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The person whom the Bible designates a believer is one who has been persuaded that Jesus is the Saviour (John 20:31). He is not one who has merely assented to gospel truth or fact, but one who has believed with all the heart; a belief that involves every faculty of his intelligent being—his reason, his sensibilities, his will (Rom. 10:9, 10). The noun “pistis,” (faith) means confidence, trust. The verb “pistēō” (believe) means adherence to, reliance on. The nobleman’s (Acts 8) belief with all his heart meant his reliance on what Philip had preached unto him as essential elements of salvation. His faith in Jesus and his confession of that faith meant nothing less than his acceptance of all terms and conditions of salvation laid down in the preaching of Philip (Acts 8:12). And the conviction of those “pricked in their hearts” on Pentecost (Acts 2) was a faith that yielded the willing spirit of obedience in the pleading question, “What shall we do?” Such a faith implies and embraces all necessary conditions named in God’s law of pardon.

Salvation

The commission according to Mark says, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” This salvation is the forgiveness of past sins; pardon, the complete absolution of guilt; remission of sins. But this pardon is an executive act. It takes place in the mind of God in heaven; not in the heart of man on earth. The thing we know as inner consciousness cannot determine by inward feelings that pardon has been granted. Pardon can be known only as God declares it. The man in the penitentiary can release an inmate of it on the ground of an inner consciousness; the Governor declares it. No warden of such an institution would have power to become a child of God, even to them that believed. “Yes see, then, that by works a man is justified and not by faith only.” (Jas. 2:24).

Faith Plus

If a man exercises faith but his faith does not exercise him; either the subject has a poor faith or the faith has a poor subject. Some plain passages from the New Testament suggesting some pointed questions will serve to show that mere faith does not save.

First: “But as many as received him, to them gave he . . . (Acts 6:7) a great company of priests became obedient to the faith. In the other case (John 12:42) many of the rulers believed but would not confess. Both of these companies of Jewish officials believed; but only one company was justified. It proves that faith only does not save, else both companies would have been saved seeing that they both believed. “Yes, see, then, that by works a man is justified and not by faith only.” (Jas. 2:24).

By Faith

The issue is not whether one is saved or justified by faith—to that we all agree. The issue is in the degree of faith—when is one saved by faith before baptism in their order of things. True, faith comes before baptism, but one is not saved by faith before baptism any more than one would be saved by repentance before faith in the Baptist order of things. This one thing answers every argument that can be made by a Baptist against baptism on the ground that one is saved by faith and that faith preceded baptism. All passages that declare justification by faith (Rom. 5:1) and others of like import we accept and believe and claim. But we deny that any of these passages teach or imply that one is saved by faith before he is baptized. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.”

By Faith When

The eleventh chapter of Hebrews lists the men of faith in the former dispensation. By faith they were approved—but faith plus what? By faith Abel offered his sacrifice and was justified by it. By faith Enoch moved in godly fear. By faith Abraham obeyed when he was called. Try faith alone on any of these examples of justification by faith and see how it works. “Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect.” (Jas. 2:21, 22).

In further proof that it requires an active faith to produce justification, contrast the cases of the priests and rulers who believed. In one case (Acts 6:7) a great company of priests became obedient to the faith. In the other case (John 12:42) many of the rulers believed but would not confess. Both of these companies of Jewish officials believed; but only one company was justified. It proves that faith only does not save, else both companies would have been saved seeing that they both believed. “Yes see, then, that by works a man is justified and not by faith only.” (Jas. 2:24).

Faith Plus

If a man exercises faith but his faith does not exercise him; either the subject has a poor faith or the faith has a poor subject. Some plain passages from the New Testament suggesting some pointed questions will serve to show that mere faith does not save.

First: “But as many as received him, to them gave he the power to become sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.” (John 1:12) Question: How does a believer exercise the power to become a child of God?

Second: “And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number that believed turned unto the Lord.” (Acts 11:21) Question: What did these believers do when they turned unto the Lord?

Third: “Repent ye, therefore, and turn again (be converted) that your sins may be blotted out.” (Acts 3:19) Question: What did these repentant persons do when they turned?
A SEPARATE PEOPLE

The divine idea of separation in religion is as old as the Jewish race. Abraham was chosen of God to be the father of the chosen race. But idolatrous Ur of the Chaldees was not a land to nourish such a race. Influences were overwhelmingly against God's purpose to raise up a separate people. Hence, the call of God came to Abram to abandon country and kindred and seek a home in an unknown land. And that is the beginning of a separation—a separate family.

Years afterwards the posterity of Abraham, through a series of varied providential circumstances, settled in the land of Egypt. There they grew into a numerous race. Time developed that they could not serve God in Egypt. Separation was essential. God called them out of Egypt. A peculiar nation was formed at Sinai, with peculiar laws, a peculiar government, and peculiar life and relations. In keeping this law and maintaining this separation Israel was blessed. But when they departed, changed their government (1 Sam. 8), served other gods (Deut. 8: 19), and formed alliances, they were rejected by God and subjected by their enemies. And only after reformation did God grant them restoration. (Ex. 10: 10, 11.) The lesson of the story is separation—a separate nation.

But that is not the end of the story of separation. God still requires it—a separate church. As fleshly Israel was called out of Egypt, God has called the church, spiritual Israel, out of the world. And to retain the favor of God, the church must maintain that separation distinct and peculiar.

1. The church must maintain separation in speech. “Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard in me.” (2 Tim. 1: 13.) The power of a united language is demonstrated in the Tower of Babel. It became the bond of an apostate union which God had to break up in a confusion of tongues. And it is so that unity and purity of speech—calling Bible things by Bible names—is brands among Christians that will triumph over error and bring order out of confusion.

2. The church must maintain separation in doctrine. Paul's admonition to “sneak thou the thines that become sound doctripns” needs constant emphasis today. The New Testament command to “touch not, taste not, and handle not.” does not refer to strong drink, but to “the commandments and doctrines of men.” (Col. 2: 21, 22.) It is a warning against flirting with error and fraternizing with denominationalism. The growing idea that the “church of Christ” must be a church among churches will prove fatal, and it must not prevail. It is the church or nothing. It is one way or none. Any participation on the part of members of the church of Christ in denominational functions can only compromise the church and is detrimental to the cause of truth.

3. The church must maintain separation in worship. The Old Testament injunction to “take heed lest ye turn aside” has its counterpart in the New Testament counsel: “Let no man beguile you...intruding into those things which he hath not seen... and not holding the Head... after the commandments and doctrines of men. Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship.” (Col. 2: 18-23.) Self-devised worship is condemned along with man-written creeds and man-made doctrines. The New Testament pattern must be adhered to.

4. Christians must maintain separation in life. Terms of dignity are applied to Christians. The church is “a chosen generation,” it is “a royal priesthood” and “a holy nation.” Christians are to “show forth the praises (or excellencies) of God who called them.

The demand of the Bible upon Christians is to deny “ungodliness and worldly lusts” and to live “soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world.” —F. E. W.
A MODERN SIMON TALKS WITH GOD
CLED E. WALLACE

He says he did, "actually and literally." Who? Dr. Frank B. Robinson of Moscow, Idaho. He is the founder and operator of "Psychiana" a religious movement of "twelve years standing." This new religion was born in a personal experience alleged to have happened to its founder. He admits that the thing he claims is "strange, almost unbelievable" and he is the sole witness. "This experience may sound unbelievable, but it's true or I wouldn't tell you it was." He expects us to believe as tall a tale as a fanatic ever told about a transcendent experience with Jehovah. He talks with God. Prophet Joseph Smith of Mormon fame had nothing on this Idahoan when it comes to modesty--the absence of it! He does not propose to bluff unseen, nor unheard, and waste his fragrance on the desert air. He is advertising himself as "that power of God which is called Great" in expensive insertions in large daily newspapers throughout the nation. He has incorporated and copyrighted his religion and "operates entirely by mail." Here is a sample of his claims to unique intimacy with God.

"Well, I own control of the largest afternoon daily newspaper in North Idaho. I own the largest office building in my City. I drive two beautiful cars, I own my own home which has a lovely pipe-organ in it, and my family gave me the organ for after I'm gone. And all this has been made possible because, one day, about twelve years ago, I actually and literally talked with God."

It is a lot easier to believe that this whole "Psychiana" set-up is a pious fraud to make money than it is to believe that a conversation with the Lord put a forty-two year old "horrible, dismal, sickening failure" on easy street in New York City than Frank Robinson does in Moscow, Idaho. He claims that he has contacted God and proposes to sell the gift of God for money. Ancient Simon proposed "to obtain the gift of God with money" from an apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ. He got a heavy jolt for his presumption. "But Peter said unto him, Thy silver perish with thee, because thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God with money." Modern Simon operates only by mail. He talks with God and proposes to sell the gift of God for money. In the light of the scriptures both he and the dupes who try to buy it from him are "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." It is "strange, almost unbelievable" that anybody could for a moment entertain the thought that God Almighty endorses the quackery that this religious opportunist constantly quacks about through the advertising mediums of the nation.

He may have all that he claims to "control" but in view of "the strange, almost unbelievable" reason he advances for having it, I would not take it as collateral on a loan without further investigation. I agree with him that he "sounds unbelievable." If he owned all of Moscow, Idaho, he could be very oxen-heavy, too. God and prophecy. Wm. Wrigley owns a better house in California than Modern Simon does in Moscow and he built his business out of his chewing gum instead of "Psychiana, incorporated"--operating only by mail! And I have heard of at least one "certain rich man" who probably had more than this Moscow Wonder; boasts of, who never even thought about talking with God until he died and went to hell, and then it was "too late."

This special pet of Jevhovah, who supposes that he has somewhat of a corner on divine communication, is reputed to be a bear-cat for temper. Criticism seems to stir up "that strange mystical Power" within him which is not usually thought of in connection with God. It has been circulated around a bit that he threatened legal action against a religious publication a few years ago for a milder attack than this. Possibly when he reads this, he will forget about talking with God alone: enough to consult his lawyer. We advise him in advance that "operating entirely by mail" may prove more profitable to him as we are about as short on cash as Simon Peter was at the Beautiful Gate of the temple. But we are not as short on brains as the nincompoop who thinks he has to have an operation from Moscow, Idaho "entirely by mail" to enable him to establish a connection with heaven.

One should really go back to the city of Samaria about the time Philip established the church there, to find a model for this modern "psychiana" wonder. Old Simon really might have gone places if he could have used some big dailies and the people could have read them. As it was he put on a pretty good show and amazed a lot of ignoramuses with his tricks until he was shown up for the windy that he was. His claims were fraudulent and he was operating for profit.

"But there was a certain man, Simon by name, who beforetime in the city used Sorcery, and amazed the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one: to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying. This man is that power of God which is called Great. And they gave heed to him, because that of long time he had amazèd them with his sorceries." (Acts 8:9–17)

"The most amazing thing about Psychiana Simon of Moscow, Idaho is the incredible nature of his claims which he admits to be "strange, almost unbelievable," and the fact that there are people empty-headed enough to allow him to reach into their pocket-books "entirely by mail." You cannot talk with God unless you "learn the secret," and this Moscow wizard appears to be the sole custodian of it. He proposes to sell you this gift of God for money. Ancient Simon proposed "to obtain the gift of God with money" from an apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ. He got a heavy jolt for his presumption. "But Peter said unto him, Thy silver perish with thee, because thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God with money." Modern Simon operates only by mail. He talks with God and proposes to sell the gift of God for money. In the light of the scriptures both he and the dupes who try to buy it from him are "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." It is "strange, almost unbelievable" that anybody could for a moment entertain the thought that God Almighty endorses the quackery that this religious opportunist constantly quacks about through the advertising mediums of the nation.

He may have all that he claims to "control" but in view of "the strange, almost unbelievable" reason he advances for having it, I would not take it as collateral on a loan without further investigation. I agree with him that he "sounds unbelievable." If he owned all of Moscow, Idaho, he could be very oxen-heavy, too. God and prophecy. Wm. Wrigley owns a better house in California than Modern Simon does in Moscow and he built his business out of his chewing gum instead of "Psychiana, incorporated"--operating only by mail! And I have heard of at least one "certain rich man" who probably had more than this Moscow Wonder; boasts of, who never even thought about talking with God until he died and went to hell, and then it was "too late."
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There is a tendency among writers of today, to withhold from their readers the words of those they criticize and read, or put into their views, things that would make the ones they criticize appear ridiculous. I do not believe in handling other people's words or position deceitfully. There is therefore not enough money in the world to get me to knowingly misstate another's position, and if I did, and he called me to attention, before I would correct it immediately. The following illustrates my ideas as expressed above. In the Christian Standard of August 31, 1940, Edwin R. Errett stated in his editorial "that the Christian Standard Publishing Company has joined hands with E. L. Jorgenson in the promotion and sale of the excellent hymn book of which he is the compiler." In the September issue of the Bible Banner 1940, I published Brother Errett's editorial with my comments. In the Christian Standard, September 6, 1941, Bro. Errett had the following in his editorial.

A NOBLE PURPOSE BUT AN IGNoble EFFORT

John T. Lewis

I think the above characterizes Edwin R. Errett's editorial in the Christian Standard of August 31, 1940. Read it.
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mental accompaniments to their worship drop them, or let those "who cannot conscientiously worship with the instruments" stultify their conscience, and violate the word of God by worshipping with them. One of these things must be done, or the division must continue, which will make Brother Errett recommend? He can worship with me and violate neither his conscience nor the Word of God, I cannot worship with him, and his instruments, without violating both my conscience and the Word of God. I hope therefore Brother Errett will not be so deceived by the Errett-Jorgenson business combine, and the Murch-Witty unity (?) meetings, that the thousands of conscientious Christian men and women who respect the authority of Christ will ever worship with instrumental music, or will ever cease fighting its use in the worship. Every innovation in the work and worship of the church has grown out of a lack of respect for the authority of Christ, but there are legions in the Church who still respect the authority of Christ, as presented in the New Testament and accept it as our last and final appeal in all matters of faith and practice. The Christian Standard and its constituents can have our fellowship without those innovations; but never with them. They are the sole arbiters in this matter, which

I did not know that my "Christian spirit was outraged," but if it was, it was because Edwin R. Errett was trying to make the "Standard-Jorgenson" song book deal, "a noble symbol of unity," and not because the churches of Christ were using the same song books that some denomination was using. You will see by reading my comments on Brother Errett's editorial of August 31, 1940, that I was trying to get him to see that there could be no "Christian unity" so long as "instrumental accompaniments" are added to the singing, and the books you use, or the songs you sing cannot change that fact. Instead of letting his readers see my comments, and draw their own conclusion, Brother Errett waits a year, and then his "Christian spirit" moves him to try to make it appear that John T. Lewis does not know that there are "words
"WHAT WE BAPTISTS BELIEVE"

CLED E. WALLACE

"Rev." W. J. McDaniel, a prominent Baptist minister of Chattanooga, Tennessee appears on me front page or me Baptist and Reviewer in a long article on "Salvation By Grace." This impresses me as about as strong a statement and defense of the Baptist position as can be made. I believe the gentleman to be dangerously wrong and shall address myself to the task of showing that he is by the scriptures. There are some points of agreement I am glad to acknowledge. "Man is lost and needs to be saved." Human power and resources are incapable of accomplishing the work. Man possesses no merit that puts God in debt to him. He must be saved by the grace of God. He must exercise faith in God, put his trust in a divine Saviour, else his case is hopeless. "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." (Jer.10:23) "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths." (Proverbs 3:5, 6) Anything, therefore, that a man does to be saved must be an act of faith, an expression of trust and in obedience to God. He does it because God tells him to do so. To expect salvation in the performance of any act that God has not commanded in specific relation to salvation would be the height of presumption. God does not require a man to do anything, nor can he do anything, that entitles him to boast. "that no flesh should glory before God." I take it that this fundamental situation is clear and agreed upon. It should serve to protect us from some more or less ugly charges that are sometimes made against vs. The Baptist brother seeks to clarify the discussion with a series of questions.

"As a matter of clarifying this discussion allow me to further reveal the position of Baptists by asking the following questions: (1) Can a person be saved by uniting with the church? (2) Does the rite of baptism save one or have any part in saving one? (3) Does the observance of the Lord's supper have any part in the salvation of the soul? (4) Can a person be saved by 'just doing the best' he can? Is there any work a man might do which will bring about salvation for him?"

I shall first answer these questions in the light of what the scriptures say and then pay my respects to why "We Baptists do not believe" it. (1) A person cannot be saved by uniting with the Baptist Church or any other religious denomination of human origin. They are plants which the Father did not plant. The New Testament knows nothing of them. The church the Lord built is "the body of Christ." (1 Cor. 12:27) and includes all the people of God. (1 Cor. 12:13; Rom. 12:4, 5) "God set the members each one of them in the body, even as it pleased him." (1 Cor. 12:18) The church is the family of God, including all the children of God and he adds them to the church, the family, when he saves them. (Acts 2:47) We invite Mr. McDaniel to point out even one Christian in the New Testament who was not a member of the church. They became Christians through the spiritual process of the new birth and entered the family of God, the church in the same way. "Uniting with the church" may be sufficient to get somebody tangled up with the Baptist denomination, but he has to be born in order to establish membership in the church of God. "Can a man be saved by" being born again? That is exactly how he is saved, and that is precisely how he enters the family of God, the church! "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new." (2 Cor. 5:17) "For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ," (Gal. 3:26, 27) By common consent the new birth has nothing to do with making a man a member of the Baptist church. He can have everything the new birth has to offer outside that human denomination.

(2) "Does the rite of Baptism save one or have any part in saving one?" If the purpose is to "clarify this discussion" care should be taken to frame questions so that they will "reveal" rather than becloud issues. God saves sinners when he pardons their sins. Sinners must exercise faith in Jesus Christ by being baptized into Christ, into his death. (Rom. 6:3, 4) Baptism is "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 28:19) Is it essential that such a relationship be established in order to salvation? Let us alter the form of the question somewhat "as a matter of clarifying this discussion". "Does the rite of Baptism put "one" into Christ or into the death of Christ?" Paul says it does, even if "We Baptists do not believe that." I believe I'll just stick to Paul.

(3) "Does the observance of the Lord's supper have any part in the salvation of the soul?" It is clearly taught in the New Testament that the Lord's supper is for the Lord's children and nobody can partake of it who is not a Christian. It is a memorial feast for Christians. It is a communion of the blood and body of the Lord for baptized believers. It is nowhere stated that the Lord's supper introduces "one" into Christ or puts "one" into his death. When convicted sinners in the New Testament asked what they must do, they were not told to repent and take the Lord's supper for the remission of sins. They were told to repent and be baptized. Why should the Lord's supper be introduced into "this discussion"? The use that has been made of it is not "clarifying" for an effort is made to make it parallel with baptism. They differ widely in both act and design. What is said of one does not apply to the other at all. A theory that requires such a mishandling of the word of truth cannot be right.

(4) "Can a person be saved by 'just doing the best he can'?" Man must not depend on his own efforts for salvation. He must trust in the Lord with all his heart. "Though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. 5:8, 9) "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 7:21)

(5) "Is there any work a man might do which will bring about salvation for him?" Yes. "Jesus answered and said unto them. This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (John 6:29) "What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but have not works? can that faith save him?" (James 2:14) "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith." (Verse 24) The "works" by which a man is justified is "the obedience of faith" and makes faith "perfect." It is active trust in God. Baptists contend that "baptism for remission" makes faith void. I deny it. Baptism is not a work of human righteousness. It is a command of God definitely related to the cross of Christ and the remission of sins. It would be refreshing if Baptists would cease being fainthearted and come up to the issue "as a matter of clarifying this discussion." About all they have succeeded in doing when they talk about baptism and the Lord's supper is to muddy the water.
I believe that I have contributed something definite as a matter of clarifying this discussion by answering Pastor McDaniel’s questions. These are scriptural answers. Now I am going to give you, in his own words, some of the reasons why “We Baptists” do not believe that.

“We Baptists do not believe that uniting with our church or any other church can or will save a single lost soul. We do not believe that the single reference where church membership is necessary to the forgiveness of sins. Our conviction is that the work of salvation is the combined work of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and therefore outside the pale of the church. The church is yitata and necessary but possesses no saving power in itself; that power rests with God and has never been given to man where individuals go to make up the church. We know as the church is presented in the ordinance of Jesus Christ in which the sheep are to be cared for and nurtured. It is Christ that leadeth into the church and not the church which leadeth into Christ.”

“We Baptists” have no monopoly on the conviction “that power rests with God” and “the church...possesses no saving power in itself.” On the other hand some of us who are not Baptists earnestly contend that the church is the body of Christ and consists of those who have been saved through “that power that rests with God.” When God saves a man by “that power” he adds him to the church. I’m afraid that “We Baptists” do not “know what the church is.” This talk about “our church or some other church” sounds somewhat Ashdodish. “Christ is the head of the church, being himself the saviour of the body.” (Eph. 5:23) The Lord built the church that he “might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.” (Eph. 2:16) “That power that rests with God” saves men “in one body” not out of it as “We Baptists” contend. The fact that “We Baptists” do not believe that “is a fairly good sign that “we” need to review our faith somewhat to make it conform to what the scriptures teach. Some of us are thoroughly convinced that Baptist pride cannot “save a single soul.” The Baptist brother is rather reckless with his use of “therefore.” Because “salvation is the combined work of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit” a fact I am not even inclined to deny, he concludes that it is various religious bodies that “save the church.” That conclusion is remarkable for its irrelevance. It does not follow at all. We might with more justice conclude that he thinks that the church itself is “outside the pale of the combined work of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.” The church is composed of men and women who have been saved through “the combined work of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.” That “power that rests with God” to save sinners is divinely declared to be the gospel. “For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.” (Rom. 1:16) It was preached by men, produced faith and sinners are saved by faith. All thus saved constitute the church even if “We Baptists” do not believe that.” Paul is right and “We Baptists” are wrong. We are told that “the church is vital and necessary.” What church? Is it “our church” that “is vital and necessary” or is it some other church? It is a little hard to figure out how any church can be either “vital” or “necessary” when a sinner can be born again, enjoy the blessings of divine cieitizenship in the kingdom of heaven and finally reach glory, and never even be a member of it. If such a church is vital, to what is it vital? If such a church is necessary, to what is it necessary? I am inclined to think “We Baptists’ like a queer people. Here is a divine reason why the church is both vital and necessary. “For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Sews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit.” (I Cor. 12:13) This baptism that introduced them “into one body” also put them “into Christ” and “into his death.” (Rom. 6:3, 4).

“We Baptists” are fanaticly opposed to the idea that baptism is a condition of remission of sins, even though the New Testament specifically teaches that it is. It is classified as “obedience of faith” but “We Baptists”, prefer to shift it to the realm of works of human righteousness and exclude it on grounds of grace. Here is a Baptist sample of that sort of thing.

“The two ordinances of the New Testament church are the Lord’s supper and baptism. Neither of these have within themselves or contribute toward the salvation of a single lost soul. Both are to be observed and participated in by the saved man and in no manner of means saves him or contributes toward his salvation. Both are symbols and representations of the work of mortal man in the administration and preparation of either or both of these ordinances will make salvation dependent in part on the work of man. For example, a sinner desirous to be saved and has thus repented of his sins and turns to God in faith-God sees the penitent sinner and discerns his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ but is held up in saving the poor sinner until mortal man prepares and administers either or both of these ordinances. Such presumption is of man and not of God or to be found in the Bible.”

“We Baptists” abruptly reject anything that “will make divine salvation dependent in part on the work of man.” It is freely conceded that a sinner is saved by grace, that he can do nothing by way of securing it, that entitles him to even one little boast. His salvation is a gift from God. At that it is “dependent on the work of man” because God has ordained it so, whether “We Baptists“ believe it or not. The sinner has access into grace through faith. He must believe. He cannot believe without testimony. He must be taught and he must learn. “It was God’s good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe.” (I Cor. 1:21) “Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?” (Rom. 10:13, 14) Why do “We Baptists” preach to sinners anyway and plead with them to accept by baptism, if salvation is not “dependent in part on the work of man?” Trying to clarify the design of baptism by talking about the Lord’s supper is a futile gesture. “We Baptists” do not believe that” the Lord’s supper is “to be observed and participated in by the saved man” unless he has been baptized. It can be easily proved by scripture citations that the Lord’s supper is to “be observed and participated in by the saved man,” but where is the text that says or implies that a saved man must be baptized? “He that believeth and is saved” shall be baptized.” (I Cor. 12:13) This is the text that says “be that believe” and is saved shall be baptized.” “Such presumption is of God and not of man or to be found in the Bible.” Possibly, but I think not, Pastor McDaniel will explain to us why the saved man can “observe and participate in” the Lord’s supper repeatedly, but can not “observe and participate in” baptism but once. What other Christian duty does the Baptist brother know about that a Christian cannot perform
Recently there appeared in Sound Words, edited by Bro. John O'Dowd, an article from the pen of the editor on “The Thieves On The Crosses.” He has a late model theory concerning this matter. Not many months ago I heard him deliver it in sermon form from the pulpit. The sermon had as many vulnerable points as any denominational sermon I ever heard. I could have replied to it from the pulpit, but conditions were such at the time that I deemed it unwise to do so. However, it is a matter that deserves careful study, and I am glad to give consideration to the position advocated by Bro. O'Dowd.

In the sermon it was contended that both thieves on the crosses were lost because

Both Did The Same Thing

An appeal was made to the gospel records of Matthew, Mark and Luke. With reference to Matthew's record it was shown that the chief priests, scribes and elders mocked him: “He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God.” Mat. 27:42, 43. So these statements made by these men were shown to be mockery—thieves mocked him. But verse 44 says: The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth. So what the others did, the thieves did also. Hence, they mocked him as they cast the same words in his teeth that others had used. Emphasis was placed upon the fact that Matthew says “the thieves” not just one of them, but both of them mocked him. Attention was next directed to Mark’s record which says: “And they that were crucified with him reviled him.” Mark 15:32. It was not a reviling by one only, but “they reviled him.” So both thieves did exactly the same thing. Then Luke’s record came up for study. And from Luke 23:39 this statement was drawn: “The malefactors railed on him.” The speaker went on to show what one of them said: “Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.” And he declared that God through Luke said this was railing on the Son of God. He knew nothing about the kingdom, it was said, except by the inscription on the cross—“The King of the Jews.” It was claimed that the thief used that as a starting point for some fun-making, and his words were paraphrased after this fashion: “Why, you king of the Jews? Huh, some king! We admit that we are thieves, but you claim you have done nothing amiss. But there you are! Dying on the cross like we are! Well, we will soon be dead and will go to a thief’s resort. So we will just elect you to be our king. Now, having elected you as our king, remember me (who led in your election) when you ascend your throne as our king.” Thus is it contended that the statement of the thief was nothing but mockery. The whole thing was said to be reproach, because God through Luke said it was.

Now, with respect to the foregoing reasoning, I wish to say that I have never heard any one say that both thieves did not revile the Son of God. According to the records of Matthew and Mark both were guilty. But I have always contended that one of them changed his attitude and asked to be remembered by the Lord when he came into his kingdom. However, if God through Luke said the statement relative to the kingdom was mockery, then I just have been wrong about it all the while. But I want you to know this: Neither God nor Luke said anything of the kind. Luke does not say, “The malefactors railed on him.” Yet this is the way Bro. O'Dowd quoted it and actually had it written on the blackboard that way. And he quotes it the same way in his paper. But it misrepresented Luke, for he said no such thing. Here is what Luke said: “And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him saying, If thou be Christ, save thyself and us.” Luke 23:39. Does that sound like the statement already mentioned? Not “the malefactors railed on him,” but “one of the malefactors” did so. It is true that both had done so, but at the time which Luke records, he says one of them railed on him. Well, how about the other? Notice it. “But the other --" Now, get that. "But another railed on him, but the other did something else. It doesn’t say, “And the other did the same.” That is what this late model theory says, but Luke did not say it. According to Luke, it is “but” instead of “and.” That draws a contrast between the two. What one said was railing, but what the other said was not railing—he said and did something else. What was it? "But the other answering rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds; but this man hath done nothing amiss. And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." Luke 23:40-42. In drawing the contrast between the two, God through Luke said this statement of the thief relative to being remember was not railing. It is not true that they both did the same thing. They did at the beginning, but both did not continue to do the same thing. One of them continued his reproach and asked to be remembered by the Lord. If this thief continued to reproach the Christ, why did he rebuke the other for continuing his? To sustain that idea, it should read that he commended the other. But why make either God or Luke say the very reverse of what they said? Such is wresting the Scriptures. So just remember that Luke said “one railed on him,” but the other followed a different course, and what he said and did was not railing. If this is not so, then some one must take the “but” and the “rebuke” out of Luke’s record.

Their Prayers

One of them said, “Save thyself and us.” The other said, “Lord, remember me.” Bro. O'Dowd said the first was an unselfish prayer—he prayed for some one besides himself. But the second, he said, was a selfish prayer; he prayed for himself alone. And the advocate of this theory says: "I had much prefer to take my chance with the thief in eternity that everyone says was lost, than with the one that all say was saved. This was the noblest prayer of the two." But the first was not a prayer at all. Luke says: "One of the malefactors * railed on him, saying, if thou be Christ, save thyself and us." This statement according to Luke, was not a prayer at all, but it was pure mockery, reproach, railing or reviling. But the words of the other are contrasted with these words of reproach, thus showing the statement, “Lord, remember me,” was not reproach. The words of the first were insincere; but the request of the second was sincere. Any one can prefer his chance with the first if he so desires, but I have different ideas with respect to my preference. I would rather take my stand with that which Luke put in contrast with reproach. Every request, of course, is not a prayer in the full sense of the term, but just grant that this was a prayer. Cannot a man pray for anything that concerns himself without being selfish? When Simon the sorcerer sinned, Peter said to him: "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee." Did Peter tell him to
pray a selfish prayer? Did Bro. O’Dowd ever pray for anything that concerned him alone? Was he selfish when he did so?

**Sinners’ Prayers Not Heard**

The sermon next called attention to a number of Scriptures that state that God does not hear the prayers of sinners. The references given were as follows: Prov. 28:9; 1 Pet. 3:12; Prov. 1:24-28; John 9:31. With these we are familiar. But do they indicate that Jesus could not forgive the sins of the thief on the cross? Do these indicate that Jesus could grant no request made of him by sinners? A simple request is not always a prayer in the strict sense of the term. On one occasion a centurion, a Gentile sinner, came to Jesus with a request for his afflicted servant to be healed. Jesus granted the request. Mat. 8:15-13. On another occasion a Canaanite woman, a sinner, requested Jesus to heal her daughter. The request was granted. Mat. 15:21-28. If Jesus could grant these requests without being disobedient to his Father’s will, why could he not grant the request of the thief? The fact is that Jesus was a testator (Heb. 9:16,17), and he could dispense his blessings as he saw fit without it being a violation of God’s will. As such he healed the afflicted as already mentioned; he forgave the sins of the thief on the faith of his friends (Mat. 9:2-7); he forgave the sins of the sinful woman (Luke 7:37-47); he bestowed salvation upon Zaccheus (Luke 18:1-9); and he promised the thief he would go to paradise that day. As a testator he had a perfect right to do all these things.

**Paradise The Grave**

The following is from a statement in Sound Words (And it agrees with statements made in the sermon): “Today shalt thou be with me in paradise. To the ‘heart of the earth’ alone did Christ and the thief go. *Christ simply told the thief that they would both rest in the tomb that day.* So the word ‘paradise’ is made to mean the grave. The word means a pleasure garden, but how any one can think of the grave as a ‘pleasure garden’ is beyond me. The three times the word occurs in the Bible do not always refer to the same place, for once it is used to refer to heaven itself (Rev. 2:7); but it never refers to the grave. No one claims that Jesus and the thief went directly to heaven that day. After his resurrection Jesus told Mary that he had not yet ascended to his Father. John 20:17. Paradise is a proper description of heaven; it is also a proper description of the place where Jesus went the day of his death: it is not a proper description of the grave. To say that Jesus went only to the grave is to accept the doctrine of materialism and to declare that Jesus was no more than a beast. His body went to the grave; but his spirit did not go to the grave. He went somewhere else besides the grave. In an effort to prove that paradise means the grave, Bro. O’Dowd presented the following parallel:

To the Chief: “Today shalt thou be with me in paradise.”—Jesus.

To Saul: “Tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me.”—Samuel (1 Sam. 28:19).

But Samuel came “up out of the earth.” 1 Sam. 28:13. And Jesus went to “the heart of the earth.” Mat. 12:40.

It is claimed, therefore, that the only difference between the two statements is in point of time—one was to occur “today” and the other “tomorrow.” And it is contended that Samuel simply told Saul that he and his sons would be buried tomorrow; and Jesus simply told the thief that he would be buried today. But some parallels are rather deadly; and this parallel proves that this late model theory is all wrong. For Bible readers know that Saul and his son were not buried “tomorrow” from the time Samuel made his statement. The record tells of the battle the next day between Israel and the Philistines in which Saul and his sons were slain. 1 Sam. 31:6. But their bodies lay on the field of battle till the morrow after that. 1 Sam. 30:8. Saul’s head was cut off and sent to the land of the Philistines and they fastened his body to the wall of Bethshan. 1 Sam. 30:9. The news reached the men of Jabesh-gilead, and they traveled all night to Bethshan to get the bodies of Saul and his sons. They took them to Jabesh and burned them, and afterwards buried their bones under a tree a Jabesh. 1 Sam. 30:11-13. So it was at least several days after Samuel made the statement to Saul before he was buried. Hence, the statement, “Tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me,” had no reference to their burial: If so, then Samuel missed it a number of days. I would rather think O’Dowd is wrong than to think Samuel was wrong. But Samuel told the truth—they were with him the next day in the hadean world-in hades-for they died on the morrow. But they were not with him in the grave. And when Jesus told the thief they would both go to paradise that day, he had no reference to the grave, but to a portion of the hadean world called paradise-a pleasure garden. So these parallels upset completely the idea that paradise means the grave.

It is unnecessary to originate such a theory in the first place, for let the thief be saved without baptism, and that will have no effect on the plan of salvation today. We are living since the will of Christ became ratified by his death, and we must meet the conditions of his will. The thief died before his will became effective.

("We Baptists"-Cont. From Page 6)

but one time? Baptism is a “symbol.” Why cannot a Christian be baptized often to symbolize what baptism is the symbol of? What the New Testament says about the design of baptism explains it, but “We Baptists do not believe that,” you know.

“For example, a sinner desires to be saved and has thus repented of his sins and turns to God in faith. . . .” How did this sinner know he was a sinner and what made him desire to be saved and what caused him to turn to God in faith? The preaching of the gospel. If God was “held up in saving the poor sinner until mortal man” preached to him so he could believe, the added delay occasioned by his baptism would not amount to much of a hold-up, unless “We Baptists” prolonged the inquest and took too much time in hearing his experience and voting on him. Elder McDaniel is not explaining the scriptures. He is merely talking back at some very plain texts which “We Baptists do not believe.” “With regard to one or both of these ordinances” he “is grossly illogical and inconsistent” in dealing with what the scriptures say about them. He asserts and assumes with little effort at proof. “We Baptists” are like that when we get worked up on what “We do not believe.”

I read “for example” about a fair-sized bunch of sinners desiring to be saved on Pentecost. They even asked the apostles what they must do to be saved. Simon Peter did not think he was holding God up when he told them to repent and be baptized for the remission of their sins. The Baptist and Reflector thinks that “such presumption is of man and not of God or to be found in the Bible.” Too bad that “We Baptists” were not there to set Peter right and rebuke his presumption. “We” got here late but we can still shout “We do not believe that.” It is “found in the Bible” all right. It is in the second chapter of Acts.
The emphatic stressing of this principle in the Character of God will tend to build determination in the hearts of Christians, and waves of indifference to spiritual things. Some of these things Paul mentions as he writes to Timothy, encouraging him to steadfast continuance in his work in the Lord; making special mention of “profane babblings,” “striving about words to no profit,” and false teachings on the resurrection.

But along with these things, each age has had that which encourages, that to which men could lay hold with no fear of it giving way, or being shaken. In the very midst of these things discouraging in their nature, the apostle says, “How be it the firm foundation of God standeth, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his: and, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness.” (2 Tim. 2:19)

This age is little different from others that have come and gone. To be sure the specific details are different, but so far as problems are concerned, and changes taking places with regard to the preceding generation or age, it is no different. Today nations are passing, old ideals are changing, the security of those things in which men have been wont to trust is being questioned, and a new wave of infidelity is dashing itself out against the “Rock of Ages,” “foaming out” its “own shame.” But these things have happened before. They were happening in Paul’s day, when he wrote as he did to Timothy. Howbeit, in the midst of all these, “The firm foundation of God” stood, and stands, a sure foundation upon which one can build, and feel secure.

In the midst of the vast uncertainty of today, and the near panicky attitude that some take, begetting a pessimism that is even being felt in the church at various places, there are three things set forth by Paul in 2 Tim 2 that need to be emphasized by Christians, especially preachers and teachers, everywhere: 1) The definite principle of the character of God as set forth by Paul in verses 11-13; 2) The fact that the “firm foundation of God stands,” though all else may be perishing; 3) The Lord knoweth them that are His,” and that His demand of them that are His, is that they “depart from unrighteousness.”

When the apostle said, “If we shall deny him, he also will deny us: if we are faithless, he abideth faithful; for he cannot deny himself,” he simply stated a definite principle in the Character of God. God cannot act contrary to His nature, and His nature is definitely set forth in the revelation of Himself in the Bible. It matters not how dark the hour, how hopeless the immediate prospects, how strong the pressure brought to bear; man is still without excuse for his sin, and should he deny God even under these circumstances, God cannot but be faithful to Himself, “he also will deny us.”

The emphatic stressing of this principle in the Character of God will tend to build determination in the hearts of those honestly seeking heaven. It will likewise eliminate the necessity of so much “re-consecration,” “re-dedication,” “restoration” of members in the meetings sometimes held. There are those who are “overtaken in a trespass,” these are to be restored, certainly. There are those who “err from the truth,” these must be converted, James urges it. But much of the half-hearted attitude that serves God “a little bit,” and the devil “a right smart,” often times results from a lack of understanding of the character of God, and the principle that He “cannot deny himself.” Once the principle is fully appreciated, greater care in conduct will be exercised.

But in the midst of ungodliness, troubles, turning away from God, and the denying of Him by those who should be faithful, the “firm foundation of God standeth.” Here we have something solid upon which to build, and to which to hold, in the midst of any storm, internal or external.

God promised that in Zion He should lay for a foundation, a “tried stone” (Isa. 28:16), which Peter affirms to have been the Christ, (1 Peter 2:6). Christ built His church upon this very foundation, (Matt. 16:18; 1 Cor 3:11); and every individual built into that structure, is built upon it (Eph. 2: 19-22). While old institutions were crumbling, and passing away, the apostle said of the Hebrews in his day, that they were “receiving a kingdom which cannot be shaken.” (Heb. 12:28). Here we have something stable and certain in any time of uncertainty, doubt, or fear.

What is the point in all this? Simply this: that when those in the church fully appreciate the fact that the only things today which cannot be shaken are the things that pertain to the church, to the kingdom of God, then the church will become more precious to them. When it is appreciated that “the firm foundation of God standeth,” regardless of all things else, the laying up of treasures in heaven will have greater prominence in the lives of its members, and the cares of riches and temporal things here, less.

But the “seal” of this assurance should not be overlooked. “The Lord knoweth them that are his.” Sometimes we become impatient, we feel that the Lord has forgotten us, and like Elijah of old, “I alone am left.” But the Lord knows them that are His. It is He who calls them, through the gospel; and it is He who justifies. He adds to the church, cares for His own, and “knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation.” One need not worry about the Lord forgetting him, for He will keep His part of the covenant. He will “in no wise fail thee, neither in any wise forsake thee.” “He knoweth them that take refuge in Him.”

There is another side of the seal also, “Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness.” Although they never won a discussion on the subject, the Baptists used to debate that an individual once saved could not be lost. However, the doctrine seemed so attractive to the worldly minded, that some, while not actually believing it, yet live in the church as thought it were so. They claim to trust God, while at the same time they depart not from unrighteousness. But the apostle said, “If we are faithless, he abideth faithful; for he cannot deny himself.” Does Paul mean God will be faithful to save even though the individual does not continue faithful? Certainly not! but that God is faithful, “if we deny him, he also will deny us.” The demand that those who know God depart from unrighteousness must be stressed today.
The name of Judas Iscariot has become a hiss and a by-word throughout the whole world. It is a synonym for treason, treachery and traitor. The name Judas was once an honorable name. Judas Maccabeus was one of the outstanding patriots of Hebrew history. Mary, the mother of Jesus, named one of her sons Judas. But Judas Iscariot degraded the name and made it repulsive for all time to come; and now no mother who knows of the life of the son of Simon Iscariot would name her baby Judas.

Judas Iscariot had a chance to be numbered with the immortal heroes of faith. His advantages were equal perhaps to those of any other Bible character. He was one of the original twelve chosen to be apostles of the Lord, and was sent forth as a messenger of God to preach, saying, “The Kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Jesus gave him power to heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, and cast out demons. “Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves;” said Jesus to Judas and all the other apostles. The apostolic office was the highest that Jesus had to bestowed upon any man, and Judas was given that office.

The greatest trust and confidence was placed in him. He was made “treasurer;” he “had the bag” in his custody; he did the buying for the little group and gave “to the poor,” the need arose. After he had begun to steal from the common fund, they were not at all suspicious, so far as the record shows. When Jesus made the startling announcement that one of the twelve would betray him, the disciples did not point the finger of scorn at Judas and say, “Is it Judas?” Each one apparently was more doubtful of himself than of Judas, and they said, “It it?”

In addition to all this he had the privilege of more than three years’ association with the Lord. When Jesus spoke the parables and other eternal truths, Judas was present and heard them; also he was in that little group that Jesus called aside to explain privately the meaning of all he had said in parables. He had witnessed the miracles of Jesus and had about as much proof of the divine sonship of Christ as any man on earth. He was acquainted with the personal life of the Christ, and knew of his compassion, mercy, charity, and frequent prayers.

But how did Judas respond to his opportunities? How did he use those special privileges? What effect did all this have on him?

Two notorious deeds in the life of Judas show that he had muffed his opportunities and had fallen far short of what he might have been. The first of these events happened in Bethany at a supper given in honor of the Lord. Martha served, but Lazarus sat at the table with Jesus and the disciples. “Mary therefore took a pound of ointment of pure nard, very precious, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair; and the house was filled with the odor of the ointment.” Judas Iscariot protested, saying, “Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred shillings, and given to the poor?” Then the other disciples joined Judas and indignantly asked, “To what purpose is this waste?”

Since the other disciples made about the same objection that Judas had raised, why was he any worse in this matter than they? It was a difference in motives. Judas cared not for the poor. He had possession of the bag containing the money and he took away what was put therein. He was a thief. Not much of that three hundred shillings would have reached the poor after Judas got his hands on it. His pretended interest in the poor was downright hypocrisy. That job of holding the money bag was right up his mercenary alley, and he doubtless would have re-

fused to relinquish it even if the poor had asked him to do so.

Since the motives of Judas have been so clearly revealed, one does not wonder why he was so anxious to carry the money-bag; but one does wonder why some today are so determined to carry the money-bag for the “foreign missionaries,” even after the “foreign missionary” has asked them to quit it. I remember reading somewhere (I think I can find it in my files for “future reference”) that one of the “foreign missionaries,” Brother J. M. McCaleb, asked one of those foreign missionary-bag-toters, Brother Don Carlos Janes, to stop collecting funds for the missionaries. Brother McCaleb believed the missionaries would earn the funds, if Janes would quit. Did he quit when asked to? No, he is still collecting funds for the missionaries, and it would be interesting to know just what proportion of the money goes to the Janes Printing Co. to pay for printing the literature he mail-out, where he gets the money to pay his private secretary, how much of the money collected goes for postage and travel expenses, and just what per cent reaches which missionary.

Anyone who will pay Brother Janes a visit, meet his private secretary, go through his printing plant, observe the amount of “missionary” literature being manufactured and mailed out for “home” consumption, and then ask, how the funds are obtained to operate this set-up, might be able to see that a one-man missionary society is about as expensive as a missionary society run by a “board.” Of course Brother Janes might tell us that all this is paid for out of his own pocket; but it would be more interesting to know how the funds got into his own pocket. I am not accusing him of anything. I understand he is an elder of one of the local churches of Louisville, and it would be unscriptural for me to bring a charge against Elder Janes, except on the word of two or three witnesses, that I am not doing. But I do believe it is legal and scriptural for me to ask him why he is so anxious to tote the missionary money-bag after some of the missionaries have asked him to quit it. Paul was determined to avoid the very thing Janes seems determined to do. (See &I Cor. 8:-:20-22).

Judas did not stop at misappropriation of funds. He went to the chief priests who were determined to kill Jesus, and asked them how much they would give him to deliver the Christ into their hands. They agreed upon thirty pieces of silver as the amount, and from that time Judas “sought opportunity to deliver him unto them.” On the night before the crucifixion that opportunity came. Leading a group of officers to the garden where Jesus had gone to pray, Judas came and identified Jesus with the traitor’s kiss.

Judas got sick of his deal with the chief priests and brought the money back to them, saying, “I have sinned in that I betrayed innocent blood.” When they refused to take the money back he threw it down in the sanctuary and went away and hanged himself. Falling headlong from the scaffold he had chosen, he “burst asunder in the midst, and now no mother who knows of the life of the son of Simon Iscariot would name her baby Judas.” But Judas got sick of his deal with the chief priests and brought the money back to them, saying, “I have sinned in that I betrayed innocent blood.” When they refused to take the money back he threw it down in the sanctuary and went away and hanged himself. Falling headlong from the scaffold he had chosen, he “burst asunder in the midst, and now no mother who knows of the life of the son of Simon Iscariot would name her baby Judas.”
THE METHOD OF APPROACH

HUGO MCCORD

1. Method more than matter.

A dog coming toward you wagging his tail, prancing about, barking happily has a pleasant effect. A dog coming toward you with a still tail and a growl in his throat makes you want to run. Certainly psychology teachers know what they are talking about when they say your method of approach has a lot to do with your success, whether you are wooing a lass, selling a merchant, or preaching to a sinner. But if a young man thinks so much about how he is going to “pop” the question that he never gets around to “popping” it, he is liable to keep on studying “methods of approach” all his lonely life. Method is important, but matter is more so. Attempts to improve journalistic methods are to be commended; but if modern, stream-lined methods are just subtle schemes to prevent error being scorched, why, that is hypocrisy.

Dale Carnegie’s popular book, How to Win Friends and Influence People, has much that is good, but when it advises “Never criticize anybody” it gets wiser than God and inspired writers. True, people resent criticism if they are foolish (Proverbs 1:7). “A scorner heareth not rebuke.” (Proverbs 13:1) “Correction is grievous unto him that forsaketh the way; and he that hateth reproof shall die.” (Proverbs 15:10) One of the divine purposes of the Bible is “for correction” (II Tim. 3:16). Mr. Carnegie’s advice is good for a preacher determined to get along with everybody and offend nobody; it is good for a people pleaser and a time-server. Paul wanted to get along with everybody (Romans 12:18) and become all things to all men (I Cor. 9:22) in order to do it and to have a hearing with them. But through it all, God was first with Paul. The truth of the gospel could not be perverted to win any man. When the truth offended a man, Paul was sorry he felt that way, deeply sorry for the man’s soul, but the truth had to be preached. “Do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.”

Men that study more about method of approach than about the approaching would be in a predicament when sitting down to study the best way to tell a man about his duty. Forthright men, and their name is legion, get nauseated when a salesman or a preacher beats around the bush, or, to change the figure, applies overdosages of tact, diplomacy, approach.

Not a lover of God, but a lover of men preached: “Except ye repent in a measure, and be converted, as it were, you will, I regret to say, be damned, to some extent.” Psychologists might call Mark 16:16 too abrupt, but one of the divine purposes of the Bible is “for correction” (II Tim. 3:16). Mr. Carnegie’s advice is good for a preacher determined to get along with everybody and offend nobody; it is good for a people pleaser and a time-server. Paul wanted to get along with everybody (Romans 12:18) and become all things to all men (I Cor. 9:22) in order to do it and to have a hearing with them.

When the truth offended a man, Paul was sorry he felt that way, deeply sorry for the man’s soul, but the truth had to be preached. “Do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.”

Men that study more about method of approach than about the approaching would be in a predicament when sitting down to study the best way to tell a man about his duty being on fire.

Forthright men, and their name is legion, get nauseated when a salesman or a preacher beats around the bush, or, to change the figure, applies overdosages of tact, diplomacy, approach.

Not a lover of God, but a lover of men preached: “Except ye repent in a measure, and be converted, as it were, you will, I regret to say, be damned, to some extent.” Psychologists might call Mark 16:16 too abrupt, but many people appreciate directness and plainness.

“One word, preach. Don’t preach negatively-preach on positive, constructive, pleasant themes,” say some advisers. If those advisers had infected tonsils or appendices a doctor would have a time getting them well. Paul preached both ways, positively and negatively. “Put off all these,” he cried in the New Testament (Col. 3:8) and “Put on” something else. Men of God cry aloud and spare not.

II. Matter regardless of manner.

Just as some are too much concerned about methods of approach, erring grievously, there are some too little concerned about manners and methods. In fact, some make fun of any “manner or method” using quite ugly manners and methods in doing so. When a preacher adopts a “you take it or leave it” attitude, why that is his method, his approach, no matter how much he may ridicule approaches. And such an attitude is the opposite of Him so concerned about even one lamb astray. When He wept saying, “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem,” (Matt. 23:37) He was not saying “take it or leave it.” And if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His.

If a salesman makes fun of my family he certainly does come with the wrong approach. If a preacher makes fun of my religion, though it be wrong, I have closed my ear to anything he will say later. Both family and religion are pretty dear to the average fellow; they are not subjects of ridicule-no matter how ugly a wife is nor how wrong the religion. At Athens Paul did not scorn and laugh at the idols, for to the Athenians those idols were as sacred as Christ was to Paul. Instead of catty remarks, biting criticisms, caustic soda, Paul employed the true psychology, real diplomacy, a Christian approach. He pointed out the good that he could find in their present system, built the truth on that, and then pointed out the utter vanity of their system. Paul was much unlike the preacher who referred to Catholics as running to “Papa,” a method angering to Catholics, repulsive to others.

“Don’t pay any attention to methods; just preach the truth, letting it scorch whom it will,” is advice of some, but not advice from above. It is advice from “don’t care” folks, “earthly, sensual, devilish.” From above advice is: “Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man.” Col. 4:6.

As much as one should despise sissy, hypocritical methods, one should not run to other extremes, saying, “Let methods be hanged.” One is bound to use some kind of method, good or bad; some kind of manners, good or bad-at the dining table or in the pulpit. Are good ones worthwhile?

III. Matter and manners.

But after all there is nobody who really means it when he says, “Let methods be hanged.” Even the rough-est, purposely tactless fellow, when appointed to go to a home and tell a good, devoted wife that her husband has just been drowned, I say, that uncouth rowdy will soften his voice, and measure every word. He wants to lighten the shock; he uses all the tact and diplomacy he can muster, and shouldn’t he? If he should make fun of her husband and hurt her more than necessarily, will not God judge? In a meeting is it God’s love for souls or some other love that prompts a brother to urge a preacher: “Let ‘em have it. Give it to them.”?

Not only are methods important, but the Bible tells us to study people to know what kind of approach to use. Jude commands us to make a difference among people: on some have compassion; others, save with fear, pulling them out of the fire, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh. Jude determined his manner of approach by the actions of the people: “What will ye? shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness?” (I Cor. 4:21).

An abuse of the Bible though is that some who emphasize tact and diplomacy and methods never use but one kind: honey and sweetening. They always come “in love and in the spirit of meekness.” Paul did not. Sometimes he was as stubborn as the next fellow (Gal. 2:5), sometimes bitter in denunciation (Acts 13:10), and he was “filled with the Holy Ghost” (Acts 13:9) when he used those methods.
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An abuse of the Bible though is that some who emphasize tact and diplomacy and methods never use but one kind: honey and sweetening. They always come “in love and in the spirit of meekness.” Paul did not. Sometimes he was as stubborn as the next fellow (Gal. 2:5), sometimes bitter in denunciation (Acts 13:10), and he was “filled with the Holy Ghost” (Acts 13:9) when he used those methods.

No matter how important methods are, matter is more so. No matter whether one uses honey or is forced to use pepper (Matt. 23), the truth of the gospel must continue to be preached. We must be so convinced of what we are proclaiming to men. Truth will save; error will condemn; no matter whether the preacher uses good or bad manners. And a man of God who exalts truth (John 8:32:14:6) and blasts error wherever found, without fear or favor. he is a man of God: his manners are incidental.
Dear Bursar:

I was very busy when your ultimatum reached me, I had moved from Colorado, and the ultimatum was forwarded around after me, it finally reached me at Gore, Okla. where I was in a gospel meeting. Your threats did not scare me, I did not lose any sleep nor have any bad dreams; I sent the ultimatum to a good friend of mine, George B. Curtis, and asked him to “stave off the blitz” if he could, until I could find time and disposition to take care of the matter. He obliged in a fine way, characteristic of Curtis, and I imagine the sting of his letter will be remembered by the Harding faculty a long time.

Enclosed is a small check as part payment on my note held by the college, and let it serve as an earnest of future payment in full. Unfortunately I can’t catch a fish with a coin in its mouth, so you will have to wait until I can (conveniently) get the rest of the money.

In paying you I am paying you for something I did not get; in other words I got “gyped” in the deal when I went to Harding. I went there under the illusion that I would get an education that would better equip me to preach the gospel, but this proved a false hope and I was sorely disappointed. The elders of the congregation for which I preached the year before I went to Harding college, concur with me in this; in fact it was they who bluntly made me conscious of the fact, when they heard me preach right after I came back from school, their comment was, “Ted, you were a better preacher before you went to Harding college than you are now.” I am not the personification of success by any means, but what I am is due to many my preacher friends, and especially those Godly elders of the church in Bentonville, Ark., with whom I worked the first two years after my one year at Harding college, their wise counsel, encouragement, and constructive criticism, did more to help me as a preacher, per year, than did all the instructors at Harding college.

Yes Bursar, I have considered buying some of the bankrupt debts of Harding College and paying the college with its own debts. That would be satisfactory to you, if you intended to be honest and pay your debts. But it is not satisfactory to you, why? Is it that you have no intention of paying your old obligations at Morrilton? I have heard it rumored that there was a similar situation in Harvard. I worked the first two years after my one year at Harding, I went there under the illusion that I did not know how soon I would pay it. However I am not looking for a legal loop-hole, I am going to pay my obligation to you.

Bursar, you threaten to write the elders of the church for which I preach, unless I come across in a manner satisfactory to you, and tell them “how mean I am.” In other words I get an “ornery” degree instead of the “honorary degree” some preachers have received. Come to think of it, Bursar, I believe I prefer the “ornery” degree to the “honorary degree,” and feel that coming from you there is less stigma to the former. So just proceed in any activity you want to stoop to, I have invited different members of your clique, a number of times when they threatened me, to do their best, and the invitation is extended to you. But before you proceed with anything rash, let us do a little reminiscing. Just to stir up your mind, I will remind you of the last time you turned your “blitz” forces loose against me; I was preaching in the church in Bentonville, Ark.

During the first year I preached there, you asked several times for an appointment to advertise the school to the church; such permission was just forth coming. You were not satisfied with the elders’ flat no; and you sent your college boosters anyway, and that over the protest a telegram, saying plainly that they were not wanted. They came but they did not conquer, your boosters did not even get to boost; for not one cheer went up for Harding college in the church at Bentonville.

In the fall of the same year, you tried another device, this was an effort to put the “skids” to me. You coerced a number of your friends to write the officers of the Bentonville church, and tell them how mean I was, (each officer received from 3 to 6 letters, about 30 letters were sent in all). Those letters were so much alike in context, arrangement, and phraseology, that they were obviously from the same source; the elders thought, and I thought, they came from the Harding master-minds. And still under all this pressure (?), the elders did not fire me. I continued to preach in Bentonville until I was ready to move elsewhere, since moving I have gone back and assisted in a protracted meeting, have preached there on a number of occasions, and furthermore I hope to go back to Bentonville, make my home there some of these days, and give full time to meeting work. You see your “blitz” is not very effective; this one back-fired, because it revealed to the Bentonville elders that you were just a set of meddling potential church-splitters, and that you would outrage the autonomy of the local church in an effort to get the church in your college corral.

Soon after I moved from Ark., you must have thought Bentonville would be a “cinch,” and you sent your ace diplomat (L. C. Sears), to rope the Bentonville church into the Harding College camp. Brother Sears marched boldly into the preachers’ study, and introduced himself; the preacher was rather unconcerned. To create interest Bro. Sears rather confidentially said, “I’ll tell you what kind of a fellow Ted McLemore is.” That was bad, Bro. Sears could even start to “run me down,” the preacher literally “ran him off.” Bursar, ask Bro. Sears if his face was red, when he “got run off” before he could peddle his scandal, wasn’t he just a little bit ashamed?

Now, Bursar, about your feigned desire to reach a “reasonable understanding” with me, I am not interested in courting a reasonable or any other kind of understanding with a crowd of heresy exponents and sympathizers. Rom. 16:17, is still in the Bible, and it applies to you at Harding College until you change your course. Yes sir, it is in the latest translation, one by the Catholics; they translated it; “Now I exhort you, brethren, that you watch those who cause dissensions and scandals contrary to the doctrine you have learned and avoid them.” Personally I shall continue to apply that scripture to you as long as you hold the course “contrary to the doctrine.” I will list some Harding College offenses.

(1) The crocodile tears and lip service you pay to honesty cannot be considered genuine, when you are at the same time renouncing your honest obligations. You varicated (begged money under false pretenses) trying to raise $17,000 for the Morrilton school; you got some from (Continued On Page 15)
In July, Harding College published a bulletin in which they attacked me most viciously. I was even surprised in the nature of the attack. I have been with them many times and have taken some awfully hard things but this bulletin surpasses even what I thought they would do. However, I am glad that it is out for all can now see just what we have to oppose in trying to get Harding to give up premillennialism and the men who teach the doctrine.

I now and here invite Harding College, any man among them, to meet me in a public debate or discussion, and deny publicly, the charges I have made. I have everything that I say I have, and they know I have, and neither Brother Benson nor Brother Sears will meet me openly before the brotherhood, and you know Brother Benson should be able to meet me if he is able to go to “congress” and tell them what to do.

The Bulletin of Christ Exemplified

In this bulletin they call me either directly or by implications: “Backslapping,” “coercing,” “intimidating,” “ostracizing,” “politician,” “political dictator,” “traitor,” “Hitler,” “wolf in sheep’s clothing,” “hypocrite.” Besides that they say, I have never been “washed in the blood of the Lamb,” and that it is “unthinkable that any gospel preacher should fall so low” and charge that the church that hires me should “blush with shame” when I occupy the pulpit; they charge me with “brazen deliberate falsehood,” “Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde,” and that I am “changed from the gentleman to the monster,” and call me “Harper the Chameleon.” This is enough for you to see what I have had to face for years. Perhaps this is what Peter meant when he said “Love one another with a pure heart fervently.” Read my writings and see if I have ever called Brother Armstrong, or any of them, any such names as have been applied to me by him and Harding College.

An Appendectomy Performed Upon Harding’s Bulletin

On page 20 of Harding’s Bulletin appears the title “Part 11, Appendix.” Now this “appendix” needs “operating on” and I have the knife that can do the job.

On page 20 begins this “appendix.” There are such glaring contradictions that it is amusing to point them out so here they are:

Contradiction No. I

1. “The reader may wish to know just what Brother Armstrong’s teaching is on the millennium. We answer quite frankly, he has never taught on it.” The Bulletin.

2. “What views he has expressed have been those he can read; “for those however who honestly want to know what Brother Armstrong does believe we need only cite; “here speaking of the theory of an earthly material reign of the Christ, which Harper says is “the heart of Premillennialism” Brother Armstrong says.” The Bulletin.

How did they know what he believes if he has never taught on it? For them to know he must have taught on it. This all appears on page 20. This needs explaining to me. How did it leak out so Harding College can tell us what is is if he has never told any one?

Contradiction No. II

1. “The subject is indefinite at best; “no matter what you and may think of it privately, all their argument will never change the matter.” The Bulletin.

2. “We need only cite his definite and positive article which appeared in the Firm Foundation of 1934.” The Bulletin.

Now we have statements absolutely the opposite the one from the other. You can’t make them harmonize. I challenge them to try it with me in debate before the brotherhood. Here they are: “The subject is indefinite at best; “We need only cite his (Brother Armstrong’s) definite and positive article.” How can he write a definite and positive article on an “indefinite at best subject” and make any sense out of it? Instead of calling me a “wolf in sheep’s clothing,” next time, let them harmonize their contradictions? It is their contradictions that make them cry “traitor; “wolf; “Hitler; “hypocrite” at me. That is more easily done than to meet me as I have requested them to do.

Contradiction No. III

1. “In a long life time as a preacher, teacher, and editor of a religious journal he (Brother Armstrong) has not preached, written, or taught on the subject.” The Bulletin.

2. “For those however, who honestly want to know what Brother Armstrong does believe we need only cite his definite and positive article which appeared in the Firm Foundation of 1934.” The Bulletin.

I can’t understand why a man who is able to tell “congress” what to do and who is able to “run the world,” can not see that he is letting poor Brother Sears and Brother Armstrong “rupture” “appendix” at me. That is long enough to look into this, we might get an answer.

On page 20 the Bulletin says: “J. N. Armstrong on premillennialism.” On page 20 the same Bulletin says: “In a long life time he has never written on the subject.” Which article, which page, which statement am I to believe. I can’t believe both of them for they contradict each other.

It is claimed that this bulletin was “authorized by the board.” I talked to one member of the board, Brother Gannus of New Orleans, who said he never authorized any such a thing as this bulletin to be published; he apologized to me for it and said “Brother Harper you have grievances and justly so, against this bulletin.” He asked me to give him thirty days to see if he could get something done about it. The thirty days are over and he could not do anything except write to me and say they were going to “work it out to the satisfaction of the sound preachers of the church.” That of itself was a slap at the past policy of the school. I have had that promised to me at least three times and it has never been done, so I asked him for his reasons for thinking it could be done this time, and begged him to publish them that we might not go further into this affair. This is November 12th and I have no answer as yet.

The board authorized them to answer my “doctrinal” charges but not this “personal abuse” tirade made by them upon my character.

Harding College Admits Being Premillennial

1. The Buzzard Feast

Revelation 19 must be literal. Bulletin, page 20: “Where John says, “the birds were filled with their flesh’ Harper (notice they never call me brother Harper), evidently notice they never call it. But where does this place Harper? The people who give this a merely figurative meaning are the Russellites.”

I have told you all the time that Harding College and Brother Armstrong taught that the “birds would literally
eat and devour the fleshly bodies of those slain by the Lord at his coming." Here they admit that and call all who deny its literal interpretation Russelites. Now you have it. This bulletin speaks for itself.

In addition to this, they try to bring in Brother John T. Hinds, (a man they put out of the school and who had nothing to do with them while he lived) to prove that he took the position that this was literal. I deny it. Get his book on Revelation. He denies that it is literal and shows all the way that it is symbolic and even says it is a symbol in the part they quote from him.

On page 336 in Dr. Brent's Sermons, he says, concerning this passage; "Is this symbolic, or is it a literal description of what will happen? We think it must be understood literally—why not? Brents was a premillennialist and Brother Armstrong says he has believed like Dr. Brents for over forty years. This is the position of Harding College. What about the students who go out from there?

2. The Word "Then"—1 Cor. 15:24

Now, I have told you all the time they are premillennial on this, saying that "Then" in 1 Cor. 15:24 may be as long as "2,000 years" and here they admit it. "As far as the word then itself is concerned it might mean a few hours or even the two thousand years' which the first then has already covered."—The Bulletin, Page 24.

You will notice that they are talking about the "thens" in 1 Cor. 15:23-24. If their idea of it is right then tell me how you would answer Brother R. H. Boll's position when he says it will be 1,000 years? Harding College will have to say, and that they do say, we do not know, Boll, you may be right!

In the Neal-Wallace Debate 1 Cor. 15:23-24 is one of the foundation arguments used by Neal.

3. The Second Coming

"Jesus warns us about speculating on just when he will come, and what will happen at his coming."—Page 24—The Bulletin.

Now you have something. Harding is teaching their preachers that it is "speculation" to talk about what the Lord will do at his coming. They have stopped them from preaching on it if they follow this suggestion. I am still saying that Harding College is not sound and her way of teaching, if this is it, will ruin the church.

Harding College says on page 20 of the Bulletin that Brother Armstrong "has never taught speculations." Yet Brother Armstrong says that "when the Lord comes he is going to slay the wicked, destroy the nations of this earth, re-establish his rule over all the earth, and have his reign on earth with his disciples, and that there will not be one enemy of God and of Christ on earth." When is this? At and after his coming, and he closes by praying for the Lord to come that it all might be brought about.

Now, according to their own admission on page 24, they, not "Harper," make Brother Armstrong a teacher of speculations. Again it is Harding versus Harding. I read in this bulletin where they called somebody "Harper the Chameleon."

Brother Armstrong Admits It

In the Bible Banner August '41, Brother Lewis publishes Brother Armstrong's letter, all of it. Here is what Brother Armstrong says, "concerning the teaching" of Dr. T. W. Brents: "I have held the same position on the millennium for well-nigh forty years, or else I am incapable of judging my own position. Either this or I am a plain liar." The words "liar," "traitor;" "wolf;" "hypocrite," "fuehrer" etc., are always at their tongues convenience. I know it can't be the "howl of the wolf" for I am that. So there is but one thing left for it to be and that is "the fruit of the spirit of our Lord," I will admit that it is strange fruit to come from the spirit of our Lord but they claim to have it. I, of course, am the "hypocrite." Bring on another bulletin boys. If they will just keep on writing you will see what I am "fighting."

But to Dr. Brents and his position. Harding will never out-live this one. Brent's Sermons, page 339, after having given 1 Thess. 4: 13-17 and Rev. 20: 1-4 he says: "This is the Millennium," and, "If this does not express a literal reign with Christ for a literal 1,000 years. We know not what assemblage of words would be capable of expressing that thought."

Again on page 352 he says "The thousand years between the first and second resurrections is the only single point now remembered that is 'dependent' upon John's vision alone for support. Being sustained in so many points by other witnesses, is he not worthy of credit in this?"

Now, let us have another bulletin, boys, Brother Armstrong says he either believes the above like Dr. Brents or else he is a just a plain liar! Well, far be it from me to call him a liar of any kind in this matter of believing in the Lord's reign here on earth. I have said all the time that he did believe it, but his boys have tried to patch it up for him. Now "Dr. Benson," of congress fame, and Dean Sears of, bulletin fame, you must stop calling Brother Armstrong a "plain liar." You are trying to say he does not believe it. He says he does or else he is a "plain liar" Again it is Harding College versus Brother Armstrong.

Conclusion

I trust that some day this may all be settled and that Harding College will stop her defense of premillennialism stop running with them, the Premillennialists, and place their fight upon a higher level. stay out of personalities, and not make it a "personal" fight as they definitely have done. I challenge them to find where I have ever called Brother Armstrong the things Harding College has called me in this bulletin. I have said that he is a premillennialist and that he are defending and running with the orremillennial group and that they should stop it. I will affirm this with any living friend of theirs if they will have it at Harding College where the students will get the truth on this thing. Then, if they want to have it at Little Rock, we will come here, and I will meet them. They will never allow this to go to Harding College. They know I have what I say I have and that they cannot stand up in a personal public discussion of the accusations I have made.

College Ultimatum—Cont. From Page 13) Morrilton merchants, then you "flew the coon" and went to Searcy, leaving about $300,000 debts behind. Sure, you got a lawyer and took bankruptcy and changed the charter, and changed the name of the school slightly; but in the main it is composed of the same people who left Morrilton, and is in reality a continuation of the same institution, the name and charter were changed for the purpose of shaking loose from honest obligations. Bursar, you disown these debts with the words, "indebtedness of a former institution, "under a different charter," and contend they couldn't "serve as payment to the present Harding College under any form of legal procedure." The facts are that a group of people through an institution made some debts at Morrilton, and in the sight of God's justice, those people still owe their honest obligations, even if they did jump through a legal loop hole and form another institution. So in preaching honesty, begin at home, "cast the beam out of your own eye, then take the mote out of thy brother's eye;" when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. There is a difference between owing a debt which one is unable to pay at a given time; and arrogantly disowning honest obligations as you have yours. (Cont. On Page 16)
Fourth: "And without faith it is impossible to please God; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is." (Heb. 11:6) Question: What does one who has believed do when he comes to God?

Becoming a child of God does not consist in mere faith, for in the first passage above it is stated that the believer is given the power to become a child of God. One cannot be given the power to become what he already is, therefore, the believer as such is not a child of God.

Turning to God does not consist in faith for the second passage above states that they believed and turned. The turning followed the believing. What was the turning act?

Again, turning to God does not consist in repentance, for in the third passage above the Jews were told to repent and turn. What was the turning act in this case? Moreover, coming to God did not consist in faith, for in the fourth passage above it is stated that one cannot come before, or without faith; the coming, therefore, must follow believing. Then what is the coming act? The turning act in Acts 11:21 is not faith, for they believed and turned. The turning act in Acts 3:19 is not repentance, for they were told to repent and turn. The coming act in Heb. 11:6 is not faith, for there it is said that one must believe in order to come to God.

If one is saved at the point of faith-by faith without further acts of obedience-then he is saved (1) before he comes to God (Heb. 11-6); (2) before he becomes a child of God (John 1:12); (3) before he turns to God (Acts 11:21; 3:19).

The Bible order in these passages is this: The persons who believed-turned to God; the persons who turned to God were pardoned; hence, faith, turning, pardon. It follows just as certainly as day follows night that the faith that saves is the faith that obeys.

The Turning Act

It is evident that the turning act is not faith, nor repentance, for in the passages cited they believed and repented and afterward turned to God. There is but one act left in which the turning can consist. Baptism is that act. Baptism is the act in which faith obeys. It is the turning act.

Who shall be saved? "He that believeth and is baptized." It is the command that points out the man who is saved. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Shall be saved-not if he is already saved before he is baptized in the exact sense that the passage says "shall be saved." If one is saved before he is baptized the whole construction of Mark 16:16 is a fallacy.

The doctrine of salvation before baptism changes the order and tenses of the verbs in Mark 16:16. The passage reads: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." To fit the doctrine of faith salvation without baptism it would read: "He that believeth and is saved shall (or may) be baptized." But Jesus did not say is saved nor shall be baptized. He said is baptized and shall be saved. The change in the order necessary for a Baptist to get salvation before baptism involves a change in the tenses of the verbs the Lord used. That is simply too much change for anybody to make who has an ounce of respect for the word of God.

Belief and baptism are joined together by the copulative conjunction "and"-the coupling pin. To both thus united is annexed the promise "shall be saved," which is conditional upon complying with both belief and baptism.

Respecting salvation-the whole matter of salvation depends on faith-the exercise of it, "and is baptized." Respecting damnation-the whole matter of damnation depends on faith-the lack of it, "he that believeth not shall be damned." If it be urged that the text does not say "he that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned," we answer certainly not-the disbeliever cannot be baptized. It all depends on which way the man is headed as to the conditions necessary to his destination. If he is headed toward perdition disbelief is enough to damn him. If he is headed for salvation it requires every condition named to reach it. When God appoints two things for the accomplishment of one end, it takes both of those things to accomplish that end. Is there anybody who will dare to say "he that believeth and will not be baptized shall be saved?" And does any preacher have the authority to say "he that believeth and is not baptized shall be saved?" The Romanist says: He that is baptized shall be saved-without faith.

Some Errors Compared

The Baptist says: He that believeth is saved-without baptism. The Bible says: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Which shall we take?

Paraphrasing further, suppose it should read: He that believeth and is baptized shall receive five thousand dollars-there is not a person who could not understand it. Or, if Noah had said "he that believeth and enters the ark shall be saved"-would it have meant that one who believed could have been saved without entering the ark? What the Son of God joined together, let no preacher put asunder.

(For more of this, see page 16.)