

The straight and narrow path is the only road that has no traffic problem.

MISSIONARY

PREMILLENNIAL

BIBLICAL

BAPTISTIC

The Baptist Examiner

Paid Circulation In All States and In Many Foreign Countries

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."—Isaiah 8:20.

VOLUME 15, NO. 25

RUSSELL, KENTUCKY, JULY 22, 1950

WHOLE NUMBER 631

What Kind Of Church Should One Join?

By ROY MASON
Tampa, Florida

The question raised here is not so much a question of Bible interpretation as it is a question of practical moment for a saved person. However, it is a question that ought to be settled in the light of scriptural leading. During the last few months we have been questioned several times by persons who were considering the matter of church membership.

Let us suppose a case: Here is a couple who come to a community, and they are Baptists in belief. They wish to unite with a church. Upon what basis should they determine which church to take membership with? What should they ask — expect — require — of the church that they are willing to unite with?

THEY SHOULD ASK "IS THIS CHURCH DOCTRINALLY SOUND? They should want to know if it is in reality a Baptist church, standing for the old-time doctrines of the Baptist faith. If it is modernistic, to belong to such would be to promote the Devil's cause rather than Christ's. A Baptist church that is Arminian in theology; that receives "alien immersion"; that practices "open communion"; and that is loose in doctrine, is certainly not the church to join.

THEY SHOULD ASK, "IS THIS CHURCH CORRUPT IN LIFE, OR DOES IT STAND FOR A LIFE OF SEPARATION FROM THE WORLD?" The average church has Sunday School teachers that are bridge players, movie-goers, dog-race goers, etc. Worldliness is the characteristic, and no real effort is made to change them.

One should avoid taking membership with such (2 Cor. 6:17). (Also I Tim. 5:22 for a principle laid down.)

THEY SHOULD ASK, "IS THIS CHURCH DOING THE THING JESUS ESTABLISHED HIS CHURCH TO DO?" What was that thing? For answer read Matthew 28:19-20. The average church is expending most of its energy on making the wheels of the machinery go; providing fun and refreshments, and things of that sort. Often people—just because the church is close by — join a church that is as dead as a door nail, or that at least is doing practically nothing to reach the lost. That is a mistake, and one does harm to his own spiritual life by such. One should drive twenty miles if need be to be (Continued on page four)

Modernism In The Seminary's Required Reading For Its Undergraduate Students

E. P. ALLDREDGE
Nashville, Tenn.

The second charge which Pastor Oscar Gibson brought against the Southern Baptist Seminary at Louisville was as follows:

II. The second charge that I bring is: That The Faculty Assignment Of Outside Reading To Those (Students) Of Immature Mind Is Modernistic. You gentlemen (of the Investigating Committee) may secure without any difficulty the copy of the assignments of outside reading for the young men who attend this school (seminary). I think you will find that the outstanding authors mentioned most often (in these assignments) are Barth and Brunner. This evidence I have; and you can easily secure. Why should a faculty that is fundamental in what Southern Baptists call the Truths Of God's Word, assign such reading to our young men? Don't they (the Faculty) know that poison such as that can bring confusion to their minds (the immature minds of undergraduate students)? Should a school that boasts of being Sound in the Faith, harbor things that may cause even one of these young men entrusted to them to become unsound in the faith; because the literature that he is assigned (and required to read) is unsound?"

Again Pastor Gibson says: "I am going to suggest that you (the Investigating Committee) investigate the actions of some (members of the faculty). I wish you might ask Brother (Professor) Dale Moody why he took a trip to Europe last summer (1948) and studied under Barth and Brunner. I understand, but have not verified it, that he (Professor Dale Moody) remained in the home of Bro. Brunner. Why should a professor from this seminary seek the teachings of two men (Bros. Barth and Brunner) whom we know to be rank modernists and liberalists and yes, deniers of the true and living God and the Lord Jesus Christ, as we know Him?"

Graduate students at the seminary of course, can and should study the whole system of theology developed and proclaimed to the world by Bros. Barth and Brunner. But just how dangerous are the teachings of these two radicals critics to immature students at Louisville or anywhere else, may best be judged by looking at some vital, concrete, and definite examples of the views held and proclaimed by these two renowned German theologians and teachers, now given such prominence in the Louisville Seminary.

(Continued on page four)

DID YOU MAIL YOUR SUBSCRIPTION COUPON?

AFRICAN LETTER

Klay, Africa

Dear Bro. Gilpin:

May God bless and keep you close to Himself.

The BAPTIST EXAMINER is a welcome visitor to this Mission. I enjoy every copy, especially your sermons. The one in February 11th issue "Why I Cannot Accept The Pope's Invitation," I think it should be published at least ONCE every year. For no man can reach God unless he is twice borned and the Catholics don't teach it.

Thank you for a full Gospel. I am in Africa for Christ and Africa is in me. Souls are being saved and Africa is turning to God. This is 48 years, God has kept me in African employment. Yea, and I hope to remain in it until He comes or until He calls me up. Am here is your stead.

Harry H. Jones

KINDS OF BOATS

Some folk are like rowboats, for they have to be pulled wherever they go. Sometimes it is a hard struggle to keep them pointed in the right direction.

Others are like sailboats. If the wind blows east, that's their direction. If it blows west, they go that way. Of course, it is possible for them to "beat against the wind," but they do not often do it. They are inclined to follow every wind of emotion and popular sentiment.

Others still are like powerboats, who drive against the wind or tide and in face of (Continued on page four)

IF NOT, THEN YOU HAVE ONLY THREE MORE WEEKS TO RECEIVE THE PAPER.

This is in keeping with our announcement of last week as to the revision of our subscription list, as follows:

Feeling certain that there are many now receiving this paper who do not care for it, and furthermore, acting in the interest of economy, we are revising our mailing list effective as of August 5, 1950.

Sometime ago our office was broken into and many personal items were destroyed. At that time our entire mailing list was stolen. Accordingly we do not know when any subscription expires and many doubtlessly are receiving the paper whose subscription has already expired.

In this issue and in the next

two issues will appear on page four a coupon. Fill out one of these and mail it to us before August 5. I regret to have to ask you to do this, but it is the only way we can bring our mailing list up to date.

If we fail to hear from you by August 5, of necessity your paper will be stopped. We will assume that you do not care for it any longer and thus discontinue it. We don't want to lose a single subscriber, and we urge everyone to immediately cooperate with us.

Mused Uncle Mose

Seem lak ev'y time one ob ouah chu'ch membahs gits mad an' quits, I c'n look aroun' an' see three or fo' peoples in de meetin' dat I ain' nevah seed dar befo'.

It will only cost you 3c to do this whereas it is costing us many dollars weekly to proceed as we are. I want to continue my weekly visits to your home, but unless I hear from you by August 5, I must assume that I am an unwelcome guest, and I won't come to see you any longer.

Please send in your coupon TODAY!

TO ALL READERS OF THE BAPTIST EXAMINER

There will be a Tent Meeting in Springville, N. Y., beginning August 1, 1950. Prayers are asked for this meeting—that no less than 1000 souls shall be saved.

Eld. S. David Sikes

The First Baptist Pulpit

"WAS CHRIST'S ATONEMENT FOR ALL?"

By T. P. SIMMONS
Coal Grove, Ohio

A letter from a preacher in Virginia makes this request: "Give me scriptures to prove that Christ did not die for all men." The letter also requests explanation of certain passages that bear upon this question. The editor has asked me to reply to these requests. This I gladly do because I BELIEVE BAPTISTS STAND IN GREAT NEED OF A FRESH AND CAREFUL EXAMINATION OF THE ATONEMENT. I do not believe that

the last word has been written on this question.

The words "all men," as used in the request, mean, of course, all men without exception — every descendent of Adam. The burden of proof rests properly upon the one who contends that Christ died for all men in this sense rather than upon the one who denies it. It must be admitted by all honest and capable Bible students that the words "world" and "all" are not always used in the Bible in the absolute sense as comprehending the totality of the human race. Quite

truly and much to the point does J. M. Sanger say: "The so-called Scripture proofs of Universal Redemption depend upon human assumption, not upon the simple Word. Thus, as regards 'propitiation for the sins of the whole world,' we are told that the word 'world' must mean every worldling. But why must it mean this? That is the unanswered question. The word 'world' means many different things in Holy Scriptures, on which see Cruden's Concordance. Connection alone (Continued on page two)

SELLING OUT

Brother C. W. Lawrence, pastor of the High Point Baptist Church in Mayfield, Kentucky has just held a meeting in the Highland Park Free Will Baptist Church in Highland Park, Michigan. The Free Will Baptist Church was organized by Benjamin Randall in 1780. They are open communionists, alien immersionists, Arminians, feminists, and they deny the doctrine of the security of the believer and total depravity, election, etc.

Brother Lawrence has sanctioned all these heresies by his actions. How can he invite one who professes to be saved to unite with the Free Wills without sanctioning their baptism as valid? Does Brother Lawrence put the church that Benjamin Randall organized in 1780 on the same plane as he does the church that the Lord Jesus organized during His personal ministry here on earth? Would Brother Lawrence and the High Point Baptist Church receive members from the Free Will (Continued on page four)

FOR YOUR GARDEN

PEAS (four rows)
Presence
Promptness
Prayerful preparedness
Perseverance

SQUASH (three rows)
Squash malicious gossip
Squash hurtful criticism
Squash indifference

LETTUCE (two rows)
Lettuce be faithful to duty
Lettuce be loyal, unselfish

TURNIPS (three rows)
Turnip at Sunday School
Turnip at worship services
Turnip at prayer meeting
—Walnut Street Church Chimes

THE BAPTIST EXAMINER PUBLISHED WEEKLY

JOHN R. GILPIN—EDITOR

Editorial Department, RUSSELL,
KENTUCKY, where communications
should be sent for publication.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE
One Year In Advance.....50c
(Domestic and Foreign)
Send Remittances to Russell, Ky.

Entered as second-class matter May
31, 1941, in the post office at Russell,
Ky., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Paid circulation in every state and
many foreign countries.

Subscriptions are stopped at expira-
tion unless renewed or special arrange-
ments are made.

The Atonement

(Continued from page one)

is its true interpreter. To rule that it must mean this or that is but to indulge in rash and idle talk. So by the word "all," Connection only can decide whether it means every one in the world, or every one in the church, or every one in a city, or every one in a room. Moreover, it sometimes fails to individualize and denotes simply all manner of people. Yet, whenever it is wanted to prove Universal Redemption, we are dogmatically informed that it must mean every human being" (The Redeemed, p. 7).

Most Baptist theologians for over one hundred and fifty years have ignored these facts in advocating a general atonement. They have offered the usual proof texts with blind abandon and with the unwarranted assumption that there can be no question as to the scope of the key words. Thus they have approached the question in a prejudicial manner.

There is a historical reason for this characteristic approach. There came a time in the history of Baptists in England when the doctrine of a limited atonement was allowed to keep men from addressing "the invitations of the gospel to the unconverted." Of one of the leaders of that day it has been said: "He would declare, proclaim, announce to men their sin and danger; but he would not call upon them to return to the Lord. That would be interfering with God's work!"—Cramp. This sentiment in "a time of general decline in religion among Englishmen, which began with the Restoration (Vedder) helped very materially to confirm and prolong among Baptists "a time of stillness—of slumber—of comparative inaction" (Cramp) with the result that "our churches were far more prosperous and numerous at this period (1753), sixty years afterward" (Ivimey).

It was only proper that good men should deplore this paralysis and declension and seek for a remedy. But it is to be regretted that they turned in the wrong direction for the remedy. Instead of turning to the Word of God, they turned to a denial of truth. Robert Hall came forth to refer to the writings of John Gill as "a continent of mud." Gill, under the necessity of dealing a death-blow to Arminianism, leaned backwards and, in his preaching, erred in abstaining "from personal addresses to sinners by inviting them to the Saviour" (Cramp); yet in general his exposition of the Scriptures is eminently scholarly, correct, and unsurpassed. It was a colossal mistake to seek relief by turning back in the direction of the mean and beggarly elements of Arminianism. Yet this is just what the denomination did.

Others contributed to this counter deflection, but none perhaps so much as Andrew Fuller; who came forth with his theory of "a general atonement sufficient for the sins of the race" (Vedder), as opposed to Gill's "particular atonement for the elect only" (Vedder). The results were such that there has obtained since that day among Baptists a theological bias in favor of a general atonement. THIS BIAS IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PRESENT DRIFT OF BAPTISTS TOWARD ARMINIANISM.

As a result of this drift the average Baptist church and Baptist preacher, not only has ceased to believe in the Calvinism of the great Philadelphia Confession of Faith, but that of the New Hampshire Declaration also. There can be no doubt that this latter declaration teaches eternal, unconditional election. This is taught, not only in the article on "God's Purpose of Grace," but in the one on regeneration (Article VII), in that the new birth is represented as securing "our voluntary obedience to the Gospel," as also in the one on repentance and faith (Article VIII), in that it represents these as "inseparable graces wrought in our souls by the re-



ELD. T. P. SIMMONS
Coal Grove, Ohio

Bro. Simmons, though pastor of a real Baptist church, is available for revivals and Bible conferences. He spends a great deal of his time delivering his series of lectures on "The Trail of Blood," depicting Baptist history through the ages. Every church in the south should hear these messages on church history and Bible doctrine. Write him today for an appointment for your church.

generating Spirit of God," and not as acts that proceed from the natural man inducing God to regenerate the individual.

This drift toward Arminianism has opened the door for the SECOND GREAT HISTORICAL APOSTASY. The first apostasy began in the second century. It produced first, the Catholic Hierarchy. Next it produced the divided hierarchy—Greek and Roman Catholicism. Following this came Protestantism, and then the hundreds of man-made organizations that have sprung up to produce this age of consummate confusion in Christendom. Through all this apostasy God preserved New Testament churches. They are known today as Baptist churches. This second great apostasy began about the beginning of this century. Among Baptists its chief characteristics are MODERNISM, ARMINIANISM, AND UNIONISM. ARMINIANISM OPENED THE DOOR FOR BOTH MODERNISM AND UNIONISM.

The time has come for a right-about-face among Baptists with

regard to Arminianism. And it will never come with the teaching of a general atonement. Unconditional election and a particular or limited atonement, historically, as shown above, and logically stand and fall together. No group of people will continue to hold to one without the other.

I maintain that Andrew Fuller did not find the scriptural solution for the lethargy of the eighteenth century. A DENIAL OF A LIMITED ATONEMENT IS NOT NECESSARY IN ORDER TO PROMOTE EVANGELISM. One needs only to see that God saves only those accountable adults that believe; that one must hear the gospel in order to believe; that God is pleased "through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor. 1:21); and that He commands us to preach the gospel to all men (Mark 16:15); beseeching them to be reconciled to God (2 Cor. 5:20), and calling upon them to repent and believe the gospel (Acts 17:30; Mark 1:15). There is absolutely nothing in the doctrine of a limited atonement that militates in the least against these facts nor anything that encourages or justifies any man in refusing or failing to address the invitations of the gospel to the unconverted.

What do some of our leading theologians mean when they say that "the atonement of Christ was for all men" (Mullins); that "Christ's atoning death made it compatible with the divine justice that all should be saved if they would accept it on that ground" (Broadus); that "the atonement . . . is sufficient . . . for each one of the numberless sins of every sinful man on earth in all time" (Sawtelle); that "the ransom was paid for all" (Harvey); that "in its sufficiency the atonement of Christ is universal" (Bancroft); that "the atonement of Christ has made objective provisions for the salvation of all, by removing from the divine mind every obstacle to the pardon and restoration of sinners, except their wilful opposition to God and refusal to turn to Him" (Strong)? Do they mean that Christ made a real and proper substitution for the whole race (2 Cor. 5:14); dying in their room and stead (Rom. 5:6); paying the price (ransom) of their deliverance (Matt. 20:28); taking away their sin (John 1:29); making propitiation (involving and expiation), thus satisfying the justice of God for them (Rom. 3:25, 26; Heb. 2:17); taking upon Him their guilt and paying their penalty (Isa. 53:6; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Pet. 3:18); becoming a curse in their stead (Gal. 3:13); making a just recompense for their every transgression and disobedience (Heb. 2:2); perfecting them forever by the one offering (Heb. 10:14); putting an end to the power of the law to condemn them (Rom. 10:4; 8:33, 34); covering all their sin so that God would not impute it to them (Rom. 4:7, 8; 2 Cor. 5:19)?

Do they mean that Christ did this for every son of Adam? If they do not, then they can not say, with any logical force, that His death was sufficient for the salvation of the race. If they say that He did all of this for all, they have no ground left for the condemnation of any. If God's justice was not satisfied for all, then the salvation of all was not made possible. If God's justice was satisfied for all, then justice demands that all go free. Does man's turning to God in repentance and faith add anything to the value of Christ's death? Can a man's faith make of Christ's death something that it was not? If not, then the fact that one man believes and another disbelieves does not explain why the death of Christ is effective for the one and not effective for the other if His death was sufficient

for the salvation of all. Since man is dead (Rom. 5:12; Col. 2:13), can not please God as long as he is in the natural state (Rom. 8:7, 8), can not turn from sin to Christ except as God gives him the ability (Jer. 13:23; John 6:65), and God must, therefore, turn him by His regenerating power, as He does in the case of all that believe; the continuance of a man in sin does not explain why he does not profit from the atonement if the atonement was made for him. If God had laid the sins of the race on Christ, then He would owe it to Christ to save all the race; and His purpose in saving men would demand that he give them repentance and faith, as He most surely does in the case of all that come to Christ. Any man that believes in a universal atonement should be consistent and believe in universal salvation. The only way he can avoid this is to bid adieu to logic.

If a believer in the theory that Christ died for the whole race wishes to escape the logical implication of his theory and refuse to believe in universal salvation, then, to retain even a semblance of logic, he must deny that Christ offered a real atonement for anybody. He must deny that He made a real and proper substitution. He must believe that the justice of God was not actually satisfied for anybody in the death of Christ. HE CAN BELIEVE ONLY THAT CHRIST DID SOMETHING THAT GOD MAY ACCEPT AS SATISFACTION IF HE PLEASES OR REJECT IF IT PLEASES TO DO THAT. In which case, justice ceases to be justice, "For God to take that as satisfaction which is not really such is to say that there is no truth in anything. God may take a part for the whole; error for truth, wrong for right . . . If every created thing offered to God is worth just so much as God accepts it for, then the blood of bulls and goats might take away sin, and Christ is dead in vain" (Hodge, Syst. Theol.).

Therefore, since the Scriptures teach that Christ made a real substitution and satisfied the justice of God, reason and logic can rest in no other conclusion than that He died for none except those to whom the benefits of His death are imparted in their deliverance from sin and death.

Before we have finished we will give further attention to those passages thought by many to teach a general atonement. But before we do that let us note in detail the passages that prove that the atonement is limited. This is what the writer of the letter requested. Note the following:

1. John 15:13—"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." In the light of this passage, if Christ laid down His life for every man without exception, then He had the greatest love for each one—loved the ones that perish as much as the ones that receive eternal life. Christ could never be satisfied with some of the objects of His greatest love in Hell.

2. Rom. 8:32—"He that spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things." This passage argues that God's greatest gift of His Son guarantees all lesser gifts. Hence it follows that God delivered up His Son for none except those to whom He freely gives all other spiritual blessings. See Eph. 1:3.

3. Rom. 8:33,34—"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth . . . It is Christ that died." . . . etc. Here the argument is that no charges can be placed against the elect because Christ died for them. This passage would be robbed of all logical force if Christ died for some that He some day will condemn in judgment.

4. 2 Cor. 5:14—" . . . if one died for all, then were all dead." There is here the undeniable assertion that all for whom Christ died, died representatively in Him. Hence death has no power over them, and none of them will suffer it; but all will receive justification and eternal life through the faith that God works in their hearts. A. T. Robertson believed in a general atonement and he dodged discussion of election wherever he could. Yet he felt compelled to comment on this passage: "Logical conclusion . . . the one died for all and so the all died when he died. ALL THE SPIRITUAL DEATH POSSIBLE FOR THOSE FOR WHOM CHRIST DIED" (Capemine—Word Pictures). Note the use of the word "all" in this passage. We shall have occasion to refer back to it later.

5. 2 Cor. 5:19—"God was reconciling (katalasso) the world unto himself, NOT IMPUTING THEIR TRESPASSES UNTO THEM . . ." This tells us what God was doing in the death of Christ and it tells how He was doing it. He was reconciling men to Himself and He was doing it by laying their trespasses upon Christ and, therefore, not imputing, reckoning, charging them to those for whom Christ died. There is here but (Continued on page three)



The Atonement

(Continued from page two)

one proper conclusion and that is that the "world" (mark the word!) for which Christ died consists only of those men of all nations "to whom God will not impute sin" (Rom. 4:8).

We turn now for an examination of the passages relied upon by the advocates of a universally sufficient atonement:

1. Passages in which the word "world" is used: John 3:16; 1 John 2:2.

These passages must be interpreted, if interpreted right, in the light of the following facts:

(1). The Bible frequently uses the word in senses other than the absolute one. We find it used of the Roman Empire (Luke 2:1; Acts 17:6; 19:27; 24:5; Rom. 1:8; 10:18; Col 1:6). By no stretch of the imagination can the scope of these passages be extended beyond the Roman Empire. Thus the "world" here has no reference to vast areas of Europe and Asia outside the jurisdiction of Rome, where lived numerous teutonic and slavonic tribes, whose history is known to antedate the birth of Christ, as well as the Chinese, whose annals go back to 2627 B. C. Moreover it is used of the generality of known people (John 12:19); of Gentiles in distinction from the Jews (Rom. 11:12,15); and of unbelievers in distinction from believers (John 17:14; 1 Cor. 4:9; 11:32; Eph. 2:2; Heb. 11:7; 1 John 3:1; 3:13; 5:19).

(2). More particularly do we have the limited use of the word. As already pointed out, in 2 Cor. 5:19. That this passage alludes to what God was doing in indwelling Christ in His death is shown by the phrase "not imputing their trespasses unto them," and by the contrast made by Paul between what God was doing in Christ and what he and others were commissioned to do. (If our opponents assert that the passage refers to Christ's preaching ministry rather than to His death, they thereby surrender the universal scope of the word "world," and even its application to the whole Roman Empire; for Christ's preaching ministry, including that of the apostles, brought actual reconciliation to only a very small remnant of the people then living in the Roman Empire.) Now, if it be admitted, as it generally is by advocates of a general atonement, that the passage has reference to what Christ did in His death, then ONLY BLIND PREJUDICE AND SLAVERY TO A THEORY CAN KEEP ANY MAN FROM SEEING THAT THE "WORLD" RECONCILED BY CHRIST IS THAT INNUMERABLE HOST OUT OF ALL NATIONS THAT RECEIVE RECONCILIATION AND, THEREFORE, DO NOT HAVE THEIR SINS IMPUTED TO THEM.

(3). The Jews, through its use in the Talmud and other Jewish writings, were familiar with the limited use of the word "world," and believed that the Messiah's coming would benefit only the Jews and bring destruction to all Gentiles. This first fact made it easy for the Jews to understand such use of the word as here contended for and explains why Jesus and the apostles could properly use it thus without explanation or fear of being misunderstood. The second fact shows their reason for using it, that is, to contradict the Jewish idea that only Jews would benefit from Christ's coming. IN THE LIGHT OF THESE FACTS THE APPLICATION OF THE WORD TO PEOPLES OF ALL NATIONS RATHER THAN TO EVERY INDIVIDUAL IS CLEAR. THE

ADVOCATES OF A GENERAL ATONEMENT WANT TO INTERPRET THE WORD IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN USE RATHER THAN IN THE LIGHT OF ITS USE IN THE FIRST CENTURY.

(4). The real nature of the atonement as a satisfaction of the justice of God. To make way for their theory, the advocates of a general atonement must tone down the justice of God and Christ's satisfaction of it. So they hold that that "propitiation" means that which renders God favorable and makes it possible for God to save men, but does not guarantee that He will. But I reply, how could a holy God become favorable and find it consistent with His nature to save men until the full penalty demanded by the law was met? And when that full penalty was met, how could a holy, covenant-keeping God fail to pardon those for whom it was meant? I CHALLENGE ANY ADVOCATE OF A GENERAL ATONEMENT PERSON TO THE MOST EMINENT SCHOLARS OF THE WORLD TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS. "Can a God of infinite ethical perfection, who with His own hand laid the awful burden on the sinner's guilt upon the adorable Surety, repudiate His own covenant engagements and withhold from Him the reward purchased at the cost of His most precious blood? To say so, is tantamount to an impeachment of the truth and justice of our covenant-keeping God" (Prof. Robert Watts, Belfast, Ireland, in one of a series of articles solicited by T. T. Eaton and published in the Western Recorder during Eaton's editorship).

(5). A love that would cause God to give His Son for the race would cause Him to save all. I CHALLENGE ANY BELIEVER IN UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION TO SHOW ANY BASIS FOR GOD'S DISCRIMINATION IN SAVING MEN IF HE LOVED ALL OF THEM ENOUGH TO SEND JESUS TO DIE FOR THEM.

(6). There would be no real expression of love in sending a saviour to die vainly for men. What kind of love is it that performs an act that cannot benefit? Would there be any real love shown by a father in buying an expensive picture for a totally blind son?

(7). The Scripture states unequivocally that God does not love all men: "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated" (Rom. 9:13). The advocates of a general atonement can wrestle with this passage from now on, but they will never be able to reduce its meaning to less than the truth that GOD LOVED JACOB AND DID NOT LOVE ESAU.

2. Passages where the word "all" is used: 1 Tim. 2:6; Titus 2:11.

These passages should be interpreted in the light of:

(1). The variety of uses of the word in the New Testament: A great number (Matt. 3:5; 4:24); all kinds and classes (Luke 2:10; Rom. 15:14; 2 Thess. 2:9; 1 Tim. 6:10); all with manifest exceptions (Mark 11:32; Acts 2:47; 1 Cor. 9:22; 10:33; Titus 1:15); all or every one of a certain class (Luke 3:21; 1 Cor. 8:1 compared with vs. 7; Col. 1:28).

(2). The use of the word in John 12:32: "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." Here Alvah Hovey, an advocate of a general atonement is forced to admit that the drawing here alluded to is "an effectual drawing, by means of which the servants of Satan are led to become

Ideas For The Hell Box

The Hell Box is where all discarded metal—printer's mistakes and errors—is thrown, to be melted and remolded.



Popular misconceptions of religion that are deadlier than yesterday's type.

"ONE CHURCH IS AS GOOD AS ANOTHER"

Eld. H. H. Overbey
Detroit, Michigan

The popular misconception that "One church is as good as another" is believed by many. The Lord Jesus Christ built His church, which was a local Baptist church, while He was here on earth. Matt. 16:18. He referred to this church as a "little flock" and said that it was their "Father's good pleasure to give them the kingdom." Luke 12:32. How can one church be as good as another when the Father will give the kingdom only to the church that Jesus built?

Jesus said, "Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." Matt. 15:13. How can one church be as good as another when all of them will be rooted up except the one planted by the Father?

After Jesus arose from the dead He gave the church that He built a commission to: Go, make disciples, then baptize them, and then to indoctrinate them. Matt. 28:19-20. How can one church be as good as another when Jesus gave the commission only to the one that He

built?

On the day of Pentecost, Acts 2, when the church that Jesus built was assembled in a house, the Holy Spirit came and filled the house and Jesus baptized that church in the Holy Spirit, accrediting it. How can one church be as good as another when the only church so accredited was the one that Jesus built?

The church that Jesus built was a local assembly or congregation. This church went about establishing other churches of like faith and order and we are told in 1 Cor. 12:27: "Now ye (church at Corinth) are a body of Christ." The article "the" is not in the original. How can one church be as good as another when man-made churches are not the body of Christ?

Jesus said that He would build His church upon "this rock" or "this petra" or Christ. In 1 Cor. 10:4 we are told that this "rock" or "petra" is Christ and in Eph. 2:20 we are told that Jesus Christ is the chief corner stone. How can one church be as good as another when only the church that Jesus built was built upon Christ and has Christ for the chief corner stone?

Paul tells the church at Corinth (and there were no man-made churches then) that he had espoused her to one husband that he might present her as a "chaste virgin" (unhandled virgin) to Christ. How can one church be as good as another when man-made churches are not chaste nor espoused to Christ?

We learn in Eph. 5:22-23 in the analogy of husband and wife with Christ and His church that Christ is the head of His church and that His church is His bride and that He will present her to Himself without spot or wrinkle, etc? How can one church be as good as another when man-made churches do not have Christ for their head? How can one church be as good as another when man-made churches are not in the bride?

All other saints except His bride will be wedding guests. The guests are the ones "called" (invited or bidden, Greek) to the wedding in Revelation 19:9. The bride is never invited to her own wedding. So we see that the popular misconception that: "One church is as good as another" must be put in the "Hell Box."

the servants of Christ; not an attempt to draw men to himself, which is resisted and rendered unavailing." It is interesting to note, then, how this writer seeks to avoid the evident meaning of "all" in this passage as referring to all men without exception, men out of all classes "all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues" (Rev. 7:9), by placing its fulfillment at some future time "when a great majority of the living will be subject to Christ—so large a part, indeed, that it will seem as if all were his friends." See to what lengths good men will go to avoid the evident truth! But, let it be noted well, that this eminent Baptist theologian and commentator admits that here the word "all" does not refer to the race. He does this because he sees that every member of the race is not being drawn to Christ, but, when the word alludes to the ransomed, he can not see that all have not been ransomed!

(3). The use of the word in 2 Cor. 5:14—"... if one died for all, then were all dead." This passage furnishes the key for the interpretation of all passages using "all" with reference to the atonement. The "all" for whom Christ died is the all who shall be reconciled through Him, the totality of the redeemed.

(4). The real nature of the atonement as providing a ransom (antilutron), "a corresponding price," a price corresponding to the debt we owed to the law, the price of our deliverance. "Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time" (1 Tim. 2:6), should be interpreted by Christ's own words: "Even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to

minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). . . . He certainly did not mean every sinner of Adam's race; for it would be notoriously untrue; but he meant all conditions and races of men, and, savingly, only all men given him by the Father" (J. R. Graves, The Seven Dispensations, p. 102). "If law can yield at all, if the universe created and uncreated can afford to have law in its higher realms melt like wax, if God's love can in any respect be shown to violators of law at the expense of justice, if Christ having done all and having suffered all he was raised up to do and to suffer, justice, exact justice, pure and mere justice, did not permit, require, demand, necessitate the deliverance of those whom he represented and whom he came to redeem, then indeed, 'Christ died in vain,' then is the 'offense of the cross' taken away, then 'the wages of sin' is not 'death,' then we are all at sea as to the necessity for Christ's intervention, then we are ready to disperse on voyages of discovery that we may find good reason for Christ's coming into the world at all, and especially for his suffering in Gethsemane and on the cross" (John M. Armour, Atonement and Law, p. 129).

3. Other passages: 1 Tim. 4:10; 2 Peter 2:1.

(1). 1 Tim. 4:10. The mere provision of possible salvation for men does not make God their saviour any more than it saves them. This does not satisfy the meaning of the word "saviour" as applied to the soul. The Greek is "soter," and this word means "deliverer" and "preserver," as well as saviour. This, no doubt, is the meaning here. God de-

livers and preserves all men (so long as it pleases Him to do so). What he does in a general and limited way for all men in general, He does in a special manner for believers.

(2) 2 Pet. 2:1. The word for Lord in this passage is not "kurios," which is used either of God or of Christ. It is "despotes," which is never used of Christ. Hence the reference here is to God. Peter wrote especially to Jews. Doubtless the false teachers were Jews also. And Deut. 32:6; Psa. 74:2; Isa. 63:11 explain in what sense God bought the Jewish nation.

I have finished. Suffer a closing word. A GENERAL ATONEMENT IS NO ATONEMENT, IT IS BUT A MISERABLE MAKE-SHIFT AND A MISNOMER. IT MAKES VOID GOD'S LAW, IT DESTROYS HIS JUSTICE, AND IMPUGNS HIS FAITHFULNESS. IT DISHONORS THE SON OF GOD BY MAKING HIS BLOOD AN UNHOLY THING, NO BETTER THAN THE BLOOD OF BULLS AND OF GOATS. IT DETRACTS FROM HIS GLORY AND GIVES GLORY TO MAN. IT LEAVES NO LOGICAL BASIS FOR THE SECURITY OF THE BELIEVER. IT PROMOTES THE ARROGANCE OF MAN IN ASSUMING THAT HE CAN ADD TO THE ATONEMENT. IT OPENS THE DOOR FOR UNSCRIPTURAL SCHEMES TO WREST PROFESSIONS OF FAITH FROM MEN BY HUMAN ARTIFICE, BRINGING INTO OUR

(Continued on page four)

The Atonement

(Continued from page three)

CHURCHES AN UNCIRCUMCISED THROG THAT STILL SPEAK THE LANGUAGE OF ASHDOD AND LUST AFTER THE FLESHPOTS OF EGYPT. IT LEADS TO LAXITY AND APOSTASY, MODERNISM AND DIVISION. I implore all believers to turn away from it, especially Baptists. Turn back, my beloved brethren, to the former historical Baptist position. It will not kill your evangelistic spirit, as it did not kill that of Spurgeon and scores of other worthy men who have held it. A limited atonement and Biblical evangelism belong together. A limited atonement will keep men from unscriptural excesses in evangelism, but it will not weaken their interest in the salvation of souls. God has committed unto men the "word of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:19). This is His preached word, which he uses as the instrument of the Spirit in regeneration (1 Cor. 1:21; Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:23).

NOTE: If you agree with the article, I shall be glad to hear from you. Do you think it would be well to issue this article in tract form for widespread distribution? If so, how many will you pay for at the bare cost of printing and mailing?



Boats

(Continued from page one)

great difficulties keep their even course. Which are you like?—Author Unknown



Kind Of Church

(Continued from page one)

in a church that is doing something. We should never, never, never join a church for convenience sake. We have Baptist churches that do practically nothing for missions. How can a person be content with such?

THEY SHOULD ASK, "IS THE MINISTRY OF THIS CHURCH SUCH THAT I WILL LEARN MORE OF THE WORD OF GOD?" "Will my soul—my spiritual life—my understanding profit by its preaching and teaching?" People are often church members for years, but learn little or nothing, because they are not subjected to the Bible. All they get is a little Scripture diluted with much "literature," while the preaching is not of a Biblical order.

What Should Not Determine Church Membership

One should not join a church just because it is friendly (an infidel club could be friendly), or because it furnished a "good time" (the various clubs do that), or because it is easy to attend, or because it is a stylish church, or because it is anything apart from the standard that we have mentioned above.



Seminary

(Continued from page one)

Examples of the Radical Views and Teachings of Bros. Barth and Brunner:

1. Bro. Karl Barth on The Deity of Jesus Christ:

In The Doctrine of the Word of God, p. 188, English Translation in 1936 we have this statement:

"Jesus Christ, in fact, is also the Rabbi of Nazareth, historically so difficult to get information about; and when it is got, (it represents) one whose activity is so easily a little commonplace alongside of more than one other founder of a religion, and even alongside of many later representatives of his own religion."

2. Bro. Karl Barth on The Bible as the Word of God.

Says Bro. Emil Brunner in reporting Bro. Barth's teaching:

"Fundamentally, Karl Barth's Dogmatic takes the same position: 'The Bible is not a book of sacred oracles; it is not an organ of direct communication. It is a real witness.' (1.2, p. 562). He says that we could not expect that the Apostles and Prophets, in addition to their encounter with the divine revelation, 'should also have had imparted to them a compendium of . . . divine Wisdom concerning everything in the universe . . . ' (op. cit., p. 564). Indeed, Barth even speaks of the possibility of error in the religious, that is, the theological content, of the Bible (op. cit. p. 565). Thus he arrives at a definite and clear rejection of the orthodox view of the Bible (op. cit., 580 ff.) and returns to the original principle of the Reformation. The same view is contained in my book Religions-Philosophic evangelischer Theologie pp. 117-344, which was published in 1925 in the Handbuch red Philosophie." p. 113.

3. Bro. Emil Brunner is even more specific than Bro. Barth. In his The Christian Doctrine of God, page 48, he says:

"Insofar as the Bible speaks about subjects of secular knowledge, it has no teaching authority. Neither its astronomical, cosmological picture of the world, nor its geographical view, nor its zoological, ethnographical or historical statements are binding upon us, whether they are in the Old Testament or in the New."

And in his book, The Theology of Crisis at page 41, he says:

"I myself am an adherent of a rather radical school of Biblical criticism, which for example, does not accept the Gospel of John as an historical source, and which finds legends in many parts of the Synoptic Gospels." (Emphasis mine).

4. Bro. Barth and Bro. Brunner on the Christian Experience.

They hold that three steps are essential for the prospective Christians to come into the experiences of the new life in Christ:

(1). When the critics have eliminated all the legendary sections of the New Testament — John's Gospel entire and many sections of Matthew, Mark and Luke, — then one must accept what is left as "the testimony or witness to Jesus Christ;" but (2) this testimony must then be explained to prospective Christians and taught them by ministers in the church who themselves have entered into this Christian Experience; and (3) the prospective Christian must then wait until he personally encounters a real revelation of God through a real experience of the Holy Spirit (see pp. 33-34 of the Christian Doctrine of God by Bro. Emil Brunner).

That is to say, they reject and repudiate the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures; also the entire conception that the Scriptures are the Word of God. They hold that the New Testament, for example, contains a true testimony." Bro. Brunner says (see p. 49 of his book: The Christian Doctrine of God):

"The result of our consideration is this: the Scriptures are the absolute authority, in so far as in them the revelation of Jesus Christ Himself is supreme"

But who is to be the judge of how far the books of the New Testament contain a supreme revelation of Jesus Christ? The critics may and do cast out large sections of it as legendary, as they have already done in the case of John's Gospel and the other Gospels. Then what is left of the New Testament must be taught and fully explained to prospective Christians, who then must wait until they personally encounter a real experience of revelation through God's Holy Spirit."

What Do Bros. Barth and Brunner Leave For Us?

These two great German scholars and theologians leave four things to New Testament Christians:

1. A Mutilated New Testament — John's Gospel and many sections of the Synoptics are eliminated. And now much more will be eliminated depends en-

CHRISTIANITY AND NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS COMPARED

SORCERY

CHRISTIANITY. Everywhere throughout the Word of God, sorcery is denounced because of its evil character and alliance with Satan. Moses, Samuel, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Micah, Malachi and Paul spoke of the practice of sorcery and denounced it. King Saul lost his life partly because of it.

BRAHMANISM. The mantras or charms used by Brahmans in consecrating idols consist of passages from the Vedas. "The gods are subject to the mantras and the mantras to the Brahmans." Thus the Brahmans exert magic power over their worshippers.

PEACE RULES THE DAY WHEN CHRIST RULES THE MIND

HINDUISM. The wily Brahman priests, with the mantra as his ready tool, plays easily on the spellbound Hindus whose minds are tortured day and night with fear from the myriads of superstitions, ghosts, demons, demigods and deified saints which they are told haunt their pathway and can be dispelled only by Brahman priests.

BUDDHISM. Great powers of sorcery are attributed to Chundi, the female Buddha, yet Buddha denounced the Brahmans who earned their livelihood by low arts of sorcery and divining. He stood out firmly against a multitude of groveling practices of his day which were employed by idle Brahmans to secure their living.

GO WHERE YOU WILL, YOUR SOUL WILL FIND NO PEACE BUT ON THE BOSOM OF CHRIST

TAOISM. Geomancy is a strong characteristic of Taoism. Its priests are expert in magic and constantly play upon the many superstitions of the susceptible Chinese. Bro. Griffis calls this mental pandemonium from fear of evil spirits, "the delirium tremens of paganism." Priests, by this means, can inflame a mob to fury and madness in a very short time.

CONFUCIANISM. Before a Chinese will build a house, or dig a grave, he must consult the geomancer, who, by incantations, will discover from the spirit world the proper place to locate it. Thus "fungshui" holds the Chinese with a grip of steel and the sorcerers profit immensely thereby.

IF YOU WANT TO BE MISERABLE, LOOK WITHIN; DISTRACTED, LOOK AROUND; PEACEFUL, LOOK UP

ZOROASTRIANISM. The founder of this system of religion was opposed to all forms of the black arts. He is believed to have been acquainted with a portion of the Old Testament teachings and to have been thereby influenced against idols and the tricks of the Oriental cults.

THE PARSEES do not practice sorcery but they are possessed by a slavish superstition to their rites and ceremonies; such as bringing a dog to look into the face of a dead man before burial that all evil spirits may thus be driven away.

ONE OF THE DEVIL'S SNARES IS TO OCCUPY US WITH THE PAST AND FUTURE SO AS TO TAKE AWAY OUR PEACE FOR THE PRESENT

SHINTOISM. The priests practice cunning tricks upon the worshippers. "In their ordeals of water and fire they make clever use of the phenomena of water boiling on mountain heights at a low temperature, and of the heat absorbing qualities of salt."

MOHAMMEDANISM. Rings are worn against the influence of evil spirits. The child-witch is feared by every mother. Amulets are placed on children to protect them from the evil eye. A chapter from the "Koran," or certain names of God, or names of the prophets are worn as amulets. The "Koran" forbids divining by arrows.

tirely on the critics.

2. What is Left of the New Testament Must be Regarded Not as the Word of God But Only as an "Authoritative Testimony to Jesus Christ—in so far as in them the revelation of Jesus Christ is supreme."

3. The Church, through her ministers, must (1) determine how far the residue of the New Testament Scriptures which the critics have left to us really "contains the supreme revelation of Jesus Christ" and (2) the church must teach these residue of Scriptures to all prospective Christians and young church members.

4. All prospective Christians who have thus been taught this residue of the New Testament Scriptures must then wait for, look for and seek an actual encounter with God who will give them a real revelation of Himself through the Holy Spirit. Alas, how little we find here of the plan of salvation, as set out in the New Testament, and especially in Paul's writings (see Rom. 10:4-17).

Just what is in the teachings of these two great radical theologians and critics which has captured the professors of the Louis-

ville Seminary and caused them to make their books and pamphlets required reading for undergraduate students at Louisville is beyond our imagination. God pity any seminary, Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian or Congregationalist, which will exalt two such radical critics and deniers of the faith of the New Testament to a place of honor in its curriculum and make their writings required reading for undergraduates!

—July issue The Baptist Challenge.

Selling Out

(Continued from page one)

Baptist Church on their Free Will Baptist baptism? Did Brother Lawrence preach that a person once saved is always saved while in the Free Will Baptist Meeting? Did he preach that God is sovereign and that man is totally depraved, his will and all? Did Brother Lawrence preach that Jesus organized His church and promised perpetuity to it? Paul wrote that the time would come when men would not endure sound doctrine. Truly the time of departing from the faith is at hand.

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

- ☐ I have a paid up lifetime subscription.
- ☐ I want to continue to receive THE BAPTIST EXAMINER weekly.
- ☐ I am unable to pay for the paper.

NAME _____

STREET _____ ZONE _____

R.F.D. _____ BOX NO. _____

CITY _____

I think my subscription is paid up until _____ 19_____.

Enclosed please find \$_____ wherewith to renew my subscription for _____ years.

Enclosed please find \$_____ as a special contribution to help pay subscriptions of missionaries and those who are unable to pay for the paper personally.

If you don't want to cut up your paper, write us a letter instead.