The commission according to Luke commanded the apostles to preach remission of sins in the name of Christ to all nations—beginning at Jerusalem. Under this deputation four things were to be done: 1. Remission of sins should be preached; 2. It should be preached in the name of Christ; 3. It should begin at Jerusalem; 4. The same things should be preached to all nations. The disciples appointed to the task were ordered “not to depart from Jerusalem” until plenary power as divine delegates had been received. The Lord said: “Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit come upon you” (Acts 1:8). Pentecost came. The twelve were together in one place” waiting. With startling suddenness in the eventful moment the room resounded with the divine presence and overwhelmed the apostles and filled them. Bearing the credentials of heaven, the inspired commissioners were ready in obedience to the divine fiat to begin preaching remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ.

How did the remission of sins begin to be preached at Jerusalem? Upon this question hangs the entire new Testament story; for the apostles either preached the same thing everywhere they went or they disobeyed the commission. The second chapter of Acts is the answer. The keynote gospel address on Pentecost, by the man authorized by Christ and qualified by the Holy Spirit to announce and bind the terms of remission commands sinners to “repent and be baptized,” the design must be understood, having been defined at Jerusalem in the beginning. So when “they both went down into it) the eunuch rejoiced. He had no experience of grace to relate before baptism; he had no confession of pardon received before baptism; remission was beyond baptism, and that is why, after baptism, he went on his way rejoicing.

Cornelius-Acts 10, 11

Sectarians cling tenaciously to the case of Cornelius as an example of salvation before baptism. They assert that Cornelius received the Holy Spirit before baptism and must, therefore, have been saved before he was baptized. That proves too much. According to Peter’s account of the case in Acts 11, the Holy Spirit fell on the house of Cornelius before he believed. It should be observed that there are two records of the events connected with this conversion—the record of Luke in Acts 10 and the record of Peter himself. (Turn to back page)
THE WEST COAST JIMMIE LOVELL

h Bible writer refers to some who are "ever learning but never coming to a knowledge of the truth." Applied to East and West Coast Jimmie Lovell it would be never learning and never knowing the truth. In his personal column, there appears in his West Coast Christian (?) the following paragraph:

John W. Akin, Longview, Tex. "I would not want my name to appear in your paper since you published that a Negro was the best preacher that we had in the brotherhood. I do not publish that any man was the best preacher in the brotherhood. I do not know any more who is the best than you know that some Negro is not.

Brother Akin contributes the income on $200,000 to Freed-Hardeman College for the education of young preachers. I thought it such a wonderful work I wanted my readers to know it, therefore I asked him for his picture.

As can be readily seen, in the foregoing excerpt is a quotation from a letter written by Brother Akin to Jimmie Lovell. It is Jimmie Lovell himself who has protested the publishing of letters — but he publishes, without the consent of the writer, a letter written to him, even after the writer had requested him not even to put his name in his paper! The request was made in answer to a letter in which Jimmie asked for Brother Akin's photograph to run in his paper with a "write-up" of the subject. Rather than ignore receiving his letter, Brother Akin answered it, stating that he did not want his name to appear in Jimmie's paper and Jimmie publishes the letter! Still, he has whined all over the brotherhood about certain papers that have published his letters without his permission and against his wishes. This is mentioned to call everybody's attention to the fact that the journalistic ethics of which these men boast is a one-way avenue — their own right-of-way. It is that fact that has caused all of us who know them to disregard their boasted love of 'ethics.'

Now, that Jimmie Lovell has made public Brother Akin's letter to him, it is only right and proper that he take the consequences. Let the readers observe that he very emphatically denies that he ever published any such statement about the Negro preacher Hogan. In addition to his editorial denial here is his statement in a letter to Brother Akin, bearing date of October 1941:

"You have falsely accused me. I have never at any time in any place said that any man was the best preacher in the brotherhood, much less a negro. My fear that you have gotten that falsehood from some other paper than the West Coast Christian. That would cause me to be 'judging' and I try not to be guilty of that sin.

"Believing you to be a Christian who will correct a mistake when shown, I await your reply. Sincerely, James L. Lovell."

Brother Akin replied on a postcard referring Lovell to his own paper, the name of which was Hogan's Helper, date of October 1937.

"Then this last May we brought a man whom I had never met who had heard of from Coast to Coast, Richard Nathaniel Hogan to Denver to hold our meeting. I heard every word he spoke in those three weeks ... I heard the Bible explained as I had never heard it before . . . To me, he is as one sent from God. I have never heard a man speak as Hogan speaks. My estimate of him — I have heard the best — is that he is the greatest asset to the church of any living man upon the earth today. A high compliment, I realize. But I speak it honestly." (Hogan's Helper, published by James L. Lovell, 1937)

So that is the "falsehood" that was "gotten" from "some other paper than he West Coast Christian" — but it is James L. Lovell's own falsehood and the 'some other paper" was his own dear Hogan's Helper. Run your peepers over his statements in parallel, side by side:

1
Jimmie proposed that he would apologize if proof was furnished that he made the negro statement. The proof has been furnished — but how can he make a sincere apology for saying what he "realized" at the time was "a high compliment" to pay a negro, but with due deliberation, he declared: "I speak it honestly." Remember, he had "heard the best" and his "estimate" of the negro preacher is that he is the greatest asset to the church of any living man upon the earth today! That will ruin any negro "upon the earth today." No doubt, Hogan has done and can do a great work among negroes, but it is time for the brethren to put him in his place, keep him there, and quit the disgraceful practice of holding meetings for white people. As for negro ability, if any white preacher, no matter what his ability is, should say the same identical things, the negro preacher says, it would sound so common the brethren wouldn't listen to it.

The foregoing statement in Lovell's Hogan's Helper is several times stronger than he was charged with making. When he denied the allegation and defined the aligator, it did not occur to him that some men's memories are better than his own, and while he talks at random, his rambling remarks are left on record to bear witness against him. When he was so willing to brand the statement as a "falsehood" little did it occur to "Jimmie" that it would turn out to be his own falsehood. But "Jimmie" is good at that sort of thing. The Bible Banner still has in its files the letters he wrote to Cled Wallace in which he went so far as to garble a telegram from Hugo McCord concerning Clinton Davidson in order to prove to Cled that Fov had told a falsehood. When he was caught red-handed in his garbling of the words of a telegram to make out his case, he wrote Cled Wallace a letter confessing that he "lied" (Jimmie's own word in a signed letter) and asked Cled not to let Foy publish it in the Bible Banner. Would Jimmie like for these letters, with the original telegram and his garbled representation of it side by side, to be published? Well, he is proceeding in exactly the right direction to get it done. Yet he, who affectionately calls himself "Jimmie Lovell," has the unmitigated audacity to talk about a "falsehood" which he says was "gotten" from "another paper"! It is his own falsehood, begotten as well as "gotten" in his own incoherent mental meanderings.

Why should any self-respecting man in the church want his name or his photograph in Lovell's paper? Jimmie Love11 wrote me for my photograph to publish with a "write-up" of me. I did not answer his letter — I never do. He then wrote Cled that if I would not let him publish my photograph, he would like to publish his (the next best, I suppose, to represent the Bible Banner). At the last report Cled had not answered that one, and who could blame him? In the last letter asking for our photographs, he stated that he was also asking for the photographs of other editors, Brother Showalter, Brother Goodpasture, and here is the thing that should open the eyes of the innocent readers — and along with them he would give R. H. Boll the same recognition by featuring his photograph!

That lets the cat out of the bag! It is well known that Jimmie has been a premillennial sympathizer, though all the time denying that he believes premillennialism (which doubtless he does not — he doesn't know the meaning of the word). Many whose memories are better than his will recall that he boldly averred some months ago that there was not even one premillennialist in the whole state of California. And at that very time there were both premillennialists and premillennial sympathizers on the line-tip of the Pepperdine College. Albeit, Jimmie proffered his services to patrol the coast and if a premillennialist even reared its head anywhere on the West Coast he proposed then and there to slay the reptile by a decapitation. Now what? Lo, and behold, he proposes to feature the living head of Bollism (premillennialism in the church) in his paper by publishing his picture, along with recognized editors and preachers in the church, thus extending the influence of the very thing he pledged himself to behead if it ever reared its head! So Jimmie has "reared" its head itself, else he has a funny idea of beheading the beast of premillennialism.

The truth is, Jimmie Lovell has been all the time linked with the insidious Davidson Movement among the churches and is yet much in sympathy with that element in the church. He is still smarting over the defeat of the Davidson movement and the collapse of Davidson's New Christian Leader, which published his picture every week, and of which he was an integral part. He has never renounced Davidson nor his movement, as some who were connected with him did when they saw the tide turning. Jimmie still stands right where the New Christian Leader stood, when he stood with it. He revived his West Coast Christian to avoid dying with it.

As a leader in the church, Jimmie is utterly uninformed and wholly unreliable. Some discerning readers in various parts of the country have suggested to us that Jimmie should not be taken seriously, and that it is a waste of good space to attempt to administer to him even occasional editorial discipline. So far as he alone is concerned, that is true, but when his "coast to coast" propaganda is spread out over a wider area it needs what seems to fall my own lot to do and say — no other paper will do it; yet they agree privately it should be done, and even venture cautiously to commend me for doing and saying it. But they themselves will neither do it nor say it.

Except for this angle — the propaganda of Jimmie Lovell's work — we would yield to the suggestion, apply the mantle of charity, and let him pass. After awhile, the brethren will see through the schemes some of these other brethren as they have seen through the schemes of Clinton Davidson, and they will go out, as he went out.

Meanwhile, if other editors and preachers want to give Jimmie Love11 the publicity, and themselves the cheap notoriety of letting him publish their pictures, along with R. H. Boll, it is okay with me — but kindly excuse me, please!

It is my purpose to write an editorial for the next issue of The Bible Banner on the subject of "Unfeigned Faith and Fellowship" in which I propose to point out some recent palpable inconsistencies in some things that are being said and done in some circles within our borders.
VITAL POINTS IN WORSHIP

CLED E. WALLACE

For practical purposes worship may be considered the all-out adoration of the human heart. When a lawyer questioned Jesus about "the great commandment in the law" he received a quick and a pointed answer. "And he said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment." The measure of a man's love for his neighbor or those who are closer to him is less than this. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." So the Lord declares.

This all-out adoration is not even to be directed toward heavenly beings such as the angels. "For it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." A sense of awe has always taken possession of men when they were confronted by angels. An angel showed the apostle John some of the visions that are found in the last book of the Bible. "And when I heard and saw, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel that showed me these things." This was a very natural reaction and John evidently considered it proper and right or he would not have acted in such a manner. He was a very intelligent and experienced Christian. He made a mistake and was instantly corrected by the angel at whose feet he lay prostrate. "And he saith unto me, See thou do it not: I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren the prophets, and with them that keep the words of his book: worship God." There we have it. "Worship God." Angels are a higher order of created beings than man, but created beings nevertheless and servants of God, fellow-servants with faithful men, and are even employed in the task of "doing service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation." If it be improper to worship angels, how much more so is it to adore the saints, so-called images of the saints, or the mother of the Lord. To worship any man is not to be thought of even for an instant. "And when it came to pass that Peter entered, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter raised him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also, am a man." The practice of bowing before the modern ecclesiastic who claims to be the successor to Simon Peter and -vicar of Christ on earth is deserving of sterner rebuke than either John or Cornelius received. No true worshipper of God will be guilty of it. It is a presumptuous thing on the part of any man to either expect from or offer to any human being a token of adoration that even the angels reject. Worship must be reserved for God.

Abundant and revealed reasons exist for this. In his address on Mars Hill in Athens Paul made clear the true relation existing between God and Man. God is "Lord of heaven and earth," the giver of "life, breath and all things. He created man and appointed the bounds of human habitation. We live and move and have our being in him and we are his offspring. It is man's duty to seek and find God and "he is not far from each one of us." The affection that a dutiful child exercises towards his father and mother is only a small measure of the honor that humanity owes Jehovah. Myriads of angels "fell before the throne on their faces, and worshipped God, saying,"

"Amen: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor: and power and might, be unto your God for ever and ever. Amen." Righteous men on earth echo the praises of angels in heaven when they worship God. His name should never be lightly used or bandied about in irreverent conversation. Thoughtless people who would not speak disrespectfully of their parents often take the name of God in vain. More teaching is needed to enlighten men on what the Bible has to say about God. This is the sure way to generate faith in him "and without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing unto him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarded of them that seek after him." Man is weak and dependent and must have super-human guidance. Human efforts to guide human destiny independently of God lead to ultimate ruin. This has always been and must always be true. The world through its wisdom knew not God." Apostate and ruined Israel wrung a cry of anguish from Jeremiah the prophet. "0 Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps. 0 Lord correct me, but with judgment; not in thin anger, lest thou bring me to nothing." The most humbling influence that can take possession of a human heart is a true knowledge of God. It is a real pity that so many who seem inclined to worship him, like the men of Athens, do so in ignorance. Human arrogance appears in its ugliest form in the rejection of God from human knowledge. Nebuchadnezzar is 'both classical and typical as an object lesson. He was sure of his powers and walked upon the broad walls of Babylon and was swollen with pride. He took credit for it all "by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty." Jehovah intervened to teach him a lesson and leave it as a monument for the generations to come. The proud usurper of divine right was driven from men and given the heart of a beast. He ate grass as oxen, his body was wet with the dew of heaven, his hair grew like eagles' feathers and his nails like birds' claws. This horrible experience was followed by a return of his understanding and with it a sane and righteous recognition of the supreme place occupied by Almighty God. "And at the end of the days Nebuchadnezzar, lifted up mine eyes unto heaven, and mine understanding returned unto me, and I blessed the most High, and I praised and honoured him that liveth for ever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion. and his kingdom is from generation to generation: and all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing: and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" Nebuchadnezzar in his pride and ignorance had set up a "olden image and commanded all men to worship it. In fury he commanded that Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego be cast into a burning, fiery furnace because they refused to bow before the image. In his humbled and chastened condition he expressed the profound truth that the Hebrew children chose a path of life rather than death. "Now I Nebuchadnezzar, praise and extol and honour the King of heaven, all whose works are truth, and his ways judgment: and those that walk in pride he is able to abase." It is this doctrine of God that gives the Bible its supreme place in the literature of the world. Such a book must be divine for human power was no more capable of producing it than it is of creating a sun or a star. Chance is the mother of neither the natural world nor the Bible. God is the only explanation of both and that explanation is the only rational one.

The question of how men can worship God acceptably is somewhat akin to the question of how a degenerate race can be Raved from sin. Human wisdom can answer neither question. "For seeing that in the wisdom of God..."
The world through its wisdom knew not God. It was God's good pleasure through me toovouness of me preaching to save them that believe." God sent a saviour into the world and revealed a plan by which man must be saved. There is no substitute for it and it must be accepted by faith. Likewise man cannot be guided by intuition or reason to a true coee or divine worship. No man can know what is acceptable to God in the way of worship except as God reveals it. "Even so the things or God none Knoweth, we might Know the things that were treely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; combining spiritual things with spiritual words." So spoke Paul and the inescapable conclusion is that the Bible is the source of all information about what a man must do to be saved and how he is to render acceptable worship to God. The man who consults his own feeling or convenience and brings an offering to God is more apt to receive the curse of Cain than the blessing of faithful Abel.

The Old Testament system of worship with its "carnal ordinances imposed until a time of reformation" was a divine kindergarten for the Jews, the vital lesson that they must depend on divine leadership. Moses was given a detailed blueprint of the tabernacle and warned to build it according to the pattern which was shown him in the mount. The law carried this fearful warning. "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." The corpses of Nadab and Abihu, sons of Aaron and princes in the assembly are grim monuments of the wrath of God toward men who are presumptuous enough to tamper with divine arrangements in worship. In burning incense, they offered strange fire which God had not commanded. They were not even given time to mouth the hackneyed excuse that God had not told them not to do as they had done. They had divine orders and it was their duty to stick to them without taking any detours in the way of experiments. They paid for their folly with their lives.

The time came for the old law and the old priesthood to be changed. They were "dis-anulled," permanently abolished. We have a new order of worship under the new and better convenant. Even though this new order is a "laws not consist in allowing men to offer up to God in worship that which is right in their own eyes. Divine leadership is as essential as ever and it is fully as important for the servants of the Lord to maintain purity in worship as it is for them to be sound in doctrine. Men have no more right to introduce unauthorized practices in the worship of God than they have to change the conditions of pardon. When the church assembles to worship God it must do what God says. Let it be assumed that the church is right in "spirit," that the members are reverent, zealous and abounding in ambition to honor him who "giveth to all life, and breath, and all things." They assemble on the Lord's day. Why? It is "the day that the Lord hath made," a monument to his resurrection from the dead, a divine appointment. What is the nature of this meeting and what procedure shall be followed? Is human wisdom to decide? Shall it be a time of feasting and merry-making? God has revealed his will in the teaching of the New Testament, in the precepts and examples recorded therein. The early church met to break bread, teach, admonish, pray, sing praises and contribute money for doing good. They did so because they were instructed to do so and the instruction they received was inspired. It would be folly to conclude that they did other things they were nor told to do, that they happened to want to do, on the pretext that they were not instructed not to do them. They did not follow the rebellious true that what is not forbidden is allowable. They respected me apostolic admonition to "not the pattern of sound words which thou hast heard from me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." The claim that worship is in the heart and cannot be embodied in specific acts is about as much lacking in both sense and tain as the like claim that a sinner can love the Lord as much in his heart out of the water as in the water, and therefore baptism is unnecessary. What God commands must be done and what he has not commanded must not be practiced in the realm of worship. It is all right to drink water and milk but it must be done somewhere else besides the Lord's table. It is very well on occasion to express personal exuberance in the singing of popular and secular songs and the playing on instruments of music, but not in the worship of God. He has not appointed such things in the worship which is directed to him. The whole situation is summed up in this. "Worship God" and do so as it is written. To try to do so otherwise exhibits a lack of faith which makes all worship vain.

SECTARIAN INCONSISTENCIES

W. CURTIS PORTER

I have never known a sectarian preacher who could preach or write without contradicting himself. His contention at one point is in direct conflict with what he preaches about something else. His declarations are characterized by sectarian inconsistencies. For example, note the following:

"If Adam did not have the power to choose to disobey, then God's command had no meaning, nor point. Certainly God will not command me to refrain from a thing he knows I cannot do!"—C. O. Baker in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

I wish you to notice especially that last sentence: "God will not command me to refrain from a thing he knows I cannot do." Who said that? A Baptist preacher. Yet this same preacher in the same article says:

"I do not believe that a person who is saved by grace can apostatize."

If that is so, then God will not tell him to refrain from falling, since he will not tell a man to refrain from a thing that he cannot do. But the two points are inconsistent. If a child of God cannot fall, then God does command a Christian "to refrain from a thing he cannot do," for God tells Christians to refrain from falling. Note the statement of Paul in I Cor. 10: 12: "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." This was written to Christians. It records what God, through an apostle, is telling Christian; and he tells them "to refrain from falling" -to "take heed lest they fall." Is he telling them to refrain from something that is impossible for them to do? Or again: "Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." Heb. 4:11. Certainly it would be absurd for any man to say that God would tell Christians not to do a thing when it is utterly impossible for the mto do the thing forbidden. If they cannot do it, there is no need of being so foolish, as to tell them not to do it. But God tells Christians not to fall! It is possible, therefore, for them to fall, and C. O. Baker contradicts both himself and God when he teaches the impossibility of apostasy.
Abraham and Sarah were ninety nine and eighty nine years old respectively, when God changed their names to Abraham and Sarah. In these articles I will speak of them only by their God given names, unless it be in quotations where their Original, or shorter names appear. God appeared to Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Haran, and told him to get out from his country, from his father's house, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land where he would show him. Abraham, Saran his wife, Sarai, his nephew, and Lot his nephew left Ur of the Chaldees, and came to haran. Ana for Abraham had not yet his name "Abraham" given. Abraham was to become the progenitor of two great nations. The first was made up of his fleshly descendants, and constituted the earthly kingdom of Israel, God's chosen, and favored people for fifteen hundred years. The second great nation was to be a spiritual kingdom, made up from all nations of the earth, of those who would obey the gospel, which was the climax and culmination of the promises.

The Abrahamic promises. In the Old Testament, three promises were made to Abraham in Egypt: 1. To make of his fleshly descendants a great nation. 2. To give him the land of Canaan. 3. To make of the fleshly descendants of Abraham a "great nation," and it was by multiplying that Abraham's descendants developed. The most oppressed people in the world have always been the most prolific, and it was by multiplying that Abraham's seed was to become as numerous as the stars of heaven, or the sand upon the sea shore.

The first was made up of his fleshly descendants, and constituted the earthly kingdom of Israel, God's chosen, and favored people for fifteen hundred years. The second great nation was to be a spiritual kingdom, made up from all nations of the earth, of those who would obey the gospel, which was the climax and culmination of the promises.

The first land promise, and it included the land of Canaan. Read Genesis 12:1-3, "Now Jehovah said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee; and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and be thou a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Out of this two-fold promise Abraham was to become the progenitor of two great nations. The first was made up of his fleshly descendants, and constituted the earthly kingdom of Israel, God's chosen, and favored people for fifteen hundred years. The second great nation was to be a spiritual kingdom, made up from all nations of the earth, of those who would obey the gospel, which was the climax and culmination of the promises.

The second time God promised the land of Canaan to Abraham and to his seed. In Genesis 15:7, we read: "And he said unto him, I am Jehovah that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it." This was the third land promise, and it was still limited to the land of Canaan. After God had made these promises three different times to Abraham, he wanted God to tell him how he might know that the promises would be fulfilled. God told him to "take a heifer three years old, a she goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove and a young pigeon." When Abraham had divided these animals and birds as God told him to do, and had driven the birds of prey away, "when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo, a horror of great darkness fell upon him. And he said unto Abraham, know of a surety that thy seed shall be sojourners in a land that is not theirs and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years" (Gen. 15:5-8).

Premillennialists declare that these Abrahamic promises of an earthly kingdom have not been fulfilled. Therefore the premillennial theory of unfulfilled promises becomes the foundation of the colossal superstition, with all the wild fancies, vagaries, and absurdities, with which the premillennialists have draped the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel. To me, this foundation is as absurd, and as vulnerable, as the foundation upon which the Roman Catholic church was founded. Yet there are millions who believe in the Catholic Church, and there are other millions, in all the Protestant denominations, who believe in the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel. There are two causes for these unfortunate conditions. First, because of teaching, not studying. Second, because the masses of people in religion are what they are because they are where they are. The average man always follows the course of least resistance and naturally accepts the popular teaching, and " Customs of his day, and of his country."

If it can be shown from the Old Testament that every promise God made to Abraham concerning his fleshly descendants were fulfilled, then the foundation of premillennialism is gone, and the theory becomes untenable. Because the only thing that gives their speculations even a shade or a shadow of truth is their contention that the Abrahamic land promises have not been fulfilled. Beginning from this point they spin and weave a labyrinth, out of what they call unfulfilled prophecy, and wind up in Jerusalem with Jesus Christ sitting on an earthly throne, and ruling over an earthly kingdom, where David sat and ruled more than a thousand years before Christ was born. I wonder how "He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory" will appreciate this wonderful (?) premillennial ascension (?) promotion (?), and coronation over an earthly kingdom?

I propose to show from the old Testament that God did make of the fleshly descendants of Abraham a "great nation," and that they possessed, and ruled over all the lands God promised to Abraham, and thereby prove that every promise God made to Abraham concerning an earthly kingdom was fulfilled in every particular. When Abraham came to Shechem unto the oak of Mamre, in the land of Canaan, God appeared to him and said: "Unto thy seed will I give this land: and there build he an altar unto Jehovah, who appeared unto him" (Gen. 12:7). This was the first land promise, and it included the land of Canaan. When Abraham and Lot separated after their return from Egypt, Jehovah appeared to Abraham again, and said: " Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward and southward and eastward and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever" (Gen. 13:14, 15). This was the second time God promised the land of Canaan to Abraham and to his seed. In Genesis 15:7, we read: "And he said unto him, I am Jehovah that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it." This was the third land promise, and it was still limited to the Land of Canaan. After God had made these promises three different times to Abraham, he wanted God to tell him how he might know that the promises would be fulfilled. God told him to take "a heifer three years old, a she goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove and a young pigeon." When Abraham had divided these animals and birds as God told him to do, and had driven the birds of prey away, "when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo, a horror of great darkness fell upon him. And he said unto Abraham, know of a surety that thy seed shall be sojourners in a land that is not theirs and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years" (Gen. 15:5-8).
God later made the same promises to Isaac and Jacob. In Genesis 12:1-8, God said to Isaac: "Sojourn in this land, and I will bless thee; and unto thy seed, I will give all these lands, and I will establish the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father; and I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these lands; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." In Genesis 28:15, 14, God makes the same promises to Jacob. We read: "And, behold, Jehovah stood above it, and said, I am Jehovah the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed: and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt be in exalted esteem to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." So, Isaac and Jacob were made heirs with Abraham of the same promise. In Hebrews 11:8-10, Paul says: "By faith Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." In Genesis 21:5, Isaac was sixty years old when Jacob was born (Gen. 25:26). Jacob was one hundred and thirty years old when he went into Egypt (Gen. 47:8, 9). It was therefore two hundred and fifteen years from the time of the promise till Jacob went into Egypt. That left two hundred and fifteen years for Israel's actual stay in Egypt. Moses was sent from the birth of Isaac, Abraham's first heir, and seed, and allow five years for Abraham's stay in Horon, you have four hundred years. This is the number of years stated in Gen. 15:13, and quoted by Stephen in Acts 7:6. It makes no difference which number you take, Abraham's fleshly descendants have become "a great, nation," and have been delivered from their bondage. Thus for God has fulfilled his promise to Abraham. We will now see if the nation ever possessed the lands that God promised Abraham.

It was forty years after their deliverance from Egypt before they crossed the Jordan into the land of Canaan, the land of promise. Moses finally led them into the land that God had promised to their fathers. The promised land was the Jordan into the land of Canaan; but Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh did not want to cross the Jordan, so they asked Moses to let them remain in Gilead because that was a good cattle country. That stirred within Moses the memories of the mistakes, miseries, and sufferings of forty years. "And, Moses said unto the children of God and to the children of Reuben, shall your brethren go to the war, and shall ye sit here And wherefore discourage ye the heart of the children of Israel from going over into the land which Jehovah hath given them Thus did your fathers, when I sent them from Kadesh-barnea to see the land. For when they went up unto the Valley of Ziph, which is before Adullam, and saw the land, they discouraged the heart of the children of Israel, that they should not go into the land which Jehovah had given them. And Jehovah's anger was kindled in that day, and he swore, saying, surely none of the men that came up out of Egypt from twenty years old and upward, shall see the land which I swore unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob; because they have not wholly followed me: save Caleb the son of Jephunneh the Kenizzite, and Joshua the son of Nun; because they have wholly followed Jehovah. And Jehovah's anger was kindled against Israel, and he made them wander to and fro in the wilderness forty years, until all the generation, that had one evil in sight of Jehovah, was consumed" (Num. 14:22). Moses said, "Every day I saw the land of Gilead, and I was unwilling to go up there. He is the Lord who granted that God made to Abraham, so on the condition that the men would cross the Jordan and fight till their brethren possessed the land of Canaan, the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half tribe of Manasseh were permitted to settle on the west side of the river Jordan. Moses had been so aggravated, and worried by the murmurations of the children of Israel while wondering in the wilderness, that he himself had failed to sanctify Jehovah in the eyes of the people at the waters of Meribah and was also barred from entering the land of Canaan." Read numbers 20:10–13. The time come for the children of Israel to cross the river Jordan, Moses went "to the tops of Pisgah," where he could see over unto the land of Canaan. "And Jehovah said unto him. This is the land which I swore unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed: I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither" (Deut. 34:4).
Joshua succeeded Moses as leader, led the children of Israel across the River Jordan, and into the possession of the land of Canaan. Before he delivered his valedictory speech, recorded in Joshua 24:1-15, he said, "So Jehovah gave unto Israel all the land which he swore unto their fathers; and they possessed it and dwelt therein. And Jehovah gave them rest around about, according to all that he swore unto their fathers; and there stood not a man or all their enemies before them; Jehovah delivered all their enemies into their hand. There tailed not ought of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel; all come to pass" (Joshua 21:43-45). Joshua here declared that God had fulfilled his promise to Abraham to give the land of Canaan to his seed for an inheritance. This was the original promise that God made to Abraham when he called him to leave his country, his kindred, and his father's house, and go unto the land that I will show thee. That Joshua was only speaking of the land of Canaan, is clearly seen from the first six verses of the twenty second chapter, where he told the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh that the victory was won, and they could go on back across the Jordon to their tents. But what about the extended and grant, was it ever fulfilled? "And after this it came to pass, that David smote the Philistines, and subdued them: and David took the bridle of the mother city out of the hand of the Philistines. And he smote Moab, and measured them with the line, making them to lie down on the ground; and he measured two lines to put to death, and one full line to keep alive. And the Moabites became servants of David, and brought tribute. David smote also Hadadezer, the son of Rehob, King of Zobah, as he went to recover his dominion at the River" (2 Sam. 8:1-3). This shows that David conquered all the countries from "the seas to the Philistines, and from the wilderness unto the Euphrates." This covered all the land that God promised to give to Abraham's seed. As our final proof we read 2 Chronicles 9:22-26, "So King Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth in richness and wisdom. And all the kings of the earth sought the presence of Solomon, to hear his wisdom, which God had put in his heart. And they brought every man his tribute, vessels of silver, and vessels of gold, and raiment, armor, and spices, horses, and mules, a rate year by year. And Solomon had four thousand stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen, that he bestowed in the chariot cities, and with the king at Jerusalem. And he ruled over all the kings from the river even unto the land of the Philistines, and to the border of Egypt." Thus we see that every promise God made to Abraham, based solely upon his faithfulness was fulfilled in every particular.

TIRE RATIONING IN PROPHECY

W. Curtis Porter

When some unusual event occurs many would-be-interpreters of the Bible are quick to look for some prophetic statement that points out that event. Oftentimes these shortcuts are made by some speculating preacher. But preachers do not have a monopoly on this thing. Recent press reports that the Governor of Texas has said that our present tire rationing is a subject of Old Testament prophecy. He introduced Isa. 3:18 to prove his point. This passage says: "In that day the Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet, and their caul, and their round tires like the moon." On the face of it this looks convincing, for if God takes away "their round tires like the moon," that must mean we are not going to have any tires for our automobiles during this emergency. At least it evidently seemed convincing to the Governor of Texas, and likely others have swallowed it, bait, hook, sinker, and all.

But I wonder why the Governor did not go a little farther and show some other things to be taken away. In verse 19 God said he would take the chains and mufflers. If the "round tires like the moon" has reference to automobile tires, then we may expect those who have to drive on slippery pavements and muddy roads to do their driving without any tire chains, for God said he would take away the chains too. But also he would take away their mufflers. Does this refer to the mufflers on our cars? If the tires refer to the tires on our cars, as the Texas Governor says, then this must refer to the mufflers on our exhaust pipes. This is going to be hard on the nervers. Think of all the noise that is going to be produced by our chugging cars with the mufflers all taken away. The muffler on my car that I must keep under the other things is not altogether perfect now. The roaring gets on my nerves sometimes now. But is is much better than if I had no muffler at all. So I would like to keep even what I have for awhile. But there is some consolation to be found in this. Maybe the mufflers we have will last as long as the tires we have, and when the tires are all gone, we will have to quit running the cars anyway. And when the cars don't run, they won't make any noise, and we won't need the mufflers. And verse 23 tells us he will take away the glasses and the hoods. So when our windsheilds and the glasses in our doors and windows are gone, and hoods over our engines are taken away, with our mufflers and tires requisitioned by the government, we won't have much car left. We would just as well get ready for some walking exercise.

But, actually now, is that the meaning of this prophecy? This application of it is just about as sensible as the application of Nahum 2:4 to automobiles when Nahum speaks about the "chariots raging in the streets" of Nineveh. The mistake made by denominational preachers generally is the mistake of the Governor of Texas-he fails to read enough of the prophecy to find out to whom or about whom, the language is spoken, or even to determine the thing that is under consideration. The whole third chapter of Isaiah is a prophecy of punishment to be inflicted upon Judah. Verses 16 to 26 are spoken concerning "the daughters of Zion." The daughters of Zion, of course, were Jewish women. So if this prophecy concerning the rationing of tires, it would have to do only with tires that belong to Jewish women. God said he would take away "their round tires like the moon." I am neither a woman nor a Jew. So the prophecy could not be applied to me and my old bus. Furthermore, if you will read the entire passage, you will see that God has no reference to automobiles, but he refers to the apparel worn by Jewish women. The chains, the mufflers, the glasses, the hoods and the round tires like the moon were but adornments worn by "the daughters of Zion."
A very zealous Baptist who is described by the Baptist and Reflector as "a member of a forward-looking church" is forwarding a plan to put that periodical into me houses of all the members. He gives as his reason "We are Baptists, and we are going to keep up with what Baptists are a-smong." The editor breaks into caps in praise of this "wonderful, progressive and co-operative spirit." I can understand the editor's enthusiasm for if I were a Baptist editor, I would have no doubt feel and talk the same way. I am not a Baptist but I do like "to keep up with what Baptists are doing" for one reason or another, so I also read the Baptist and Reflector. It is an official organ of the Tennessee Baptist Convention and is the proper place to look for that information. Now the New Testament is a useful book when it comes to finding out how to become a Christian and glorify God in the church but I do not recall reading anything about a Judean or Macedonian Baptist Convention promoting an official organ to help the brethren "keep up with what Baptists are doing." The church appears to have done very well in those days without Baptists, state conventions and official organs. If there were any Baptists "to keep up with" the New Testament makes no mention of them. Possibly that is one reason why Baptists now admit that a man can be a Christian while he liyes and go to heaven when he dies without being a Baptist. It makes one wonder if it is worth while to even try to keep up with them.

"All works, whether technically of the law or not, are excluded from the sphere of the conditions of salvation. Sinners are saved entirely by grace or entirely by works, not by a mixture of the two (Rom. 11:6). But the Book says men are saved by grace; therefore works are excluded from the process. If a man could be saved by works, salvation would not be by grace." (Baptist and Reflector)

"The second theory of salvation is that only those who obey the commandments of God are saved. Those who believe this fail to realize that according to their theory no human being who ever lived on earth was saved, or can go to heaven." (Baptist Standard)

This sort of talk from Baptist editors is somewhat shocking when placed along side of some plain texts of sacred scripture. "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) "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but the keeping of the commandments of God." (1 Cor. 7:19) "But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6:17, 18) "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren?" Ye see that by works a man is justified and not only by faith ... For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead." (James 2:14-26). The one fact that Baptist doctrine excludes obedience as essential to salvation brands it as false.

I have given some study looking toward an explanation of why these editors cannot grasp the obvious truth on this question of the true relation of grace and obedient-faith. They studiously ignore the devastating arguments we let loose at their positions and go right on repeating their errors as though a flood of repetitions has merit to establish their contentions. And they possibly, do, in the minds of some who read only their side of the controversy. They close their eyes, or at least their pens, to some stubborn facts. They cite Romans 11:6 which says "if it is by grace, it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace; and if it is by works, then is it no more of grace: otherwise works are no more works." (Matt. 7:21)

"The works of which James speaks in the second chapter of his epistle are works after salvation, not before. Faith without, cancel out grace and makes the "reward as of debt" is entirely excluded. That kind of work cannot be mixed with grace at all. They do not mix. These gentlemen assume without offering any proof whatever that baptism belongs to that kind of works and proceed to "exclude" it as a condition of salvation even though Jesus did say: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' In the scriptures baptism is classified as "the obedience of faith," not with works of merit that make faith void. They stubbornly ignore all this and go on shouting their perverse repetitions. They declare that "Sinners are saved entirely by grace." Paul says, "Men must have access to God's grace through faith." This faith is the act of the creature. Man must believe, he must repent, he must submit to baptism. "The process" is one of faith. They will not go to the extreme of advocating unconditional salvation because "sinners are saved entirely by grace" but if the performance of one condition on the part of the sinner does not make void the grace of God, why should the performance of another do so, if God commands that it be done? It would be genuine ly refreshing if these gentlemen would quit begging the question and make just one real effort to deal with the issue involved. So far every effort to persuade them to do so has been futile. We are patient and persistent and can continue to press the point as long as they mouth their eva-
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CONTRIBUTORIAL

ARE YOU A CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR?

IF SO, THE CHANCES ARE THAT YOU HAVE SOME TRYING DAYS AHEAD OF YOU.

In Hitler's Germany there is little doubt that it befell him. The treachery of the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor electrified the nation into a unity of feeling and purpose that is simply astonishing. At no time in World War I was there such perfect accord and such universal approval of measures to be taken for the destruction of the enemy.

"Buy a bond—and slap a Jap across the pond"! "Let’s axe the Axis!" "Life, Liberty and pursuit of Japanese!" "To Hell With Hitler!" These, and scores of other such expressions are becoming the pass-words of America. They indicate the character of the emotional attitude throughout the nation. Personal sacrifices are to be made; luxuries, comforts, and even necessities (or what we thought were necessities) are to be foregone. The nation must fight!

In the midst of this national fever of enthusiasm for the task of war, the conscientious objector, perforce, finds himself in a most trying and difficult position. Patriotism is as strong in his heart as in the heart of any of his fellow-Americans. The love for home and country is as natural to him as it is to anyone. He has the willingness to sacrifice his life to preserve those values no less than any other loyal citizen.

But-and it is a forceful negative!—his allegiance to Christ forbids that he have any part in the slaughter of his fellow-beings. He is a citizen of America, to be sure, but first, and foremost, he is a citizen of heaven. He cannot, and will not, violate his conscience toward God at the behest of any human government. Such a stand may mean death. In Hitler's Germany there is little doubt that it would mean death—or worse. In Russia in all probability the same fate would befall him.

But here in America, by the providence of God, we have a nation which recognizes the value of a man's conscience. Our nation is fighting as much to preserve the sanctity of the individual conscience as it is to preserve democratic institutions and ideals, and all the other values which totalitarianism would destroy. And our government does not propose to destroy that value in seeking to preserve other values. Section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 provides that:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form.

How Can He Serve?

This exemption does not mean at all that the conscientious objector cannot, or will not, serve his nation. It merely provides that he will not be asked to violate his conscience in doing so. There will remain an area of service to him just as important, just as necessary, and just as "patriotic" as would be the bearing of arms.

At the time of this writing Adolph Hitler's armies are reeling back in steady retreat before the crushing blows of the Red army. Hurled back from the gates of Moscow, it seems now that Hitler has suffered a major disaster. Even if he should recover himself, and stabilize his lines, he has suffered a blow that may well prove mortal.

This unexpected and disastrous stroke was delivered by about 4,000,000 Red troops who had been held in reserve back of Moscow. All through the summer and fall, when the Germans were rolling on like an ocean tide, these troops were held there. They were not sent in to stem the rush of Hitler's legions. They merely waited. To many of them it must have been a heart-breaking thing to do. Their country was being invaded; their homes were being laid waste; their wives and mothers and children were being subjected to all the brutal treatment for which the Nazi soldiers have become notorious. And yet they were not permitted to strike.

The Red army command realized that the time had not yet come. Not until Hitler had spent his strength; not until the cold Russian winter set in could these men be used.

Then came the crucial moment. And the reservers were called on to do their part.

The result has astonished the world.

In somewhat similar fashion we believe the Christian has his part to play, his place to serve, in the struggle that has enveloped the world today. His training and his allegiance to Christ unfit him for the business of killing. His whole attitude is one of love and good-will, not one of hate and anger. Even if he should be inducted into the army he could not make a good soldier. One of our leading army authorities has said that, "No man can be a good soldier until he learns to hate-to hate to the point that he wants to kill." It is a psychological impossibility for the humble follower of Christ to have such a feeling.

But one day this war will be over. Peace will settle once again upon a troubled world. The flags will be furled, the uniforms packed away, and the war-weary world will try to return to normal and peace-time pursuits.

Then will come the opportunity for the conscientious objector to serve his country-and humanity. For the world will be in desperate need of men of peace—men of goodwill—"who have not been participants in the bitter heat and hatreds of the battle-field. There will be a ministry of reconciliation necessary, a time of healing up the wounds of bitterness and malice which any war leaves in its wake. The nation will need, as never before, the leavening influence of a company of people who have kept themselves aloof from all the spiritual and moral degradation which is an inevitable part of warfare.

And the Christian, whose conscience unfitted him for war, will be, by virtue of that very conscience, the best fitted man on earth for carrying on this work of building up and re-establishing the spiritual values which war has destroyed. He is the man who can do most to restore the friendly relationships and normal intercourse which must exist between nations if peace is to endure. The soldier is peculiarly fitted and prepared to fight to preserve the nation; the Christian is peculiarly fitted and prepared to carry the spiritual values for which the soldier fights into all the world, and so make future wars impossible.

So, if you are a conscientious objector, if you cannot bring yourself to the point of taking human life, let no one persuade you that such an attitude is "unpatriotic." There will be hot-heads who lose their sense of balance in time of national peril. They will doubtless make life as miserable as they can for those who believe Christ has forbidden it.
followers to shed human blood. But to a man of conviction the slurs and jibes of more belligerent souls will serve only to strengthen him in his will to follow the way of men. And, above all, remember that you have a part to play, you have a service to render to the nation and to the world. That service can be given only by those who keep their hearts free from hatred and their hands free from blood.

Your government recognizes the value of that service; it appreciates your worth to the nation. It places a high estimate on the very convictions which unfit you for blood-letting. And when this war is over, you, like the Red soldiers saved for the crucial moment, will be called upon to render a service which was not possible before that hour. See to it that you are prepared to serve, that no malicious or bitter speech or hatred is ever allowed to find harbor in your heart; that your prayers for the suffering people of the Axis are as often and as fervent as are your prayers for our own nation. And let no unhinging citizen provoke you to doubt your stand by his taunts of "Coward" or "unpatriotic." Remember the last lines of Milton's Sonnet on His Blindness:

"They also serve who only stand and wait."

**THE BREAD OF LIFE**

CHARLES HUGO McCORD

I am the bread of life. Only one could make that statement.

Even our literal bread, corn or wheat or rye, has relation to religion. The Master's followers were taught to pray for their "daily bread." When a Christian offers thanks for his morning toast, audibly or otherwise, that toast is "sanctified by the word of God and prayer." Should one become so dilatory about prayer that he decides to go into his closet and pray and pray till a loaf of bread came bounding in, that one is liable to lose faith in prayer and God. But he is just mistaken. He has forgotten Genesis 3:19: "In the sweat of thy face shall thou eat bread." Hard work is connected with getting clover-leaf rolls ready for butter. Many who can see this truth about prayer-and-bread fail to see it about prayer-and-sickness. He who refuses doctors and medicine, trusting only in his faith in prayer, is as foolish as the man doing nothing but praying for bread. That man who has not learned that miracles do not happen now. Walking on water, feeding five thousand with two fishes, raising a corpse, being fed by a raven, raising up sick people—were all easy in days of miracles; and one of them is as easy as another today: to raise a corpse is as easy as to raise a sick person by miraculous faith or prayer. Neither is possible.

Another mistaken notion is that God takes better care of Christians in this world than of sinners. No, he sends the sun on a Christian's garden no more than on the vilest sinner's; he sends the rain on the just and the unjust. More bread will not be in your cupboard because you are a church member. God's natural laws operate on saint and sinner alike, "Even the slightest reference to natural desert is." In a rainstorm, it is not the man with religion, but the man with the umbrella, that keeps dry. In the next world it is different.

Does this teaching validate the sermon on the mount: "and all these things shall be added unto you"? No, for it is the same preacher in the same sermon who declared the sun and rain come on all alike. "All these things shall be added unto you" by natural laws. If you are lazy and won't work you'll starve. And even if you are a hard worker and put the kingdom first, "all these things will be added unto you" by natural laws. Sometimes you, like Paul, may suffer necessities; you may know what it is to be full and to abound, to be empty and to be abused. You may desire crumbs from the rich's man's table. Does not God know about every sparrow that falls? Yes, but some of them fall. Are not the hairs of our head numbered? Yes, but good heads have been scalped; even Paul's bounced from the chopping block.

Thus natural bread comes by natural laws, but it is spiritual bread that comes to the bread of life. "Work not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which abideth eternal life." "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me." Certainly one cannot eat and drink of Jesus Christ if he does not do what he says do. When a Christian partakes of the Lord's supper, he is eating and drinking of Jesus Christ. No, not literally, no more than he eats a book when he feeds on the word of God. Anything Jesus commands is a way for one to eat his flesh and drink his blood: denying oneself, bearing the cross, reading the Bible, praying, visiting the sick and the poor, assembling with the saints. Until we get the spirit of being so close to Jesus as to think of eating his flesh drinking his blood, we have no life in us. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." Therefore a Christian can say, "Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of my enemies."

**SIGHTING-IN SHOTS**-Con%. from page 9

Sentry. They insist that sinners are saved without obeying God. We insist that Jesus "became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." These gentlemen do not answer inquiring sinners as Peter did on Pentecost. "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." (Acts 2:37, 38) There were no Baptist editors there to remind Peter that "sinners are saved entirely by grace" and therefore baptism is not necessary. So without such interferences Peter continued. "And he took them to his closet and pray and pray till a loaf of bread came bounding in, that one is liable to lose faith in prayer and God. But he is just mistaken. He has forgotten Genesis 3:19: "In the sweat of thy face that thou eat bread." Hard work is connected with getting clover-leaf rolls ready for butter. Many who can see this truth about prayer-and-bread fail to see it about prayer-and-sickness. He who refuses doctors and medicine, trusting only in his faith in prayer, is as foolish as the man doing nothing but praying for bread. That man who has not learned that miracles do not happen now. Walking on water, feeding five thousand with two fishes, raising a corpse, being fed by a raven, raising up sick people—were all easy in days of miracles; and one of them is as easy as another today: to raise a corpse is as easy as to raise a sick person by miraculous faith or prayer. Neither is possible.

Another mistaken notion is that God takes better care of Christians in this world than of sinners. No, he sends the sun on a Christian's garden no more than on the vilest sinner's; he sends the rain on the just and the unjust. More bread will not be in your cupboard because you are a church member. God's natural laws operate on saint and sinner alike, "Even the slightest reference to natural desert is." In a rainstorm, it is not the man with religion, but the man with the umbrella, that keeps dry. In the next world it is different.

Does this teaching validate the sermon on the mount: "and all these things shall be added unto you"? No, for it is the same preacher in the same sermon who declared the sun and rain come on all alike. "All these things shall be added unto you" by natural laws. If you are lazy and won't work you'll starve. And even if you are a hard worker and put the kingdom first, "all these things will be added unto you" by natural laws. Sometimes you, like Paul, may suffer necessities; you may know what it is to be full and to abound, to be empty and to be abused. You may desire crumbs from the rich's man's table. Does not God
The contention that baptism is a “mere symbol” of no vital consequence is based often upon the passage: “For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel” (I Cor. 1:17).

The Savior sent the apostles out under the great commission to teach all nations and to baptize believers (Matt. 28:19, 20; Mark 16:15, 16). On the day of Pentecost this work was begun. “Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven” heard the gospel and three thousand of them were baptized (Acts 2:38-41).

Paul, “an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God” (Eph. 1:1), claims to rank with the apostles who stood with Christ in the mountain of Galilee when the great commission came from the lips of our Lord. To doubt his claims is to doubt the most of the New Testament, for Paul wrote the most of that volume while claiming to be “not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles” (II Cor. 12:11).

Eleven of the apostles were laboring under a commission that included the right to baptize believers for the remission of sins. If Paul labored under a commission that did not include this right, he was at least a “whit” behind the other apostles, provided baptism amounts to a “whit.” And if baptism does not amount to a “whit,” lots of good time was wasted in baptizing the many thousands that the Bible says were baptized.

Paul says he baptized Crispus, Gaius and the household of Stephanas (I Cor. 1:14-16). Consistency forces him who says Paul had not been furnished with the authority to baptize, to take the position that he acted rashly in baptizing even one. But Paul “kept the faith;” therefore, when baptizing he was doing what the Lord had authorized. If Paul had baptized without authority to do so, he could not have said that he had kept the faith.

God commanded penitent believers to ‘be baptized for the remission of sins’ (Acts 2:38), and if it were true that one of the apostles did not have the authority to baptize, it would not make void the command of God. Nor does a desire to disparage a part of the great commission justify and “interpretation” of I Cor. 1:17 that denies Paul the right to baptize and charges him with over-reaching his authority when he baptized Crispus, Gaius, and the household of Stephanas.

“For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel” (I Cor. 1:17). He does not say that the Lord forbade him to baptize or that the Lord failed to give him authority to baptize; but that the Lord’s chief purpose in sending him to Corinth was to preach the gospel. Paul had helpers who could take care of the baptizing, as well as he. But he excelled in the gift of teaching. Therefore, it is appropriate for him to apply himself to the work in which he excelled, and leave the work that he less enjoyed to those who could easily and conveniently do. This comparison in no degree detracts from the importance of baptism. Paul preached baptism as a part of the gospel at Corinth and elsewhere, and those who believed under his preaching were baptized immediately (see Acts chapters 18 and 19). He “made so much of baptism” that the jailor wanted to go out in the middle of the night and obey that commandment, and he did (Acts 16:33).

Paul reached Corinth before his helpers (Acts 18:1-4), and knowing the importance of baptism, did not wait until his helpers came or until the meeting closed to do the baptizing, but immediately baptized the first converts that he met. “This was the proof of his election” (I Cor. 1:16; 18:19). So, in the light of what Paul preached and what he practiced, we conclude that the Lord’s chief purpose in sending him to Corinth was to preach the gospel; that his helpers could do the most of the baptizing (Jno. 4:1, 2); that he preached baptism as a part of the gospel (Acts 19:9; 18:4); that in the absence of his helpers, he himself did the baptizing (I Cor. 1:14-16).

An illustration: The elders of a certain church called and experienced evangelist, not to baptize, but to preach the gospel in a protracted meeting. Did those elders forbid the evangelist to baptize? No, in the absence of the local preacher the visiting preacher himself did the baptizing. Didn’t those elders want that evangelist to preach baptism as a part of the gospel? They most certainly did, and if he had not preached baptism as a part of the gospel, somebody else would have been doing the preaching before the meeting closed. Several in that church could do the baptizing more conveniently than the visiting evangelist could. Therefore, it was appropriate for the visiting preacher to apply himself to teaching and preaching and leave the baptizing to his helpers. Paul acted on the same principle while at Corinth.

The statement, “Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel,” and yet not forbidding him the right to baptize, is necessarily elliptical. There are other elliptical statements in the Bible. Jno. 12:44 will serve as an example: “He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.” Here the Savior is made to say that he that believes on him does not believe on him. But the contradiction is removed when the ellipsis is supplied: “He that believeth on me, believeth not on me (only), but (also) on him that sent me.” That the words only and also should be supplied in the quotation is beyond question.

In translating from the Greek to the English, words must be supplied. In the English to make the meaning clear. The italicized words in the Bible are not in the original. They have been supplied by the translators. By trying to read a few chapters, leaving out the italicized words, their necessity can be seen clearly. Paul says he did baptize some and it is absurd to suppose he did so without authority. His statement in I Cor. 1:17, is clear when the ellipsis is supplied: “Christ sent me not (only) to baptize, but (also) to preach the gospel.” The ellipsis in Jno. 12:44 removes a contradiction within the statement, and the ellipsis in I Cor. 1:17 removes the contradiction between Paul’s statement and his practice. Jesus spoke Jno. 12:44 to show the chief purpose of believing on him; Paul spoke I Cor. 1:17 to show the chief purpose of his being sent.

“But why did Paul thank God that he had baptized but few of them, if baptism is a condition of salvation?” Paul himself tells us why he was thankful that he had baptized so few of the Corinthians: “Lest any should say that I had baptized in my own name” (I Cor. 1:15). Here he is rebuking a spirit of faction that had sprung up among the Corinthians. Some claimed to be of Paul; and I of Stephanas; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ,” and lest some might assume to belong to him in an extraordinary degree, he is thankful that he baptized but few. He did not thank God that but few had been baptized, but that few of them had been baptized by him. Any other gospel preacher who wants Christ to have all the glory and honor would say the same thing under the same conditions.

Some were saying, “I am of Paul,” therefore he must prove to them they are of Christ and not of himself. This he does by calling there attention to facts: (1) Christ was crucified for them, and not Paul; (2) they were baptized in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, and not of Paul; (3) he asks that for them to be of Paul, he must be crucified for them and they must be baptized in his name; and for them to be of Christ, he must be crucified for them and
they must be baptized in the name of Christ. Paul here states two necessary conditions before they can be of Christ: Christ must be crucified for them and they must be baptized in his name. Both of these conditions had been complied with; therefore they were “of Christ.” Paul was not crucified for them and they were not baptized in his name; the conditions had not been complied with, therefore, they were not of “of Christ.” How then could they be of Christ unless both conditions had been met unless Christ had been crucified for them and they had been baptized in his name? Paul could not have made this argument if the Corinthians could have been “of Christ” without being baptized in the name of Christ.

**PRAYER AVAILS**

**CHARLES HUGO MCCORD**

As God’s heroes and heroines, since men began “to call upon the name of Jehovah,” have been prayerful. Abraham changed God’s mind by prayer. By fervent entreaty Moses changed the mind of the I am that I am. Prayer added fifteen years to Hezekiah. David spent hours valuably with the Lord. At least three times a day Daniel was on his knees. John the Baptist taught his disciples to pray. James taught by Elijah’s example that power lies in the earnest supplications of righteous men.

Do miracles happen today in answer to prayer? No matter how much one prays, emulating Daniel, he had better not risk getting among lions. Jehovah is the same today, yesterday, and tomorrow, but he does not feed five thousand today; he is the same, but he has changed his law about miracles happening, no matter how good the man is who prays. Jesus is the same, yesterday, today, and tomorrow, but he does not answer my prayers according to his own will. There I fail. God is faithful, and he has told me, his child, “If any man among you be naked, let him take the衣 of his neighbor and put it on.” (James 2:15.) If I have enough faith, I shall not worry about God’s side of the matter. God is faithful, and he has told me, his child, that he wants me to pray; that he will hear; that he will answer my prayers according to his own will. There I fail. God always does his business; my business is to pray. God always does his business; my business is to pray.

The failure to distinguish this difference would condemn Paul for the language he used and the attitude he took in the long-ago. Paul gloriied in “the cross.” He said: “But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Gal. 6:14. Certainly Paul did not glory in “a cross.” In 1 Cor. 1:18 he spoke of “the preaching of the cross.” In all such statements “the cross” is a symbol—it does not refer to a piece of wood or metal. To glory in the cross is to glory in that which the cross represented the suffering of Jesus for the redemption of man. And to “praise the cross” was simply to praise the gospel, the fact of which is the death of Jesus, which is the power of God to save men. To “kneel at the cross” simply means to bow in submission to the demands of the cross—to humble ourselves in obedience to the requirements of the gospel—and in no other way can any man be saved. If Paul could “praise the cross” and “glory in the cross” without being an idolater, then we can surely “kneel at the cross” without being an idolater, then we can surely “kneel at the cross,” bow in submission to its demands—and even sing about it—without being guilty of idolatry.

The song suggests no such idea. One line of the song begins like this: “Kneel at the cross, give your idols up.” Surely the song would not, in the same sentence, both suggest and condemn idolatry. The song says, “Give your idols up.” That would require the giving up of any image before which we might bow in worship. Even “kneeling at a cross” would not be permitted by the words of the song. But there is a vast difference between “kneeling at the cross” and “kneeling at a cross.”

A failure to distinguish this difference would condemn Paul for the language he used and the attitude he took in the long ago. Paul gloriied in “the cross.” He said: “But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Gal. 6:14. Certainly Paul did not glory in “a cross.” In 1 Cor. 1:18 he spoke of “the preaching of the cross.” In all such statements “the cross” is a symbol— it does not refer to a piece of wood or metal. To glory in the cross is to glory in that which the cross represented the suffering of Jesus for the redemption of man. And to “praise the cross” was simply to praise the gospel, the fact of which is the death of Jesus, which is the power of God to save men. To “kneel at the cross” simply means to bow in submission to the demands of the cross—to humble ourselves in obedience to the requirements of the gospel—and in no other way can any man be saved. If Paul could “praise the cross” and “glory in the cross” without being an idolater, then we can surely “kneel at the cross,” bow in submission to its demands—and even sing about it—without being guilty of idolatry. Brethren, please learn the difference between “the cross” and “a cross.” It will do you good to learn this lesson.

The universe. And if he did not get what he played for, but did not lose faith in prayer, but is praying to this day; then let me doubt, never, never. If he prayed the same words over and over again, not vainly but fervently, then let me persevere, continuing instantly.

Prayer is abused and prayer is misunderstood. Nobody understands it. But he wants us to use it, not grudgingly or of necessity. Lord, teach us to love it more.
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Box 1804—Oklahoma City, Okla.
In order to obtain the unity for which Christ prayed and when "endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" we preach: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." (Eph. 4:3-6).

One New Man

"There is one body;" "There is but one body" (1 Cor. 12:20). That one body is "one new man." It is made up of both Jews and Gentiles who have been converted to Christ. "For He is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that he might create in Himself the two one new man, so making peace; and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." (Eph. 2:14-15). This one new man, this one body, has but one head. Christ is "head over all things to the church, which is His body." (Eph. 1:22, 23).

One Man-One, Hope

Before the Ephesians were converted to Christ, they were without hope (Eph. 2:12). A Jew without Christ, or a Gentile without Christ, is without hope. For hope is in Christ (Eph. 1: 12 R. V. and 1 Cor. 15:19), "And ye are called in one hope of your calling." (Eph. 4:4). One hope for the one new man, for this one new man has but one mind. "Be of the same mind." (1 Cor. 1:10). Two hopes would be doubled minded, "a double-minded man, unstable in all his ways." (Jas. 1:8). If you think that the Jew out of Christ has any hope at all, you are wrong, for hope is in Christ, and "he that believeth not shall be damned." If you think that the Jew in Christ has one hope while the Gentile in Christ has a different hope, you are wrong, for this one new man, made of both Jews and Gentiles, was "called in one hope of your calling." If the hope of Israel is to go to Palestine when Christ comes and live with Christ on earth there for a thousand years, then it must be the hope of the Gentiles to do so too, for there is but one hope. If you say that there is a hope of Israel and another hope for the Gentiles, you make two hopes. The Bible says there is "one hope." We say with James "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double-minded." (Jas. 4:8). There are no more hopes than bodies, no more bodies than Spirits, no more Spirits than Lord's, no more Lords than Gods and Fathers. No more hopes than faiths. No more hopes than baptisms. There is but one hope.

The premillennialists talk of more than one hope. Do they are not fellowship with many bodies also? Do they not thus allow that there are many baptisms? And do they not thereby accept the claims of the denominations that there are many faiths? No wonder James said that a double minded man is "unstable in all his ways." When they claim that there are at least two hopes, is it strange that they often claim to be baptized with the Holy Spirit, while contending for water baptism I would no sooner say that there are two hopes than I would that there are two baptisms.

Anchored To Heaven By Hope

What is the "one hope?" If the one hope is to go to Palestine and live with Christ a thousand years on earth, after He comes and before the judgment, I find myself unable to give a reason for it. That is not the hope. The scriptures fix the object of our hope. They locate the anchor of our hope. The anchor of the church is above us and not east or west or north or south of us, and certainly not below us. Our hope is anchored in heaven. "God, being minded to show more abundantly unto the heirs of the promise the immutability of His counsel, interposed with an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us; which we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and steadfast and entering into that which is within the veil; wither as a forerunner Jesus entered for us." (Heb. 6:17-20). The promise of God to Abraham involved our hope. The hope is anchored in heaven where Jesus entered within the veil. The promise to Abraham therefore had to do with our going to heaven, and not to Jerusalem. We all know where Jesus went when He entered within the veil. He went to heaven. That which anchors my soul and by which I am encouraged is the hope to go there where He is. Set your affections on things above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God.

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to His great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." (1 Pet. 1:3-5). We hope for an inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled and that fades not away. It is reserved in heaven for those who have been saved by the power of God (the gospel), and who are kept by the power of God (the gospel) through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed at the last day. Heaven is where our hope is anchored.

Jesus said, while standing in Jerusalem, "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." (John 14:2-3). Where did Jesus go to prepare a place He went to heaven, He was in Jerusalem when He made this promise. He was not talking about preparing that City as a place where they might be with Him. Again, before Jerusalem, Jesus said to the Jews, "I go away, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sin: whither I go, ye cannot come." (John 8:21). There is no hope for anyone who does not believe and obey Christ. There is but one hope for all who do. That hope is to go to heaven and be with God and Christ and all the redeemed of all the ages.

Where Was Its Shadow?

The tabernacle of the Old Testament was a type of the church and of heaven. (See Heb. 9). The Holy Place foreshadowed the church. The Most Holy Place typified heaven itself. Jesus was the great High Priest entered as a forerunner within the veil into the Holy of Holies.

Now, we are told by the premillennialists that the church was not in the original plan of God. That a kingdom of Christ on earth was His plan, promise and prediction. How then could the tabernacle have been the type of the church for 1500 years if the church was not then intended to exist? And, if there is to be a millennial reign between the church age and heaven, where is its shadow in the type? Will the premillennialists tell us that it was foreshadowed by the thin veil between the Holy Place and the Most Holy Place? Guess they will call in the "then" stretchers who' have been overworked on 1 Cor. 15:22-24.
AMERICA’S FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

LUTHER G. ROBERTS

In January of 1941 I received a pamphlet from a preacher of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), C. C. Klingman of Comanche, Texas. The main part of the tract was an article on, “The Bible, America’s First Line of Defense.” This to me was a fine thought. The Bible accepted and practiced is the best defense against war, crime, sin, superstition, ignorance, etc., that there is.

I was disappointed, however, in reading the tract to learn that the writer of it did not believe the Bible. The Bible must be studied, believed and practiced before it can be a real line of defense in America. But the writer of the pamphlet thinks that heaven and hell are myths. He does not believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; he does not believe that the Bible is the inspired word of God. He thinks that the prophets of the Old Testament were the “forerunners of the modern sociologists.”

When one does not believe these truths how can he expect the Bible to be a deterrent against crime, war and sin? If one does not believe that there is a Savior to save from sin, does he hesitate to sin? If one does not believe that there is a hell where unforgiven sins are to be punished after death, will he be deterred from sin? As much as he would otherwise? If one does not believe that there is a heaven to gain, will there be the same high and holy incentive to live the righteous life? To show that I am not misrepresenting the writer, and the things that he does not believe, at least some of them, I quote from the article. He raises certain questions which show that he does not believe the Bible, and from some deductions we easily, naturally, reach the conclusion that he does not believe that Jesus is the Christ the Divine Son of God. He asks, “Did He (Jesus) say, for example, ‘I will give you rest’ if you believe that Joshua made the sun stand still till he could butcher his neighbors? Or did he say, ‘Ye shall know the truth, etc.’ provided you believe that Jonah literally swallowed a whale or vice versa? Did He promise His peace only to those who say they believe in His Virgin Birth, His literal second coming, etc? To raise such questions would be irreverent if it were not for the fact that such things have been made tests of Christian fellowship,++.”

Little wonder that he mentions, or that it came to his mind about the questions being irreverent! Any body who has an ounce of respect for God, Christ and the Bible, who reads the questions and sees the scoffing, and sneering at the ‘events mentioned would realize the irreverence displayed.

The man does not believe the historical event recorded about Joshua commanding the sun to stand still while the enemies of God were overthrown. Jehovah killed more of the Amorites with hailstones than the children of Israel slew with the sword. Of course, that would be rejected as too absurd to believe. He does not believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. He thinks he was just a man, born out of the Virgin, nor begotten of God. He does not believe that the whale swallowed Jonah. (If the Bible had said that Jonah swallowed a whale a man with faith in God would believe that too! But Jesus approves as true that Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale (Matt. 12:39-41). As surely as Jesus was in the heart of the earth three days and three nights, and was raised the third day, so surely was Jonah in the belly of the whale three days and three nights. A man who rejects the authority and testimony of Jesus on any subject cannot believe that he is the sinless Son of God. How would he answer this fact? By denying that Jesus was ever raised from the dead at all. If the event concerning Jonah did not happen, and Jesus referred to it, as an actual event of history, then Jesus was not infallible, he made a mistake, he was not then what he claimed to be. But Jesus did refer to the fact of Jonah’s being in the whale as a sign, a proof that he would be buried and resurrected. Therefore, he thought it occurred, and he is not the Son of God if it did not actually happen. But Mr. Klingman would save you the trouble of arguing about the matter I am sure, by saying that he does not believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Of course, a person who denies these facts does not believe in the second coming of Christ as the New Testament quotes Christ as saying he would come. How can such a person have “hope in Christ!” The above things being true there is no “hope in Christ,” for “strength, peace, and joy” at Christmas or at any other time.

To argue for the Bible as America’s first line of defense, and in the same breath to deny the Bible as true Is an anomaly. For a man, posing as a minister of the gospel, to deny the virgin birth of Christ, and then to plead for ethical teaching of Christ is to plead for the teaching of some philosopher, with no more assurance that he is right in his ethical teaching than Zoroaster was in his teaching. Such a double-minded man is unstable in all his ways. Such a modernist does not believe in the first principles of the gospel, not in the items of Christian worship. Yet he poses as a spiritual leader of people who claim to believe in the first principles of the religion of Christ, at least. Why does a man who denies that any of these things are essential to salvation, write about Christ, to say nothing of the “spirit of Christ!” The apostles of Christ, inspired by the Holy Spirit, demanded of people who wanted to accept Jesus as the Christ, that they confess him as the Son of God. According to this man, who wrote this tract, they were required to confess, to put it mildly, an untruth, that is a lie. They demanded of sinners that made this confession that they be baptized for the remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ. They should have known the “spirit of Christ” too ‘well to have made baptism a test of fellowship, or to have required the confession of a thing not true, and to have made that a test of fellowship also.

Two little school girls were discussing their progress in school, and one of them mentioned that in her class they had passed multiplication. The other girl replied, “That’s nothing, our Sunday School teacher said we were beyond redemption.” It may be that the brethren have decided that this man is beyond redemption. This may account for the fact that his book, “Christianity Through The Centuries,” and this pamphlet, have not been reviewed and answered.

This book was published in 1936. Under “Unit I.—Christian Ancestry,” the author ascribes many of the basic ideas of Christianity to “Persian Heritage,” or to the philosophy of Zoroaster. The ideas of heaven, hell, the devil, miracles, and paradise, are mong the ‘Magi’ or ‘Wise men from the East,’ who brought their gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh to Bethlehem’s manger at Jesus’ birth were Zoroastrian priests. At His death Jesus said to the thief on the cross, “This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.’ Thus both at His birth and at His death, Jesus moved on the cross, ‘This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.’

Two little school girls were discussing their progress in school, and one of them mentioned that in her class they had passed multiplication. The other girl replied, “That’s nothing, our Sunday School teacher said we were beyond redemption.” It may be that the brethren have decided that this man is beyond redemption. This may account for the fact that his book, “Christianity Through The Centuries,” and this pamphlet, have not been reviewed and answered.

This book was published in 1936. Under “Unit I.—Christian Ancestry,” the author ascribes many of the basic ideas of Christianity to “Persian Heritage,” or to the philosophy of Zoroaster. The ideas of heaven, hell, the devil, miracles, and paradise, are mong the ‘Magi’ or ‘Wise men from the East,’ who brought their gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh to Bethlehem’s manger at Jesus’ birth were Zoroastrian priests. At His death Jesus said to the thief on the cross, “This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.’ Thus both at His birth and at His death, Jesus moved much more in the mental climate and atmosphere of Zoroaster’s teaching than He did in the mental climate and atmosphere of either Moses or Abraham.” There is more to the same strain. To state his sentiments is sufficient. They stand self-refuted. How can a man, who attributes the teaching of the Bible, and particularly the teaching of Christ, to influence of a Persian philosopher, who lived 660-583 R. C. recommend the “Bible as America’s First Line of Defense”? 
BAPTISM IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES—Continued From Page 1

Saul of Tarsus—Acts 9, 9

The sixteenth verse of the twenty-second chapter of Acts is Paul's own statement of his baptism in Damascus. "And now why waitest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." This was Ananias' answer to Saul's question, "What shall I do, Lord?" and to which the Lord replied: "Arise, and go into the city and it shall be told thee what thou must do" (Acts 9). But with some people the word "must" appears to have degrees in meaning. The word in Heb. 11:6, "must believe," means that faith is essential. But in Acts 22:16 what Ananias tells Saul what he "must do"—commands him to be baptized—the word loses most of its must, and deprived of its absoluteness it degrades into a meaningless, empty, vacant nonessential.

When was Saul saved? If he was saved before Ananias came to him, he was a miserable saved man-blind, fastig, shut-up, praying—a miserable saved man, indeed! If he was saved when Ananias laid hands on him, he was saved before he was told what to do to be saved. If he was saved before he was baptized, he was saved before his sins were washed away, for he was commanded to "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." In short, if he was saved in the flush of the light on the road, as the sectarian preachers dogmatize, then he was saved when he did not know it, for he asked what to do; and he was saved when Ananias did not know it. Who came to tell him what to do; and he was saved when the Lord did not know, for the Lord sent him unto Damascus to be told what to do; and if he was saved then, he was saved contrary to all the so-called experiences of grace required by these preachers themselves, before peace came to his soul, and while yet in his misery. What a strange conversion and a peculiar salvation the preachers make of it! In the precept of Ananias three commands are joined together by the copulative and "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins. No matter in what sense the word "wash" is used, the fact stands out that baptism stands itself in Acts 11. Luke does not claim that his account was given in the order of events but he does say that Peter "expounded the matter unto them in order" (Acts 11:4). Hence, Peter's own account of the happenings "to the whole multitude" at Jerusalem is the order of occurrence. In the order of occurrence Peter said that the Holy Spirit fell on Cornelius before he believed. Does that prove that he was saved before he believed? No denominationalist will allow that it does; hence, their argument is lost. The fact is that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the house of Cornelius did not effect his salvation nor affect the issues involved in it.

The elements entering the conversion of Cornelius are set forth in three passages in the record. First, the angel said to Cornelius: "Send to Joppa, and fetch Simon, whose surname is Peter, whom thou shalt be saved" (Acts 11:14). Second, Peter said to Cornelius: "To him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts 10:45). Third, Peter "commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 10:48). The casual reader cannot fail to observe that remission of sins was promised to Cornelius in the name of Christ; and that he was commanded to be baptized in the name of Christ; and that remission of sins in the name of Christ began at Jerusalem as defined in Acts 2:38; and that the same thing that began at Jerusalem should be practiced also. Acts 10:45 speaks of the name of Christ, and the fact that Cornelius received the same remission in the same name, and on the same terms as stated in Acts 2:38 on Pentecost. Since baptism in the name of Christ is for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38) and Cornelius was commanded to be baptized in the name of Christ (Acts 10:48) it follows that Cornelius was baptized for the remission of sins. Indeed, remission of sins in the name of Christ, and baptism in the name of Christ for remission of sins, represent one process.

The Phillipian Jailor—Acts 16

The question "What must I do to be saved?" asked by the jailor, and the answer "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved," given by Paul and Silas, has been the chief stock in trade of sectarian revivalists—from the frothing holiness and shouting Methodists on up the scale through the unconventional Billy Sunday type of evangelists to the frocked and formal dignitary-who fervidly expounds suppliants for salvation to "only believe." They aver that Acts 16:31 is the answer—the one and only answer—to the question what to do to be saved. True, they have not explained why Peter, Ananias, and others equally inspired gave other answers, but all the more reason for trouble-some explanations. "Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved"—that, and that alone, we are told, is all that is necessary to the sinners salvation. When reminded that this answer does not mention repentance, with a slight hitch we are assured that repentance must be included. Believing on the Lord Jesus can be stretched to include repentance, which is not named in the connection, but its elasticity gives out before it gets to baptism, which is named in the immediate connection!

When Paul and Silas told the jailor to "believe on the Lord Jesus," without even a break in the story the narrator states that "they preached unto him the word of the Lord." He evidently had not believed upon merely being told to: He must be told what to believe—on what believing the Lord Jesus consisted. Having heard the word preached, the jailor washed their stripes (repentance, change of attitude), was baptized the same hour. And rejoiced with his house, as "having believed in God." When had he believed in God? When he had done all that the gospel narrative tells, including his baptism, then he had "believed in God." So baptism in the case of the jailor has the same place and the same design as on Pentecost.