

VOTED

The Whitsitt Resolutions By 177 Majority.

The Discussion Concluded—Cuban Resolution Introduced.

When the forms closed for the regular edition Saturday the discussion on the Whitsitt matter was in progress. A second edition briefly gave the result of the vote. The following is a part of the unfinished discussion:

Third speaker, Dr. W. H. Felix said in part:

"I have had positive convictions since the meeting at Chattanooga. I most heartily concur in the resolutions. I wish it understood where I stand. I have never seen any intimation that Dr. Whitsitt wants my sympathy. He hardly recognizes me when he sees me. We are called the rabble. No man not of the elite can differ from those of the other side. But I have my opinion. The other side say they don't know anything about the question, don't care to read, don't care whether Dr. Whitsitt is right or wrong. 'I'm for Uncle Billie,' and they censure us who do care. They ought to have convictions. I stand here because Dr. Whitsitt has done more to prejudice other denominations against the Baptists than any



REV. A. T. ROBERTSON.

other man alive. We must fight over his head, against his principles. Why did he want to take a Pedit-baptist stand? Why write damaging articles, sign no name, and remain so long silent? As long as he is at the head of the Seminary that statement about Baptist history will be an obstacle to Baptist progress. They will say the head of your Seminary does not believe on Baptism as you do. Many Pedit-baptists formerly troubled are now quiet, and because of Dr. Whitsitt's position. If it is good enough for Baptists, it will suit other denominations. Sprinkle or baptize, it is all right. Dr. Whitsitt says so. You have to fight the world, the flesh and the devil over Dr. Whitsitt's head. Not one dollar more of my money, not one mite more of my influence shall ever go to the Seminary as long as he is President. And the Treasurer's books show that I have a right to make this statement."

The fourth speaker, Dr. J. T. Christian, said in part:

"I have been accused of saying some very ugly things. I have never said any such thing. I never question a man's motives. I love facts. Dr. W. made statements

I went to the books and found he misquoted, garbled and made mistakes. I spent time to get the truth. I got it. I have no apology to offer. I have always studied originals for twenty-five years. There are one thousand errors in Dr. Whitsitt's book, "A question in Baptist history." These errors are all in favor of Dr. Whitsitt and against the Baptists. Therefore he is utterly unfit to be the President of the Seminary. Things in his mind and not in the authorities occur frequently in his book. The things from the Kiffin MS. are not in it at all, but were introduced from another place and called a discovery. I read a paragraph from the book. I turn to the Boston edition (1813) of Benedict's Baptist History to prove the statement that the word "immersion" does not occur, is absolutely false. He did this. He is not fit to be the President of a Baptist Seminary. Everywhere you open this book you find like remarkable mis-statements. Dr. Hague (1846) is misquoted the same way. How could he thus write against his own brethren? At Bowling Green he was making his mis-statements, and I was sitting just in front of him with the book he was thus mutilating in my hand. I have never had such feelings to come over me. I am speaking of Featley's "Dippers Dipped."

I think there is no trouble in understanding the English I am using in this connection.

Dr. Whitsitt left out introductions and began in the middle of paragraphs, so changing the whole drift of meanings. So I believe he should not be the President of any Baptist Seminary.

This was one of the strongest speeches we have heard on this side of the subject.

Those who opposed the resolution now announced Dr. F. H. Kerfoot to speak for them.

He said in part: This is one of the most painful moments of my life. I made no preparation. I expected no fight. I've been in no caucus. I am not willing to go into the personalities of this discussion. I speak for the good of the Seminary alone.

Only two things could force me to speak: first an anticipated split in the Southern Baptist Convention; second, the breaking of the relation between the Convention and the Seminary. You do not touch the most serious point of the report. This is your Seminary. Because of something in it you do not like you propose to throw up your Seminary, refuse it a chance, crush it if possible. Dr. Boyce said of old if the Seminary is not what you want it to be make it so. Whether there is a real or a fancied taint are you going on that account to destroy or try to destroy the Seminary? It has taken forty years to build it up. Will this remove the trouble? Will you whenever a professor takes a view you do not like, refuse all support until it suits you exactly. Another point, the spirit that because you can't

control the institution as you would like or as soon as you like, you will urge the separation from the convention. Think, act slowly. The Seminary has had given it the lives of Boyce, Broaddus, Williams and Manly, and the thousands of dollars which you all have contributed. Would you cripple it? If this matter ever passes, it will be done by a junction of the extremes. Cut loose from the Seminary, what then? To-day the denomination can make itself felt. Cut it loose you can control it no longer. Professors can then teach what they please. The Seminary has \$800,000. It can live on this. Now you can say something. If you carry this resolution you can no longer do anything. I want to be cut loose from the Seminary if it is cut loose from the Baptists. Let it be bound a thousand times more closely rather than this. Do not rush madly on that which it has taken years to build, and destroy the grandest monument of Southern Baptists. It can't be done by dash, by rush. Let public sentiment crystalize, then the denomination can carry out its will. Do not throw away in a few years your grand institution. Leave the matter to the committee appointed under the Carroll resolution at Norfolk.

Prof. A. T. Robertson spoke next somewhat as follows:

We must get the attitude of the whole South. The Seminary belongs to the Baptists of the South.



REV. J. W. WARDER.

Consider this. Neither Kentucky nor Virginia has a right to control the Seminary, but the Baptists of the South. We are not thinking of the Baptists of other States. We are divided on a great many different things, this is a large country. The religious atmosphere of the different States is not the same. We are all agreed on all leading doctrines, but there are some doctrines on which we are not united. The most extreme positions were taken two years ago when this was a mere historical question. He was at once called unsound, not a Baptist because of his historical position. We have lost sight of the main issue. "1641" is but a day in the great realms of history.

Here ensued a lively tilt between Dr. Coleman and Prof. Robertson, which caused much mirth in the audience. Dr. Robertson then said: This trouble has been in the denomination years and years. It existed before the war of 1861-65. In '72-'74 resolutions were passed condemning the Seminary on account of Dr. Williams' views on Alien immersion. I have letters from Boyce to Broaddus about this discussion. Dr. Boyce said:

"Soul liberty is worth more than Alien immersion even among Land-markers." My only point is this: We are divided on many points. Who are the Baptists? Are we or are the other fellows? Let us have soul liberty. Let us agree to disagree.

Dr. Carter Helm Jones then spoke in part as follows:

I wish to beg you not to adopt this resolution. You say the Trustees have waved aside all your resolutions. Have they? I do not think so. They have carefully considered them and courteously answered them. No institution ever had wiser or abler men than these. And after all due deliberation they decided that Dr. Whitsitt had done nothing to merit his being turned out. Don't we have to trust them?

Is the matter not entrusted to their charge. I feel too deeply and sadly to bandy words or match phrases. I have never heard you called the rabble. I have never used the term. Have these brethren proved that this resolution should be passed? I think not. Have the Southern Baptists demanded this? Not at Wilmington, not at Norfolk, not in Maryland, nor in Virginia, nor in North Carolina, nor in South Carolina, or Missouri. The trustees did not think it wise to subvert a Missionary body into an ecclesiastical court. How has the past year shown him to be unfit? Has the Seminary gone to wreck? I studied under him. He is wise, careful and successful. The students are there, the personnel is good. What is the trouble? When Dr. Whitsitt meets Dr. Christian on a subject of scholarship it does not take me long to decide who has the best of it. I read Dr. Whitsitt's book and see very different things from those Dr. Christian found. We must not get out of accord with the great Baptist brotherhood of the South. If the date "1641" bothers you, you have already put yourself on record twice. Let the matter alone. Let the trustees decide it. Let us have in essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity."

Rev. J. O. Rust then spoke in part:

"If I believed as Dr. J. T. Christian does I would make his accusation to the Board of Trustees and let them sift and weigh the matter. I sat by an eminent jurist as that speech was being made. He said he could reach no conclusion from that speech. No man can answer the speeches on the other side of this question, for they are all wide of the resolution. Dr. Whitsitt is a Baptist. He who says he is not misrepresents him, misunderstands him.

Is Dr. Whitsitt merely incidental in this attack? This attack is against the Seminary. If he should go, make him go, but I beg do not for one man wreck out Seminary. Will you not halt and think? Behind that leading step there is marching into the heart of the convention, the disruption of the greatest Baptist constituency on this earth. Leave the matter to the committee appointed. If this resolution is passed, Dr. Coleman, himself on that Committee, can not act with justice and judgment. Pause and think and do not act so as to harm the Seminary.

The last speaker on this side, Dr. W. O. Carver, then delivered a strong speech on his side of this much discussed question. He was followed by Rev. Z. T. Cody and he in turn by Dr. T. T. Eaton. Lack of space prevents our reporting these most excellent speeches.

Dr. Eaton spoke in part as follows:

"I asked all moderators two questions: 'What do you think ought to be done with the Whitsitt question?' Second, 'How should it be done?' I wrote to 57 and 53 answered against Whitsitt. North



PROF. A. C. DAVIDSON.

Carolina sentiment is overwhelming against Dr. Whitsitt. Dr. Whitsitt believes he stands for a great principle. Here Dr. Whitsitt raised his eyes and hands to Heaven and said: "I do in the name of the Lord." Let's ask all District As-

(CONTINUED ON 4TH PAGE.)

BOYS

In Blue Arrive At Santiago To Invade Cuba.

Gen. Shafter's Army of 16,000 Are Ready To Land.



GENERAL SHAFTER.

NEW YORK, June 20.—(Special.)—A Journal dispatch from Mole St. Nicholas says Gen. Shafter's army of 16,000 soldier son a flotilla of 49 vessels has arrived off Santiago and Guantauamo and a landing will probably be made to-day

Following is an official estimate of Gen. Shafter's forces: Infantry, (regulars) 9520; Cavalry, 2640; Light artillery, 300; Heavy artillery, 200; Signal corps, 100; Volunteer infantry, 2000; Engineers, 200; Volunteer cavalry, 500; Officers, 1000. Total 16,460.

Another Report From Manila.

Victoria, June 20.—(Special.)—Manila advices say that the steamers Boston and Concord, that left May 12th to attacked Iloilo captured the place without resistance. The Saranac seized by the Spanish gunboat was found deserted and recaptured. The Americans have plenty of coal, having captured 6,000 tons at Cavite arsenal.

Col. San Miguel, of the Spanish artillery, after inspecting the small stock of ammunition at his disposal, committed suicide. Montejo, the "Fighting Admiral" praised for bravery deserves disgrace, say the correspondents. He fled from ship to ship and was among the first ashore at the battle of Manila.

Believe Havana Will Be Burned.

Key West, June 20.—(Special.)—The Cubans feel certain that Havana will be burned and Cervera's ships destroyed when capture becomes inevitable. The monitor Terror arrived here to-day. A government vessel brings two men from Havana, one a Spanish pilot who deserted Blanco and the other a Cuban spy. They have complete charts of Havana fortifications and mines in the harbor.

France's Very Bad Faith.

Paris, June 20.—(Special.)—Austrian commission agents have returned from Madrid where they delivered 3,000,000 cartridges and 120 tons of explosives. This shows how easy it is to deliver contraband roads through France, that government's efforts to prevent it being merely nominal.

Camara's Feet Not Formidable.

Dublin, June 20.—(Special.)—Freeman's Journal says: English experts report Camara's Cadiz fleet in a frightful condition. The arsenal and ships are grossly neglected. Vessels are short of ammunition and the armament can't be fixed at Cadiz.

Two More Ships Sail.

Fort Monroe, June 20.—(Special.)—The Newark and the destroyer Yankton sailed yesterday, mission and destination unknown.

Another Refusal to Exchange.

Washington, June 20.—(Special.)—Commodore Watson has reported to the Navy Department that Blanco refuses to exchange Hobson.

Manila Believed to Have Fallen.

Madrid June 20.—(Special.)—The belief prevails here that Manila has surrendered.