

The Deadline of Doctrine Around the Church

A REPLY TO
DR. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK'S SERMON
ENTITLED
"SHALL THE FUNDAMENTALISTS WIN?"

BY
JAMES M. GRAY, D. D.
DEAN OF THE MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE
OF CHICAGO



THE MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE OF CHICAGO
153 INSTITUTE PLACE CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE DEADLINE OF DOCTRINE
AROUND THE CHURCH

A REPLY TO
DR. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK'S SERMON
ENTITLED
"SHALL THE FUNDAMENTALISTS WIN?"

BY
BY JAMES M. GRAY, D.D.
DEAN OF THE MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE OF CHICAGO

I do not call myself a fundamentalist, not because I lack sympathy with the Bible truths for which that name now stands, but because I think the name itself is unnecessary and perhaps undesirable.

It is unnecessary in my judgment, because the body of truth for which it stands has always had a name which requires neither explanation nor defense. And it is undesirable for the reason that it is needlessly irritating to some opponents and also gives them a two-fold advantage before the public. It enables them to speak of fundamentalism as something new, and not only new but divisive in the churches which are said to be already "sufficiently split and riven."

And yet there is nothing new in fundamentalism except it may be its name. It is the same old "offense of the cross" which Paul's words to the Galatians imply shall never cease. It is the same old "stumbling block to the Jews" and the same old "foolishness to the Greeks."

It was fundamentalism under another name, and perhaps without a name save that "Name which is above every name," which explained the martyrdoms of the Diocletian era and of the middle ages. To be a fundamentalist cost life then. The Waldenses and the Hussites were fundamentalists. The most

succinct, and yet comprehensive statement of fundamentalism of which I know is the Apostles' Creed, and surely this has never been divisive of the churches? It has not "split and riven" them. We have always regarded the Apostles' Creed as a bond of union, and have praised God for it as a near-inspired expression of the evangelical faith.

That is what fundamentalism is, namely, the evangelical faith, the

"Faith of our fathers, living still,
In spite of dungeon, fire, and sword."

And it is in the light of that fact that I desire, in all fairness and charity, to examine the Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick's sermon of last May, entitled, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?"

MISAPPLYING THE SCRIPTURE

I select this sermon as a text because it is an authoritative statement of the present opposition to the evangelical faith, and because it has been published and circulated with a definite request for comment. For the time being its author seems to be considered as an accepted spokesman for the liberal school of theology.

With strange infelicity, however, he commences his sermon with a reference to Gamaliel's advice to the Jewish council as recorded in Acts V. The Jewish council, as he says, had haled before it Peter and the other apostles because they had been "preaching Jesus as the Messiah." They proposed to slay them, when in opposition Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, rose up and said: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this counsel be of God ye will not be able to overthrow them; lest haply we be found even to be fighting against God."

The preacher makes the Jewish council to represent the fundamentalists, and Peter and the other apostles to represent himself and his brother liberalists. But is not the opposite nearer the truth? Peter and the other apostles who "had been preaching Jesus as the Messiah" were fundamentalists. One has only to examine the content of their preaching in the preceding chapters of the Acts to be assured of that.

Moreover, the preacher claims that the fundamentalists are dividing the churches, but if so they could not be represented by the Jewish council. The council was not the dividing

body, but the body that was being divided. And what a happy thing it has been for the world and the church that it *was* divided! Yes, blessed be God, Peter and the other apostles kept right on "preaching Jesus as the Messiah," until before long the council was very seriously divided, "and the Word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied "in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7).

Therefore let not the fundamentalists slack their hand nor forego their testimony; but at the same time let them have their behavior seemly among the liberals, that wherein they speak against them as evil doers, they may by their good works which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation (1 Peter 2:12).

WHAT JUSTIFIES LIBERALISM?

Dr. Fosdick justifies the liberalism he represents on the ground that "there have been strange new movements in Christian thought," "new knowledge about the physical universe," "about human history, and in particular about the ways in which the ancient peoples used to think in matters of religion, and the methods by which they phrased and explained their spiritual experiences."

He assumes all this so-called new knowledge to be truth in the same sense that the Bible is the truth, a revelation from the God of the Bible, and of the same value as the Bible. The Christian faith must now be seen and stated in the terms of this new knowledge, he affirms. In other words, if he is understood correctly, the revelation in the Bible must now be qualified by modern philosophy, by the evolutionary hypothesis, and by comparative religion.

He offers only one analogy to support his affirmation, however, and that is the change in the planetary system from the Ptolemaic to the Copernicon. But does he mean that the evolutionary theory of the universe is to be accepted on the same scientific ground as the conviction that the sun is the center of our system? Will a gentleman of his distinction in the religious and educational world stand sponsor for that opinion in the face of the testimony of noted specialists to the contrary? And will he at the same time affirm that the concepts of modern philosophy are in themselves so superior to those underlying the Christian faith of all the centuries as now to be substituted for them?

"By their fruits shall ye know them." What have these "strange new movements in Christian thought" yet accomplished for the world? The late world war and Bolshevism are a correct answer. "Strange" indeed are these movements, and perhaps relatively "new"; but while they may be *in* Christian thought, as Christians themselves are in the world, yet they are not of it, but absolutely alien to it.

And about "the ways in which the ancient people used to think in matters of religion," what call have we Christians, having "escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," to be again entangled therein and overcome? Shall it happen unto us according to the true proverb, "the dog is turning to his own vomit again, and the sow that had washed to her wallowing in the mire" (2 Peter 2:20-22)? If this is what the liberals are disposed to do, are not the fundamentalists entitled to respect at least for standing by the old faith?

IS LIBERALISM CHRISTIANITY?

Dr. Fosdick notes four stakes which the fundamentalists are driving "*to mark out the deadline of doctrine around the church*" he says, every one of which he and his liberalistic school would uproot. But one may appeal to the consciousness of regenerated men and women to say whether these four stakes are not only Biblical but vital to the Christian faith.

The first he names is *the virgin birth of our Lord*; the second, *the plenary inspiration of the original Scriptures*; the third, *the substitutionary atonement of Christ*; the fourth, *the second coming of Christ* to set up a millennium on the earth. He claims that no one has a right to deny the Christian name to those who do not hold these doctrines, or to shut against them the doors of Christian fellowship.

"To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." (Isaiah 8:20.) In other words, what saith the Scripture about the Christianity of such men and the shutting of the doors of Christian fellowship against them?

Paul was a fundamentalist surely, and he testified against the false teachers in Galatia, saying: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we preached unto you, let him be accursed." He repeats the anathema twice to make it the more sure (1:8-9).

Writing to Timothy, he says: "This charge I commit unto thee * * * that thou mightest war a good warfare, holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck; of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I delivered unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. 1:18-20).

Peter stands with Paul: "There were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, *and bring upon themselves swift destruction*" (2 Peter 2:1).

John stands with Peter. Writing unto the elect lady, he says: "Many deceivers are gone forth into the world, even they who confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the anti-Christ. * * * * If any one cometh unto you and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting; for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil" (2 John 7:11, R.V.).

It is not therefore a question as to whether the fundamentalists so-called,—I use the term simply for convenience,—it is not a question as to whether they shall withhold the Christian name from, and shut the door of Christian fellowship against deniers of such doctrines, but the question rather is whether they can consistently and conscientiously do otherwise?

I

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THE VIRGIN BIRTH

But now on what grounds would Dr. Fosdick question the virgin birth of our Lord? Two are named. For one he goes back to "the ways in which ancient peoples used to think in matters of religion," and for another he mentions the silence of John and Paul on the subject.

He tells us that "to believe in virgin birth as an explanation of great personality is one of the familiar ways in which the ancient world was accustomed to account for unusual superiority," * * * * especially in the case of founders of great religions. Buddha, Zoroaster, Lao-Tsze, according to the records of their faiths, were all supernaturally born, he says. "That is to say, when a personality arose so high that men adored him, the ancient world attributed his superiority to some special divine influence in his generation, and they commonly

phrased their faith in terms of miraculous birth." In this way large groups of people in the evangelical churches came to think of Jesus as coming especially from God, "but they phrased it in terms of a biological miracle that our modern minds cannot use." So far Dr. Fosdick.

But would he permit a few questions?

1. Would he consider it as making any difference in Jesus' case that men and angels also, did not wait until His personality arose "high" before they adored Him, but that they actually adored Him while He was yet a new-born babe? Or, would Dr. Fosdick possibly deny the historicity of the song of the heavenly host, the visits of the shepherds and the wise men from the east, and the prophesying of Simeon and Anna, to say nothing of Elizabeth, the virgin's cousin, who recognized her even before the birth of Jesus as "the mother of my Lord"? (Luke 1:41-43; 2:8-38; Matt. 2:1-10).

2. Touching those records of the pagan faiths of which he speaks, were they contemporaneous records as in the case of the gospels, or were they written hundreds of years later? Was the claim of virgin birth made by them in the very period and in the very place when and where the founder of the religion lived and toiled and was best known, as was true of Jesus? Were those records filled with other evidences of the supernatural in the lives of those men as the gospels are filled with such evidences concerning Jesus? Did any of those men cast out evil spirits with a word and heal all that were sick with all manner of diseases? Did the winds and the sea obey any of those men (Matt. 8:23-27)? Did any of them raise the dead, or perchance, did any one of them himself arise from the dead? In other words, was the supposed biological miracle in their case a logical and consistent event in an otherwise unique life, or was it an isolated and contradictory occurrence in comparison with their subsequent history? Moreover, has Dr. Fosdick himself perused these records, and will he affirm that any of them make a distinct claim of *virgin* birth such as that recorded of our Lord? Was it not rather a birth resulting from the supposed carnal intercourse of a pagan god with a victim of his lust?

3. Is Dr. Fosdick fairly well acquainted with the Biblical description of Satan? And would it occur to him that possibly the prince of darkness might wish to forestall the effect of the

biological miracle of Jesus' birth by counterfeiting it in the annals of paganism? And would Satan have had any reason or suggestion for doing so arising out of the divine promise in the garden of Eden concerning the *seed of the woman* that should bruise the serpent's head, or because of Isaiah's prophecy that the Messiah should be born of a virgin, which was known some seven hundred years before the event?

4. Does Dr. Fosdick believe, and would he have his hearers believe, that Matthew and Luke, who so explicitly record the circumstances of the virgin birth, are guilty of actual fraud? Is that his real position? And would he in so far give aid and comfort to the Jews who charged Jesus with imposture, who called Him a bastard, and would he in so far justify them in His crucifixion?

5. Finally, in this particular connection, just what kind of an impression is Dr. Fosdick seeking to make when he speaks of "large groups of people in the evangelical churches as coming to think of Jesus as coming especially from God," and phrasing it "in terms of a biological miracle"? As one not unacquainted with church history, would he deny that the virgin birth was from the beginning a criterion by which genuine and spurious Christianity were distinguished? Or, would he question the primitive origin of the Apostles' Creed, and assume to say that practically the whole church was not back of the article, "Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary"?

DOES SILENCE PROVE ANYTHING?

To pass now to the silence of John and Paul. Dr. Fosdick says that these "two men who contributed most to the church's thought of the divine meaning of the Christ, never even *distantly allude* to the virgin birth."

Even if this were absolutely the case, could it nullify the plain and unmistakable testimony of Matthew and Luke? In the mouth of two witnesses a fact must be established in Jewish law, and Matthew and Luke are two witnesses to the fact. If one discards their testimony to this fact for any arbitrary reason, why not do the same with any other fact that does not run alongside of his mind?

There are four gospels, and each is different from every other. Each was written with a particular object and for a particular class of people. John's gospel up until the record

of the passion at chapter twenty, is almost entirely new in its relation of facts, as compared with the other three. For example, he omits all reference to the life of Jesus prior to His baptism. Does this silence cast doubt upon everything else that Matthew and Luke wrote covering that period?

And reversing the situation, shall we say that John is not to be believed in the marvelous events he relates because Matthew and Mark and Luke are silent on them?

Dr. Robert Dick Wilson has discovered that William Cullen Bryant's History of the United States, with its 3,500 pages quarto, makes no mention of Thanksgiving Day, nor of the days of fasting and prayer during the Civil war, nor the Bible, except in the relation of the Bible Society to slavery. Shall some destructive critic later on affirm therefore that this nation ignored God in that sad chapter of its history?

The work of Bryant has fifty-three pages of index, double column, and yet the word *Presbyterian* does not occur in it, nor the word *Christian* except in the title of the Christian Commission, and the word *church* only occurs twice. And yet, as Professor Wilson remarks, that work is a history of a republic founded by Christians, observing the Sabbath, devoted to foreign missions, and full of churches and their activities. The argument from silence therefore proves nothing absolutely.

But Dr. Fosdick errs when he says that these two men, John and Paul, "*never even distantly allude to the virgin birth.*" For instance, John says: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was GOD * * * * *And the Word was made* (or became) flesh and dwelt among us, and we behold His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

It did not occur to Dr. Fosdick to mention these words of John to his hearers, but had he done so, might his hearers have surmised that while John did not definitely name the virgin birth, he certainly did more than "distantly allude" to it? Surely if God became man, as John says, there must have been a biological miracle of some kind?

And a similar conclusion is equally obvious from Paul's words to the church at Philippi: "Let this mind be in you," he says, "which was also in Christ Jesus; Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation and took upon Him the

form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." If this is not an affirmation of the virgin birth, does it not, as in John's case, at least "*distantly allude to it*"?

Paul's epistles, like John's gospel, were penned for a very distinct purpose, not to recite the history of Christ's life already familiar to and believed by the whole church, but to build up a great body of truth on the basis, not of His incarnation, but His atoning death and resurrection.

Quoting Professor James Orr, of Glasgow, "Did not Paul know of Christ's birth from a virgin? Certainly he did, for Luke, who narrates it in his gospel, was the travelling companion of Paul, and everything Luke knew, Paul knew."

The same inquiry might be made of John. Did he not have the other gospels before him when he wrote his gospel? And was not the virgin birth of Christ an already accepted article of belief in the church? But does he repudiate or contradict it? And if not, on the supposition that it was untrue, how could one believe anything else that John wrote? When it comes to an argument from silence, if it proves anything in this case, it proves that the record in Matthew and Luke is correct.

II

ARGUMENT FOR AND AGAINST INSPIRATION

But passing from Dr. Fosdick's views about the virgin birth of Jesus, let us consider those which he entertains about the inspiration of the Scriptures.

First, he reminds his hearers that the original documents of the Scriptures are no longer in our possession.

This is true, of course, but it does not invalidate their inspiration.

The Declaration of Independence may be taken as an illustration. How many American citizens now living ever saw the original document, or even know whether it exists? And yet it is important to know that there was such a document, and that we possess accurate copies of it which carry all the significance and authority of the original. We are zealous for its very words. Is it unreasonable that as much importance should be attached to the original of the sacred Scriptures which furnish the foundation for the Christian faith?

Dr. Fosdick's idea of inspiration is confused. He thinks that the plenary inspiration of the original documents means,

to quote his words, that "whether we deal with the story of creation, or the list of the dukes of Edom, or the narrations of Solomon's reign, or the sermon on the mountain, or the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, they all came in the same way and they all came as no other book ever came."

ON WHAT DOES INSPIRATION TERMINATE?

But this is not so, and it is difficult to believe that so intelligent a gentleman wishes to be taken seriously in saying it. He must know that the inspiration of the Scriptures terminates on the *record*. They who maintain its plenary inspiration may leave others to determine the human source of the story of creation, for example. It is not incumbent upon them to say, nor is it with them a primary matter to determine, just how, or where Moses obtained that story. They merely say that the story has the stamp of God upon it, that as a *record* it is correct and the story of creation which God desires man to believe.

The same is true of the list of the dukes and the other examples which Dr. Fosdick names. All of them did not come in the same way but in different ways, and yet putting them all together in the one book, it is competent to say that the book came as no other book ever came. That is, no other book as to its *record* is inspired of God (2 Tim. 3:16-17).

To illustrate this from another point of view, Dr. Fosdick says the fundamentalists believe that everything was "inerrantly dictated, scientific opinions, medical theories, historical judgments, as well as spiritual insight, all is infallible." And the way he says it we fear, is intended to make fundamentalists appear ignorant and silly.

But his remark should be qualified. There may be scientific opinions, medical theories, and some other utterances in the Bible which are in themselves untrue, and yet the record of them may be an inspired record for all that.

THE TRUE AND THE FALSE IN THE BIBLE

Take the book of Ecclesiastes as an example. It contains some statements that are only partially true and some that are altogether false, yet the *record* that its author said, and thought and acted in accordance therewith on the different occasions named is an inspired, and hence an absolutely true record.

If Dr. Fosdick knows this to be the fundamentalists' view of inspiration, and it is reasonable to suppose that he knows it, how can he justify the placing of the Koran on the same level as the inspiration of the Bible? He finds things in the Bible which he dislikes and he finds the same things in the Koran; and he scarcely saves himself from something approaching blasphemy by saying simply that in the Bible they are not final, that "they are always being superseded, that revelation is progressive."

This last remark, "revelation is progressive," as he uses it, is another evidence of his misunderstanding of the subject, inasmuch as he confounds "revelation" with inspiration. Revelation in the Bible is indeed progressive, "dynamic," to quote a favorite word of his, but inspiration in contradistinction thereto is static. Revelation in the Bible progresses from the first promise of the Redeemer in the garden of Eden to His closing words in the apocalypse, "Surely I come quickly." But the inspiration of the record, from the writing of Moses in Genesis to that of John in the apocalypse remains ever the same, so that we have precisely the same reason and the same authority for accepting the divinity of Moses' writings as we have for accepting the divinity of the writings of John.

HOW FAR IS REVELATION PROGRESSIVE?

Dr. Fosdick says that to him and to those he represents the Bible "is more inspired and more inspiring than it ever was before." More inspiring it may be, but more *inspired* we wish to say, it can never be, inasmuch as it is and always has been *God-breathed*.

But this part of the subject should not be left without a cautionary word. We have admitted that revelation is progressive. But we mean revelation as contained in and limited to the Bible. We are not talking about a progressive revelation outside of the Bible.

The Bible is now a completed revelation. "If any man shall add unto it, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in it, and if any man shall take away from it, God shall take away his part out of the book of life" (Rev. 22:18-19).

There was progress while that revelation was in process of delivery to men, but the progress ended where the process ended. And that which was thus delivered to the saints, was

delivered, as Jude instructs us, *once for all*, and it is this which constitutes the reason why we are commanded to earnestly contend for it against false teachers who have come in amongst us unawares (Jude 3, 4).

III

ARGUMENT FOR AND AGAINST CHRIST'S SECOND COMING

Dr. Fosdick does not enlarge upon his objection to the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, but proceeds to do so with reference to the second coming of Christ, approaching the subject with his customary preconceptions. Instead of coming to the Bible as the Word of God to ascertain what is therein revealed concerning the second coming of Christ, he begins to tell his hearers what the ancient world thought and did not think. For one so ambitious to be progressive it is astonishing how he loves to linger in the teaching of the ancient world, the heathen world at that.

"No one in the ancient world had ever thought as we do of development, and gradual change as God's way of working out His will in human life," he tells us. That is, no one in those days ever thought of evolution.

"They thought of human history as a series of ages succeeding one another with abrupt suddenness."

Thus would he forestall on the part of his hearers any acceptance of Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of history as visioned in the metal image. It was not in his opinion a divine revelation, but "the Hebrew way of expressing hope for the victory of God and righteousness." And "when the Christians came they took over that phrasing of expectancy, and the New Testament is aglow with it."

In other words, the second coming of our Lord is not a divine promise ever to be literally fulfilled, but merely "the early Christian phrasing of hope," a remark which for simon-pure rationalism can hardly be surpassed.

He says that the literal coming of Christ externally on the clouds of heaven, to set up His Kingdom here, was a teaching that he never heard in his youth, as if that proved anything. There are many who never heard it in their youth, and yet like him, presumably, were brought up in Christian homes and in the habit of attending church. Some of them, however, have since come to learn that it is one thing to believe the

Bible in a general way, and quite another thing to know what the Bible actually contains.

In other words, there is such a thing as progress in the knowledge of God's revelation and in the knowledge of what really constitutes the Christian faith, and it is lamentable that one should increase in years and in general erudition and yet make no progress in that direction.

ON WHAT SHALL WE BASE OUR THINKING?

He tells us that the group to which he belongs believes that Christ is coming, "but they are not thinking of an external arrival in the clouds."

Why are they not thinking so, may one ask in all sincerity, inasmuch as Christ Himself witnessed before the Sanhedrin, saying: "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven"? (Mt. 26:64.)

Why are they not thinking so, when the angels on Mount Olivet said to the waiting disciples: "This same Jesus, which was taken up from you into heaven, shall so come *in like manner* as ye have seen Him go into heaven"? (Acts 1:11.)

Why are they not thinking so, when Paul writes to the Thessalonians: "The Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord"? (1 Thess. 4:16, 17.)

Why are they not thinking so, when John says: "Behold, He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him"? (Rev. 1:7.)

If the preacher is not thinking of an external arrival on the clouds, of what kind of a second coming of Christ is he thinking?

He explains the kind he is thinking of by saying that man's music has *developed*, man's painting has *developed*, man's architecture has *developed*, development is the way in which God works. Therefore the second coming of Christ simply

means that "slowly but surely His will and principles will be worked out, by God's grace, in human life and institutions." This is the evolutionary hypothesis applied to the "Blessed Hope." The underlying principle of evolution is that of continuity, no break, no abrupt change, no *cataclysm*.

Now, this is beautiful and interesting if it were only true. But it is not true if the Bible is to be taken at its face value, if Christ Himself is to be believed.

A SOLEMN WARNING

Moreover, there is at least one passage of Scripture that squarely opposes it, and does so in connection with a most solemn warning, to any who are tempted to believe it.

That passage is where Peter says, "that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts," or as the Revised Version puts it, "mockers shall come with mockery, and saying, 'Where is the promise of His coming?' For since the fathers fell asleep all things *continue* as they were from the beginning of creation." "For this they wilfully forget," he adds, "that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and amidst water, by the Word of God; by which means the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished."

In other words, the theory of continuity, no abrupt changes, no cataclysm, is contrary to history, contrary to fact.

Then follows the warning: "But the heavens that now are, by the same Word, have been stored up for fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. Forget not this one thing, beloved, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning His promise (the promise of the return of our Lord, he means) as some count slackness; but is long-suffering to you-ward, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. 3:3-9).

It is a solemn matter indeed, in the face of this warning, to deny, and to lead others to deny, the "Blessed Hope," for as the same apostle says in another place: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of His majesty" (2 Pet. 1:16).

IV

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE

It remains only to inquire into the meaning of the title of this sermon, "Shall The Fundamentalists Win?"

Win what? It might be supposed that the preacher was thinking primarily of Christ and the Scriptures. Would it eventually be found that the fundamentalists are right as to the inspiration of the Scriptures? Would it eventually be found that Christ is more than a religious teacher, that He is the Very God, conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, and that He died as a sacrifice for human guilt, and that He is coming again personally and visibly in power and great glory? It might be thought that these were the questions uppermost in the use of the word "Win."

But not so. The inquiry is more mundane and personal than that. For, after distinguishing between the view of the fundamentalists and the liberalists on the virgin birth, the preacher says: "Here in the Christian church are these two groups of people, and the question which the fundamentalists raise is this: '*Shall one of them throw the other out?*'" He repeats the question after distinguishing between their views of inspiration, and again after distinguishing between them as to the second coming of Christ, "*Shall one throw the other out?*"

In his opinion "the fundamentalists are not going to succeed," i.e., they are not going to be able to throw the liberals out, and doubtless he is a true prophet in saying so. If the liberalists will not go out of themselves, as they did in John's day (1 John 2:19), if their sense of fairness and consistency and honor will not lead them to relinquish their hold upon the treasure and the institutions which fundamentalists of other generations have accumulated and built up for the furtherance of the truth, the latter, we prophesy, will not lay hands upon them. Fundamentalists have suffered the loss of all things to follow Christ in other days, and if necessary they will rejoice to do the same again.

The preacher pleads for tolerance and Christian liberty, but on that score of what can he complain? He is a Baptist minister who, over his signature, has renounced and denounced the evangelical faith; and yet he is occupying a pulpit in the

Presbyterian church whose confession of faith affirms the four essential doctrines which it is the purpose of his sermon to refute.

A preacher, therefore, who is permitted to do this, and be generously compensated for it besides, so far from suffering intolerance or the curtailment of spiritual liberty, must feel rather that the lines have fallen unto him in pleasant places, and that he has a goodly heritage.

THE PREACHER'S IDEA OF THESE GREAT DOCTRINES

He tells us that if we are to reach a happy solution of this problem, what we need "is a clear insight into the main issues of modern Christianity and a sense of penitent shame that the Christian church should be quarreling over *little matters* when the world is dying of great needs."

But the question will not down as to who introduced this "quarreling" if it so be, and who is responsible for this controversy over the inspiration of the Bible, the Godhood, the atoning sacrifice and the second coming of our Lord? To seek to fasten it upon the fundamentalists would be like Germany laying the blame for the world war upon Belgium because she defended the forts of Liege. If the liberalists, in other words, had not sought to introduce their strange and subversive doctrines among God's saints, would the latter have had need to contend for the faith delivered unto them once for all? (Jude 3.)

And really *are* these "little matters" over which they are contending? Is the preacher justified in calling them as he does in a further sentence, "*the tiddledywinks and peccadillos of religion*"? Is that a sane or reverent estimate of the importance of the Bible and the truth as to the Person and the work of Christ?

He speaks of the world as "dying of great needs" while the quarreling is going on, and he cites Armenia. "They are killing the Armenians yet," he says, "the Turkish deportations still are going on; lately they crowded Christian men, women, and children into a conventicle of worship and burned them together in the house where they had prayed to their Father and ours."

WHY THE ARMENIANS SUFFER

Yes, the name of the Armenians belongs in the inspired Hall of Fame which Bible lovers recognize as the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. But has Dr. Fosdick paused to think *why* the Armenians are willing thus to suffer the loss of all things? Has he reflected that they might escape their afflictions if they would? Does he know that if they were not fundamentalists in principle they would not be persecuted?

If the Armenians could take the position of the liberalists, if to them Christianity were only *a* religion and not *the* religion; if the origin of the Bible, if the Person of Jesus Christ, if the atonement of the cross, if the second coming of the Lord of glory bringing His reward with Him, if these truths were to them the "little matters" which they are to Dr. Fosdick and his group; if they were merely "the tiddledywinks and peccadillos of religion;" if, in other words, they were not to them the "main issues of Christianity," ancient as well as modern, and modern as well as ancient, would they consent to be "made a gazing-stock by their reproaches"?

They have been "tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection. They have had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment; they have been stoned; they have been tempted; they have been slain with the sword; they have wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented, of whom the world was not worthy" (Heb. 11:33-38). But let not twentieth century liberalism add the remaining grief of professing to minister to their deepest needs. That can be done only by the Saviour whom liberalism rejects.

(Reprinted from the November, 1922, issue of The Moody Bible Institute Monthly.)

(Copies of this pamphlet will be supplied without charge on request, accompanied by postage, and gifts of money to aid in its circulation will be appreciated.)

The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago

Founded by D. L. Moody in 1886

"The West Point of Christian Service"

International

Interdenominational

TRAINING FREE

THE OBJECT OF THE INSTITUTE is to give free training to men and women in the knowledge of the English Bible, Gospel Music, Personal Evangelism and Practical methods of Christian Work, so they may become effective Bible teachers, Evangelists, Pastors, Missionaries, Gospel Singers, Sunday-school and Mission Workers, etc. The Course of the regular Day Classes covers two years, and had an enrolment in 1921-22 of 1,238.

THE EVENING CLASSES are now correlated with the Day Classes, and give a corresponding training and diploma. The full course covers four years. The enrolment for the year 1921-22 was 1,132.

THE CORRESPONDENCE DEPARTMENT is for the benefit of those who cannot attend the Institute classes in person, but desire to pursue systematic correspondence Bible study. Eight courses are given, viz.: Synthetic Bible Study, Bible Doctrine, Chapter Summary, Practical Christian Work, Evangelism, Christian Evidences, Introductory Bible Course, and the Scofield Bible Course. For these a limited fee is charged. The total enrolment in these courses for 1921-22 was 10,309.

THE EXTENSION DEPARTMENT supplies Evangelists, Bible Teachers, and Gospel Singers for Churches and Missions, and conducts Bible Conferences, Music Classes and Evangelistic meetings in all parts of the country.

THE MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE MONTHLY continuing the Christian Workers' Magazine, is devoted to Bible knowledge and interpretation, news and methods of world-wide Christian work, editorial comment on current events and conditions; contending for the faith delivered once for all to the saints. Issued monthly, \$2.00 per year to any address. Rev. James M. Gray, D.D., editor.

Send for Free Catalogue giving full information. Address

THE MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE
153 Institute Place CHICAGO, ILLINOIS