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INTRODUCTION

During the past twenty years, more particularly from the time of the New World Movement (1919), Baptist ranks have been disturbed by constant charges and rumors of Modernism. When these charges first began to appear the National and State Convention leaders everywhere were loud in their denials of the truth of such charges. Those of us who insisted that all was not well on board the Baptist ship were charged with mutiny. We were called "falsifiers," "destructionists," "religious bolsheviks," etc., etc.

In more recent years another sinister element has begun to show its head in Baptist ranks. There is a constantly growing tendency in Convention circles toward a radical Socialism, and a sort of a "pink" Communism. Of course, Convention leadership denies the presence of either Modernism or Communism. Regardless of the denial, however, there are literally hundreds of Baptist Churches that know there is truth in the charges, but how to prove it is another thing. Some of us who are in possession of the indisputable facts are constantly besieged by letters and even telegrams, to acquaint them with the evidence. This has become such a task that we can no longer take care of it by personal correspondence. We have, therefore, set ourselves the task of gathering together a few facts which we present herewith, which we trust will meet the demands of the situation.

Our difficulty has by no means been to find facts enough. On the contrary our difficulty has been the problem of selection. There is evidence enough left in my files to produce this book many times over. We have endeavored to select from this mass of evidence truly typical cases. Some of them date back through several years, some of them from the immediate present, but all of them are designed to show that back of the scenes there is a deliberate program being carried out which is destined to land the Baptists of this country completely in the camp of Modernism and a rank Communist Socialism.

No doubt many who start to read this booklet will become indignant and will be tempted to throw it aside before it is finished. May we respectfully suggest that you read it to the end, then take one long look at Calvary, and in the light of what you see there, make your decision?

R. T. KETCHAM,
Gary, Indiana.
April 15, 1936.
## CONTENTS

| CHAPTER V—Modernism and Baptist
| Page |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| Modernism and Baptist Publications | 47 |
| (a) "The Baptist's" | 37 |
| Jesus a converted man. | 37 |
| Satan and "Midsummer Night's Dream" | 37 |
| (b) "Young People" | 27 |
| Mary of Bethany said, "Ghandi | 27 |
| a breather of the spirit." |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER VI—The Educational Situation</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Franklin College</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Spencer and the ordination of</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jefferson.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal to answer pointed</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions. Dr. Spencer and moral</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributes. Indiana State Convention</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Franklin College.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Ohio College</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text books advocate divorce. Bible</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not sufficient revelation of God's will.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only traces of Jesus meaning still</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>left in the Gospels. The Philippian earth</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quake. Paul's violent headaches.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Crozier Seminary</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing understandable in the absolute</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rationality theory. The atomism a</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slander upon God.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Rochester-Colgate</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Brown</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) De sales</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Certain Harvest of Such Education</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Rochester student wrestles with the</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem of too many acids. Professor</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster's Communion Mirth caused</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advocate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER VII—Modernism an Organized System of Deliberate Destructive</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martin B. Evans and the lait of Modernism.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER VIII—The Conventions and Hypocrisy</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Case Number One, Indiana Convention and</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession of Faith</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Case Number Two, The Baptist</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Case Number Three, The Valurity Amendment</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Convention Versus Denomination</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER IX—In Conclusion on Modernism</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Aiding Atheism</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Baptist Churches Can Withdraw</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal from Conventions does not affect Denominational</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standing. Dr. Persons agrees.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Confrontation From Within Hopelessness</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracting existing services. Sub-</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>served services hold balance of power.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER X—What Is Communism?</th>
<th>43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of power.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER XI—Communism in Baptist Ranks</th>
<th>45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Rochester-Colgate</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Rochester Baptists</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Dr. Albert W. Beaven</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Commission on Christian Social Action</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) The Famous Brown Envelope</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Mr. Frederick J. Libby</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) The Federal Council of Churches</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Brooks House in Hamilton, Ind.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Sunday School Literature</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) In Conclusion on Communism</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART ONE

MODERNISM

In the presentation of facts revealing the presence of Modernism in Baptist ranks, it will be necessary for us to bring forward as evidence several cases which reach back into the years. We desire to show that while all of these things were transpiring in our midst, our leaders were constantly denying the presence of Modernism. We also desire to show that this is not something that has come suddenly upon us or that it will pass in a moment. Modernism is so thoroughly entrenched in the machinery of the Northern Baptist Convention, that it can never be eliminated and at the same time save the machinery.

We call attention also to the fact that while in two or three instances the particular Modernist referred to has been removed, yet such would not have been the case had not some of us who are called "destructionists" raised our voices in protest. We are constantly met with the argument that when anything wrong is pointed out, the leaders make every effort to correct it. The point at issue which I raise here is, why should we have to constitute ourselves a denominational police force to force our leaders to behave themselves? Fielder and Randle would have been on the mission field today, and Communists would have been meeting in Brooks House still, had such "destructionists," as we are called, said nothing about the situation.

I

THE FOREIGN BOARD AND THE FIELDER CASE

The present Board will never live long enough to convince a Baptist who thinks twice in the same place that they are not guilty of permitting missionaries to teach Modernism when the facts of the Fielder Case are known. Mr. Fielder was a missionary in Assam. While there he wrote a long confession of his faith, and sent it to the Board in New York. We have the entire article in our possession and it is before us as we write. Here are a few quotations from the same:

"Jesus definitely disclaims any intention of placing Himself on a level with God the Father."

"But the unique element of Jesus' nature does not lie in His being the 'only begotten' Son of God. He is not that, by His own teaching. Rather, He is the only perfect one among the countless millions of sons of God who have been born into our heavenly Father's home."

"In all our lives one fact we must keep uppermost in our minds—we are the children of God, and in using this term I do not mean it in the special sense in which it is sometimes used, as meaning those who have come to recognize their relationship to God through Jesus. I mean that every human being, no matter what his condition, is inevitably a child of God."

"The account of the creation given in Genesis is wonderful, and I have great reverence for an explanation which has been so satisfying for thousands of years. Without the new knowledge of our growth which God has blessed us with in these recent years, I do not see how a finer explanation of our creation and of our unhappy condition under sin could have been made than that. But now that we have the theory of evolution, attested by so much convincing evidence, I believe we have an explanation ever so much more satisfying and joyous, since it clearly sets forth God and us in our true relationship, the relationship of an unfailling and perfectly loving Father and His growing children, the perfectly normal relationship of a grow-
ing family. I rejoice in this added and detailed evidence of the relationship to God which Jesus teaches us we hold.”

“I rejoice also in another great blessing which the knowledge of evolution has brought. It has released us from two dreadful ideas that have been hanging like a dark cloud over us through all these years. By it we know that at the time when we became conscious of good and evil we could not, in the nature of things, have refrained long from doing things that were wrong. It was not in us. So we did not deliberately set ourselves in opposition to the will of God when we should and could have avoided sin. There never was a time in those early days when we could have remained free from sin for any considerable period. Ought not our hearts sing with joy to know at last that we are not the culprits that we have been made out to be but that we have been doing only what people in their spiritual infancy might have been expected to do? God does not hold that against us.”

“That brings us to the other idea from which we may rejoice to be free, that God, upon the commission of our first sin, drove us out in wrath from the garden of good things under a curse (of having to earn our bread by the sweat of our brow). To my mind, an age-long misrepresentation of the spirit of our God now has been done away with, and we can see clearly what the statement in Genesis has heretofore prevented us from seeing, that He never at any time has ceased loving us and providing blessings for us and caring for us in every way, as a faithful father always does for his children.”

“When we see ourselves in our true position as the growing, erring children of God, is it not clear that such a thing as an atonement, a making good, for us by another could not possibly be acceptable to our Father, or even considered by Him? Surely, even in earthly families, no real father looks for an atonement for the wrong-doing of his children. He understands their short-comings and puts up with them, knowing that in time these children will show that they are true children of their father. He would take the deepest pride in an elder son who gave up all to save his brothers. But he would neither demand nor accept the gift of his life in recompense for their short-comings. That is not in harmony with loving fatherliness. A father is not looking for recompense, he is looking for right living in his children. Seeing that we are a family together, not only is it not derogatory of God and Jesus to abandon the idea of the atonement, but it is testifying to the perfect quality of God’s fatherliness. Once the idea that we were born mature is shown to be not true and the fact of God’s perfect fatherly love is established, the idea of the atonement immediately loses all its force. Vicarious sacrifice remains, but the atonement cannot. It remains for us individually to make all atonement we can for our past sins by living the kind of life our Father yearns for.”

“After His experience of exaltation at the time of His baptism, when He was convinced beyond doubt that it was He who was the Messiah, comes the inevitable period of depression, from which even He was not free, when He questions whether after all He is the Son of God.”

“There is no man, no matter how vile, without some solid good, some of the stuff of God, in him. There is some invitation of God to which he will respond, although he may have to bear it in the next world. God will never turn His back upon His children, ‘neither in this world; neither in the world to come.”’

“Neither are the life and death of Jesus necessary to bring men who do not know of Jesus into a relationship with God which He will honour and reward.”

In spite of the awful character of the above statements of Mr. Fielder, it was a little over a year before he was examined by a committee of the Foreign Mission Board. The result of that examination is seen in their report of the
Board as a whole. The report is as follows:

"The committee on the case of C. G. Fielder, through its Chairman, A. C. Baldwin, introduced missionary C. G. Fielder, who addressed the Board regarding his work in Assam and in particular his service among students at Cotton College, calling particular attention to the evangelistic opportunity which this service presented. At the conclusion of his address the committee presented the following report, which was adopted unanimously:

"To the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society.

"Your committees, appointed to meet Mr. Cecil G. Fielder and inquire into his theological views and message as a missionary, desires to make the following report:

"First: Your committee are agreed that in Mr. Fielder's theological statement are declarations which are open to question and which standing alone would make it impossible to return him to the work in Assam.

"Second: Your committee faces the fact that in his work Brother Fielder has been signal blessed of God. The testimony of many of his fellow missionaries and of Dr. Witwer, his predecessor in the work at Cotton College, speak in such high terms of his Christ-like character, his zeal and usefulness, his success in a position requiring peculiar qualities of spiritual equipment, that we feel he has been used of God to a marked degree.

"Nevertheless the limitations of his theological statements are real in the judgment of your committee and the criticisms which his statement has aroused cannot be ignored.

"In view of the fact, therefore, that Mr. Fielder has never had a course of theological study, we would recommend that the Board grant Mr. Fielder's request for a year of study at Newton Theological Institution, and that the question of his return to Assam be made a special order at some meeting of the Board in 1926."

ARTHUR C. BALDWIN,
W. S. ABERNETHY,
THOMAS H. STACY.

On behalf of the Board of Managers,
New York, New York,
June 10th, 1925.
(Sgd.) J. C. Robbins,
Foreign Secretary.

The Committee says that Mr. Fielder's theological statement is open to question; and that if it were to stand alone, his return to Assam would be impossible. Following that is a bit of character testimony. How in the name of common sense a man can possess peculiar qualities of spiritual equipment, and can be used of God to a marked degree, when holding a theological position which the report itself admits is practically a negation of everything for which Baptists stand, surely only a white-washing committee could discover!

Mr. Fielder pursued his course at Newton and then applied for ordination. He was ordained with thirteen voting against him. After his ordination the Board published a statement in "The Baptist" (Chicago) issue of October 16, 1926, in which they say that Mr. Fielder had "considerably changed the views expressed in the original paper prepared by him in Assam." The Board then goes on to paraphrase Mr. Fielder's views, and then in closing dismisses all charges against him in the following language:

"Hearing this confession of faith and being convinced of Mr. Fielder's sincerity, his exceptional devotion to Christ, and his sympathetic love for all his fellow men, we felt impelled by the Spirit to dismiss the theological charges against him, leaving the question of his future service to later consideration."

Desiring to know exactly what Mr.
Fielder said in his own words, I wrote him for a copy of his last statement which, of course, refused to produce, but did write a long letter, parts of which I now quote. Referring to the Board's published summary of his new and "considerably changed" views he says:

"I should be amazed if anyone who really knew anything about me considered that this summary indicated any radical change of view on my part."

In justification of his presence on the field he says: "This has been my basic contention from the beginning, that I represent in general a goodly part of our denomination, and that if such were the case I could serve our denomination as a missionary in all good conscience."

"So I take my stand squarely on my rights as a Baptist. Never at any time have I believed, or taught anything which it was not thoroughly proper for a Baptist to believe and teach. Many thousands of Baptists now holding positions of honor in our churches hold essentially the same views, I am sure. My contention that I represent in general a goodly part of our denomination has been abundantly proved. The statement I wrote in Assam has been read by many Baptists, persons of maturity and experience, mostly conservative in thinking; and, together with a fair presentation of the whole situation, has gained their whole-hearted expressions of confidence in my fitness and right to serve as a missionary of our denomination. Persons high in the councils of our denomination have read it, without my having brought it to their attention, and later have voluntarily told me of their approval. One leading member of our denomination told me that he could not but be in favor of my return to Assam, since my point of view so closely paralleled his own."

As to any real change of views, Mr. Fielder says of his last statement: "I used the accepted theological terminology and treated some of the subjects more fully. But as I told the committee of the Board that waited on me, I felt that the considerable change mentioned in the Board's statement was rather by way of amplification and greater adequacy of statement than any radical departure from the general point of view which I had held before."

Mr. Fielder candidly admits that he changed the rough verbal dress which he used in his Assam statement for the more pleasing attire of "accepted theological terminology," but also frankly admits that this was the sole extent of his "considerably changed views" and, furthermore, that he told the Board so. Notwithstanding this they dismiss all charges and, I am convinced, had we not exposed the whole miserable affair they would have returned him to the field.

---

**THE FOREIGN BOARD AND THE RANDLE CASE**

For some time prior to the Milwaukee convention, reports had been current that Missionary Randle of Suifu, China, was unsound. The reports declared he had refused to accept the deity of Christ. At the Milwaukee convention, Dr. W. B. Riley was exposing this matter, when suddenly Dr. Franklin, then Foreign Secretary of the Board, now President of the Northern Baptist Convention, arose and flourished a letter, stating:

"God Almighty answered Dr. Riley by mail this morning." He then proceeded to read a letter from some missionary friends of Randle disproving the whole charge. Dr. Riley retired amid the hoots and jeers of the Modernist crowd. Immediately upon the conclusion of that session the pastor of the church from which Mr. Randle went to the field, came to us and stated that he had refused to participate in Randle's ordination because of just such statements before ever he went to the field. We now know that at the moment Dr. Franklin was reading from the letter before the Convention he had in his possession a letter from Randle himself ad-
dressed to the Board of Managers in which he admits the whole charge in the following language:

"I am also accused of being unwilling to answer in the affirmative the question, ‘Do you believe that Christ is God?’ This was a prayer meeting which I was leading and not a class in theology. Nor was it the proper time or place to catechize the leader because he had not expressed his faith in the phraseology which certain individuals were accustomed to use. However, to be perfectly fair to all parties concerned, I must say that I do not wish to ascribe to Jesus any higher position than that Which he claimed for himself. He did not claim to be God, but he did say that he was the Son of God. I was not asked as to my faith in the divinity of Jesus, the deity of Jesus, or His place in the Trinity. I was asked to answer categorically whether Jesus was God. Passages like the following make an affirmative answer to that question rather difficult. I Tim. 2:15; Matt. 27:46; Jno. 20:24; Col. 3:1; Luke 9:48; Matt. 3:17; 19:37; Luke 10:22."

THE FOREIGN BOARD AND MISS MARIAN BURNHAM

Miss Burnham appeared on the platform of the Northern Baptist Convention at Detroit as an outgoing missionary to India. Just before that her home church in Elmira, N. Y., on Sunday morning had publicly commissioned her, and Mr. Alden of the Board of Missionary Cooperation was present and delivered the message. Miss Burnham had been before the Board in New York, was examined and accepted, and was sent to the field, and this year (1936) is home on her first furlough.

The "Elmira Star Gazette" carried prominent news items concerning the public service in honor of Miss Burnham. Turning to the society notes of the same issue of the "Elmira Star Gazette," I quote: "The office employees of the Frostell Company entertained Saturday evening at Elizabeth Inn with a dinner complimenting Miss Marian Burnham of Lower Maple Avenue, who is making preparations to become a missionary in India. Bridge and five hundred followed. High scores for bridge were secured by Miss Frances Cusby and Miss Helen Jenkins. Five hundred favors were won by Miss Marian Burnham and Mrs. Marian Longstreet." After that date, there were still several other social notes announcing the fact that Miss Burnham had proven herself to be no novice in the art of winning at five hundred!

This young lady comes from the card table with her high score record on Saturday night, to the pulpit of the Baptist church on Sunday morning, where she is commissioned to go to India as an "evangelical" under the "inclusive policy." From the pulpit she goes to the Convention platform at Detroit and from there back to her home city to engage in a merry round of card parties, etc., from whence she departs to the mission field. Who, in this case, should have acted as denominational policeman to keep the Board from appointing such a missionary?

THE FOREIGN BOARD AND EVANGELISM

A study of the annual reports show that during the eight years from 1925 to 1933, there was a net gain on the foreign field of 311 churches and 967 schools. During this same period there was a net loss of 186 native evangelists, and a net gain of 1,480 educational workers. Someone may say, "Why go back to such ancient records?" Simply to prove that the ills from which the denomination is now suffering, began years ago and the harvest now being reaped is inevitable. Anyone can pick up the last Annual of the Northern Baptist Convention and compare its reports with those of five or ten years ago and produce substantially the same figures as we have here shown. It ought to be noted further that the decline in churches and native evangelists, and the
tremendous increase in schools and educational workers, took place not during years of depression, but during the years of plenty, namely, the New World Movement. The actual period for the New World Movement, 1918 to 1923, being as follows: a net gain of 236 churches and 786 schools; a net loss of 176 native evangelists and a net gain of 833 educational workers.

THE BOARDS AND WASTE

The Foreign Board is now putting forth frantic appeals calling attention to the fact that we have cut down the force by practically two hundred missionaries within the last few years, and that seventy more must be recalled unless funds are forthcoming. It would be impossible for us to cite every case of waste on the part of the Societies, but one or two samples will suffice. The district secretary for the Rochester, New York, area, Dr. Isacs, has some rather interesting and illuminating items in his expense account. I have before me the 1929 financial report of Dr. Isacs in which he charges up an amount for tips at the Sagamore Hotel; also the 1931 report which shows that Dr. Isacs received a salary including automobile expense of $4,720.00. Nevertheless, in his items of expense he charges up $25.00 for his local Chamber of Commerce dues! I have also before me, Dr. Isacs’ annual report for 1934, with a salary allotment of $4,360.00. We have another item of $37.50 charged up for the secretary’s Chamber of Commerce dues. Just why executive secretaries with fat salaries and expense accounts for legitimate denominational service, should also load on to the already depleted missionary funds, their personal membership in Chambers of Commerce, and for tips to waiters in fashionable hotels, the report does not reveal.

Every year in mid-winter, the entire official family of the Northern Baptist Convention, together with the state official families, meets in Chicago for a mid-year conference. Time was, and some of us believe still is, when our paid denominational servants could have gone to Chicago, found adequate quarters in reasonable hotels, found some Baptist church that would have been glad to donate the use of its building for the conference sessions, and in such surroundings conduct the business affairs of the Convention. For such necessary overhead expenses, Baptists would be glad to pay. But instead of this, the Stevens Hotel, the most expensive hotel in the city, is always selected as the place of meeting and entertainment, and here for several days in the most expensive surroundings in the city, our Baptist official family meets at terrific expense to the missionary funds of the Convention.

This year we note that one of the speakers imported from Washington, D. C., was none other than Frederick J. Libby. Mr. Libby has been by government order denied the use of the public school buildings in Washington, and has been declared by an investigating committee of the government to be one of the enemies of our country, and yet he is brought to Chicago to address our Baptist official family on what Baptists can do to prevent war. Mr. Libby, as we will prove elsewhere in this pamphlet, is decidedly Real in some of his convictions, yet his transportation from Washington to Chicago, entertainment in Stevens Hotel, and no doubt a good sized honorarium is handed over to him, while at the same time preparations are being made to bring seventy missionaries home. No doubt some one will charge us with being puerile and childish in bringing forward such small items. Our reply is that thousands of such small items scattered from Maine to California bulk large in the total!

Only a few years ago, an Advisory Committee appointed by the Northern Baptist Convention itself, reported that five hundred thousand dollars was "wastefully squandered in the work of the entire Northern Baptist Convention annually." Mark you, this is not Dr.
Ketchum's statement, this is the sober utterance of the Convention's own committee. In addition to this, we quote again from the Advisory Committee.

"We found one of the National Society's investments had 310 mortgages — maturing date of 22 not known; appraised valuation of 25—no record. In 38 cases, no assessed valuation. In 25 cases, not known when taxes were paid. In 44 cases, not known whether property was insured. In two cases, expiration of insurance not known. In 25 cases, not known how mortgage was acquired. In 18 cases, no knowledge of when the interest was last paid. Interest payment overdue in 6 cases. Taxes overdue in 4 cases. Principal overdue in 38 cases. And in 85 cases the amount of the mortgage was beyond what the Society's by-laws allowed. While in 85 cases the Society did not know whether the property was income bearing, or not."

THE MISSIONARY DOLLAR

According to the bulletins coming out of Baptist headquarters in New York, the missionary dollar for 1935 and 1936 is divided as follows: Foreign Missions, 31.15; Home Missions, including City Missions, 24.07; State Convention expense, 22.45; Board of Education, 9.82; Minister's and Missionary's Benefit Board, 8.44. In addition to these percentages the following flat amounts are assigned outright: State Convention Promotion, $150,000; Council of Finance and Promotion, $225,000.

Everywhere we are met with frantic appeals to give to the Unified Budget. It is called "giving to missions." In the last issue of the Indiana state paper, "The Baptist Observer," a warning is issued to every Baptist Pastor in the State, that if he wants to be considered in good standing in the State, he must swing his Church back of the Unified Budget. It is called "giving to missions." Examination of the above figures discloses some interesting information. For instance, a tittle more than 31c out of each dollar given to the Unified Budget goes to Foreign Missions. Then when we remember that the Foreign Mission Board has its tremendous overhead expense to pay out of this percentage, one can easily figure how much of this precious 31c out of each dollar given actually gets to the foreign mission field. Little wonder that 210 missionaries have been cut off in the last few years, and 70 more about to be recalled. The officers of the Foreign Board will come back immediately and say that due to returns from invested funds, which enables them to pay overhead, the entire 31c actually gets to the field, but where did these invested funds come from? Did they not come from Baptists who gave them for missions?

The Home Mission Society, including City Missions, gets practically 25c out of every missionary dollar. They, too, have their overhead to pay. State Conventions get almost 25c out of each missionary dollar. This goes to keep an army of secretaries in the field to lord it over the Churches. Proof of this last statement will be found elsewhere in this booklet. The Board of Education gets almost 10c out of each missionary dollar, and when you have finished reading the item in this booklet under the heading "The Educational Situation" you can easily judge whether the 10c is well spent.

In addition to the 30c out of each missionary dollar given to the State Conventions, there is another flat $150,000 distributed among the State Conventions for promotion and then, of course, the expense of the big machine, clear at the top, called "The Council of Finance and Promotion" pulls out a cool quarter of a million, and all of this, mark you, out of the Unified Budget, which is called "giving to missions."

THE FOREIGN MISSION BOARD AND THE LAYMAN'S MISSIONARY APPRAISAL COMMISSION

I sat in the LaSalle Hotel in Chicago one day, and listened to nearly a dozen
men and women, members of the Layman's Missionary Appraisal Commission, speak. It was an all-day affair, and during the entire day we heard nothing but appeals from these investigators of Missions to change the emphasis of the missionary message from the old-fashioned historic Baptist faith, in a crucified, buried, risen and regenerating Christ to some kind of a new-fangled thing called "Religion." We were to take the "best" out of Christianity, the "best" out of Mohammedanism, the "best" out of Confucianism, etc., and put them together. During the day questions could be written and sent by an usher to the platform where the speaker would answer them.

When Dr. Jones of Haverford College was speaking, I wrote this question: "In view of your contention that the Christian missionaries should fellowship with the Buddhist, Confucianist and Mohammadan, should not the Christian minister in the home land fellowship with Christian Scientists, Mormons, andRussellites?" Dr. Jones read the question and in a clear, ringing voice answered in one word, "Yes!" This was only one experience of many of like nature during the day.

In spite of all this our Foreign Board has never repudiated the report of this Commission, but on the other hand, according to their own report of 1934, page 22, we find that the Board has sent to every mission station on the foreign field a complete set of the seven volumes published by this Commission. On page 23 of their report we read this significant sentence: "When the constant decline of receipts which has created so many problems during recent years has finally been arrested, it will be possible to give further consideration to other of the advance steps suggested by the layman's report." We are of the distinct impression that there are a few Baptists left who will not relish any "further steps" in the direction of this conglomeration of theologies.

The Layman's Missionary Appraisal Commission disbanded and set up in its place a thing called the "Modern Missions Movement." The purpose of this new movement was to act as a clearing house for designated missionary funds, which the donors might desire to be used on such missionary projects as were described by and approved by the Layman's Missionary Appraisal Commission. Sixty-seven Mission Boards were approached by the Modern Missions Movement, asking them to cooperate with them, by listing with the Movement certain fields or sections of their foreign work which are being carried on in such a fashion as to meet with the approval of the Modern Missions Movement. They, in turn, would then send on to the Board such monies as they might have in their possession, designated to such modernized work. The last report we had was that out of 67 Mission Boards thus approached, only five had responded favorably, two of them were the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, and the Women's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society. This fact alone is an admission by that there are scattered through our foreign fields stations and institutions that fully meet the approval of this new-fangled, bloodless religion. This in spite of the fact that Dr. Earle V. Pierce, noted Convention Fundamentalist and a member of the Foreign Board, says that I am "mendacious" when I say that the Foreign Board sends Modernists to the Foreign field! Incidentally, we wonder how our good friend, Dr. Pierce, is enjoying his new-found fellowship with the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, of which Council he became a member last year!

THE INCLUSIVE POLICY

In the Seattle Convention of 1925, the late Dr. W. B. Hinson offered a Resolution before the Convention which, if passed, would have instructed the Foreign Board to call home at once all missionaries known to be doctrinally unsound. This Resolution in its simplicity
was doctored up, changed, and amended, and left entirely in the hands of the Foreign Board to exercise its own discretion. It was at this Convention that Dr. Anderson, then President of the Foreign Board, announced the adherence of the Board to the "Inclusive Policy," under which missionaries of all shades of theological opinion should be sent to the field.

In "The Baptist," official organ of the Northern Baptist Convention, issue of June 12, 1926, we read: "The reaffirmation by President Anderson of the inclusive policy of the American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, as that policy has been previously defined, seems to have been accepted and settled, and under the policy, graduates of some of the most divergent schools of theology in the country have accepted appointments this year."

Under date of November 15, 1923, the Foreign Board sent out a four-page folder answering charges lodged against it by those of us who believed that the Foreign Board was far too lax in its adherence to the historic faith of Baptists. I quote from that statement:

"It is charged that the Board permits the teaching of liberal doctrines by its missionaries. Our Board has frankly stated to its constituency that it gives to its officers and missionaries a considerable degree of liberty of theological opinion in accordance with the long standing policy of the Denomination, and that it firmly and kindly declines to reverse that policy. Our denomination like our individual churches, is made up of men and women of diverse views, and our Board, most appropriately made up in the same way, thinks it only right, fair and wise that our missionary force should reflect the situation in our churches at home. We have no intention of restricting our appointees and missionaries to any one group. We represent the whole Denomination and we treat all our constituency as brothers and sisters in the faith.

"This does not mean that we will appoint or retain any Baptist in good standing, regardless of what he may or may not believe. There are limits beyond which we will not go at either end of the line. We will not knowingly appoint any brother, conservative or liberal, who holds such personal views and gives such expression to them as would impair his fellowship with his colleagues on the field or obscure the vital message of the gospel of Christ.

"The exact limits of theological liberty have slowly changed in our Denomination with the years, and will doubtless further change in the future. Our Board represents the present feeling of our constituency."

According to this defense published by the Foreign Board, they frankly tell us that they will continue to send missionaries to the foreign field who are representative of the various groups in the denomination at home. This policy is no doubt satisfactory to many of the Modernists, but it is anything but satisfactory to an old-fashioned historic Baptist. The Board declares plainly that they will appoint both conservative and liberal missionaries so long as the individual missionary does not allow his personal views to impair his fellowship with his colleagues on the field. This is the Inclusive Policy.

---

THE BOARDS AND THE DESIGNATED DOLLAR

Much has been said about designated gifts. Many of our Fundamental churches are comforting themselves with the idea that by designating their gifts to sound missionaries, they are helping to solve the situation within the Convention. Even the optimistic Dr. Pierce admits in his article in the "Watchman Examiner" of February 27, 1930, that
the designation policy is not an honest one. Quoting from the article we read:

"For several years the plan was followed of equalizing every three years, the budgets of the various cooperating and coordinating societies of the Northern Baptist Convention because of designated gifts. This essentially defeated the will of donors who had as the purpose of their designation that certain fields of work should receive more than they otherwise would. The rule under reorganization is that when any society is brought by designations to 85% of its budget, it shall receive no more share in the Unified Budget until all other societies are up to the same level."

From a later paragraph, we quote further:

"If a church or individual makes a designated gift to a society for the special work within the budget, it is because of the desire that that cause shall have more than it otherwise would have. But if because of this and other designations, that cause is given a smaller share of the Unified Budget to which the church may also be giving, then the will of the donor is divided. . . . Can we then blame people and churches because under these conditions they turn from our missionary projects to those where they can express themselves as they will?"

Here then is the plain simple fact that designated gifts may result in the hastening of a given society in reaching 85% of its assigned budget. From that moment on it can get no more money from the undesignated funds of the Unified Budget until ALL OTHER societies have reached 85%. It is therefore not only a possible thing, but a very probable thing that designated dollars simply continue to release so many undesignated dollars for work in other fields which do not meet the approval of the individual who designated the dollar.

THE FOREIGN BOARD AND MISSIONARY SCHOOLS

That the situation is not all that it should be in some of our schools on the foreign field, has been the contention of many of us for a long time. We have space to present one case only, namely that of Shanghai College. A missionary a few years ago, writing to the late Dr. F. J. White, president of Shanghai, says:

"It is unfortunate that the college is hedged around by a sympathetic Board of Managers, and that nothing can be done to root out heterodox members of the faculty."

President White wrote to his chief in New York City, Dr. James H. Franklin, quoting the above statement and then continues:

"This is a condition that must continue, or most of the members of the faculty would get out."

In this same letter President White objects to having certain orthodox conservative mission fields more largely represented on the College Board of Managers, and says:

"To put on three men from these conservative missions, two or three of whom might be very conservative and put on especially to smelt out heterodoxy, would be exceedingly unfortunate."

In another letter to Dr. Franklin, Dr. White says:

"Dr. X has been at the head of the agitation against the theology of the institution. Have felt if we could win him the whole agitation would collapse."

Then he writes of conferring with Dr. X and telling that they proposed to elect a member of his family, and then Dr. White reports a complete change of attitude on the part of Dr. X and says:

"Think this was brought about unconsciously to Dr. X by co-educat-
tion and the election of his ... If this is approved by the Board of Trustees, I do not see how Dr. X can relapse to the old position and oppose the college. With the defection of Dr. X the whole opposition to the college will probably collapse."

The following letter was received by a missionary in China from a young man studying at Shanghai Baptist College:

"My Dear Honored Sir:

"You are so kind to me that I often dream to talk with you in the night. I am very sorry because I cannot see you at Shanghai. At present I am sick and anxious to know some news from my church for which I have prayed. As to the conditions in our college, I am glad to say that I can pass in the lessons, but I am much troubled with teachings here. As you have told me very, very often and advised me very frequently, Christianity is indeed not good in the college. I have been told by some teacher that God spoken here is quite different from that in the church and that one's value depends totally upon the God one worships. Evolution is famous in the college, as you know. In the Biological class evolution is much emphasized. Everybody in freshman class should study biology. The examination subjects are emphasized on evolution. Moving pictures are shown in the chapel to tell how animals are made, and how a single cell can develop into a man. Secondly, I love Holy Bible though we have only two hours to study Bible every week. We are not so fortunate as the students of Nanking University where Bible is much more emphasized. They study four hours in Bible in the class room a week. I am very unhappy. This school advised me to change church. Gentlemen, can you see how can I do this? You love me, help me and have good hopes for me in all respects. How can I forget you and the church? I have my duty for my church. I hope you pray for me for this reason; tell me what else I can do for my church.

Very respectfully yours."

THE FOREIGN BOARD AND AN OUTSTANDING MISSIONARY

Rev. W. M. Young, who in 1925 had served 30 years under the American Baptist Foreign Mission Board in India, and who on one tour of 70 days, together with his son, baptized 3,751 believers, 2,408 of them in eight days, writes as follows to Rev. James Wallace Jacobs, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Vassar, Mich. This letter was written while Frederick L. Anderson was still President of the Foreign Mission Board, but it reveals the truth of our general contention concerning the situation on the foreign field.

"Dear Brother Jacobs:

"Your letter of October 16 reached me while I was out on tour. . . . . I have no objection to your publishing the letter, as all statements were carefully considered before writing and I have not written stronger to others than I have written to the Board. I have sent careful discussions to the Board of the present trend of mission work for several years now. My letters have been based entirely on the Board's annual reports so they cannot object . . . .

"Nothing in recent years has moved me more deeply than Dr. F. L. Anderson's message at Milwaukee N. R. C. He tried to make out that Fundamentalists are demanding a radical change in methods of appointing missionaries from our time honored history, and that no doctrinal statements were required in the past. I was amazed at the statement, and more amazed that the Board should publish the address and send it out as a fact. As a
matter of fact, I do not believe anyone could have been appointed as a missionary a third of a century ago when I was appointed, without a decidedly clearer and fuller doctrinal statement than Dr. Anderson gives in his homoeopathic dose of theology at Milwaukee. What does Dr. Anderson mean by the vague phrase, ‘Within the limits of the Gospel’? Is there a Unitarian or an Universalist in the United States that would not claim to be within the limits of the Gospel? Is there an ultra Modernist in the Baptist or any other denomination that would not claim to be within the limits of the Gospel? Who is to decide what the limits are? We need men and women today on all the mission fields, not simply within the limits of the Gospel, but truly regenerate, spirit-filled, men and women of prayer and a positive virile message, the fulness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, with all its supernatural and regenerating power. . . . .

The hour has come for us to strike and to strike from the shoulder, to write and speak with no uncertain sound. The Bible Union of China and the Bible League of India are doing most effective work. I am a member of both organizations. . . . .

"We recently returned, my oldest son and I, from a tour of 70 days. It was the most successful tour I have ever made from the standpoint of ingathering. We baptized 3754 on the tour and laid the foundation for much larger ingatherings in the future. . . . ."

"At Hsi Ken, four days west from Mong-Mong, we baptized 2408 in eight consecutive days, beginning the last Sunday in January and completing the work the first day of February. In that section we ought to have 10,000 more converts in the near future. In many places we were received with sorts of ovations, but the paths were not all strewn with roses by any means. . . . .

"We need a new emphasis on evangelism. My convictions are that 25,000 baptisms per year should be considered the minimum, with our present equipment and working staff, with present open doors on every hand. I have so written the Board at different times. Dr. Anderson in his annual addresses, gives figures from a few conservative fields with large ingatherings, then represents them as representative of all our work, and makes his plea for liberalism and an inclusive policy, but he could not point to a single field under liberalism that would support the claims made. What we want is the facts. The present trend of our work is undoubtedly toward educational work at the expense of the evangelistic work. . . . ."

Yours in His joyful service,

(Signed) W. M. YOUNG.

THE CONVENTIONS AND OVERLORDSHIP

Perhaps at no point in this disturbing situation is departure from Baptist polity more pronounced than in connection with the individual liberty and freedom of local, independent churches and pastors. No matter what kind of work a pastor and his church may be doing for the Lord Jesus Christ, and no matter how much blessing the Lord may be pouring out upon the same, unless it all goes into the United Budget, that pastor and church are immediately made the objects of Convention interference, and attempted Convention control.

The Central Baptist Church of Gary, Indiana, of which I happen to be the pastor at this present writing, is the sixth largest Baptist church in the state. It is second in the amount of money given last year both for current expenses and missions, and it is first in the number of baptisms—the number last year
being 114. The next largest in the state was 70. In the past three and one-half years, a few more than 500 people have united with this church. Within the last year four of its young people (two couples) have been sent to the mission fields. Missionary giving last year was well over the $4,000.00 mark. This year it bids fair to be well over the $5,000.00 mark. A few weeks ago twelve young men, members of this church, were licensed as lay-preachers at a Sunday morning service, while at the same time twenty-four more of our young people who are either day or night students in Moody Bible Institute were seated in the choir loft. At the close of the service, fourteen more gave themselves for full time, definite service. Yet only a few weeks ago, the State Baptist paper announced in bold-faced type that this church and its pastor were no longer in good standing in the state of Indiana!

On February 13, 1935, the Central Baptist Church of Gary, withdrew from the fellowship of the Northern Baptist Convention, Indiana State Convention, and the local Calumet Association. Out of a membership which was at that time eleven hundred, twenty-two votes were cast against the resolution. Unbiased review of the entire membership would indicate that had everyone of the eleven hundred actually been in the meeting, the opposition vote could not possibly have been more than thirty. Furthermore, most of the twenty-two who did vote, did so not because they did not believe that the situation was as had been presented, but for other reasons. In spite of this sovereign vote of a sovereign Baptist church, the Calumet Association nine months later, October 4, 1935, appointed a committee "to keep in touch with and work with the loyal Baptists of Gary."

In answer to all of this, we advised the executive state secretary, by telegram as follows:

"To Mr. T. J. Parsons, Executive Secretary, Indiana Baptist Convention. Re account in Baptist Observer stating hand of fellowship was withdrawn from Central Baptist Church and pastor October 4, 1935 beg to advise that Central Baptist Church and pastor withdrew hand of fellowship from Convention and Calumet Association February 13, 1935, your article therefore is reverse of the truth. Stop. Re my standing with Convention beg to advise that if I am in good standing with heaven I should worry about my standing with Indiana headquarters."

(Signed) R. T. KETCHAM.

CASE NUMBER TWO

In a certain northern Pennsylvania city, there was a small mission church pastored for eight years by an open and avowed Modernist. The church went through those years at a dying rate. At the same time the State Convention poured $500.00 a year into the pastor’s salary. At the end of eight years the church asked the brother to resign, which he did. A young Fundamentalist was called and accepted the pastorate on the one condition that they cease taking the $500.00 a year aid from the state. He made no effort to pull the church out of the state, but simply insisted that he would not be under obligation to the state. The young man declared that he would take the entire responsibility, and that at the end of the year if they had not been able to pay him the stipulated salary including the $500.00, that he would cancel whatever they owed him. He was called and began to work. Prayer meetings began to jump up in attendance; preaching services well attended; several folks saved and everything in general going along fine; with salary paid in full at the end of the year.

In this same city lived another Baptist pastor who at the time was the president of the Pennsylvania State Convention. During the week of Feb.
February 28, 1931, this State Convention president wrote a letter to the Rev. William G. Russell, then secretary of the Board of Missionary Promotion of the state. By a blunder on the part of the president in addressing the envelope, with another blunder on the part of the mail man, this letter fell into the hands of the young Fundamentalist pastor before it got out of the city on its way to Philadelphia. We quote two paragraphs from it, and mark you it is a state president writing to a state secretary! Not in the Roman Catholic church, not even in a Methodist church, but in a Baptist fellowship.

"Please send me some of your Bombing Literature in the big envelope. You may need to send some of your 'Shock Troops' into this 'Sect' to line up some of the men in this territory."

"I would advise you to keep your eye on ——. You may not have connected him up as —— successor at ——. He is a good fellow but did not get his training at the feet of Gamaliel. The great variety of educational background of the men here in —— is largely responsible for the failure to line up with the big things of the Denomination. But we will pray and plan and push."

The church of which the young Fundamentalist was pastor took the matter up with the good president, whereupon he offered a weak apology.

**CASE NUMBER THREE**

What can be said in defense of such procedure as revealed in the following Pennsylvania case. I have before me a letter announcing the coming of a denominational official to hold a conference in Mendville Baptist church. The conference is to discuss "organization and work of the local church." The church officers of an entire association are urged to be present, but all pastors are frankly requested to stay at home so that the "official" and church officers may feel no embarrassment in discussion. I quote here the two main paragraphs of the letter:

"The conference will consist of two sessions. The first will be at 11 o'clock, at the time of the morning service, at which Brother Killian will speak. The second session will be at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, when ample time will be given for a full discussion of the organization and work of the local church. Church officers are urged to attend both sessions, and if possible make a report of the conference to their own churches at the evening service."

"All church officers, both men and women, are urged to attend. Deacons, trustees, church clerks, financial secretaries, treasurers, Sunday School superintendents, presidents of women's missionary and ladies' aid included. Pastors are requested not to attend in order that both Brother Killian and the church officers may feel free to discuss all phases of church life. But the pastors are urged to secure as full attendance as possible of their church officers for the sake of a higher level of lay service in the churches."

Let any sound Baptist give one same reason why the presence of pastors should be undesirable at such a conference.

**CASE NUMBER FOUR**

The Baptist Convention of Pennsylvania in 1934 adopted resolutions setting up a veritable ministerial inquisition. There will be two lists of preachers in the state Annual, one of them the approved list and the other the black list. In substantiation of this charge, I quote Article 4, 5 and 6 from the resolutions adopted in 1934.

"IV. That this Convention shall print in the State Convention ANNUAL the above statement of the requirements of ordination to be
followed immediately by the list of all such regularly ordained ministers in the Convention.

"I. The names of all men ordained in the future, not in conformity with the above requirements, shall be printed in the State ANNUAL in a separate list, so designated.

"5. Ministers coming into the fellowship of the Pennsylvania Baptist Convention from other denominations, or other State Conventions shall satisfy the Commission on Pastoral Education and Ordination that they have met the above standards of ordination before their names shall appear in the list of regularly accredited ministers of the State Convention.

"V. That each Association of the State be urged to adopt some Permanent Council form of ordination procedure, if they do not have it, wherein all candidates for ordination are required to appear before the Permanent Council or its executive committee for examination, and be approved by this Council before the regular ordination council is called.

"VI. That churches of the Pennsylvania Baptist Convention be urged to deal only with ministers whose names appear on the accredited list printed in the State Convention ANNUAL."

The joker is found in Article Six where the churches of Pennsylvania are urged to deal only with ministers whose names appear in the accredited list. If this does not mean that all the ministers appearing in the other list are on a black list, then I have lost all power to interpret the English language when I read it.

Furthermore, the Pennsylvania State Convention drew up an article which they sent out to the faculties of all theological seminaries and Bible training schools. This article describes the working of the ministerial committee and also describes the kind of preachers who will be acceptable to the state with of course, the idea in mind that these seminaries and training schools will bend every effort to produce that particular brand. The third paragraph in this article would cause Roger Williams to turn over under ground. The article goes on to say that after a man has been accepted by the "Commission" that the name then is reviewed by "the committee of nine, pastors peers, elected by the Ministers' Union and appointed by the State Convention, the review being with the purpose to accredit those with whom is found no moral derogation (which in their province includes a record for church breaking, unchristian practices and schismatic action in reference to our organized work)."

Who in the wide world ever heard of a committee of nine being set up in a State Convention of Baptists calling themselves "pastors peers"? Shades of Roger Williams! Sounds like a congress of cardinals, and to all practical intents and purposes it comes mighty near being just that. Yet every Baptist pastor who dares to think for himself in reference to the "organized work" bear in mind that his failure or refusal to support the organized work is called in this paragraph "moral derogation." Since when, we would ask, has it become an immoral thing for a man to act in accordance with Christ and conscience with reference to the organized work?

**CASE NUMBER FIVE**

In 1919 when the New World Movement was launched, I was Pastor of the
First Baptist Church, Butler, Pennsylvania. We were asked for $17,000. After weeks of study the Church authorized me to publish a 24-page pamphlet, pointing out modernism in the beneficiary boards and societies, and the decision of the Church not to participate in the Movement.

Within two weeks after this pamphlet was released a Committee of the Pittsburgh Baptist Association called upon me in my office. They made the flat proposition that I was to recall and withdraw my pamphlet. Not one of them denied the truth of the assertions in the pamphlet. They all said, however, that it was "harmful to the Denominational Program." It didn't seem to make much difference to the Committee how harmful the Program might be to Christ.

I will remember that day throughout eternity. Just a young preacher, with my ministerial career still before me, then and there I had to decide whether my load was to be the Lord Jesus Christ or the Denominational Program. We make no boast when we declare that we decided that day that the Christ Himself should occupy that position. There is nothing to be particularly proud of in that decision, for the simple fact of the matter is that I was afraid to make any other. It was just a question with me as to who could best take care of me in the hours of crisis which I knew would face every minister. I decided He could, and I cast my lot with Him that day, and to the praise of His everlasting glory, what a happy lot it has been.

After more than two hours of grilling, the Chairman of that Committee said: "Mr. Ketchem, we may as well tell you that you must withdraw that pamphlet from circulation, or I will personally see to it that you never get another Church in the Northern Baptist Convention." My reply was: "Brother, $17,000 is too much money to pay for my Baptist pulpit. I can secure a soap box for a dime." No sooner were these words out of my mouth than another member of the Committee jumped from his seat, raced across the office, grabbed me by the coat collar, and literally shook the daylight out of me, yelling into my face: "You get down on your knees and tell God to forgive you for that statement."

Well, 17 years have passed since then, and God has been faithful to the trust we committed to Him that day. Three years ago, however, I had placed in my hand a letter which the Chairman of that Committee wrote to a friend in another State. He said: "For God's sake get me a church if you can. I must have something within the next six months or I shall have to crawl out of Pittsburgh on my hands and knees after dark."

Fourteen years of serving under the lordship of the Denominational Program—and the end? Crawling out of Pittsburgh on his hands and knees after dark? Seventeen years of working under the Lordship of Christ—and the end? Occupying the pulpit of one of the greatest Baptist Churches in the country; called upon North, South, East, and West for the ministry of the Word; more than 11,000 men and women having publicly confessed Christ under our ministry; more than 20 young men and women in the home and foreign mission fields in full time service for Christ, who have gone into such service under our ministry. All of this and much, much more has been our lot and all because we are some extraordinary preacher? No. But because we dared to be faithful to Him.

We cite this case not with any notion of the parade of self, but in the hope that some scared preacher who may read these lines will take courage and cast off the shackles of fear. Within the past three months I have received no less than 20 letters from pastors in the State of Indiana alone, saying in substance: "God bless you Brother Ketchem. Go on with the fight, but as for me I dare not move."

One dear fellow wrote me some time
ago declaring himself to be openly on our side of the issue, and then the Convention "powers that be" began to put the screws down. Last week I received a letter from him declaring that he was ceasing all connection with our contention for the Faith, that he was going back to the N. B. C. and the Indiana State Convention. I wrote him as follows:

"Dear Brother:

"Poor fellow!

"I say this not in derision, but in heart sympathy for a Baptist preacher who can thus be scared by the 'powers that be.'

"It is just such letters as yours of March 28 which prove more and more the need for some one to arise and help break the shackles of fear from God-called ministers, and sovereign Baptist Churches.

"With every good wish, I am,

Yours and His,

(Signed) R. T. Ketcham."

RTK-LK

CASE NUMBER SIX

Another case of Convention overlordship and interference comes before us in the instance of the Corinth, Iowa, case. Some twenty years ago, the Baptist cause in Corinth, Iowa, seemed about to die out. In order that the property might be conserved for the use of Baptists in the future, in case there should be a revival of Baptist interests, the property was deeded to the Iowa State Convention for the consideration of one dollar, the expressed reason for such a transaction being that the property might be held in trust by the Convention until such time as Corinth Baptists might require the use of it again and there should be a Baptist organization of sufficient strength to carry on the work. During the years that have passed since then, the work has revived and it has developed into one of the finest smaller churches in the state. During recent years, several attempts have been made to get the State Convention to deed the property back to the church, since the purpose of transferring it to the State Convention temporarily had been fully met. This the State Convention has persistently refused to do. During these intervening years, the church had come to take a position of non-cooperation with the Northern Baptist Convention and the Iowa State Convention program. Exercising the right of conscientious judgment which hundreds had also exercised, they had decided that they could not consistently support a program so overloaded with Modernism.

Approximately a year ago, the State Convention through its secretary, Mr. Anderson, notified the church that unless they began to support the Convention programs, that they would have to give up the use of the church building. It was argued with Mr. Anderson that in the broadest ethical sense of the word, the State Convention did not own the church, but that the local congregation were the true owners of the property. The State Convention had come into possession of the deed for the sum of one dollar for very apparent reasons. Now that those reasons were eliminated, the property should have been deeded back to the local church. This the Convention refused to do, and then ordered the congregation to vacate the building or support the program. The church at a called business meeting, voted overwhelmingly not to support the program, and acting in accordance with the mandate of the state secretary, got up and walked out of the building in which some of them had worshipped for forty years. The next week they rented a building elsewhere in town and continued doing business as the First Baptist Church of Corinth, Iowa.

A few years ago, a parsonage proper-
ty was purchased, which had no connection whatever with the original church property, and was not involved in the State Convention deed. A few weeks after the church voted not to support the Convention and had removed itself from the Convention owned property, a minority in the church, numbering but a handful, got together under Convention instigation, called themselves the First Baptist Church of Corwith, Iowa, and served a legal notice on the pastor, Mr. Albert Rust, to vacate because the parsimony was the property of the First Baptist Church, and since the majority of the church had voted not to support the Conventions, they were therefore no longer a Baptist church. That since they, the minority, had voted to support the Conventions, they were therefore the First Baptist Church, and upon these grounds sued for possession of the parsimony. The case went to court for trial. Mr. Anderson was the star witness for the prosecution. After all the evidence was in, the judge handed down a decision in favor of Pastor Rust and the majority and ordered the State Convention minority to pay the costs. The judge’s decision declared that a local Baptist church was sovereign, and that no matter what Convention program it voted not to support, it did not thereby cease to be a Baptist church. Full details of this entire proceeding may be secured by addressing Pastor Albert Rust, Corwith, Iowa.

Why should Convention officials feel that they have a right to instruct preachers to cheer for the official family simply because they happen to occupy their pulpits because a Convention official “spoke a good word” for them? When a Church has expressed itself as no longer willing to support the program of the Convention why should a Convention official or committee feel called upon to undertake to come into that church and seek to change their position? Even granting for argument’s sake that the Church’s position is wrong, what right has an outsider to go in to set it right?

III

SOME CONVENTION PRESIDENTS
DR. FRANKLIN

The present President, Dr. James H. Franklin, published in 1835 his book “The Never Failing Light.” The book throughout is an emphatic appeal for the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. On page 9, Dr. Franklin says “He (Jesus) told them of a Father—God who would have them all as members of one family, living together as brothers and sisters regardless of race, social status, economic privileges, or differences of belief.”

On page 10 Dr. Franklin says “Truly the light was shining in dense spiritual darkness when Jesus began teaching men of all races, of all religions, and all classes to look up to the Unseen as our Father and to practice love and brotherhood as the sum total of all requirements of His children.” There are thousands of people who practice the idea of love and brotherhood, and yet have no time for Jesus Christ. Such a practice is positively not the sum total of God’s requirements of men. Somewhere I have read that God requires men to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ!

On page 33 Dr. Franklin says “He (Jesus) did not talk about the Fatherhood of God or the Brotherhood of Man in so many words, but He proceeded to live as if both were true. He also bade men try the experiment of living as if they were sons of God and brothers one of another.” Dr. Franklin could hardly claim that Jesus said anything about the Fatherhood of God in the face of such a passage as John 8:44, “Ye are of your father the Devil.” Dr. Franklin says that Jesus “lived” as though all men were sons of God, but Jesus Himself declared that all men were not the sons of God. If what Dr. Franklin claims is true then Jesus lived one thing and said another! There are some of us who still prefer to let Jesus stand as the Scriptures present Him, minus Dr. Franklin’s interpretation of Him.
On page 34 Dr. Franklin quotes approvingly H. R. L. Sheppard when he says: "To love God and to love your neighbor as yourself is the beginning and end of the Christian religion." Such teachings as these reduce Jesus Christ to simply a teacher who told men they were to love God and their neighbor. It is true that He told them this, but it is also true He told them something else, namely that no man could love God and his neighbor without taking Jesus Christ into account. The beginning and the end of the Christian religion is not our love for God and our neighbor, but the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, who said, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end."

On page 36 Dr. Franklin says: "What was the cross to Him? Naught but an incident in the life which He had already laid down for His kind." The cross may be a mere "incident" to Dr. Franklin, but you may rest assured it was far from that to Jesus! It was neither incident nor accident to Him—but the supreme consummation of all His redemptive plans.

Elsewhere we devote a chapter to some of the hypocritical actions of the Convention and Convention leaders. We pause here to discuss the hypocrisy of Dr. Franklin. The Denominational press has just released the news that Dr. Franklin has chosen as the Convention hymn, to be sung in St. Louis in May, "When I Survey The Wondrous Cross."

Thousands of Baptists will sing this precious old hymn at the next sessions of the Northern Baptist Convention, and as they sing it their hearts will be aflame with the precious message of the cross. They will know as they sing that it was there the great transaction took place, that it was there where "He who knew no sin was made to be sin for us that we might be made the righteousness of God." They will know that it was there on that cross that God dealt with His precious, Holy Son as He would have had to deal with every one of them, had Christ not gone to that Cross. Thousands of Baptists will sing this old hymn, and as they sing it they will know full well that it wasn't the life of Jesus prior to the cross which saved them, but that it was that life poured out in penal substitution in death for them, which alone gives them hope.

While thousands of Baptists will thus be singing this hymn, the President, Dr. Franklin, will be thinking of it as "naught but an incident" in the life of Christ. Baptists everywhere will be led to conclude that the old-fashioned cross is to be lifted up in the heart of the next Northern Baptist Convention because the President has selected this hymn, but let the same Baptists read Dr. Franklin's book "The Never Failing Light," and then let them wonder why he selected this particular hymn.

On page 34 Dr. Franklin declares: "The teachings of Jesus support Bishop Gore in the declaration that the unaccomplished mission of Christianity is nothing less than to reconstruct Society on the basis of Brotherhood." The Lord Jesus Himself in Luke 24 reverses both Bishop Gore and Dr. Franklin when He says: "Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things." Getting men to act in love toward one another simply on the basis of the teachings of Jesus is a million miles from the Gospel. Something else than the Gospel may turn men to a higher plane of morals and a more civilized manner of life, but these accomplishments are far from salvation!

DR. SHAW

The Northern Baptist Convention President immediately preceding Dr. Franklin was Dr. Avery A. Shaw, President of Denison University, Granville, Ohio. A few years ago six brethren and
I spent seven hours in a hotel room in Columbus, Ohio, in conference with Dr. Shaw and fifteen or twenty other Baptist leaders of the State. We were trying to arrive at some method by which the Convention could be purged from within of these objectionable features. Dr. Shaw in the presence of all of us declared "I am a theistic evolutionist."

We confronted Dr. Shaw with several newspaper accounts of the accomplishments of his card-playing faculty in the realm of prize winning. His sole answer was "I did not know it was contrary to Christian views to play 'cards.'"

At the time of the Washington Convention Dr. Shaw was pastor of Emmanuel Baptist Church, Brooklyn, New York. It was at this Convention that it was voted two to one in favor of "Open Membership," that is, allowing Baptist Churches to receive members without Baptism, and at the same time hold full fellowship in a Baptist Convention. Dr. Shaw went home from that Convention and preached to his own people a sermon entitled "Sanity of Northern Baptists" in which he said "The sanity of northern Baptists is revealed in their settlement of the open membership question." This certainly places Dr. Shaw on that question.

When Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick left the pastorate of a Presbyterian Church in New York City the Baptist Ministers Conference of that city, meeting in the Madison Avenue Baptist Church, appointed a Committee to send a signed statement of appreciation of his ministry to the Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick. The statement which was sent to Dr. Fosdick follows: "The undersigned, your brethren of the Baptist Ministers Conference of New York, appreciating the remarkable ministry you have rendered, wish to express to you our fellowship with you in your attitude toward the truth of Christ, and our admiration of your kindly courage under great trial. We greatly desire and confidently hope that on your return, opportunity will open for you to exercise the great preaching gift in some pulpit in our city."

The above words were drafted by Dr. A. S. Hobart and Dr. Avery A. Shaw. Dr. Shaw has since said that it was simply an appreciation of the person of Dr. Fosdick, but what he actually wrote was "We wish to express to you our fellowship with you in your attitude toward the truth of Christ."

It is worthy of note, too, as evidence in this case, that Dr. Fosdick endorses Dr. Shaw. The Rev. Chester E. Tuggle, then pastor at Niles, Ohio, wrote Dr. Fosdick stating that Dr. Shaw was passing in Ohio as a Conservative, and asked if he would advise his own personal opinion concerning the matter. Dr. Fosdick replied as follows: "I am very fond of Dr. Shaw and your letter is the first intimation I ever had that he was a Conservative in the sense which your letter seems to imply. He certainly has had very liberal associations here in greater New York, and I have supposed that he belonged to the circle of intelligent and wide awake minds that were open to all new lights. I am sure that you will find this to be the case."

DR. BEAVEN

While reference is made elsewhere in this book to Dr. Beaven's apparent sympathies for a radical Socialism, we have the following to say concerning him under the head of "Convention Presidents," since he occupied that position only recently.

The League for Industrial Democracy is one of the many Red "front" organizations which is being subsidized and propagated by Communists. In 1905, the Rochester, New York League for Industrial Democracy published a program of several meetings to be held in Rochester under its auspices. The program itself was printed on flaming red paper. On the back page of the program is a list of the sponsors, among which is the name of Dr. Albert W. Beaven, President of Colgate Rochester
Divinity School, and ex-President of
the Northern Baptist Convention. In
this connection, we quote herewith the
entire article from the pen of Dr. Har-
old Straube in his paper: “The Bap-
tist Fellowship.”

“DR. ALBERT W. BEAVEN AND HIS
ASSOCIATIONS”

“We are constantly receiving inquiries
at our office concerning Dr. Beaven. The
question that is always asked is: ‘Do you
consider Dr. Beaven a Fundamental-
list?’

“To start with, there is doubt in the
inquirer’s mind. We always answer the
inquiry in simple and positive language.
‘Dr. Beaven is not a Fundamentalist!’
We would remind the reader that Dr.
Beaven’s ability is not to be minimized.
He possesses a pleasing personality. He
is a political strategist to the point of
keeping one guessing. His guarded
phraseology leaves many people in a
fool as to what side of the fence he is
on. There are those in the South who
look upon him as a Fundamentalist. He
is known in the North as a Liberal. Dr.
Beaven’s influence in the Northern
Baptist Convention is fully recognized
which makes it all the more serious
that he would lend his name to in-
fluence as a sponsor of a subversive,
radical organization.

“The reader may draw his own con-
clusions from the following informa-
tion.

“Permit us to introduce an organiza-
tion known as the LEAGUE FOR IN-
DUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY. First; its
history:

“The national officers are all mem-
ers of the American Civil Liberties
Union.

“The League is headed by Robert
Lovett, active in Communist orga-
nizations; founded by the revolutionary
Jack London in 1906 heavily subsidized
by the famous Garland Fund which is
the financial foundation of the ‘Red’
movement in this country; spreads So-
cialistic, Communist propaganda and
literature in American Colleges; con-
ducts student conferences each summer
at Camp Tamiment, Pennsylvania;
formed the Federation of Unemployed
Workers Leagues of America which is
under joint Communist-Socialist I. W.
W. control; its slogan is ‘Education to-
wards a new social order based on pro-
duction for use and not for profit’; it
boasts that ‘student members of the
League for Industrial Democracy have
been in the thick of the miners’ strug-
gles in Harlan, Kentucky, and in West
Virginia’; is the distributor of scores
of pamphlets of the extreme ‘Red’ po-
sition. The subject of its 1931 student
conference held at the University of
Chicago was ‘The Student in World Re-
volution.’ The December, 1931 National
Conference held in New York City was
titled, ‘Guiding the Revolution’ and
discussed such topics as ‘What Tactics
Should Students Use,’ et cetera. The
first page of ‘Students Outlook’ for
February, 1933, which is published by
the League for Industrial Democracy
says ‘Wanted: Students with Guns.’
Under this heading we find the follow-
ing: ‘If you have enlisted under the
banners of Socialism you have got to
carry the job through.’

Second; its objects:

1. Abolition of private property.
‘Education for a new social order based
on production for use and not for profit.’
2. Recognition of Soviet Russia.
3. Disarmament of United States. This so-
ciety operates through the establish-
ment of so-called Liberal groups in college.
IT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RAD-
ICAL DISTURBANCES ON THE CAM-
PUS OF SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY ON
FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1933; NEW YORK
UNIVERSITY, MAY, 1933. And others.

“June 6, 1931, a closed meeting of the
League for Industrial Democracy, The
American Civil Liberties Union, Fellow-
ship of Reconciliation, and the Commit-
tee on Militarism and Education held a
New School of Social Research in New
York City, admission by ticket only. In
addition to the publicly announced program of this organization, the following was adopted:

The protection of aliens.
Co-operation with the working class movement.
Release of Mooney and Billings.
Release of I. W. W. convicts in the Centralia case.
Recognition of Russia.
Enactment of legislation to admit pacifists to citizenship.
Repeal of Federal laws prohibiting free dissemination of birth control.
Protection of political and industrial prisoners.
Problems of Japanese, Philippine and Mexican radicals.
Aid to strikers.
Freedom of Philippine Islands.
Unemployment insurance.

(Note: This program is a resume of practically every Radical propaganda.)

"Addressing the 'Forum of revolution' held at Barnard College, December 27, 28, and 29, attended by the Intercollegiate Student Council of the League of Industrial Democracy, Norman Thomas, well-known radical, discussed plans for the revolution which they feel is bound to come, and envisioned a world built of, by and for the proletariat. Delegates from 28 colleges and universities were in attendance. Lewis Mumford, author, Paul Blanchard, and others spoke. Birth control and other topics were discussed.

THE STUDENTS WERE ASKED TO LIVE LIKE COMMUNISTS IN PREPARATION FOR THE GENERAL UPHAVELV TO COME. (Sojourners, May 1933.)

"One of the speakers for the League is Scott Nearing, editor of the 'Revolutionary Age,' (BARKED FROM THE MAIL). He is a paid speaker under Communist auspices. He was jailed for sedition during the war. He recently said at the Play House, in Washington, D. C., when speaking on, 'The Stability of the Russian Soviet Government', that he stood for the Soviet Government of Russia, as opposed to the capitalist government of the world. He advocated the establishment of World Communism. 'It is our business to prepare America by propaganda to do what Russia did in 1917,' he said.

"New York State chapter headquarters, 112 East 19th Street, New York. President Reinhold Niebuhr, radical pacifist, and labor agitator, advocate of intermingling of whites and negroes. Treasurer: Stuart Chase, member of many prominent radical societies and personal friend and associate of the notorious deported anarchist, Alexander Berkman; connected with War Resisters League, Evelyn Hughes; Communist Federated Press, Frank Palmer; the Socialist Party, Paul Blanchard; the Committee on Militarism and Education, Cutler P. Smith.

"This society has organized a chapter in Rochester, through an individual known to be intimately connected with Communism and other subversive movements.

"Its second speaker this year was J. B. Matthews, Executive Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation; another radical, pacifist organization. The meeting place for the Rochester organization is a building known as the Garratt House, which is the property of the Unitarian Church. Rev. David Rhys Williams is pastor of the church, and his associations are listed in 'The RED NET WORK,' a who's who and handbook of radicalism for patriots, by Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling.

"We have in our possession the 1935 program of the Rochester League for Industrial Democracy. It is worthy of note that the program is not printed in black, blue, or pink, but 'RED.' This program lists the subjects and speakers as follows:

January 29—'TWO YEARS OF ROOSEVELT!' J. B. Matthews.
February 5 — "GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS!" Carl Thompson.

February 12 — "THE MARCH OF LABOR!" Tucker P. Smith.

February 19 — "NATIONALISM IN AMERICA!" William Pickens.

February 26 — "PREPARATIONS FOR WORLD WAR!" Ellen Wilkinson.

March 5 — "THE COMING STRUGGLE FOR POWER!" Norman Thomas.

"On the back page of this program we find the list of sponsors and, included in that list is the name of Dr. A. W. Beaven, president of Colgate Rochester Divinity School; also the names of Professor Conrad H. Moehlman, and Professor Henry B. Robbins; both teachers in the school of which Dr. Beaven is president.

"Is the above good company for Dr. Beaven to be keeping? Is he fair to Baptist interests? Is he consistent to be allied with the enemies of the Church, and the Christian Faith? Will you be led by Dr. Beaven or by the scriptural injunction:

"'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils.'"

IV

THE CONVENTIONS AND KAGAWA

Perhaps no individual has caused more comment in the religious world in recent years than has Dr. Kagawa in his tour of the United States under the sponsorship of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Dr. Kagawa spoke before a Southwide meeting of Baptist youth only recently. He also delivered a series of lectures for a week to the students of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary of Louisville. He is also to be one of the speakers at the joint meeting of the Northern and Southern Baptist Conventions in St. Louis in May. The Indiana Baptist State paper, the "Baptist Observer" said of him, "He is the greatest force for Christ in the world today."

A prominent Baptist leader said of him, "He is the greatest Christian in the world." Another Christian leader said of him, "If Kagawa is not a Christian, then there are no Christians."

Over against these statements, we place a few from Dr. Kagawa himself:

"Jesus experienced God as the forgiver of sins."—Page 32, "Religion of Jesus."

"Thus discovering the marvelous fact of an elaborate cosmic design, we cannot but feel that there exists a Being in the universe, great beyond our power to imagine. Whether this Being should be called God or not, I do not know."—Page 68, "Love the Law of Life."

"The reconstruction of human nature depends upon the power of evolution."—Page 245, "Love the Law of Life."

"Belief in evolution is faith in the progressive emergence into an ever expanding freedom, from seed to shoot, bud to flower, from anthropoid to human, from man to son of God. What a courageous faith: The belief that there is a direct line of evolution from amoeba to man is more daring and romantic than the belief in the myth of a Creator making something out of nothing."—Page 298, "Love the Law of Life."

"Belief in evolution is a holier faith than Abraham's belief in the promised land. His land was the lean country of Palestine; the promised land of evolution is growth from electron to divinity."—Page 299, "Love the Law of Life."

"Science is the movement preparatory to our becoming divine."—Page 272, "Love the Law of Life."

"It (faith in evolution) is convinced that though stones may not become sons to Abraham, electrons can become sons of God."—Page 300, "Love the Law of Life."
With unhesitating emphasis, we say that any man who can write the above sentences, is to an old-fashioned Baptist a long, long way from being the greatest Christian in the world, and yet he is paraded from one end of the country to the other, and everywhere our Baptist leaders are putting their approval upon him. What all of this means to a thinking young person, I am afraid to contemplate. Our leaders do not need to think that our youngsters are going to be able to "push the bones aside and take only the meat." To thousands of Baptists, young and old, what the leaders endorse must be acceptable. In a soon coming day, when our Baptist forces will reap the harvest that they have been sowing through their parading of Dr. Kagawa, let them remember that it was the leaders who led them into it.

V
MODERNISM AND BAPTIST PUBLICATIONS
"THE BAPTIST"

THE BAPTIST was originally created as the official organ of the Northern Baptist Convention. Later it was turned over to a group to edit it, and finance it. While through this arrangement it lost its "official organ" complexion, yet it was put forward as one of the great mediums of publicity and propaganda for the Convention. During its last days, Dr. U. M. McGuire was its editor, and in the issue of December 31, 1882, on page 1102, in his exposition of the Sunday School Lesson for January 8, 1883, dealing with the temptation of Jesus, Dr. McGuire says:

"Naturally, after Jesus' conversion, he faced his life work seriously. Certain problems were to be settled and choices made between goods and the Good. What was he going to be and do? The question covered a field of large and obvious options of various values. He could not dawdle with them. He must weigh and choose, in the light of his experience. A spiritual dynamo within him drove him to such a crisis. Some of his problems he must settle with and for God, without human intrusion. But what of Satan? Shall we think of him in terms of theology, as the guilf of God sent to sting and torment men; or in terms of psychology, as the shadow demon created by human imagination, like the "shadow children" of Louisa M. Alcott or Puck of "Midsummer Night's Dream," haunting all human life with leadings to error, failure and ruin?"

The page is filled with equally blasphemous statements. We understand that Dr. McGuire claims we have misinterpreted him. It is too bad that these learned gentlemen are so limited in their vocabulary that they have to use the word "conversion" if they mean something else. If I should say to you that another man, whom I called by name, did something "after his conversion" I would expect you to interpret it to mean that the man had been converted, and in view of the rest that follows on page 1102, Dr. McGuire will have a hard time convincing any thinking man that that is not exactly what he meant in reference to Jesus.

"YOUNG PEOPLE"

"Young People" is a periodical published as a story paper for Sunday Schools. In 1926 a serial ran under the title "The House of Simon" by Ambrose Bailey. I have before me the issue of November 14, 1925, which is the seventh chapter in the serial. The story goes into revolting detail of how a young man acting under orders from the Jewish leaders, inveigled Mary the sister of Martha to slip out of her room at night after everyone else was asleep to go to a dance with him. On the way to the dance he seduced Mary and the waiting guards caught her in the act of adultery and then brought
her to the temple court and accused her before Jesus. This is surely taking liberty with the name and character of an ancient Bible personage; who, of course, is no longer here to defend herself against the yearning of Mr. Bailey to make a good story. I would far rather trust my reputation in the hands of Mary who could wipe the feet of Jesus with her hair, than in the hands of a modern story writer whose mind could conjure up such a revolting episode.

I have before me also a copy of the same paper, issue of June 1, 1935, which carries an article entitled "Gandhi and Imperialism" by Albert E. Bailey, with sub-title, "Go Ye Into All the World and Preach the Gospel."

We quote:

"Go preach the gospel, you little wizened Gandhi squatting defenseless and helpless before the might of an empire! You do not amount to much—only ninety-three pounds of flesh and bones! But thank God you have a weapon that will beat them yet. It is called the Sword of the Spirit. You are sharpening it now in the great dome of a head, behind those near-sighted eyes which are seeing immaterial and eternal things. Preach your gospel of non-resistance, for you have Jesus as your backer...."

"Preach your gospel of brotherhood. Its medicine is good for your untouchable countrymen and your Brahmans as it is good for the white man. Preach your gospel of prayer for more light, of penance for the wrongs others do you, of forgiveness towards those that stone you...."

"Oh, Hindu Gandhi, the command rests upon you as much as it does upon the whites."

And this glorification of Hinduism before the hundreds of thousands of Baptist young people. Under our item on Communism we shall have something more to say about this periodical called "Young People."

VI
THE EDUCATIONAL SITUATION

The most prolific source of Modernistic Baptist preachers is our Baptist schools. I am not in a position to bring a wholesale indictment against all our Baptist schools. I have not had time to investigate every one of them. I am prepared to say however, concerning those which I have investigated, that not one of them is thoroughly sound and true to the faith historically held by Baptists.

FRANKLIN COLLEGE

The Baptist college of the State of Indiana, known as Franklin College certainly does not appeal to orthodox Baptists. Its president, Dr. William M. Spencer, is certainly far from clear as to his position concerning the orthodox faith. Dr. Spencer preached the ordination sermon in connection with a certain ordination within a few miles from me when I was pastor in Elyria, Ohio. In the examination of the candidate, it developed that the young man denied the authority of the scriptures, claimed the doctrine of the virgin birth was of no importance, the death of Christ was purely inspirational, and refused to acknowledge His deity. He was finally ordained by a vote of ten to four, and four not voting. In the executive session which followed the examination, Dr. Spencer, who was then with Hillsdale College, took the floor and pleaded for the young man. While the name of the young man and the place of ordination does not necessarily enter into the present argument, yet knowing the tendency of the opposition to always demand names and places, we anticipate that challenge now by declaring that the young man in question was Mr. Howard B. Jefferson, ordained December 30, 1926, in the First Baptist Church, Norwalk, Ohio.

On March 7, 1934, Dr. Spencer wrote me asking for the privilege of sending Dr. P. L. Powell, dean of Franklin Col-
lege, to Gary to speak to my people in the interest of the college. I wrote Dr. Powell, as follows:

"March 13, 1934

Dr. E. L. Powell
Dean
Franklin College
Franklin, Indiana

Dear Dr. Powell:

Under date of March 7 I received a note from Dr. Spencer calling attention to "Franklin Day" on April 8, and asking for the privilege of assigning you to the pulpit of Central Baptist Church of Gary on that occasion.

You are, of course, aware that many of our Baptist churches are attempting to safeguard their testimony in relation to the historic Baptist faith. Central Church is one of them. Our Baptist schools and seminaries are at the very heart of the present day controversy touching these matters. In view of that fact I deem it wise to ask that a few questions be answered before we make any decision as to "Franklin Day" in Central Church. First of all a few personal questions as to your own views.

1. Do you believe that Jesus Christ was God, pre-existent with the Father, and born of a virgin?
2. Do you believe in the miracles of both the Old and New Testaments?
3. Do you believe that Christ's death upon the cross was substitutionary in the sense that He bore the wrath of God against our sin?
4. Do you believe in the bodily resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ?
5. Do you believe in the bodily resurrection of believers?
6. Do you believe in the personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ to this earth, and if so it is premillennial or postmillennial?
7. Do you believe in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures in the sense that the original manuscripts were verbally inspired?
8. Do you believe in creation by an immediate act of God, or do you accept the Evolutionary theory?

I should like also to know the general position of Franklin College as a College on the above questions.

With every good wish, I am

Yours and His,

R. T. Ketcham."

On March 18, Dr. Powell, replied and I quote the following paragraph:

"The time between now and April 8 would probably be entirely too short for us to satisfy your mind upon the controversial questions which you raise and which you might subsequently raise, even though we thought it worth while to enter upon such an undertaking. In view of these considerations, after consultation with President Spencer, we are withdrawing our request that the College be represented in your Church on the date suggested."

Surely any fair minded person will agree that as pastor of Central Baptist Church we had a perfect right under the circumstances to ask Dr. Powell where he and his school stood before we opened our pulpit to him. But instead of answering these simple questions "Yes" or "No" he takes the position that it is really none of our business what the college believes, and that really after all it is not even worth while to discuss it. I quote the last two paragraphs of my letter to Dr. Powell under date of April 8, because they briefly set forth the logical answer to such an attitude.
"Surely, Dr. Powell, we had a right, in these days especially, to ask these simple questions, particularly when the College was coming here to ask for the support of Central Church. Your refusal to answer these questions says in essence "It is none of your business what we believe." It is just such attitudes as this on the part of our denominational leaders which makes it impossible for hundreds of Baptist Churches to support Denominational programs.

"The scriptural injunction is "be ready to give an answer to everyone that asketh for the hope that lieth in you" and when a man is asked in all Christian courtesy if he believes that Jesus Christ was God, pre-existent with the Father and born of a virgin, and that His death upon the cross bore the wrath of God against our sins, and he refuses to answer, he cannot blame his questioner if he assumes that his reason for silence is due to the fact that he does not believe it."

Last November, the Michigan state B. Y. P. U. convention was held in Grand Rapids. Dr. Spencer was one of the speakers. At the close of the service, some young people interviewed him. The actual quotations of the interview are as follows:

"Question: How in your estimation can one obtain salvation?

Dr. Spencer: By accepting Christ and by trying to live up to His ideals.

Question: Then don't you believe in salvation through the blood alone?

Dr. Spencer: Shibboleth! It is just a difference of the place of emphasis. You stress the blood and we stress the moral attributes that can be developed within the individual."

In the 1935 Indiana Baptist Annual, on Page 24, the committee of seven appointed by the State Convention to investigate the entire situation in the Convention, reporting on Franklin College says the following:

"There is a strong desire all over the state that Franklin shall be so distinctively Baptist and so loyal to the Word of God in spirit and in influences, that it may receive the hearty support of all our pastors and churches. There have been severe criticisms. Many of these have not been based on facts. But wherever anything has been contrary to the truth, changes should be courageously made. We recommend that immediate steps be taken by the trustees of Franklin College and the Indiana Baptist Convention board, to make Franklin College a distinctively Baptist institution. We further recommend that as soon as this is assured, the Indiana Baptist Convention approve a launching of a campaign to increase the student body, etc."

Here then, is only a little of the evidence which can be brought forth in the case of Franklin College to cause Baptist parents to have some fear concerning the future Baptist faith of their children when once they are sent to Franklin.

**OHIO COLLEGES**

The text "Problems of Conduct" by Drake was used in both Baptist colleges in the State of Ohio in their course in Ethics. A few quotations from this book will show that it has no place in a Baptist College.

"How can we know what is the will of God except by considering what makes for human welfare? Our Bible is but one of a number of holy books which are held to be a revelation of God's will. Even if we grant the superior authority of the Hebrew-Christian Bible, can we rely on its teachings implicitly?" Page 161.
"Finally, we have a duty to those dumb brothers of ours, the animal species that share with us the earth."

Page 232.

"It should be possible for any man or woman to find deliverance from an intolerable and apparently irremedial situation without expense, publicity, or any imputation of scandal. Divorce is always a sad matter, but is occasionally as necessary as a surgical operation and should be essentially a private arrangement. It is doubtful whether any moral end is served by requiring 'grounds' for divorce to be shown—as proof of infidelity, cruelty, or the like; most of these alleged reasons for divorce at present are false and exaggerated pretexts offered to satisfy the law. The fundamental ground for most divorces is that the couple have found that they cannot be happy, cannot be their best selves together."

Pages 227-228.

Another text used in the Ohio schools is "The Teachings of Jesus" by Stevens.

It was this very book that caused me twenty years ago to abandon my course in Crozier Theological Seminary. It is shot through and through with Modernism, a sample or two of which is hereby given: Speaking of Jesus' teaching concerning His second coming the author takes the position that Jesus was mistaken in His notions concerning it, or that those who recorded His words deliberately wrote into them the apocalyptic viewpoint. After discussing these theories through several pages he comes to his conclusion, page 175, and says, "Traces of the original meaning of Jesus are by no means wanting."

"The Life of Paul" by Robinson is another text used in the Ohio schools.

An illustration of the attitude of the whole book is found on page 123 where the earthquake which released Paul and Silas is said to be simply one of the many natural earthquakes common in that country. In passing I would remark that it was "some NATURAL earthquake" that could shake the fetters off the wrists and ankles of prisoners, and yet leave the prisoners unhurt by the shaking! It is rather strange, too, that the jailor's home next door was not even touched by this NATURAL earthquake! We have often noticed that in doing away with the scriptural miracle our Modernist friends put themselves in the position of being forced to accept an explanation which presents a greater miracle than the one they set aside.

Another characteristic sample of the book is found on pages 39 and 40.

"In II Cor. 12:7 he speaks of a 'thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet me.' Many are the explanations of this thorn. Among the various explanations which most nearly fit Paul's references is that under special excitement he was subject to sudden attacks of violent headaches or dizziness, or even fainting." Who, Paul or the author?

CROZIER

Dr. Milton G. Evans, while President of Crozier said: "We have men working in the field of evangelism. Especially in the foreign fields, like China, and other countries we have already many of our Modernist men working there. We are continually gaining new ground."

When asked, "What about your prospects in America?"

Dr. Evans replied, "Very good, indeed. Why every year our leading seminaries, Colgate, Rochester, Chicago Divinity School, Newton Center, and our own Crozier are turning out New Theology men who are speedily filling the pulpits of our land."

Dr. A. S. Hobart of Crozier in his "Transplanted Truth from Romans,"
page 29, says, "I cannot see anything understandable or acceptable in the theory that my guilt and my penalty were placed upon Christ, or that Christ’s holiness is imparted to me, in any way that involves a substitution of His holiness for mine or my suffering for what was due me, that view of the theory of the atonement finds no foothold in my conscience or my reason."

The late Professor Vedder of Crozier said, "Of all the slanders men have perpetrated against the Most High, this is positively the most impudent, the most insulting. No sin cannot be escaped by a bloody sacrifice. Jesus never taught and never authorized anybody to teach in His name that 'He suffered in our stead, and bore the penalty of our sins.'"

---

ROCHESTER

In 1917 Rochester was deeply tainted as evidenced by the professorship of Walter Rauschenbusch, who spoke of "The Blessed Skepticism of the Age of Enlightenment." He further says, "What the death of Jesus now does for us, the death of the prophets did for Him." In addition he says, "Speaking of Democracy, we must democratize the conception of God and then, he declares, "The worst thing that could happen to God would be to remain an Autocrat while the world is moving towards democracy—he would be de-throned with the rest."

Prof. George B. Cross of Rochester says, "And now after the lapse of all intervening centuries it is still an open question whether after all it was not misleading to call Jesus the Christ."

When Prof. Cross was elected to the Rochester faculty it was none other than Dr. Strong who said, "I regard that election as the greatest calamity that has come to the Seminary. It was the entrance of an agnostic, skeptical, and anti-Christian element into its teaching, the result of which will be only evil."

---

BROWN

Pres W. H. P. Faunce says, "We are not absolutely sure as to just how religion came into existence any more than we are sure as to how human life itself arose."

Professor Errett Gates, Chicago University in his "The Development of Modern Christianity," sums up the training of all of these schools when he says, "It has gradually dawned upon the entire missionary management, at home and abroad, that the old approach to non-Christian peoples, on the basis of the old religious ideas, and methods, and in the old spirit, was one of the principal causes of 'The Failure of Modern Missions,' and there has recently appeared among missionary leaders an outspoken approval of and an eager resort to modern religious ideas for the solution of problems in the mission field."

---

DES MOINES

Another evidence of the situation within our schools was disclosed when the Baptist Bible Union took over Des Moines University. For some time charges had been made of the presence of Modernism in Des Moines. Iowa state and national leaders, however, emphatically denied the truth of the charges. In fact, several Baptist pastors in the State of Iowa lost "endorsement" because of their criticism of the university, but when we took over the control of the university we found as Dean of the Pharmacy Department a prominent Unitarian. He had been with the university for twenty years. We found that the head professor in the Biology Department was the rankest kind of an evolutionist with a written statement from the board of trustees that he could teach any kind of evolution he desired. We found the teacher in the Philosophy Department an atheistic evolutionist. The dean of the Bible Department was a full-blown Modernist. Others were found equally unsound, all of whom
A booklet twice the size of this entire work could be written dealing with the educational situation in Baptist schools, but here again, as everywhere else in this booklet, we must confine ourselves to short articles from a limitless field, and present typical cases only.

THE CERTAIN HARVEST

The effects of some of this education is seen in the following instance. A Colgate Rochester Seminary student pastor, preached in the Lincoln Baptist Church New York, on Sunday evening, May 6, 1934. His subject was "Birth Control." The young student pastor, just fresh from his class room, referred to the over abundance of fish we would have in the ocean if all the eggs hatched, and so we must limit our offspring by proper methods. He then invited the young men present who wanted more advance information to see him, and the young women present could go and see his wife. This young Baptist preacher has since, by the aid and cooperation of state secretaries, been transferred to a pulpit in the state of Wisconsin.

Someone may say, "What right have we to make his school responsible for such nonsense?" The answer is at hand. On December 10, 1933, only five months before he preached this sermon, Professor Charles C. Webber, industrial secretary of the World Fellowship of Reconciliation (main purpose to work for the recognition of Soviet Russia) was brought in to Colgate Divinity School to address the student body. We quote from his address as reported in the Rochester Journal.

"Communist and socialist principles will be taught by the missionaries of the future in an attempt to overthrow capitalism. Capitalism is un-Christian and unethical, and must give way to socialism and communism, and the missionaries of the future must be social revolutionists. The missionary of tomorrow will show the workers of the Orient how they can bring about the abolition of capitalism by cooperative organizations, trade unions and socialistic political parties, and the missionary of the future will allow these organizations to hold meetings in his church. He will sustain the workers in their efforts by picketing with strikers and organizing protest meetings against police interference. Missionaries should establish birth control clinics, so that workers can control the population of the world and thus better their standards of living."

VII

MODERNISM AN ORGANIZED SYSTEM OF DELIBERATE DISHONESTY

We are fully conscious of the seriousness of this charge. When we say that modernism is an organized system of deliberate dishonesty we certainly should be prepared to defend ourselves. We submit herewith documentary evidence in substantiation of this claim.

I quote a letter written by Rev. C. E. Tulga, at the time pastor of the First Baptist Church, Galeton, Pennsylvania, to Dr. Milton G. Evans, then President of Crozier Baptist Theological Seminary.

"A church near here is very anxious to secure a pastor and they want a pastor who will not fall in line with the fundamentalists of the Association. Mr. S________, at present a pastor in New Jersey, has been recommended. Some say he is a funda-
mentalist, and some say he isn’t. In view of the fact that fundamentalism is on a rampage in this Association it becomes an important question.

"Could you conscientiously recommend Mr. S——— to a church that wants a liberal pastor?"

Very truly yours,

(Signed) C. E. Tulga."

To this letter Dr. Milton G. Evans personally replied as follows:

"Dear Brother:

"Yours of May IV inquiring about Mr. S——— received.

"I can conscientiously recommend Mr. S——— to any church that wants a liberal pastor. He is thoroughly modern in his approach to the Bible, and questions of Baptist church polity. I do not know a more enthusiastic and constructive pastor than Mr. S———. He has done good work wherever he has been.

"I am wondering if it is not a tribute to him that some people cannot locate him—they cannot determine whether he is a fundamentalist or a modernist. When he has occasion to speak he speaks decidedly against the fundamentalists, but he is not combative. He wins. He has won a great many disposed to be fundamentalist to the modernist group by his tactfulness, and by his undoubted Christian devotion to the good of his people.

"If I were a member of any church thinking of him for pastor I would unhesitatingly vote for him."

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Milton G. Evans.

Here is the signed statement of one of the most noted outstanding Baptist leaders in the Northern Baptist Convention, passing a tribute to an outright modernist who, by his tactfulness (literally dishonesty) wins many from the fundamental position to the modern position. If this is not both deliberate and dishonest then we need a new dictionary.

That this is a real system operating among modernists is demonstrated by the fact that this same language is used in many of our Baptist Schools. Several years ago when Rev. Donald J. Dunkin, now pastor of the Berean Baptist Church of Elkhart, Indiana was attending Chicago University Divinity School, one of his professors gave deliberate instruction that if one of the graduates should find himself in a fundamentalist church, he should for the most part use fundamental phraseology, with his own modernistic interpretation.

Other definite instances of such procedure are on file in my office. In this connection the passage in II Peter 2:3 is tremendously interesting. The verse reads "And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you." I was startled recently to discover that this word translated "feigned" in the King James Version is in the literal translated "forged." The Spirit of God, through Peter, declares that these modernistic teachers, through covetousness (for their salaries’ sake) make merchandise of you, by the use of forged words. Now a forged word is a correct word used for wrong purposes, and by the wrong person. If I forge a check on John Doe I cannot disguise signing it John Smith. Here is God’s divine revelation of the truth involved in the heading of this item—Modernism is an organized system of deliberate dishonesty.

VIII

THE CONVENTIONS AND HYPOCRISY

Space forbids us to cite many cases in substantiation of the assertion that our Conventions often act in a hypocritical fashion. One or two will suffice.
CASE NUMBER ONE

At the last annual meeting of the Indiana Baptist Convention held in Greensburg, October, 1935, a Confession of Faith was presented by a Committee, appointed the year before to bring in recommendations for better efficiency in the State work. The Confession of Faith which this Committee presented would satisfy the heart of any loyal Baptist. It is a clear cut declaration of the old historic Baptist position.

On Wednesday morning it was presented to the Convention for action. Five hours of hot debate followed. At a late hour in the afternoon it was finally adopted with the following amendment: "With the understanding that it is not to be used as a test of fellowship, service or membership in the Indiana Baptist Convention, nor in any of its departments."

I have shown this report to at least 50 different individuals and without a single exception they instantly look up and say "Well, why adopt it then?" That is exactly what we would like to know. However, we have a pretty thorough conviction as to why. For instance in a recent issue of the Baptist Observer Dr. Parsons says that when Dr. Ketcham says that Indiana Baptists are not orthodox he is "worthy of neither confidence nor respect" and then refers to the glorious Confession of Faith adopted by the Convention as proof of his assertion.

In another recent issue of the same paper Dr. Hillyer Stratton, who signs himself "member Executive Committee Fundamentalist Movement N. B. C.", declares that "The Indiana Baptist Convention is 99 44/100% Fundamental. This was made so clear at the State Convention at Greensburg that only one who willfully desired to pervert the truth could claim otherwise. It would have been impossible for the doctrinal statement that was adopted to have been more Fundamental, and it was adopted unanimously."

The reason for the adoption of such a Confession begins to be apparent. Whenever we declare that the Convention has in it elements of Modernism the leaders can frantically pick up this Confession of Faith and wave it in the air declaring that this is what we believe, therefore anyone who declares to the contrary is a liar. I know Dr. Stratton uses the more moderate term "willful perversion of the truth", but out where we come from it means the same thing. Dr. Stratton's 99 44/100% of Fundamental Baptists must be reduced to a state of anemic helplessness when the other 56/100% can hold them at bay for five hours before they can pass their own Confession of Faith, and then after it is passed pull all the teeth out of it and remove all the jaw bone, so that if a Modernist should ever get his finger in the month of the thing it couldn't even pinch him, let alone bite him!

Under the amendment tacked onto this Confession of Faith a man who believes absolutely nothing could act as State Secretary, Director of Young Peoples Work or any other position in the State Convention, without violating the provision one iota. We unhesitatingly charge this to be an hypocritical act.

CASE NUMBER TWO

We go back to the 1925 Northern Baptist Convention held in Washington, D. C. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, in his acceptance of the call to the pastorate of the Park Avenue Baptist Church of New York City, had laid down, among other conditions, that of "open membership." The membership of the church was to be open to anyone who wanted to join it, regardless of Baptism. This, of course, was an abandonment of historic Baptist practice. The Constitution of the Northern Baptist Convention, as at that time set up, would make it impossible for the Park Avenue Baptist Church to seat delegates at the annual Conventions with such a provision obtaining in their own local practice. In view of the fact that the Park Avenue Church was also Mr. Rockefeller's
Church, and in view of the fact that the Convention found itself faced with the necessity of refusing to seat delegates from the Park Avenue Church, quite obviously something had to be done.

At the Seattle Convention in 1924 a Committee was appointed to draft an amendment to the Constitution so that the Park Avenue Church might be in good standing in the Convention. This Committee met in Chicago, drafted the proposed amendment, and it was published in the Denominational papers the required length of time prior to the Washington Convention. The proposed amendment was as follows: "The Northern Baptist Convention recognizes its constituency as consisting solely of those Baptist churches in which the immersion of believers is recognized as the only scriptural baptism; and the Convention hereby declares that only immersed members will be recognized as delegates to the Convention."

We charge this amendment with being hypocritical on two counts. First, the very fact of the amendment itself puts the Convention in a hypocritical position. Through all time Baptists have insisted that the baptistry should be at the door of entrance into the local Church, and not relegated to some optional place in the rear. We have insisted that the Church is a body of baptized believers. We have insisted that the local church should be a body of baptized believers because the invisible church is exactly that. According to I Corinthians 12:12 and 13 we are all members of one body and in one Spirit are all baptised into that one body. Here we are told that the only way a believer gets into the invisible body of Christ, which is His Church, is to be baptized into it in the Spirit. As Baptists we believe, therefore, that the believer should enter the local Church which is the earthly and outward symbol of that Heavenly and invisible body, by the same method through which he entered the Spiritual reality, namely, by baptism. The symbol should not be broken. If we enter the Spiritual Body through believing and being baptized in the Spirit, we should, therefore, enter the earthly body through believing and being baptized in water.

Why should all of this glorious heritage of faith and practice be amended out of the Constitution in order to make room for a Church which no longer believes it? We have a suspicion which amounts to a certainty that had it been a poor Baptist Church, with a membership made up of poor people who had asked to have their delegates seated in the Convention, while practicing open church membership, there would have been no machinery set in motion to amend the Constitution to let them in. We unhesitatingly charge this whole affair was a miserable gesture of submission to the millions of Mr. Rockefeller. The fact that Mr. Rockefeller has since announced the withdrawal of his gifts in no wise affects the hypocrisy of the Convention's action in Washington in 1925. If it does anything at all it simply adds new emphasis to the utterance of Scripture that "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap."

In the second place, we charge the amendment with being hypocritical in its wording. Instead of wording the amendment in such a fashion that everyone understood it was opening the door to open church membership, the amendment was so adroitly worded that it has to be read several times over before even a trained mind discovers what is wrong with it. The amendment declares that the Convention considers "its constituency as consisting solely of those Baptist churches in which the immersion of believers is recognized as the only scriptural baptism." I have handled this resolution to literally dozens of men and women and almost without exception they say "Why that amendment stands for an immersed membership." And not until it is pointed out that the word used is "recognized" instead of "practiced," and that even then it doesn’t require the practice to be a prerequisite to Church membership, do they suddenly realize the actual meaning of the text.
Hast the amendment read as follows: everyone would have understood the issue: "The Northern Baptist Convention recognizes its constituency as consisting of Baptist churches regardless of whether immersion is practiced as a prerequisite to membership, but that only immersed members will be seated as delegates to the Convention." Everybody would then have known what the amendment was actually saying, but this was exactly what the leaders of the Convention didn't want the people to know.

Over against this amendment a substitute amendment was proposed. The amendment read as follows: "The Northern Baptist Convention recognizes its constituency as consisting solely of these Baptist Churches in which the immersion of believers is recognized and practiced as a prerequisite to membership." This was simple and straightforward, nevertheless because of the fog in the original amendment, and the fine platform work of the Convention Fundamentalists, Dr. Virgin, of Chicago, Dr. Masse, Dr. Boyanton and Dr. J. Whitchurch, the Convention voted for the original amendment against the substitute by an overwhelming majority of more than two to one.

Now, the Church for which the leaders went to all this trouble has even dropped the name "Baptist" from its title, and the man whose money it was designed to hold, has hidden a fond adrift!

CASE NUMBER THREE

Another glaring instance of hypocritical action on the part of Convention leaders was the famous amendment presented at the meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention in Indianapolis. While this instance happened several years ago, yet it is constantly being referred to by Convention leaders whenever it serves their purpose to do so.

One night nearly 300 fundamental Baptists met for conference in the Palm Room of the Claypool Hotel. After several hours of discussion and conference we decided to ask the Convention the next day to go on record as reaffirming its faith in the old New Hampshire Confession of Faith.

I shall never forget that night. Brother Joshua Gravitt of Denver, Colo., stood before us and read the New Hampshire Confession throughout. The Spirit of God came upon that group and great, strong men sobbed as the glorious realization of all the precious truth involved in that Confession, gripped our hearts afresh. It was decided that Dr. W. B. Riley should read this Confession on the floor of the Convention the next day, and move that it be adopted by the Convention as a reaffirmation of their faith. Perhaps one of the most tense moments in all Northern Baptist Convention history followed Dr. Riley's reading of that document.

I shall never forget the remark made by Mr. James Colgate, a prominent Convention official. As he came to the platform to speak, the motion he said: "Well, so that's the New Hampshire Confession of Faith, huh? I thought Dr. Riley was reading from the back of a Western Union Telegram blank." Suddenly Dr. Cornelius Wolfkin arose with a substitute motion which was as follows: "Resolved that we accept the New Testament as our ground of faith and practice, and that Baptists need no other Confession." This substitute motion carried by almost three to one.

The hypocrisy of Dr. Wolfkin's motion was fully revealed when only a few weeks after the Indianapolis Convention, he preached a sermon in his own Park Avenue pulpit in New York City, pleading for admission to the circle of Christian fellowship of such groups as Christian Scientists and Spiritualists, etc. The old historic terminology used the words "rule of faith and practice." Dr. Wolfkin deliberately changed the word "rule" to "principle." When you use a rule you must use it all or you must use any section of it in its proper relation to the rest of the rule. But
when the New Testament was put down simply as the ground of our faith and practice it meant that you could go anywhere in the New Testament, make it mean anything you wanted to, so long as you claimed justification for your position by some interpretation which you might place upon the New Testament.

Dr. Wolflin's substitute motion also put the delegates in a position of technically voting against the New Testament if they voted against his amendment. So far as we know, there never has been such an hypocritical move made in the history of the Northern Baptist Convention, as was witnessed during that session. And yet within the past year I have had letters from Baptist leaders in the State of Indiana pointing to the professed orthodoxy of the Northern Baptist Convention because it accepted the New Testament at Indiana!

IN CONCLUSION ON MODERNISM

Perhaps no more forceful argument can be advanced for our contention that old-fashioned Baptists ought not to stay in and support such a honeycombed organization as the N. B. C. than an article taken from page 4 of the 1933 Annual Report of the American Association For the Advancement of Atheism, Inc.

"Modernists" Smoke Screen

"The Modernists seem to attack Atheism only to screen their own unbelief. No better proof of our contention that the Church is losing can be given than that the Modernists are now in control of all the larger Protestant denominations and, working from the inside, discredit the basic teachings of Christianity in the name of Christianity.

Dumb Fundamentalists

"In this grand grand farce, fortunately for us, the dumb Fundamentalists through contributions pay for the destruction of their own belief in this Bible as a superhuman, infallible book. The Modernists are superior in strategy. When recently President Smith twitted the Rev. Riley with these facts, the Fundamentalist leader boasted of what he would do at the recent annual conference in Washington of the Northern Baptists. But at that and the other denominational conventions this Spring the Fundamentalists were defeated. They are hopelessly beaten. They cannot vote the Modernists out and dare not themselves withdraw. These two groups are held together by real estate.

Acme of Absurdity

"Higher Critics within the Church, carrying on the work of Voltaire, Paine and Ingersoll, in milder language, it is admitted, have made many Christians so ashamed of their creed that we now hear of that acme of absurdity, 'a creedless faith'—of persons who believe, without believing anything. Thus Christianity slowly dissolves.

Atheists Lead, Modernists Follow

"But the good work of these Modernists not only does not lessen the need of Atheist propaganda but instead serves to emphasize its importance. Though its activities are on a small scale, the Advance Guard is always the most important unit in the army. We must continue to lead the way."

BAPTIST CHURCHES HAVE A RIGHT TO WITHDRAW

In support of this assertion we quote from Hiscox Directory for Baptist Churches. This book is published by the American Baptist Publication Society, and from the publisher's note on page 3 we quote, "We commend with increased confidence the new Directory to the favor of American Baptists as a
sound and scriptural exposition of New Testament Church polity as represented by our faith and practice."

On page 4, five outstanding Baptists of former days are quoted as commending this Directory: Dr. Hovey, then President of Newton Theological Seminary, Dr. Strong, then President of Rochester Theological Seminary, Dr. Weston, then President of Groomer Theological Seminary, Dr. Corey, then President of Richmond Theological Seminary, Dr. MacArthur, then Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York. This then sets Hiscox Directory squarely before us as a sound and capable guide for Baptist Churches in the matter of polity.

On page 335 speaking of Associations Dr. Hiscox says: "No Church is under obligation to affiliate with it; and any connected Church can withdraw cooperation, at any time, for any reasons which seem to itself sufficient, without prejudice to either its evangelical or its denominational reputation and standing." Here then is the straight out statement that a Baptist Church can withdraw from the organized work at any time and for reasons sufficient to no one but itself, without prejudice to its denominational reputation and standing. In other words Dr. Hiscox is stating what we have been trying to present for years, namely, that the Conventions and Associations are not the Denomination. Therefore, when a Church withdraws from a Convention or an Association it does not cease to be a Baptist Church.

The Central Baptist Church of Gary, Indiana withdraw from the Conventions February 13, 1935. We are now being published all over the State as no longer a Baptist Church. Dr. T. J. Parsons, Executive Secretary, so declares. In view of this it is interesting to quote from the Indiana Baptist Observer, issue of May 12, 1921, when Dr. Parsons was the Editor and Manager. He runs an article on page 5 by M. C. Longh on "Civil and Religious Liberty." At the head of the article Dr. Parsons has an editor's note in which he comments the article and says that it is so good that he is passing it on to his readers. I quote from this article: "True, Baptist Churches form Associations, and these Associations may make up a General Association, which is a State organization, and these State Associations may unite in National Conventions, but none of these bodies possess any authority over a local Baptist Church. If a Baptist Church does not wish to affiliate with an Association it can drop out of the Association, but there is no way of keeping the congregation from going on in its own way as a regular Baptist Church so long as it observes the scriptural principles adhered to by the Denomination."

CORRECTION FROM WITHIN HOPELESS

We believe it to be an utterly hopeless task to attempt to bring to pass any adequate correction from within of the evils either of Modernism already outlined, or of Communism which is set forth in the last section of this book. There are many reasons which lead us to this conviction, but we present one that is foremost in our mind, namely, the voting power of the paid secretarial staff. My good friend, Dr. W. B. Riley, who does not agree with any position of withdrawal, but feels that the situation can be corrected from within, is himself the most ready of all to admit the seriousness of this particular phase of the situation. He has said to me often, "Ketchum, we must disfranchise the salaried servants of the Convention, for they hold the balance of power on any vote taken." The inevitable reply to such a statement is that as long as the salaried servants have a right to vote, they would of course have a right to vote on any such resolutions calling for the surrender of their voting power. Since by Dr. Riley's own admission, they now hold the balance of power on any vote, how then can they be disfranchised? One would hardly expect them to vote in favor of dis-
franchising themselves! That the salaried servant group in the Northern Baptist Convention does hold the balance of power has been proved many times.

At the Northern Baptist Convention held in Chicago, the militant Fundamentalist group presented a complete ballot for all Convention offices and committees. The names on this ballot were taken from the original Convention ballot in every instance where the individual was known to be Fundamental, substitutions being made for only such as were known to be untrue to the historic Baptist faith. Then the entire ballot was printed and distributed on the floor of the Convention along with the Convention ballot. Every delegate in the audience held in his hand two ballots. If he wanted to vote a mixed ticket of Modernists and Fundamentalists, all he had to do was to mark the Convention ballot. If he wanted to vote a straight Fundamental ticket, all he had to do was to mark the other ballot. There was no cause for confusion and neither was there any confusion. We have forgotten the exact figures, but we do recall distinctly that the margin by which the Convention ballot won over the substituted ballot was less than the number of salaried servants of the Conventions (State and National), who were present at the Chicago Convention. In other words, had the salaried servants of the Northern Baptist Convention and its affiliate state conventions, been barred from voting that day, the Fundamentalist ticket would have won. This has happened on many occasions.

One may rest assured that the army of salaried servants, secretaries, undersecretaries, clerks, assistants, etc., will pretty much as a whole, vote the machine program. We believe that the disfranchisement of the servants of the Convention is a sound policy, but how it can be done without a vote of the Convention is another matter, and since the army of salaried servants can vote on the issue of disfranchisement, well—there you are!

CONVENTION VERSUS DENOMINATION

Baptists everywhere need to keep in mind that the Convention is not the Denomination. We know full well that the Convention officials make the words synonymous, but that does not make it so. They contend that a church which withdraws from the Northern Baptist Convention has thereby withdrawn from the Denomination. A moment's sober reflection will reveal that this cannot be. If the Northern Baptist Convention is the Baptist Denomination, then we would ask what is the Southern Baptist Convention? The Canadian Baptist Convention? The English Baptist Union, etc.? It ought to be self-evident at once that no Baptist church has to belong to any certain organized group of Baptist churches in order to be "in the Denomination." The Denomination is larger than any or all Conventions. The Denomination was here long, long centuries before the Conventions arrived. Central Baptist Church of Gary, Indiana, and scores of other Baptist churches have withdrawn from the Conventions, but by no means have they withdrawn from the Denomination. If we had done that, we would not be bothering ourselves with the presentation of the evidence in this book.
Reproduction of
THE MOST BLASPHEMOUS CARTOON EVER PRINTED
Showing the real spirit of the Bolshevik Movement—Atheistic,
Anti-Christian.

Translation of the caption:
"TAKE, EAT, THIS IS MY BODY." (Matt. 26:26)
A front page cartoon, reproduced in original colours, from The Godless,
illustrated anti-religious weekly PUBLISHED IN MOSCOW BY THE COM-
MUNIST PARTY OF RUSSIA. A careful study of the detail will disclose a
particularly vicious sacrilege, depicted in a style now called "advanced" or
"Russian" art.
? Can We ? Prevent War
Will We Stop Fascism?

These are vital and imminent questions confronting every worker, farmer, professional, and every honest middle-class person.

Professor Robert Morss Lovett, veteran champion of peace and the more abundant life, will discuss these questions.

That preparations for fascism and war are going on with increasing speed is indicated by the newspapers, radio, huge war appropriations, C. C. C. camps, Hearst, Huey Long, Coughlin, N. R. A., terror and double-cross in strikes, inflation (reduction of buying power), etc.

Shall we go through the horrors of another war (compared to which the last war was a children's squabble and in which the civilian population will suffer as much as those at the front) to make again several thousand new war millionaires?

Shall we be lied and fooled into another war by their propaganda of defense, democracy; (blood) prosperity, yellow or red menace, etc? We must unite regardless of social, religious, or political views to defeat the imperialist war makers and head off fascism. We must fight against being used as cannon fodder and coolie slaves.

The American League Against War and Fascism, a part of the International League Against War and Fascism, is such an organization. The local branch meets in the Brooks House every Friday evening at 8 p.m. and invites you to these meetings.

If you want the proofs of the danger of war and fascism in the U. S. and want to know the program of the American League Against War and Fascism come and bring your friends to listen to

(Professor Robert Morss Lovett)
of Chicago University and vice chairman of the League, and local speakers.

TUESDAY EVENING, APRIL 23
at 7:30 p. m.
(Brooks House Auditorium)
Corner Conkey Street and Howard Avenue
PART TWO
Communism

I
WHAT IS COMMUNISM

Through the years our heart has been made heavy by the presence of modernism stalking through the corridors of our denominational work, but now we have the added spectacle of Communism joining hands with it and these two monsters are becoming so thoroughly entrenched that we actually despair of recovery. What is Communism? Perhaps this poster which lies before me may give us some idea. This cartoon is reproduced from “The Godless” an illustrated anti-religious weekly, published in Moscow by the Communist party of Russia. Underneath the cartoon are these words, “Take, eat, this is my body. Matthew 26:26.” The center figure in this cartoon is a grotesque caricature of the Lord Jesus Christ. Swarming around and over his body is a horde of men and women. One woman has just pulled a great chunk of flesh from one of the legs of Christ and is gnawing away at it. A man is pictured eating away a foot. Others seem to be tearing an arm from the Savior and greedily running away to eat it. A great hole has been poked in the side of Christ and blood is gushing forth being caught in a big container preparatory to drinking. The most revolting of all is found when we see the abdomen of the Saviour opened and men and women eating the intestines. This is the Communist view of the broken body and shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Further evidence of their attitude toward Christianity is to be found in such horrifying examples as the beheading, almost within the last year, of our two young friends John and Betty Stam on the mission fields in China. A sixteen year old Communist wielded the sword that beheaded Betty.

Much more space could be taken up with the presentation of such evidence. The boast of the Communist leaders of Russia is that they will annihilate God from the face of the earth and likewise from His Heavens. We shall refer later on in this article to the pacifist attitude of the Communist party in the United States.

COMMUNISM IN BAPTIST RANKS
COLGATE-ROCHESTER DIVINITY SCHOOL

The purpose of this article is to show so far as possible in the space permitted, just how Communism has entrenched itself in Baptist ranks. At the very outset let it be understood that I do not charge any Baptist leader with actually being a Communist. So far as I know, no Baptist actually belongs to the Communist party, but what we do contend and shall demonstrate is that on the part of some of the leaders, there is an increasing sympathy with and propagation of some of the Communist principles which are most deadly.

On December 10, 1933, Professor Charles C. Weber, Industrial Secretary of the World Fellowship of Reconciliation (organized to bring about the recognition of Russia) spoke before the student body of Colgate Rochester Divinity School in Rochester, New York. He announced that the future missionary would have to be a teacher of Communist and Socialistic principles if he expects to be a success. Quoting from his address, I read:

"The missionary of the future will sustain the workers in their efforts by picketing with strikers and organize protest meetings against police interference. Missionaries..."
should establish birth control clinics. 
... He will point out the contribu-
tion of Soviet Russia in her at-
ttempt to establish a new social or-
der."

When it is remembered that Dr. Al-
bert W. Beaven, president of this di-
vinity school, at that time was presi-
dent of the Northern Baptist Conven-
tion, and that he is now vice-president of the World's Baptist Alliance, and when it is further known that he con-
doned the appearance of Mr. Weber be-
fore the student body, the implications are not the most reassuring.

ROCHESTER BAPTISTS SOCIALIST

In this same city of Rochester, Sep-
tember 28, 1934, the Baptist Union comprised of all the Baptist churches of Rochester and vicinity, passed a res-
olution which is state Socialism pure and simple. It contained four recom-
mandations, as follows:

1. Society, or people acting through the state, shall assume control of all natural resources of the nation.

2. Society shall control or own all natural monopolies in relation to the necessities of modern living.

3. Society should control or own competitive businesses that control the necessities of life. Competitive profit systems should be restricted to non-essentials of life.

4. Society should take over entire control of money and banking functions conducted as non-profit producing social service.

DR. ALBERT W. BEAVEN

Dr. Beaven, president of Rochester Colgate Divinity School, vice-president of the World's Baptist Alliance, former president of the Northern Baptist Con-
vention, and former president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, on November 30 signed a letter to the President of the United States, which purported to speak for the ministers in which he says: "You have done far more than any previous adminis-
tration, but they (the ministers) are convinced that you have not gone far enough." In a later paragraph in the letter which Dr. Beaven signed, he shows upon the use of police and mili-
tia for the quelling of strike riots. The letter urges the President to take "dras-
tic steps" to bring about further improve-
ment. "This improvement," says Dr. Beaven, "involves transferring the distribution of the necessities of life as well as other consumptive goods to co-operatives. It involves the national-
ization of the basic industries. . . . To the extent that you take steps to make these fundamental changes, we can and will support you."

Dr. Beaven is also a sponsor in Ro-
chester for the League of Industrial Democracy. The League is Communi-
tic to its very foundation and is headed by Robert Morss Lovett, whom even a whitewashing legislative committee could not swallow.

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ACTION

At its convention in Rochester, New York, in 1934, the Northern Baptist Conven-
tion appointed a committee of nine known as the Commission on Christian Social Action to bring in a definite re-
port on all matters involved. The Conven-
tion ordered that the committee's re-
port should be published in denominational papers at least one month before the 1935 convention in Colorado Springs. The first release of the report of the Committee of nine created such a storm of protest that the committee eliminated some of its most radical recommenda-
tions before it made its official report to the Convention.

From page Seven of this report I quote:
"On April 24 and 25, 1925, a committee of the commission met in Chicago immediately in advance of the release of the report for publication after it had been reviewed and approved by all the members of the commission."

Here is the admission that the Social Commission's report in its original form as well as in its final form, was approved by nine men and women who are of sufficient prominence in Baptist circles to be named upon this most important commission. From page eleven of the final report, I quote:

"The course of sanity and safety for America is to assure these liberties (civil liberties) even for those whose ideas are admittedly contrary to our established order and religious faith, and whose political philosophy would deny these liberties to others were they in power."

The last few words of this quotation certainly describe perfectly the Communist party. From page fifteen, I quote:

"We stand for a cooperative commonwealth."

A very familiar term in the parlance of Communists. On page eighteen of the report, the commission frankly endorses and recommends the Consumers Cooperatives. This of course is a blow at all private industry and individual initiative. Quotimg from J. B. Warbasec's book, "Cooperative Democracy" Page 258 I read:

"The ultimate aim of the Consumers movement should be to purchase the land from the farmers and employ the latter as agricultural worker."

The Communist Internationale of July, 1928, says: "The Cooperative League of North America contains considerable left wing elements." Quoting from the same magazine I read:

"The United Workers Cooperative Association of New York City is building a series of houses; controls a number of camps for workers and conducts cultural work on a Communist basis."

THE FAMOUS BROWN ENVELOPE

Last fall every Baptist preacher in the Northern Baptist Convention received a large brown envelope containing in the upper left hand corner these words, "Pastor's Packet for Social Action" from the Northern Baptist Convention, 152 Madison Avenue, New York. The envelope contained eight pieces of literature including the report of the Commission on Christian Social Action presented at Colorado Springs last June, program suggestions for world peace, etc., etc. There was also a four page folder listing publications which Baptist preachers can secure from the National Council for Prevention of War at Washington, D. C. The National Council for Prevention of War has as its executive secretary, Mr. Frederick J. Libby. The Washington Post of January 23, 1926, states:

"Frederick J. Libby, super-pacifist, executive secretary of the National Council for the Prevention of War, yesterday was denied the right to speak in the public schools of the District of Columbia. This was done by the action of the Board of Education in adopting a report presented at yesterday's meeting of the special committee to investigate Libby."

The report said in part, as follows:

"With the desire to be correct in our conclusions we have sought and have carefully studied and considered the masses of records submitted to us, hearing upon the activities of said Libby; and have been controlled by the broad scope and purposes underlying the patriotic organization of which we are members."

"The perusal of the documentary evidence we have had in hand gives
an astounding revelation of the extent and character of the propaganda work throughout the country, originating with the class of revolutionary organizations now operating in this country, whose object and purpose is to undermine and, if possible, to destroy the prosperity now enjoyed by all who live within our borders and who respect our Constitution and laws.

"Through their secret agents and representatives, acting under their orders and instructions, they have become active in their pernicious work; and through organizations pretending to aid the masses, they seek to create discontent, to arouse ill feeling by misrepresenting facts, and so to mislead the uninformed and ignorant classes among our fellow citizens.

"From the evidence submitted to us we have become convinced that Frederick J. Libby is one of the recognized leaders in the movement originated with the avowed enemies of this country."

Seymour Waldman, up until recently was editor of the Bulletins of the National Council for Prevention of War. He is now head of the Washington Bureau of the Communist Daily Worker. With men like this at the head of the National Council for Prevention of War, it would seem a rather strange place to send Baptist preachers for peace material. The famous brown envelope coming from Baptist headquarters contained a 16-page paper called "Peace Action," a great portion of which was written by Frederick J. Libby. The fact that Mr. Libby was barred from the public schools of Washington, D. C., did not bar him from the brown envelope.

---

**MR. LIBBY PROMOTED**

Last December, the entire official family of the Northern Baptist Convention and subsidiary State Conventions met in Chicago in the Stevens Hotel for two or three days of conference. According to the official report of that conference, Mr. Frederick J. Libby delivered an address on "How American Baptists Can Help in the Present World Crisis." Was there no one else in all the United States who could tell American Baptists that, without calling in a man who because of his radical statements is barred from the use of public schools and is recorded by the committee of investigation as one of the country's dangerous enemies?

---

**THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA**

It would take volumes for us to go into all of the ramifications of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, but we make the assertion and have the proof to back it that the Federal Council is tied up hand and glove with some of the most radical Communist leaders and organizations in this country.

On April 1, 1935, the Naval Intelligoence section presented to Congress, a report dealing with their investigation of subversive activities in the United States. They listed several organizations which were carrying on activities subversive to the best interests of the peace and safety of the United States, among them was the American League Against War and Fascism, National Labor Defense, The National Student League, American Civil Liberties Union, The National Council for the Prevention of War, and THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA.

---

**BROOKS HOUSE IN HAMMOND**

The American Baptist Home Mission Society conducts throughout the Northern Baptist Convention territory what they call Christian centers. They are really settlement houses to do work among foreign speaking peoples. Rev. J. M. Hostenes is the director in charge
FACTS FOR BAPTISTS TO FACE

of all these centers numbering around thirty. He is, however, personally in charge of the one located in Hammond, Indiana, known as Brooks House.

On the 24th of January, 1935, Mr. Hestenes opened the auditorium of Brooks House to the Communists of the Calumet region for the purpose of conducting a memorial service in honor of the eleventh anniversary of the death of Lenin. Lydia Oken of the Gary Communist Workers’ School delivered the address on “What Lenin Did for Russia.” According to a poster passed out from door to door in the city of Hammond, the American League Against War and Fascism meets every Friday night in the Brooks House auditorium. The particular handbill which I held advertised Professor Robert Morris Lovett as the speaker for April 23, 1935.

We understand that Mr. Hestenes is insisting that the American League Against War and Fascism is not a Communist organization and therefore he cannot be charged with opening Brooks House to Communists for more than one meeting. Just why he should open it for one, nobody seems to know. But what about the family tree of this American League Against War and Fascism? I quote from the Communist Internationale of January, 1934, page 78. The editor is giving a report of the various activities of the Communist party. He says:

“We (the Communist party) led a highly successful United States congress against war which brought together 2,016 delegates from all over the country . . . . The congress from the beginning was led by our party quite openly . . . . This success was, of course, largely due to the very favorable situation and the position of our party as almost a monopolist of anti-war movement in the United States . . . . The congress set up a permanent organization on a federative basis called the American League Against War and Fascism.”

Please note the open frank statement, that the Communist party considers itself the leader of the monopolist of anti-war propaganda in the United States. This is exactly the charge we have been making and that scores of these apparently disconnected societies and organizations working for non-preparedness in the United States are but affiliated fingers reaching out from the mighty hand of Communism. Be that as it may, here is the open declaration that the American League Against War and Fascism is a child of the Communist outfit. We understand that the League is not now meeting in Brooks House, but we want the reader to understand that they would have been meeting there had it not been for our exposure.

Robert Morris Lovett, Chicago University professor, was ordered removed from the university staff by the Illinois State Legislature, on account of his Communist views and connections, but he was nevertheless an acceptable speaker on the platform of Brooks House. We have been told that he did not speak, but if so, the only reason was because we turned the heat on.

It is more than passing strange that while the Communists are amusing themselves drawing pictures of men and women eating Christ’s intestines, and clipping the heads off of Christian ministers, that the Rev. J. M. Hestenes opens the doors of the American Baptist Home Mission Society’s auditorium to this same crowd. And it is still more than passing strange that while the evidence of all of this has been in the hands of Convention authorities ever since it happened, Mr. Hestenes is still retained, but those of us who produced the evidence have been called “smurks”, “traitors”, “deserters”, “obstructionists”, and in fact anything and everything but Christians.

SUNDAY SCHOOL LITERATURE

The infiltration of this God-deceiving Communism into Baptist circles is fur-
ther seen in some of our Sunday School publications. The American Baptist Publication Society publishes a paper called "Young People" for distribution among the young people of our Sunday Schools. Last June a serial story called "New Alters" ran for four weeks. The stories have to do with life in Russia. In each of the four issues, as a preliminary to the story installment there appeared a few paragraphs of editorial comments. We quote from some of them:

"American traditions of individual liberty may cause many of us to question the justice of those in power, herding peasants into collective farming against their will, and exiling millions of the more recalcitrant. Nevertheless the program has already justified itself. . . . . But it (life in Russia) daily grows easier. . . . . That the youth of new Russia are less spiritual than their elders is questionable. They have for the time being substituted faith in a new social system for faith in God." 

All of this editorial comment is designed to throw a favorable light upon the rule of the Soviet government in Russia.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

The mass of evidence lying here before us would require books to be written to properly present it. We must however, pass all that by. Surely every sane thinking American is against war, but we charge that the Communist at heart is not against war. It is true that almost every organization in this country which has peace as its objective is either Communistically organized or Communistically controlled, but it is also true that the Soviet Communist government of Russia has built up in their home land the most powerful military machine ever known on the face of the earth. At this hour they have more than one million men under arms and have just appropriated multiplied hundreds of millions of dollars to be spent this year in the building up of a still greater army. Military training is compulsory in Russia, and yet Communist influence is tearing American college life into shreds by propaganda against compulsory military training in public institutions of education.

Mr. Hathaway, editor of the Communist Daily Worker in the issue of July 4, declares: "Every day that we can prevent war among the imperialist nations of the earth, gives us time to add one more tank to our great red army." Even a blind man can see that the policy of the Communist government of Russia is to reduce the United States of America to a state of anemic helplessness and then proceed to overthrow the established order and set up the Communist reign in America, and a bunch of pussy-footing, compromising Modernistic pink-tea-drinking preachers seem to have no better sense than to join hands with this Godless outfit.

Every Baptist pastor should have constantly on his desk a copy of Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling's book, "The Red Network." This book gives the pedigree of everyone of these scores of Communist-controlled organizations working in our country, and to this hour not a single, solitary statement in the book of more than 300 pages has been disproved. There is enough in the book to put Mrs. Dilling behind the bars the rest of her life if what she says is not so. The tragedy of it is, not that Mrs. Dilling has told the truth but that there was such truth for her to tell. At any rate, no Baptist pastor or leader needs to be in ignorance as to what kind of a crowd he is working with.

Once more we remind the reader that the facts presented in this book are only a few of the many which could be brought forward, but if the facing of these facts herein presented does not convince one that there is a hopeless situation confronting Baptists, then a book twice the size of this would be useless.