captains of his chariots, "Fight ye not with small or great, save only the king of Israel. Get him, and you will get the crowd." When therefore they saw Jehoshaphat with his royal robes, and all the marks of royalty upon him they said, "There he is", and every man drew his bow to bring Jehoshaphat down. But Jehoshaphat was not such a brave man after all! What cowards these Fundamentalists are when they go to battle with Ahab! Really one would have supposed he would take his medicine! But when he saw all the enemy were concentrating upon him he said, "I am not the king of Israel. I am not a Modernist. Do not shoot me"! Did you ever hear that? You say the Bible is out of date? They have not got that in the evening papers, but I am sure it happened this afternoon!

But a certain man drew a bow at a venture; putting

his hand to his quiver and putting his arrow to the bow, he shot at a venture, but as he did so, an unseen Hand was laid upon his, and, guided, unerringly, the arrow shot on its way. Then the disguised Modernist said, "He has found me. Turn thine hand, that thou mayest carry me out of the host; for I am wounded." And "about the time of the sun going down he died", and they took the chariot down to the pool of Silqam, and as they were washing the royal blood away, the dogs came and licked his blood "according to the word of the Lord" that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, "In the place where the dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine." And Modernism, naturalism in religion,—Sadduceeism of old times, and the Modernism of our day—inspired by a lying spirit, took a man from the proud position of king of Israel, and brought him literally to the dogs. That is what it always does. Always!

What shall we do? My friends, we do not fear for the Book—"About the time of the sun going down"! When the sun at last shall set upon this earth's long day of trial and conflict, and the dark night shall fall whose thick blackness shall be broken at last by the rising of the Sun of Righteousness with healing in His wings—"about the time of the sun going down" it will come to pass according to the word of the Lord. Not one jot or tittle of this Word shall fail till all has been fulfilled, "Let God be true and every man a liar"!

Meanwhile, did I know that some teacher, having lost his reason and possessed by some evil, destructive, spirit, were putting poison into the drinking fountain of which the children will drink; did I know that behind the drug-store counter there was a disguised murderer who changed every physician's prescription, and instead of compounding a healing draught, were putting in a poisonous drug, thus digging a grave; did I know that on the train there was an engineer determined to pass all signals, to court danger, and to destroy himself and his cargo of living freight; did I know that a company of men were now conspiring to break into some household to-night when father and mother and family of beautiful children are locked in slumber, and to despoil the house of all its treasures, and fill it with some poisonous gases that would prevent their ever waking to see the light of another day—if I knew that men were thus abroad poisoning the springs of life, turning health to disease, planning plunder and murder, ought I to whisper polite things to men of such criminal instincts? Or ought I report it to the police, and, failing help in that direction, ought I merely as a man if I had to do it alone, leap into the breach, and by some means endeavour to put an end to their fiendish programme?—"Peace, peace, when there is no peace"? God helping us, we will never so prophesy.

I heard some years ago, before the West had developed as it has since, a story of a transcontinental train crossing our western prairies in the dead of night, and in the midst of winter when the thermometer registered twenty or thirty below zero, and a blizzard was raging. On the train was a woman with four little children going home. She was sitting in the car with her children, not much used to travelling. She was rather nervous about her station, and as the conductor came through she said, "Conductor, I am to get off at such a station, will you please tell me when I come to it?" "Certainly, madam, your station is the next stop." Thank you, sir." After a while the train slowed down and came to a standstill.

The woman said to a passenger nearby, "Is this where I get off?" "Yes, madam, the conductor said the next stop." She gathered up her parcels (it was in the days before vestibule trains), and with her children got off the train. The train sped on into the zero night for nearly an hour. Presently as it was slowing down the conductor came in, and looking around, he said to this man, "Where is that woman with her children?" She got off." "Got off! Where?" "She got off at the last station. I told her that was the place." "You told her! Man, that is out on the prairies miles from human habitation. A woman with four little children alone in a prairie blizzard thirty below zero!" He pulled the rope, ran through the train, gave his directions to the engineer, and the train pushed back for nearly an hour, until they came to the place; and there beneath the snow they found a woman and four little children frozen to death—because some man undertook to direct them when he did not know the way.

Brethren, our pulpits are filled with men who do not know God, who do not know His Word, who do not know the gospel of the blood, blind leaders of the blind, verily they are the devil's executioners. Our theological seminaries are turning them out by the hundred. To say nothing of being Christians, if we are men, we will swear before high heaven that to the last drop of our blood we will oppose this damnable traffic in human souls; and expose not only the Ahabs, but the cowardly, conspiring, Jehoshaphats who help Ahab on in his work. We need not be troubled though we stand alone, for our God is with us, and some day, God pity us! some day we shall have to give an account. I could pray that God would terminate my life to-night rather than suffer me to live ever to say one word that would destroy men's faith in the Word of God, or to turn men away from their only Saviour. This is no child's play, my brethren, it is the war of the ages that will end only when Jesus Christ rends the skies and comes down. May He help us to live for that great and glorious day!

REV. FRANK LAWSON SPEAKS ON THE ROCKWOOD "TRIAL"

ADVERTISING his subject as "My Church," Rev. Frank Lawson, whom the papers described as the "Prosecutor" in the Rockwood "trial," preached on the Rockwood matter. We have been sent some excerpts from the address as taken down by a special stenographer.

Baptists "A Scandal of Protestantism"

"The Independent: The minister is hired and fired by the congregational system. There is no such thing as a Baptist church in this land. We have divisions and subdivisions—regular Baptists, irregular Baptists, independent Baptists, Four-Square Baptists, hard-shelled Baptists—300 different branches of it. Somebody discovers a text in the Bible, and puts a different interpretation on it, and they go out to build one more church,—it is a scandal of Protestantism.

"If you are looking for a church, seek out some church that has a history or a tradition. When you want to know what the Bible is, come to my church to know. John Moffatt, the translator, was a Presbyterian (several other prominent men of history were also named). This is the quality of men that my church produces—not intolerant or persecutors, despite the fact that Dr. Shields says they are."

The Moffatt "translation" of the New Testament is really not a translation at all, but in many places a mere modernistic paraphrase. or instance, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was divine." When did *Theos* mean only "divine"?

First A Small Compliment

"T. T. SHIELDS: Dr. Shields has had the courage to say many things that should be said by the Protestant Pulpit in this country, and for that part of his ministry I am grateful."

Dr. Shields' "10,000 Disciples All Have the Mark of Cain Upon Their Brow"

"It is now my turn to say that Dr. Shields has shown his gospel is hate and his god is the collection plate; 10,000 disciples are following him, and all have the mark of Cain upon their brow. His influence is more on the side of evil than on the side of good. He cares not the crack of his finger for a little minister in Truro. He will use him and then drop him like a hot potato.

"The Presbyterian Church is not the church Dr. Shields thinks it is. It is the church of the Gospel. The Governor General of Australia is a Presbyterian. The greatest Governor General of Canada was a Presbyterian."

The readers of THE GOSPEL WITNESS will recognize in Mr. Lawson's description of its Editor, as of his attacks upon Mr. Rockwood the usual modernistic venom.

What does Mr. Lawson know about the Jarvis St. collection plate? He says "ten thousand disciples are following him, and all have the mark of Cain upon their brow." That is complimentary to the thousands of ministers who read THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and the many thousands of people of all Denominations who are also readers!

"Ten thousand disciples!" If he means by that, the readers of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, he would need to multiply his "ten thousand" several times.

"A Little Minister in Truro",—or St. David's, Halifax

And what about "a little minister in Truro"? We know no such man. We know a man called Rockwood, who stands out before the Christian public of this country as a great Christian hero. But for a "little" minister, we must go to St. David's Presbyterian Church in Halifax. Could anything more infallibly indicate littleness than Mr. Lawson's fulminations? Our great predecessor, Dr. B. D. Thomas, describing ministers who were really "little", once said: "Their souls are so small, so shrivelled, so infinitesimal, that a thousand of them could dance on the point of a needle without touching each other." He must have had ministers of the type of Rev. Frank Lawson in mind.

At all events, our readers will know the type of men Mr. Rockwood has had to deal with. "Little" ecclesiastics, who, for spiritual purposes, are not worth five cents a train-load.

Mr. Lawson predicts that we shall "use him (Rockwood) then drop him like a hot potato." We are not "using" Mr. Rockwood: we are merely contending with him for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. Time will show whether Mr. Rockwood will be "dropped like a hot potato" by his friends. Upon this, however, we must insist, that it is not the way of THE GOSPEL WITNESS to support men only with idle words.

SUBSCRIBE FOR
THE GOSPEL WITNESS

\$2.00 per year

A GREAT LETTER FROM DR. ALEXANDER G. MURRAY, SYDNEY, N.S.

Dr. Alexander Murray who is an out and out evangelical and who, while a loyal Presbyterian, has always shown that he considers loyalty to Christ and His Gospel his primary obligation. We feel sure that great numbers of Presbyterian Ministers and others will be of Dr. Murray's opinion.

To The Editor,
Halifax Herald,
Sir,

Permit me to congratulate you on the publicity you have given in your pages to the case of the Rev. Perry Rockwood. As far as I know no brother Presbyterian minister has said anything publicly in favour of the stand Mr. Rockwood took. The moderator of our church in a press interview said that "he is a fine lad but fanatical". If by being true to the doctrinal standards of our church, and exposing error in our church, and seeking to purify the church as Mr. Rockwood did, is the work of a fanatic, then may God in His abundant grace fill our pulpits with that sort of fanaticism.

Many of us deplore the circumstances under which Mr. Rockwood resigned from our church. I believe had Mr. Rockwood appealed his case to the higher courts of our church he would have found a body of ministers and laymen who would have taken a courageous stand for the right of free speech, as well as the right to criticize wrong wherever found. To be ordered to burn his sermons which told the truth was something no honourable man could do.

Surely it was the duty of those who judged him to examine the sermons and find out if they were true! As I said, Mr. Editor, in a previous letter to your paper, "If Mr. Rockwood has told the truth, then let us commend him; if he has not told the truth, then let us censure him." As I see it Mr. Rockwood did not set out to split the Presbyterian Church. The boot is on the other foot. It is the men who are flirting with modernism and seeking to affiliate our church with modernism that will split the church. If our church is split it will not be men like Mr. Rockwood that will split it, but those who are not contending honestly for our Doctrinal standards, but are holding the views of variance with our standards.

Mr. Rockwood saw as many of us see the downward trend of Theological thought and teaching. As a brave young man whom Luther would have delighted to honour, whom John Knox would have trusted, he sought to do his duty as a true minister of Jesus Christ. He sought to be true to his ordination vows, and here is one of them.

"Do you believe the Westminster Confession of Faith . . . to be founded on and agreeable to the word of God, and in your teaching do you promise faithfully to adhere thereto?"

No one who ever listened to Mr. Rockwood can have any doubt about his loyalty to his ordination vows. Mr. Rockwood has left us as others have left us, and our church is vastly the poorer. He has started an independent work which under the smile and blessing of high heaven will bring spiritual and eternal blessing to thousands. He has the god wishes and prayers of a great group of Presbyterians as well as thousands of others who love the Christ of God, and who are labouring in the light of the soon coming again of the Bridegroom.

Alexander A. Murray,

March 13, 1947

Sydney, N.S.

THE RIGHT OF CRITICISM

April 1, 1947,
Sydney Mines, N.S.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS.

Dear Sir:

I would like to use the opportunity you are offering to us to speak in regard to the Rockwood Case. There

must be many others like myself who feel shocked by the decision of the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery.

The Presbyterian form of government is clearly intended to be democratic. No democracy, however, can truly exist without the right of criticism. And that means criticism of ALL of its weaknesses and of ALL of its policies wherever anyone feels that it must be given. There is no segment of the church which has any right to feel that it is immune.

It is, therefore, completely arbitrary and absurd for anyone to try to say just what weaknesses are open to criticism and which are not. It is also something worse than absurd to accuse Mr. Rockwood of defaming characters and then to proceed to compare him with Goebbels and to say that Mr. Rockwood has an "itch for fame" and "delusions of greatness."

If criticism is going to be looked on as an act of disloyalty or "following a divisive course" then Presbyterianism itself has been repudiated and above all, the Bible, which teaches us that only God has the right to bind the conscience.

In my judgment Mr. Rockwood was only exercising his right and I want to take this opportunity to commend him for the stand he has taken.

Sincerely,

(Rev.) F. Clarke Evans,

St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Sydney Mines, N.S.
P.S.—Enclosed find \$5—would like \$2 of it to be used for subscription for a year, and use rest for your fund in printing this Rockwood Case.

FROM A JUDGE WHO IS A PRESBYTERIAN ELDER JUDGE'S CHAMBERS

Ontario

Rev. T. T. Shields,
Dear Dr. Shields:

The Perry Rockwood number of THE GOSPEL WITNESS reached me yesterday and I have read them with a great deal of interest. As a Presbyterian Elder, I wish to express to you my thanks for the support you are giving him and to the cause for which he stands. I have attended many church courts and I know that it takes great courage to stand out against abuses. It is much easier for a layman because he cannot be "knocked about" as a minister can.

I am enclosing a small donation of which \$2.00 is for subscription to THE GOSPEL WITNESS and the balance for your general fund.

When I read Mr. Rockwood's reference to the suggestion of a certain professor that Ordination Vows could be taken with "Mental Reservations", I was reminded of a letter written to a Toronto Daily Newspaper in 1925 by the late Rev. W. G. Hanna, then Principal of Toronto Bible College. During the Church Union discussions some Presbyterian Ministers had indicated that they had taken their vows with Mental Reservations and Mr. Hanna made a suggestion which should have been adopted by the Presbyterian Church that a clause should be added to the Vows to the effect that they were taken "without Mental Reservations." In his words this would put an end to this form of "Ecclesiastical perjury."

I wonder what would be the reaction of some of these clergymen if a Judge or Magistrate should say that he had taken his oath of office—in which he swears to deal justly, etc., between man and man, with mental reservations. Or the man in the armed services, when he takes the oath of allegiance. Would these "men of God" be willing to deal lightly with a sin of this kind? I don't think so.

With best wishes for your continued success,
Yours sincerely,

A Few of Many Presbyterian Letters

From a Saskatchewan Letter

Pambrun, Sask.
Box 49
March 22, 1947

The Gospel Witness.

Dear Sir:

Thank you for the copy of your paper containing Rev. Rockwood's sermons. I'm enclosing a small contribution to help with the expense and would appreciate very much if you would send a copy to each of the following.

I'm an elder in the Presbyterian church and agree 100% with Mr. Rockwood. I hope all this publicity etc., will not fill him with pride and that he keeps humble that he may be useful.

I'm disappointed in that no Presbyterian Publication championed this worthy cause so far but thankful to God that you did.

We hate to leave our beloved church because sin dwells within her. We also are grieved to see such fearless men as Mr. Rockwood driven out of her. But should our General Assembly see fit to uphold the decision of the Truro Presbytery it will be hard to stay in and support a church that is doomed because Christ and His Gospel have been given less than first place.

Either He is Lord of all,
Or not at all.

I intend to pass my copy of THE WITNESS along to others to read. And I earnestly hope and pray that out of all this a stronger, purer, truer Church will emerge. And that God's Holy Spirit will completely control and keep Rev. Rockwood and all his faithful servants as He always has done.

Sincerely yours,

John Brell.

Calvary Orthodox Presbyterian Church
Willow Grove, Pennsylvania

Rev. Robert Strong, S.T.D., Pastor

March 18, 1947

Dear Dr. Shields:

I cannot too heartily express my appreciation as a Presbyterian minister of your stand in behalf of the valiant Rev. Perry F. Rockwood. The fight for the faith cuts across denominational lines and calls upon all true believers to come to the help of the Lord against the mighty when as in the present instance a true servant of His has been most unjustly condemned. It is cause for thankfulness that you have ever been quick to proceed upon this principle. I enclose a check to assist your efforts.

Sincerely,

Robert Strong.

305 Washington St.

New Glasgow, N.S.

March 19, 1947

Dear Dr. Shields:

I wish to thank you for the copy of GOSPEL WITNESS dated March 13th. The one copy is worth more than the subscription price.

I am glad to know that you are standing behind Rockwood.

I was in charge of the Thoburn Congregation when he was called and settled there. In the short time he was there he did more for them than any other minister that they have had in recent years, especially in having the two churches renovated, one at Thoburn and the other at Sutherland's River. While he had enemies it was due to his aggressiveness in getting needed repairs done, rather than doctrine. As far as I know, Pictou Presbytery is solid for him in this matter of controversy with the Halifax Presbytery.

You will appreciate this from the late Principal Allen Pollock of Pine Hill, Halifax, N.S., when he said on the occasion of the late Dr. James Robertson's visit to the College, "These Old Country Ministers play the Devil with our congregations." Well that is about what happened in the Halifax Presbytery.

Success and best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

W. A. Cunningham.

10213, 124th St.
Edmonton, Alberta.

March 18, 1947

Dr. T. T. Shields,
Jarvis St. Baptist Church,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Dr. Shields,

The Lord bless you for putting out this special edition of the GOSPEL WITNESS. I am wiring to-day for 300 copies for we want them for Sunday.

I am a former member in the Presbyterian Church in Canada but trained at Faith Theological Seminary and am now a Bible Presbyterian minister. We have been holding Bible Presbyterian services here now for six months.

Commenced a series on "The Church Sick Unto Death" taking up Mr. Rockwood's sermons, trial and resignation and we are having a real response. Now here's something for your paper.

The editor of the religious page here told me that they have had a conference and decided not to enter this issue. Our ad was accepted this past week, and one paper gave us a very brief writeup simply telling of the commencement of the series, the other said they were going to but didn't.

Thanks for what you are doing. May the Lord bless you.

Yours in Christ,

Rev. R. Allan Killen.

Torrance, Ont.

March 24th, 1947.

Dr. Shields,
130 Gerrard St. E.

Toronto, Ont.

Sir:

As a believer on the Lord Jesus Christ as my personal saviour and an elder in the Presbyterian Church in Canada, I am glad to accept your invitation to protest through the GOSPEL WITNESS the action of Halifax Lunenburg Presbytery against Rev. Perry F. Rockwood, until recently minister of St. James' Presbyterian Church, Truro, N.S.

When I first heard the voice of Gordon Sinclair over CFRB announcing the trial of Rev. Rockwood by Halifax Lunenburg Presbytery, I thought it must surely be for denying the faith once delivered to the Saints, but after reading his sermons in your instructive weekly, I was horrified to find that the reverse was the case and I could see the hand of the serpent behind the scenes.

That most of our (Pres.) Ministers, (many of whom I know personally), are still true to the faith, as it is in Christ, and believers in Democratic Church procedure, I have no doubt, but there are others, (if only a vociferous minority), as is evident by attempts to link our Church with the Canadian Council of Churches. The Church of Christ in China, (once Christian and Presbyterian), now indefinite if not modernist, and the attempt of certain individuals to get around the Barrier act, the Presbyterian safe-guard against minorities imposing their will on majorities.

That the Canadian Council of Churches is a spiritual fifth column, I have not the slightest doubt despite the honeyed phrases of its defenders, as witness the attempt to co-operate with the Vatican, that satanic institution, which during the late war, did its utmost to help the Axis powers destroy the Democracies and is still fomenting trouble wherever it can, despite the superb lying and deceptive propaganda of its agents in Canada and all other countries.

Furthermore, if the recently elected head of the above named Council, i.e., Professor Gilmour, of McMaster University, is the same man against whom Dr. Shields waged war twenty-five years ago, for his, Gilmour's, denial of the essentials of the faith as it is in Christ, then what need we of further witnesses? (*The present Chancellor of McMaster is a son of the Professor Gilmour referred to. Ed. G. W.*)

I would suggest that all Presbyterian ministers and elders, petition the General Assembly, not so much for Mr. Rockwood's sake, who has now resigned, but to prevent possible future aggressions against Evangelical ministers.

Thanking you for the opportunity of protesting against what looks to me like Ecclesiastical Fascism.

Mr. Alex. McBain.

Subscribe For The Gospel Witness

THIS is the only distinctively weekly Protestant paper in Canada, and contains weekly a sermon by the Editor as stenographically reported, preached in Jarvis St. Baptist Church. Many hundreds of ministers of all denominations are among our subscribers.

It deals weekly also with the menace of Roman Catholic aggressions in Canada in politics, education, foreign relations, etc. The French language press is carefully scrutinized, and translations are made from it

which appear in no other publication in Canada. The paper has been discussed in Parliament and in various legislatures and city councils.

Subscription \$2.00 per year. With each new subscription a free copy of Father Chiniquy's great book, "The Priest, The Woman, and The Confessional," (sold singly for 75c), or "The Antichrist—His Portrait and History," by Baron Porcelli, refuting the Futurist view of the Second Advent, (50c singly).

JOHN MILTON ON THE HALIFAX-LUNENBURG PRESBYTERY

"Because you have thrown off your prelate lord,
And with stiff vows renounced his liturgy,
To seize the widow'd whore Plurality
From them whose sin ye envied, not abhorr'd,
Dare ye for this adjure the civil sword
To force our consciences that Christ set free,
And ride us with a classic hierarchy
Taught ye by mere A.S. and Rutherford-
Men whose life, learning faith, and pure intent
Would have been held in high esteem with Paul,
Must now be named and printed heretics
By shallow Edwards and Scotch what d'ye call:
But we do hope to find out all your tricks,
Your plots and packing worse than those of Trent,
That so the Parliament
May, with their wholesome and preventive shears,
Clip your phylacteries, though bauk your ears,
And succour our just fears,
When they shall read this clearly in your charge,
NEW PRESBYTER IS BUT OLD PRIEST WRIT LARGE."

THIS WEEK'S SERMON

(From March 27 issue)

DR. SHIELDS did not preach on Sunday, and we are reprinting in this week's issue a sermon preached in 1929 when the Baptist World Alliance held its meeting in Toronto. The subject then discussed, though nineteen years ago, is so perfectly in keeping with the principles at issue in the Rockwood controversy that we republish it without any amendment, as setting forth the true philosophy of Modernism.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS
and
Protestant Advocate

Published every Thursday for the propagation of the Evangelical principles of the Protestant Reformation and in defence of the faith once for all delivered to Saints

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

Editor
T. T. SHIELDS

Associate Editors
W. S. WHITCOMBE, M.A. (Tor.)
W. GORDON BROWN, M.A. (Tor.)

Contributing Editor
OLIVE L. CLARK, Ph.D. (Tor.)
S. S. Lesson and Exchanges

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

Address Correspondence:
THE GOSPEL WITNESS
130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada
Telephone RAndolph 7415
Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada

ORDER FORM

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto 2.

Please find enclosed \$2.00 for one year's subscription to THE GOSPEL WITNESS and as a pre-

mium Father Chiniquy's book Baron Porcelli's book (cross out book not wanted) as advertised above.

Name

Address