

Shall The Funnymonkeyists Win?
Answer to Dr. Fosdick's Sermon on "Shall The Fundamentalists Win?"

Sermon preached by Rev. JOHN ROACH STRATON, D.D.,
at Calvary Baptist Church, New York City

Sunday Night, September 24th, 1922

Text: “And it came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, Art thou he that troubleth Israel? And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father’s house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.” 1 Kings 18:17-18.

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, one of the pastors of the First Presbyterian Church of this city, preached recently on the subject: “SHALL THE FUNDAMENTALS WIN?” For his text, Dr. Fosdick very ingeniously and adroitly, though without regard for proper exegesis, turned some words of Gamaliel into a bit of gratuitous advice to the Fundamentalists of today not to fight against the rationalists and the radicals, lest they should later find that they had been opposing the truth and fighting God.

Dr. Fosdick charges that the Fundamentalists are trying to drive liberal minded people out of the evangelical churches. He says that “The Fundamentalists’ program is essentially illiberal and intolerant,” and then he gives a statement of the alleged beliefs of the Fundamentalists which is grossly unfair and untrue. It is nothing but a caricature. We simply do not hold to the crass, crude and mechanical formulas that he alleges. Where misrepresentation is so manifest, argument is not necessary, and I dismiss this aspect of the question with a simple denial.

THE REAL DISTURBERS OF ISRAEL.

He also charges that the Fundamentalists are the people who are making the trouble in the churches today. His very first sentence is as follows: “This morning we are to think of the Fundamentalist controversy which threatens to divide the American churches, as though already they were not sufficiently split and riven.” Throughout his sermon he runs on the assumption that those of us who still dare to believe the Bible as God’s word and who hold to the great fundamental truths of revealed religion are the ones who are causing trouble and stirring up strife and splitting churches. But the truth is that the Fundamentalists are merely old-fashioned Christian believers, who are standing just where we have always stood. We are not on the offensive but on the defensive. We still persist in holding to the beliefs that our fathers held, and it is these religious revolutionists and rationalists within the ranks who are really disturbing and distressing the Christian brotherhood and dividing the churches into warring camps.

The prophet Elijah rebuked King Ahab for his unbelief and his wrong living and pronounced a sentence of judgment upon him. Then, in obedience to God’s command, Elijah hid himself and the judgment fell. The drought and famine came upon the land, even as Elijah had predicted, and Ahab sought everywhere for Elijah that he might destroy him. Finally, three years later, the Lord commanded Elijah to show himself unto Ahab, and so Elijah came out from his hiding place and sent word to Ahab, and it is written that Ahab went to meet Elijah. Then our text for this evening tells us that “It came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, Art thou he that troubleth Israel? And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father’s house in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.”

THE BAPTIST WRECK

We charge that these religious radicals are the “disturbers of Israel” today. So far as our Baptist denomination is concerned, we were making marvelous progress until this radical propaganda fell like a blight upon our ranks. Through this insidious leadership which is seeking to beguile our people from the old paths of God’s revealed truth, we have suffered immeasurably. Our forces have been divided and a debt of \$2,500,000 from the ill-fated “Inter Church World Movement” has been saddled upon us, for which vast sum of money we have received not one advantage or benefit, but only distress and disturbance and division. And on top of this, other millions of debt have been added by this wrong leadership. I say, therefore, to Dr. Fosdick tonight, and through him to the whole radical and revolutionary religious group of today: “We have not troubled Israel, but thou and thy father’s house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.”

Yes, my friends, the trouble today is that these leaders have turned away from God’s revealed word. They have forsaken His commandments. They have set their human consciousness above God’s revelation as an authority. They have denied every essential tenet of the Christian faith, and so far as the Baptists are concerned, in the very hour when the world is clamoring for democracy and when Baptists have the greatest opportunity for success and for service that we have ever faced, this radicalism has been forced upon us, and confusion worse confounded has fallen into our ranks. Instead of the glorious victory that the times called for and that our opportunities warrant, we are having to retrench, and withdraw missionaries from the foreign field, and to cut down our program at every point. Thus the whole cause is suffering, and these radical men are the disturbers of Israel and the source of all these ills. I charge it home upon them tonight, without bitterness but with fidelity to the Lord who redeems us from sin, and to the Bible which is our guide, inspiration, and comfort.

NO PERSONALITIES, BUT A NECESSARY FIGHT.

In what I shall say concerning Dr. Fosdick and his sermon there will not be one single atom of personal malice or unkindness. There are many things about Dr. Fosdick to admire. Beyond any question, he has an unusually brilliant mind; and, as I shall show later, he, himself, is a victim of wrong religious teaching. I am also glad to recognize that his motives are good. Like Paul when he was persecuting the Christians, he no doubt thinks he is doing God a service by his radical and revolutionary propaganda. As to this, I shall let the facts speak for themselves, and when I have presented the facts, this great congregation can reach its own conclusions.

Having disclaimed, then, any personal ill-feeling, I go on to say that all lovers of the faith are under obligation to meet the destructive errors of today, and to battle against them. When any of us dare to raise our voices in behalf of the faith, that has so blessed the human race in the days that are gone, immediately many people take the position we are “cantankerous,” to use the word that Dr. Fosdick himself employs, and that we are bigoted and bitter, and, as Dr. Fosdick said, “illiberal” in our ideas, and “intolerant” in our attitude. Because Galileo and other scientists suffered persecution at the hands of superstitious and grossly immoral monks during the dark ages, therefore, we are expected to accept without protest every half-baked theory that skeptical theologians or embryo “scientists” present! To some, the greatest crime of today is to stand true to God and His

Word. Some seem to think that, as a matter of course, we should just supinely lie down without a contest and let the radicals take the field!

This absurd viewpoint is sufficiently answered when we say that there rests upon the individual child of God a sacred responsibility, in this day of apostasy and in the midst of the ruin which unbelief has already spread around us, to proclaim the truths of God against such sophistries, and, as the Bible says, to “Contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.” And this necessity is rendered the more imperative by the aggressiveness of the radicals. Dr. Fosdick not only preached this revolutionary sermon against the fundamentalist, but he went further and put it into pamphlet form and it is now being broadcasted all over the continent.

SELF-EXPLOITING “SCHOLARSHIP”

While we will not deal in personalities, nevertheless, it is right that we should point out another false assumption upon which Dr. Fosdick founds his entire sermon, and that is the assumption of intellectual superiority on the part of the liberals and the radicals. This attitude invariably characterizes these dear brethren in their discussion of any mooted subject. They always look down upon us from the heights of a lordly superiority. So Dr. Fosdick speaks of the “great mass of new knowledge that has come into man’s possession,” as though those who hold to the old faith know nothing about this alleged new knowledge; and he caters to the vanity of immature minds by approaching them on the assumption that they really belong to a superior order of intelligence. Even while mildly warning them against passing harsh judgments on those who cling to the old faith, he, nevertheless, soothes their vanity and encourages their intellectual pride by speaking of “young, fresh minds” who are “holding new ideas” and who have “fought their way by intellectual and spiritual struggle to novel positions,” as though there was some especial virtue in repudiating old faiths, and reaching new and novel positions.

He tells us, then, that science treats a young man’s mind “as though it were really important;” and then he gives us a statement of the patronizing way in which a “scientist” speaks to a young man as contrasted with the crude and narrow way in which he says the church speaks to the young man: ‘Here is the universe challenging our investigation. Here are the truths which we have seen, so far. Come, study with us! See what we already have seen and the look further to see more, for science is an intellectual adventure for the truth.’” But science is not “an intellectual adventure for the truth.” The Standard Dictionary defines science as “knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking.” That is what true science is, and much of the trouble today arises from wild adventuring after unverified guesses by such minds as Dr. Fosdick’s. His saying “science is an intellectual adventure for the truth,” is pretty rhetoric, but the trouble with it is that it is not true!

This attitude is characteristic of all these radical crusaders, and it would be amusing if the stakes involved were not so holy and important. The false assumption in all of this is that we must cater to the spoiled vanity of the intellectually proud youngsters of today, whereas the Scriptures warn us against the “vainglory of life” and enjoin us to “humble ourselves under the might hand of God, that in due season we may be exalted.” The Scripture further says: “Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching

to save them that believe. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.”

Those of us who hold the old faith are patronizingly regarded by these “wise” men of today as antiquated. We belong back with the stage coach, the hoopskirt, and the flint lock rifle. We are not “modern men” unless we tear the Bible to pieces and reject the divine Christ it enshrines!

Just let me say, in this connection, that this attitude of the religious radicals is no new thing. From the very beginning it was so. The devil came to our first parent, Eve, and appealed to her vanity. He told her that he had a newer and higher truth than God had given. God had said that if they ate of the forbidden fruit they should surely die, but the devil said: “Ye shall not surely die, but the devil said: “Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.” By this suave and oily flattery, her foolish mind was led astray, to her own undoing and the ruin of the race. And multitudes are being misled today by the devil parading in the guise of what the Bible terms “science, falsely so called” and a bogus “learning.”

NO QUARREL WITH REAL SCHOLARSHIP

We have no quarrel with true scholarship, but great learning and profound scholarship always produce modesty and not self assertiveness and this attitude of lordly superiority. After Newton had discovered the law of gravitation, when he was being complimented on his scientific achievements, he said modestly that he had done but little, and that “he felt like a little child who had simply picked up a few pebbles beside the great ocean of truth,” and Kepler, after his monumental achievements in the field of astronomy, exclaimed devoutly, “I have been thinking God’s thoughts after Him.”

Yes, we all owe a debt of undying gratitude to devout scholarship, but we need not be unduly exercised by this swaggering, self-assertive, boastful “new learning,” which arrogates to itself superior insight and which sneezes every time a German skeptic takes snuff!

Those hypotheses and assumptions of the “new learning” which have set themselves in opposition to God’s revealed truth are not accepted and proved facts, as Dr. Fosdick assumes. They are the subjects today of hot debate the world over. Not only is this true, but while scientific and philosophic theories and speculations are constantly changing, the great truths of revealed religion are still shining like fixed stars in the firmament of heaven; and despite the vanity and skepticism of this hour, Jesus Christ is “the same, yesterday, today, and forever!” I would point out to Dr. Fosdick the significant fact that while there is scarcely a scientific text-book which ten years old that is not already out of date, the Bible, after all these thousands of years, is still doing business at the old stand!

THE REAL ISSUE OF TODAY

And this brings us, my friends, to the real issue of today. Everything that Dr. Fosdick says in this revolutionary sermon — and I shall quote him to show you just what his positions are — and everything that the other radicals are saying, is founded upon the assumption that the Bible can no longer be accepted and believed at its face value as a revelation from God.

The supreme religious issue of today is: *Do we believe God?* Not do we believe *about* God? Every man who has the capacity for thought believes something about some sort of God. The great question is: Do we believe God? Has God spoken? Is this Book a real revelation from a living God, and will we believe God as He speaks through the Book, and keep His Commandments? That is the great question today. If we do, then blessings and peace shall fall upon us, even as God has promised. If we do not, then the same wreck and ruin that fell upon ancient Israel, and the same destruction that came to Ahab because he departed from God's Word, will also come to us.

Let us turn, then, to the teaching of Dr. Fosdick in this remarkable sermon. We can at least commend him for his frankness. He does not beat around the bush and hide his real thought in a fog-bank of verbal evasions. He faces the issues of today with manly frankness, and we are indebted to him because he has shown us plainly just how far the radical religious leaders of today have gone in their thinking.

In this sermon against the Fundamentalists, he takes up four great doctrines of Christianity: the virgin birth, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the atonement of Jesus, and the second coming of our Lord. He rejects the Bible teaching on all of these great doctrines, because he frankly admits that he is speaking "from the viewpoint of liberal minds."

Now, I wish to use parallel columns on Dr. Fosdick. I shall quote first enough of the teaching of the Bible on each one of these great doctrines to show its position, and then, side by side with it, I shall quote Dr. Fosdick in rejecting the Bible view.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH

First, what does the Bible teach on the subject of the virgin birth? Beyond any question, the Bible explicitly teaches the miraculous conception and virgin birth of our Lord Jesus Christ. In Old Testament times the prophets, under inspiration of the Holy Spirit, had foreseen that the Messiah would be born of a virgin, and in a supernatural way. I will quote a few prophecies, first from the Old Testament, and then give some of the chief passages in the New Testament, that clearly and specifically teach the virgin birth. Side by side with that, I will quote Dr. Fosdick's repudiation of this clear teaching of the Bible, that we may see plainly just how completely he has cut away from the authority of God's Word.

THE BIBLE ON THE VIRGIN BIRTH

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." (Isaiah 7:14).

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." (Isaiah 9:6-7).

THE ANNUNCIATION OF THE VIRGIN MARY AT NAZARETH. (Luke 1:26-38):
"And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee,

named Nazareth. To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou art highly favored, the Lord is with thee: Blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: For thou has found favor with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: And therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age; and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren. For with God nothing shall be impossible. And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word. And the Angel departed from her."

THE SONG OF ELISABETH UPON MARY'S VISIT TO THE HILL COUNTRY OF JUDEA. (Luke 1:39-45): "And Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill country with haste, into a city of Judah; And entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elisabeth. And in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost: And she spake out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. And blessed is she that believed: For there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord."

THE MAGNIFICAT OF MARY IN REPLY TO ELISABETH'S GREETING.

(Luke 1:46-56): "And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord. And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden; for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For he that is mighty hath done to me great things, and holy is his name. And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned to her own house."

THE ANNUNCIATION TO JOSEPH IN NAZARETH. (Matthew 1:18-25): "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was in this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privately. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: For that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: For he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which interpreted is, God with us. Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and

took unto him his wife: and knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: And he called his name Jesus.”

DR. FOSDICK ON THE VIRGIN BIRTH

Here, now, is what Dr. Fosdick has to say:

“The virgin birth is not to be accepted as an historic fact. 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 is this true about the founders of great religions. According to the records of their faiths, Buddha and Zoroaster and Lao-Tsze and Mahavira were all supernaturally born. 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. So Pythagoras was called virgin born, and Plato, and Augustus Caesar, and many more. Knowing this, there are within the evangelical churches large groups of people whose opinion about our Lord’s coming would run as follows: Those first disciples adored Jesus — as we do; when they thought about his coming they were sure that he came specially from God — as we are; this adoration and conviction they associated with God’s special influence and intention in his birth — as we do; but they phrased it in terms of a biological miracle that our modern minds cannot use.”

We have here, then, first the simple but sublime story of the miraculous incarnation of the Son of God, than which there is nothing purer or more beautiful in the literature of earth. It has inspired poets and artists and musicians and literary geniuses down all the ages, and with it, we have the explicit statement, not only of the prophets, that the Saviour would be thus conceived and born, but also the explicit statement that that which was conceived in Mary was “of the Holy Ghost.”

Side by side, now, with this plain and glorious Bible account of the matter, we have Dr. Fosdick’s skepticism. He puts the tender and noble account which the Bible gives of the supernatural conception that the virgin birth of our Lord on exactly the same plane as the sensuous superstitions connected with the debasing myths about pagan gods coming down to cohabit with women upon earth — usually wives and not virgins — and thus to produce what were regarded as super men or human divinities.

I shall send Dr. Fosdick a copy of this sermon, and I feel hopeful that when he sees his doubts side by side with the noble affirmations of the Word of God, he will feel that his teaching is shocking and blasphemous. My hope is that he may be brought back from the far country of doubt and negation, even as Reginald Campbell of London, Romanes, and others have been brought back. But in the meantime, in faithfulness, he should be answered. The Bible account of the virgin birth of our Lord consists of statements that are clear and straight forward and connected with human witnesses who recorded the events. But those crude myths and superstitions about supernatural births among heathen and pagans came about in ways that were vague and foolish, and, as remarked, were connected with the grossest human vanity or the most debasing and licentious lust.

PAGAN MYTHS

In thinking upon these pagan superstitions, we need to remember that it is one of the characteristics of the sinful human mind to take sublime truth and to debase it for the sake of false religion or sensualism.

Furthermore, there is no good reason for being surprised that men had fore gleams of a great coming event which would have vital consequences for the human race. Plato, long before Christ was born, taught that human redemption could only come about by some superior being who would be connected with both the gods and man. We might as well discount the deity of our Lord because of this pre-vision of a pagan philosopher, as to discount His miraculous birth because the minds of men had fore gleams of the coming truth, and because some who were evil and vain used such ideas for their own selfish and sensuous ends.

As we read these tender and beautiful words of the Bible about the conception and birth of our Lord, with all of its holy mystery, and yet with its sublime meaning, and then when we read these sentences from Dr. Fosdick's sermon, giving the skeptical ideas that have been used by Ingersoll and by other unbelievers down the ages in their effort to discount the truthfulness of Scripture, it is sad and shocking, beyond the power of words to describe, when we realize that they emanate, in this instance, not from the laboratory of infidelity, but from the pulpit of the Christian church!

BIOLOGY AND THE VIRGIN BIRTH

I wish to go further, however, and say that Christian believers today can meet men like Dr. Fosdick, even on scientific grounds, and still defeat them. Again and again, especially in recent years, we have had the hypotheses of skeptics and critics of God's Word which, when first propounded, were announced as overthrowing the Scriptures — utterly discounted and exploded by science itself. The spade of the archaeologists, again and again, has brought doubters of the Bible into utter confusion and final defeat; and such scientific discoveries as the X-ray, wireless, radium, etc., to say nothing of psychological phenomena such as hypnotism, etc., have utterly revolutionized many conceptions which were formerly believed, and accepted as final truth.

And there have been in recent years great advances in the science of biology. For one thing, it has been demonstrated that the generation of new life is possible, under certain circumstances, apart from the sexual union. Scientists have demonstrated by their experiments that the eggs of sea-urchins, star-fish, and other living creatures can be and have been fertilized and made to reproduce their kind without the usual operation of sex forces. Dr. Jacques Loeb, of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, one of the foremost authorities in the field of biology, says that "eggs which naturally develop only when a spermatozoon enters, can be caused to develop artificially by certain physician and chemical means" ("Dynamics of Living Matter," 165). These scientists have demonstrated that certain forms of electrical energy or light rays are capable of thus stimulating eggs into activity and development. The scientists have further demonstrated that these rays can penetrate living matter and may be definitely directed to produce specific effects in a living body as, for example, the treatment of cancer by radium or the fertilization of an egg within the body. Further, the amazing announcement was made by Dr. Charles Russ, of England, in 1921, that, as demonstrated by experiments, the human eye in vision emits a ray that, varying in strength, according to conditions of health, etc.,

can actually move ponderable matter. Furthermore, the scientists have demonstrated that that seemingly most intangible thing of all, namely, thought, causes chemical changes. It has come to be well known, for example, that anger turns loose certain poisons in the human system, and fright has been known to produce such radical chemical changes that death followed. Boris Sidis, of Harvard, and other investigators, have proved not only that thought may be registered electrically, but also that thought causes these chemical changes.

Here, then, is a group of facts which, when taken together, may shed some light even upon the question of the virgin birth. If man's limited understanding and finite power can send rays of light through matter which will fertilize eggs, and if even thought has tangible transforming effects upon matter which bring about actual electrical and chemical changes, then what shall we say of the effects of God's light and the application of His infinite and unlimited power of thought? We are taught that Mary, in wonder, said unto the angel of the annunciation, when he told her that she should conceive and bring forth a son: "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Then the Scripture tells us that the angel answered her and said: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

Apart, then, from the question of faith, in the light even of the marvelous facts of science, need we stumble in accepting such a miracle as the virgin birth of our Lord? When we are taught that the power of Almighty God moved upon a virgin's thought and overshadowed her, and that the radiant light of heaven shone upon her, and that her submissive thought was centered in obedient willingness upon this blessed enterprise of bringing forth a Saviour for mankind, even our poor limited minds can catch some glimpse of understanding of it all.

But at last this truth lies primarily in the realm of faith and not the realm of reason. In connection with the virgin birth, the angel declared that "nothing shall be impossible with God," and it was God's love, backed by His power, that gave a Saviour to mankind.

The author of a recent little book on "Science An Aid To Faith" concludes by saying: "Modern science affirms nothing that discredits the doctrine of the virgin birth. To assert that there is anything in biology or in any other modern science that discredits the virgin birth, considered as a physiological event, is to display lack of knowledge of the latest advances of science. Not knowledge of the facts of science, but ignorance of the facts of science causes disbelief in the virgin birth. The blunderings of the 'New Theology' in abandoning the doctrine of the virgin birth may be owing in a measure to the tardiness of the development of the biological and physical sciences; though, certainly, to deny the virgin birth today is to be behind the times in science."

Dr. Fosdick says, that "the virgin birth is not to be accepted as an historic fact," because it involves "a biological miracle that our modern minds cannot use." But whose modern minds? I believe in the virgin birth with all my heart, and whether my mind is modern or ancient. I am at least still alive with all my faculties, and I believe in the virgin birth after science and reading many philosophical and skeptical works!

JESUS NOT AN EVOLUTION

In closing this part of our discussion, I wish to point out that Dr. Fosdick takes the position that it is really of no moment whether we believe in the virgin birth or not. But, my friends, it is of the utmost moment because the right view of the deity of our Lord depends upon it. If Jesus Christ was the Son of God, then it was necessary that He be conceived by God. If He was conceived by a man, then He was only a man; and not only that, but he was a bastard, and Mary was an impure woman.

The claim of the radicals that Jesus was “the fairest flower of evolution,” that He was divine only in the sense that all men have a spark of divinity which He had in a superlative degree, is not tenable. If Jesus was a product of evolution, then He came simply as the result of the combined influences of His heredity and His environment. We cannot rationally believe that such was the case. As to his environment, He lived in one of the most sin-cursed and degraded days in the world’s history; and as to His heredity, if He was not what the Bible pictures Him, then He was the illegitimate son of a prostitute. And we are asked to believe that from such an environment and such an heredity there sprung the profoundest wisdom, the most beautiful holiness, the fairest love and the greatest power our poor earth has ever known!

It is too much to believe! The miracles of unbelief are infinitely more difficult than the miracles of faith.

No! The whole of Christianity depends absolutely on the uniqueness of Jesus, if the Bible has lied about Him, then He was the product of lawless lust, and unchastity. He was nothing but a human imposter, our fair dreams are delusions, and the glory of our race is forever dimmed!

Yes, and the hope of our salvation is also gone. If we are to be redeemed, then we must have a spiritual heredity to take the place of the sinful human heredity which is ours through fallen Adam; and only a virgin-born, divine Christ can supply that!

At the end of each division of his sermon, Dr. Fosdick asks a pointed question, in the effort to discount the Fundamentalists who he has misrepresented and caricatured. In the light, now, of these great truths which I have here given, I also wish to ask a question. It is this: Shall a professor in a theological seminary and a preacher in a great historic pulpit give these teachings, that utterly repudiate the truthfulness of the Word of God and overthrow the holiest tenets of our faith, unanswered and without rebuke?

THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE

Take, again, the question of inspiration of the Bible that Dr. Fosdick raises. I cannot go into much detail here, further than to say, that the Bible itself claims to be a revelation from God. It does not elaborate any formal theory of inspiration, yet inspiration is implied and assumed upon every page. All through the Bible runs such expressions as: “Thus saith the Lord,” etc. But hear, now, some of the specific statements of the Bible on this question.

THE BIBLE ON ITS “INSPIRATION”

In the case of Moses we are told that.

“God spake these words” (Exod. 20:1)

“And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord” (Exod. 24:4) and in repeating them to the children of Israel he was able to say, “These are the words which the Lord hath commanded” (Ex. 35:1).

David said “The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His Word was in my tongue” (2 Sam. 23:2).

Isaiah said “Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord has spoken.” (Isa. 1:2).

Jeremiah said “The Word of the Lord came unto me.” (Jer. 1:4).

Ezekiel saw visions of God and wrote: “The Word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel.” (Ezek. 1:3).

Daniel tells us he received his message in visions (Dan. 7:1) and from the lips of Gabriel (Dan. 9:21).

Amos says he wrote “the words . . . which he saw concerning Israel,” etc. (Am. 1:1).
John says what he writes is “the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him” (Rev. 1:1).

When Jeremiah was first inspired he seemed for the moment quite unconscious of the fact, so that God had actually to tell Him — “Behold, I have put My words in thy mouth.” (Jer. 1:9).

Isaiah said, again, “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them” (Isa. 8:20).

Jesus said: “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.” And “The Scripture cannot be broken.”

Peter said, “For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (2 Pet. 1:21).

Paul said, “For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the Word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe. (1 Thes. 2:13).

“All scripture is given; by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness” (2 Tim. 3:16).

DR. FOSDICK ON “INSPIRATION”

Now, listen again to Dr. Fosdick.

“They (the Fundamentalists) insist that we must all believe in a special theory of inspiration — that the original documents of the Scriptures, which of course we no longer

possess, were inerrantly dictated to men a good deal as a man might dictate to a stenographer . . . They were inerrantly dictated; everything these scientific opinions, medical theories, historical judgments, as well as spiritual insight — is infallible. That is one idea of the Bible's inspiration. But side by side with those who hold it, lovers of the Book as much as they, are multitudes of people who never think about the Bible so. Indeed, that static and mechanical theory of inspiration seems to them a positive peril to the spiritual life. The Koran similarly has been regarded by Mohammedans as having been infallibly written in heaven before it came to earth. But the Koran enshrines theological and ethical ideas of Arabia at the time when it was written. God an Oriental monarch, fatalistic submission to his will as man's chief duty, the use of force on unbelievers, polygamy, slavery — they are all in the Koran. The Koran was ahead of the day when it was written, but, petrified by an artificial idea of inspiration, it has become a millstone about the neck of Mohammedanism. When one turns from the Koran to the Bible, he finds this interesting situation. All of these ideas, which we dislike in the Koran, are somewhere in the Bible. Conceptions from which we now send missionaries to convert Mohammedans are to be found in the Book. There one can find God thought of as an Oriental monarch; there, too, are patriarchal polygamy, and slave systems, and the use of force on unbelievers.”

Here, then, we have once more, side by side, the Bible's assertions concerning its inspiration, and Dr. Fosdick's adroit denial of the Bible teaching. The first thing that I wish to say about this is that here, once more, Dr. Fosdick grossly caricatures the orthodox faith. I do not know a single Christian worker or orthodox preacher who holds to any such theory as he alleged. where God is pictured by Dr. Fosdick, almost with a sneer, as dictating the Bible, as a man dictates to a stenographer. So far as I am acquainted with the orthodox faith, we simply believe what the Bible itself says that “holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” Dr. Collett, in his interesting book upon the Bible, says upon this very subject:

“Let it, however at once be said we do not believe that it partook of that nature of mechanical dictation, nor have we ever met any one who viewed inspiration in that light. Such a theory is absolutely impossible, for it is perfectly clear that the writers of whom anything at all is known, not only maintained, but strikingly betrayed, their own undoubted individuality. The stern character of Moses, the poetic nature of David, the love of John, etc., are clearly stamped upon their particular writings. So that, instead of these men being turned, into mere machines, as the critics unwarrantably charge us with suggesting, their several individualities were evidently made use of by God the Holy Spirit in inspiring them to write His Book, which was intended to be read by all sorts and conditions of men.”

While Dr. Fosdick presents the idea of some sort of vague progressive revelation in the Bible, he does not tell us the full truth by saying that the radicals do not stop with the idea of progressive revelation *within the Bible itself*, but extend the idea beyond the Bible, and set up their own individual consciousness as the final authority. They arrogate to themselves the right to accept some parts of the Bible as the Word of God and to reject other parts. But if we once admit that it is proper to handle the Bible in this way, then all binding authority in God's Word is utterly destroyed. If Dr. Fosdick has the right to

reject the virgin birth, for example, because it does not appeal to him, then have not I the right to reject some other part that he might approve, but that doesn't appeal to me?

Jesus said "the Scripture cannot be broken," but is it not manifest that the entire Bible will soon be broken to pieces by these methods? Is it not perfectly apparent that this new viewpoint for which Dr. Fosdick stands is utterly destructive of any adequate doctrine of inspiration or authority? The great question at issue is not any peculiar theory of inspiration, as Dr. Fosdick asserts, but the credibility, truthfulness, and authority of the Bible itself. And Dr. Fosdick has carried his conceptions of the right of the individual to pick and choose for himself so far that he has rejected the great fundamental teaching of God's Word.

THE KORAN AND THE BIBLE

In his sermon, Dr. Fosdick put the Bible on the same plane as the Koran, so far as inspiration is concerned. He says that the followers of the Koran have suffered because they believe in its inspiration, and argues that the followers of the Bible will suffer in the same way. There is no ground for any such teaching as this other than the ground that Ingersoll, and such free thinkers have always stood upon.

Furthermore, when Dr. Fosdick asserts that all the repulsive ideas which are taught in the Koran are also taught somewhere in the Bible, he does not speak the truth. The Bible does not teach anywhere, as Dr. Fosdick asserts, "God is an oriental monarch, fatalistic submission to His will as man's chief duty, the use of force on unbelievers, polygamy, slavery," etc. It is a monstrous slander against the Holy Word of God to make any such assertion. Even where wrong social or domestic practices are pictured in the Bible, it is made clear that they were tolerated by the Holy God only because of the blindness of the age in which the people lived or the "hardness" of their hearts.

We have vividly before us at the present time the difference between the Bible and the Koran. Once more the people who follow the Koran are butchering and raping and stealing and burning. From the flames of poor tortured Smyrna agonized cries of suffering and despair are ascending because of the monstrous iniquity of the followers of the Koran; but in those very same lands the followers of the Bible are giving their money and sending their food to those poor sufferers; yea, the servants of the Saviour revealed in God's Word, once more are comforting the sorrowing, clothing the naked, binding the wounds of the maimed, and pointing the dying to the shining heights of heaven! Surely, in this sermon of Dr. Fosdick's religious radicalism has overreached itself!

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

We will pass by the question of the atonement, as Dr. Fosdick touches but lightly upon it; and come now to a consideration of the great and important doctrine of the second coming of Christ. Here also Dr. Fosdick follows the same tactics that he followed in discussing the other fundamental tenets of the faith. He rejects the plan Bible teaching upon this all important subject. All through the Bible there runs like a golden thread the blessed hope and expectation of a good time coming when unrighteousness will be overthrown, the devil will be defeated, and purity and peace will prevail over all the earth. This time is called in the Scripture "the day of the Lord," and the Bible makes perfectly plain that in the judgment time of purging and world regeneration, Jesus, Himself, will come back to reign.

THE BIBLE ON CHRIST'S RETURN

God, the Father, through the prophets, said that Jesus would return.

In Zechariah 14:4 it is written: "And His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives which is before Jerusalem on the East."

Jesus, Himself, said that He would come again as recorded in the 14th chapter of John's gospel. He said: "I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am; there ye may be also." And again, He said: "Behold I come quickly: Hold fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown" (Rev. 3:11). Whole chapters of the Gospels are given over to detailed statements from Jesus concerning His coming again, and in the midst of this explicit teaching, we have such expressions as this: "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" — (Matt. 24:30) and this: "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory" (Matt. 25:31). "Watch therefore; for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh" (Matt. 24:42).

After He ascended in to Heaven, the angels said He would come again: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven" (Acts 1:11).

Further, the Holy Spirit, through the Apostles, said that He would come again. "For 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" (1 Thes. 4:15). "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. 9:28). "For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and he will not tarry" (Heb. 10:37).

The very first prophecy and promise of the Bible is that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and in the last sentence in the Bible, Jesus says, "Surely, I come quickly," and the response, to that, the devout prayer of John: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

DR. FOSDICK ON CHRIST'S RETURN

As over against this glorious and majestic teaching of the Word of God, Dr. Fosdick says that Jesus will never come in any such personal way as the Bible declares. He says: "Side by side with these to whom the second coming is a literal expectation, another group exists in the evangelical churches. They too, say, 'Christ is coming!' They say it with all their hearts; but they are not thinking of an external arrival on the clouds. They have assimilated as part of the divine revelation the exhilarating insight which these recent generations have given to us, that development is God's way of working out His will"

And these Christians, when they say that Christ is coming, mean that, slowly it may be, but surely, His will and principles will be worked out by God's grace in human life and institutions, until 'He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied.'"

Here, then, is the explicit teaching of Dr. Fosdick that Jesus Christ will not return personally to this earth at all. To Dr. Fosdick, and these rationalists who thus coolly reject the Bible, the second coming Christ means merely the triumph "of His will and principles in human life and institutions."

I would point out that this teaching utterly rejects the entire plan of our Lord. Those who believe in the second coming of Christ have division in their own ranks as to when He will come — whether before or after the millennium — but this teaching, note you, jumps entirely over all of those views and explicitly contradicts the plain teaching of the Bible and rejects the age-long faith of the church that at some time in human history Christ, Himself, will surely return. Dr. Fosdick is not troubled over any question of the "pre-millennial" or the "post-millennial" return of our Lord. He joins Shailer Mathews and other rationalists and simply contradicts the Bible flatly and says He will not return at all in any real or personal way.

The great question, then, is: Will we believe the Word of God, or will we believe the word of Dr. Fosdick? Will we stand with those who accept the Bible as true, or will we stand with those who practically say that it is filled with lies and illusions? That, my friends, is the great issue of today.

Hear me, then, in a few closing observations:

CAN WE EXPLAIN DR. FOSDICK?

For one thing, I want to say that there is an intelligible explanation for Dr. Fosdick. He has not come about simply by chance. He is an excellent example of the finished product of the skeptical schools and seminaries of today. Dr. Fosdick has a brilliant mind and could have been a gloriously useful preacher of the Gospel, but unfortunately in his youth he fell under the domination of radical teachers who fascinated him and who swept him away from the safe moorings of faith in the Word of God. Dr. Fosdick for years was a student of Dr. W. N. Clark of Colgate University. Dr. Clark was an interesting gentleman in many ways, but, himself, had been poisoned by German rationalism, and though he did not proclaim his views so baldly as Dr. Fosdick, he, also, rejected the true inspiration of the Scripture and many of the other great fundamental tenets of our faith. Dr. Clark in his book on "The Use Of The Scriptures In Theology" in speaking for example, of the first chapters of Genesis, says: "Now we know that they are not historical records and bear no testimony as to the age of the world and man, or the manner of creation." In the same connection, he declares that the narrative in Genesis is not a trustworthy record concerning the origin of sin (pages 80-90). Dr. Clark taught further that the Bible record concerning the words of Jesus is not trustworthy, and even in instances where the Bible record is admitted to be accurate, in quoting the actual words of Jesus, Dr. Clark took the position that Christ was mistaken concerning some of the things He taught, being influenced by Jewish conceptions of the Kingdom, etc.

Here, then we have the fountain-head of Dr. Fosdick's theology. But he has out-Heroded Herod, and has gone even further than Dr. Clark, because this downward tendency in unbelief is always cumulative in its gathering force. It begins very mildly, then the next generation is stronger, and the next stronger still, and the students that Dr.

Fosdick is teaching in the Union Theological Seminary, therefore, we may expect, will go even further than he has now gone. In fact, I had a concrete illustration of this truth in precisely this connection. A few weeks ago there came to my study here in Calvary Church a young Baptist preacher who was formerly sound in the faith, but he has been, for some time, a student at union Seminary. He told me that he had specialized under Dr. Fosdick, taking everything that he could possible get from him. He admitted to me, in the course of the conversation, that he had completely changed his viewpoint, and was about ready to leave the Baptists and go over to the Unitarians. Well, that is exactly what he ought to do, to be honest and consistent. But, my friends, the pathos and the tragedy of it! In the name of the divine Christ, the Son of God, I cry out in protest against this downward trend in the seminaries today, which, instead of strengthening the convictions of their students, is weakening their confidence in the Bible as God's Word and even wrecking their faith in Jesus Christ, Himself, as the Son of God.

THE QUESTION OF ETHICS

There is a further practical observation which I wish to make, and that is that I do not believe that Dr. Fosdick has any ethical right to stand in a great historic Christian pulpit, under the conditions which exist in connection with his present pastorate of the First Presbyterian Church. Dr. Fosdick still announces himself as a Baptist, and his utterances are printed in our own radical denomination organ "THE BAPTIST." Well, if he is a Baptist, he certainly cannot preach Baptist doctrine from a Presbyterian pulpit, nor if he is in any true sense a Baptist can he preach Presbyterian doctrine from his pulpit. What, then, is left to him? Nothing except to preach upon secondary theological questions, social service issues, and general humanitarian betterment.

It is an utterly anomalous situation, and to be perfectly frank, a mere statement of the conditions proves that it is highly embarrassing to both the Presbyterian and Baptist brotherhoods. If John Know should sit in the First Presbyterian Church and hear a sermon of Dr. Fosdick's, he would either die all over again of apoplexy, or stand up and give expression to such righteous wrath as that before which Queen Mary cringed and wept; and if John the Baptist were to hear Dr. Fosdick preach, he would throw up his hands in inexpressible amazement, and exclaim: "Great heavens, is that one of my sons?"

VIOLATES THE PRESBYTERIAN CREED

I do not wish, my friends, to seem unkind, but the situation demands the same frank and outspoken treatment from the standpoint of orthodoxy and faith that Dr. Fosdick has exemplified from the standpoint of rationalism and doubt. Dr. Fosdick is one of the pastors of the great historic First Presbyterian Church of this city. The noble Presbyterian Church has a Confession of Faith which has been the bulwark of sound doctrine for ages, and which every minister of the Presbyterian Church and every ordained elder takes a public vow to maintain and sustain. Listen to what this Confession of Faith says upon the inspiration of the Holy Scripture:

"The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God."

The creed of the Presbyterian church says again:

“Jesus Christ was conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and born of her, yet without sin!”

Listen, again, to what the Presbyterian Confession says on the second coming of Christ:

“Christ is to be exalted in His coming again to judge the world, in that He, who was unjustly judged and condemned by wicked men shall come again at the last day in great power and in the full manifestation of His own glory, and of His Father’s with all His holy angels, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, to judge the world in righteousness.”

A PRESBYTERIAN EDITOR ON DR. FOSDICK

How can Dr. Fosdick reconcile his radical utterances with these tremendous and beautiful statements of Christian truth? Little wonder that the editor of their official organ “THE PRESBYTERIAN,” in the issue of Sept. 7th, 1922, makes a few remarks on Dr. Fosdick. Speaking under the head “THE LAWLESSNESS OF THE THING,” the editor says:

“Dr. Fosdick takes the same view of the authority of the Bible and of the essential doctrines taught in it and accepted by the church, as did Colonel Robert Ingersoll. They both reject the Old Testament, and rehearse its mistakes. They accept the New Testament in its social teachings of Christ, but reject all of its great fundamentals. Both Dr. Fosdick and Colonel Ingersoll were brought up in the church. The difference between the two is this: When Colonel Ingersoll knew his beliefs were antagonistic to the church, he withdrew and carried on his propaganda independently, accepting the responsibility and maintenance of the same himself. Dr. Fosdick is determined to remain inside the church and fight her by the boring process with in her own walls, and compel the church to maintain him and be responsible for him and his propaganda. Rather than withdraw and follow his own course in his own way and with his own support, he means to stay in the church, and by a bitter fight compel the church to endorse him or exclude him and his followers. How does this differ from the purpose and action of the bandits who force their way into a home and compel its occupants to throw up their hands or yield their property and their lives. In the case of the bandits, the only question is, has the man of the house power to resist? If not, all is lost. If the church has not the power to resist, she, too, will be devastated. Every Sabbath, in the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church of New York City, both the doctrinal and governmental parts of this constitution are violated. The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church declares that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only infallible rule of faith and obedience. Dr. Fosdick says they are not infallible, and new knowledge of the twentieth century and the individual religious consciousness are the rule of faith and obedience. The Presbyterian Constitution says: ‘Jesus Christ was conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and born of her, yet without sin.’ Dr. Fosdick scorns this, and calls it ‘a biological miracle,’ and argues that other great teachers were said to have had a virgin birth, and the whole matter is a myth. The Presbytery of New York by its silence violates its own vows and constitution by permitting Dr. Fosdick’s infidel

pronouncements every Sabbath from the pulpit of one of its leading churches, and that to crowded houses, such as went to hear Colonel Ingersoll when he delivered the same general message. What is all this but concentrated lawlessness, and we ask Dr. Fosdick how, as a professed Christian, a gentleman, and a fair man, he justifies himself in being a party to such violence and lawlessness in this twentieth century?"

DR. FOSDICK AND THE BAPTISTS

Since Dr. Fosdick is preaching from a Presbyterian pulpit, I for one, feel that the editor of "THE PRESBYTERIAN" has a perfect right to ask that question; and I think, also, that some Baptist voice has the right ask Dr. Fosdick some questions. I think the time has come when, with the same frankness he displayed on these theological matters, he ought to declare himself upon the question of denominational and church affiliation.

I read a little while ago an incident telling about a farmer who was driving a pair of old-fashioned horses along the public highway. A new fangled artist was sitting under a tree beside the road painting a landscape. He had his easel, with a large canvass on it, and a gaudy colored umbrella shading him from one side. As he crouched on his stool, with his white shirt shining in the midst of all that blaze of color, and a straw hat topping it off above, he was a startling and unusual sight to the sedate and staid horses of the farmer. So, when they saw him, they began rearing and plunging and standing on their hind legs. The farmer arose and tugged energetically at the reins and called to the horses, but could not quiet them; and then he called out to the artist: "Stand up, dern yuh, and let my critters see what you are!"

That may be a little rough in its application, but since the time has come when the faith of students for the ministry is being wrecked and churches are being split to pieces by these revolutionary and destructive heresies, we have a right to demand that the radicals shall openly declare themselves, and then that they shall do what they ought to do, in all honesty — organize their own schools and their own churches for the proclamation of their revolutionary views, and no longer divide and burden the faithful churches of Christ, who want no better belief than the faith once for all delivered to the saints of God.

A CHALLENGE TO DEBATE

Speaking, therefore, as a Baptist from a Baptist pulpit, and with the simple desire that the attention of all thoughtful people may be directed to these issues, I take this opportunity to challenge Dr. Fosdick to a public debate. As he seems to hold these revolutionary views in sincerity, he ought to be willing to defend them in public and to answer whatever questions those who still believe the Bible may desire to ask him.

I have, therefore, written Dr. Fosdick a letter challenging him to a discussion of the following question:

"RESOLVED, that the Bible is the inspired and authoritative revelation from the living God, and that it teaches the virgin birth, the vicarious atonement, the bodily resurrection, and the visible return of Jesus Christ."

If Dr. Fosdick accepts this challenge, which I earnestly and sincerely hope he will do, I shall suggest two other discussions to follow, one on this subject:

“RESOLVED, that the world was created by a personal God, transcendent to the material universe, and not evolved through the chance operation of resident forces within dead matter.”

Following that debate there should be still another on this subject:

“RESOLVED, that man is a creation of the living God and not an evolution from an ape-like beast.”

FUNDAMENTALISTS OR FUNNYMONKEYISTS?

Dr. Fosdick has raised the question in his sermon: “SHALL THE FUNDAMENTALISTS WIN?” In this last debate I would like to raise the question: “SHALL THE FUNNYMONKEYISTS WIN?” for that is really what the issue of today is: — Is man a child of God or a descendant of the monkeys? And the Fundamentalists are neither as dangerous nor as amusing to the thoughtful as the Funnymonkeyists!

I believe the time is ripe for a full and frank discussion of these great questions. This debate can be carried forward upon a plane of high dignity, and with a proper spirit of courtesy, and yet with utmost frankness and the sincere desire that the truth shall triumph. In my letter to Dr. Fosdick extending this challenge, I have suggested that the debate, or debates, be held on Sunday afternoons, either in the Hippodrome, Carnegie Hall, or some other suitable assembly place. I have also suggested that if he would prefer holding the discussion in a church, I will meet him for the first debate in the First Presbyterian Church and then that he can come for the second debate here to Calvary auditorium, and that the third debate can be held upon neutral ground in some other church edifice.

I stand ready and willing to defend the affirmative of all of these propositions, and I would suggest, as the discussion is to deal with questions of fact and evidence, that we ask three of the learned judges of our city to hear the discussions and to render decision as to which side wins. If the offerings at these meetings exceed the expenses, then I suggest that we send the surplus to the relief of the suffering people of Armenia.

THE FRUITS OF FAITH

In closing, my friends, may I call your minds and hearts once more now to the thought of individual responsibility which we all must carry in the face of the tremendous conditions of today. The faith that has redeemed uncounted men and women down the Christian centuries, that has brought guidance in perplexity, light in darkness, comfort in sorrow, and cheer in the solemn presence of death itself; the faith that has brought into being the noble churches that have blessed the children of men, that has touched government with the hand of liberty, that has rendered sacred the marriage vow, and thus laid the foundations of our homes; the faith that has inspired poets and artists and romancers and musicians; the faith that has brought the spirit of brotherhood and charity to at least some sections of the race, — yes, the faith which has touched the darkness and horror of the grave with the glorious light of heaven — this faith is being assailed today almost flippantly and jauntily. Young crusaders of error are breaking their lances upon its shield. And our schools and theological seminaries, instead of deepening the faith and enriching the spiritual lives of their students, in many cases, are blighting their faith and taking away an authoritative Bible and a Divine Christ. Numbers of young men are

constantly leaving the ministry completely because of what they are taught in the seminaries. This, to my mind, is the supreme tragedy of the modern religious world. The fight for the faith, outside the ranks, has been gloriously won, but Jesus said: "A man's foes shall be those of his own household," and the worst enemies of today, alas, are those within the ranks! We can answer skepticism and infidelity on the outside, but it is infinitely more difficult to answer it when it puts upon itself a religious label and fights within the gates. The call comes strong and clear today, to "endure hardness," to prove ourselves "good Soldiers of Jesus Christ" and to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints." Shall we stand idly by in the midst of this great conflict, or shall we put on the whole armor of God and stand forth now to do valiant battle against the foes within the ranks, in the name of our Crucified, Risen, and Coming Lord?

The Religious Searchlight

Rev. John Roach Straton, Editor

Vol. 1, No. 7

October 1, 1922