



THE CONTROVERSY

C.R. STAM

The
CONTROVERSY

By

CORNELIUS R. STAM

BEREAN BIBLE SOCIETY
N112 W17761 Mequon Rd.
Germantown, WI 53022

COPYRIGHT, 1963

By

CORNELIUS R. STAM

Jacket artwork: kindness of
Messrs. Walter and Kenneth Scott,
Advertisers engraving Company, Cincinnati, Ohio

DEDICATION

This volume is humbly dedicated to God and His glory – and, under God, to that band of believers who “know the grace of God in truth” and have proclaimed it faithfully in the face of great opposition.

CONTENTS

Preface 7

Introduction 8

CHAPTER I

How I First Became Involved In the Controversy 11

CHAPTER II

A Prominent Bible Teacher
Warns the Christian Public
to Keep Us Out of the Pulpit 17

CHAPTER III

Popular Men Are Not Necessarily Faithful Men 40

CHAPTER IV

Riding Two Horses In Opposite Directions 44

CHAPTER V

Both Sides – Representation and Misrepresentation 51

CHAPTER VI

The Tide of Falsehood Rises About Us 53

CHAPTER VII

It Always Amazes us That leading Men Can Go on
Publishing These Falsehoods as if They Had Never Been Exposed 79

CHAPTER VIII

Now We Are Higher Critics! 96

CHAPTER IX

We are Analyzed Officially – Twice! 116

CHAPTER X

The Students Too Must Be Informed 134

CHAPTER XI

Two Men, One Admittedly Out of the Will of God
and Another Admittedly Bewildered, Explain Why
We Are Not Working Miracles 143

CHAPTER XII

A Third Man, Who Is Not Filled with the Spirit,
Tells Others How They Can Be Filled 154

CHAPTER XIII

We're Happy to Have Our Books Reviewed – But 161

CHAPTER XIV

The Scofield Bible Is To Be Revised 171

CHAPTER XV

How Can We Expect a Revival? 184

DON'T FOLLOW THE CROWD

When Paul was at Ephesus "all with one voice, about the space of two hours cried, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*" and the town clerk, referring to the religion which surrounded this pagan goddess, said confidently: "THESE THINGS CANNOT BE SPOKEN AGAINST" (Acts 19:34-36).

But at Rome the apostle was informed, with reference to those who had accepted the truth of God: "As concerning this sect, we know that EVERYWHERE IT IS SPOKEN AGAINST" (Acts 28:22).

Which side would you rather be on: that of the superstitious multitude or that of the minority who place their faith in the sure Word of God?

Today, who knows Diana? but that Blessed Book still stands unchanged and unchangeable!

Do not fear to be in the minority, for with regard to some of the most important and vital truths the majority, even among God's people, has often been *wrong*.

PREFACE

Never have I written any book into which there has gone so much meditation on the Word of God, so much earnest prayer, so much sober thought and so much searching of my own soul.

Now that it is completed and I write this preface, I am keenly aware that some may, at first glance, feel that it should not have been published, for it is, indeed, a *protest*.

This book will prove beyond reasonable doubt that for many years there has been a determined attempt on the part of some of our most outstanding Fundamentalist leaders to suppress that body of truth which, more than any other, would serve to unite the Church, now so confused and divided.

I beg the doubtful, therefore, to withhold their judgment until they have read this book *through*. I *have* read it through - and *lived* it through and know that I speak the truth when I say that if such read the documented facts in this volume and are not moved to deep concern - and to some kind of positive action in behalf of a stricken Church, the trouble is not with me but with them.

Such may *pray* for a spiritual revival in the Body of Christ, but they do not *deserve* one, for spiritual indolence is exactly what *prevents* revival.

As *The Controversy* goes to press many are joining in fervent prayer that God will graciously use it to arouse those who are spiritually asleep, to convict the indifferent and to quicken a Church which, alas, lies prostrate in a time of grave crisis.

-*Cornelius R. Stam*

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
January 15, 1963

INTRODUCTION

In a book of this kind I must necessarily speak for myself. Let me begin, then, by stating that for the thirty-five years covered by this volume I have held, without reservation, the following doctrinal beliefs:

WHAT I BELIEVE

The verbal inspiration and plenary authority of the BIBLE in its original writings.

The eternal trinity of the GODHEAD.

The eternal deity, the virgin birth, the spotless humanity and the vicarious death of the LORD JESUS CHRIST.

The personality and deity of the HOLY SPIRIT.

The total depravity of MAN by nature.

SALVATION by grace, through faith in the crucified, risen and glorified Christ.

The essential unity of all believers of the present dispensation as members of the ONE TRUE CHURCH, the Body of Christ.

The GIFTS enumerated in Ephesians 4:7-16, and that these alone have been necessary for the building up of the Body of Christ.

The privilege and duty of all the saved to WALK as children of light.

The communion of the LORD'S SUPPER as revealed through Paul for the members of the Body of Christ "till He come."

One divine BAPTISM, the operation of the Holy Spirit, by which all true believers are made members of the Body of Christ, being identified with Him in His death, burial and resurrection. In the light of 1 Cor. 1:17, Eph. 4:5 and Col. 2:12 I affirm that water baptism has no place in God's spiritual program for the Body of Christ in the present dispensation of grace.

The RESURRECTION of the body.

The pre-tribulation RAPTURE of the Church.

The personal, premillennial RETURN OF CHRIST to reign on earth.

The ETERNAL PUNISHMENT of the unsaved dead.

The GOSPEL which Paul called "my gospel," and "the gospel of the grace of God," as God's specific message for the world today.

It will be noted from the above that I have stood with Bible-believing Christians on *every single fundamental of the faith*. Furthermore, as God has given strength and grace, I have consistently and vigorously defended these truths against heresy.

WHERE I HAVE DEPARTED FROM POPULAR FUNDAMENTALISM

Perhaps the reader has noticed one issue - *not a fundamental one* - on which I differ from *popular* Fundamentalism: *Water Baptism*.

This does not mean that I have departed from any *particular* teaching as to baptism which Fundamentalists in general hold, for actually Fundamentalists are so divided over this question that no matter what one believes he is in the minority-for *there is no majority*.

I do not believe therefore, that my Fundamentalist brethren have any basis for charging me with heresy because of my conviction that water baptism is not included in God's program for this present dispensation. The great diversity of opinion regarding baptism among Fundamentalists is in itself a proof that the majority are at least partly wrong in their views.

I believe that the Scriptures teach that water baptism once *was* included in God's program-indeed, was required, along with faith and repentance, for the remission of sins. But I believe that when Christ's kingdom - with which water baptism was associated - was finally rejected under the ministry of the twelve, God raised up *another* apostle to proclaim "the preaching of the cross" (as glad news) in "the gospel of the grace of God." This apostle, Paul, was *not* sent to baptize, and in his special message water baptism had no part.

HOW I ARRIVED AT THIS POSITION

Few people have been so signally blessed as I.

I was brought up in a Christian home - more than a Christian home. My parents were deeply devoted to God and my five brothers, my two sisters and I all came to know the Lord at early ages and all became active in His service.

My father, Peter Stam, Sr., was the founder of the *Star of Hope Mission*, a gospel and Bible teaching center in Paterson, N. J., where I became engaged in Christian service at an early age and continued active for some twenty years.

Perhaps one reason for the appearance of this volume is that previously - long before my birth - Dad had been an old country comedian, travelling through the low

countries, Holland, Luxembourg and Belgium, utterly without Christ. Later, in America, however, he was converted to Christ and his whole life revolutionized through trying to learn to read English out of a parallel column (Holland-English) New Testament. This gave him, and later his family, a profound reverence for the Word of God and an appreciation of its transforming power.

The Stam family had Bible reading and prayer at every meal, as well as at other times. We were surrounded by Christian books and Bible commentaries. We had constant and close contact with missionaries from all over the world and with many of the ablest Bible teachers, whom father had engaged for Bible conferences or evangelistic services.

There are probably few people, preachers' children included, who have been privileged to hear so many different evangelists, preachers and Bible teachers as I.

For all this I will never cease to give heartfelt thanks. How it increases my responsibility before God!

In listening to, and observing, the men of God referred to above, it was thrilling beyond words to see the spiritual oneness of believers everywhere in *Christ*, yet I could not help noticing that *practically* they were not one, for they were far from united in teaching and practice.

The greatest divider of all, I soon became convinced, was water baptism. Fundamental, evangelical believers were - as they remain today - sadly confused and divided over this issue, yet each held tenaciously to his particular view.

It was largely through hearing the messages and listening to the conversations of great men of God who *did* subscribe to water baptism for this dispensation¹ that I first came to realize that Paul's apostleship was wholly distinct from that of the twelve and that water baptism has no place whatever in "the dispensation of the grace of God." This was before I had even heard of Dr. E. W. Bullinger (with whose teachings I have so often been linked) or Pastor J. C. O'Hair, whom I later came to know, and to whose teachings and personal friendship I owe so much.

Since those early days I have been amply confirmed in my convictions both by my further studies in the Word and by the response which this view has received from its opponents.

Most of the men of God whom I had come to know prior to this time have frequently expressed regret that certain members of our family have come to believe that water baptism does not belong to this present dispensation, but, speaking for myself, I cannot recall *any* of them ever approaching me with the Word in an effort to show me the error of my way, with the single exception of Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr. This is typical of the treatment which many of our "grace" folk have received at the hands of those who once

¹ Though in such sharp disagreement as to who should be baptized and *how* and *why*.

were closest to them.

Theirs is a great sin, for professing to love us and expressing grave concern over our lapse into "heresy," they make no attempts to rescue or restore us. They just pray for us. It's simpler that way, for then one need not face facts or answer questions from the Scriptures.

We are convinced that had we gone into *Seventh Day Adventism* or *Christian Science* or joined *Jehovah's Witnesses* most of them would have come, Bible in hand, to show us the error of our way, but in this case they seem to have concluded that they are not their brothers' keepers; indeed, they seem afraid lest we might seek contact with *them!*

It is further significant that while the teachings of the so-called "Grace Movement" on the subject of baptism have aroused such bitter opposition among Fundamentalists for more than a quarter of a century, we know of no book of even one hundred pages that has been written to refute them and almost invariably the smaller books which have been published to answer them have seriously misrepresented our views. We know of *no* book or booklet which has answered by the Scriptures *what we teach*.

What is wrong, that our leading Bible scholars do not answer *by the Scriptures* a teaching which manifestly disturbs them so greatly? Is it possible that they cannot? that the doctrine of the "one baptism" is a Scriptural *truth*, which they should be proclaiming instead of opposing? In this case their sin is the greater, for it means that they are wilfully closing their eyes to God's Word, thus depriving multitudes of sincere believers of precious truths which God would have them know.

Their case is similar to that of the spiritual leaders of our Lord's day, to whom He said:

"... ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered" (Luke 11:52).

***How I First Became Involved
In the Controversy***

Chapter I

A CANDLE UNDER A BUSHEL

Somewhere about the year 1926, through the ministry of a New York investment consultant, I was led into the most blessed truth of "the mystery"² with its "one body" and "one baptism."

This brother was a frequent guest at our home, and as we discussed the Scriptures together, dad and several others of the family were convinced that the rite of water baptism had no place in God's program for the Body of Christ, having been superseded by a divine baptism in which the Holy Spirit eternally and inseparably unites individual believers to Christ and His Body.

I still have - and prize - a booklet which this friend later gave us on the subject. It was written by Pastor J. C. O'Hair and contained two messages, one entitled, *Jesus Christ a Minister of the Circumcision*, and the other, *The Twelve Apostles and Paul*.

I am not at liberty to publish this brother's name, however, for the following reasons:

By 1932 I had become pastor of a small church in Preakness, N. J. (now the *Preakness Bible Church*) and, having had to face the question of baptism, published a booklet entitled: *Water Baptism, Is It Included in God's Program for This Age?*

Soon after its publication, the brother in question invited me to dine with him in New York City, where he requested me not to tell others that he believed as I did about the subject of baptism. This was soon followed by another invitation. This time he earnestly besought me not to press the subject further publicly, warning me that if I did I would ruin my ministry in a short time.

Furthermore, he argued that if I were an Ironside or a Gaebelein,³ I might "put it across," but I had not yet arrived at that position. All this while, however, he kept assuring me that I was not to conclude that he had repudiated the truths he had taught us.

It seemed evident from his conversation that he was concerned about his own public ministry with Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse of Philadelphia and others in various parts of the country.

I had sought to keep my ministry as a young pastor balanced, Scripturally, and had avoided riding any hobby, but in the sight of God I could not promise him to be silent on

² Or "secret." This is what Paul, by divine inspiration, call, God's revelation concerning the present dispensation (Eph. 3:1-11 , *et al*).

³ Referring to Dr. Arno C. Gaebelein.

a subject so prominent in the Word, and concerning which the Church was so sadly divided, especially since he and I were both sure that by God's grace we had found the answer to the baptism problem in Scripture. I did promise him, however, that I would not mention his name in our literature as the one who had been instrumental in leading us into these truths.

In June, 1933, Dr. Barnhouse, deploring the fact that I was scheduled to conduct a week of meetings on these subjects at the *Berean Church* of Muskegon, Michigan,⁴ asked me point blank whether any others among our mutual friends had accepted this "hellish heresy." I then told him we had been led into this truth through the brother referred to above, but Dr. Barnhouse insisted that I was wrong and that this brother believed in the sprinkling of infants. He was certain of this since this brother had so often occupied his pulpit at the *Tenth Presbyterian Church* in Philadelphia and they had enjoyed close fellowship together.

This prompted me to write our brother directly about the matter. In his reply, dated July 6, 1933, he said among other things, that he believed that infant baptism was "a relic of the Roman Catholic Church," but was careful to add: "That is in confidence, remember."

Evidently I was still to "remember" not to publish the fact that he did not believe in water baptism - and he kept reminding me of this in various ways, until I published the following item in the *Berean Searchlight*:

CONFIDENTIAL

"Would you ever suspect that I would believe in the sprinkling of infants? ... a relic of the Roman Catholic Church....That is in confidence, remember."

These words were written to us by a well known Christian leader in the East who for years has secretly believed that water baptism is contrary to God's program for this age.

Some time ago a Presbyterian pastor insisted that this brother (who frequently occupies his pulpit) believed in the sprinkling of infants, so we wrote him a letter of inquiry. The brother's reply makes it clear enough that he does NOT believe in the sprinkling of infants, but he adds: "That is in confidence, remember."

We wish these brethren would not ask us to conceal their convictions for them, for we fear that in being loyal to them we may be disloyal to God.

The brother whose letter we quote from, has risen to high places of public esteem, but before God he has taken step after step downward.

At first he merely kept his beliefs to himself. Next he asked us not to mention his beliefs. Next he asked us not to mention *our* beliefs. *Now* he has good fellowship with

⁴ Dr. Bultema was then pastor.

the greatest opponents of Pauline truth today - men who disfellowship those who openly proclaim what he secretly believes.

This experience showed me what small considerations sometimes serve to close the mouths of men of God to truths they believe and should openly proclaim. The brother in question was at that time the executive vice president of a New York investor's service, and did not need to close his mouth or hide his convictions for anyone. But where financial need does not cause men to capitulate, "the fear of man" often does, and where "the fear of man" fails to silence them, love of position and popularity often succeeds, as it did with certain spiritual leaders of our Lord's day:

"Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on Him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess Him. . . . FOR THEY LOVED THE PRAISE OF MEN MORE THAN THE PRAISE OF GOD" (John 12:42,43).

I KEPT NOTHING BACK

Perhaps we should pause here to consider two statements from Paul's farewell address to the Ephesian elders:

"I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you" (Acts 20:20).

"I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God" (Acts 20:27).

Both the above statements are found in the record of Paul's farewell address to the Ephesian elders.

The apostle was very closely attached to these men of God having previously labored among them faithfully for three years. And now, passing through Miletus, some thirty miles away, he sends for them. He is on his way to Jerusalem and feels certain that he will never again see them on earth. He must give them one farewell word of encouragement and exhortation before going on.

When they have arrived, he reminds them how he served the Lord among them with humility of mind and with many tears and testings, often in peril of his life, faithfully teaching them both publicly and from house to house. But what impresses us most of all is his declaration:

"... I KEPT BACK NOTHING THAT WAS PROFITABLE UNTO YOU" (Ver. 20).

And he emphasizes this fact further as he calls upon them to bear him witness:

"... I HAVE NOT SHUNNED TO DECLARE UNTO YOU ALL THE COUNSEL OF GOD" (Ver. 27).

How many men of God today, we wonder, can say this with respect to their ministry of the Word? How many, even, among those who clearly understand the gospel of the grace of God? Alas, how many today *do* keep back blessed truths which they well know would be profitable to their hearers! How many *do* shun to declare *all* the counsel of God!

There are so many reasons, they tell themselves, to speak with reserve; so many reasons to refrain from preaching openly truths that may be ever so blessed. And so they always *go just so far*, but always come short of proclaiming boldly those truths which are most vital of all; those truths which are the very conclusions to their premises, and to which they keep hoping to lead their hearers.

They call this *tact*. If only it *were* tact. If only they declared the *whole* counsel of God tactfully! But instead of tactfully preaching the whole truth, they "tactfully" keep back truths which would bless their hearers, and shun to declare the whole counsel of God, thus proving unfaithful both to man and to God.

This was not the spirit of the apostle of grace. He had been entrusted with too glorious a message to keep any of it back. He recognized too keenly his obligation to men and his responsibility to God, to shun to declare unto them all God's counsel. To the Psalmist's words: "*I believed, and therefore have I spoken,*" the apostle could respond: "*We have the same spirit of faith.*"

"WE ALSO BELIEVE, AND THEREFORE SPEAK" (II Cor. 4:13).

And even when the test became hardest and he was held a prisoner in Rome, he was still determined to keep nothing back, and requested the prayers of other believers:

"... THAT UTTERANCE MAY BE GIVEN UNTO ME, THAT I MAY OPEN MY MOUTH BOLDLY, TO MAKE KNOWN THE MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL,

"FOR WHICH I AM AN AMBASSADOR IN BONDS: THAT THEREIN I MAY SPEAK BOLDLY, AS I OUGHT TO SPEAK" (Eph. 6:19,20).

Paul was one of the most tactful men of God the world has ever seen, but he did not confuse tact with faithlessness: he did not allow diplomacy to degenerate into duplicity. His one great passion was to make known "the gospel of the grace of God" in all its fulness (Acts 20:24) and in the fulfillment of this "ministry he displayed the very essence of tact, "*speaking the truth in love*" (Eph. 4:15).

Let us learn the lesson if we would serve our blessed Lord acceptably. We may avoid offending certain hearers by our mis-named "tact," and hope, that certain other hearers will draw the proper conclusions from what we so cautiously say, but in reality we will but deprive both our hearers and ourselves of further light on the Word by such unfaithfulness for, depend upon it, God will never give us further light on the Word until we stand true to the light we have already received.

May God give us all *"the spirit of faith."* May we join our voices with those of the Psalmist and the apostle, and say with them: *"WE ALSO BELIEVE, AND THEREFORE SPEAK."*

***A Prominent Bible Teacher
Warns the Christian Public
To Keep Us Out of the Pulpit***

Chapter II

DAD PROVIDES A TIE

As dad finished reading through a letter I had received from Dr. Barnhouse in 1937, he let out sort of a whistle and said with considerable feeling: "*The Christian public should know!*" This is where I got the title for a booklet I published two years later, in 1939. The text of most of this booklet follows in this chapter:

THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC SHOULD KNOW

"Therefore, seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not, but have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the Word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

-II Cor. 4:1,2.

In the earlier part of 1933 I had a discussion with Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse of Philadelphia about water baptism. Unavoidable circumstances terminated our discussion, but he promised that I would find a clear statement as to his stand on water baptism in the July issue of REVELATION.

I expected, of course, to find in the July issue, Dr. Barnhouse's Scriptural reasons for practicing water baptism. What was my astonishment to find instead, an editorial entitled *Dispensationalism Running Wild*, in which he linked our views with Bullingerism and advised those who arrange Bible conferences and select special speakers to be on guard, and refuse to invite those who hold these false views!

It was then that I wrote him the following letter:

July 10, 1933

Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse
P.O. Box 2000
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Brother Barnhouse:

It was a shock to me to read your editorial in REVELATION about "Dispensationalism Running Wild." You say that "Those who arrange Bible conferences and who select special speakers should be on guard, and refuse to invite those who hold these false views." One of the "false views" you mention is the belief that water baptism is not for this age.

Would you really want to gag the testimony of men who are fundamentally sound, just because they hold this view about water baptism? If so, what about the many other sound men who preach and practice water baptism in entirely different modes, and for entirely different reasons than you do?

With all the varied views as to this question, I do not see why a fundamental preacher should be refused an admittance into the Christian pulpit simply because he has another view on the ground that it would cause division. What about the division that already exists? Certainly there is no united testimony as to water baptism now.

It seems to me that in the ranks of those who practice water baptism there is nothing but confusion. It is a question on which many of the greatest Bible teachers of the world are divided. This condition certainly indicates that there is something wrong somewhere. For myself, I have felt for some time; long before I ever knew there was such a man as Bullinger, that water baptism was no more intended for this age, than tongues, or any of the other signs of which we read in the book of Acts.

What seems so illogical and unreasonable to me, is, that you should advocate shutting the mouths of fundamentally sound men just because they do not agree about water baptism with the hundreds of preachers who cannot even agree with each other!

I am sure that many of the readers of REVELATION would be very much interested to know whether you really mean what you seem to say in this editorial.

Wishing you the Lord's richest blessing in your ministry for Him, I am,

Yours in our soon-coming Lord,

s/ Cornelius R. Stam

Dr. Barnhouse acknowledged receipt of this letter and promised an answer by October, 1933.

More than six years have passed.

I am still waiting!

In May, 1937 I wrote a booklet entitled "Water Baptism," which found its way to Dr. Barnhouse's desk through a brother in Philadelphia. He read it the same day and wrote me the following letter: (*Italics mine*).

Nov. 4, 1937

Mr. Cornelius R. Stam
RFD #2, Lanetta

Paterson, N. J.

My dear Mr. Stam:

I received today your pamphlet on "Water Baptism" and have read it through carefully. You will pardon me if I write you very directly and candidly as a friend in Christ.

My first thought on completing it was that I could understand better Paul's statement that hands should be laid suddenly on no man, in other words that a novice should not be put into the place of teaching position, for I have seldom read anything that is more replete with false premises and falser conclusions than your leaflet. It is just one more expression of *Bullingerism* that has worked here in so many circles and has proved to be satanic in its divisive nature. At a time when all of those who believe should be united, why do you permit this *carnal thing* to come in to divide believers? For where I can go and stand in the pulpit of Calvary Baptist Church and have its pastor come and stand in my church and where we, disagreeing on the question of methods can have perfect harmony and fellowship as we do in so many thousands of baptisms,⁵ the theory you hold is so divisive that in my mind it is *sufficient grounds for a refusal of Christian fellowship*. If my memory serves me well, a good many years ago you wrote me a letter disagreeing with a statement I made that anyone who held Bullingerism should not be invited to speak on our Bible conference programs. I had no idea that you were tainted with the *horrible thing* at that time.

Perhaps you say to yourself "not so fast. Instead of speaking like that point out to me where I'm wrong," and this it is most easy to do. From Page nine on you speak of Paul's silence and use that as an argument against water baptism in this dispensation. I would refer you to Dr. Machen's gigantic book on the "Virgin Birth," where he takes up the claim of, the Modernists that Christ is not born of a Virgin because Paul is silent on that point also. Dr. Machen shows the whole argument to be puerile in the highest degree and utterly untenable. With great scholarly logic he simply devastates the position of this argument from silence, until no one who would wish to be considered intelligent in logic would hold to it for a second. *That whole section of your book then is entirely childish.*

You seek to consider baptism in the same light as tongues, miraculous signs and circumcision without quoting in any way the fact that the order to baptize was very clearly linked up with a promise that was coexistent with the order, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the age."

The further argument concerning Paul's thankfulness that he had baptized so few, especially I Cor. 1:17 which you put in boldface type, also falls down because of the very special nature of Paul's ministry. Paul was born for the gospel, separated from his mother's womb unto it. Christ did not send him to baptize any more than He sent him to be married and found a family, though in other parts of the Bible it is clearly taught that it

⁵ It is difficult to understand what Dr. Barnhouse means here. Probably it is a typing error.

is not good for man to be alone. Paul had a special position with reference to his particular ministry. The fact that he baptized some shows that baptism was current and there could be no doubt at all that all in Corinth were baptized but that the actual baptizing had been done by the lesser disciples.

We quite agree that the one baptism refers to the baptism of the Holy Spirit and that Romans 6 is also connected with the Spirit's baptism, but *just as there was one sacrifice which could be represented by the covering of Adam and Eve with skins, by the death of a lamb, by the death of a dove, by the offering up of Isaac and many other ways, so the one baptism of the Holy Spirit can readily be symbolized by the water ceremony no matter how it is performed.*

I pray you most earnestly to withdraw this ill-advised booklet and do not further disturb the weak ones for whom Christ died. In the name of the Lord I tell you, you will be held responsible for such a thing at the judgment seat of Christ.

With kindest regards I am,

Yours most sincerely,

s/ Donald Grey Barnhouse

Here is one of the outstanding fundamental preachers of the country. He thunders at me because my Scriptural arguments threaten his theories as to water baptism. Yet he apparently has little or no clear light on the subject himself, for he actually adds his blessing upon the utter confusion that exists, and argues for "the water ceremony NO MATTER HOW IT IS PERFORMED"!

Our reply, dated Nov. 11, 1937, reads in part as follows:

Dear Brother Barnhouse:

....

Why do you assail me so bitterly now? You knew my position more than four years ago and did nothing to rescue me from what you call a "horrible thing." I do not think you are fair to rebuke me so sternly now.

I told you my stand some five years ago as Arthur Van Houten and I took you to Newark. Then you called it "hellish heresy" but seemed to want me to believe it was hellish without having refuted it from Scripture. And on July 10, 1933 I wrote you a letter in regard to this very matter, to which you did not even reply. I am enclosing a copy. Why did you fail to show a younger brother where he was wrong? I can only assume it was because you could not. This is certain that if I have gone into heresy, you and many of my older brethren in Christ are to blame, for you did not lift a finger to save me from it.

....

You say the theory I hold is so divisive that you consider it sufficient grounds for a refusal of Christian fellowship, and address me "Mr. Stam" instead of "Brother Cornelius."⁶ Do you not think you are going much too far? What, just what, makes this theory as divisive? Is it our preaching it or your fighting it? You have freely presented your views among those who differ with you, yet you would refuse me the same privilege and even disfellowship me because I state my views. And all this while you yourself are denominationally affiliated with men who deny the very fundamentals of the Truth.

If you want to scare me into silence, please don't shout, Booh!" I did not publish this booklet on the impulse of the moment. I believed these things ten years before I wrote. In those ten years I had an opportunity such as few have had to hear Bible teachers from everywhere, including yourself. Yet the conviction grew on me that water baptism 'has no place whatever in God's program for this age. You can understand, then, that such a letter as yours can have little effect upon me. You call this teaching "carnal" and "satanic" and "hellish heresy" and "Bullingerism" and a "horrible thing," but I know too well that these terms are only used for lack of Scriptural argument. If you had Scriptural arguments which you considered strong enough to present I am sure you would bombard me with them instead of with evil-sounding phrases. If you really want to scare me, show me from the Word of God that I am wrong, and I assure you that I will "tremble at His Word."

I think we are justified in using Paul's silence as an argument against water baptism in this dispensation. I agree, of course, with Dr. Machen's contention, but there is no parallel there, at least none that I can see, though I do "wish to be considered intelligent in logic." There *would* be a parallel if I maintained that water baptism never was in place in any age. Have I made myself clear?

It is true that Paul does not mention the virgin birth of Christ, but other writers do, and that settles it. But Paul was "the apostle of the Gentiles" (Rom. 11:13). He calls his message "My gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began" (Rom. 16:25). According to Eph. 3:1-8 and Col. 1:24-26 he was appointed to make known the truth for this dispensation, which had been hid from those going before. This message was not committed to the twelve (Gal. 2:7-9). This means, it seems to me, that we must go to Paul's writings to find what God has to say to the Body of Christ in particular.

It does not seem logical to take baptism from the Pentecostal program and condemn tongues and miracles as being dispensationally out of order. I do not "seek to consider baptism in the same light. as tongues, miraculous signs and circumcision." I only say that they all belonged to a past dispensation when God was dealing with His earthly people. I think if you had considered my argument more carefully and with a more open mind, it would not have seemed so "entirely childish."

...

⁶ As he had always addressed me previously.

Your comments on I Cor. 1:17 are not very enlightening. I agree that Paul was separated from his mother's womb unto the gospel, but so were the twelve, though they do not say so in his words. Yet *they* were sent to baptize while Paul was not. *Why?* Is it not significant that the twelve who *were* sent to preach the "gospel of the circumcision" were sent to baptize, while Paul, who was sent with the "gospel of the uncircumcision" *was not* sent to baptize?

You speak of disturbing the weak ones for whom Christ died. I know of no surer way to build them up than by the study of the Word (Acts 20:32). Then, you call this teaching carnal, but is it carnal to teach that we are "complete in Christ"? It seems to me that the many unscriptural baptisms being practiced today are carnal, and even you must admit that most of them are unscriptural.

Why not be more considerate of the views of others? Remember, we really believe this, or we would not teach it. Your article of four years ago, when boiled down, sounds like this: "Be careful or doors will be closed, and we are the ones who close them"! And your letter of the 4th is as unreasonable, or more so.

As long as I have the Word of God on my side you cannot hurt me, so I beg you to reconsider your threat to disfellowship me, and to consider me still what I really am,

Your brother in Christ,

s/ Cornelius R. Stam

A few days later the following note came from Dr. Barnhouse:

Nov. 17, 1937

Dear Friend:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter and to promise you an answer at some length in the near future.

Yours very truly,

s/ Donald Grey Barnhouse

BUT: Two years have passed and his answer has not arrived.

Why doesn't Dr. Barnhouse fulfill his promises?

If he feels I teach "hellish heresy" he must surely have some Scripture to refute it. If he is sincere in his desire for unity among believers why does he immediately proceed to disfellowship a brother instead of seeking to show him the error of his way? Dr.

Barnhouse was a friend of the family for many years, and invariably called me simply "Neill," or "Brother Neill." But water baptism, the great divider, has come between us " and now he addresses me coldly as "Mr. Stam, and "Dear Friend! His error is an old one. He has made *water baptism* a basis for Christian fellowship instead of *the blood of Christ*. He well knows that I am fundamentally as sound as he, but he cannot answer my questions nor show me from Scripture why I should submit to his vague baptism theories, so he disfellowships me and seeks to induce others to do the same.

...

We want peace, but not at the price of truth. God knows, I have nothing personal against the brethren who so bitterly Oppose me. I wish we could enjoy fellowship again, but *they* disfellowship me while they talk of peace! They want the kind of peace that says: "Don't let's talk about this subject. It will only cause trouble." But such peace is superficial indeed. We want the kind of peace that says: "Let's discuss this thing in love with open Bibles and see if we can't remove the *cause* of the trouble." When that has been accomplished the Church of Christ will be more solidly united than ever and its testimony infinitely more powerful. Then indeed we shall be able to "*stand fast in one Spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel*" (Phil. 1:27).

Has there not been division over this subject long enough? When God in His grace sends forth light from His Word, shall believers, and even Bible teachers shut their eyes to it?

How believers from the various denominations love to get together at Bible conferences and evangelistic meetings! How they rejoice in the fellowship! One can hear them on every side, telling how blessed it is that Baptists and Presbyterians and Methodists who love the Lord can all be together as one. But why must the fellowship end with the Bible conference?⁷ If we are *positionally* one in Christ, why can't we be *practically* so?

Before we can be, some Christian leaders will have to be willing at least to listen when a Scriptural remedy is offered. They must be willing to give it a hearing and put it to the Berean test.

The divisions over water baptism have done as much damage on the missionary field as at home. Faith boards must be careful whom they send out together. Two men may be just fitted to work together in a certain field, but they cannot be sent out together because they do not agree in the matter of water baptism. Even the members of our greatest faith missionary boards hold conflicting views.

How soon these things would be remedied; how great would be the blessing to the Church if our leaders would honestly face this question! If our attack on the practice of water baptism in this age is contrary to Scripture, they need not fear it, but if it is true to the Word they can never hope to stand before it, no matter what their tactics may be.

⁷ Since this written the Church has declined so much further that few such Bible conferences are held.

How can we expect to receive more light on the Word if we refuse the light that is given to us? How can we take the *next* step until we have taken *this* one? How can we make progress standing still? Or is there no more progress to be made?

In Matt. 13:52 we read that a good scribe will bring forth from his treasures "*things new and old.*" Modernism casts away precious treasures of the Bible complaining that they are old and out of date. But the Fundamental Church, while clinging tenaciously to old truth, is rejecting new light. While mere professors cast away old truths merely because they are old, true believers too often reject new light just because it is new! They vie with each other to be orthodox instead of vying to find more light from the Word of God.

Has the Church *drained* the Well of Scripture dry? Are there no more precious stones in that exhaustless Mine? Have we received *all* the light that shines from the Bible? Is it not possible that the Church as a whole has made a mistake? Has she not made many before?

Then, cost what it may, let us be pioneers, like Luther and Darby and Scofield, those honored scribes who brought forth out of the treasure-house of Scripture things new as well as things old.

Almost immediately after publishing *The Christian Public Should Know*, we received from Dr. Barnhouse an angry letter stating: "I hereby formally demand that you withdraw your leaflet from public circulation and destroy all copies."

We did not feel led to comply with this demand, and in the years that followed we received letters from friends in many parts of the country informing us that Dr. Barnhouse was warning his hearers publicly against us and our teachings. Some of these friends went up to Dr. Barnhouse after meetings in which he had spoken, to protest against his misrepresentations, which were now becoming more serious in nature, for according to Dr. Barnhouse we didn't believe in the Lord's supper, we believed in soul sleep, in universal reconciliation, etc. These protests did not stop him, however, from continuing his campaign of slander.

What a shame that Bible truths which should be freely discussed by believers everywhere, should be suppressed and even misrepresented by leaders who esteem their positions of higher value than the Word Of God.

With the passage of time men often change in their attitudes, and we had prayed that this might be the case with Dr. Barnhouse, but toward the end of 1954 we were grieved to learn certain facts which gave alarming witness to what happens when one refuses light from the Word of God. We dealt with this in the following brief article published in March, 1955:

DR. BARNHOUSE APOLOGIZES BUT TO WHOM?

More than twenty years ago, when the Modernist-Fundamentalist battle raged in the Presbyterian Church, USA, many faithful men of God left the denomination rather than remain yoked together with unbelievers. Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse of Philadelphia's *Tenth Presbyterian Church*, however, stayed.

At that time he wrote an editorial aimed at us, in which he said with regard to our views on baptism: "Those who arrange Bible conferences and who select special speakers should be on guard and refuse to invite those who hold these false views" (*Revelation*, July, 1933).

Thus he sought to gag the testimony of men fundamentally sound in the faith, because they did not agree about water baptism with the hundreds of preachers who cannot even yet agree with each other - and that while he himself was still denominationally affiliated with men who denied the very fundamentals of the Christian faith.

....

Now Dr. Barnhouse is still farther from us and still closer to men who deny the basic doctrines of Christianity, for after all these years he has apologized to the Presbytery for a technical breach of church law in failing to make his charges of heresy in the Presbyterian Church through the proper channels, and has expressed a desire to work in closer fellowship with it. His statement to the Presbytery reads in part as follows:

There have been personal differences over the years. In my earlier years I fought against anything I thought had in it a small percentage of error.

But while outwardly critical of some of the church's program, I have always considered myself to be a Presbyterian, and I am in the Presbyterian Church because I think that its theology and polity are closest to that which is set forth in the New Testament.

In the moment of the Presbytery's greatest controversy⁸ I accepted every ruling of the Presbytery and bowed to its decisions. However, I have come to realize that some of my personal relationships have suffered because of these past differences and I now recognize that this has been a mistake.

It is perhaps saddest of all to read the report in the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* (Nov. 12, 1954) that "the Presbytery, in an open-arm gesture of welcome, has unanimously endorsed a series of television programs prepared by Dr. Barnhouse to be produced by the *National Council of Churches Broadcasting and Film Commission*."

⁸ When Dr. Machen was suspended by the General Assembly in connection with his stand for the fundamentals; an action which Dr. Barnhouse then called "iniquity" and "blasphemy."

Whether this select TV opportunity with a Modernist organization had anything to do with Dr. Barnhouse's apology to the Presbytery we do not know, but we do know that this will attach him still more closely to Modernists, pinks and worse. He will shine here, but not before the judgment seat of Christ.

We write these lines not to discredit Dr. Barnhouse, but as a warning to those who would oppose truths they cannot answer by the Scriptures. Dr. Barnhouse has consistently tried by bluff and intimidation, by name-calling and false report, to still the voices of those who stand for "the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery." He has harassed them relentlessly for more than twenty years. In doing so, however, he himself has not gone forward, but backward, spiritually, as will all who, whatever their motives, set themselves to hinder the recovery of truth.

After his apology to the Presbytery Dr. Barnhouse began receiving letters from our friends, asking him whether he did not feel it inconsistent to have apologized to the Presbytery for a *technical* mistake during a controversy over Modernism, while allowing his public misrepresentations of true believers in the "grace movement" to stand and gain ground. Some prominent men of God wrote him at that time that they felt he owed us a public apology, especially since so many others had followed his lead in publicly misrepresenting our teachings.

The result was that Dr. Barnhouse did write an editorial on the subject which caused me to respond with the following article in the *Berean Searchlight* of May, 1958:

IS THE TIDE TURNING?

An editorial appearing in the April issue of *Eternity*, under the heading "*Are We Guilty?*" has brought us a considerable amount of correspondence.

The general feeling is that, after having misrepresented our doctrinal position for twenty-five years, Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse now publishes an editorial "apology" which actually confuses the issue and gives the impression that he is *not* guilty, charging us still with "hyper-dispensationalism" and with leaving the "main stream of Christianity" to get into "doctrinal sidetracks and error."

In response let us first say that we cannot expect everything at once. Dr. Barnhouse does say: ... their [doctrinal] statement declares that there should be no observance of baptism in this age. A group in England denies both baptism and communion, and I regrettably confused the two."

He also says: "Mr. Stam informs me that he and the 'grace movement' do not hold other errors attributed to them. They do not believe in conditional immortality, annihilation, or universal reconciliation. I am glad to record these facts here in order to correct any misinformation which I may have formerly believed and disseminated."

Finally, he says: "I am truly sorry if I hurt any of, them by misquoting their beliefs, for they are brethren in Christ, members of His Body.... We regret that we have misunderstood some of the teachings of the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* and hope that this statement will help to clear up any ill feelings which may have existed because of these past misunderstandings."

In all this we feel that Dr. Barnhouse has taken a step for which those of the "Grace Movement" should be grateful. Perhaps his action will serve as an example to men like Dr. Martin R. De Haan, Dr. E. Schuyler English and Dr. John R. Rice, who have publicly and repeatedly misrepresented our teachings despite our earnest protests.

We have often wondered what could be done to turn off this fantastic flow of falsehood by which our adversary has relentlessly opposed the truth of the mystery. Perhaps the Lord will use this one example to turn the tide of untruth.

As to the remainder of Dr. Barnhouse's editorial, it must in fairness be maintained that *the reason* why "many Christians" believe that we hold "a hyper-dispensational form of doctrine," as he says, is because he and other evangelical leaders have publicly and persistently proclaimed this to be so for many years. If Dr. Barnhouse, as it seems, *still* believes this to be so, he should now show in what respects our doctrines are hyper-dispensational, for we believe basically in the seven dispensations, just as he does.

We must also insist that Dr. Barnhouse is in error when he states that we have left "the main stream of Christianity." Have we done this by proclaiming the sufficiency of the "one baptism" by which the Holy Spirit has united us all into "one body"? Surely there is no "main stream" where the doctrine of water baptism is concerned, for the Church has never been more completely divided on the subject. We have not left the main stream of Christianity or the Church. We have consistently proclaimed the doctrine of the "one body" and have declared our *feeling* of oneness with all believers, whether in or out of the various denominations.

It is rather Dr. Barnhouse and other champions of denominationalism who, unwilling to face up to the Scriptural doctrine of the "ONE body" and its "ONE baptism," have misrepresented us in an effort to separate us from the main stream of believers.

In this same issue of *Eternity* Dr. Barnhouse writes on "*Finding Fellowship With Pentecostals.*" The first sub-heading reads: "*Pentecostal Leaders Express 95 Per Cent Agreement With the Editors,*" and Dr. Barnhouse indicates that he feels this to be so.

Now this is remarkable in the light of Dr. Barnhouse's editorial about us. In 1955 we attended the annual convention of the *Assemblies of God* (with whom Dr. Barnhouse has now found fellowship) in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The theme of the convention that year, displayed on a large banner, was: *EVANGELISM.*

The "evangelist" for that night scarcely mentioned the Lord Jesus Christ. He said *nothing* about salvation through His shed blood, but after many acrobatics and much screaming that his hearers "needed God," "needed to get the devil knocked out of them," "needed the Holy Ghost," etc., he gave no invitation to come forward - not even mentioning faith in Christ.

Around us sat a group of men shouting "hallelujah" and "praise the Lord," as waves of noisy emotional expression swept over the audience. At this point we took a slip of paper and wrote: "*Is this evangelism? The preacher has not even told them that Christ died for their sins.*" We handed this to one of the men seated near us and noted that he and his neighbor read it carefully and that it was then handed down the row until it disappeared out of sight.

We visited the convention the second night. This time another evangelist *did* proclaim salvation through the finished work of Christ, though this may have had no connection with our note. The second evangelist however, did not get the same response from his audience. He would leap into the air and spin around, crying: "This overwhelms me." but it did not seem to overwhelm his audience. They wanted a full scale tongues and healing demonstration.

Suddenly stopping, the evangelist finally asked all present to get down on their knees and pray. This writer and his friends chose not to join in the bedlam we knew would follow. A great flood tide of human emotion was released, as some prayed, some sang, some moaned, some chanted, some lifted their hands or pounded with their fists and many spoke in "tongues." All was confusion.

In front of us, and now facing us, was an average-looking man who gave clear evidence that it was *not* the Spirit of God who controlled him as he spoke in "tongues." Clearly possessed by some power outside himself, he kept alternately uttering some sort of jibberish and repeating "Save souls, save souls, save souls, save souls," perhaps a dozen times, so fast that he could scarcely be understood.

It is true that, not being able to understand what this man spoke in "tongues" we could not prove that he was not intelligently doing so. But we *could* understand the English as, like a man out of his mind, he rattled on with his "save souls."

Now this was not an exceptional case in some particular Pentecostal assembly. This was the annual convention of the *Assemblies of God*. If we know Dr. Barnhouse's views at all, he believes that the "tongues" and healing sessions and much of the fanaticism and confusion which characterize the services of the *Assemblies of God*, are of Satan. Yet he now finds himself in 95% agreement with them doctrinally! As a friend of ours wrote to him recently: "If you gentlemen found yourselves in 95% agreement with the Pentecostals I am sure that after a discussion with the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* you would find yourselves 99.9% in agreement."

In the light of all this we should like to know just what Dr. Barnhouse feels is so

seriously wrong with our views that they should place us outside the main stream of Christianity, while the Pentecostals should be included in it. Also, how Dr. Barnhouse can now overlook unscriptural delusions of such serious nature, to find closer fellowship with Pentecostals than he does with us.

The interesting fact is that we possess, as Dr. Barnhouse does not, the Scriptural answer to the delusions of Pentecostalism. Our contention that water baptism is not in God's program for today is based upon the fact that the Body of Christ did not begin, historically, with Peter and the eleven at Pentecost, but later, with Paul. This, Dr. Barnhouse calls "hyper-dispensationalism," but what answer does *he* have for his big 5% disagreement with the Pentecostal movement? He himself believes that the Body began at Pentecost under the so-called "great commission." In the light of this he cannot blame sincere believers for seeking to recover the kind of power that was displayed at Pentecost in fulfillment of our Lord's declaration: "*And these signs shall follow them that believe* (Mark 16:17,18).

It is our earnest prayer that the commendable step which Dr. Barnhouse has taken with regard to the "grace movement" will be followed by another: a sincere and thorough investigation of its Scriptural position, for this most certainly has never been *answered*. Should he deal with it again in writing, without such an investigation, he will be back where he started, back with those who misrepresent views which they have never thoroughly investigated and cannot meet with Scripture. A candid investigation of the facts on the other hand, should convince him that we are *not* "hyper-dispensationalists" and have *not* "left the main stream of Christianity."

After this article appeared it was *our* turn to receive letters from Fundamentalist brethren who asked whether we felt it would be right for us to have fellowship with one who remained unequally yoked with those who denied the of the faith and - were we *seeking* such fellowship with Dr. Barnhouse? We dealt with this question in the following article appearing in the *Searchlight* of June, 1958:

CAN WE HAVE FELLOWSHIP WITH DR. BARNHOUSE?

An increasing number of Christian friends are asking us whether we can consistently have fellowship with Dr. Barnhouse, not merely because of his dealings with us, but because of his continued association with Modernists.

This is a serious question, indeed, for during all the twenty-five years in which Dr. Barnhouse has warned the Christian public against us, he himself has remained unequally yoked together with Modernist unbelievers, and it is only recently that he wrote an article on the oneness of the Body of Christ, *including Modernists in that Body*.

We have thought this question over in the light of the Word for many years and our conclusion, we fear, will run counter to the feelings of many who have written us about

the matter.

The fact is that Dr. Barnhouse himself stands for all the great fundamentals of the faith and must therefore be considered a brother in Christ. Any *active* fellowship with him would, however, be tinged with concern over his inconsistency in encouraging those who deny the Word of God and the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Why Dr. Barnhouse remains in fellowship with Modernists is a question he himself must answer before God, who searches all hearts.

As to Dr. Barnhouse's present quest for wider fellowship, it will help clear up the questions which many are asking if he will state and demonstrate whether he really wants to enjoy *mutual* fellowship with the various groups he has been including in his orbit, or whether he merely desires the one-sided sort of fellowship that will procure him speaking engagements in the churches of those whom he would never invite to speak at Tenth Presbyterian Church.

This question is to the point, but valid, and it will be up to him to demonstrate that his wider fellowship campaign is not merely a device to widen his own sphere of speaking engagements. This will at the same time prove that his offer to us of the right hand of fellowship, is more than a gesture, as so many of our friends seem to think it is.

The above question was after all a theoretical one, for Dr. Barnhouse kept making it plain in various ways that he had no intention of allowing anyone from the so-called "grace movement" into his fellowship.

As far as *editorial* comment was concerned, he now refrained from misrepresenting us publicly BUT less than two years later there appeared in his magazine, ETERNITY, a bitter attack on the "grace movement" by his friend Pastor Ray C. Stedman of Palo Alto, California. This attack contained several of the old misrepresentations and some new ones, but it did at least contain numerous Scripture passages, with which we could deal in the following article, dated April, 1960:

LIGHT REJECTED

And

CONFUSION WORSE CONFOUNDED

"...the gospel of the glory of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust."

-The Apostle Paul in I Tim. 1:11 (R.V.).

UNANSWERABLE TRUTH

When Pastor J. C. O'Hair and others of us first took our stand for the distinctive

character of Paul's apostleship, as the apostle of the present dispensation, we were subjected to a steady barrage of oral and written attacks by those who, though themselves so divided on the details involved, were sure we were unscriptural in our views.

Through the years, however, this truth has proved to be the one basic Scriptural fact which, if accepted, would go farthest to dispel the doctrinal confusion which has so long gripped the Church of Christ. For more than half a century it has stood not barely, but *easily* - against every form of opposition, from sincere Scriptural investigation to false report.

We thank God for the constantly growing numbers of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ who have come to know Him in a deeper way through an understanding of the glorious "mystery" revealed to and through Paul.

It is not strange that those who oppose the truth of "the mystery," with its "one Body" and "one baptism," consistently avoid those who stand for it. It is not strange that so many spiritual leaders are loathe to *discuss* these issues over an open Bible. And as to public debate, this, of course, is the last thing they would consider. Yet when Great Britain was at her strongest, spiritually, the great Dean Howson rejoiced that the Scriptural issues of his day were being "eagerly debated all over the land." He rejoiced that his believing countrymen were *discussing* the Scriptures frankly and openly. This vigorous interest in the Word was both the source and the sign of Britain's strength.

Sad to say, the majority of believers today frown on controversy over the Word in any form. They have been taught to frown upon it by those whose foundations are so weak, Scripturally, that they dare not enter into it, and so find themselves in the same untenable position as those who sought to avoid controversy in Luther's day and Darby's day. The battle for truth raged, but they, poor soldiers of Jesus Christ, did not even take the Sword of the Spirit out of its scabbard.

....

Strange it is that when the so-called "Grace Movement" was in its infancy, we were "dealt with" in the columns of the majority of Fundamentalist periodicals, while now, that the *Grace Gospel Fellowship*, *Milwaukee Bible College*,⁹ *Berean Bible Society* and several other "grace" organizations have been added to the original *Worldwide Grace Testimony*; now that our numbers have increased and the "threat" of our "false teachings" is greater than ever, few indeed attempt to answer us. Are these shepherds no longer concerned with the spiritual welfare of their sheep? Their silence is strange, we say, except for the fact that their arguments have proved so simple to answer and that misrepresentations of our teachings have only hurt *them*.

RECENT ASSAULT

⁹ Now Grace Bible College, Grand Rapids, Mich.

One recent assault on the distinctive character of Paul's ministry has appeared in the February issue of *Eternity* magazine. Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse, its Editor in Chief, has long since ceased trying to answer our teachings, but in this issue Pastor Ray C. Stedman of Palo Alto, California, tries it for him. His article demonstrates how weak the general Fundamentalist¹⁰ Position is on Pauline truth.

STRAW DUMMY

Pastor Stedman begins by inferring that in our view the ministries and messages of Paul and the twelve were "largely conflicting." We have *never* taught this. We *have* taught that Paul received a *further* revelation which superseded that previously committed to the twelve.

Our brother needed something to knock down, so he found it necessary to set up a straw dummy. It is like the old argument still used by many today, that Paul's gospel of salvation by faith alone is a repudiation of the law. But Paul himself said, by the Spirit:

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law" (Rom. 3:31).

Like Paul, we of course believe that what the twelve taught during our Lord's earthly ministry and through Pentecost, was true, but we also believe that "the gospel of the kingdom" and "the gospel of the circumcision" have now been superseded by a further divine revelation: "*the gospel of the grace of God,*" committed to Paul.

We have explained all this scores of times in our published writings - which raises in our minds the serious question: Do these men really *wish* to know what we believe and teach?

DID THE TWELVE PROCLAIM CHRIST'S DEATH AS GOOD NEWS?

In his article, Pastor Stedman proceeds to state that under the "great commission" the apostles at Pentecost "began to proclaim the good news of Christ's death." For this statement he does not and cannot offer the slightest confirmation from Scripture. Nor can he show us one passage in all five records of the so-called "great commission," directing the apostles to proclaim Christ's death as *good news*.

Let our readers consider the following declarations by one of the twelve during the Pentecostal era, and see for themselves whether these men spoke of Christ's death as good news, or offered it as a basis for salvation.

In his great Pentecostal address, Peter *accused* his hearers of having crucified their

¹⁰ We do not by any means repudiate Fundamentalism. We rather feel that our leaders have been woefully weak on one of the most important fundamentals of the faith: salvation by grace through faith in the finished work of Christ alone. This truth they have qualified and neutralized by confusing the Pentecostal message with Paul's "gospel of the grace of God."

Messiah, saying:

"Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, YE HAVE TAKEN, AND BY WICKED HANDS HAVE CRUCIFIED AND SLAIN" (Acts 2:23).

"Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made THAT SAME JESUS, WHOM YE HAVE CRUCIFIED, both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36).

This passage further records the response of Peter's hearers to his accusation:

"Now when they heard this, THEY WERE PRICKED IN THEIR REART, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, MEN AND BRETHREN, WHAT SHALL WE DO?" (Ver. 37).

Did Peter now offer them salvation by grace through faith, saying that Christ had died *for* them? In no wise. On the contrary we read:

"Then Peter said unto them, REPENT, AND BE BAPTIZED EVERY ONE OF YOU IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost", (Ver. 38).

Mark the striking contrast between this and Paul's glorious proclamation of grace some years later:

"Being JUSTIFIED FREELY BY HIS GRACE, THROUGH THE REDEMPTION THAT IS IN CHRIST JESUS: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS . . . TO DECLARE, I SAY, AT THIS TIME HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS: THAT HE MIGHT BE JUST, AND THE JUSTIFIER OF HIM THAT BELIEVETH IN JESUS" (Rom. 3:24-26).

We submit that there is a vast difference between Peter demanding repentance and baptism for the remission of sins at Pentecost, and Paul offering Christ's righteousness for the remission of sins years later. And there is a vast difference between the "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*" of the so-called "great commission" and God as "*the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus*" as later proclaimed by Paul.

Paul's message does not blame the sinner for his part in the death of Christ, or demand submission to some ritual as a sign of repentance. Rather he declares that ...

"WE HAVE REDEMPTION THROUGH HIS BLOOD, THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS ACCORDING TO THE RICHES OF HIS GRACE" (Eph. 1:7).

In Acts 3:13,14; 4:10,11 and 5:30 we further find Peter *accusing* his hearers of the crucifixion of Christ. Never once, before the raising up of Paul, did he say: "Christ died for you; believe on the Lord JESUS Christ and you will be saved."

Surely our brother ought either to produce Scriptures to the contrary or acknowledge that the twelve did *not* preach Christ's death as good news prior to the raising up of Paul.

PAUL'S CURSE

Next, Pastor Stedman, seeking to prove that Paul received by revelation "the same gospel proclaimed by the twelve," says: "Either Paul's gospel is the same as that of the Great Commission, or the twelve were in great danger of falling under Paul's curse." (i.e., in [Gal. 1:8,9](#)).

Here the blind spot in our brother's spiritual vision again appears. Paul's message was a *further* revelation of divine truth. As "the apostle of the Gentiles," he had been proclaiming this gospel *among the Gentiles*. When Judaizers came from Jerusalem to Antioch, seeking to bring these Gentile believers under circumcision and the law, Paul and Barnabas had "no small dissension and disputation with them," and finally they went up to Jerusalem, with Titus, to deal with the leaders there about this matter. After much further disputing, the great council there concluded that *the Gentiles* were not to be subjected to Moses' law. They did not, however, come to any such conclusion with regard to themselves. This is evident, not only from the records in Acts 15 and Gal. 2, but from their own testimony years later, when they said to Paul:

"Thou seest, brother, HOW MANY THOUSANDS OF JEWS THERE ARE WHICH BELIEVE; AND THEY ARE ALL ZEALOUS OF THE LAW" (Acts 21:20).

"AS TOUCHING THE GENTILES WHICH BELIEVE, WE HAVE WRITTEN AND CONCLUDED THAT THEY OBSERVE NO SUCH THING" (Acts 21:25).

In view of the fact, then, that Paul's further revelation had not yet been vouchsafed to the Jews of Judaea, it is not strange that he should write to the Gentiles: "*If any man preach any other gospel unto YOU ... let him be accursed.*" This would place no curse upon those at Jerusalem who were still going on under the law, as Pastor Stedman contends.

We are loathe to leave this part of Pastor Stedman's article without pressing upon *him* the gravity of this warning by Paul. How serious a matter it would be today to proclaim any other gospel than that which Paul has delivered to us! How important to make certain that our message conforms to the very "form of sound words" received by revelation through him! How the apostle's curse has been reaped by the Church, weak, confused and divided as ever! For himself, this writer will never cease to thank God for the time when Gal. 1:8,9 first came home to his heart.

THE FAITH WHICH ONCE HE DESTROYED

In his whole article our brother advances only one passage of Scripture to prove that Paul had the same gospel as that which the twelve proclaimed. This passage is Gal.

1:22,23, where the apostle, writing about those who had learned of his conversion, says: "They had heard only, That he which persecuted us in times past now *preacheth the faith which once he destroyed*" (Pastor Stedman's italics).

Perhaps if we underlined the first four words of this quotation it would help our brother to see that Paul here discusses "only" what "they had heard" about him. He should also consider that, even if they heard correctly, this passage is concerned only with the very beginning of his ministry, when the apostle had first learned and proclaimed that his former doubts about Christ had been falsely founded and that "Jesus is the Christ." Indeed, to the Jews everywhere the apostle continued to prove that "Jesus is the Christ." This is where he would have to begin with them before he could proclaim the gospel of the grace of God. To the very end Paul *confirmed* this message of Peter's - as we still do today. In this sense then, and to this degree, he preached the faith which once he destroyed.

NOT THE SAME

Quoting Paul's words in I Cor. 15:3,4: "*For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again. . . .*" Pastor Stedman comments:

"This is another forthright statement of the gospel Paul preached. Compare it with the words of Peter to the household of Cornelius. Isn't it the same simple, wonderful message of the grace of God, forgiving and reconciling sinners unto Himself on the basis of the death and resurrection of Christ?"

Any Berean among his readers who may have taken the trouble to compare Peter's message to Cornelius' household with Paul's words in I Cor. 15:3,4, would have to answer: "No, it is *not* the same." Peter did not tell his hearers that Christ had died for their sins. Instead there is the same note of accusation against Israel for her dealings with Christ: "*Whom they slew and hanged on a tree*" (Acts 10:39).

Without a doubt Peter, according to his commission, would again have instructed his hearers to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins had not God taken things out of his hands and shown that He wanted the Gentiles (and later *all*) to have salvation by grace alone, for,

"While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the Word.

"And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished (Acts 10:44,45).

WAS PAUL A BAPTIST?

Perhaps the most amazing statements in Pastor Stedman's incredible article are 1.) that Paul "habitually encouraged the baptism of his converts" and 2.) that "He baptized

in water because he was told to do so by the same Lord who had said to the other apostles: 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them. . . .'"

Think of this in the light of I Cor. 1:17, where the apostle emphatically declares that Christ had *not* sent him to baptize!

You ask how Pastor Stedman explains this declaration by Paul? He doesn't *mention* it in the whole of his article. He completely ignores this well-known passage, obviously so pertinent to the discussion!

Since our brother has omitted this important verse from his article, we should like to include it in ours - along with part of the next, which is even more vital to the discussion:

"For CHRIST SENT ME NOT TO BAPTIZE, BUT TO PREACH THE GOSPEL: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.

"For THE PREACHING OF THE CROSS IS ... THE POWER OF GOD."

OBSERVING THE ORDINANCES

But if the above statements by Pastor Stedman are the most amazing, then this following one is the strangest. He quotes 1 Cor. 11:2 ("*I praise you, brethren, that ye ... keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you.*") explaining that the word "ordinances" should have been translated "*traditions*" and then argues that Paul was probably praising the Corinthians for observing the Lord's supper and baptism! And all this while admitting that Paul had to *correct* the Corinthians for their disorderly conduct at the Lord's table! We still haven't been able to figure this one out!

COMPARING NOTES

But reading this article the reader receives surprise after surprise at the conclusions the author comes to. Pursuing his argument that Paul preached the same gospel as the twelve had preached, Pastor Stedman says concerning the great council at Jerusalem ([Gal. 2:1-10](#)) that this was an occasion such as the apostles at Jerusalem must have longed for, "to sit down with Paul and compare notes."

How far our brother is from the simple truth here can be seen from the record. In Gal. 2:2, Paul says:

"And I went up BY REVELATION...."

This can only mean that the Lord *sent* him up to Jerusalem.

But what for? To "compare notes" with the leaders there? Not at all. Read on:

"And I went up by revelation, AND COMMUNICATED UNTO THEM THAT GOSPEL

WHICH I PREACH AMONG THE GENTILES. . . ."

And was this the same gospel they had been preaching among the Jews? The remainder of the verse indicates that it was not, but that it was rather something with regard to which he had to *persuade* them.

"BUT [I WENT] PRIVATELY TO THEM WHICH WERE OF REPUTATION, LEST BY ANY MEANS I SHOULD RUN, OR HAD RUN, IN VAIN."

This would not have been necessary had his gospel been the same as theirs. And then the apostle shows how he was *opposed* by some who were brought in, but "*gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour*" (Ver. 5).

Finally, we read in Verses 7 and 9 that the leaders "saw" and "perceived," and that James, Cephas and John gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, recognizing Paul as the one to whom God had committed "the gospel of the uncircumcision." Thus the apostle won an important battle for Christ and for the message of grace.

How all this annihilates any idea that Paul and the apostles at Jerusalem sat down "to compare notes" and found that they had all been preaching the same thing!

DOUBLE TALK

Our poor, confused brother really goes into double talk when he deals with Gal. 2:7, where Paul states that "*they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter.*"

What does the apostle mean by "the gospel of the circumcision," committed to Peter, and "the gospel of the uncircumcision," committed to Paul? The rest of the verse, he says, explains that this involved only a "division of labor," not a "difference in message." But then why are these gospels labelled differently? Read his explanation:

When Scripture distinguishes various aspects of the gospel, it uses a qualifying phrase which invariably means "about." For instance, the gospel of the kingdom means the gospel *about* the kingdom, never *to* the kingdom or *for* the kingdom. The gospel of the grace of God means the gospel *about* the grace of God. The gospel of peace means the good news *about* peace, etc.

We interrupt the quotation here to point out that the phrases "the gospel of the uncircumcision" and that "of the circumcision" in Gal. 2:7 are *precisely* the same both in the Greek and in the English, as in the cases he mentions above. Therefore, according to Pastor Stedman's own argument, the phrases in Gal. 2:7 mean "the gospel *about* the uncircumcision" and that "*about* the circumcision." It cannot mean "the gospel *to* the uncircumcision" or that "*to* the circumcision."

But after building up this argument about "the gospel of the kingdom" and "the gospel of the grace of God," read what he goes on to say about Gal. 2:7:

But the phrases, "the gospel of the circumcision" and "the gospel of the uncircumcision," certainly cannot mean the good news about the circumcision or uncircumcision! They can only signify "the gospel *to* or *for* the circumcision or the uncircumcision."

If this is not double talk this writer will have to consult his dictionary again. Pastor O'Hair once wrote to one of his opponents that as a boy, at the circus, he had seen a man riding two horses at the same time - but never two horses going in opposite directions!

Can Pastor Stedman not see that according to his own argument, if Gal. 2:7 should read "the gospel to the uncircumcision" and that "*to* the circumcision," then assuredly Matt. 4:23 should read "the gospel to the kingdom" and Acts 20:24 should read "the gospel *to* the grace of God"?

If he intended to twist Gal. 2:7 in this way why did he even bring up the argument about the Scriptures *distinguishing* these messages by using a phrase which means "about" and *not* "to"?!

The interesting fact is that *even if* the word "of" in Gal. 2:7 might be rendered "to" (as it *cannot*) it would still not indicate that the two messages were the same. If God sent the twelve with a message "to" the Jews and then sent Paul with a message "to" the Gentiles, would this indicate that the messages were the same?

GOOD NEWS?

We wonder why our brother has concluded that Paul could not have been referring to the *good news* about the circumcision and the uncircumcision. Was Peter not proclaiming good news when he declared that through the Circumcision all nations were to be blessed? (See [Acts 3:25,26](#)). And was not Paul proclaiming good news when he declared that the Uncircumcision could be saved by grace, through faith? (See [Rom. 3:30](#); [Col. 2:13](#)).

OPEN DOOR TO PENTECOSTALISM

In the light of all his confusion over the so-called "great commission," Pentecost and baptism, it is not strange that our brother leaves the door wide open to Pentecostalism. Closing his article, he says that the need for miraculous signs lessened as the Word of God took hold in human hearts and churches were multiplied, but referring to the centuries since, he says:

Yet when contact was made with primitive people where such signs would be particularly effective and where special encouragement was needed, they are

manifested.

This kind of talk would seem more appropriate in *Christian Life* than in *Eternity*. Yet *Eternity* and Dr. Barnhouse and Pastor Stedman might as well all go back to Pentecostal signs along with Pentecostal baptism if they continue to refuse to recognize the distinctive character of Paul's apostleship.

THE ONLY WAY OUT

Thank God for those who stand unequivocally for "*the gospel of the grace of God*" and the message which Paul calls "*my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery*" (Rom. 16:25). These can never thank God enough that they have been delivered from such confusion as this article in *Eternity* evidences. As we expose this confusion we pray that God will use our effort, by His grace, to deliver many, many more.

Among the great principles which prevail in every age is that which our Lord enunciated in John 7:17:

"HE THAT WILLETH TO DO HIS [GOD'S] WILL, HE SHALL KNOW OF THE DOCTRINE, WHETHER IT BE OF GOD, OR WHETHER I SPEAK OF MYSELF."

Further light on the Scriptures is not given to those who blindly follow their own spiritual leaders, but to Bereans, who give men a fair, interested hearing and then search the Scriptures daily to see whether these things are so ([Acts 17:11](#)).

***Popular Men Are Not
Necessarily Faithful Men***

Chapter III

RETREAT

Dr. Martin R. De Haan of Grand Rapids, Michigan, once believed and taught that water baptism has no place in God's program for this present dispensation.

In Pastor J. C. O'Hair's book, *The Accuser of the Brethren*, he states:

... Dr. Martin De Haan agreed with my dispensational teaching and "no-water" teaching one hundred per cent at the time he was pastor of the *Calvary Udenominational Church* in Grand Rapids. Dr. De Haan, with full knowledge of what I taught concerning water baptism. . . . invited me to speak for a week to his congregation when they were dedicating their new building. He endorsed from the pulpit what I taught. He sold many of my books to his people, books that set forth in no uncertain language what I believed then and believe now. He publicly expressed endorsement of my ministry and graciously asked me to come back again and give some more of the same "dispensationalism." While I was with him in this first series of meetings he ridiculed the zealous immersionists and he continued for some months to preach to his own members what I had preached in the special meetings. He was as dry as I was.

This testimony by Pastor O'Hair as to Dr. De Haan's former position on baptism was confirmed to me by Dr. De Haan himself when I visited him at his home in 1933. By that time, however, "something had happened," as Pastor O'Hair puts it in his book.

That something was that several hundred members of a nearby Baptist church had begun attending *Calvary Udenominational Church*, and Dr. De Haan was beginning to soft-pedal his beliefs as to baptism. Thus, when he spoke to me in 1933, he said, among other things: "You know what I think about water baptism! Yet, sometimes I wonder whether it's worth fighting about." I replied that I would rather use the term "fighting *for*," since, while I did not believe in going about with a chip on one's shoulder, I did believe that any doctrine of the Bible is worth fighting *for*, and should be defended when it is attacked.

Since that time Dr. De Haan has retreated farther and farther from his former position as to the one baptism," until now he has joined one of the Baptist denominations.

Also, since that time he has taken many opportunities to attack those who stand for what he himself once believed. Like other opponents of Pauline truth, however, he has not been exactly honorable in these attacks, but has set up straw dummies which he could throw down more easily and more dramatically than the truths we actually teach.

Again and again we have been shocked at the lengths to which our brother has gone

in his radio addresses to misrepresent and discredit us. At least one of these attacks is preserved intact in his booklet entitled, *Factions and Divisions in the Church*, containing his radio message of Feb. 12, 1956.

While pleading for "grace and tolerance and love," Dr. De Haan, referring to I Corinthians 1, asks: "Are not all of these, Paul, Apollos, Peter, preaching the same Christ, and essentially the same gospel?" And then, commenting on the trouble at Corinth: "And Paul singles out those who admired him first of all, as the worst offenders. He rebukes his own followers, rather than those who followed Apollos, or Peter . . ." (Page 8).

We wonder how Dr. De Haan expected Bereans not to notice the fact that Paul did *not* rebuke those who followed him, since *in the very same letter* the apostle says to *these same Corinthians*:

"WHEREFORE I BESEECH YOU, BE YE FOLLOWERS OF ME" (1 Cor. 4:16).

"BE YE FOLLOWERS OF ME, EVEN AS I ALSO AM OF CHRIST" (1 Cor. 11:1).

Had the Corinthians followed Paul there would not have been strife and division among them, for it was Paul who taught the great doctrine that "*by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body*" and he had taught this doctrine to *them* (I Cor. 12:13). To follow Paul is very different from saying, as some of the Corinthians did: "*I am of Paul.*"

But from here on Dr. De Haan really goes overboard to misrepresent those who still stand for the truths he once embraced. On Page 9 of his booklet, he says:

What tremendous violence has been done to this passage by the "Paulites," by those who hold up Paul as the one superior apostle, above all the other writers of the New Testament. There are even some who would exalt his teaching above the teachings of the Lord Jesus Himself.

Surely, when we "magnify Paul's *office*," as he himself did by divine inspiration in Romans 11:13, we do not "hold him up as the one superior apostle above all other writers of the New Testament." Nor do we "exalt his teaching above the teachings of the Lord Jesus Himself," for again and again the apostle insists that his teachings *are* the teachings of the exalted Lord, as, for example in I Tim. 6:3,4 and II Cor. 13:2,3:

"If any man teach OTHERWISE, and consent not to wholesome words, even THE WORDS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness,

"He is proud . . ." etc.

"... if I come again, I will not spare:

"SINCE YE SEEK A PROOF OF CHRIST SPEAKING IN ME. . . ."

As to the passage in I Cor. 1:14, our brother states, on Page 9:

In trying to get rid of water baptism, they have seized upon this passage to prove their point, but in doing so have mutilated the Scriptures to the destruction of their own argument. These "Bereans," who are nobler than the poor, ignorant Thessalonian Baptists, make the terrible mistake of reading only part of the passage. They usually quote: "*I thank God I baptized none of you,*" *PERIOD!*¹¹ and cry out, "See here, Paul never baptized anyone at all."

What nonsense! and how untrue! Would we not be idiotic to quote Paul as saying: "*I thank God I baptized none of you,*" *PERIOD!* or to say: "See here, Paul never baptized any one at all"! We are certain that neither Dr. De Haan, nor any of our readers have ever heard or read any such foolish statements from the lips or pens of any of our preachers or writers, yet he would have his readers and hearers believe that we "*usually*" say this. This straw dummy was easy, of course, to throw down, but it certainly didn't look anything like the original. Indeed, it didn't look like *anything* - just a pile of straw, which took little ability or manliness to overthrow.

With regard to I Cor. 1:17, our brother says, on Page 9:

Now Paul does not say in this verse that Christ told me "NOT to baptize." That is the meaning given to it by the "Paulites."

It so happens that Pastor J. C. O'Hair, Pastor Charles Baker and others of us have written a great deal about baptism, but has any of our readers ever found one instance where we have ever stated that "Christ told Paul NOT to baptize"? Have we not rather said just what the Scriptures say: that Christ did not send Paul to *baptize*, i.e., that baptism did not belong to his special commission?

Dr. De Haan's reckless misrepresentations of his brethren in Christ ill become him as a teacher of the Word of God, and his sarcasm belies his professed desire for more tolerance on the subject. From his booklet it is evident that he wants the Baptists, Presbyterians and Methodists to tolerate each other on this subject, but wants none of them to tolerate those of us who consistently proclaim the glory of the "one baptism" which unites all believers to Christ and each other. He wants them to shun us as heretics, lest they read our writings and begin asking *him* questions.

We wrote Dr. De Haan about this broadcast and the published booklet, but to date he has done nothing to correct these misrepresentations. His custom is to lie low until the protests die down and then to do the same thing all over again.

How important then, for all of us to be Bereans! When men of God, widely reputed

¹¹ It should be noted here that the emphasis has not been supplied by us. Both the italics and capital letters are his own.

as teachers of the truth, can stoop to widespread misrepresentation in order to hush up doctrines which they would rather not face up to; when those who proclaim so many precious truths can oppose the most precious of all truths by slandering those who stand for them, and thus help to keep the Church divided and confused, it is high time that all of us "search the Scriptures" for ourselves, "to see whether these things are so."

***Riding Two Horses
In Opposite Directions***

Chapter IV

ABOUT FACE

It was in 1937 that we received a copy of a new book by Dr. H. A. Ironside, entitled, *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth*.

We had been blessed by many of Dr. Ironside's Bible expositions and had often enjoyed his oral ministry and the fellowship of his company in our home.

Here, however, appeared a book from the good doctor's pen that shocked us. Angrily he denounced those who stood for the distinctive character of Paul's apostleship and for the "one baptism" which Paul proclaimed. "Bullingerites," "ultra-dispensationalists," "satanic," "higher critics of the worst type," "unscriptural theorists," "ecclesiastical hobbyriders" and "self-styled expositors," he called us.

He called it "amazing presumption" to teach that Israel was given a second chance to accept Christ as King during the book of Acts and charged that it was "Bullingerism" to deny that the great commission" of Matthew 28 applies to members of the Body of Christ.

In this he unwittingly indicted men of God like Dr. James M. Gray, Dr. William L. Pettingill, Dr. Arno C. Gaebelin and J. N. Darby, who had been teaching exactly this for years.

What astonished us most, however, was the fact that in *Wrongly Dividing* Dr. Ironside had contradicted many of his own former writings. This was so evident that within the next few months at least six different writers had published articles showing how Dr. Ironside had completely reversed his position as to the revelation of the mystery concerning the Church which is Christ's Body.

Further angered by this, Dr. Ironside wrote a preface to the next edition of *Wrongly Dividing*, in which he wrote the following paragraphs which we trust our readers will read with great care:

My attention has been called to a most dishonest effort to set my teaching for the past forty years in apparent opposition to what is herein set forth. I disavow any such change of attitude. The leaflet in question quotes from my books on "Colossians" and "Sailing with Paul," in which I sought to show that *the mystery of the one Body is never found in any other New Testament writer save Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, and nowhere in the Old Testament. This I here reaffirm. Paul was distinctively the one to whom this sacred secret was revealed.* In apparent contradiction to this, quotations are given from the present booklet to show that I now teach that the mystery of the blessing

of Jew and Gentile on one common ground is set forth by others than Paul; as, for instance, John in the 10th chapter of his Gospel, when he gives us our Lord's teaching as to the uniting of His Jewish sheep with "other sheep not of this fold" - Gentile believers - in one flock under one Shepherd. The same mystery is opened up in Peter's vision of the sheet let down from heaven.

Is there any contradiction here? None whatever. *I affirm still that Paul alone speaks of the mystery of the Body*, but the mystery of the blessing of Jew and Gentile on the common ground of free grace was revealed to others before it was made known to Paul.... (Our italics).

But now Dr. Ironside had contradicted himself, not only in his own writings, but *in the same book*, for in *Wrongly Dividing* he did deny that the mystery of the Body was distinctively a Pauline revelation. In fact a whole chapter is given to this denial, entitled: "*When Was the Revelation of the Mystery of the One Body Given?*" We shall presently quote several passages from *Wrongly Dividing* to prove this.

Pastors J. C. O'Hair, Charles F. Baker and others ably exposed Dr. Ironside's attempt to cover up his "about face" in this way, but Dr. Ironside continued to claim that he was teaching just what he had taught for forty years.

As the new book began to gain in circulation, we published, along with our comments, the following excerpts from Dr. Ironside's earlier writings, under the title:

DR. H. A. IRONSIDE'S FORMER TESTIMONY AS TO PAULINE TRUTH

"The mystery of the Church as the Body of Christ was never made known in Old Testament times, nor yet in the days when our Lord was on earth. We are told distinctly that it had been 'hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints.' The divine method of making it known was by a special revelation to the Apostle Paul, as he tells us in Ephesians 3" (*Lectures on Colossians*, P. 58).

It was a special revelation given not to the twelve, but to him, as the apostle of the new dispensation (*Lectures on Colossians*, P. 57).

But this doctrine of the one body is never referred to by any other apostle than Paul. He calls it "the dispensation of the mystery" which he had especially been entrusted with (*Sailing With Paul*, P. 44).

To the epistles of Paul alone do we turn for the revelation of this mystery. He was the special vessel chosen to make known the heavenly calling. The twelve were, as we have seen, connected primarily with the testimony to Israel. Paul, as one born out of due time, was selected to be the messenger to the nations, announcing the distinctive truths of the present dispensation (*Mysteries of God*, P. 74).

We deeply regret that Dr. Ironside now labels those who believe and teach these truths as "Bullingerites." In his later book, *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth*, he says: "The Bullingerites tell us that the mystery was only made known to the Apostle Paul, not to the other apostles" (P. 40).

What we cannot understand is how, in the light of his later book, Dr. Ironside can still circulate his former writings.

Let us note a few more of his former statements concerning these truths.

Throughout the writings of the Apostle Paul he again and again refers to a wonderful secret, which he designates in a special way as "the mystery," or "the great mystery." (*Mysteries of God*, P. 50).

That a doctrine so clearly revealed in the Scriptures could have become so utterly lost is only to be accounted for by the Judaizing of the Church, and the consequent minding of earthly things that beclouded the heavenly ones. (*Mysteries of God*, P. 51).

Now if the mystery be for those who have faith to obey, it is certainly of vast importance that every child of God be instructed as to its true character (*Mysteries of God*, P. 52).

How earnest was the apostle in seeking to lead Christians into the knowledge of this precious truth (*Lectures on Colossians*, P. 59).

The mere publishing of these excerpts from Dr. Ironside's earlier writings so enraged him that on Sept. 18, 1940, he wrote us the following letter:

Dear Mr. Stam:

My attention has been drawn to your contemptible effort to make my teaching (which is unchanged through the years) as to the mystery agree with the unscriptural Bullingerite theories you are advocating.

As one who loved and esteemed your noble father¹² I am grieved to think that a son of his would stoop to such methods.

I teach today just what I taught in the books you quote from. But these teachings are as far removed from Bullingerism as from Seventh Day Adventism.

Can you not *read*? In my book "Wrongly Dividing" I am referring not to the mystery of the Body, but to the mystery that Jew and Gentile are both saved on the ground of pure grace - as common to all the apostles.

¹² My father, Mr. Peter Stam, Sr., sacrificed both friends and money in his stand for the truths which Dr. Ironside here assails.

This mystery - not "the mystery of the Body," was clearly enunciated by the Apostle Peter as recognized truth in Acts 15:11, and this Peter had preached from the beginning.

The preface to the second edition of "Wrongly Dividing" makes this clear for those who read the first edition carelessly, and leaves no excuse for such ignorance now.

You are making a sorry spectacle of yourself by trying to build up a reputation as a teacher through attacks on men of God, many of whom were in Christ and preaching the mystery of the Body before you were born.

God grant you may see your folly and retrace your steps before you go the full length, as others have done, and wind up where Bullingerism leads - in universal reconciliation and the denial of all practical truth for the conscience.

Sincerely yours,

S/ H. A. Ironside

Our reply, dated October 4, 1940, follows:

Dear Doctor Ironside:

I confess that I hardly know how to answer your letter of Sept. 18th. It is hard to believe that a man of God in your position could have written a letter so uncivil and abusive. I am comparatively young and you are advanced in years, and your attitude makes it difficult to know how to reply.

Among other things, you remark that you were in Christ and preaching the mystery of the Body before I was born. Perhaps this is so, but you are surely opposing the proclamation of it now, and helping to keep God's people confused and divided.

In your *Lectures on Colossians*, Page 58, you say distinctly: "The mystery of the Church as *THE BODY OF CHRIST* was never made known in Old Testament times, nor yet in the days when our Lord was on earth. We are told distinctly it had been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints.' THE DIVINE METHOD OF MAKING IT KNOWN WAS BY A SPECIAL REVELATION TO THE APOSTLE PAUL, AS HE TELLS US IN EPHESIANS 3."

But in your *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth*, you have written just as distinctly, as the heading over Chapter Four: "When Was the Revelation of the Mystery of *the One Body* Given?" In this chapter you flatly contradict your earlier writings and say of the "Bullingerites": "Generally, too, the ground is taken that this revelation was given to him alone, and that the twelve knew nothing of it," and then you go on to try to show that it was not revealed to Paul alone. On Page 41, commenting on Eph. 3:6, "That the

Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same BODY . . ." you say: "Was this mystery made known by other servants besides the Apostle Paul? It was. The Apostle John makes it known in his account of our Lord's ministry as given in the tenth chapter of his Gospel." Then farther on you try to prove that Peter had it revealed to him too.

But now you seek to reconcile these contradictions by saying you had two mysteries in mind. In your letter to me you say: "In my book 'Wrongly Dividing' I am referring not to the mystery of the BODY, but to the mystery that Jew and Gentile are both saved on the ground of pure grace." But how can you say you are not referring to the mystery of the Body, when the very heading over the chapter reads: "When Was the Revelation of the Mystery of *the One Body* Given?" How can you expect honest students of the Scriptures to accept your attempts to reconcile such glaring contradictions?

What baffles me is that you can still go on presenting these arguments when the fallacy of them has already been exposed by Brother J. C. O'Hair and others.

You ask in your letter, "Can you not *read*?" Yes, Doctor Ironside, I can read, and I am interested to find that many other people are beginning to learn to read too. We can even begin to read between the lines! As we compare your statements in *Wrongly Dividing* with your earlier writings and then examine your pathetic attempts to reconcile the two, we can see quite clearly that you are in a dilemma, trying to defend your unscriptural theories as to water baptism.

Why should insult and abuse have to take the place of fair and honest controversy over the Word of God? *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth* is filled with more nasty names, mean insinuations and sarcastic remarks than I have read in any book for a long time. And your letter to me shows that you have not yet gotten over this spirit. What can such books produce except a harvest of believers like myself, who are more determined than ever to proclaim boldly the precious truths of which you would now deprive God's people?

I can honestly say that I harbor no bitter feelings against you, but it seems only fair that you should know that there are increasing numbers of sincere believers, who, though they once looked up to you as a Bible teacher, are more than dissatisfied with your juggling of the Scriptures.

As to your charge that I am trying to build up a reputation as a teacher through attacks on men of God - do you not feel in your own heart that you are both unfair and unkind? I certainly have not attacked you.¹³ If public men can no longer afford to have their statements examined by the public, something is wrong. Surely Bereanism is dead if your readers may not put your writings to the test of Scripture to see whether these things are so. And surely you should not consider it a sign of bitterness or unlove when we do this. God commended the Bereans for testing by Scripture the statements of even the Apostle Paul.

¹³ I had imply quoted from his earlier writings in answer to his attack in *Wrongly Dividing*.

May I not, as a younger brother in Christ, plead with you to stop fighting men who honestly seek to proclaim the truth? No matter how great your influence or prestige may be, you cannot hope to win, for the weakest are strong with God on their side, but the strongest are weak without Him. So why not confess honestly that you have not been consistent in your teachings? See how mightily you could be used in your position "to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God"!

Be assured that you are often in our prayers.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

s/ Cornelius R. Stam

To this Dr. Ironside replied in part on Oct. 9, 1940:

Your letter received. I am sorry my letter to you seemed harsh and unkind. I was provoked. It would have been better if I had not written while I felt so indignant.

The letter went on, however, with warnings about the evils of our system of interpretation, while avoiding entirely our sincere question about the complete reversal of his teachings as to the Pauline revelation. We therefore replied in part, on Oct. 17th:

Thank you for your letter of apology. It was more than I had asked for or expected. I am disappointed, however, that you have not given me what I asked for and had a right to expect – an answer to my questions concerning your contradictory writings on the Body of Christ, as well as an explanation of your subsequent claim that you were not referring to the mystery of the Body in the passages I quoted, while the very heading over those passages reads: "WHEN WAS THE REVELATION OF THE MYSTERY OF THE ONE BODY GIVEN?"

To this Dr. Ironside replied, on Oct 21st: "I see no need whatever to go into any explanation of my statements. I have looked them over again and they are perfectly clear."

So the book, *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth*, continues to enjoy a wide circulation, largely through the efforts of pastors who use it to warn inquiring believers against the Scriptural teaching that water baptism is not included in God's plan for the members of the Body of Christ in this dispensation.

For the sake of those who may still be doing this innocently, we quote here a parallel list of Dr. Ironside's writings on the subject which show how completely he reversed his own position as to the mystery of the Body when he wrote his attack on those of us who refuse to bring the washing of water into the dispensation of the grace of God. This list is taken from a pamphlet circulated at that time by a group called the *Philadelphia Bible Testimony*.

H. A. IRONSIDE

Lectures on Colossians

P. 58: "The mystery of the Church as the Body of Christ was never made known in Old Testament times, nor yet in the days when our Lord was on earth. We are told distinctly it had been 'hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints.' The divine method of making it known was by a special revelation to the Apostle Paul as he tells us in Ephesians 3."

P. 57: "It was a special revelation given not to the twelve, but to him as the apostle of the new dispensation."

Sailing with Paul

P. 44: "But this doctrine of the one body is never referred to by any other apostle than Paul. He calls it 'the dispensation of the mystery' which he had especially been entrusted with."

Mysteries of God

p. 74: "To the epistles of Paul alone do we turn for the revelation of this mystery. He was the special vessel chosen to make known the heavenly calling. The twelve were, as we have seen, connected primarily with the testimony to Israel. Paul, as one born out of due time, was selected to be the messenger to the nations, announcing the distinctive truths of the present dispensation."

Dr. H. A. IRONSIDE

Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth

P. 30: "Generally, too, the ground is taken that this revelation was given to him alone, and that the twelve knew nothing of it."

P. 40: "The Bullingerites tell us that the mystery was only made known to the Apostle Paul, not to other apostles."

P. 40: "But is it true that other apostles and prophets had already known of the mystery? It is."

P. 41: "Was this mystery made known by other servants besides the Apostle Paul? It was. The Apostle John makes it known in his account of our Lord's ministry as given in the tenth chapter of his Gospel."

P. 41: "John, as an apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ, had received the revelation of the mystery even before the Apostle Paul did."

"Then what of the Apostle Peter? We dare to say this same mystery was made known to him on the housetop of Simon's residence in Joppa."

Pp. 41, 42: "The greatest of all the New Testament prophets is Luke himself, and in his book of the Acts the mystery is plainly made known."

P. 32: "Error is never consistent."

***Both Sides -
Representation and Misrepresentation***

Chapter V

AT THE CROSSROADS

One of those who did much to circulate Dr. Ironside's *Wrongly Dividing* during these years was Mr. Herrmann Braunlin, Pastor of the *Hawthorne (N. J.) Gospel Tabernacle*, later called the *Hawthorne Gospel Church*.

I had known Pastor Braunlin well from my youth. As a young pastor he had stood at a moral crossroads as to water baptism. He had been convinced that water baptism has no Scriptural place in the present dispensation of the grace of God, but the members of his official board were by no means convinced of this.

One day he visited our home and told me how happy he was that his board had voted not to make water baptism a *requirement* for membership at the *Hawthorne Gospel Tabernacle!*¹⁴ He felt this was a real victory.

Actually he had taken the *wrong* road, and continued down this road until he was actively opposing the truths he had once believed and helping to spread misrepresentations about those who still stood firm.

One such occasion caused us to publish the following article in the September, 1945, issue of the *Berean Searchlight*:

A WORD OF WARNING

Again and again we have stated clearly just what we believe and why we believe it. We have published far and wide the doctrinal statement of the *Worldwide Grace Testimony* and the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* - the statement to which Pastor J. C. O'Hair heartily subscribes with us. We have not walked deceitfully, but have openly and honestly made known our convictions.

Yet, in spite of our open proclamation of our beliefs, there are those who persist in spreading false propaganda, charging us with teaching errors which we have never taught.

Recently the pastor of a "Gospel Church" in Hawthorne, N. J., tried to "rescue" a group of sincere Christians from "heresy" by giving them copies of a booklet entitled "O'Hairism." The pastor knew that this booklet misrepresents both Mr. O'Hair and the message we preach, for he has had close contact with "O'Hairism" for years.

When we wrote him about it, he dismissed the matter by replying that our friends now

¹⁴ Those who wished to be baptized, of course, could be.

had had "both sides" presented to them. That the side he presented was a misrepresentation of facts does not seem to trouble him and we understand that he intends to continue to give out the booklet.

We beseech all sincere Christians to beware of propaganda of this sort, being distributed as it is even by Fundamentalists, in a vain attempt to defend their unscriptural baptism theories.

To all who really want to hear both sides we say: Why not find out from US what we believe? We have literature covering every phase of our doctrine and detailed doctrinal statements are also available.

The author of "O'Hairism" well knows that Pastor O'Hair has never joined the Modernists in discarding *any* part of the Bible as not for us. He also knows very well that Pastor O'Hair *does* believe that the Lord's supper is included in God's program for this age. To cast doubt upon this fact and call the opposite view "O'Hairism" is base dishonesty, since Pastor O'Hair has again and again made his position clear on this subject.

Furthermore, it is amazing that this booklet should designate as "O'Hairism" the teaching that "the so-called Prison Epistles ... and these only ... are for this dispensation," when for so many years Pastor O'Hair has strenuously opposed this very teaching.

The booklet asserts that the late Dr. James M. Gray called the teachings of Mr. O'Hair "*Dispensationalism Running Wild*." Yet Dr. Gray himself has written Mr. O'Hair: "In the writing of our editorial, '*Dispensationalism Running Wild*,' your name never came into mind. Personally, I have never associated you with Bullinger."

Pastor W. A. Haggai, then, who wrote this booklet, Pastor David Otis Fuller, who published it and Pastor Herrmann Braunlin, who distributes it, are guilty of dishonesty. They are propagating lies about a servant of the Lord.

It may be objected that these men are soul winners or that "O'Hairism" is written in such a sweet, humble spirit. But in God's sight a lie is a lie, even when told by a "soul winner" in a sweet, humble spirit.

We should be unfaithful to our Lord if we allowed His truth to be opposed in this way without a protest.

We call upon our brethren to cease slandering a man whom they cannot answer with the Word of God. They could well use some of Pastor O'Hair's honesty and courage. Also, we would exhort sincere believers to find out from US what we believe before concluding we are heretics, for surely no honest Christian would oppose even a heretic by propagating untruths about him.

Would we be faithful to God or to those who are misled and kept in darkness, if we remained silent about these things? Clearly this is not a matter of bearing personal reproach, but of whether or not we shall hold our peace while sincere believers are being frightened and driven away from the truth by the misrepresentations of religious leaders who are more determined to maintain their positions than to know and preach the truth. It is a matter of whether or not we shall sit passively by, while the Church, confused and divided, is warned against the only remedy for her situation by leaders who would rather leave her in her present condition than risk any possible danger to their own popularity or financial security.

None of us should be belligerent or un-Christlike in our conduct toward others, but we do have a responsibility to show our colors for Christ and the truth.

Perhaps we all need a greater concern for the honest souls who are being kept in the dark and Sincerely believe that the glorious revelation committed to Paul for believers today is a dangerous heresy to be shunned and avoided. Perhaps we need a deeper concern for the truth of God's Word and the glory of our blessed Lord, who gave Himself that *all* of us might live in the full sunlight of His glory and grace.

***The Tide of Falsehood
Rises About Us***

Chapter VI

THE JITTERS

Many Fundamentalist leaders were getting jittery during these years.

Rather than face up to a subject which continued to divide and embarrass them they seemed determined to close the mouths of those who kept asking questions or who proclaimed "the gospel of the grace of God" without mixture.

This they could not do - and have not yet done - *by answering* our teachings *from the Word*, so for a time the tide of untruth rose high.

In January, 1946, we published an article beseeching them to STOP misrepresenting and face the facts. This article follows:

WILL FUNDAMENTALISTS FACE THE FACTS?

Along with a copy of this issue of the *Berean Searchlight* we are sending to a brother in California two of our pamphlets; one entitled *The Lord's Supper* and the other, *The Early Ministry of Paul*.

The reason for this is that our teachings have again come up for discussion, this time in the December, 1945, issue of one of the country's leading Christian periodicals - of which this brother is editor - and, sad to say, the facts have again been misrepresented.

The magazine to which we refer is *Prophecy Monthly*, and its editor, *Dr. Keith L. Brooks*.

Calling both the *Berean Searchlight* and its editor by name, Dr. Brooks says, among other things:

1. That we are "The exponents of the Bullinger extreme dispensational ideas."
2. That we teach that the Lord's supper is not for this age.
3. That we teach that " 'Church truth' is to be found only in the prison epistles of Paul."
4. That we teach "that miracles are ... confined to Peter's ministry as distinct from Paul's."
5. That we teach that "The Great Commission is Jewish."

We realize fully that there are some who will accuse us of "attacking" a man of God if we protest that these charges are false.

To such let us say that we had planned to send out another issue devoted entirely to Bible exposition. But when an outstanding Christian monthly singles us out, charging us with errors we have never taught, it becomes necessary either to face the issue or to consent by silence that we teach error.

Before answering Dr. Brooks' charges let us make it clear that we do not consider ourselves credulous for believing, from the tone of our brother's article, that he wrote it out of ignorance rather than dishonesty. We cannot feel that he meant to misrepresent us as he did, but rather that he merely joined popular criticism without looking up the facts.

One thing will prove whether our hopes are justified - whether or not Dr. Brooks retracts his statements as fully and publicly as he made them.

We regret to say that some who have widely broadcast these very untruths have not proven themselves humble or honest enough to do this, even after being supplied with the information, even after being shown that their statements would have been as false ten or twenty years ago and that we have *consistently* opposed the very errors which they charge us with teaching.

Dr. John R. Rice, Dr. H. A. Ironside, Dr. D. Otis Fuller, Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse, Mr. W. A. Haggai and *The Bible Today* have all broadcast these and other falsehoods, yet, so far as we know, none of them, after being supplied with the facts, have been fair enough to confess honestly that they have misrepresented their brethren in Christ.

What will the harvest be? Will sincere Christians continue to respect these men when they find out that false accusations have been substituted for Scriptural answers?

One thing is certain, these brethren thus far have been able only to throw down straw dummies which they themselves have set up. They *cannot*, certainly do not, answer WHAT WE TEACH.

Since we are personally sending Dr. Brooks our literature, plus this article, we call upon him to prove himself an exception and first honorably and fully retract these false charges. Then he can begin to answer what we *do* teach.

Friends have been asking us for some time to come to California for meetings. If Dr. Brooks should be interested in a public discussion of these questions it would be an added inducement to us to come and we would be happy to meet him on equal terms.

And now to the issue. We will deal first with Dr. Brooks' charges against us and then with his own dispensational views.

BULLINGERISM

The real reason why we are called Bullingerites again and again is because we do not believe that water baptism is in God's program for this age and it so happens that Dr. Bullinger also taught this.

But Dr. Bullinger also was a Premillenarian. Does this make Dr. Brooks a Bullingerite?

And what about those who *do* believe in water baptism for this age; are *they* agreed upon the subject? The fact is that the disagreement over baptism is so great that it is the scandal of the Church.

So far from being the exponents of the "Bullinger extreme dispensational ideas," we are the ones who have from the beginning consistently opposed them in our published literature. With this literature in free circulation it seems unbelievable that Dr. Brooks should take of *the very errors of Bullingerism which we have opposed* and tell the public that we are Bullingerites *because we teach them!*

THE LORD'S SUPPER

It is most unfortunate that Dr. Brooks should have charged us with teaching that the Lord's supper is not for this age, when we have books on sale proving that we emphatically *do* believe it is for this age.

It is a pity he did not first look up the facts. Moreover his ignorance is inexcusable, for surely it *is wrong* to make reckless charges - to publicly accuse a brother of teaching error without even inquiring into the facts.

Even now we trust that Dr. Brooks will not be misled by statements which enemies of the truth may make. Let him make a thorough, personal, firsthand investigation, for the tragedy of this slander is that it has become so persistent and widespread that Christians, who should put away evil speaking, have actually helped to spread the lie.

If Dr. Brooks *does* inquire for firsthand information he will find:

1. That we have always stood vigorously for the celebration of the Lord's supper in this age.

2. That Pastor J. C. O'Hair, who is unquestionably the champion of the "one baptism" today, has never taught that the Lord's supper is not for this age.

3. That the *Worldwide Grace Testimony*, our missionary organization, and the *Grace Gospel Fellowship*, our ministerial fellowship, have in their doctrinal platforms the following statement:

The communion of the Lord's Supper as revealed through the Apostle Paul in I Cor. 11-23-26 is for members of the Body of Christ to observe "until He comes."

There is no place in Scripture where the Lord's Supper and Water Baptism are linked together, either as ordinances or as sacraments for the Church.

Are there some who were once with us who have gone to extremes and given up the Lord's supper? Certainly. And there are likewise Premillenarians who have gone to extremes, setting dates, pointing out "antichrists," etc. Would this justify our calling Dr. Brooks an extremist and a date-setter?

We feel sure that when Dr. Brooks has read the literature we have sent him he will want to apologize for misrepresenting us and thus causing sincere Christians to shun us as heretics.

It is very true that many Christians, perhaps including Dr. Brooks, feel - *without Scriptural foundation* - that baptism and the Lord's supper go together as ordinances of the Church. But it is also very true that we believe and *with the plainest Scriptural proof* - that water baptism and miraculous signs go together in the Mark 16 commission to which our brother refers.

Would we not be one long step fairer than he has been if we published the lie that he is a Pentecostalist and believes that miraculous signs are in order for today?

CHURCH TRUTH

When Dr. Brooks charges us with teaching that "'Church truth' is to be found only in the prison epistles of Paul" it is evident that he is very ignorant of what we really teach.

In the first place, he puts the phrase "Church truth" in quotation marks, as though he is quoting from our literature, but he is not. In the *Berean Searchlight* we have always been very careful not to call the truth for this age "Church truth."

God has always had His *ekklesia*, His called-out assembly. Israel at Sinai was "*the church in the wilderness*" (See [Acts 7:38](#)). When our Lord was on earth He taught that when a brother refused to repent of a wrong after being properly dealt with, the offended one should "*tell it unto the church*" (See [Matt. 18:17](#)). After the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost we read that "*the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved*" (Acts 2:47).

But does the Church today have the same message and program as the Church at Sinai? And perhaps our brother will tell us whether the Church today has the same message and Program as the Church of our Lord's day or even the Church at Pentecost.

The Church of today is called "*the Body of Christ*" (See [1 Cor. 12:27](#) and [Eph.](#)

1:22,23; 4:12) concerning which not one word is to be found in Scripture until we come to the epistles of Paul.

But even if our brother means that we teach that the truth for *the Body of Christ* is to be found only in the prison epistles of Paul he is wrong, for we have taught through the years that the truth for the Body of Christ is *progressively* taught in all of Paul's epistles and have as consistently opposed those who teach that it is to be found only in his prison epistles.

PETER AND PAUL

As to his charge that we teach that miraculous signs were "confined to Peter's ministry as distinct from Paul's," we hardly know what to say; it is so far from the truth.

In reply to such a theory we would say with Dr. Brooks: "*One need but read his New Testament.*" But in reply to his *charge* that we teach such a theory we would say: *One need but read our literature!*

Why did Dr. Brooks make such a statement? Was he writing too fast? Was he in such haste to overthrow us that he could not even take time to examine the rock on which we stand?

We understand, of course, that if Paul had not been given miraculous signs during his early ministry, the Jewish believers, including the twelve apostles, would have questioned the genuineness of his calling, for they were given to expect signs from God's messengers.

THE GREAT COMMISSION

Another statement that amazes us is the charge that we teach that "*The Great Commission is Jewish.*"

Where in our literature did Dr. Brooks ever read that?

Imagine reading "*Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature,*" and contending that it is Jewish!

We are not stone blind! Dr. Brooks must suppose that we read the Bible as carelessly as he reads our literature unless the challenge of the pure grace gospel has excited him so that he can only make reckless charges.

THE TEACHINGS OF CHRIST

There are other charges in which Dr. Brooks states half-falsehoods, which should be considered here. For example, his reference to "*the teachings of Christ not now being in effect.*"

This, Dr. Brooks says, we teach. But what does he mean by "the teachings of Christ"? Sad to say, he means what every Modernist means when he speaks of "the teachings of Christ." He means our Lord's *earthly* teachings; the teachings of *the lowly Jesus*.

Sadder still, most Fundamentalists, when they refer to the teachings of Jesus, mean what Modernists mean by that phrase. They refer to the so-called "great commission" as His "*last words*" and His "*last marching orders*," as though He did not speak again after that.

What the Modernist denies, the Fundamentalist has forgotten - that our Lord spoke again from heaven - that Paul received the body of truth for this age "*by the revelation of Jesus Christ*."

We could quote scores of Scriptures to prove this, but a few will suffice:

Gal. 1:11,12: "BUT I CERTIFY YOU BRETHREN, THAT THE GOSPEL WHICH WAS PREACHED OF ME IS NOT AFTER MAN. FOR I NEITHER RECEIVED IT OF MAN, NEITHER WAS I TAUGHT IT, BUT BY THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST."

Eph. 3:1-3: "FOR THIS CAUSE I PAUL, THE PRISONER OF JESUS CHRIST FOR YOU GENTILES, IF YE HAVE HEARD OF THE DISPENSATION OF THE GRACE OF GOD WHICH IS GIVEN ME TO YOU-WARD; HOW THAT BY REVELATION HE MADE KNOWN UNTO ME THE MYSTERY....."

Concerning his message Paul says: "I delivered unto you THAT WHICH I ALSO RECEIVED" (I Cor. 15:3).

Concerning the celebration of the Lord's supper he says: "FOR I HAVE RECEIVED OF THE LORD that which also I delivered unto you" (I Cor. 11:23).

Concerning the Lord's return for His own he says: "THIS WE SAY UNTO YOU BY THE WORD OF THE LORD" (I Thes. 4:15).

Writing to the fickle Galatians he takes up nearly two chapters to prove that his gospel is nothing less than a message from Christ in glory.

To the carnal Corinthians he writes: "If I come again I will not spare; SINCE YE SEEK A PROOF OF CHRIST SPEAKING IN ME" (11 Cor. 13:2,3).

After giving Timothy directions concerning the affairs of the church, the apostle makes this strong statement:

"If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, EVEN THE WORDS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, and to the doctrine which is according to

godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but dotting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife. . . ."

Could there be any stronger emphasis laid on the fact that the teachings of Paul were "*the words of our Lord Jesus Christ*"?

To teach that the Sermon on the Mount or even the "great commission" is God's program for the Body of Christ is to pervert the gospel, for the Apostle Paul says by the Spirit:

"Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: YEA, THOUGH WE HAVE KNOWN CHRIST AFTER THE FLESH, YET NOW HENCEFORTH KNOW WE HIM NO MORE" (11 Cor. 5:16).

Strange that those who claim that the Sermon on the Mount or the "great commission" or both embody the commands of Christ to the Church, *never obey orders*. They merely choose what seems convenient to obey and explain away the rest.

After Dr. Brooks condemns us for teaching that the Mark 16 commission is not for this age, *he himself goes on to prove that more than half of it isn't!*

Of course he is willing to take the "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," but apparently he finds it difficult to work the miracles. It is significant, however, that while he appeals to Paul to show why the signs have vanished away, he remains silent about the baptismal salvation. We venture to say that in his heart he has real misgivings as to the correctness of his interpretation.

Does Dr. Brooks tell anxious inquirers: "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*"? Does he say, like Peter: "*Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost*"? Does he say to repentant sinners what Ananias, that "devout man according to the law," said to Saul of Tarsus: "*Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord*"? (Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16). *He does not.*

He must twist and distort every one of these plain Scriptures to make them fit at all with the gospel of the grace of God. Peter or Ananias might exhort us to obey the "great commission," but Dr. Brooks has little reason to do so.

Just think! While arguing that the "great commission" as recorded in Mark 16 is for our obedience, he neither holds to the signs of Verses 17 and 18, nor the baptismal salvation of Verse 16. What has he left? Only Verse 15, which says: "*Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.*" Needless to say, we too are eager to get the gospel into all the world and to every creature, if by "the gospel" is meant "*the gospel of the grace of God.*"

In this way we may *apply* Isa. 6:8,9 and many other Old Testament Scriptures to

ourselves, for "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable....." But this is quite different from Dr. Brooks' contention that the "great commission" is our Lord's command to us, the members of the Body of Christ.

It was because Paul's message was a message from Christ in glory that he said:

"BUT THOUGH WE, OR AN ANGEL FROM HEAVEN, PREACH ANY OTHER GOSPEL UNTO YOU THAN THAT WHICH WE HAVE PREACHED UNTO YOU, LET HIM BE ACCURSED" (Gal. 1:8).

So serious is this matter that he repeats the warning:

"AS WE SAID BEFORE, SO SAY I NOW AGAIN, IF ANY MAN PREACH ANY OTHER GOSPEL UNTO YOU THAN THAT YE HAVE RECEIVED, LET HIM BE ACCURSED" (Gal. 1:9).

Look at the Church today; listen to the Babel of voices and consider whether the Church has not reaped the curse of departing from the message delivered through Paul. This is the same Paul who says:

"I SPEAK TO YOU GENTILES, INASMUCH AS I AM THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES. I MAGNIFY MINE OFFICE" (Rom. 11:13).

This is the one who again and again uses such phrases as: "*Behold I Paul say unto you....*" This is the one who says:

"IF ANY MAN TEACH OTHERWISE, AND CONSENT NOT TO WHOLESOME WORDS, EVEN THE WORDS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST . . . HE IS PROUD, KNOWING NOTHING..." (I Tim. 6:3,4).

The Church needs to have these truths re-affirmed and indelibly impressed upon mind and heart. She needs, once more, to be delivered from the error that "the words of our Lord Jesus Christ," are those only which are emphasized in the "Red Letter New Testament." She needs, once more, to learn that His message for us today was sent from His exile in heaven - a message of grace and peace to His enemies.

COMPETENT EXPOSITORS

Our brother, referring to "the strange notion of the few" who hold that the signs of Mark 16 are for this age, says: "No competent expositor has construed the words as recorded by Mark in such a manner." But the next part of his sentence betrays the reason: "*nor has the experience of the Church borne out the strange notion. . .*"

In other words, the Church of this age has not been able to work these signs! Hence "competent expositors" have perforce interpreted them as of temporary significance!

But what "competent expositor" could give an intelligent *Scriptural* explanation of the disappearance of the signs without turning from the "great commission" to the writings of Paul?

Furthermore, if a "competent expositor" can prove from Paul's epistles that the miraculous signs have vanished away, can he prove that the water baptism did *not* vanish away?

Surely any such expositor would search in vain in the writings of Paul for one command or even an exhortation to be baptized with water. Much less will he find such statements concerning water baptism as are found in connection with the "great commission."

But any "competent expositor" *will* find such statements as the following:

1 Cor. 1:17,18: "FOR CHRIST SENT ME NOT TO BAPTIZE, BUT TO PREACH THE GOSPEL: NOT WITH WISDOM OF WORDS, LEST THE CROSS OF CHRIST SHOULD BE MADE OF NONE EFFECT.

"FOR THE PREACHING OF THE CROSS IS TO THEM THAT PERISH FOOLISHNESS; BUT UNTO US WHICH ARE SAVED IT IS THE POWER OF GOD."

Col. 2:10-12: "AND YE ARE COMPLETE IN HIM [CHRIST] WHICH IS THE HEAD OF ALL PRINCIPALITY AND POWER:

"IN WHOM ALSO YE ARE CIRCUMCISED WITH THE CIRCUMCISION MADE WITHOUT HANDS, IN PUTTING OFF THE BODY OF THE SINS OF THE FLESH BY THE CIRCUMCISION OF CHRIST:

"BURIED WITH HIM IN BAPTISM, WHEREIN ALSO YE ARE RISEN WITH HIM THROUGH THE FAITH OF THE OPERATION OF GOD, WHO HATH RAISED HIM FROM THE DEAD."

Gal. 3:26,27: "FOR YE ARE ALL THE CHILDREN OF GOD BY FAITH IN CHRIST JESUS.

"FOR AS MANY OF YOU AS HAVE BEEN BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST HAVE PUT ON CHRIST."

1 Cor. 12:13: "FOR BY ONE SPIRIT ARE WE ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY, WHETHER WE BE JEWS OR GENTILES.

Eph. 4:4,5: "THERE IS ONE BODY ... ONE BAPTISM."

We acknowledge, of course, that Paul baptized, circumcised, spoke with tongues and wrought miracles during his early ministry, but that was the economy under which

he was saved and from which he emerged.

MIRACULOUS DEMONSTRATIONS

Dr. Brooks' general explanation of the passing of the signs is that *"These sign miracles were ... a special provision for demonstrating the divine authority of the apostles until the New Testament was finished."* And to this he adds the astonishing declaration that *"By that time the world had ceased to be a pagan world."*

What does Dr. Brooks mean by this? Did the mere *presence* of the Church constitute the world a Christian instead of a pagan world? Then what about the *presence* of Israel, with her God-given religion, until that time?

No matter how one looks at it, it is foolish to assert that the world, through the preaching and miracle working of the apostles had ceased to be a pagan world.

Why, the world is *still* a pagan world! Millions in Africa, China, India, still sit in heathen darkness, without the light of the gospel, while the Church, as large as it is, is too confused and divided to break down the strongholds of paganism.

Furthermore, if, as our brother argues, the sign miracles were "the credentials of His atoning sacrifice ... by which the gospel was introduced," why have they not continued at the frontiers until today?

If, as he says, the signs were "the credentials of His atoning sacrifice," for the benefit of a pagan world, why did the Lord Jesus and the twelve and the seventy work miracles while going, *"not into the way of the Gentiles,"* but only *"to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"*? (Matt. 10:5-8; Luke 10:17).

Also, if the signs were "the credentials of His atoning sacrifice," to induce men to believe, why were the twelve given miraculous powers before they themselves understood anything about His "atoning sacrifice"? (Matt. 10:5-8 cf. [Luke 18:31-34](#)).

Again, when our brother appeals to Matt. 4:13-16 to prove that "Christ's first recorded miracles were among the Gentiles," he is plainly wrong. Matt. 10:5,6; 15:24 and Rom. 15:8 make it too clear that Christ was *"not sent, but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,"* nor is there any indication that He ever stepped outside the land of Palestine during His earthly ministry. The phrase "Galilee of the Gentiles" merely indicates that Galilee was the borderland of Palestine. Our brother must know that Galilee was a province of Palestine, not a heathen nation. Furthermore the *same* passage to which he refers says:

"And Jesus went about all Galilee, TEACHING IN THEIR SYNAGOGUES" (Ver. 23).

And he is just as wrong when he says concerning Paul that miraculous signs "continued throughout the apostolic ministry." In the later epistles of Paul there is no

trace of such signs. Instead their absence is conspicuous.

He is in prison, but there is no earthquake nor any angel to lead him out. He must ask his friends to pray for his bonds.

He prescribes wine as medicine for Timothy's "*oft infirmities*" (I Tim. 5:23), says "*Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick*" (II Tim. 4:20), explains how Epaphroditus "*was sick nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him; and ... on me also*" (Phil. 2:27).

Indeed, even in his earlier epistles, before his own inspired writings were completed, he makes it clear that miraculous signs were vanishing away.

In Rom. 8:22,23 he says: "*For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now ... and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit.....*"

In II Cor. 4:16 he says: "*though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day.*"

In II Cor. 5:2 he says: "*For in this [tabernacle] we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven.*"

In II Cor. 12:1-9 he tells why he himself had been given a thorn in the flesh. It was because he had been caught up into the third heaven - had been given a glimpse of his position in Christ and needed a thorn in the flesh "*lest I should be exalted above measure*"-so glorious was the revelation.

Strange, is it not, that so many will point to Matthew's "*Lo, I am with you, even unto the end of the world [age],*" to prove that the "great commission" is perpetually binding throughout this present age, and then find it necessary to prove in some way that the signs of Mark's record were *not* meant to continue!

No wonder so many "competent expositors" have been choosing commissions from the various records!

Of one thing we are sure. If miraculous signs were being wrought today "competent expositors" would soon enough associate the "unto the end of the age" with the sign works and say: "He is keeping His promise"!

But we can leave everything just as it is, without explaining away any part of any record of the commission, if we but recognize the parenthetical character of this age of grace - that it was a mystery kept secret since the world began that God would send salvation to the Gentiles through the fall of Israel, reconciling both unto Himself in one body by the cross.

We can leave the "great commission" intact if we but recognize the later, greater

commission given by the glorified Lord to Paul and to us, for God "*hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation ... and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation*" (II Cor. 5:18,19).

We earnestly pray that our brother will honorably retract the falsehoods he has spread about our teachings and then seriously and prayerfully consider our message in the light of the Word of God.

OPEN NOTE TO DR. BROOKS

Dear Doctor Brooks:

Since beginning the above I have received from a friend in St. Louis a letter written by you, trying to explain that you did not mean to imply that I teach the errors you associated with Bullingerism in your article.

Brother, aside from Bible names you mention no other names in your article besides Bullinger and Stam.

Speaking of "the Bullinger extreme ideas," you refer to "Cornelius R. Stam, who edits the chief paper of *this school of thought*, the *Berean Searchlight*," and add: "Those of this school tell us that ... the Great Commission is Jewish . . . We should not be baptizing or administering the Lord's Supper ... the teachings of Christ not now being in effect ... 'Church truth' is to be found only in the prison epistles of Paul ... miracles ... confined to Peter's ministry as distinct from Paul's."

And now, in a private letter, you plead that you did not mean to imply that I teach all these errors and excuse yourself by saying that the public in general believes we are Bullingerites.

You say: "It is difficult for most people to distinguish their published views from those of Bullinger, and so the name sticks to them."

Apparently you have not even read our published views. It is not our published views but articles such as yours, Brother Brooks, that cause the name to stick. Men like you are responsible for what "most people" have been saying.

This wholesale misrepresentation will surely be brought to light.

Why not retract your statements without delay - and as publicly as you made them - so that we may look upon each other as friends and brethren in Christ who died for us?

Very sincerely,
s/ Cornelius R. Stam

Did Dr. Brooks retract his published misrepresentations? By no means! Read the

following article which appeared in the *Berean Searchlight* of November, 1949:

TRUTH IS FALLEN IN THE STREET

"And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter."

-Isa. 59:14.

SATAN AND THE SAINTS

Every true believer knows that "*the god of this world [age] hath blinded the minds of them which believe not,*" but many seem unaware of another vicious objective which their adversary constantly and relentlessly pursues - to keep them, *God's children*, from enjoying the blessings that are theirs in Christ. By his cunning wiles he seeks continually to divert their attention, to obscure their vision, to confuse their thinking - anything to keep them from ascending by faith into heavenly places.

And as for those who are aware of his devices and are determined by grace to appropriate all that God has for them - these become the special objects of Satan's attention. Fearful lest they should come to know too much of the power of Christ's resurrection, he fiercely assails them with his "fiery darts." Hence those to whom Paul, by the Spirit, writes concerning their position and blessings in the heavenlies are warned again and again that they will need to put on "*the whole armor of God*" and are urged again and again to *stand*.

'For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world [age], against spiritual wickedness [wicked spirits] in high places [the heavenlies]" (Eph. 6:12).

With our invisible adversary thus working behind the scenes, using every subtle device to thwart God's program and turn men from the truth, it is not strange that the gospel of the grace of God should arouse controversy on every hand. This is normal under the present circumstances, nor will any true soldier of Jesus Christ expect peace or ease in his stand for the truth. He will rather make certain that he has all his armor on and knows how to wield the Sword of the Spirit as he heeds the call to "*fight the good fight of the faith*" (I Tim. 6:12).

Alas for those who talk only of peace and love when called upon to take a stand for the truth. Do they suppose the devil has gone to sleep? Do they imagine he has relaxed his efforts to oppose God's Word and will? Do they think the principalities and powers in the heavenlies have decided to leave us alone? Do they not see what is happening to the professing Church? Or do they suppose that Satan works only in the realm of the moral, enticing men to worldliness and fleshly lusts? Do they not know that he occupies himself *chiefly* with the *spiritual*, appearing as "an angel of light" and sending forth "ministers of righteousness"? (II Cor. 11:14,15). Or, perhaps, do they suppose that they can count upon Satan always to oppose us openly, through

unbelievers? Do they not expect him to work from within the Church, until even the choicest saints are in danger of unsuspectingly becoming his tools?

The contest would not be nearly so difficult if Satan succeeded in stirring up only *unbelievers* against the truth. The difficulty is that often, in his treachery, he succeeds in taking advantage of true, born again, believers and especially of leaders among them.

Here, for example, is a man of God who has been brought face to face with a truth which has proved some of his sermons and writings incorrect. Unwilling to acknowledge his error, yet unable to gainsay the truth, he is tempted to misrepresent and falsely accuse those who proclaim the truth. Thus misrepresentation and slander take the place of an appeal to the Word.

Were his antagonism merely over personal matters, the course of humility and love would be to bear it silently, but since the truth of God and the welfare of His children are at stake, it becomes the duty of those thus misrepresented to protest, like Paul: "*We be slanderously reported*" (Rom. 3:8). When they fail in this the adversary wins an easy victory as sincere believers, affected by the slander, are driven from the truth and deprived of growth in grace and in the knowledge of the Word.

Hence this reply to the editor of an outstanding Christian magazine who continues to turn sincere Christians from the truth by public misrepresentation.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Four years ago (Dec., 1945) there appeared in *Prophecy Monthly* an article by its editor, Dr. Keith L. Brooks, in which he charged:

1. That we are "The exponents of the Bullinger extreme dispensational ideas."
2. That we teach that the Lord's supper is not for this age.
3. That we teach that " 'Church truth' is to be found only in the prison epistles of Paul."
4. That we teach that "miracles ... are confined to Peter's ministry as distinct from Paul's."
5. That we teach that "The Great Commission is Jewish."

Not wishing to conclude that Dr. Brooks had knowingly misrepresented our beliefs before the public we assumed he was ignorant of the facts and answered the article on that basis, pointing out, however, the wrong of publicly charging men with heresy without first making sure of their beliefs.

At the same time individuals were writing Dr. Brooks about his article. One of them

sent us a reply from him in which, passing over his false charges, he explained that he had not meant to imply that we taught the errors he had associated with Bullingerism in his article.

....

Upon being pressed about this matter by others, Dr. Brooks wrote another letter, also forwarded to us, pleading that he had been unable to obtain our doctrinal views before publishing his article, adding that he was "very glad to get these distinctions."

This, of course, was another untruth and we called Dr. Brooks' attention to this in a personal letter on Jan. 28, 1946, writing in part:

The facts are, as you very well know, that you could have obtained literature as to our views, indeed, had been receiving it all along, but disregarding this information, indulged in reckless slander such as would cause sincere Christians to shun us as heretics.

In the February (1946) issue of *Prophecy Monthly*, Dr. Brooks published a half-hearted apology for *some* of his charges, saying, for example:

Doubtless we have erred in using the name "Bullingerism" of some who do not *in all points* follow Bullinger.

But only two paragraphs later he adds:

One need but read the O'Hair statement of doctrine however, to understand why the majority identify his positions with those of Bullinger.

So, after all it would seem quite fair to call Mr. O'Hair a Bullingerite!

Now in the first place, Dr. Brooks' Dec., 1945 article did not mention Mr. O'Hair, but Mr. Stam in connection with Bullingerism. Why should Dr. Brooks appeal to O'Hair's teachings to prove Stam a heretic? This writer does not stand in Pastor O'Hair's shadow, either as a student of the Word or as a champion of its truths and we often pray that we may prove as faithful and courageous as he has been through the years, but this does not mean that we are carbon copies, so to speak, of O'Hair, or that for Dr. Brooks to prove his serious public accusations against us it suffices him to say in effect: "Just read O'Hair's writings. That should be enough!"

However, Dr. Brooks is also dishonest and unfair with respect to Mr. O'Hair here, for anyone acquainted with Pastor O'Hair's oral or printed ministry knows him to be a vigorous *opponent* of Dr. Bullinger's extreme teachings. He has many books and booklets for sale at this moment against Dr. Bullinger's views on the Lord's supper, the rapture of the Church, the soul and spirit, his two body theory, etc. In these and other matters we stand with O'Hair and not with Bullinger, yet Dr. Brooks continues to mislead

his readers into thinking that if they but read "the O'Hair statement of doctrine" they will see why "the majority" look upon him as a Bullingerite - and that should do to make Mr. Stam a Bullingerite too!

Dr. Brooks, in his published "explanation" disposed of the matter by superficially dealing with the doctrinal statement of the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* (of which O'Hair and Stam are members) but there was no real apology, nor any indication of regret over the wrong done in so seriously misrepresenting a brother in Christ before the public.

STUMBLING OVER THE SAME STONE TWICE

One would suppose that Dr. Brooks would at least have learned a lesson from this experience, but not so, for now, four years later, in a defense of Dr. Ironside, he once more indulges in public misrepresentation of the "hyper-dispensationalists," again mentioning especially the *Berean Searchlight* and its editor.

Also, one would surely suppose that this time Dr. Brooks would have made it his business to acquaint himself thoroughly with our teachings but again, not so.

Rather than give our writings on the "one body" and the "one baptism" his prayerful, interested consideration, he complains that it is next to impossible to understand them. "Lay aside the literature," he says, "and few could hope to remember the new explanations or maintain the higher ground on which they are supposed to have been placed by the understanding of the 'mystery.'"¹⁵ Again calling us "hyper-dispensationalists," he claims that we have a new interpretation for almost any familiar passage in the New Testament that one might mention" and "everything must be re-interpreted." This, of course, is not so, but suppose it were; the way to answer heresy is not to complain of the number of its unorthodox interpretations, but to subject it to the test of the Word, rightly divided.

QUESTION PLEASE

Dr. Brooks supposes, for one thing, that we deny "that the gospel of the grace of God came by Jesus Christ." The difficulty is, of course, that he is thinking only of Christ *on earth*, for we believe and teach that the gospel of the grace of God was given by the revelation of Christ to Paul after the ascension. But here let us ask a few questions:

Would it have been consistent with the gospel of the grace of God for Christ to say: "*am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel*" (Matt. 15:24) and to forbid His apostles to minister to the Gentiles (Matt. 10:5,6)? Is the gospel of the grace of God for the Jews only?

Would it have been consistent with the gospel of the grace of God for our Lord to keep Jewish feasts (John 5:1, etc.) and to teach His followers to offer animal sacrifices (Matt. 5:23,24) and to instruct them to obey those who sat in Moses' seat (Matt. 23:1-3

¹⁵ Yet on every hand the simplest believers are coming into the knowledge and joy of these truths!

cf. Gal. 5:1)?

Would it have been consistent with the gospel of the grace of God to send His apostles forth with the instructions: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16)? And is not this what Peter taught at Pentecost (Acts 2:38) after Christ had already gone to heaven? Did Paul ever preach this? Did anyone until Paul ever claim to have the gospel of the grace of God committed to him?

Dr. Brooks charges that we "set 'Paul's gospel' in contrast with the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." This, of course, is to give the impression that we set the words of a man up against the words of the Son of God. Dr. Brooks does or should know better than this, however, for we have always held that Paul's gospel was the gospel of the Son of God.

Gal. 1:11,12: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man.

"For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, BUT BY THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST."

We *do* deny, however, that the message which our exalted Lord committed to Paul was exactly the same as that which He preached while on earth. Nowhere do we read that Christ on earth preached "*the gospel of the grace of God*," or that Paul proclaimed: "*Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*." The "gospel of the kingdom" was proclaimed by Christ Himself while on earth (Matt. 4:17, 23); the "*gospel of the grace of God*" was proclaimed by Christ in heaven *through Paul* (Acts 20:24). But when we make this clear there is always someone to say or imply that we set Paul up against Christ or exalt Paul above Christ. This strategy has been used and dealt with so often, however, that it is getting old and the general Christian public is beginning to know better without even needing to hear the answer.

Dr. Brooks states that we deplore the ignorance of "those who so easily reconcile the message of the four Gospels and Acts with that of the Epistles." May a poor "hyper-dispensationalist," then, inquire how these messages can be reconciled *without acknowledging that a new dispensation was ushered in with Paul*?

How, for example, would Dr. Books reconcile the following:

Matt. 23:2, 3

“The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat: ALL THEREFORE, WHATSOEVER THEY BID YOU OBSERVE, THAT OBSERVE AND DO.”

Matt. 28:19, 20

“Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: TEACHING THEM TO OBSERVE ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I HAVE COMMANDED YOU: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world [age]. Amen.”

Matt. 4:17, 23

“From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS AT HAND.” “And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people.”

John 1:31

“And I knew Him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel; therefore am I come baptizing with water.”

Acts 2:38

“Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.”

Gal. 5:1

“STAND FAST THEREFORE IN THE LIBERTY WHEREWITH CHRIST HATH MADE US FREE, AND BE NOT ENTANGLED AGAIN WITH THE YOKE OF BONDAGE.”

Rom. 11:13; Gal 2:2

“I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I AM THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES; I MAGNIFY MINE OFFICE.” “And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them THAT GOSPEL WHICH I PREACH AMONG THE GENTILES, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.”

Eph. 3:1-3

“For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of THE DISPENSATION OF THE GRACE OF GOD which is given me to youward: How that by revelation He made known unto me the mystery.”

I Cor. 12:13; Eph. 4:4,5

“For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles.” “There is one body, and ... one baptism.”

Rom. 4:5

“But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.”

Dr. Brooks claims that if we are correct in our division of the Word "the Church throughout the entire era of the Spirit has been on Jewish and legal grounds, misapplying the teachings of Christ and actually proclaiming the wrong gospel." This we affirm is largely so. But have not many of the leading Bible teachers of this and the past generation, such as Scofield, Gaebelien, Chafer, Ironside, et al, decried the fact that the Church has been on Jewish and legal ground? We are not the first to make this assertion. And as to proclaiming the wrong gospel: We do not deny that the gospel of the grace of God has been proclaimed throughout this dispensation, but we maintain that it has been confused with the gospel of the kingdom - that it has not been preached in all its purity. Indeed, it is fortunate that salvation is by grace through faith, or few would even be saved.

The difficulty is that it has been erroneously assumed that our Lord, before His ascension, commissioned His apostles to go forth proclaiming the *gospel of the grace of God*. This is not so. If it were, such passages as Acts 2:38; 10:28 and 11:1,2 would prove that they either misunderstood their commission or disobeyed it. But the fact is that these Spirit-filled men of God both understood and faithfully obeyed their "great commission."

"The gospel of the grace of God," however, and *"the dispensation of the grace of God"* are not even referred to in Scripture until the raising up of Paul. And as to carrying out the "great commission" today, while Christendom *talks* about obeying it, not one single person today is in fact carrying it out, for God has rendered this impossible.

Let the reader examine the records of it carefully and see if he is ready or able to "observe all things" which Christ commanded while on earth (Matt. 28:20) or to work miracles (Mark 16:17,18) or to begin at Jerusalem with Israel (Luke 24:47 and Acts 1:8). And should Dr. Brooks' readers really begin to teach that *"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,"* according to Mark 16:16, or *"Repent and be baptized . . . for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,"* according to Acts 2:38, we feel sure that he would soon be quoting from the Pauline epistles to call a halt to the undispensational procedure!

Concerning the scattering of the Jewish believers in Acts 8:1, Dr. Brooks believes with Dr. Ironside that "the results of this scattering, so far-reaching and fruitful, were according to the plan of God for the speeding up of the commission of Acts 1:8." He says this in defense of Dr. Ironside, who wrote concerning the same passage: "God sometimes has to act through disagreeable circumstances in order to compel His saints to work in accordance with His plan for them . . ." (*Lectures on Acts*, Pp. 176, 177).

We do not, of course, object to Dr. Brooks' disagreeing with us here, but we do object that in answering us he does not faithfully represent our views before the public. Says he: "Mr. Stam contends that the very opposite is the truth. These believers did not leave Jerusalem under the Lord's leading, but lacking the courage of the apostles who remained in the city, they were simply taking to the tall timbers . . . those who were

scattered abroad (and went everywhere proclaiming salvation through Christ) were cowards - unfaithful men who deserted the twelve just at the point when Israel was about to have the kingdom offer withdrawn. . . “

Now, in our article (August, 1949) we said nothing about these Jerusalem believers being cowards or taking to the tall timbers and deserting the twelve. We simply disagreed with Dr. Ironside in his view that God had to use "*disagreeable circumstances*" to "*compel*" the *twelve* to carry out the great commission.

We do not share the view that the twelve were unfaithful in the carrying out of their commission, and to prove that they *were* faithful we pointed out that: 1.) they had been sent to proclaim the *Messianic kingdom*, 2.) which was to be set up at Jerusalem, and that 3.) it took more courage for the twelve to remain at Jerusalem in a raging persecution than to flee with the multitude.

Dr. Brooks twists our words to mean that the multitudes were cowardly and deserted the apostles, but he fails to answer what we really said on this passage:

It was natural, of course, that the believers at Jerusalem should flee when the fearful persecution broke out there, but how shall we regard the conduct of the apostles in staying there?

Were they delinquent in their duty? The Scriptures answer plainly that they were not, but it is sad to think that many do charge these Spirit-filled men with failure to obey the divine orders because they did not leave Jerusalem with the rest.

The reason the twelve stayed at Jerusalem is that they had been sent to proclaim, not the gospel of the grace of God, as Dr. Ironside supposes, but the kingdom rights of Christ. These twelve had been promised thrones in that kingdom (Matt. 19:28). That kingdom was (and is) to be established at *Jerusalem* and could not be established until *Jerusalem* had accepted Messiah.

Which took the greater courage, to flee from Jerusalem now or to remain there in the raging persecution in daily peril of death? Would not unfaithful men have died at such a time as this.

In all this we said nothing of the faithfulness or unfaithfulness of the multitudes of the Jerusalem disciples, for it was the twelve to whom our Lord had originally given His "great commission." Will Dr. Brooks deny that these were the very men to whom our Lord had given this commission? Will he deny that the "disagreeable circumstances" of the persecution *failed* to dislodge them from their headquarters at Jerusalem? Will he deny that it took great courage to remain at their post at such a time?

If Dr. Brooks will explain wherein the twelve were unfaithful and how the "disagreeable circumstances" of the persecution "compelled" them to work in accordance with [God's] plan," we shall certainly be interested in the explanation, but let

him answer what we teach rather than distorting our words so as to make them answerable. Surely it should be simple for him to understand that the "disagreeable circumstances" of the persecution did not "compel" *the twelve* to carry out a "worldwide missionary program" by driving others from Jerusalem! Surely, too, he understands what we mean when we say:

The kingdom was (and is) to be established at *Jerusalem* and could not be established until *Jerusalem* had accepted Messiah. . Had not our Lord Himself made it clear that He would not return until Jerusalem should say: "*Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord*"? (Matt. 23:39). This is why our Lord made it so clear to His apostles that they should begin their ministry at Jerusalem (Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8). (*Berean Searchlight*, August, 1949).

SOUL WINNING AND STRAIGHT PREACHING

In connection with the "great commission" Dr. Brooks says: "If we may judge straight preaching by soul-winning passion and results, who will not prefer to go along with the 'Archbishop' [Dr. Ironside]?"

This is another unfair thrust, for it implies that those of us who do not see eye to eye with Dr. Ironside and Dr. Brooks on the "great commission" do not have a passion for the lost. Dr. Brooks is not alone in this assumption, for often it is supposed that if it is once admitted that the "great commission" is not *our* "marching orders" we have no basis for doing missionary work. But was not Paul the greatest missionary of all? Did he not in his oral and written ministry constantly plead for the salvation of the lost? And would not Dr. Brooks have to admit that we, in our oral and written ministry, constantly plead with the lost to accept Christ as Savior?

But with all of this it must be added that we may *not* judge straight preaching by soul-winning passion. Soul-winning passion is only one element in straight preaching. Many of God's workmen have been very zealous to win souls, but will not be approved of God because they have not rightly divided the Word of truth (11 Tim. 2:15). They have sought earnestly to get "decisions" for Christ but have done little or nothing to *establish* the newly saved. They have confused the gospel of the kingdom with the gospel of the grace of God. They have built Petrine material upon the Pauline foundation, failing to follow the plans and specifications of the "wise masterbuilder" (I Cor. 3:10,11). How astonished these unfaithful workmen will be when finally the divine Building Inspector passes upon the work they have done for Him!

"Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.

"If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.

"If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire" (I Cor. 3:13-15).

No, we may *not* judge straight preaching by soulwinning passion, or even by any results which we may see. As important as soul winning is, the mere passion to win souls does not by any means make a man a faithful or competent preacher of the Word. We may judge straight preaching only by the Word of God itself.

GOD HATH CHOSEN THE FOOLISH

Dr. Brooks chides: "To straighten all this out, one is supposed to become dependent on the literature of those who claim they preach 'body truth.' Everything must be re-interpreted. Lay aside the literature and few could hope to remember the new explanations or maintain the higher ground on which they are supposed to have been placed by the understanding of 'the mystery.'"

Probably there is no other statement in the whole of Dr. Brooks' article which is so exactly *opposite* the truth. On every hand we find that the mystery revealed by the glorified Lord to Paul is just the key which earnest Bible students have been looking for in their study of the Scriptures. Hence it happens over and over again that one small pamphlet or one brief statement from a pamphlet is used of God to open the eyes of some seeking saint to the wonders of the dispensation of grace. *Dependent upon our literature!* More often those whose eyes God has opened through our literature commence studying the Bible themselves as never before and begin writing literature of their own or use our literature merely to get the truth out to others!

It is not mental acumen that brings men to an understanding of the mystery, but a sincere desire for the truth. How many of God's humblest saints rejoice in "*the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles,*" while the intellectual wonder what it is all about! Surely it is true that:

"God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty;

"And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are:

"That no flesh should glory in His presence" (I Cor. 1:27-29).

A MORAL ISSUE

Few of us have as much difficulty with those passages of Scripture we do not understand as with those we *do* very well understand.

Dr. Brooks would soon be rejoicing in these truths with us if he were willing to consider them honestly. The trouble is that he does not *wish* to see them. The issue is a moral one, for, closing his eyes to those things which he does clearly see, he strives vainly to stand his unscriptural ground by confusing the issue and diverting the attention

of his readers from the truth by misrepresenting what we teach and falsely accusing us.

Those who take the trouble to examine our published writings know that Dr. Brooks is out of the will of God in this. Unless he faces this moral issue before the Lord, in the light of His Word, he will surely suffer loss for it at the judgment seat of Christ. And not until he does face it and seek by God's grace to correct it will he ever find the joy that is ours in the knowledge of the mystery.

We are well aware that in the Pauline epistles there are "some things hard to be understood," but we also insist that it is God's will that we *do* understand them and that the great prerequisite to their understanding is not a brilliant mind, but a *willing heart*. Thus there is no excuse for any believer to remain ignorant of them. This is why the prisoner for the mystery "bowed his knees" in prayer to God:

"That He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man;

"That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith: THAT YE, BEING ROOTED AND GROUNDED IN LOVE,

"MAY BE ABLE TO COMPREHEND WITH ALL SAINTS WHAT IS THE BREADTH, AND LENGTH, AND DEPTH, AND HEIGHT;

"AND TO KNOW THE LOVE OF CHRIST, WHICH PASSETH KNOWLEDGE, THAT YE MIGHT BE FILLED WITH ALL THE FULNESS OF GOD" (Eph. 3:16-19).¹⁶

It has been our observation that whenever one turns his back on the truth of the mystery, the issue is basically a *moral* one, for God never withholds needed light from those who sincerely seek it.

Some years ago the editor of a weekly evangelistic paper publicly charged us with discarding much of the Bible for present use, with teaching that Paul's epistles written before Acts 28:28 were for the Jews, insinuating that we are "Subtle Modernists" along with "Dr. Fosdick" and "Dr. Matthews" and that we "repudiate even the Lord's Supper as being of law instead of grace."

We sent him a copy of our published reply, proving from our own literature that his charges were false and asking him to correct this in his paper. When we later made this known in our columns we received a letter from his secretary complaining that we had treated him unjustly since he did not even know that we had replied to his article. This was not our first experience of this kind, so we sent him another copy of our reply, this time by registered mail, "return receipt requested." We now have in our files the card, signed at his office in Wheaton, Ill., acknowledging receipt of our reply. This card was dated Feb. 17, 1947. But this has made no difference. The popular evangelist has to date made no move to retract the brazen falsehoods he has published against his

¹⁶ See the author's booklet entitled, *The Dimensions of the Mystery*.

brethren - indeed, he goes on spreading them.

And this sort of thing takes place with disappointing frequency all about us. It is the crying scandal of Fundamentalism today and that which more than anything else, is holding back the heaven-sent revival which the Church so sorely needs.

AN APPEAL TO THE TIMID

God is satisfied with nothing less than "the obedience of faith." If we do not take a stand for what He has shown us from His Word – even though it may affect what we formerly taught - we cannot expect Him to show us more. He gives us light only that we may "*shine as lights in the world; holding forth the Word of life.*"

Many who have begun to see the glories of God's unprophesied dispensation of grace have refrained from making it known for fear of opposition and persecution. These timid saints should remember that no truth is fully enjoyed until we have shared it with others. Nor are we ready for further truth until we have shared what we have with others. Nor are we faithful stewards of God if we do not make it known to others.

True, if we are faithful, our adversary will do all in his power to oppose us, but we need not fear him when God is with us. And what if we do fear? Shall we allow natural, human fear to make cowards of us? Shall we shirk our *duty* just because we are afraid? Did not Paul and the other apostles and prophets often do their duty in fear and trembling (1 Cor. 2:3, *et al*)? The essence of courage is not the absence of fear, but disregard for it - doing the right even though we *are* afraid.

Why should unfaithful and unjust men intimidate you and keep you from faithfully proclaiming what you know to be the truth? "*The fear of man bringeth a snare.*" It is not of God.

"FOR GOD HATH NOT GIVEN US THE SPIRIT OF FEAR; BUT OF POWER, AND OF LOVE, AND OF A SOUND MIND" (II Tim. 1:7).

This is why Paul - as prone to fear as we - requested special prayer:

"THAT UTTERANCE MAY BE GIVEN UNTO ME, THAT I MAY OPEN MY MOUTH BOLDLY, TO MAKE KNOWN THE MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL,

"FOR WHICH I AM AN AMBASSADOR IN BONDS; THAT THEREIN I MAY SPEAK BOLDLY, AS I OUGHT TO SPEAK" (Eph. 6:19,20).

And this is why he wrote to Timothy:

"BE NOT THOU THEREFORE ASHAMED OF THE TESTIMONY OF OUR LORD, NOR OF ME HIS PRISONER: BUT BE THOU PARTAKER OF THE AFFLICTIONS OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE POWER OF GOD;

“WHO HATH SAVED US, AND CALLED US WITH AN HOLY CALLING, NOT ACCORDING TO OUR WORKS, BUT ACCORDING TO HIS OWN PURPOSE AND GRACE, WHICH WAS GIVEN US IN CHRIST JESUS BEFORE THE WORLD BEGAN” (II Tim. 1:8,9).

One thing is sure, the more we truly love God, the more we will be emboldened to speak out for Him, for *"perfect love casteth out fear"* (I John 4:18).

God grant us the love and faithfulness to serve Him as we should!

***It Always Amazes Us That
Leading Men Can Go on Publishing
These Falsehoods as if They Had
Never Been Exposed***

Chapter VII

A PROTEST

I was ministering the Word in Indianapolis, Ind., when I received a copy of *The Sword of the Lord* with an editorial that amazed me.

Seldom have I published an article of any length that has not first undergone several readings and many changes, but after reading the above-mentioned editorial I took my Bible and a pad of paper, drove out to a nearby park and, after a prayer for divine guidance, wrote the following article at one sitting and sent it without change to the printer for publication in the *Berean Searchlight*.

The lengths to which the editor had gone in misrepresenting our teachings and the outrage of his having done this when he knew full well what we taught, somehow inspired me to write my reply. My pen could not write fast enough the thoughts that filled my mind. The completed article appeared in the *Berean Searchlight* of September, 1944:

QUESTION PLEASE

Since Dr. John R. Rice, of Wheaton, Illinois, has openly attacked certain Bible truths as "O'Hair's and Stam's hyper-dispensationalism," it becomes our duty to reply to him.

We have not sought a controversy with him, but we would be poor soldiers indeed were we to run from an attack on the Word of God.

Read our reply carefully, prayerfully and in the light of God's Word. Do not be upset over the controversy. God uses it to bring His truth to light.

AN OPEN LETTER TO DR. JOHN R. RICE

Indianapolis, Ind.
August 23, 1944

Dr. John R. Rice
Wheaton, Illinois

Dear Dr. Rice:

I was, surprised to receive through a friend, your printed attack on what you call

"O'Hair's and Stam's hyper-dispensational teaching" (August 4, SWORD OF THE LORD).

First, let me say in all honesty, dear brother, that I have not desired or sought to enter into controversy with you, even though you have been asking for it for some time. You have made this reply necessary, and lest you call us "quarrelsome" again, it should be clearly noted that at least in this case *you* started the "quarrel," not we.

We are going to reply to your accusations rather thoroughly, also rather plainly, but we ask you to believe us when we say that we do so, not at all because we dislike you, or feel like quarreling, but simply because you have placed us in such a position that we must either reply or, by our silence, plead guilty to your charges.

If mere personal matters were involved, we should, by the grace of God, remain silent, but you have attacked us as the exponents of important Bible doctrines, and as soldiers of Jesus Christ we rise to defend these doctrines with "the Sword of the Spirit."

SOME BASIC QUESTIONS

More than two years ago you began calling us "pestiferous" and "ultra-smart." Now you declare that we are "quarrelsome and critical," that we "split churches" and "arouse enmity," and, to add insult to injury, you actually let the public in on the deep dark secret that we have not had "adequate theological training," or "any solid seminary training"!

Even without such training, however, we understand quite well what you mean. You mean that only trained theologians, like yourself, are capable of interpreting the Scriptures. There can be no other meaning. You mean that I, for one, should not question your unscriptural theories as to water baptism because I am not intellectually qualified. You mean that your readers, most of whom are also without "adequate theological training," should place confidence in you and take your word for granted since you, not we, have the academic qualifications necessary to the understanding of the Scriptures.

Here the flesh would prompt me to compare my background with yours, but that would be foolish.

"FOR WE DARE NOT MAKE OURSELVES OF THE NUMBER, OR COMPARE OURSELVES WITH SOME THAT COMMEND THEMSELVES: BUT THEY MEASURING THEMSELVES BY THEMSELVES AND COMPARING THEMSELVES AMONG THEMSELVES, ARE NOT WISE" (II Cor. 10:12).

Surely you know that worldly education does not qualify one to understand the Scriptures.

"THE NATURAL MAN RECEIVETH NOT THE THINGS OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD: FOR THEY ARE FOOLISHNESS UNTO HIM: NEITHER CAN HE KNOW THEM,

BECAUSE THEY ARE SPIRITUALLY DISCERNED" (1 Cor. 2:14).

Surely you know that "UNLEARNED AND IGNORANT MEN" put to silence the highest leaders in Israel, and that "GOD HATH CHOSEN THE FOOLISH THINGS OF THE WORLD TO CONFOUND THE WISE" (Acts 4:13,14; 1 Cor. 1:27).

If you do not know these things you have not yet learned the very first principles of spiritual understanding.

Do not suppose for a moment, dear brother, that you can send us back to Rome so fast, where poor, ignorant souls are told that they must trust trained theologians to interpret the Scriptures for them, however grotesque those interpretations may be. By the grace of God we come from Berea and intend to continue testing man's word by God's Word, nor will it shock us any longer to find that many trained theologians have been utterly in the dark about some of the most wonderful truths in the Bible.

We do not, of course, despise learning, but we do declare that man by nature is spiritually blind and deaf and that mere education will not open his eyes or unstop his ears. Only the Spirit can do this. Some trained theologians have been mightily used of God, but others have perverted and opposed the truth, as you know. Trained theologians sent our Savior to the cross. Trained theologians sent Paul to jail. Trained theologians led the Church into the dark ages.

To be sure, we have much, very much, to learn, but we must ask questions in order to learn, so here are a few:

1. Why can you trained theologians not agree, with each other? Why is it that under your leadership the Church has become so confused and divided, especially as to water baptism, that *whatever one may believe, he is in the minority - there is no majority?*

2. Again and again THE SWORD OF THE LORD has advertised a certain book thus:

A DREAM OF HEAVEN

A Thrill You Have Never Experienced Before

Almost too sacred to be revealed! Reunion of loved ones with earth ties unchanged, our home life in heaven.... Describes in detail the celestial gardens, the crystal sea, wondrous palaces, pillared temples of pearl, etc., as the author actually saw them in her vision.

Is this what a "theological training" provides? Is it your "solid seminary training" that leads you to substitute a woman's dream for the written Word of God? Unscriptural fancies described *"as the author actually saw them - IN HER VISION!"* May God have

pity on you!

And *you*, a sponsor of religious dreams, call us "ignorant of the Bible"! As ignorant of the Bible as we may be, we naturally recall God's Word in Jer. 23:28:

"THE PROPHET THAT HATH A DREAM, LET HIM TELL A DREAM: AND HE THAT HATH MY WORD, LET HIM SPEAK MY WORD FAITHFULLY. WHAT IS THE CHAFF TO THE WHEAT? SAITH THE LORD."

We are reminded too of Paul's words to Timothy in II Tim. 4:4:

"AND THEY SHALL TURN AWAY THEIR EARS FROM THE TRUTH, AND SHALL BE TURNED UNTO FABLES."

We call upon you to give us a clear, frank explanation of this, for it lies at the very heart of our controversy.

Our next question deals directly with your article and is, perhaps, the most important of them all.

3. Why do you tell lies, Dr. Rice?

You call Pastor O'Hair and me hyper-dispensationalists and explain that "hyper-dispensationalists, or ultra-dispensationalists, say that a new dispensation began at Acts 28:28."

You say we "discredit much of the Bible for present use," and charge us with teaching that Paul's epistles written before Acts 28:28 were for the Jews. Furthermore, you leave your readers under the impression that perhaps we have "repudiated even the Lord's supper as being of law instead of grace."

Be careful, dear brother, that the "father of lies" does not use you as one of his propaganda ministers. You need not oppose even error by such methods.

You well know that neither Pastor O'Hair nor I teach that a new dispensation began at Acts 28:28, or that Paul's epistles written before then were for the Jews. You well know that both of us believe and teach that the Lord's supper is included in God's program for this age.

You well know that neither of us discredit *any* of the Bible for present use, and your insinuation in your baptism booklet that we are "subtle modernists," along with "Dr. Fosdick" and "Dr. Mathews," is dishonest and wicked.

You well know, or should well know, that we vigorously defend the verbal inspiration of the Bible, the eternal deity of Christ, His supernatural birth, His vicarious death, His bodily resurrection and every other fundamental of the faith.

If you do *not* know these things, then you are the more guilty for being so unscrupulous as to slander your brethren in Christ and brand them heretics without even trying to find out what they believe.

Surely you must know these things, however, for not long ago you and I talked together for four full hours on this subject and you claim that you have read Pastor O'Hair's literature.

You owe us all an explanation of your conduct. In the next issue of the SWORD you should publish the truth about these things, at least as conspicuously as you published the untruths, and "fess up" whether it was ignorance or dishonesty or both that caused you to misrepresent us.

Remember, many *Berean* readers also read the SWORD and they will not respect you very highly if you try to hush this matter up as some other editors have done.

Furthermore, *God* is looking on, and you and I will soon give an account to Him. So, for the truth's sake, make this matter right as soon as possible and be assured that we will forgive you with all our hearts. Indeed, we are not angry with you now. We are sorry that you have used these methods to attack the truth, and pray that our reply may be used of God to bring you to yourself and to make others aware of the truth in the matter.

From here on our questions will be wholly *doctrinal*, and taken mostly from your article.

CONCERNING THE "GREAT COMMISSION"

4. You say, "These eleven apostles were to go to all nations."

We agree that they "were to go," but can you explain why, as far as the Scriptures are concerned, they did not go?

Can you explain what Paul meant when he said, some twenty-five years later:

"I SPEAK TO YOU GENTILES, INASMUCH AS I AM THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES. I MAGNIFY MINE OFFICE" (Rom. 11:13).

Does this not indicate a change in dispensation with Israel's rejection of the message of the twelve? And does it not simply explain Gal. 2:2 and 2:9:

"AND I [PAUL] WENT UP BY REVELATION AND COMMUNICATED UNTO THEM [THE TWELVE] THAT GOSPEL WHICH I PREACH AMONG THE GENTILES, BUT PRIVATELY TO THEM WHICH WERE OF REPUTATION, LEST BY ANY MEANS I SHOULD RUN, OR HAD RUN, IN VAIN.... AND WHEN JAMES, CEPHAS AND JOHN, WHO SEEMED TO BE PILLARS, PERCEIVED THE GRACE THAT WAS GIVEN UNTO

ME, THEY GAVE TO ME AND BARNABAS THE RIGHT HANDS OF FELLOWSHIP; THAT WE SHOULD GO UNTO THE HEATHEN, AND THEY UNTO THE CIRCUMCISION."

Does this not prove conclusively that the twelve, by the Holy Spirit, handed over their Gentile ministry to Paul? Otherwise, was not Paul entirely out of the will of God in calling himself "the apostle of the Gentiles"?

5. If, as you say, we are still under our Lord's command to "OBSERVE ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I HAVE COMMANDED YOU," are we not duty bound to observe the law of Moses? Had not our Lord said in Matt. 23:2,3:

"THE SCRIBES AND THE PHARISEES SIT IN MOSES' SEAT: ALL THEREFORE, WHATSOEVER THEY BID YOU OBSERVE, THAT OBSERVE AND DO..."

This was their clear duty under the "great commission," nor does the "law of love" alter this.

6. Is it not true that what Calvary did to the law was only revealed "*in due time*," through Paul? He said, years after Pentecost:

"BUT NOW THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD WITHOUT THE LAW IS MANIFESTED ..." (Rom. 3:21).

"BUT NOW WE ARE DELIVERED FROM THE LAW" (Rom. 7:6).

"CHRIST HATH REDEEMED US FROM THE CURSE OF THE LAW" (Gal. 3:13).

"WHEREFORE THE LAW WAS OUR SCHOOLMASTER TO BRING US UNTO CHRIST ... BUT AFTER THAT FAITH IS COME WE ARE NO LONGER UNDER A SCHOOLMASTER" (Gal. 3:24,25).

"SIN SHALL NOT HAVE DOMINION OVER YOU, FOR YE ARE NOT UNDER THE LAW BUT UNDER GRACE" (Rom. 6:14).

"STAND FAST THEREFORE IN THE LIBERTY WHEREWITH CHRIST HATH MADE US FREE, AND BE NOT ENTANGLED AGAIN WITH THE YOKE OF BONDAGE" (Gal. 5:1).

Did Peter preach anything like this at Pentecost? Was not Ananias, Saul's baptizer, commended as "*a devout man according to the law*"?

Surely there is some change in dispensation here.

7. If the great commission to the eleven was to go on uninterrupted to the end of this present age, why do you not "cast out demons, speak with new tongues," etc? (Mark

16:15-18).

Your argument on "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the age," would be a good one if it were not that God makes it so plain that this parenthetical age, this "dispensation of the grace of God," was a mystery until revealed to and through Paul:

"FOR THIS CAUSE I PAUL, THE PRISONER OF JESUS CHRIST FOR YOU GENTILES, IF YE HAVE HEARD OF THE DISPENSATION OF THE GRACE OF GOD WHICH IS GIVEN ME TO YOU-WARD: HOW THAT BY REVELATION HE MADE KNOWN UNTO ME THE MYSTERY" (Eph. 3:1-3).

Does it still need to be asked of *you* at this late date, "*if you have heard*"? I am convinced that you know almost nothing about "the mystery," the great secret revealed to and through Paul.

AN ANSWER

Let us pause here for an answer instead of a question.

Under the "great commission" salvation was to go to all nations *through Israel* according to prophecy and covenant (See [Acts 2:39; 3:25,26](#)). But under Paul's greater commission, and ours, we know no man after the flesh ([II Cor. 5:16-21](#)). Salvation now goes to all nations apart from Israel, according to *the mystery and grace*.

According to *covenant* and *prophecy* salvation was to go to all nations through the RISE of Israel ([Gen. 22:17,18](#) and [Isa. 60:1-3](#)). But by grace and the revelation of *the mystery*, salvation now goes to all nations through the FALL of Israel ([Rom. 11:11,12,15](#)).

The *covenant promise* was offered to Israel by PETER ([Acts 3:19-26](#)). But when this was rejected, God revealed *the mystery* of His eternal purpose to PAUL and sent him forth to offer to His enemies, reconciliation by grace through faith alone.

The most glorious news God has ever proclaimed to the world was sprung as a surprise when sin had risen to its height, when Jew had joined Gentile in organized rebellion against God and the stage was all set for God to make Christ's enemies His footstool ([Psa. 2](#)).

God had planned this but had not promised it. He did not owe it to the world for any reason. It was *grace, pure grace*.

"WHERE SIN ABOUNDED, GRACE DID MUCH MORE ABOUND ... THAT GRACE MIGHT REIGN" ([Rom. 5:20,21](#)).

We are now living in the reign of grace. We do not know when it will end. We only know that for sinners "now is the accepted time now is the day of salvation" ([II Cor. 6:2](#))

and that saints are told to be "redeeming the time because the days are evil" (Eph. 5:16).

Peter's early ministry concerned that "WHICH GOD [HAD] SPOKEN BY THE MOUTH OF ALL HIS HOLY PROPHETS SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN" (Acts 3:21,24). But Paul distinctly says that his message ("my gospel") had been "KEPT SECRET SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN" (Rom. 16:25) and multiplies phrases to assure us that it had *not* been before revealed:

"HID IN GOD."
"HID FROM AGES AND FROM GENERATIONS."
"THE UNSEARCHABLE RICHES OF CHRIST."
"IN OTHER AGES NOT MADE KNOWN."
"KEPT SECRET SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN."
"THE MYSTERY."

There is a wide distinction between the preaching of Jesus Christ according to prophecy by Peter (Acts 2-4) and "THE PREACHING OF JESUS CHRIST ACCORDING TO THE REVELATION OF THE MYSTERY" by Paul. And note, it is distinctly this latter message by which we today are to be established in the faith (See [Rom. 16:25](#)).

QUESTIONS RESUMED

8. Can those who refuse to recognize this distinction "*rightly divide the Word of truth*"? Can they be "*approved of God ... workmen who need not to be ashamed*"? (11 Tim. 2:15).

9. If, as you say, "There has never been any dispensational change in the matter of salvation," why was Abel accepted for bringing the right sacrifice and Cain rejected for bringing the wrong one? You do not need to bring any sacrifice at all. One was brought for you at Calvary before you were born. And you say there has never been any dispensational change in the matter of salvation?

Of course, since you have had such an extensive education and we practically none, it will be easy for you to answer our questions. You can just wave us aside as illiterate, but neither your readers nor ours will be satisfied with this.

Frankly I do not believe you know what a dispensation really is. I do not believe you even know the difference between the principles of God and the dispensations of God.

I am enclosing a pamphlet on this subject. I wish you would read it carefully.

TAMPERING WITH THE SCRIPTURES

10. Why do you skip so lightly over Mark 16:16?

Concerning this verse you say in your "Bible Baptism" that "Christians are supposed to be baptized as soon as possible after they are saved."

Thus you alter the Lord's command to read: "He that believeth and is saved should be baptized as soon as possible." But Mark 16:16 says: "HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED. . . ." This allows of no other interpretation than that baptism was linked with faith as required for salvation. You merely change this verse to make it fit your theory.

As to the rest of the verse: "*He that believeth not shall be damned*" of course one who did not believe would not be baptized, and even if he were he would not be saved.

11. Concerning Mark 1:4 and Acts 2:38 where repentance and baptism are said to be "*for the remission of sins,*" You say that the word "for" means "because of," so that John and Peter really told their hearers to repent and be baptized because their sins were forgiven!

I wonder how you would harmonize this with Acts 22:16 where Saul of Tarsus was told: "*Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.*"

True enough, this washing was symbolic; so were the sacrifices, but you cannot make baptism a memorial of sins forgiven any more than the sacrifices.

Imagine Ananias telling Saul to "wash away his sins" because his sins had been washed away! The clear fact is that Saul could not *claim* salvation until he had been "baptized ... calling on the name of the Lord."

But now consider what Paul later wrote to the Corinthians:

"And such were some of you: BUT YE ARE WASHED, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and BY THE SPIRIT OF OUR GOD" (I Cor. 6:11).

The word "washed" is the same word translated wash" in Acts 22:16 and these are the only times it is used. When *Saul* was first saved, baptism was necessary to the washing away of sins, but later Paul wrote to the Corinthians: "*Ye ARE washed ... by the Spirit of our God.*"

Is there not some progress in revelation, some change in dispensation here? What do you say?

12. You say: "It is foolish to say that the 'kingdom gospel' is one gospel and the 'gospel of grace' is another gospel," and add: "This is a distinction made by men ignorant of the Bible."

But *God* made these distinctions, not we. The word "gospel" simply means "good

news" and unless the good news is qualified or explained you merely have a blank message. Why does God use distinguishing terms if not to tell us what the "good news" is about in each case?

I can understand how, by some MISinterpretation, you might say that "the gospel of the kingdom" and "the gospel of the grace of God" are the same message, but, for the life of me, I cannot see how you can make "the gospel of the circumcision" and "the gospel of the UNcircumcision" one and the same.

Even if you change the preposition "of" to "to" in Gal. 2:7, it will not help you out of this dilemma, for it would still mean that to Paul was committed "the gospel to the uncircumcision" while to Peter was committed "the gospel to the circumcision. Reading the verse, even thus changed, we would have to conclude that there was some difference between the message for the Gentile and that for the Jew.

This does not, of course, mean that we concede that the preposition should be "to," for of the twenty-two versions of the New Testament which I have, not one renders this word "to."

JOHN THE BAPTIST AND PAUL

13. From John 3:36 you argue that "John the Baptist taught exactly the same plan of salvation that ... Paul taught."

Did Paul preach "*the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins*"? Remember, this was the very *theme* of John's message, not merely some angle of it. Mark 1:4 says distinctly that:

"JOHN DID BAPTIZE IN THE WILDERNESS, AND PREACH THE BAPTISM OF REPENTANCE FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS."

Peter later called this "THE BAPTISM WHICH JOHN PREACHED" (Acts 10:37).

Compare this with Paul, who speaks of "... *the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God*" (Acts 20:24) and "*Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel*" (1 Cor. 1:17).

You no doubt agree with me that the Apostle John's Gospel was written considerably after Paul. It was written after Israel had rejected the glorified Christ and Paul had been sent forth with the message of grace. This is what makes John 1:10-12 so significant. But even if John 3:36 records the words of John the Baptist, the case is not altered.

John proclaimed Christ, and of course only those who believed on Christ were saved, but do you suppose for a moment that a man who refused John's baptism really believed John's message? Anyone who claimed to repent and believe John's message about Christ, but refused to be baptized showed that he hadn't really repented or

believed at all.

We have a concrete example of this in Luke 7:30:

"BUT THE PHARISEES AND LAWYERS REJECTED THE COUNSEL OF GOD AGAINST THEMSELVES, BEING NOT BAPTIZED OF HIM."

In John's day he that believed on the Son would most assuredly submit to baptism.

And notice further that their baptism was not "because of" their having been saved - a "blessed picture of death and burial with Christ." It was an acknowledgment of "*the counsel of God against themselves.*" It spoke of their need of cleansing. That is why they had to submit to it to be saved.

But today, according to "the gospel of the grace of God" and according to your own admission, the simplest believer is "*justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*" (Rom. 3:24).

And you say John the Baptist and Paul taught exactly the same plan of salvation! Come, brother, acknowledge that there is at least some difference between John's message and God's message for the world today.

14. Do your converts come to your baptisms "*confessing their sins,*" as John's did?

Your baptism booklet contains some touching stories about candidates for baptism kissing you, shouting "Hallelujah," "weeping for joy," "whispering . . . 'Oh! Praise the Lord!' " etc., but I search in vain to find them weeping for sorrow and confessing their sins" as they did at John's baptism.

Concerning your own baptism you say: "the Father spoke from heaven to me, saying, in some manner as He did to Christ at His baptism, 'This is My beloved son in whom I am well pleased.'"

Be careful, brother, that you do not unwittingly fall into the sin of blasphemy. To say you are "*accepted in the Beloved*" is one thing, but what you say here is quite another, for you rob our blessed Lord of a glory that belongs to Him alone.

Here again you have forgotten that John's candidates were baptized "*confessing their SINS,*" and that John's message was "THE COUNSEL OF GOD AGAINST THEMSELVES" which they could acknowledge only by being baptized.

It was because Christ, the holy Son of God, had here been "numbered with the transgressors," that God broke through the heavens to say: "*This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*" But He did not say it concerning any of the others whom John baptized, nor would He say it about you.

15. You surely astonish me when you say that "John the Baptist properly belongs in the New Testament and not in the Old."

You must know that the Old Testament (Covenant) was not put away by King James at Malachi 4:6, but by Christ at Calvary, and even this was not *historically* done until some time later (See [1 Tim. 2:6,7](#); [Heb. 8:13](#)).

And how can you place John in the New Testament when the New Testament was not made until after John had been beheaded? ([Matt. 26:28](#)).

You have to do this "juggling" to make your baptism views seem consistent, but the more we examine those views by the Scriptures, the more impossible they prove to be.

16. You say that those who teach that "baptism is essential to salvation simply misunderstand the Scriptures."

Of course! But here you confuse the issue. You know that we do not teach that water baptism is essential to salvation. We teach that it once was required for salvation. Your attack was levelled at *us*, not at the Campbellites, so do not lead your readers into confusion about this.

I believe that in your heart of hearts you must acknowledge that we employ Mark 1:4; Mark 16:16; Luke 3:3; Acts 2:38 and Acts 22:16 as *they are written*, while you "interpret" them to mean something else. Perhaps your "theological training" has taught you this, but it is wrong.

Let me ask you one simple question as to this. Suppose YOU had been one of those guilty murderers at Pentecost. Suppose YOU had been so conscience stricken that YOU had cried with them: "*Men and brethren, what shall we do?*" Then suppose you had heard Peter's answer: "*Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*"

What would you have done?

There is only one answer. You would have repented and have been baptized. If you had not, you would not have received "the remission of sins," nor "the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Do you mean to tell us that you could have been saved that day, had you refused to be baptized? Will you dare to alter this as you do Mark 16:16?

No, brother, there has been a *great* change in dispensation, for you and I agree that today the simplest, humblest believer is "*accepted in the Beloved [One]*" (Eph. 1:6). To add water baptism now is not only unnecessary, but *wrong*, for it casts reflections on the glorious finished work of Christ.

You are trying to alter "the gospel of the kingdom" to make it synonymous with "the gospel of the grace of God," but this cannot be done.

You must recognize that with Israel's rejection of the risen, glorified Christ, she fell, and now, in matchless grace God has sent salvation to the world through her *fall* (Rom. 11:11,12).

He did not use the twelve to proclaim this message, but *another* apostle, the very leader of the rebellion against the Lord Jesus - Saul of Tarsus, saved and made Paul.

17. You surprise me again when you say that John the Baptist "preached the gospel of grace and did not preach the law."

Brother!

Can you deny that it was not until Acts 15 that the church at Jerusalem even agreed that the Gentiles were to be free from the Law? As for themselves, they still took it for granted that they were to continue under the Law. Hear James' brethren as they speak to Paul, as late as Acts 21:20:

"THOU SEEST, BROTHER, HOW MANY THOUSANDS OF JEWS THERE ARE WHICH BELIEVE, AND THEY ARE ALL ZEALOUS OF THE LAW."

And you have John the Baptist, even before the cross, preaching "the gospel of grace" and "not ... the law!"

Of course there was grace in John's message but there is a vast difference between grace in a dispensation and "*the dispensation of the grace of God*," which was committed to Paul.

18. John the Baptist's father made a very significant statement after God had opened his mouth (Luke 1:64):

"Blessed be the Lord God of ISRAEL; for He hath visited and redeemed HIS PEOPLE.

"And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of His servant David:

"As He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began.

"That we should be SAVED FROM OUR ENEMIES, AND FROM THE HAND OF ALL THAT HATE US;

"To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember His holy covenant;

"The oath which He sware to our father Abraham,

"THAT HE WOULD GRANT UNTO US THAT WE, BEING DELIVERED OUT OF THE HAND OF OUR ENEMIES MIGHT SERVE HIM WITHOUT FEAR,

"IN HOLINESS AND RIGHTEOUSNESS, BEFORE HIM ALL THE DAYS OF OUR LIFE.

"AND THOU, CHILD, SHALT BE CALLED THE PROPHET OF THE HIGHEST: FOR THOU SHALT GO BEFORE THE FACE OF THE LORD TO PREPARE HIS WAYS" (Luke 1:68-76).

Does this sound as though John was to proclaim "the gospel of the grace of God"? Of course not. He was the forerunner of the King, to proclaim "*the gospel of the kingdom.*" And surely a comparison of the above passage with Paul's epistles should be enough to convince anyone that there is a difference.

THE PRAYER OF FAITH

19. Some of us have been waiting for a long time for an explanation of your statement in the January 16, 1942 SWORD on "The Prayer of Faith" and "Whatsoever Ye Ask." I quote:

No, it is not always God's will to heal the sick; but when the elders are called on to pray, then it is their faith that will *guarantee* the healing of the sick.

Can it be that the elders' prayer will guarantee healing when it is not God's will?

Dear brother, your difficulty concerning prayer as a guarantee of healing will vanish once you see that the "whatsoever ye ask" promises are found *only* in connection with the proclamation of the kingdom to Israel, God's earthly people.

Have you forgotten that James distinctly addresses his epistle "*to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad*" (James 1:1)?

And have you forgotten that Paul says: "*I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles. I magnify mine office*" (Rom. 11:13)?

We must not forget that sin has risen to its height in "*this present evil age*" (Gal. 1:4). We are told that Satan is the "god" of this age, blinding the minds of sinners (II Cor. 4:4) and wrestling to overthrow saints (Eph. 6:10-20).

In this darkness, when God Himself seems to be in hiding, it is not strange that we should be reminded that:

"WE KNOW NOT WHAT WE SHOULD PRAY FOR AS WE OUGHT" (Rom. 8:26).

But, thank God, the apostle hastens to add:

"AND WE KNOW THAT ALL THINGS WORK TOGETHER FOR GOOD TO THEM THAT LOVE GOD; TO THEM WHO ARE THE CALLED ACCORDING TO HIS PURPOSE" (Rom. 8:28).

As the darkness deepens, how blessed to leave all in His hands to work out for our good!

In "this present evil age," grace on God's part, and faith on man's, rise to their highest levels. This is why Phil. 4:6,7 so comfortingly says:

"BE CAREFUL [FULL OF CARE] FOR NOTHING; BUT IN EVERYTHING BY PRAYER AND SUPPLICATION, WITH THANKSGIVING LET YOUR REQUESTS BE MADE KNOWN UNTO GOD.

"AND ("AND" WHAT? "and whatsoever ye ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive?" No. "AND ...) THE PEACE OF GOD, WHICH PASSETH ALL UNDERSTANDING, SHALL KEEP YOUR HEARTS AND MINDS THROUGH CHRIST JESUS."

What rich blessing goes with *this* sort of prayer life! The storm may rage. God may seem not even to be listening to my prayer, but I know why! I know this poor world is given up to judgment and my position and blessings are in the heavenlies. I know that His seeming indifference certainly does not mean that He does not care, for:

"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?" (Rom. 8:32).

He would have me live above this world - above its sorrows as well as its "joys," and so He asks me to have the greatest faith and leave all to Him.

You may have "whatsoever ye ask," if you will - and if you can get it! But I do not want to be so foolish as to give away a dollar for a dime. I want to join Paul in singing that great doxology:

"NOW UNTO HIM THAT IS ABLE TO DO EXCEEDING ABUNDANTLY ABOVE ALL THAT WE ASK OR THINK, ACCORDING TO THE POWER THAT WORKETH IN US,

"UNTO HIM BE GLORY IN THE CHURCH BY CHRIST JESUS THROUGHOUT ALL AGES, WORLD WITHOUT END. AMEN." (Eph. 3:20,21).

DIVISIONS

20. One closing question, concerning your charge that we cause division, split churches, etc.

It is true that as long as we are in this world the truth will cause division. Truth draws a straight line. Either you believe it or you don't. It cuts right through business and social friendships and even family ties.

Truth is the greatest divider on earth. Thank God, however, it is also the greatest uniter. It constantly reconciles bitterest enemies and brings together those once farthest apart.

Surely our doctrine is not *in itself* divisive, for the very core of it is that by ONE BAPTISM all believers are baptized into ONE BODY.

Present day *water* baptism theories certainly are divisive *in themselves*, however. Fundamentalist churches all over the land are excluding fellow members because they have not been baptized in the "right way." God will accept these "wrongly baptized" saints, but the brethren won't!

You know that your malicious opposition to these truths causes more division than our preaching, for we preach the unity of believers in Christ. We call upon you, therefore:

- (1.) To cease opposing a message which you plainly do not understand.
- (2.) To publicly retract the false statements you have made concerning our teachings.
- (3.) To answer our questions frankly and sincerely *with the Scriptures*.

If you continue to oppose these truths you will find only that "WE CAN DO NOTHING AGAINST THE TRUTH, BUT FOR THE TRUTH" (II Cor. 13:8).

One pastor in this city recently drove out of his church a group who had come to see and rejoice in the mystery revealed to Paul. Already two of them are pastors and the third is engaged in Bible teaching work! This is how the truth spreads.

In the very same mail with your SWORD there came three letters from pastors.

The first says: "Three weeks ago I went on through and preached on 'One Baptism.' Since then my position here has been in jeopardy. The crisis has not turned yet. We, my wife, two children and I, are ready for God's will, ourselves seeking to be patient and loving to all, regardless of accusations and charges."

The second says: "God has wondrously sustained and we have made it very plain that no water rite shall ever enter this church."

The third is from a boyhood friend who writes to tell how he is being blessed in

proclaiming the message, adding: "all the troubles we must go through for it, just make us more determined than ever, and give great joy in the heart."

All three of these have just recently come out for the mystery, but it means so much to them that they are quite willing to pay what it costs to make it known.

In these days when once again "all seek their own," it is heartening to find men of God who are willing to forsake position, fame and money to stand for the *truth*. This is the hope of the Church.

We have asked you only twenty questions. We should like to ask you sixty more concerning your booklet "Bible Baptism," for instance, about your statement that "the word *baptism* or *baptize* is not even mentioned in the Old Testament"-when *baptism* and *baptizing* are originally Greek words, not Hebrew! But we will stop with this for now. Printing costs money and long articles tire readers.

May God help and bless you, dear brother. We have no ill will toward you. Many of us know what it is to be cast out by friends and loved ones for these truths and somehow it has made us more tenderhearted toward them.

We battle for the truth only that we may be good soldiers of Jesus Christ," and that you and those whom you would mislead may be won for the truth and delivered from error.

Repeatedly and relentlessly, Dr. Rice has continued to spread the above and other falsehoods about those of us who proclaim "the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery."

We, of course, could not reply to him each time, but others did, and in January, 1957, we placed the following among our news items in the *Searchlight*:

THE SWORD OF THE LORD has come out with another attack on the alleged teachings of Pastor J. C. O'Hair and your Editor. Despite the fact that Dr. Rice has for years known what we stand for, and has again and again been requested not to misrepresent our teachings, he still continues to misinform the tens of thousands of his readers, instead of answering our teachings by the Scriptures. This latest attack has been ably answered by Brothers R. B. Shiflet and Charles F. Baker in their columns. We sincerely appreciate this, though we had decided not to answer Dr. Rice ourselves. What can one do with a man who wilfully and habitually tells lies, but leave him with the Lord?

Now We Are Higher Critics!

Chapter VIII

IT IS GETTING CONTAGIOUS

It seemed, during these years, that one popular leader stirred up another to make reckless and unfounded charges against those who proclaimed the unadulterated gospel of the grace of God. They seemed to charge us with any crime that came to mind in their efforts to keep sincere Christians from listening to us or reading our writings.

They were largely successful too, for then, if ever, we felt like Paul when it was reported to him that all his informants knew about this "sect" was that "everywhere it is spoken against."

It was not encouraging to receive letters from people who had concluded that we did teach the heresies we had been charged with since so many people were saying so and that therefore they wanted us to stop sending them our literature.

As "stewards of the mysteries of God," however, we could not just "leave it all with the Lord" or "just pray about it," as some of our friends urged, for we realized keenly that had Paul and Luther and Calvin and Darby followed this course the Church would still be in the Dark Ages.

In October, 1946, therefore, we answered another vicious attack by Dr. James R. Graham as follows:

THEY WALK NOT UPRIGHTLY

Satan is ever the enemy of truth.

As the pure message of the grace of God becomes more and more widely received we must not be surprised to see the attacks against it become more and more widespread and vehement, until, as in Paul's day, many who have had no direct contact with it can say only: "We know that everywhere it is spoken against."

While it is with sorrow that we witness the determined opposition of many - even among God's children - against it, we nevertheless rejoice that in this way our teachings are tested from every angle, for it is our sincere desire, before God, to preach *sound doctrine*, whatever the cost.

By "sound doctrine," however, we do not mean popular orthodoxy but conformity to the Scriptures and we cannot forget the Spirit-inspired words of Paul, the one who has so much to say about sound doctrine:

"Hold fast the form of sound words WHICH THOU HAS HEARD OF ME, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus" (II Tim. 1:13).

Amid the storm of opposition which rages against the truth, our hearts are filled with gratitude and praise as each new test bears witness that what Paul calls "*my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery,*" is indeed God's message for us today, the answer to present problems, the very heart of the "sound doctrine" to which the apostle of the Gentiles refers.

While it would be impossible as well as unprofitable to reply publicly to all the charges publicly made against us for preaching this blessed message, there are certain ones which, for obvious reasons, we must either answer or, by our silence, acknowledge to be valid.

Among these is a recent book entitled "The New Higher-Criticism" by James R. Graham, formerly of China, whom Dr. Barnhouse, some years back, hailed as "the greatest living missionary."

We regret that while the book is an attack upon the "O'Hair-Stam-Neo-Tubingens," both Pastor O'Hair and this writer had to learn of it indirectly. Neither were sent copies of it. This is perhaps not strange, since the book so far exceeds the bounds of common fairness and honesty.

Dr. Graham's book is plainly the writing of a man hard pressed, for the language is by no means reserved. As we open its pages we find that we are:

A fifth column within the citadel . . . modern Gnostics... rushing in with their thin blades to "rightly divide" (?) the word of truth . . . Bible choppers who pride themselves on "rightly dividing the word of truth" ... hair-splitting quibblers . . . 20th century "dividers" who vaunt themselves on being "grace teachers" ... vivisectionists ... Neo-Tubingens . . . modern hydrophobes . . . modern Paulists ... Satan's latter-day masterpiece (Pp. 5, 9, 11, 23, 26, 27, 30, 39, 40, 42).

But Dr. Graham's name-calling is mild compared to the actual charges he makes. Among them:

As one of old betrayed the Incarnate Word, so they betray the Written Word with a kiss ... vandalism toward the sacred writings ... Satanic subtlety... They (the German higher critics) assailed Moses and Daniel, but these the very words of the blessed Son of God Himself! ... no subtlety of verbal contortion, false assumption, sheer misstatement or hermeneutical legerdemain is neglected to prove the case of these 20th century higher critics . . . It took the Devil eighteen centuries to hatch this and other cockatrice' eggs . . . the real modernism ... the cleverest masquerade to date of: "Let us sin that grace may abound." . . . Mr. Stam, and the other antinomian teachers, fear no such implication nor insinuation against the character of God if they can serve the ends of their dangerous Bible chopping, and prove that Christ's words are *not* "for our

obedience!" (Pp. 5, 6, 8, 20, 33, 42, 43, 52).

And even this is but a taste of the language used against us in "The New Higher Criticism."

If these charges are true, then to be sure, we are wholly unfit to be ministers of the Word. If they are false they surely cast dark reflections upon the man who made them, for of all the many attacks thus far made upon us, this is by far the most vicious.

TRUE OR FALSE?

The word of slander, however false, or lightly uttered, is very difficult and troublesome to disprove, and the disproof never carries as far as the slander (The New Higher Criticism, P. 5).

So writes Dr. Graham himself on the subject of slander. Yet, knowing full well, both from our writings and from personal acquaintance with this writer that we have always heartily and vigorously defended the inspiration of the Scriptures - knowing this full well - Dr. Graham calls us "Bible choppers," "a fifth column within the citadel" and "20th century higher critics." Indeed, this man, so sensitive about the matter of slander, actually dares to impugn motives and tell his readers that we "*betray the Written Word with a kiss.*"

Does Dr. Graham realize the import of such a charge - that it means we merely *pretend* to love the Word in order to betray it? Does he realize the seriousness of such loose talk? Perhaps a few charges should be made against Dr. Graham for such vicious slander of his brethren in Christ.

No less untrue or unkind are his railing accusations that we neglect no *fraudulent* methods to prove our case, that we seek to "get rid" of certain portions of Scripture, "throw out the moral law" and do not fear implications or insinuations against the character of God if we can but serve our ends and prove that Christ's words are not for our obedience.

It is extremely distasteful to us to have to deal with charges so utterly false as these. The kindest thing we can say about them is that they are the words of one who has lost his equilibrium. We deny, however, that one of these charges can be proven by *evidence from our own writings.*

Perhaps his greatest departure from truth and justice is his charge that our teaching is "the cleverest masquerade to date of 'let us sin that grace may abound,'" adding that in this matter "Mr. Stam ... will whimper about being misquoted or misunderstood."

But Mr. Stam is not whimpering when he protests before God and man that this is a slanderous lie and calls upon Dr. Graham to retract it.

We do not deny that there is much room for heart-searching among us, but to call our teaching "the cleverest masquerade to date of 'Let us sin that grace may abound,' " is as mean as it is untrue. It is the very slander Paul had to protest against in his proclamation of the gospel of the grace of God.

"And not rather, (AS WE BE SLANDEROUSLY REPORTED, AND AS SOME AFFIRM THAT WE SAY,) Let us do evil, that good may come? whose damnation [condemnation] is just" (Rom. 3:8).

That our proclamation of grace tends to loose living, much less that we "ignore moral righteousness," is the exact opposite of the truth, for the very doctrine which we emphasize so greatly - that of our baptism into Christ -- spells *death to the flesh*, as Paul clearly writes to the Romans:

"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?

"God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?

"KNOW YE NOT, THAT SO MANY OF US AS WERE BAPTIZED INTO JESUS CHRIST WERE BAPTIZED INTO HIS DEATH?" (Rom. 6:1-3).

And with no less clarity the apostle points out that grace, not law, is the very secret of victory over sin, when he says:

"FOR SIN SHALL NOT HAVE DOMINION OVER YOU: FOR YE ARE NOT UNDER THE LAW, BUT UNDER GRACE" (Rom. 6:14).

May God forgive our brother for his excessive and cruel slander and cause him humbly to confess his wrong.

On Pages 6 and 72 he goes so far as to charge that our dispensational teachings are "a Satanic attack on the unity of the Divine revelation" - that we "allege disunity."

This is not merely incorrect; it is the exact *opposite* of the truth, for we have constantly contended that dispensationalism is the only path to an appreciation of the harmony and unity of the divine purpose.

As recently as Dec., 1945, the *Berean Searchlight* carried an article entitled, "Synthesis and Synopsis," in which we pointed out that many courses of Bible study which are called synthesis are really nothing more than synopsis. We quote:

True Bible synthesis, then, is a *dispensational* subject. It has to do with the harmony of God's varied dealings with men from Genesis to Revelation. . . . It is a systematic study of just what the Bible is-the record of the principles and dispensations of God. It reveals the sweep, the progress, the development of God's dealings with men, as well as the unity of His purpose in those dealings. No course which denies or ignores the

doctrine of dispensations is true Bible synthesis.

Does this seem as though we "allege disunity" or as though our dispensationalism is "a Satanic attack on the unity of the Divine revelation"?

All through his book Dr. Graham gives the impression that in interpreting the Bible dispensationally we divide the Word in order to discard parts of it. Indeed he says: "They throw out the moral law." But this is untrue and *Dr. Graham knows it*.

Before passing on to matters in which Dr. Graham seems not to understand what we teach, mention should be made of the late Dr. Bullinger, since Dr. Graham refers to "the real Bullingerites, with their universal reconciliationism" (P. 12) and charges that "Mr. E. W. Bullinger . . . 'graced' everybody into ultimate salvation, including the devil . . ." (P. 14).

This charge continues to be made against Dr. Bullinger, though the writer has never yet seen it substantiated by one single quotation from the pen of Dr. Bullinger himself.

While it is true that Dr. Bullinger taught some serious errors, it is also apparent that Dr. Graham has a propensity for making reckless charges-that where slander is concerned, his words are by no means representative of his actions. Furthermore, while we have, of course, not read all of Dr. Bullinger's voluminous writings, we have read several articles by him *against* Universal Reconciliation!

We therefore call upon Dr. Graham either to produce the evidence or to acknowledge that his charges are false and slanderous. We hope that he will not side-step this issue but meet it fairly.

Of one thing we are sure - that in the next paragraph, which Dr. Graham makes to sound so large-hearted, he is really ruthless in his injustice to Mr. O'Hair. He says on Page 14:

Be it said in fairness, Mr. O'Hair has not yet arrived in his "grace teaching" to the reconciliation of the devil, and is certainly not yet a thorough-going Bullingerite.

"Be it said in fairness"! - and then he proceeds to an insinuation which is as wholly *unfair* as it is sinfully subtle. When he says "Mr. O'Hair has not yet arrived in his 'grace teaching' to the reconciliation of the devil," and is "not yet a thorough-going Bullingerite," he insinuate - wholly without reason - that this is where Pastor O'Hair is headed and where his "grace teaching" inevitably leads.

Dr. Graham is like the man who was angry with his butcher, and on a Friday afternoon, when the store was filled with customers, walked in carrying three dead cats in each hand. Pushing his way through the crowd, he tossed the cats on the counter and went away, calling to the butcher: "There you are, George. That makes twenty-one. You can pay me on Monday"!

Dr. Graham uses the same unscrupulous method to keep sincere believers from even considering what we really teach, but he can never show where our teachings lead to belief in Universal Reconciliation. Indeed, we venture to say that Pastor O'Hair and this writer have written more against Universal Reconciliation than has Dr. Graham, and for the simple reason that the "grace teaching" he so despises is THE ANSWER to Universal Reconciliation.

DOES DR. GRAHAM MISUNDERSTAND?

Again and again, when our opponents have misstated our beliefs, we have given them the benefit of the doubt, assuming that they have honestly misunderstood our writings.

We cannot do this with Dr. Graham, for, as we have said, he has too far exceeded the bounds of common honesty.

When compared with what we really teach his charges prove to be nothing more than a series of straw dummies he has erected to show how easily they can be thrown down. He cannot answer what we teach so he invents heresies for us.

But we venture here to take a few of these dummies apart and *show* that they are merely straw after all - and a poor grade at that.

EIGHT STRAW DUMMIES

STRAW DUMMY No. 1: Concerning the mystery, Dr. Graham states: "The 'dividers' assume that ... Paul was the only one who understood this truth" (P. 37).

Those who read our writings know that we do not teach this.

What we do teach is that Paul was the *first* to understand this truth - that it was made known to him by direct revelation from the glorified Lord.

That others came to understand it is clear from Eph. 3:5, which Dr. Graham quotes. However, he has apparently missed the significance of a very important phrase in this passage - the last three words.

"Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets BY THE SPIRIT."

Even as early as the Galatians epistle, Paul wrote concerning his message:

"For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, BUT BY THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST" (Gal. 1:12).

Then he adds, concerning the others:

"AND I WENT UP BY REVELATION, AND COMMUNICATED UNTO THEM THAT GOSPEL WHICH I PREACH AMONG THE GENTILES, BUT PRIVATELY TO THEM WHICH WERE OF REPUTATION, LEST BY ANY MEANS I SHOULD RUN, OR HAD RUN, IN VAIN" (Gal. 2:2).

Next we read that "*they saw*" and "*perceived*" the truth of Paul's words (Gal. 2:7,9).

But *how* did they see and perceive it? How does anyone see or perceive the truth? The answer is: *By the Holy Spirit*. This is how the other apostles and elders first began to come into an understanding of the message committed to Paul.

"Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets BY THE SPIRIT" (Eph. 3:5).

What was first made known to Paul "by the revelation of Jesus Christ," God later revealed to others as He does to us, "BY THE SPIRIT."

We have never taught that "Paul was the only one who understood this truth."

STRAW DUMMY No. 2: Of the same quality is Dr. Graham's assertion that we teach that "only Paul knew or taught the grace of God" (P. 13). Of course we have never taught this. It is a mere invention. Dr. Graham needed something to prove the fallacy of dispensational teaching so he made something up.

STRAW DUMMY No. 3: Dr. Graham refuses to "concede" that Paul ever "*repudiated*" water baptism (P. 38). But who ever asked him to concede this? He seems always to have to create issues he can attack, so impoverished is he for a real answer.

We have always agreed that Paul was in the will of God when he baptized believers during his early ministry. That was the economy under which he was saved and from which he emerged.

STRAW DUMMY No. 4: Referring to our teaching as to Acts 13:46, where Paul and Barnabas turn to the Gentiles at Antioch, Dr. Graham says: "The unwary would be led to believe ... that they were thenceforth abandoning the preaching to the Jews . . ." (P. 31).

But we contend that the unwary would not be led to believe this from any of our writings. It is only because Dr. Graham needs a case so badly that he is "led to believe" that we teach this.

It is sad that here again Dr. Graham represents us as deceivers of "the simple-hearted and poor-in-spirit," without *quoting what we really say*.

The pity is, that while "the simple-hearted and poor-in-spirit would have no reason to

gather this from our writings, many probably will believe it from *what Dr. Graham says about our writings, and will gather in addition that we mean to deceive them.* Dr. Graham is not so sensitive about slander after all.

STRAW DUMMY No. 5: Dr. Graham is a pacifist. He believes that it is wrong for Christians to obey their earthly rulers when commanded to take up arms.

He seems to take it for granted that our views of grace should force us to stand with him here and complains that during World War II "there was 'never a peep' out of any of them along the line of the incongruity, contradiction and disobedience of the recipients of divine grace requiting violence and death to their fellowmen" (P. 67).

But let no one be misled here, for we by no means agree that grace teaches pacifism and Dr. Graham is unfair when he implies that cowardice closed our mouths here. The truth is that our mouths were not closed at all. He simply made another charge without looking up the facts. He would do well to order and read thoughtfully, Pastor O'Hair's "*Should a Christian Go to War?*" distributed so widely at the outset of World War II.

STRAW DUMMY No. 6: Because we hold that *certain* words which our Lord spoke *while on earth* are not *now* to be obeyed, Dr. Graham charges that we teach disobedience to Christ and "assail the very words of the blessed Son of God Himself!" (P. 8).

But does Dr. Graham offer gifts at an altar (Matt. 5:24)? Does he tell no man that Jesus is the Christ (Mark 8:29,30)? Does he still observe all that the scribes and Pharisees taught (Matt. 23:2,3)? Our Lord commanded all this.

He himself states that certain orders of our Lord were later countermanded, so there are *certain* commands of our Lord which he too believes are not for our obedience. Shall we therefore charge him with "assailing the very words of the blessed Son of God" and teaching disobedience to Christ? Of course not. He is not doing this at all and neither are we - *and Dr. Graham knows this perfectly well.*

He should hasten to take back his published slander before it becomes necessary for God to deal with him.

STRAW DUMMY No. 7: On Page 25 of "The New Higher-Criticism" Dr. Graham speaks of "Paul (whom they glorify beyond measure)" and of "these men who elevate Paul."

What he implies is that we glorify the *person* of Paul. He even goes so far as to charge, on Page 37, that we come "perilously close" to the sin of "Paulolatry" - worshipping Paul, while on Page 67 he goes still farther and actually calls us "Paulolatrists."

But all this he simply says, without troubling to quote one of our thousands of

statements concerning Paul as proof.

Dr. Graham does, or should, know that it is Paul's *office*, not his person, that we magnify. And this is precisely what Paul himself, by the Holy Spirit, does. Let every reader hear his words and acknowledge them to be also the Word of God:

"For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles. I MAGNIFY MINE OFFICE" (Rom. 11:13).

Throughout his book Dr. Graham *minimizes* Paul's office. He denies that the mystery was committed to him by a special revelation, says it was already an open secret when Saul entered the Church, that Paul was only an apostle of the Gentiles.

In thus minimizing what God has magnified he is out of the will of God. He should read again the letter of rebuke the Galatians received for doing this very thing.

The distinction between Paul's person and his office has been clearly stated in many of our writings, including our two pamphlets "Saul the Sinner" and "Paul the Boaster," but Dr. Graham evidently is not interested in knowing what we teach; he *must, somehow*, have a victory.

STRAW DUMMY No. 8. Putting his own words into our mouths, Dr. Graham writes: "The great commission, given just before Christ ascended is also 'Jewish' and really was not even primarily meant for the disciples to whom it was addressed, but for an imaginary group of Jewish evangelists, who, allegedly are to go out in the days of the great tribulation!" (Pp. 9,10).

The exclamation mark at the close of this statement is very appropriate. This dummy has not merely been *set* up, but *dressed* up so that all may see how easily Dr. Graham can knock the handsome fellow down.

We do not presume to know all that others have taught about the so-called "great commission," but we have always believed and taught that our Lord's words were very definitely meant for those to whom they were addressed and that the eleven (later twelve) began to carry them out. That they did not accomplish the work there outlined was no fault of their own. The accomplishment of the commission was interrupted because of Israel's rejection of Christ and His kingdom.

Since Dr. Graham denies this, perhaps he will explain to us why the leaders of the twelve later shook hands with Paul and Barnabas, agreeing to confine their ministry to Israel while Paul and Barnabas went to the Gentiles.

DR. GRAHAM'S OWN BLUNDERS

Dr. Graham contends that the mystery was revealed to others before Paul; that "it was an open secret when Saul entered the Church" (P. 70).

Is this why Ananias said to Saul: *"Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord"* (Acts 22:16)? Was it an understanding of the mystery that made this same Ananias live as *"a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there"* (Acts 22:12)? Was it an understanding of the mystery that caused Peter to feel, up until the 10th chapter of Acts, that *"it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation"* (Acts 10:28)? Does all this sound as though the mystery was "an open secret when Saul entered the Church"?

And when Peter and his friends did minister to the Gentiles, we read that they *"were astonished ... because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost"* (Acts 10:45).

In the next chapter we read that the believers at Jerusalem *"contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them"* (Acts 11:2,3) and Peter, explaining the whole matter, could only answer: *"What was I, that I could withstand God?"* (Acts 11:17). Does this sound as though the mystery "was an open secret when Saul entered the Church"?

Dr. Graham complains that we have no right to place Paul "on a plane of privilege or apostolic authority above the others" (P. 70) and this after conceding on Page 66 that Paul was "the head gardener" though "not the ONLY gardener" (His caps).

But is not the head gardener placed over the other gardeners? His very language here reminds us of I Cor. 3:10, where the apostle says:

"According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise MASTERBUILDER [chief architect] I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. BUT LET EVERY MAN TAKE HEED HOW HE BUILDETH THEREUPON."

It is as the chief architect of the Church of this dispensation that the apostle warns every man to take heed how he builds upon the foundation laid by him. We do not exalt Paul to this position. God has done so.

It should be noted here, however, that Paul's authority as the apostle of this dispensation did not set aside the authority of the twelve as the apostles of the kingdom. They will yet "sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" ([Matt. 19:28](#)) With not one tribe given to Paul. But in precisely the same way the twelve cannot be made to share the apostolic authority of Paul in those things which pertain to the Body of Christ.

MY GOSPEL

One of the saddest of Dr. Graham's blunders is found on Page 26, where he quotes Paul's words to Timothy in II Tim. 2:8:

"Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel."

"Did Paul's gospel differ from Peter's?" he asks. "Could anyone give in a brief space a better outline of the gospel Peter preached on Pentecost than 'Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead'?"

The full quotation, as we have seen, closes with the words "*according to my gospel*" but apparently Dr. Graham's understanding of that phrase satisfies him that Paul means to state here that his gospel was "of the same general content with that which Peter commenced on Pentecost" (P. 26).

He would neutralize the significance of these important words to make them mean merely: "Remember that Jesus Christ ... was raised from the dead as I have told you."

It is pathetic to see II Tim. 2:8 used in this way. The Scriptures bear a threefold testimony that he is grossly in error here:

1. *The context.* Let us consider the passage along with the preceding verse:

"Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things.

"Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead according to my gospel" (II Tim. 2:7,8).

Surely to a man of God such as Timothy, the exhortation to "consider what I say" and the special prayer that Timothy might be given understanding in all things would not precede a mere reminder that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, had been raised from the dead!

2. *Other uses of the term "my gospel" and of the word "according."*

They are both used in Rom. 16:25, and in such a way as to indicate with crystal clarity the distinctive character of Paul's message, as well as the importance of it.

"Now to Him that is of power to establish you according to MY GOSPEL, AND THE PREACHING OF JESUS CHRIST ACCORDING TO THE REVELATION OF THE MYSTERY, which was kept secret since the world began."

Mark well; it is not merely "the preaching of Jesus Christ," but "*the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery.*" Hence it is not merely "the gospel," but "*my gospel.*" Note also how he uses the word "according" (Gr., *kata*) in this case. Alas, how little we hear, in our day, of "the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery"!

3. *The facts in the case.* Dr. Graham would neutralize the meaning of the words "according to my gospel," but he cannot deny that Paul did in fact proclaim glorious revelations concerning the resurrection of Christ of which we find no hint in Peter's Pentecostal address.

The very theme of Paul's message was that the crucified Christ was "raised again for our justification" (Rom. 4:25) and exalted far above all, to become "Head over all things to the Church which is His Body" (Eph. 1:22,23), that we have been "raised together with Him" and made to "sit together in heavenly places" (Eph. 2:6) and to "walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4).

Did Peter preach *any* of this at Pentecost? Does this seem as though Paul's gospel were "of the same general content as that which Peter commenced on Pentecost"?

At Pentecost Peter proclaimed that God had raised Christ from the dead to sit on the throne of David (Acts 2:30,31). A few days later he pleaded with Israel to repent, promising that God would then "*send Jesus Christ*" and that "the times of refreshing" should "*come from the presence of the Lord.*" But Israel refused her Messiah and God revealed through Paul the mystery of His purpose and grace.

How significant, now, and how forceful, becomes the injunction of Paul to Timothy! It is just because Satan would keep Dr. Graham and every true believer from understanding and proclaiming this glorious message in its fulness that the apostle, by the Holy Spirit, pleads:

"CONSIDER WHAT I SAY; AND THE LORD GIVE THEE UNDERSTANDING IN ALL THINGS.

"REMEMBER THAT JESUS CHRIST OF THE SEED OF DAVID WAS RAISED FROM THE DEAD ACCORDING TO MY GOSPEL" (II Tim. 2:7,8).

DISPENSATIONALISM

After ridiculing dispensationalism and dispensationalists - after calling us "vivisectionists" and "Bible-choppers" - after strenuously objecting to our "attack on the unity of the Divine revelation," Dr. Graham himself begins to talk about "ONE GREAT CLEAVAGE" (P. 33).

He overthrows his whole argument to warn us that we have ignored "the one great cleavage" of Scripture - the cross!

But we have not forgotten the cross. We *glory* in the cross. Dr. Graham has apparently forgotten, or has never known, that God's great purpose in the cross, like His great purpose in the resurrection, was not "testified" until "due time" through the Apostle Paul (See [I Tim. 2:4-7](#)).

Peter, at Pentecost, *blamed* Israel for the crucifixion and demanded repentance and baptism for the remission of sins. It was not until some time later that Paul declared:

"BUT NOW the righteousness of God without the law is manifested ... I say, AT THIS TIME.. ." (Rom. 3:21-26).

The time element has too long been neglected in the interpretation of the Scriptures. If we would understand the most precious truths of this dispensation we must ask ourselves two questions about them: *How?* and *When?*

How was the covenant of the law put away? You say, By the cross. (Gal. 3:13; Col. 2:14). But now ask yourself *when*.

Dr. Graham apparently has not stopped to ask himself this question, for he does not hesitate to condemn the Spirit-filled apostles and call their post-Pentecostal observance of the ceremonial law an abomination." Yet he cannot find, until Paul, any revelation that the law was no longer to be observed. He moves Paul's "But now" of Rom. 3:21 back to Pentecost and puts the words in Peter's mouth. Think how far from the truth he is here, when we read that even as late as the conversion of Saul, the one whom God chose to minister to the convicted persecutor was "*a devout man according to the law*" (Acts 22:12).

Again, *how* was "the middle wall of partition" between Jew and Gentile broken down? By the cross, to be sure (Eph. 2:14,15). But *when*? Surely not immediately. Acts is the history of the gradual breaking down of that wall.

Again, *how* did the Body of Christ, the Church Of this age, come into existence? By the cross, of course (Eph. 2:16). But *when*? Not immediately. Why, reconciliation, which is also by the cross, was not proclaimed until Paul proclaimed it some years after the cross (Read II Cor. 5:16-21 and note the word "henceforth"). Israel as well as the Gentiles had to be *alienated* before God could *reconcile* both unto Himself as a joint body (See Rom. 11:15,32; Eph. 2:16).

We could continue here to consider our most precious blessings - the greatest results of the cross - asking *how* and *when*, and in each case it would become apparent that what was purchased for us by the cross was not proclaimed until "due time."

THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM

When we read to a friend Dr. Graham's complaint about placing him on the horns of a dilemma, our friend remarked dryly: "*His dilemmas have no horns.*"

A reading of "The New Higher-Criticism" with its historical data and its many names, gives one the impression that the author must be exceedingly well read. We wonder, however, whether Dr. Graham reads so much so fast that he does not digest what he is reading.

Concerning the kingdom, for example, he says: "They claim that the kingdom 'offered' by John and Christ Himself, was the literal, covenanted kingdom spoken of by the Old Testament prophets. The kingdom was rejected, so instead, Christ went to the cross" (Pp. 7,8).

Now, in the matter of the kingdom Dr. Graham takes issue mainly with this writer. Yet, while he claims: "We have read extensively of these writings," we are sure that Dr. Graham cannot find one single passage where we say that the kingdom was *offered* before the cross - much less that "the kingdom was rejected, so instead, Christ went to the cross."

We say, as the Scriptures do, that the kingdom was proclaimed "at hand" before the cross, but Dr. Graham just keeps misrepresenting us.

We know that our Lord was not so ignorant of Old Testament prophecy as to seek the crown before the cross. Indeed, one of our strong arguments that the Body of Christ did not begin at Pentecost is the fact that *the first offer of the kingdom* was not given until after that - *and could not have been!*

Especially for Dr. Graham's benefit, we repeat what we have stated clearly again and again and have even published in chart form:

In Old Testament times the kingdom was PROMISED; during our Lord's earthly ministry it was PROCLAIMED AT HAND; in early Acts it was OFFERED; then Israel REJECTED it and it was POSTPONED until a future day, when it will be ESTABLISHED.

Long ago we gave this simple and Scriptural answer to Philip Mauro's argument that "Dispensationalism Justifies the Crucifixion" and we repeat it here again so that Dr. Graham need not continue to stumble over so simple a matter.

Dr. Graham, of course, like Mauro, does not believe that the kingdom proclaimed "at hand" by Christ, and later offered by Peter, was the literal covenanted kingdom at all, but a spiritual kingdom.

He says (P. 8): "This new higher-criticism assumes a false hypothesis of a literal kingdom offered and rejected (of which there is not the remotest suggestion in the text)...."

Let us see:

When we open our Bibles to find the Lord's forerunner crying "*Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,*" we do well to inquire into the background of the expression "kingdom of heaven." What was the nature of this kingdom now said to be at hand? Do we find any prophecy that it was a kingdom to be set up in *heaven*? Of

course not. Daniel says:

"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed" (Dan. 2:44).

The kingdom, then, is to be heavenly, not in *sphere*, but in *origin* and *character*. The *God of heaven* is to set up a kingdom *on earth*. The rest of the prophets add abundant testimony to this fact.

Isa. 11:9 says that "*THE EARTH shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.*"

Jer. 23:5 says: "*Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in THE EARTH.*"

In the Old Testament we will find literally hundreds of prophecies of a kingdom to be set up on earth, but not one about the purely spiritual kingdom to which Dr. Graham refers.

Proceeding to the gospel records, what is this the angels are proclaiming at Messiah's birth?

"*Glory to God in the highest, and ON EARTH peace, good will toward men*" (Luke 2:14).

How foolish and illogical now to contend that the kingdom John proclaims "at hand" is a spiritual kingdom, *not* to be set up on earth! If we did so, we should have to explain the words of John's father as to John's mission - only a picked portion of which Dr. Graham quotes. We here quote a part he omits:

"As He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began:

"That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us;

"To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember His holy covenant;

"The oath which He sware to our father Abraham,

"That He would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve Him without fear,

"In holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life" (Luke 1:70-75).

If we interpreted John's words to refer to a purely spiritual kingdom we should also

have to contradict our Lord who, referring to this very kingdom, declared: "*Blessed are the meek; FOR THEY SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH*" (Matt. 5:5) and taught His disciples to pray: "*Thy kingdom COME. Thy will be done IN EARTH, as it is in heaven*" (Matt. 6:10).

Nor is this changed even at Pentecost, for in Acts 3 we find Peter promising that if Israel will repent "*the times of refreshing shall COME FROM the presence of the Lord*" and "*HE SHALL SEND JESUS CHRIST*" (Acts 3:19,20).

In his book "*The Kingdom of the Heavens*," Dr. Graham declares that "it is through faith in the shed blood, in any age since the fall, that men have been 'translated ... into the kingdom of the Son of His love.' " He says this, but he does not offer a shred of Scriptural evidence to support it.

On Page 73 of "*The New Higher-Criticism*" Dr. Graham says contemptuously: "The merest tyro and Biblical novice that overnight has learned to parrot some of the artificial distinctions of this school, will be lauded by them as possessing prodigious understanding in the Scriptures."

As untrue as this is, we would nevertheless be amused to look in on a private conference between some of our dispensational babes and Dr. Graham on the subject of the kingdom.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

On Page 8 Dr. Graham again puts words into our mouths, exclaiming: "But since it [the kingdom] was not accepted, the sermon [on the Mount] is also a dead letter!"

We believe nothing of the kind, any more than Dr. Graham believes that Exodus 12 is a dead letter just because he does not slay lambs at Passover time. The sermon yields its richest treasures only when seen in the light of further revelation, which is also true of Exodus 12.

As to the Lord's prayer, it is pitiful to witness our opponents try again and again to make Matt. 6:10 virtually the same thing as Eph. 4:32. According to Dr. Graham, our Lord did not actually mean His disciples to pray: "*Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors*" but "*Forgive us our debts (shortcomings, trespasses, not sins) even as having been justified by Thy grace and having become members of Thy family, we have forgiven those who have offended us*"! (P. 51).

Even this differs greatly from Eph. 4:32, but what astonishes us is that Dr. Graham and others who share his views in this, so consistently overlook or ignore the two verses which immediately follow the prayer:

"FOR IF YE FORGIVE MEN THEIR TRESPASSES, YOUR HEAVENLY FATHER WILL ALSO FORGIVE YOU:

"BUT IF YE FORGIVE NOT MEN THEIR TRESPASSES, NEITHER WILL YOUR FATHER FORGIVE YOUR TRESPASSES" (Matt. 6:14,15).

We agree, of course, that Matt. 6 speaks of parental, not initial, forgiveness - it speaks to God's children. But does not Eph. 4:32 speak to God's children? Yet the Jewish believers of our Lord's day were not given to expect such forgiveness unless they first forgave others, while in Eph. 4:32 we are urged to forgive others purely on the basis of God's grace to us.

"AND BE YE KIND ONE TO ANOTHER, TENDERHEARTED, FORGIVING ONE ANOTHER, EVEN AS GOD, FOR CHRIST'S SAKE, HATH FORGIVEN YOU" (Eph. 4:32).

APPALLING CONFUSION

Lack of space prevents us from answering all the errors in "The New Higher-Criticism," for here is a book so replete with mis-statements, shallow arguments and sheer blunders, that it would require many books to point them all out. As we glance through it again we wonder that one with such weak arguments should use such strong language. In closing we give passing notice to a few more:

"THE CHURCH which was born at Pentecost ... is the *same church*" as that which exists today, says Dr. Graham.

Will he also agree that the church of our Lord's day (Matt. 18:17) and "the church in the wilderness" (Acts 7:38) were the same church?

God has had His called-out people (*ekklesia*, church) in every age, to be sure, but the Church of today certainly does not have the same message and program as the Church of Moses' day - or of our Lord's day - *or of Pentecost!*

PAUL was not "THE apostle of the Gentiles," argues Dr. Graham, since "there is *no article* in the Greek" (Rom. 11:13). So - he bolsters up *his* view by quoting the *Revised Version*: "I am an apostle of the Gentiles" - after arguing that there is NO article in the Greek!

Read all of Rom. 11:13 without the article and see the result. Then add Gal. 2:2,9 and Eph. 3:1-3 and see if there can be any doubt that Paul was preeminently THE apostle of the Gentiles.

MIRACULOUS SIGNS "were necessary evidences of the divine accreditation of His

servants to His people" before the Bible was complete (P. 28).

But there is no evidence that John the Baptist worked a single miracle. Was he not divinely accredited?

Acts 2:38 is apparently giving Fundamentalists more and more trouble. We are interested to learn that Dr. Graham now stands with those who suppose that Peter there referred to "Spirit baptism an *not* water baptism at all" (P. 23). But he says: "We think" this.

Read Acts 2:38, consider the context and see whether he has not gotten himself into deeper trouble.

His own uncertainty is revealed as he follows his "We think" with "Even if it were conceded that Peter was referring to water baptism in Acts 2:38, it certainly could not be interpreted to mean that remission of sins is by water, but simply that in rapid speech the signifier can be substituted for the thing signified" (P. 23)

BUT, if he can make Acts 2:38 mean Spirit baptism, this still leaves him Mark 1:4 and other such passages to deal with.

For help in this he goes to Luke 1:77,78 to show that salvation under John was "through the tender mercy of God" (P. 23) not water baptism. As though it would not be tender mercy on God's part to offer to rebellious Israel "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins"!

We agree, of course, that the blood of sacrifices and the waters of baptism did not save essentially but *instrumentally*.

"THE IMPARTATION OF THE SPIRIT as an abiding presence," says Dr. Graham, was "inherent in post-Pentecostal Christian baptism" (P. 22).

The impartation of the Spirit *inherent in Christian baptism!* Can he really mean this? How many thousands have been baptized with water who are not even saved!

Yet he says on Page 20 that he is "vigorously opposed to undue emphasis" on the importance of baptism!

"A WELL-KNOWN FACT - that the baptism of John was distinct in significance from post-Pentecostal baptism" (Pp. 17,18).

He is wrong. Historical events (the resurrection, etc.) attached added emphasis and importance to water baptism but did not change its essential *significance*. It *signified* a

confession of and a cleansing from sin (See Mark 1:4,5; Acts 2:38).

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT, says Dr. Graham, calls for "a willingness" and "the attitude of mind" which will give up all for Him (P. 60) and Christian communism "seems to have been a temporary arrangement" (P. 60). He refers to those who agree with him here as "the simple ones who take Christ seriously" (P. 54).

Concerning *himself* he says: "Many have sold all and given to the poor, even though this is not indicated as a blanket command. We cannot but honor those who have conscientiously gone the limit in Christian discipleship and pray for power to obey as soon as such a course were indicated in our own case" (P. 56).

But we contend that this is not taking Christ seriously. He did not merely teach "a willingness" to "sell that ye have and give alms" should peculiar conditions arise. He said:

"Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.

"SELL THAT YE HAVE, AND GIVE ALMS ... " (Luke 12:32,33).

And at the close of His Sermon on the Mount, He said:

"AND EVERY ONE THAT HEARETH THESE SAYINGS OF MINE, AND DOETH THEM NOT, SHALL BE LIKENED UNTO A FOOLISH MAN WHICH BUILT HIS HOUSE UPON THE SAND:

"AND THE RAIN DESCENDED, AND THE FLOODS CAME, AND THE WINDS BLEW, AND BEAT UPON THAT HOUSE; AND IT FELL: AND GREAT WAS THE FALL OF IT" (Matt. 7:26,27).

Apparently Dr. Graham forgets that Ananias and Sapphira were stricken dead, not merely for deceit, but for deceitfully keeping back part of their possessions (See [Acts 5:3](#)).

DR. GRAHAM CONCEDES that the Holy Spirit may reveal undisclosed beauties in the Scriptures even to men of this late day, but adds: "But they would likely be on minor points"! (P. 73).

Has he forgotten that the great doctrine of justification by faith only began to be recovered for the Church at large in the sixteenth century? Is he going to restrict the Holy Spirit as to what light He may impart?

DR. GRAHAM SAYS: "We are a little impatient that good time should have to be consumed in refuting this modernistic heresy ... somewhat irked . . . at the necessity laid

upon us by these casuists to consume time in refuting a set of wrong theories . . (P. 32).

We leave it to our readers to decide who, if any one, might have reason to be "somewhat irked," and to decide which of us is guilty of "verbal contortion" and which speaks "the words of truth and soberness."

In closing - we feel no ill will toward our brother. May God give him the grace to prayerfully, humbly consider what we teach, in the light of God's precious Word. If he does this, we know what the result will be; if not, he will continue to contribute to the confusion which has already brought the Church into such disrepute.

***We Are Analyzed
Officially-Twice!***

Chapter IX

NOW IT'S AUTHENTIC

There is nothing like having a thing done right! And there has been, for some time, an organization specifically dedicated to examining and publicly exposing heresies. To see how this organization operates - how it publicly exposes *some* "heresies" *without* examining them, read the following article from the Nov., 1947, *Berean Searchlight*.

RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.

IS IT WORTHY OF OUR CONFIDENCE?

(Certain passages and names have been deleted from this article because they involve an organization whose present Executive Secretary has graciously apologized for misrepresentations he made about our teachings. We thank God for the Christian grace this brother has exhibited and pray that his ministry may be richly blessed.)

We believe with all our hearts in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, the doctrine of the Trinity, the deity of Christ, His bodily resurrection and premillennial return, the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, the total depravity of man, redemption through the finished work of Christ alone, the celebration of His death at His table "until He come," the eternal security of the believer and the eternal, conscious punishment of the unsaved dead.

But we also believe that in the present dispensation there is but "*one baptism*" (Eph. 4:5) in which the Holy Spirit, by one operation, baptizes us into the death, burial and resurrection of Christ (Rom. 6:3,4; Col. 2:9-13) into Christ Himself (Gal. 3:26, 27) and into the Church which is His Body (I Cor. 12:13).

We believe that the humblest believer is "*accepted in the Beloved One*" (Eph. 1:6) and stands before God "*complete in Him*" (Col. 2:10).

This the devil hates and fiercely opposes by his wiles" and "fiery darts." Nor is he content to move unbelievers to oppose these blessed truths. He can much better serve his purpose by misleading and confusing God's saints until they take up carnal weapons against the very message they should be proclaiming.

Published attacks, therefore, upon those who stand for the gospel of the grace of God with its "one body" and "one baptism" are nothing new. Nevertheless, one after another, they continue to hold new surprises for us.

AN ASTONISHING ARTICLE

The most astonishing attack to date is one which appears in a recent issue of -----
-----.

The astonishing thing about this article is not the ignorance as to our views which it betrays, nor its brazen misrepresentation of the truth, nor the malicious ruthlessness with which unsubstantiated charges are publicly made. All this is no shock to us, for it is constantly being done.

The astonishing thing about this article is that it was prepared by the Editorial Committee of *Religion Analysis Service, Incorporated*.

Let us explain:

A COUNCIL OF NOTABLE BIBLE TEACHERS

The Advisory Council of *Religion Analysis Service, Inc.*, is made up of the following well-known Bible teachers: Arthur I. Brown, M.D., Lewis Sperry Chafer, D.D., R. V. Clearwaters, D.D., Chas. L. Feinberg, Ph.D., W. S. Hottel, D.D., Harold S. Laird, Wm. R. McCarrell, D.D., James McGinlay, D.D., Wm. H. Murk, D.D., A. D. Muse, Wm. L. Pettingill, D.D., Paul S. Rees, D.D., H. H. Savage, D.D. and Louis T. Talbot, D.D.

A NEW POLICY FORMULATED

In the early part of this year one of our readers sent several of our books in to the Service with the simple request that they be given a Scriptural analysis.

For some time there was no reply. It was not until more than a month later that the following response was received:

Dear -----:

For several weeks your interesting inquiry has been in our hands, and we must ask your pardon for the delay which has occurred in making response. The nature of your inquiry made it necessary for us to await the preparation of a general statement of policy of our organization regarding controversial questions, not within the province of this ministry, before writing this answer to your inquiry. That statement of policy has at last been formulated, and we are quoting the same below. We feel sure that this is self-explanatory, and we would be pleased to hear from you as to your reaction:

Religion Analysis Service, Inc., believes that those errors within Christendom which, though controversial, are not fatal to the eternal welfare of the soul, are distinct from, and ought not to be confused with, those Christ-denying heresies which preclude the functioning of God's plan of salvation. The fundamental purpose of this organization is to provide a comprehensive and aggressive specialized service, denominationally

unrelated, designed to enlighten and safeguard uninformed and unwary individuals and groups against those false teachings which definitely prevent men from finding the saving grace that is obtainable alone through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

However, let it be emphatically said, and fully understood, that this organization is unreservedly dedicated, without compromise or evasion, as a witness to the glory of God and the historic faith of the Church universal, and pledges all of its abilities and resources for the maintenance within the visible Church, of purity of life and doctrine.

Very truly yours,

S/ E. B. Jones, Ex. Dir.
RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.

This statement was then published in *The Discerner*, the official organ of RAS.

In other words, when requested to analyze teachings which are being opposed on every hand as heresy, the leaders of this organization which advertises itself as *Religion Analysis Service* and lists as its advisors the outstanding Bible teachers of the day and solemnly "pledges all of its abilities and resources for the maintenance within the visible Church, of purity of . . . doctrine" - the leaders of this organization, took considerable time for reflection and then finally came out with a new statement of policy: *not to deal with such questions!*

We thought it was the business of *Religion Analysis Service* to deal with such questions, but we are told that these teachings do not come "within the province of this ministry"; that they are "controversial questions" not "fatal to the eternal welfare of the soul" and do not "Preclude the functioning of God's plan of salvation."

This sounds generous, but we were disappointed, nevertheless, that an organization created especially to deal with questionable doctrines had declined to commit itself on an issue which has taken a front seat in nearly every fundamental church in the land. We could not erase from our minds the story of Israel's spiritual leaders in a similar dilemma, when our Lord asked whether John's baptism were from heaven or of man, and how they, after considerable reasoning among themselves, had replied: "*We cannot tell*" ([Matt. 21:23-27](#)).

Manifestly, the declaration that the Service is still "unreservedly dedicated without compromise or evasion, as a witness to the historic faith of the Church universal," means exactly nothing, and it is pathetic to find such a statement as the above in the published policy of an organization such as RAS, which boasts an Advisory Council of America's leading Bible teachers.

The decision of RAS was not without its encouragement, however, for it is a blessed confirmation of the truth for which we stand that the leading Bible teachers of the day do not - apparently *cannot* - answer it.

Furthermore, it encouraged us to assume that since *Religion Analysis Service* had declined to answer a direct inquiry about the message, it would certainly not oppose it.

But here we were mistaken.

ABOUT FACE

Religion Analysis Service, Inc., has joined with the bitterest enemies of Pauline truth in openly attacking - and that by the grossest misrepresentation - a doctrine which it declines to analyze Scripturally. The same organization which has just disposed of an honest inquiry by explaining that the teachings in question do not come "within the province of this ministry," now publishes a solemn warning that these same teachings are of the Devil, but it does this in *another periodical*.

It is very evident that the statement of policy referred to above was formulated only to protect RAS from the embarrassing questions of those who might ask for a *Scriptural* analysis of what we really teach. It was in no way intended as an assurance that it would refrain from assailing us - and misrepresenting us - publicly!

Of course RAS was well aware of *the public's ignorance* of the fact that its statement of policy had been formulated simply because it had been brought face to face with these very teachings, for these teachings are not specified in the statement. Nor did its officers know that a copy of the above letter would get into our hands. It is this which accounts for the ruthlessness of their attack.

It has been well said that those who appeal to popular leaders for information along certain lines are apt to get plenty of heat, but very little light.

INEXCUSABLE MISREPRESENTATION

It has become a habit of late for those who cannot face the truth we teach to charge us with Bullingerism and then to associate Bullingerism with Universalism - which Bullinger vigorously opposed! This is just what our latest assailant has done, outlining in detail the various "Bullingeristic" errors we are supposed to teach. And this in the face of our consistent, continued, published stand against the whole idea of Universalism and also against those very teachings of Bullinger with which we are charged.

We could pass the attack off as a gross display of ignorance as to both Bullinger's teachings and ours, but the matter is of greater significance than this. This article was written in the name of *Religion Analysis Service, Inc.*, and published in ----- . Some of the greatest Bible teachers in the country are involved.

The writer, whoever he is, *could* and *should* have examined our writings, or at least our doctrinal statement, before attacking us. Perhaps this would have prevented him from making all sorts of reckless and unfounded charges against brethren who are

standing for the truth of God.

It is a sad fact, however, that too many enemies of the Pauline message of grace do not care to know what we believe. To them it is heresy enough that we refuse to bring the washing of water into the dispensation of the grace of God and they scarcely consider it necessary to investigate before charging us with other offenses.

We have written to nearly all of those officially associated with RAS and -----, but still have not discovered who the author of this attack is.

Dr. J. Enos Windsor, President of RAS, writes us that he had "nothing personally to do with the article," but ridicules us as not "mentally competent to deal with such tremendously important matters." Our teaching concerning the commissions, says he, "is one of the silliest things I have ever heard from a purported Bible student."

But here is one for "Believe It or Not": In this same letter Dr. Windsor writes that ...

A man, for instance, or a movement, who would take the position that such things as the Sermon on the Mount, is not valid and binding for normal Christianity in our day, would be to me a worse heretic than Mary Baker Eddy.

Has the president of RAS never read the writings of Dr. Arno C. Gaebelein, or Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, or Dr. Wm. L. Pettingill? Not one of these would agree that the Sermon on the Mount is "binding for normal Christianity in our day," and they are representative of a large body of Premillenarian Fundamentalists.

Imagine Dr. Windsor, President of RAS, calling Dr. Chafer and Dr. Pettingill, *two of the leading members of his own Advisory Council*, "worse heretics than Mary Baker Eddy"! How dependable can any analysis by such an organization be?

Like Dr. Windsor, Dr. McCarrell assures us that he had nothing to do with the attack and that he would not have approved any statement charging Pastor O'Hair or this writer with the errors of soul-sleep, annihilation or universal reconciliation, but adds: "However, I would not want this reply to your inquiry to be construed or so used as to give the impression that I believed the Editorial Committee of *Religion Analysis Service, Inc.*, did accuse the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* of teaching these errors." Clever man! He mentions only those errors which the article failed to *specifically* charge us with, gliding lightly over the specific false accusations which we pointed out to him.

The *Grace Gospel Fellowship* and Pastor O'Hair will publish their own replies to this slanderous article, and others too will take it up, but the unfortunate thing is that evil reports spread so fast that many of those reached with the slander will never see the replies. It is for the truth's sake that we must inform as many as we can possibly reach that the charges made in this "analysis" are false and libelous.

Several other replies from those involved show the same lack of principle, but there

is one happy exception - Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer. We quote his reply in full:

My dear Mr. Stam:

In reply to your letter of Oct. 29, in which you request me to state whether I had any share in the attack which was made by the *Religion Analysis Service, Inc.*, upon the work you are doing, I wish to state that I was not consulted in any way and knew nothing about it. In fact, I know nothing about it now except what you have written me, for no copy of it has come to my desk. I am sorry for these disagreeable things. They are not within the range of a right Christian attitude.

I do not know who serves the *Religion Analysis Service, Inc.*, in investigating and rendering judgment. My relation to it is tentative. In fact, I have no relation to it at all actively.

I desire every blessing of God to rest upon you and upon our work.

Most cordially yours,

S/ Lewis Sperry Chafer

In other words, leading members of the Advisory Council of RAS are not asked to advise at all. RAS merely uses their names to lend it prestige.

Unless the author of this attack means to involve in his slander all the men of God associated with RAS and -----, he should reveal his name and state just who was and who was not responsible for its publication.

WHO'S WHO

Our assailant begins by giving us the reason for his attack. A promising young missionary candidate has left a certain denominational mission board. Why? Because he has become "entangled" in "that form of ultra-dispensationalism commonly known as Bullingerism." This, he says, is not an "isolated case," but a "typical example" of what is being "re-enacted with alarming frequency in many of America's finest Bible schools, seminaries and churches."

Now, the fact is that the young man referred to was not led into Bullingerism at all, nor was it Bullinger's writings, but the writings of Mr. J. C. O'Hair that caused the stir at the *Northwest Bible Institute* (Minneapolis) which has already had such significant repercussions.

The explanation of our antagonist's little mistake is simply that it is much easier to make vague charges of Bullingerism than to face the truths for which Mr. O'Hair has stood so faithfully through the years. We have known Pastor O'Hair for many years and say before God that if these his opponents had the honesty, the courage and the love of

Pastor O'Hair, they would face his teachings with the Word instead of insinuating and implying and even affirming that he teaches errors which he has consistently opposed.

"One branch of these ultra-dispensationalists," says the writer, "has gone the limit into the Universal Restoration alluded to above. . ."

But have not some former -----¹⁷ "gone the limit" into Universalism? Does this indicate that the teachings of lead to Universalism?

Again, linking the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* with the Universalists, he says:

If space would permit, we could show that there are still other points of common ground on which these two groups stand. . . .

Of course! On this basis we could prove that our assailant himself is tainted with Romanism, Seventh Day Adventism, Christian Science and what not? Every false cult teaches *some* truth and there are many truths which all of us hold in common with heretics of all sorts.

.....

These are the tactics used by RAS in order to cast suspicion upon the fundamental soundness of the *Grace Gospel Fellowship*. How ungracious and dishonest! And lest there be any misunderstanding, these tactics underlie the article as a whole. We quote again (emphasis ours):

THE MAIN PURPOSE OF THIS ARTICLE IS TO INDICATE SOME OF THE TENETS JOINTLY HELD BY THIS "MILD" FORM OF BULLINGERISM AND THE EXTREME TYPE REPRESENTED BY RESTORATIONISM....

Here in one sentence we are called Bullingerites and linked with Universalists. But even those "tenets" which the writer says are "jointly held" by us "Bullingerites" and the "Restorationists" are non-existent, as we propose to prove.

WHY NOT ANSWER US?

Why is the article in question so lacking in quotations from *our* writings? If RAS means to warn the Christian public against O'Hair why do they not take *his* writings and prove him a heretic? If it is our writings which have stirred them up, why do they not quote them and prove that we are heretics by the Scriptures? If it is the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* or the *Worldwide Grace Testimony* or the *Milwaukee Bible Institute* they mean to warn believers against, why do they not take the common doctrinal statement of these three groups and subject it to Scriptural analysis?

¹⁷ The organization mentioned in our introduction.

What kind of Analysis Service is this which attacks O'Hair by answering Bullinger and Knoch and assails those who are fundamentally sound by insinuating that they are Bullingerites or Universalists or both?

It is amazing that this article ever got into print, for certainly there is wide disagreement as to our views among the members of RAS. This is proven by the striking fact that while the Editorial Committee was calling us Bullingerites, etc., the ink was barely drying on an editorial by Dr. Chafer, decrying the fact that some indulge in "such foolish untruths." We quote the article as it appears in *Bibliotheca Sacra*:

BULLINGERISM

Dr. William Bullinger was one of England's greatest Greek scholars, who nevertheless went far afield at times in certain interpretations of the Scripture. On the basis of due authority it is asserted, however, that Dr. Bullinger reversed before his death practically all the heretical things he had advanced. Still, as these teachings have been put into print they have claimed the attention of minds of like tendency.

It has become common for a preacher or a teacher to be classed as a Bullingerite by those who wish to imply that the man thus classed is an extremist in dispensational teaching. Yet it is to be doubted if those who employ this term can give a worthy analysis of truth which Bullinger produced. His most extensive work is *The Companion Bible*, which contains so much that is invaluable that one can scarcely afford to be without it.

It so happens at the present time that some are classed as Bullingerites who are in no way related whatever to, or in sympathy with, the claims of Dr. E. W. Bullinger. Such foolish untruths should not be averred of any person unless it is thoroughly understood that these things are actually true and the person who makes the claim is prepared to demonstrate that the things are true.

-Lewis Sperry Chafer.

AN APPEAL TO HONEST MEN

Typical of the tactics employed by our anonymous opponent is the statement that:

It is reported that one national, interdenominational movement found it necessary to delete all reference to the conscious punishment of the wicked dead from its doctrinal statement in order that certain high-ranking clergymen might be included in its fellowship. Thus does Satan have his willing "fifth columnists." ...

To what purport is the publication of this "report" and what has it to do with us? The "movement" referred to is, of course, not the "grace movement," for that is not interdenominational but strictly *undenominational*; moreover the doctrinal statement of the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* is very clear as to the conscious punishment of the wicked

dead. Such statements as the above are simply part of the policy of this "analysis service" to cast suspicion upon those whom they cannot answer with Scripture.

The time is fast approaching when those who insinuate that God's grace preachers are Bullingerites or Universalists will be immediately branded as liars and we feel that those men of God whose names are being used to lend prestige to RAS should protest vigorously lest they also be classed as false accusers. Honest men associated with ----- should let their voices be heard in protest, for in addition to endangering their good names here and now, members of these organizations who condone such dishonesty must be prepared to share the guilt and condemnation when they give an account before the judgment seat of Christ.

This continual lying must stop if our opponents are to retain any of their spiritual power and influence. Meanwhile, though false accusations, of course, do their damage, God in His grace and power overrules all to His own glory as these very tactics cause increasing numbers of honest believers to consider these teachings in the light of the Word, and those who love the truth make greater sacrifices than ever to get the message out to others.

A BEWILDERED ANALYST

These are by no means the only false accusations contained in this "analysis," but the others betray such ignorance both as to the Word itself and as to our teachings, that they should come under another heading.

DO WE ROB THE SAINTS OF ANY PART OF THE WORD?

To the mean accusation that "the name 'Grace Gospel Fellowship' conceals, rather than reveals, the true character of the movement under the *pretense* of teaching 'The Most Wonderful Truth in the Bible,' " our assailant adds:

This interpretation deliberately robs the saints of great segments of God's Word, maintaining, as it does, that because such portions were not written while Paul was in prison, they do not apply in this day.

The publishing of such a statement is positively inexcusable. It is a plain lie. Neither Pastor O'Hair's book "*The Most Wonderful Truth in the Bible*," nor any of the literature of the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* teaches that the truth for this present dispensation is confined to Paul's prison epistles. Indeed, we have emphatically and consistently opposed this very view. And to think that one so ignorant of our views should make such an unfounded assertion and then ruthlessly use it as a basis for the charge that we "*conceal*" our true character "under the *pretense*" of preaching the truth, while "*deliberately*" robbing saints of "great segments of the Word of God"!

We affirm before God that we *do* believe that:

"ALL SCRIPTURE IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD, AND IS PROFITABLE FOR DOCTRINE, FOR REPROOF, FOR CORRECTION, FOR INSTRUCTION IN RIGHTEOUSNESS" (II Tim. 3:16).

If our opponent believes this why does he not reprove and correct us *by the Word* instead of by false charges and insinuations?

We believe, furthermore, that Christ died for us:

"THAT THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW MIGHT BE FULFILLED IN US, WHO WALK NOT AFTER THE FLESH, BUT AFTER THE SPIRIT" (Rom. 8:4).

And we therefore believe that the commandment, "THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOR," places a greater obligation upon us than it did upon those to whom it was first given.

Does our opponent believe these Scriptures? From his article it would appear that he does not. May God forgive him and give him the grace to practice them and take back his falsehood before he is called before the judgment seat of Christ to answer for his lies.

PAUL AND THE MYSTERY

How far from anything we teach is the idea that "*Paul knew nothing of the dispensation of the 'mystery' until his imprisonment in Rome*"! How foolish we should be to make such an assertion when the Scriptures state so clearly that Paul was a prisoner for the mystery! We quote Paul's own words:

"Praying always, with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints;

"And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known THE MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL,

"FOR WHICH I AM AN AMBASSADOR IN BONDS: that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak" (Eph. 6:18-20).

"Withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST, FOR WHICH I AM ALSO IN BONDS" (Col. 4:3).

Have we not hammered away at this very truth for years? Why did not our brother read our writings before publishing an "analysis" of what he *imagines* we teach?

BAPTISM AND THE COMMISSION

When he charges us with teaching "that water baptism is Jewish," he tells half a truth and gives false impression. We teach that water baptism is Jewish only in the sense that it is associated with the Messianic Kingdom, which centers around Israel ([John 1:31](#)). We are not so blind as to miss the fact that the so-called "great commission" commanded the baptism of Gentiles.

But here we have a question or two to ask. Why do these brethren complain that we do not obey the great commission" when they themselves fail to obey it? They quote Mark 16:15 to prove that we should go to all the world with the gospel, but they fail to quote the rest:

"HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED; BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT SHALL BE DAMNED [CONDEMNED].

"AND THESE SIGNS SHALL FOLLOW THEM THAT BELIEVE; IN MY NAME SHALL THEY CAST OUT DEVILS; THEY SHALL SPEAK WITH NEW TONGUES;

"THEY SHALL TAKE UP SERPENTS; AND IF THEY DRINK ANY DEADLY THING, IT SHALL NOT HURT THEM; THEY SHALL LAY HANDS ON THE SICK, AND THEY SHALL RECOVER" (Mark 16:16-18).

If this is *our* commission, then the brethren who oppose us so bitterly do not even have the evidences of salvation, for as certainly as water baptism was required for salvation under this commission (see also Acts 2:38 and 22:16) so certainly were these signs given as evidences of salvation, for: "*These signs shall follow them that believe.*"

How much simpler to see that the fulfillment of this great commission has been temporarily interrupted because of Israel's unbelief and that Peter and his fellow apostles handed their Gentile ministry over to Paul, who went forth with the gospel of the grace of God.

Gal. 2:2,9: "AND I WENT UP BY REVELATION AND COMMUNICATED UNTO THEM THAT GOSPEL WHICH I PREACH AMONG THE GENTILES, BUT PRIVATELY TO THEM WHICH WERE OF REPUTATION, LEST BY ANY MEANS I SHOULD RUN, OR HAD RUN, IN VAIN."

"AND WHEN JAMES, CEPHAS AND JOHN, WHO SEEMED TO BE PILLARS, PERCEIVED THE GRACE THAT WAS GIVEN UNTO ME, THEY GAVE TO ME AND BARNABAS THE RIGHT HANDS OF FELLOWSHIP; THAT WE SHOULD GO UNTO THE HEATHEN, AND THEY UNTO THE CIRCUMCISION."

How much clearer the Scriptures become when we acknowledge the words of Paul, by the Spirit:

"FOR I SPEAK TO YOU GENTILES, INASMUCH AS I AM THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES. I MAGNIFY MINE OFFICE" (Rom. 11:13).

"NEVERTHELESS, BRETHREN, I HAVE WRITTEN THE MORE BOLDLY UNTO YOU IN SOME SORT, AS PUTTING YOU IN MIND, BECAUSE OF THE GRACE THAT IS GIVEN TO ME OF GOD,

"THAT I SHOULD BE THE MINISTER OF JESUS CHRIST TO THE GENTILES, MINISTERING THE GOSPEL OF GOD, THAT THE OFFERING UP OF THE GENTILES MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE, BEING SANCTIFIED BY THE HOLY GHOST" (Rom. 15:15,16).

How the confusion disappears when we see that Paul's commission, not the commission to the twelve, is ours!

II Cor. 5:16-21: "WHEREFORE HENCEFORTH KNOW WE NO MAN AFTER THE FLESH: YEA, THOUGH WE HAVE KNOWN CHRIST AFTER THE FLESH, YET NOW HENCEFORTH KNOW WE HIM NO MORE.

"THEREFORE IF ANY MAN BE IN CHRIST, HE IS A NEW CREATION: OLD THINGS ARE PASSED AWAY; BEHOLD, ALL THINGS ARE BECOME NEW.

"AND ALL THINGS ARE OF GOD, WHO HATH RECONCILED US TO HIMSELF BY JESUS CHRIST, AND HATH GIVEN TO US THE MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION;

"TO WIT, THAT GOD WAS IN CHRIST, RECONCILING THE WORLD UNTO HIMSELF, NOT IMPUTING THEIR TRESPASSES UNTO THEM, AND HATH COMMITTED UNTO US THE WORD OF RECONCILIATION;

"NOW THEN WE ARE AMBASSADORS FOR CHRIST, AS THOUGH GOD DID BESEECH YOU BY US; WE PRAY YOU IN CHRIST'S STEAD, BE YE RECONCILED TO GOD.

"FOR HE HATH MADE HIM TO BE SIN FOR US, WHO KNEW NO SIN, THAT WE MIGHT BE MADE THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD IN HIM."

Perhaps the outstanding blunder in our opponent's whole article is the passage in which he seeks to convince us that under the "great commission" the eleven were sent to Gentiles as well as Jews! He says: "Did not Christ command these very men, 'Go ye into *all* the world and preach the gospel to *every* creature'? Does 'all the world' and 'every creature' exclude the Gentiles?"

This is pathetic. Our friend is apparently in such utter ignorance of what we really teach that he actually seeks to persuade us that the apostles were sent into all the world! As if we had ever taught that under this commission the eleven were sent to Jews only! As if we did not know that the Messianic kingdom was to be - and is to be - world-wide!

But this kingdom was refused and for the time being has given place to "the dispensation of the grace of God," in which poor sinners from both Jew and Gentile are "reconciled to God in one body by the cross," "accepted in the Beloved One" and pronounced "complete in Him" (Eph. 2:16; 1:6 and Col. 2:10).

Concerning water baptism, our friend says, "*The very thought of water sets him foaming with indignation.*" This reminds us of the man who said to his friend: "Now we'll go introduce ourselves to Mr. O'Hair, but don't mention water baptism to him, for they say he gets so angry about it he's apt to strike you"! We wonder who does the "foaming," those who try vainly to defend their varied and conflicting water ceremonies or those who find their all in Christ.

THE WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS

Our assailant charges us with an "unnatural exaltation of Paul and his writings" and with "setting aside the words of the Lord."

But why are the words of Christ according to the gospel records any more the words of the Lord Jesus than those recorded in Paul's epistles? Christ Himself left no writings behind.

Does not Paul say again and again that his teachings are the words of Christ?

"For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you" (I Cor. 11:23); "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received" (I Cor. 15:3); "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man, For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:11,12); "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord" (I Thes. 4:15).

"... IF I COME AGAIN I WILL NOT SPARE; SINCE YE SEEK A PROOF OF CHRIST SPEAKING IN ME..." (II Cor. 13:2,3).

Those who would join with Modernists in following the earthly Jesus should listen to the inspired apostle when he says:

"THOUGH WE HAVE KNOWN CHRIST AFTER THE FLESH, YET NOW HENCEFORTH KNOW WE HIM NO MORE" (II Cor, 5:16).

It is the message of the *exalted* Lord through Paul himself to which he refers when he says:

"LET THE WORD OF CHRIST DWELL IN YOU RICHLY IN ALL WISDOM" (Col. 3:16).

Our opponent's quotation of I Tim. 6:3-5, to prove that we should put greater emphasis on the words of the Lord Jesus than on the words of Paul, acts as a

boomerang, for this very passage is but another proof that the words of Paul were the words of the Lord Jesus. Referring to *his own instructions to Timothy*, the apostle says:

"IF ANY MAN TEACH OTHERWISE, AND CONSENT NOT TO WHOLESOME WORDS, EVEN THE WORDS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST ... HE IS PROUD, KNOWING NOTHING. . ."

We in no wise exalt Paul above the Lord Jesus. We simply recognize the fact that the glorified Lord committed to Paul "*the dispensation of the grace of God*," as he states so clearly in Eph. 3:1-3.

DOES THIS VIEW LEAD TO DANGEROUS DELUSIONS?

Our opponent says that this "fact" should be "firmly kept in mind." But the *fact* is that "the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery" (Rom. 16:25) holds *the answer* to every heresy which challenges the Church today, while on the other hand those who claim to work under the so-called "great commission" are helpless to answer the Seventh Day Adventists as to Matt. 28:20, or the Campbellites as to Mark 16:16, or the Pentecostalists as to Mark 16:17,18, or the Romanists, Millennial Dawnists and others as to their claims for the kingdom, since they themselves confuse "the gospel of the kingdom" with "the gospel of the grace of God."

CLOSING APPEAL

It is pathetic that with such a poor grasp of the Word; with such meager knowledge of our teachings; with such a want of facts in hand, anyone should attack a truth which is as unanswerable as it remains unanswered. May God forgive those responsible and give them the grace to retract their false accusations and consider our teachings in the light of the Word alone.

We hold no ill will toward *Religion Analysis Service* or -----, only they must cease dodging honest questions only to strike at us in public. And above all, they must stop this unprincipled slandering of those whom they cannot answer with the Word. All those associated with these two organizations whose consciences tell them that we are right here should make their convictions known and do their part to check this evil.

As the days grow darker, let us "put on the armor of light" and walk worthy of our calling.

One would suppose that *Religion Analysis Service* and the anonymous writer of this article would be deeply embarrassed at having the inaccuracies and misrepresentations of their "analysis" exposed before the Christian public, and that they would now give up any further attempt to discredit the so-called "grace movement."

Not so, however, for so deep is the antipathy of some religious leaders toward the

Pauline message and those who proclaim it that they will simply lie low each time their falsehoods are exposed and await an opportunity to strike again. This is Satan's, strategy, for it is easier to believe a lie one has heard a thousand times than to believe a truth he has never heard before.

And this is the course which *Religion Analysis Service* has taken, as indicated in an article which appeared in the *Berean Searchlight* of November, 1961. Part of this article reads as follows:

THE GRACE MOVEMENT ANALYZED AGAIN

One would suppose that *Religion Analysis Service* would ... have more reason than ever to decline to discuss the teachings of the "Grace Movement." But 14 years have passed and evidently its leaders have decided that the time has come to strike again.

The major part of this past July-September *Discerner* is devoted to articles on Bullingerism, O'Hairism and Ultra-dispensationalism. This does not mean that they are dealing with three different groups, however, for they call us by all three names! On Page 3 the editor says: "The term *Bullingerism* is usually applied to ultra-dispensationalists" and "*O'Hairism* is used to identify the same crowd. . . ." Again on Page 15 we read that "O'Hairism is a new garment for the old heresy of Bullingerism," while on Page 10, in an article on "Ultra-dispensationalism," it is stated that "Since the death of O'Hair the leadership has passed to such men as Charles Baker and Cornelius Stam."

As if they had never been corrected, these analyzers of false religions repeat some of the same old falsehoods of their previous "hit-and-hide" article and add a few for good measure.

Their article on "Ultra-dispensationalism" starts off mildly with an "admission" that these Ultras "are thoroughly sound in their views of *most* of the major doctrines of Scripture . . ." (Our italics). This is a "left-handed compliment" indeed, for if we are *unsound* in one or more of the major doctrines of Scripture we are most assuredly heretics. But which of these doctrines do we deny or pervert: The inspiration of the Bible? the doctrine of the Trinity? the deity of Christ? His virgin birth, vicarious death, bodily resurrection or personal return? the personality of the Holy Spirit? the total depravity of man? salvation by grace through faith in Christ's finished work alone? the eternal punishment of the unsaved? Not one of these cardinal truths do we either deny or pervert. Indeed, we have defended the fundamentals of the Christian faith more vigorously than most of our critics. What then do these religious analysts mean by declaring that our views are sound on "*most* of the major doctrines of Scripture"?

We decline to use valuable space to deal at length with all the other brazen misrepresentations but will at least enumerate some of them so that our readers may see *how* the truth of the mystery is being opposed.

1. Page 3: "O'Hair . . . and his followers have sought vigorously to detach . . . Paul's prison Epistles from ... some of the apostle's earlier writings. If we follow these innovators actually we will have a shorter Bible....."

2. Page 10: "Essentially the claim is made . that the commission of Matthew 28 (and the other gospels) is merely an expansion of the one recorded in Matthew 10 and is therefore limited to Israel."

3. Page 13: "Some hold that [the Church age] ... did not begin until after the close of the Book of Acts."

We must pause to reply here that neither Mr. O'Hair, nor Mr. Baker, nor Mr. Stam have ever held this view, nor have *any* of the organizations with which we have been associated. This false charge is made, of course, to lend credence to a worse charge:

4. Page 15: "O'Hairism . . . teaches that the so-called Prison Epistles ... and THESE ONLY of Paul's Epistles, are for this dispensation" (Our emphasis).

And this leads to still another false charge:

5. Page 15: "It teaches that the ordinance of Baptism (and some include the Lord's Supper also) is not for this dispensation."

This charge is made in the face of the fact that Pastors O'Hair, Baker and Stam have all defended the observance of the Lord's supper repeatedly in their published writings and that all the members of all of our "grace" organizations subscribe to this view as an article of their doctrinal statements.

6. Page 16: We are further charged with teaching "soul sleeping" because we are "Bullingerites," even though O'Hair, Baker and Stam have all opposed Bullinger's teachings on this subject. Similarly we are charged with teaching the annihilation of the wicked dead, though we have consistently opposed this error also in our published writings.

7. Page 16: Our critics go farthest in their reckless slander when, calling us Bullingerites, they charge that "many in America who accept him as their teacher become restorationists, some going so far as to teach the final salvation of the Devil and all fallen angels."

To link this grave heresy with either Bullinger or us is mean and dishonest indeed, for Bullinger opposed it vigorously, as we have consistently done.

We would be discouraged indeed at this continued campaign by self-styled protectors of orthodoxy to oppose the plainest truths by misrepresentation and slander, were it not for the confirmation it gives us that they *cannot* answer what we do teach and dare not subject our teachings to a *Scriptural* analysis. The leaders of RAS should

consider, however, that to bear false witness is one thing but to attempt to confirm a misrepresentation after it has been exposed is quite another, and is infinitely more reprehensible in the sight of a holy God.

AN AMUSING SIDELIGHT

Their grasping for straws to smite us with is sometimes amusing. For example, O'Hair is quoted on Page 14 as saying about "the Mystery": "This is the 'chief gem in the diadem of the truth of Christianity,' that truth which was so unspeakably precious to the apostle of the Gentiles. . . ."

What the writer fails to reveal is that O'Hair alluded here to a statement by Dr. H. A. Ironside in his *Mysteries of God*, Pp. 50, 51. This statement reads as follows:

Throughout the writings of the Apostle Paul he again and again refers to a wondrous secret which he designates in a special way as "the mystery" or "the great mystery." Other mysteries he treats of, as we have seen, but there is one that is preeminently such. It occupies much of his ministry, and is clearly THE CHIEF GEM in the diadem of the truth of Christianity; yet for centuries it was ALMOST ENTIRELY LOST SIGHT OF. In fact . . . it is scarcely to be found in a single book or sermon throughout a period of sixteen hundred years! ... Of ordinances exalted to the place of mysteries, as in heathen rites [the searcher] will find much; but as to the mystery, which to the apostle was so UNSPEAKABLY PRECIOUS, rarely a reference.

.....

That a doctrine so clearly revealed in the Scriptures could have become SO UTTERLY LOST is only to be accounted for by the Judaizing of the Church, and the consequent minding of earthly things that beclouded the heavenly ones.

We cannot understand how our opponents at RAS can reject our basic claim that the present dispensation began, not with Peter at Pentecost, but some time later, with Paul, for they themselves hold that: "Each age or dispensation has associated with it, or is inaugurated by, a special revelation (P. 6). Can they deny that Paul received such a special revelation, or revelations, in connection with the "dispensation of the grace of God" and "the Church which is [Christ's] Body"? Let us hear what the apostle himself says about this:

"But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man.

"FOR I NEITHER RECEIVED IT OF MAN, NEITHER WAS I TAUGHT IT, BUT BY THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST" (Gal. 1:11,12).

"And I went up BY REVELATION, and communicated unto them¹⁸ that gospel which I

¹⁸ The leaders at Jerusalem.

preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain" (Gal. 2:2).

"And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision" (Ver. 9).

"For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles,

"If ye have heard of THE DISPENSATION OF THE GRACE OF GOD which is given me to you-ward:

"How that BY REVELATION HE MADE KNOWN UNTO ME THE MYSTERY (Eph. 3:1-3).

" ...I am made a minister, according to THE DISPENSATION OF GOD WHICH IS GIVEN TO ME FOR YOU....

"EVEN THE MYSTERY, which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints:

"To whom GOD WOULD MAKE KNOWN WHAT IS THE RICHES OF THE GLORY OF THIS MYSTERY AMONG TRE GENTILES (Col. 1:25-27).

"Now to Him that is of power to establish You according to MY GOSPEL, and THE PREACHING OF JESUS CHRIST ACCORDING TO THE REVELATION OF THE MYSTERY, which was kept secret since the world began" (Rom. 16:25).

In the light of these facts may we heed those other words of Mr. Wm. R. Newell in his *Paul's Gospel*:

Would that we had the grace to defend just as vigorously this great message today, FOR IT HAS MANY ENEMIES and even real friends who do not yet see it clearly; and there are others, who like Peter ([Gal. 2:11](#)) THROUGH FEAR OF OTHERS, ARE READY TO COMPROMISE (Our emphasis).

***The Students Too
Must Be Informed***

Chapter X

A COURSE ON FALSE CULTS

In 1950, when the present *Omaha Baptist Bible College* was still the *Omaha Bible Institute*, we learned that we had been included among the false cults in a course on this subject, having received the syllabus and notes from a student.

The following article was published in the *Berean Searchlight* of June, 1950, as our response:

IT'S TIME TO STOP IT

Those who are seriously interested in the welfare of the Church at large; who really wish to know the cause of her present illness; who wonder what is hindering the true, heaven-sent, spiritual awakening so desperately needed in these dark days - these should take the time to read this article thoughtfully and prayerfully, for the local condition discussed is but a symptom of the malady which continues to sap her vitality.

Some time ago we received a syllabus from a course on False Cults taught at *Omaha Bible Institute*. This particular lesson dealt with the *Grace Gospel Fellowship*, Pastor J. C. O'Hair and Cornelius R. Stam as propagating Bullingerism under a new name.

It was not surprising to find that this syllabus contained many statements contrary to fact, for those of us who have sought to proclaim the gospel of the grace of God in all its fullness have been misrepresented almost continuously by the enemies of the mystery revealed through Paul. What did trouble us, however, was that students at a Bible Institute, seeking a better understanding of the Word, should be *warned* against the very truths they should be learning there - and warned, not by an *exposition* of the alleged heresy, but by *misrepresentation* of it. Certainly, if this course has the effect it is calculated to have, these earnest young men and women will close their ears to "the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery," refusing even to give it an interested hearing because it is supposed to be heresy.

For this reason we requested first Miss Margaret Reynolds, the instructor of the course, and later President J. L. Patten, to correct the matter for the sake of the truth itself, as well as for the sake of the students entrusted to their care. Listing the misrepresentations and proving from our published literature that they were such, we asked them in the name of the Lord to lay the true facts before the students affected and to remove this lesson from their course on False Cults.

Replies from both Miss Reynolds and President Patten made it clear that they did not intend to set the matter right. Miss Reynolds offered to "check and revise my notes as seems necessary," but to date there has been no acknowledgment of the misrepresentations made, nor any promise to lay the true facts before the students affected. Moreover, it has been made clear that we are to be left in their course on False Cults, and this cannot be done without Misrepresentation on their part.

We therefore take this means of making the facts known, praying that this message may somehow reach those who have been warned against a "heresy" which is in fact a most blessed and glorious truth and that they may search the Scriptures for themselves to determine whether these things are so.

WHAT THE STUDENTS AT OBI ARE BEING TAUGHT

We quote herewith a few of the misrepresentations found in the syllabus, along with brief comments of our own:

Broadly known as O'Hairism, it is a new name for the older heresy, Bullingerism.... Dr. O'Hair has popularized this error in our day.

The fact is that Pastor O'Hair has vigorously and consistently opposed the errors of Bullingerism through the years. Many of his books deal with Dr. Bullinger's errors as to soul-sleep, the "two-body" theory, his rejection of the Lord's supper for this dispensation, his theories about *hades*, etc.

It teaches that the so-called prison epistles ... and these only, of Paul's epistles, are for THIS dispensation.

Paul received his special revelation of the mystery of the Body while imprisoned in Rome, and his prison epistles alone are for the Church. All other epistles by Paul have no permanent value for us but are for the so-called Jewish Church of that time.

Mr. O'Hair says that the revelation of the mystery was not received until Paul was imprisoned in Rome, 63 A.D.

This is all pure and unmitigated falsehood. We do not presume to speak for the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* or Pastor O'Hair, but our writings prove that none of us has ever taught these things.

Would it not be foolish for us to teach that Paul did not receive the revelation of the mystery until he was imprisoned in Rome, when he states so clearly that he was in prison *for* the mystery! ([Eph. 3:1-3](#); [6:19,20](#); [Col. 4:3](#)). And would it not be foolish of us to say that these truths were not *revealed* to Paul until he was imprisoned at Rome, when he himself *taught* them in his early epistles ([1 Cor. 12:12,13,27](#); [Rom. 12:5](#), etc.).

Those who charge us with heresy at *Omaha Bible Institute* will also search our writings in vain for any statement to the effect that Paul's prison epistles alone are for the Church, or that "all other epistles by Paul have no permanent value for us but are for the so-called Jewish church of that time." This is false propaganda which they have blindly accepted and passed on to their students.

It teaches that the ordinance of Baptism (and some include the Lord's Supper) is NOT for THIS dispensation.

Mr. O'Hair asserts ... that the Lord's Supper and Baptism were observed until Israel had definitely refused the Gospel message.

This is another pure fabrication so far as the Lord's supper is concerned. The fact is that it is impossible to be a member of the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* and deny that the Lord's supper is included in God's program for today, nor have Mr. O'Hair or this writer ever taught that it is not.

It is true that we deny that water baptism is in order for today, but shall we be called heretics for this? Has Fundamentalism ever been more confused and divided than it is on this subject? Are the constituents or the staff of *Omaha Bible Institute* agreed as to it?

This is exactly where the difficulty lies. We teach that the believer is "accepted" in Christ ([Eph. 1:6](#)) "complete" in Christ ([Col. 2:9,10](#)) and baptized by one divine baptism into Christ and His Body ([Gal. 3:26,27](#); [1 Cor. 12:13](#)). This is a "heresy which our confused critics cannot answer, so they charge us with a dozen others which they *can* answer - but which we do not teach!

No doubt Miss Reynolds and Mr. Patten *assumed* we reject the Lord's supper for today because they think water baptism and the Lord's supper belong together. But these do not go together in the Word of God.¹⁹

For example, the unorthodox teaching of "Soul Sleep" [in the Companion Bible] has led many students into the belief of annihilation . . . "Grace Fellowship" teaching is a kindred system although they sometimes deny any association with "Bullingerism."

It is deplorable that the students of *Omaha Bible Institute* should be sent out believing this lie when the Doctrinal Statement of the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* clearly states:

THE SCRIPTURE IN NO PLACE EXTENDS THE HOPE OF SALVATION TO THE UNSAVED DEAD, BUT INSTEAD REVEALS THAT THEY WILL EVER CONTINUE TO EXIST IN A STATE OF CONSCIOUS SUFFERING. THE TEACHINGS OF UNIVERSALISM, OF PROBATION AFTER DEATH, OF ANNIHILATION OF THE UNSAVED DEAD, AND OF THE UNCONSCIOUS STATE OF THE DEAD ARE

¹⁹ See the writer's booklet entitled, *The Last Supper: Its Place in God's Program for Today*.

OPPOSED BY US AS BEING THOROUGHLY UNSCRIPTURAL AND DANGEROUS DOCTRINES.

And as to Dr. Bullinger and the doctrine of annihilation, he wrote in *Things to Come*: "The term *annihilation* is non-scriptural and the statement that the doctrine is held by the writer is both false and malicious."

It has been our experience that those who oppose the teaching of the "one body" and the "one baptism" on the ground that it is Bullingerism, know less about Bullinger's teaching than they do about ours. They simply tell others: "These men have gone into Bullingerism," and that sounds bad! A friend of ours was accosted by a young man, some time ago, who said: "Did you know that Mr. Stam has gone into Bullingerism?" "Is that so?" replied my friend. "Yes. Isn't it a pity!" continued the young man. "Just what is Bullingerism?" asked my friend. The young man didn't know and began asking my friend what it was!

Not long ago a minister wrote us a letter of inquiry: "Will you state exactly what your position is regarding *Bullingerism*, or is it *Buchmanism*? I've forgotten the spelling!" He did not know the difference between the Oxford Movement and Bullingerism. Yet that same minister, since even *before* this letter was written has declined to have fellowship with us because we are supposed to have gone into heresy. Somebody told him with authority that we were Bullingerites!

And thus the father of lies continues to oppose the truth by slander and misrepresentation, sometimes influencing even sincere believers to join him unwittingly.

The four Gospels are entirely Jewish and have no real message for the Church, the Body of Christ.

How often we have protested that we believe with all our hearts that "ALL SCRIPTURE IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD AND IS PROFITABLE." But certainly no one would say that all Scripture is *addressed to us or written about us*. Our critics confuse the issue here.

James writes to "*the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad*," for example (James 1:1), while Paul writes:

"FOR I SPEAK TO YOU GENTILES, INASMUCH AS I AM THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES. I MAGNIFY MINE OFFICE" (Rom. 11:13).

In the light of this should we not consider the Epistles of Paul our private mail? Is not this where we should begin "*rightly dividing the Word of truth*"?

Furthermore, referring to the Body, the Apostle Paul writes:

"WHEREOF I AM MADE A MINISTER, ACCORDING TO THE DISPENSATION OF

GOD WHICH IS GIVEN TO ME FOR YOU, TO FULFIL [COMPLETE) THE WORD OF GOD" (Col. 1:25).

Does this not clearly indicate that while, to be sure, all the Bible is *for* us, Paul was specially called and sent forth to minister to members of the Body and to complete the divine revelation for them?

"They accuse the apostles, prophets and martyrs of holding false interpretations of the faith."

This charge is as unfounded as it is sweeping. Have we ever taught that God's prophets proclaimed falsehoods or that the kingdom message or the gospel of the circumcision were contrary to the truth? We have insisted only that they belonged to other dispensations.

Are the feasts of Jehovah observed at *Omaha Bible Institute*? Are lambs offered in sacrifice there? Do they refrain from doing these things because they hold that Moses was out of the will of God in commanding them? Of course not. They refrain from doing these things because they know from the Word itself that they belonged to another dispensation. But when we apply this principle of interpretation consistently and point out that Paul's message and ministry were distinct from that of the twelve, they tell their students that we accuse divinely inspired men of holding false interpretations of the faith.

"They have divided Christians and wrecked Churches without number."

In the light of all the other unfounded and false accusations in this syllabus it is not strange that this unfair and ungracious charge should be included. But, pray tell, is it divisive to teach that all believers are baptized by one Spirit into one Body? Surely not. It is true there have always been divisions over the truth-there has been division in *Omaha Bible Institute* over the truth - but this has not been because the truth itself is divisive, but because it is not received by all.

The syllabus contains many more false statements and implications. We wish Miss Reynolds and Mr. Patten would do the right and take them all out. If they did there would, of course, be no reason to leave this lesson among those on false cults at all. But since they refuse to do this it has become necessary to make the facts known in this way, both for the sake of the truth and for the sake of the young men and women who have been misinformed. Our final communication with Mr. Patten on the subject was as follows:

A LETTER TO MR. PATTEN

My dear Brother in Christ,

The reason I omitted sending you the address of the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* in my last letter [to Miss Reynolds] was not, as you suspect, because of some doctrinal

difference between us. I am a member of the GGF, have signed its doctrinal statement and agree heartily with the distinctive truths for which it stands. Apart from the fact that I was answering for myself, not for the GGF, it was simply that I felt you were rather late in inquiring for their address after including them (and naming Mr. O'Hair and me) in your course on False Cults and warning young students of all the heresies we are supposed to teach.

Your defense of Miss Reynolds because she was "careful to stay in the bounds of writers who have previously expressed themselves in print on the teachings of the 'Grace Gospel Fellowship'" is illegitimate. You know very well that she stayed only in the bounds of such writers as had expressed themselves *unfavorably* - mainly Dr. Ironside. She did not inquire from us about our teachings, as she should have done, for the names of GGF, O'Hair and Stam would not then have appeared among your false cults. Frankly, it's difficult for me to understand how you, as President, could allow your own brethren in Christ to be included in a course on False Cults without requiring your instructor to get one bit of firsthand information to justify classifying them with heretics.

Like Miss Reynolds you now talk of "correcting", "changing" and "revising" your course, but we know and you know that such "revision" would be little improvement on the original course unless you were willing to retract the untruthful and slanderous statements and take us out of your course on False Cults. I understand, of course, that our stand for the one Body with its one baptism is a radical departure from your own baptism theories, but surely you would not class us among the false cults on this account, for the Fundamental Church and your own constituents are probably more confused and divided on this subject than on any other.

I repeat that "revising YOUR notes as seems necessary" not enough. You have already spread slander about your brethren in Christ, charging them with grave heresies in your course on False Cults. The only course consistent with Christian honor now is to correct these misrepresentations conscientiously before the students affected and request them to explain to any to whom they may have passed on the misinformation.

You protest that "since the adherents of the faith of the *Grace Gospel Fellowship* have attempted to make inroads into [your] student body . . . [You] find it incumbent upon [you] to dispense information upon the matter and to give a reason for [your] present beliefs." But the fact is, dear brother, that you have not dispensed information but *false propaganda* upon the subject, as has been pointed out to you. Do you not feel that it is rather incumbent upon you to look prayerfully into these teachings in the light of the Word of God?

The constant spread of false propaganda about those who stand for the gospel of the grace of God is the scandal of Fundamentalism today. Why remain involved in it? Why not do the right and extricate yourself and *Omaha Bible Institute* from it before you find yourself involved in still more serious wrongs? In the final analysis you are not harming us. You are harming the students to whom you teach these untruths and those to whom they will spread them. You are doing grave injustice to those of God's people whom you

succeed in driving away from the truth by these methods. And what is most serious of all - you are setting yourself in opposition to the Word of God itself.

The office of the GGF is located at 153 W. 19th Street, Holland, Michigan, with Pastor Frank Moore its President, but let's be honest, dear brother; you know that you have already received literature as to our teachings and could have procured more (whether GGF, O'Hair's or Stam's writings) from the very brethren in your vicinity whom you are now blindly opposing. Why do you not ask *them* to supply you with literature instead of putting out a syllabus for your students to circulate which depends upon Dr. Ironside to state what we believe and teach? This is the crux of the matter.

Perhaps you began opposing these truths little by little, not looking into them very carefully yourself, but going along with popular opinion regarding them. In that case we pray you to begin looking into them carefully and prayerfully now, remembering that our adversary has seen to it that truth is never popular; that Christ was crucified, that Paul was beheaded and great men of God down through the ages persecuted and slain because they dared to stand for the truth regardless of lack of popularity.

With sincere assurance that this letter, rather than indicating any root of bitterness, has been written out of love for the Lord and His cause, and with an earnest prayer that God will lead you to do the right in this matter and that before long you will be rejoicing with us in a fuller realization of the infinite grace of God, I am,

Yours in His blessed service,
S/ Cornelius R. Stam

Another school year is drawing near at *Omaha Bible Institute*, and the question arises in our minds whether the instructors there will persist, as it now seems probable, in portraying us to their students as a false cult. For this reason we make this closing appeal to our brother and sister in Christ:

"Wherefore, putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor, for we are members one of another" (Eph. 4:25).

If you can answer *what we teach*, BY THE WORD, we will find no fault; not even if you do it publicly, but let's not misrepresent one another.

"Now we pray to God that ye do no evil; not that we may appear approved, but that ye may do that which is honorable, though we [appear] as reprobate. For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth" (II Cor. 13:7,8, R.V.).

It must not be supposed that other Bible Institutes and Colleges have been innocent of keeping the truth of the mystery from their students. On the contrary, many of them have been guilty of "playing their cards" carefully so as to avoid any contact with those who proclaim the great Pauline message.

Some years ago a young lady from one of our largest Bible Institutes was denied permission to participate in Christian work at one of our "grace" churches. We wrote the president about this, inquiring whether indeed it was the Institute's policy not to permit its students to take part in such ministry.

The reply? The old story: Never put it in writing. Instead the president had asked the dean of the Institute to call us by 'phone and explain their policy in this regard, which was in fact not to permit their students to accept practical work assignments in "grace" churches.

I asked the dean what we "grace" folk had done that we should be singled out for ostracism to the extent that the school would not even permit its students to help us bring the gospel to the neighborhood children.

He answered that he didn't know. There just "seemed to be something" about our teachings that was "divisive." I asked whether it might be our stand that saved Baptists, saved Presbyterians and saved Methodists are really one in Christ, baptized into "one body" by "one baptism" - and was this teaching divisive?

To this he replied that the leaders at the Institute would deem themselves unfaithful to God and to these students were they to send a Baptist student, for example, back to his home town Baptist church questioning water baptism. It was perfectly clear from our conversation that it was the policy of the leaders at this Institute to maintain *status quo*, denominationally; to send Baptist students out as Baptists, Presbyterians as Presbyterians and Methodists as Methodists, as far as it lay in their power.

How deplorable that this great institution, to which so many earnest young people go for a Bible training, can offer no positive teaching on a subject which to this day divides so many sincere believers! How sad that one cannot find the Bible answer to a major Bible question at a Bible Institute - indeed, that free discussion of such a question must be suppressed!

The late Pastor J. C. O'Hair rightly said: "*An interdenominational organization is impossible without compromise.*"

Let one instructor in an interdenominational school become too aggressive in championing the views of his denomination, especially where baptism is concerned, and there will soon be dissatisfaction among the other faculty members and grave concern among the board members over continued support.

Water baptism has doubtless been the subject over which most of the difficulty has arisen but the so-called "great commission," the distinctive character of Paul's message and ministry, the mystery of the one Body and other truths are all involved and it is difficult to keep away from too many Bible subjects at a Bible Institute! Therefore class discussion on the subject of baptism is generally discouraged if not forbidden.

In any case the best the student in search of truth may expect to find on such a subject at such a school is the conflicting views of the various denominations represented. Certainly the interdenominational school can offer him no positive instruction on the subject. And if the student cannot find the answer to a Bible question at a Bible Institute, where can he find it?

But consider the crippling effect these attempts at union by compromise are having upon the leadership of today and tomorrow.

How can an instructor in Bible truth have spiritual power in his ministry when he dare not teach what he believes; when even if he has the answer he may not impart it to his students since the board, the faculty and the supporters are disagreed on the subject? And by what miracle can he prevent his unfaithfulness from having its effect on the students under him?

Let us take stock. Where are the Bible teachers of yesterday? They are vanishing fast. And the pastors: more and more they speak only in generalities. They dare not be specific. More and more their sermons are "devotional" and "inspirational" while their hearers long for *food* and *light* from the Word. And the missionaries and evangelists: with many of them there is a deplorable lack of knowledge and conviction where doctrine is concerned. Indeed, the feeling is quite prevalent that missionaries and evangelists need not be too proficient in doctrine - their business is to win souls!

And so the mighty power of the Word of God is frittered away.

***Two Men, One Admittedly Out of
The Will of God and Another
Admittedly Bewildered, Explain
Why We Are Not Working Miracles***

Chapter XI

CRIMINAL PRAYERLESSNESS

Among the attacks on the truth of Paul's distinctive ministry that appeared in the forties, was a booklet by Pastor W. J. McNaughton of Wheaton, Ill., entitled *Wholesome Words*. At the time this booklet was brought to our attention, in early 1945, any comprehensive reply to it in the *Berean Searchlight* was rendered impossible due to lack of space, but we did publish the following brief note:

Says Pastor W. J. McNaughton of Wheaton, Ill., in his attack on the doctrine of Paul's distinctive ministry:

"Criminal prayerlessness is all that keeps us from experiencing the book of Acts."

Strangely, however, Pastor McNaughton himself does not experience the book of Acts!

He does not speak with tongues. He does not heal the sick or cast out demons with a word. People do not become blind or fall dead at his rebukes. And, as far as we know, he has never raised one single person from the dead.

Such lack of power, he explains, is due to "*criminal prayerlessness*," but what we cannot explain is how this brother has the temerity to write about the deeper spiritual life while he himself is knowingly guilty of *criminal prayerlessness*!

Here is a man confessedly out of the will of God, actually presuming to lead others in spiritual matters! Little wonder he should be found in opposition to "*the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery*."

If criminal prayerlessness continues to hinder our brother from experiencing the book of Acts, he should not enter the pulpit again nor write another leaflet - certainly should not attack the teachings of others - until he gets right with God himself.

May we suggest to Pastor McNaughton that perhaps his trouble is not so much criminal prayerlessness as criminal disobedience to II Tim. 1:13 and 2:15. Otherwise his book *Wholesome Words* would never have been written.

The second man, *admittedly "bewildered,"* wrote a lengthy article on the subject that

bewildered him - and *Christian Life* published it!

Today *Christian Life* aggressively promotes modern Pentecostalism. The following article, published in the *Berean Searchlight* of June, 1953, shows how this started more than ten years ago.

ARE WE MISSING SOMETHING?

We may write this down: If the popular monthly magazine, *Christian Life*, does not depart radically from its present course, it will soon be wholly given over to Pentecostalism.

For some time now the magazine has been teetering on the brink of that great delusion and there are growing indications that it is beginning to fall. Is this significant of what is taking place among Fundamentalists in general?

INTELLECTUAL AND SPIRITUAL DEFEAT

The April, 1953, issue of *Christian Life* carries as its feature article a discussion of miraculous signs by Myrddin Lewis, entitled: "*Are We Missing Something?*"

The article is a pathetic example of confusion, both as to Pentecostalism and God's revealed program for the day in which we live. The writer, an ordained Baptist minister, goes out of his way to emphasize the fact that *he* is in the dark, even suggesting that he and others like him may be seriously to blame for their lack of "Pentecostal power." Admitting his ignorance and possible guilt, he says in part:

"I must frankly admit I am puzzled.

My bewilderment comes from the realization that there is a possibility that I - together with evangelical Christians as a whole - am to blame for this lack of the power of God being manifested today.

Could it be that we have been warring against the things of God?

... there appears to me to be a strong possibility that we may have robbed ourselves of spiritual blessing - possibly the great spiritual awakening of this age for which we all are praying.

... if we are disbelieving God we have much for which we must answer.

I deplore the extravagances of many. . . . Nevertheless, God will not accept that as my excuse. I shall be faced with ... the awful charge of unbelief. "I could not because ye would not."

The depth of this writer's bewilderment is manifested in his statement that:

“Up to this time, I have assumed that the miracles as recorded in the book of Acts were not for our day. BY WHAT SORT OF TWIST OF THEOLOGY I MANAGED THIS, I DO NOT KNOW. ALL I KNOW IS THAT I HAVE NOT BEEN ALONE IN MY ASSUMPTION. . . . I AM NOT NOW SAYING WE HAVE BEEN WRONG, I am simply asking the question: "Are we sure - absolutely sure - that we are right?" (Emphasis ours).”

Imagine! This writer is not sure whether he and his colleagues were wrong in the "twist of theology" by which they "managed" to conclude that the miracles of Acts are not for today; he is only asking!

Why a man confessedly so bewildered should write for publication on the very subject that bewilders him, and why *Christian Life* should publish the results as a featured article, is beyond our understanding. If they, an ordained Baptist minister and the editors of a leading Christian periodical, cannot seek and find the Scriptural answers to such questions what good to exhort their readers about them? And how *wrong* to exhort their readers to seek what they themselves are not sure believers should have! Offering no light on the subject, such an article can contribute nothing constructive to its readers. It can only tend to give them too a sense of intellectual and spiritual defeat, making them ripe for Pentecostalism because they are unable to refute it.

But the tragedy is that the article in question could hardly represent more accurately the position of Fundamentalists as a body with regard to Pentecostalism. Fundamentalists in general had never felt that Pentecostalism was Scriptural, but had not searched the Scriptures as to it either, and now that the movement is spreading rapidly they are, like the writer referred to, "puzzled" and "bewildered." They just *don't know* whether or not miraculous demonstrations are in order for today, but more and more they are beginning to entertain the notion that they may be. Without the Scriptural antitoxin they are thus exposed to the delusive disease, so that the desire to experience "Pentecostal power" for themselves often follows naturally.

THE WORD GIVEN SECOND PLACE

But while confessing that he is "puzzled" and "bewildered," all the *arguments* our brother offers in his article are on the side of Pentecostalism. Are they Scriptural arguments? No, for while he does refer to several Scripture passages, not one of them deals with the question whether the miracles of Pentecost are in order for today.

The first passage he quotes is: "*Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and today, and forever*" (Heb. 13:8). But what believer would deny that He remains the same in His essential character, or what believer would deny that He *changes* in His manifestations and His dealings with men? The Gospel records alone bear this out. The Babe in the manger was certainly not "the same" in manifestation as the Man on the cross, nor did He deal "the same" with His apostles before and after His crucifixion (See [Matt. 10:5](#) and [Mark 16:15](#)).

His second quotation is: "*I am the Lord, I change not*" (Mal. 3:6). This passage likewise has nothing to do with the question of whether or not miraculous demonstrations are in order today. If the mere fact that *the Lord* does not change proves that they are in order, then it also proves that the sacrifices and washings of the Old Testament are still in order.

His third quotation is from the words of Gamaliel: "...*If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God*" (Acts 5:38,39).

This argument is not a strong one, however, for these were the words of one of the persecutors of the apostles. Furthermore Pastor Lewis uses them to prove even more than Gamaliel meant them to prove. Gamaliel proposed to "*let them alone*" on this basis, to *wait and see* whether, after all, they might be of God. Surely the *present* success of any movement is no sign that it is of God, otherwise we shall have to conclude that some of the most subversive heresies are of God.

His fourth reference is not even an actual quotation, but evidently a combination of two thoughts from Mark 6:5,6 and Matt. 23:37: "*I could not, because ye would not,*" neither having any bearing on the working of miracles today.

But if our brother truly desired to let the Scriptures speak as to the working of miracles, including miracles of healing, today, why did he not deal with such pertinent passages as the following:

"FOR WE KNOW THAT THE WHOLE CREATION GROANETH AND TRAVAILETH IN PAIN TOGETHER UNTIL NOW.

"AND NOT ONLY THEY, BUT OURSELVES ALSO, WHICH HAVE THE FIRST-FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT, EVEN WE OURSELVES GROAN WITHIN OURSELVES, WAITING FOR THE ADOPTION, TO WIT, THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY" (Rom. 8:22,23).

"Charity [love] never faileth: but WHETHER THERE BE PROPHECIES, THEY SHALL FAIL; WHETHER THERE BE TONGUES, THEY SHALL CEASE; WHETHER THERE BE KNOWLEDGE, IT SHALL VANISH AWAY"²⁰ (I Cor. 13:8).

"FOR WHICH CAUSE WE FAINT NOT; BUT THOUGH OUR OUTWARD MAN PERISH, YET THE INWARD MAN IS RENEWED DAY BY DAY.

"FOR OUR LIGHT AFFLICTION, WHICH IS BUT FOR A MOMENT, WORKETH FOR US A FAR MORE EXCEEDING AND ETERNAL WEIGHT OF GLORY;

"WHILE WE LOOK NOT AT THE THINGS WHICH ARE SEEN, BUT AT THE

²⁰ The context proves that the miraculous gifts of prophecy, tongues and knowledge are referred to.

THINGS WHICH ARE NOT SEEN: FOR THE THINGS WHICH ARE SEEN ARE TEMPORAL; BUT THE THINGS WHICH ARE NOT SEEN ARE ETERNAL.

"FOR WE KNOW THAT IF OUR EARTHLY HOUSE OF THIS TABERNACLE WERE DISSOLVED, WE HAVE

"A BUILDING OF GOD, AN HOUSE NOT MADE WITH HANDS, ETERNAL IN THE HEAVENS.

"FOR IN THIS [HOUSE] WE GROAN, EARNESTLY DESIRING TO BE CLOTHED UPON WITH OUR HOUSE WHICH IS FROM HEAVEN" (II Cor. 4:16-5:2).

"... THERE WAS GIVEN TO ME A THORN IN THE FLESH . . . LEST I SHOULD BE EXALTED ABOVE MEASURE.

"FOR THIS THING I BESOUGHT THE LORD THRICE, THAT IT MIGHT DEPART FROM ME.

"AND HE SAID UNTO ME, MY GRACE IS SUFFICIENT FOR THEE: FOR MY STRENGTH IS MADE PERFECT IN WEAKNESS. MOST GLADLY THEREFORE WILL I RATHER GLORY IN MY INFIRMITIES, THAT THE POWER OF CHRIST MAY REST UPON ME.

"THEREFORE I TAKE PLEASURE IN INFIRMITIES FOR WHEN I AM WEAK, THEN AM I STRONG" (II Cor. 12:7-10).

Or why did not our brother search to see why, after having wrought so many miracles, Paul had to prescribe medicine for Timothy's "Often infirmities" (1 Tim. 5:23), leave another fellow-worker at Miletum, sick (II Tim. 4:20) and himself remain, weak in body, in prison as "an ambassador in bonds" (Eph. 6:20).

The fact is that in our brother's arguments for "Pentecostal power," the appeal is almost entirely to human experience and the Word of God is given second place. He points to modern Pentecostalism, the revival in Wales in 1904 and several experiences and observations of his own as indications that miraculous demonstrations must be in order. And the written Word means continually less to those who are caught in the mesh of modern Pentecostalism. An occasional irrelevant verse, or such passages as merely state that miracles once *were* wrought, suffice to justify their position, while they yield themselves ever more unreservedly to what they suppose is the power of the Spirit of God, but is in reality far from it. One such exclaimed: "The Bible? Who needs the Bible when he has the Holy Spirit to lead him?" Neither this attitude, nor the "power" associated with it comes from the Spirit of God (who is the Author of the Bible) but from "seducing spirits" (I Tim. 4:1) who would control even believers in this way.

Pastor Lewis himself should beware of this, for evidently he has already tasted of this "power." According to his testimony, it was as he anointed a friend with oil that:

Hardly realizing what I was doing, I found myself not only praying for her sick body, but actually asking the Lord to give this blind woman her sight. *For a moment I was frightened* at what I had done. Then, *in a loud voice*, I cried... (Italics ours).

"Hardly realizing what I was doing... frightened ... a loud voice"; these are familiar phenomena of Pentecostalism, but hardly indicative of the Spirit's control.

But how, it may be asked, can we then account for the apparent restoration of the sick at Pentecostalist healing meetings? Must this not be of God? Not at all, for we know that Satanic forces have the power to inflict infirmities as in the case of Job and others, and while they do not have the power to bestow *life*, why may they not withdraw infirmities which they have inflicted?

How subtle and powerful is our adversary! Take one step away from the written Word and he will begin to whisper his lies into your ears. Listen to him and he will draw you farther and farther away from the study of that blessed Book-especially from the message of the glorified Lord through Paul - until you are engulfed in a soul-withering God-dishonoring delusion.

WHO'S TO BLAME - FOR WHAT?

Pastor Lewis does not spare himself or his colleagues of possible blame for their own spiritual loss and the absence of a true awakening in the Church. He says:

"My bewilderment comes from the realization that there is a possibility that I - together with evangelical Christians as a whole - am to blame for this lack of the power of God being manifested today.

...if we are disbelieving God we have much for which we must answer.

I deplore the extravagances of many.... Nevertheless, God will not accept that as my excuse. I shall be faced with the awful charge of unbelief.

... there appears to me to be a strong possibility that we may have robbed ourselves of spiritual blessing-possibly the great spiritual awakening of this age, for which we all are praying."

Doubtless some part of the blame for the absence of a true awakening in the Church falls upon each of us. However, when our brother speaks of unbelief and of disbelieving God, he should remember that all true faith is based upon *what God has said* ([Rom. 10:17](#)). The miracles of the Gospels and the Acts did not in themselves possess any claim to faith. They were *signs* of the fulfillment of *what God had predicted*.

Our brother will never be judged for failing to yield in faith to apparent miracles, however genuine they may seem, but he *will* be judged for failing to yield in faith to

God's Word. He, and evangelical Christians at large should get their minds off "the things that are seen" and begin listening to *what God has said*, or they will surely be called to account for it.

And more, they should give heed to what God has to say to *them* - to us, who live in this present dispensation of grace.

Some years ago an acquaintance of ours defended a sick friend who had called in the "elders" to anoint him with oil, remarking: "Well, it's in the Bible." On this basis we should go back to circumcision, blood sacrifices and a hundred other practices commanded in the law of Moses, but now forbidden by God through Paul. The part of the Bible that gives instructions for anointing with oil for the healing of the sick is that part addressed by *James* to "the twelve tribes" of Israel ([James 1:1; 5:14](#)).

As a remedy for the present condition our brother prescribes a "sober study of the books of John and Acts on the part of all believers." Here, precisely, is where he is wrong, for a sober study of Paul's epistles is the *only* remedy. It is not John or Luke, but Paul who says, by the Spirit:

"FOR I SPEAK TO YOU GENTILES, INASMUCH AS I AM THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES. I MAGNIFY MINE OFFICE" (Rom. 11:13).

Paul, not John or Luke, is the one who, by the Spirit, writes to us Gentiles about:

... THE DISPENSATION OF THE GRACE OF GOD WHICH IS GIVEN ME TO YOU-WARD: HOW THAT BY REVELATION HE MADE KNOWN UNTO ME THE MYSTERY" (Eph. 3:2,3).

Let John and Acts be soberly studied, of course, along with every other part of the Word of God, but *in the light of the Pauline revelation*. It is not enough to prove that miraculous demonstrations are "in the Bible" any more than to prove that circumcision and blood sacrifices are "in the Bible." The question is: does the Bible teach that these things are in order in the present "dispensation of the grace of God, and only Paul's epistles will answer this, for he alone, by revelation, discusses the message and program of the Body of Christ.

POWER-WHAT KIND?

Pointing out that today we have more Bible teachers, evangelists, etc, preaching to more people than ever before in the world's history, Pastor Lewis says: "Yet, somehow the power of God - as it has been demonstrated in other ages - is lacking."

That the power of the Spirit is lacking in most revival and evangelistic efforts of our day is not to be denied. Yet, curiously, in his own admission of this fact our brother betrays the basic reason. He is expecting the Spirit to show His power in the same way as He did at Pentecost, by the working of miracles. It is true that *such* power was

displayed in connection with the proclamation of our Lord's kingdom rights, for in His reign on earth sickness and infirmity were to be (and are to be) abolished. But with the rejection of the King and His kingdom, "grace did much more abound" and God raised up *another* apostle, the chief of sinners, saved by grace, to proclaim the good news of His grace, with a view to forming the "Body of Christ," the Church of this dispensation, with a position *in the heavenlies* in Christ. This apostle declared, by revelation, that the miraculous signs of the kingdom would pass away, but proclaimed an even greater power - the resurrection power of Christ, to be experienced and demonstrated in the life of each believer.

This, rather than the physical, visible demonstrations of the power of Pentecost, is what our brother and all believers today should seek. How fervently and unceasingly Paul prayed for the saints:

"That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him:

"The eyes of your understanding²¹ being enlightened; THAT YE MAY KNOW what is the hope of His calling, and what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints,

"AND WHAT IS THE EXCEEDING GREATNESS OF HIS POWER TO US-WARD WHO BELIEVE, according to the working of His mighty power,

"Which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places,

"Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come" (Eph. 1:17-21).

Who would sigh for the power of Pentecost when he has tasted something of the exceeding greatness of God's power in lifting us, not only positionally, but, by faith, experientially into the heavenlies with Christ? Paul did not cry: "Back to Jesus" or "Back to Pentecost," as so many do today, but "*on to perfection*" (Heb. 6:1). He longed, not for power to work miracles, but for "*the power of His resurrection*" (Phil. 3:10).

Pastor Lewis asks, with regard to Pentecostal power: "Are we failing to see the power of God demonstrated for the simple reason that we are afraid of its manifestations?" The answer is, No, for even if believers were not afraid of the manifestations of the power of Pentecost, that power would not be demonstrated today. Since the rejection of Christ as King and the ushering in of the dispensation of grace, God has rendered this impossible, as a study of the Pauline epistles and a fair comparison of early Acts with modern Pentecostalism will prove. What purports to be the power of Pentecost today is actually the work of our adversary in seeking to draw the attention of men, even believers, from *what God has said in His Word*. But believers, especially Christian leaders, are failing to experience a *greater* power in their lives

²¹ Gr., *heart*.

because of their failure to obey 11 Tim. 2:7,8,9,15, and their denial of the distinctive character of Paul's God-given message and ministry for the present dispensation.

The fact that Pastor Lewis' discussion of Pentecostal power appeared as a feature article in *Christian Life* and that this magazine has had so much to say about this subject of late, would seem to indicate that the editors share the same longings for the miraculous demonstrations of Pentecost. But this has certainly failed to elevate the magazine to a truly high spiritual level, for this is the magazine that recently featured an interview with boxer Jersey Joe Walcott, displaying his picture on its front cover and presenting him as a firm believer who prays and reads the Bible every day. What an example to Christian young people of how to get to the "top"!

ARE WE MISSING SOMETHING?

In closing, let us take stock and see whether we are missing something by turning from Pentecost to God's plan and program for us today as outlined by the Spirit through Paul.

Which, we would ask, is the greater victory, to be delivered physically *from* infirmity, or to be delivered spiritually while suffering infirmity? Which is the greater blessing, to be healed by a miracle, or to be able to say with Paul: "We faint not ... our *inward* man is renewed day by day," and to be able to add: "*For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory*" (II Cor. 4:16,17)?

Which evidences the greater faith and procures the greater satisfaction, to claim miraculous healing, or to "*be anxious for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving [to] let your requests be made known unto God,*" so that "*the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus*" (Phil. 4:6,7)?

Which is the greater triumph, to be delivered out of prison by an angel, as Peter was on two occasions, or to be enabled by grace to write *from* prison, as Paul did later, about sitting "in the heavenlies in Christ," "blessed with all spiritual blessings" (Eph. 1:3; 2:6) referring at least eleven times in one short epistle to "rejoicing" (Phil.)?

Which is the higher plane to live on, that which leaves much for sight, or that which leaves all for faith? Paul, by the Spirit, answers:

"While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: FOR THE THINGS WHICH ARE SEEN ARE TEMPORAL; BUT THE THINGS WHICH ARE NOT SEEN ARE ETERNAL" (II Cor. 4:18).

"FOR WE WALK BY FAITH, NOT BY SIGHT" (II Cor. 5:7).

No, we are missing nothing by going on from Pentecost to appropriate "the

exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe." We are missing nothing by coming out by faith into the full sunlight of God's grace and glory to *occupy* our God-given position in the heavenlies as members of the Body of Christ.

It is our earnest desire and prayer that our brother Lewis and the editors of *Christian Life* may come to accept and experience *this* power in their lives and ministries so that God may yet use them to more than undo the damage certainly done by their published yearning for Pentecostal power.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

(From the *Berean Searchlight*, June, 1952)

Most of our readers have doubtless read the reports of the death, by starvation, of an Ozark pastor, after fifty-one days of fasting. In a note to the newspapers the pastor gave his reasons for the fast:

I am seeking the more perfect will of God for my own life and asking God to show me why the signs do not follow my ministry as Jesus said they would.

When our attention was first called to this item in the newspapers, we sent the pastor some appropriate literature and wrote him, explaining that the will of God cannot be ascertained by fasting but by searching the Scriptures, and showing him from the Scriptures why the signs did not follow his ministry. At this writing we do not know whether he even received our mail, but we must confess that the death of this pastor in an unsuccessful attempt to learn the will of God by fasting has awakened in us a concern as to who is responsible for his untimely death.

It may be truly said, of course, that he himself was responsible. Did he not have a Bible? Could he not; *should* he not, have searched its pages to find the truth, rather than expecting God to reveal it to him in some miraculous way in response to his demands?

Perhaps, however, there are others more gravely responsible because they possess more light. What about the leaders of Fundamentalism who have closed their eyes to the difficulties this pastor so frankly faced; who claim to be working under the so-called "great commission," but pay little heed to carrying out its commands, or who actually change its wording to suit their own programs? One such Fundamentalist leader has opened his radio program for years with the words: "*Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature*" (Mark 16:15) adding: "We are on the air with the gospel of the grace of God." This Fundamentalist leader knows very well that he could not read the remainder of the commission in Mark 16 and still claim to be preaching "*the gospel of the grace of God.*" We have written him regarding this, but he still goes on handling the Word of God unfaithfully - not to say deceitfully - thus misleading weaker brethren.

What about the Bible Institutes all over the land (excepting *Milwaukee Bible Institute*)

which teach their students to labor under the so-called "great commission," while still evading the issue that has confronted them for years - the *impossibility* of carrying out this commission in the present dispensation of grace and the *incompatibility* of this commission with the *message* of grace? Do they not share in the responsibility? Must they not expect that some whom they send out will be honest and conscientious enough to make it their business to find out "why these signs do not follow their ministry as Jesus said they would"?

But most of all we who have come to understand God's program for today, as outlined in the Pauline epistles, are responsible. Who knows whether this pastor's life might have been spared, and his ministry enriched, if we had gotten the solution of his problem to him in time? Who knows how many more of the saved and unsaved alike might have been delivered from superstition and brought out into the sunlight of God's grace if we had been more faithful in getting the message out to them?

May God speak to our hearts, beloved, and make us *faithful* in His service, living always with eternity in view.

***A Third Man, Who Is Not Filled
With the Spirit, Tells Others
How They Can Be Filled***

Chapter XII

FAILING THE TEST

A man may write searching articles, asking his readers if they have been filled with the Spirit, or instructing them how to be filled, but we want to know if *he* is Spirit-filled. If not, how seriously can we take his instructions? It is such a situation we dealt with in an article, appearing in the *Berean Searchlight* of February, 1959. Part of this article follows:

**THE HOLY SPIRIT'S MINISTRY TODAY
DO FUNDAMENTALISTS UNDERSTAND IT?**

Popular Fundamentalism is going farther and farther astray in its teachings on the work of the Holy Spirit in this present dispensation of grace. The cry: "*Back to Pentecost!*" is growing ever more insistent as erring Bible teachers lead multitudes of confused believers down the road to disillusionment and shaken faith.

This trend is seen in articles published by such interdenominational Fundamentalist periodicals as *Christian Life*. For years this magazine, while evidently hesitant to embrace Pentecostalism outright, has nevertheless been leading its readers in that direction.

In April, 1953, *Christian Life* carried as its *feature article* a discussion of miraculous signs by Myrddin Lewis, entitled "*Are We Missing Something?*" (This is discussed in Chapter XI.)

.....

Another phase of the "Back to Pentecost" movement was presented in a series of articles by Dr. A. W. Tozer, which appeared in *Christian Life* in 1957. One of these was entitled: "*How To Be Filled With the Holy Spirit.*"

This, of course, is a subject in which every sincere believer should be heartily interested. Each of us does, or should, desire to have as great a measure of the power and liberty of the Spirit as it is possible to possess.

Dr. Tozer's article, however, was so manifestly contrary to the Word, rightly divided, that we wrote him a letter about it. He did not answer until we wrote him again nearly six months later, urging that the questions we had posed were vital and had not been asked in a contentious spirit. He then replied, but stated that he did not wish to discuss the matter.

We then wrote Mr. Robert Walker, Editor of *Christian Life*, enclosing copies of our correspondence with Dr. Tozer, showing how we had put Dr. Tozer's teachings to a simple test and requesting that, in the interest of truth, he would place an article by us, presenting these facts along with the dispensational side of the subject in *Christian Life*. We felt that this would contribute toward crystallizing the thinking of believers on this important subject and help to establish them in the faith.

Mr. Walker replied in the kindest manner, *suggesting* that perhaps more could be accomplished if we stopped by to talk the matter over with him. Brother Clarence Kramer and the writer then did this. Again Mr. Walker dealt with us in the most kindly way, repeating several times that he felt himself far from qualified to deal with the subject and was not defending Dr. Tozer's views. As to presenting the other side of the question in *Christian Life*, however, we received no satisfaction. We were not surprised, of course, since it is typical of popular Fundamentalist leaders to avoid facing up to these issues if at all possible.

We are therefore placing this material in this issue of the *Berean Searchlight*, with the conviction that many a believer will receive much needed light and blessing by seeing how the popular, but confused view of this subject has been put to a simple, conclusive test and is answered by the Word, rightly divided.

Certainly we have not "rushed into print," for it is now more than a year since the article in question appeared in *Christian Life*, and in the meantime we have dealt with both Dr. Tozer and the Editor of *Christian Life* about the matter, to no avail. We would now be remiss in our duty if we did not expose the fallacy and unscripturalness of that view which has already led to so much confusion and frustration, and show by contrast the balancing and stabilizing effect which a correct understanding and appropriation of the Spirit's ministry today is bound to have upon the life of even the simplest believer.

The following is a letter we wrote to Mr. Walker on August 25, 1958, here published as

**AN OPEN LETTER TO MR. ROBERT WALKER,
EDITOR OF CHRISTIAN LIFE**

Aug. 25, 1958

Dear Brother Walker:

We believe that *Christian Life* has correctly represented the work of the Holy Spirit today in its Statement of Faith, as follows:

"We believe that the Holy Spirit indwells those who have received Christ, for the purpose of enabling them to live godly lives."

Yet *Christian Life* has permitted certain articles to appear in its pages which constitute departures from this statement and must, it seems to us, lead inevitably to confusion, frustration and shaken faith.

We have now put these teachings to a simple, practical test and give you herewith the results, in a letter which we have received from Dr. A. W. Tozer, replying to some pointed questions we put to him nearly eight months ago.

We are sincerely hopeful that, in the interest of the truth, you will place this information before your readers, and so make a genuine contribution toward crystallizing the thinking of believers on this important subject and toward establishing them in the faith.

On Dec. 21, 1957, I wrote Dr. Tozer as follows:

Dear Doctor Tozer:

I have read with interest your article on "How to be Filled With the Spirit," in the December, 1957, issue of *Christian Life*.

This subject is certainly a vital one for these days and we deplore, as you do, not only the lack of spiritual power in the Church today, but the evident lack of *desire* on the part of so many, even among our leaders, to be filled with the Spirit, and experience His power. It is for this reason that I venture to write you as a brother in Christ with regard to your views on the Spirit's infilling.

In your article you refer to "Tens of thousands" of Christians and Christian leaders, who "manage to get on somehow, without having had a clear experience of being filled" (emphasis mine) and speak of "the crisis of the Spirit's filling."

From this and from your article as a whole I gather that, whatever terms you may use to express it, you believe in the Spirit's infilling as a second work of grace, apart from salvation; "a spiritual breakthrough," as you call it, "that will transform your whole life."

Now, dear brother, though you have written instructing others "how to be filled with the Spirit," we cannot, in so serious a matter, take things for granted which you have not specifically made clear. May I therefore press the matter further and ask you for answers to the following questions:

1. Have you ever been *filled* with the Spirit; brought *completely* under His control?
2. If so, are you still, at this moment, filled with the Spirit?

I am sure you can answer these two questions simply and directly, since you believe that no believer was "ever filled with the Holy Spirit *who did not know that he had been filled*" (Your emphasis) and that the Spirit's filling is "a spiritual breakthrough that will

transform [one's] whole life."

I am not asking, of course, whether you have ever experienced the Spirit's power, or help, or enlightenment, but whether you have been filled with the Spirit, an experience which, as you teach in Paragraph 13 of your article would "strip away" from you all self-love, self-indulgence, pride, etc.

Without meaning to cast any unkind reflections upon your service for Christ, I believe that the sacred record proves that if you were *filled* with the Spirit your ministry would be still infinitely more powerful and effective than it is.

You have asked us many searching questions in your article: Are we *willing* to give Him full control, to be stripped of self, etc., and this is legitimate, but the solution to this problem, I verily believe, is not *only* a matter of the heart, but also of the understanding. I believe that there is a dispensational key which you have hitherto declined to accept but with which, if you would use it, you could open the door of vastly increased blessing to many to whom you minister.

Will you take the time to consider this prayerfully in the light of the Word of God?

Since Dr. Tozer, in his reply²² does not even refer to this dispensational explanation, we interrupt our letter at this point to give you his response to the two questions put to him. His reply, dated June 16, 1958, reads as follows:

Dear Brother Stam:

By not replying to your letter I have not meant to be discourteous. There are however some things too sacred to make a matter of contention. My experience with the blessed Holy Spirit is too highly personal to expose to the unsympathetic gaze of one who believes as you do. For this reason, I must decline to have any further correspondence over the matter of the Holy Spirit and His work in the Christian heart.

I would just say one thing in closing and I hope that I may say it in complete charity. If God's people sought as earnestly to be filled with the Holy Spirit as they do to prove that one cannot be, the Church of Christ might approximate New Testament standards today instead of lying in her present state of moral and spiritual decadence.

Your Brother in Christ,
s/ A. W. Tozer

We are too grateful for the light God has given us on this subject to be offended at Dr. Tozer's hasty appraisal of our attitude toward his spiritual experience, or his implication that we merely seek to make the subject a matter of contention. However, we cannot but conclude from his reply that the real answers to both our questions are in the negative.

²² Received only after prodding from us.

Dr. Tozer has written instructing others on "How To Be Filled with the Spirit." He has taught that this filling is a once-for-all experience, "a spiritual breakthrough which will transform [one's whole life." He has further stated that no one was ever filled with the Holy Spirit *who did not know that he had been filled.*" (Emphasis his). Yet when the matter is put to a legitimate test and he is asked whether *he* has been, and still remains, filled with the Spirit, he replies that his experience with the Holy Spirit is too highly personal to expose to our unsympathetic gaze." We do not believe that the apostles at Pentecost would have answered their questioners in this way.

Salvation too, is a very sacred and personal matter. Yet suppose we should ask someone who had been preaching on salvation whether he himself had been saved, and he should reply that this experience was too sacred and personal to expose to the "unsympathetic gaze" of the questioner; what would we think?

In so important a matter as "How To Be Filled With the Spirit," would Dr. Tozer expect us to receive instruction from one who has himself *failed* to be thus filled? Surely *Christian Life* would not. If it were a matter of *degree* we might accept a quotation from Paul: "I have not yet attained," but Dr. Tozer makes the filling with the Spirit a once-for-all experience, a spiritual breakthrough which transforms the whole life. Yet he will not tell us whether this spiritual breakthrough has occurred in *his* life. This subject is not "too sacred" for him to discuss where it concerns *others*, for he asks many searching and personal questions. Why, then, is it "too sacred" to discuss where it concerns *himself*? Is not this bound to shake our confidence in his whole theory? And is not this the more so when in his very first response he makes it clear that he wishes no further correspondence on the subject?

The remainder of our letter to Dr. Tozer contains what we believe is the answer of the rightly divided Word to this urgent problem. We pray that you will give the readers of *Christian Life* a chance to at least consider it. Now back to our letter, which continues as follows:

At Pentecost, to be sure, the filling with the Spirit was a crisis, but those gathered in the upper room did not receive this infilling in the manner which you prescribe; by surrendering, etc., for in that case some would surely have reached this state of yieldedness before others. *They were ALL filled* with the Holy Spirit ([Acts 2:4](#)) because God had promised this ([Ezek. 36:26,27](#), etc.) and because the day for the fulfillment of this promise, "the day of Pentecost," had "fully come" (Acts 2:1) and the establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth was imminent.

The eleven had not been instructed to return to Jerusalem to *pray* for this infilling, but to "wait for the promise of the Father," and when the time had arrived for the fulfillment of the divine promise, they were *ALL filled* with the Spirit; *completely* under His control. As the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel had predicted, the Spirit caused them to walk in His statutes and to keep His judgments. This is why, in those early chapters of Acts we find not a sin, not a blunder, not a mistake committed by any of the believers. This is why

five thousand believers (Acts 4:4) could live together in such complete harmony that none among them said "that ought of the things that he possessed was his own, but they had all things common" (Acts 4:32).

But with Israel's rejection of the King and His kingdom, a change in dispensation took place. God saved the chief of sinners and, through him, offered, not a changed way of life on earth, but grace (to be appropriated by faith) for salvation and for victory in the Christian life.

It is most evident from the exhortations and rebukes in Paul's writings that it could not have been said of *any* of the churches which he founded: "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit." It is further evident that at the great council at Jerusalem the believers there were no longer "all filled with the Holy Spirit," and it is more than evident that Peter was no longer filled with the Spirit when he visited Antioch ([Gal. 2:11-14](#)).

May I now press the matter home by suggesting that even without prying deeply into our lives it must be evident to sincere and thoughtful people that you and I are not filled with the Spirit, much as we might long and seek to be.

The filling with the Spirit, unlike the Pentecostal experience, is now a goal, an attainment which our apostle, by inspiration, sets before us. He *exhorts* us: "Be ye filled with the Spirit" (Eph. 5:18) just as he *exhorts* believers, and prays that they may be:

"filled with all the fulness of God" (Eph. 3:19).

"filled with the fruits of righteousness" (Phil. 1:11).

"filled with the knowledge of His will" (Col. 1:9).

When we can say we have been filled with all these, and surely not before, we may also say that we have been filled with the Holy Spirit.

Today, then, the Spirit dwells within us by grace, ready to help in any time of need, but this help must be appropriated by faith ([Rom. 8:11,12](#)). Grace and faith are always the characteristic features of the present dispensation, nor is this in any way a loss when compared with Pentecostal blessing.

It was no personal victory for any of the Pentecostal believers to be filled with the Spirit, for the Spirit took supernatural possession of them, according to promise, and "caused" them to do God's will. But great victories are ours as by faith we appropriate the Spirit's help and overcome the world, the flesh and the devil, and for these victories we will gain rewards.²³

Do you not see, dear brother, that a recognition of these truths will *establish* the heart and life, while efforts to return to Pentecost must prove as disappointing as they are

²³ For a more comprehensive discussion of this whole subject we the authors book *True Spirituality*.

futile.

I am sure you will believe that this has been written in the spirit of Christian love and with a heartfelt prayer that the Spirit may lead us both further into His truth, for the glory of the Lord Jesus and the blessing of those for whom He died.

Yours in His blessed service,

s/ Cornelius R. Stam

We had intended to close our article at this point and, with this in mind, had sent copy to our printers. With the arrival of the proofsheets, however, the January issue of *Christian Life* also arrived. This issue, perhaps more than any previous one, shows how *Christian Life* is headed straight toward Pentecostalism in its most fanatical form. An editorial entitled, "1959 Perspective," reads in part:

"... when Christ came to earth as God and man He did no mighty works apart from the power of the Holy Spirit working through Him²⁴ – as a demonstration to us that we have the same potential" (Their emphasis).

In support of this proposition John 14:12 is cited: "*He that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do.*" There is no doubt that our Lord made this promise to His apostles. Nor is there any doubt that they performed these "greater works." But the article fails to prove that this promise applies to us in this present dispensation, and most certainly it fails to prove that it is being fulfilled today. Surely it is not being fulfilled in the editor and publishers of *Christian Life*. Further, if this part of our Lord's promise to His apostles applies to us today, so does the rest:

"And whatsoever ye shall ask in My name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.

"If ye shall ask anything in My name, I will do it" (Vers. 13,14).

This promise is not being fulfilled today, nor was it made to us, for in the darkness of "this present evil age" we do not even know "what we should pray for as we ought" (Rom. 8:26). This is why we should be so grateful that "*the Spirit helpeth our infirmities*" and "*maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God*" (Rom. 8:26,28).²⁵ If the editor and publishers of *Christian Life* could obtain anything they asked for in Christ's name they would doubtless request the dubious "blessings" associated with their perverted view of the Spirit's filling. Indeed, another article in this same issue: "*Discovery at Hillside*," tells of a Presbyterian pastor, who, finally having been induced to give up his briar pipe and other "sins rooted in the heart," was suddenly "filled with the

²⁴ Even this much of the statement is misleading to say the least. See John 14:10 and cf. Acts 2:22, "which God did by Him," Acts 4:7,10. etc.

²⁵ This subject is discussed at length in the author's booklet, *Unanswered Prayer*.

Spirit." The pastor's testimony continues:

"Scarcely had I gone to bed that night, when from deep within me came words in another language, and soon I was speaking fluently in an unknown tongue. . . . I could feel the Holy Spirit's tingling warmth and life settling all over my body."

Such an experience is most certainly *not* of the Spirit, for the Holy Spirit is neither physical nor psychic. The Scriptures never do, nor would they, speak of "the Spirit's tingling warmth" being felt all over one's body. But this is the type of experience which *Christian Life* confuses with the Spirit's filling and encourages its readers to seek. Those responsible surely cannot be aware of the deep disillusionment into which they are leading their readers. But they *do* know that for the past years they have been evading, rather than facing up to, the pleas of a growing number of believers who claim to have a satisfying dispensational answer to this problem.²⁶ In this they are not Bereans, but, closing their eyes to what they have pre-judged as error, allow the adversary to continue to delude them into accepting substitutes for true spirituality which must inevitably lead to defeat and despair rather than to victory and blessing.

OUR TIMES AND OUR SPIRITUAL LEADERS

Many good Fundamental churches have trouble filling their auditoriums on Sunday mornings and are embarrassed by the small attendances at their Sunday evening and midweek services. And as to special Bible conferences - why, the people simply won't come out on week nights!

Shall we blame this all on the television, the automobile, or the times in which we live? This writer is convinced that our times have little to do with the present spiritual decline in the Church. Rather the interest in Bible study has declined because *the Bible teachers have failed to go on in the truth.*

Dr. Wilbur M. Smith is quoted as saying about a group of Bible teachers occupying the platform at a Bible conference sponsored by *Moody Bible Institute* in 1914, that a similar group "*could not be gathered together today in the English world.*"²⁷ Why should this be so? Surely there is no good excuse for it when we have more light on the Bible today than our forefathers had.

The dearth of outstanding Bible teachers today is due to the fact that most of our Fundamental leaders have stubbornly withstood further progress in the recovery of truth and as a result have forfeited the power of the Spirit in their ministry and have rendered their own teaching mediocre. They gladly accepted more light on the Scriptures - until this light threatened their various theories as to water baptism, and then they stopped short, unwilling to investigate further with open hearts and minds.

²⁶ See the author's booklet: *The Believer's Walk and this Present Evil Age.*

²⁷ In *Moody Bible institute, A Pictorial History*, by Bernard R. De Remer, P. 56.

***We're Happy to Have Our Books
Reviewed - But ...***

Chapter XIII

DR. ENGLISH TRIES

While not writing about us himself Dr. E. Schuyler English had a friend do it for him in a review in *Our Hope*, a periodical of which he was then editor. The results may be seen in the following article, published in the *Searchlight* in June, 1955.

DO WE BELITTLE CHRIST?

Still the arrows keep flying. Satan sees to that.

For some time now our readers have been calling our attention to a special two-and-a-half-page review of our book *The Fundamentals of Dispensationalism*, which appeared in the March issue of *Our Hope*. Ray C. Stedman, of Palo Alto, California, is the reviewer, and Dr. E. Schuyler English, Editor of the magazine (and successor to the late Dr. Arno C. Gaebelin) endorses the article.

We decline to deal at length with the many exaggerated and unfounded charges made in the review. It states that we are "the ardent foes of water baptism and the Great Commission," that according to us "no one has ever understood Paul's ministry until our day" and that we are "practically hydrophobic" as to water baptism. It charges us with a "violent refusal to acknowledge the Great Commission as the marching orders of the Church today," and says: "Mr. Stam especially raises hands of horror at the thought that Paul sought to fulfil this commission. . . ."

This review states that we substitute "a convenient series of dots" for the last half of Eph. 3:5, though we have an extended footnote on it on Page 66 and deal with the whole passage again and again in our book. It states that to sustain an alleged distinction between the gospels of the circumcision and the uncircumcision, we "ignore totally the context of Galatians 2," though it is the context which we deal with at length to prove this distinction! Dr. Arno C. Gaebelin would certainly have taken issue with Mr. Stedman in his objection to our teachings about "an offer of the kingdom to Israel during the period of the Acts," for Dr. Gaebelin himself taught this, as did Dr. Ironside.

Finally, the review states that doctrinally we are "the heirs of Bullingerism." It does not tell that we have more vigorously and consistently opposed Dr. Bullinger's extreme views, both doctrinally and dispensationally, than have those who call us Bullingerites. The fact is that we are the heirs of the Scofield-Darby movement, not of Bullingerism. It was the teachings of such men as Ironside, Gaebelin, Chafer, Haldeman, Pettingill, Newell, Ottman and Gray that led us to the position we now hold. We saw that their dispensationalism, as a system of interpretation, was sound, but were increasingly convinced that their failure to see the *absolute* distinctiveness of Paul's apostleship lay

at the root of their many doctrinal differences.

But Mr. Stedman is no less reckless in stating *his own* views. Among other things, he writes in capital letters:

THERE IS NOT A SINGLE HINT IN ALL THE NEW TESTAMENT OF ANY DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF GOD IN THE EARLY ACTS PERIOD AND THE CHURCH OF GOD TODAY! (Exclamation mark also his).

It would be interesting to hear one of our humblest "grace" pastors debate this question with Mr. Stedman.

Perhaps Mr. Stedman was a bit ruffled by what our book *does* say about water baptism, the commission to the eleven and Paul's distinctive ministry, but to those of us who have come to rejoice in "the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery," the article in question again confirms a fact that is becoming increasingly clear: the opponents of the "grace movement" do not have even a fair grasp of this great truth.

Those who oppose us publicly often admit this ignorance in private. Recently one such Christian leader confided to this writer that the claims of the so-called "grace movement" had never been answered and that he himself had never gone into them thoroughly - and this even though, like the reviewer in *Our Hope*, he agreed that the movement was growing fast.

Naturally this brings a series of questions to our minds. If our teachings are contrary to Scripture and spreading fast, why has no one answered them in all these years; why do our Fundamentalist leaders fail to go into them thoroughly? A growing number of sincere believers can find but one answer: the leaders are afraid to investigate them because they suspect they are true and to acknowledge this would involve considerable cost.

Let Fundamentalist leaders who read these lines search their consciences as to this. Let them ask themselves whether it is quite moral to oppose publicly what they have never even considered thoughtfully, thus driving simple and sincere believers away from men of God who love and preach the truth and vigorously defend every fundamental of the faith.

A footnote to the review reads: "This review is not to be construed as an attack upon the author of the book, a long-time friend of the Editor, but an analysis of a doctrine which we believe to be erroneous but which is making noticeable strides in conservative circles."

We appreciate this and feel the same toward Dr. English, but this is not of primary importance. This article has attacked *the truth* - and this while *we personally know* that Dr. English has never taken the trouble to examine it thoroughly.

But rather than deal with all these points at length, let us go to the most serious point at issue and the Scriptures which bear upon it.

DO WE BELITTLE CHRIST?

There is one charge made in Mr. Stedman's review which we feel is quite misleading and unfair, and with regard to which we make our chief defense. At the close of his review he lists as "the most serious error of the book":

Minimizing the cross, the resurrection, and the Person of Christ as the true dividing line of God, and substituting instead the person of Paul and his ministry.

Now, while Mr. Stedman inserts the words "true dividing line" to qualify his statement technically, yet the whole statement gives the impression that we belittle Christ and exalt Paul instead, for obviously "the person of Christ" can constitute no historical dividing line. He is eternal. Nor would Mr. Stedman call an erroneous historical dividing line "the most serious error of the book and one which Mr. Stam ... would not knowingly commit." What he has done here is to give the impression, without actually saying it, that we belittle Christ and exalt Paul in His place.

Rather than berate him for using such methods to brand a brother unsound in the faith, let us see whether his inference is well founded - whether we belittle the crucifixion, resurrection or person of Christ in *any* sense by insisting on the distinctive character of Paul's apostleship.

THE CRUCIFIXION OF CHRIST

Has the reader ever asked himself how many clear predictions there are in the Old Testament Scriptures that say in so many words that Christ would die for the sins of the world? The answer is *-not even one!* Even Isaiah 53, doubtless the most significant of all, does not say that *Christ* would die for the sins of the *world*. It merely depicts *someone* dying for the sins of *Isaiah's people*. Thus the Ethiopian prince, though he had been studying the passage carefully, had to ask Philip: "*I pray thee of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?*" (Acts 8:34). This was a legitimate question, for the passage does not say.

And thus it is with all the Old Testament prophecies. They were purposely couched in veiled phraseology. I Pet. 1:10-12 makes it clear that the prophets themselves failed to understand their own and each other's predictions as to "the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." It was only after their fulfillment that men could look back at them and see their significance.

It is the same with the types of the Old Testament. How many there are, both in its history and its ritual, that speak of Christ and His redemptive work! But in how many cases does it say so? The answer is - *not even one!* The type could not possibly be

understood until the appearance of the Antitype.

Now we can look back at all the prophecies and types of the Old Testament and exclaim: "How many meaningful statements He made; how many significant ceremonies He ordered; how He even controlled history - with this in view!" The crucifixion did not take Him by surprise! It was part of His great plan! He had it in mind all the while! But, we repeat, this is only as we look back at it now. Nowhere does the so-called Old Testament say that Christ would die for the sins of the world. All is hidden in veiled phraseology and in the shadows of typical events and ceremonies.

But did not our Lord's disciples understand that Christ would die for the sins of the world as they walked and worked with Him during His earthly ministry? The record says that they did not. Those who insist upon reading more into John 1:29 than it says and suppose that John the Baptist preached "the gospel of the grace of God," should consider two passages from Luke's record.

The first is in Chapter 9, where the Lord tells His disciples that He must "suffer" and be "rejected" and "slain" (Ver. 22). Evidently they did not even begin to grasp His meaning, for in the same chapter we find Him saying: "*Let these sayings sink down into your ears: for the Son of man shall be delivered into the hands of men*" (Ver. 44). Did they now begin to understand Him? Read on -

"BUT THEY UNDERSTOOD NOT THIS SAYING, AND IT WAS HID FROM THEM, AND THEY PERCEIVED IT NOT; AND THEY FEARED TO ASK HIM OF THAT SAYING" (Ver. 45).

The second passage is found in Luke 18, where, after having labored and preached with Him during most of His earthly ministry, the twelve are called to Him to hear Him say that the time has come for Him to go to Jerusalem to "*be delivered unto the Gentiles, and... mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on..... and put to death...*" (Vers. 31-33).

If Fundamentalists in general are right these apostles must surely have understood our Lord's plain words in the very shadow of the cross, but the record reads otherwise:

"AND THEY UNDERSTOOD NONE OF THESE THINGS: AND THIS SAYING WAS HID FROM THEM, NEITHER KNEW THEY THE THINGS WHICH WERE SPOKEN" (Ver. 34).

Here again, with a threefold emphasis, the Holy Spirit informs us that His own apostles, after having preached "the gospel" for at least two years, did not know or believe that their Master would even die, much less understand what that death would accomplish. Indeed, we read in this connection:

"THEN PETER TOOK HIM, AND BEGAN TO REBUKE HIM, SAYING, BE IT FAR FROM THEE, LORD: THIS SHALL NOT BE UNTO THEE" (Matt. 16:22).

What greater proof could there be that "the gospel of the kingdom" which the twelve had proclaimed was *not* "the preaching of the cross?" or "the gospel of the grace of God"?

By the time Pentecost had arrived the crucifixion had, of course, become an historical fact, but it must not be supposed that even then the apostles understood what the cross had accomplished. Peter, at Pentecost, though filled with the Spirit, did not preach the cross as good news; he *blamed* that death upon his hearers ([Acts 2:22,23](#)). He did not offer the finished work of Christ for salvation; he demanded repentance and baptism for the remission of sins (Ver. 38). Read his great Pentecostal message again and see if this is not so.

It is not until we come to Paul that we find what is properly called "the preaching of the cross" (i.e., as good news). It is in connection with the "*But now*" and "*at this time*" of Rom. 3:21,26 that we first learn of "*being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*" and of being saved "*through faith in His blood*" (Vers. 24,25). It is in this connection that we first learn that His righteousness and His blood availed even "for the remission of sins that are past" (Ver. 25) (i.e., of past generations) so that Abel and all the saints of past ages were *really* saved, not by their sacrifices, but by Christ's blood.

This is why Paul speaks of "*the faith which should afterwards be revealed*" (Gal. 3:23) and says that Christ Jesus. . . gave Himself a ransom for all, TO BE TESTIFIED IN DUE TIME.

"WHEREUNTO I AM ORDAINED A PREACHER, AND AN APOSTLE (I Tim. 2:6,7).

And with Paul the cross, the blood, the death of Christ are his very *theme*. He *boasts* in their accomplishments. We cite just a few examples:

"When we were yet without strength ... Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. 5:6).

"While we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8).

"When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Rom. 5:10).

We are "justified by His blood" (Rom. 5:9).

"We have redemption through His blood" (Eph. 1:7).

We are "made nigh by the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2:13).

We are "reconciled unto God in one body by the cross" (Eph. 2:16).

He has "made peace through the blood of His cross" (Col. 1:20).

He nailed the law to the cross (Col. 2:14).

He triumphed over Satan and his hosts by the cross (Col. 2:15).

In the light of all this let the reader decide for himself whether we belittle the crucifixion of Christ by our emphasis on the distinctive character of Paul's apostleship. It was to Paul that the glorified Lord first revealed all that the cross had accomplished. If our opponents could see this their appreciation of our Lord's redemptive work would be greatly increased. Certainly they would no longer add to that great work an ordinance that once was required for the remission of sins. They would see clearly their completeness in Christ in the heavenlies and could truly say with Paul:

"GOD FORBID THAT I SHOULD GLORY, SAVE IN THE CROSS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, BY WHOM THE WORLD IS CRUCIFIED UNTO ME, AND I UNTO THE WORLD" (Gal. 6:14).

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

As with the crucifixion of Christ, so with the resurrection, there is not one clear prediction of it in the Old Testament Scriptures. All is veiled in hidden meanings and types, understood only in the light of later events and revelations.

The passages we have advanced to prove that the twelve, during our Lord's earthly ministry, did not know or believe He would die, include the resurrection also (See [Luke 9:22,44,45; 18:31-34](#). Also [Mark 8:31,32; 9:10,31,32](#)).

At Pentecost the resurrection, as well as the crucifixion, was recognized as an historical event but, as with the cross, its deepest significance was not even then understood. Peter simply declared to the "men of Israel" that the King whom they had crucified was alive again and *would* occupy the throne of His father, David, as predicted. But with Paul - and not until Paul - the resurrection blossoms with new and greater meaning.

It is not without significance that the same chapter in which Paul, by the Spirit, urges us to "study" with a view to "rightly dividing the Word of truth," should contain these words:

"CONSIDER WHAT I SAY; AND THE LORD GIVE THEE UNDERSTANDING IN ALL THINGS.

"REMEMBER THAT JESUS CHRIST, OF THE SEED OF DAVID, WAS RAISED FROM THE DEAD ACCORDING TO MY GOSPEL:

"WHEREIN I SUFFER TROUBLE AS AN EVIL DOER, EVEN UNTO BONDS: BUT

THE WORD OF GOD IS NOT BOUND" (II Tim. 2:7-9).

Why should Paul insist that Christ, the Seed of David (whom the twelve had preached) had also been raised from the dead according to *his* gospel? Why should he bid Timothy to "consider" and "remember" this? Did he proclaim the resurrection in a different light than the twelve had done before him? *Indeed he did.*

No one before Paul had ever proclaimed Christ's resurrection for, or on account of, our justification (Rom. 4:25) or the believer's identification, his baptism, with Christ into His resurrection (Rom. 6:1-4; Eph. 2:3-7) or the overcoming power vouched to us by His resurrection (Rom. 8:11; Eph. 1:19-21; Phil. 3:10-14).

These great truths were first revealed by the *glorified* Lord through Paul. Do we then belittle the resurrection of Christ by insisting upon the distinctive character of Paul's apostleship?

THE PERSON OF CHRIST

Again, as with the crucifixion and resurrection, the Old Testament presents Christ, the Son of God, only in veiled phraseology and in types. The Trinity is only hinted at. This is one reason why the Jew insists that there is but one God and that He did not, and will not, have a Son. True, Psa. 40:7 says: "*In the volume of the book it is written of Me*" but, again, who is the "ME"? We do not find out until some time after the Son of God has appeared incarnate.

The glory of His person is not revealed even in His ministry on earth, for from birth to death He suffers humiliation. The stable, the swaddling bands, the weariness, hunger and thirst. He has no place to lay His head, the multitudes throng Him, the leaders plot against Him, Martha rebukes Him, Peter denies Him, Judas betrays Him. His deity is veiled by His humanity; His glory is buried under poverty and shame.

After His baptism by water He spoke of another baptism; that of the cross:

"But I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished" (Luke 12:50).

Thank God we know Him no longer after the flesh (II Cor. 5:16) for, as one has said, how could a Christ in straitened circumstances mean so much to us as the Lord of glory dispensing the riches of His grace and the merits of Calvary?

Even in resurrection His glory was still veiled, else His disciples could not have beheld Him. Probably the greatest display of His glory, while on earth, took place at the transfiguration when, appearing with Moses and Elias, His face shone as the sun and His raiment was white as the light. Yet Peter could say: "*Lord, it is good for us to be here...let us make here three tabernacles; one for Thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias*" (Matt. 17:4).

Compare this with that light above the brightness of the noonday sun, which blinded Paul, as the glorified Lord appeared to him ([Acts 26:13-16](#)).

Once more it is Paul - and no one until Paul - who says:

"YEA, THOUGH WE HAVE KNOWN CHRIST AFTER THE FLESH, YET NOW HENCEFORTH KNOW WE HIM NO MORE" (II Cor. 5:16).

In his one letter to the Colossians alone he presents Christ in His glory as all the other Bible writers together do not present Him.

There he presents Christ as the Head of all creation - not the material creation alone, but also things "*invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him and for Him*" (Col. 1:15,16).

There he presents Him also as the Sustainer of all, for "*by Him all things consist [i.e., cling together]*" (1:17).

There he presents Him as *the Head of the Body* and *the Master of death* (1:18).

There he declares that *in all things Christ must have the pre-eminence* and that "*it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell*"; that He should be the Fount of every blessing, the Source of all supply (1:18,19).

There he presents Christ as *the sole Medium of reconciliation to God* (1:20) and unfolds "*the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is CHRIST IN YOU [GENTILES] THE HOPE OF GLORY*" (1:27).

There he shows Him as the One "*in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*" (2:3) as the One in whom dwells "*all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*" and in whom the believer stands gloriously "*complete*" (2:9,10).

Little wonder he warns us lest any man "*rob*" us, "*judge*" us, or "*beguile*" us (2:8,16,18) of the *appropriation* and *enjoyment* of our position and blessings in Christ!

And we have but *begun* with the Colossian Epistle. Delve into the remaining chapters and more deeply into all the chapters and then read all that Paul says in his other great epistles as to the glory of Christ and see if we belittle Christ by insisting upon the distinctive character of Paul's apostleship.

To those who foolishly suppose that the words of Christ are found only in the so-called Gospel records and that the so-called 'great commission' contains His last words, we say: look again and learn that His most important words were spoken from heaven to and through the Apostle Paul.

It is with regard to his First Epistle to Timothy that the apostle says, by inspiration:

"If any man teach OTHERWISE, and consent not to wholesome words, EVEN THE WORDS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST ... he is proud, knowing nothing (I Tim. 6:3,4).

And in even sterner tone the apostle speaks to the Corinthians:

"...IF I COME AGAIN I WILL NOT SPARE:

"SINCE YE SEEK A PROOF OF CHRIST SPEAKING IN ME ..." (II Cor. 13:2,3).

No, we do not belittle our blessed Lord by recognizing the distinctive character of Paul's ministry, but we do belittle Him by *failing* to recognize it, since Paul was the chosen vessel to and through whom His heavenly glory was revealed, and if we turn a deaf ear to his words we shall have to give an account to Him who instructed him to say:

"I SPEAK TO YOU GENTILES, INASMUCH AS I AM THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES. I MAGNIFY MINE OFFICE" (Rom. 11:13).

Perhaps our brethren who have been *minimizing* Paul's office and the glorious truths he was sent to proclaim, will yet reconsider their position and join us in preaching the Lord Jesus Christ "*according to the revelation of the mystery.*" God grant it!

The Scofield Bible Is To Be Revised

Chapter XIV

A SERIOUS MATTER

Dr. English's attitude toward dispensational truth concerned us more than ever when we learned that he had been chosen as chairman of a committee to revise the widely known and blessed *Scofield Reference Bible*. It was this concern that caused us to write the following three articles in the October, 1956, and April, 1958, issues of the *Searchlight*.

THE SCOFIELD REFERENCE BIBLE

And

THE RECOVERY OF TRUTH

The opening page of the *Scofield Reference Bible* contains an important statement by Dr. C. I. Scofield, written in 1909. It reads as follows:

The last fifty years have witnessed an intensity and breadth of interest in Bible study unprecedented in the history of the Christian Church. Never before have so many reverent, learned, and spiritual men brought to the study of the Scriptures minds so free from merely controversial motive. A new and vast exegetical and expository literature has been created....

A glance over the books in our own modest library bears out the truth of Dr. Scofield's statement, for many of our very richest Bible commentaries and expositions came from the era to which he referred.

Taking advantage of this opportunity, Dr. Scofield, along with a group of consulting editors, compiled the *Scofield Reference Bible* in the face of many difficulties and much Satanic opposition.

The *Scofield Reference Bible* contained many helpful features, including its subject headings and helps at the hard places where they occur, but the underlying reason for its tremendous influence through the years has been the fact that it was built upon the dispensational principle of interpretation, which Darby, Scofield and others had been emphasizing.

To thousands who studied the *Scofield Reference Bible*, seeming discrepancies in Scripture disappeared as they saw how God's dealings with men have been *progressive*, unfolding step by step with the advance of the ages. Passages which had previously meant little or nothing to them now sprang to life and became vital and meaningful. The Bible became an open book to them. They now *enjoyed* Bible study.

As a result the spiritual experience of thousands was enriched, multitudes were added to the Church in *the right way*, by faith in God's Word intelligently understood, the Bible conference and Bible school movement flourished and missionaries, in unprecedented numbers, were sent to carry the gospel to foreign lands.

Not that the *Scofield Reference Bible* was the ultimate in dispensational truth. By no means. But it was an excellent start and demonstrated how God blesses the Church when she goes forward in the study of His Word.

Of course there were some truly born again believers, especially in the Reformed and Presbyterian denominations, who never accepted the dispensational principle of interpreting the Bible, but the really live segment of the evangelical Church was the dispensational segment. It was among the dispensationalists that pastors *taught* the Scriptures from the pulpit. It was among the dispensationalists that people carried their Bibles to church and followed the preacher as he expounded the Word. It was the dispensationalists who were using their Bibles to win others to Christ. There was no doubt about it; God had used the *Scofield Reference Bible* and those who stood for dispensational truth, to bring about a spiritual revival in the Church, the results of which are still felt among us.

The sad fact is, however, that the Church, as such, has ceased going forward in the truth. Many have felt that the Darby-Scofield movement brought us to the zenith of truth and that to depart from what these men have taught is to be guilty of heresy. But those who do not go forward in the truth go inexorably backward, so that many who once felt they had reached the summit of dispensational truth have now fallen back into Amillennialism and Pentecostalism, and others, who still hold generally to Scofield's position are beginning to ask whether, after all, we might not have to go through the prophesied tribulation period or at least part of it.

This is the tide that must, by God's grace, be stemmed - not by returning to the teachings of the *Scofield Reference Bible*, but by *going* on from them as God gives us light. More than three hundred years ago, John Robinson made the following statement in a sermon delivered at Leyden, Holland:

“The Lord has yet more truth to break forth out of His holy Word. I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the Reformed Churches who are come to a period of religion and will go at present no further than the instruments of their reformation.

“Luther and Calvin were great and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God; but were they now living, would be as willing to embrace further light as that which they first received.

“I beseech you to remember it - it is an article of your church covenant – that you be ready to receive whatever truth may be made known to you from the written Word of God.”

Robinson might well have been referring to the condition of the Church today, and that condition being what it is we have naturally become concerned about the revision of the *Scotfield Reference Bible* which is now in progress. Frankly, we are convinced that the proposal to revise this volume has sprung from the natural desire of the publishers to be able to offer the public an up-to-date work and sell more copies, rather than from such considerations as prompted Dr. Scofield's efforts. Certainly there has been no progress in dispensational truth in those circles in which the revisers move, but rather a growing repudiation of it.

In the light of these considerations we have pled with the *Scotfield Revision Committee* to weigh the views of a growing minority in the Church who are carrying on where Dr. Scofield left off and feel that they are the spiritual heirs of the Scofield movement.²⁸ We have done this by personal contact, by letters and by signed petitions.

A report of the results follows in this issue. This report is made without animosity or ill will. We simply state the facts as we know them, in an effort to awaken Fundamentalists and especially their leaders, to the importance of keeping mind and heart open to new light from the precious Word of God. Our plea is not for the sanctity of the *Scotfield Reference Bible*, but for the welfare of the Church.

We wish it to be understood that we stand united with the members of the *Scotfield Revision Committee* on all of the fundamentals of the faith, except perhaps one, on which we feel *they* waver.

We believe with them in the inspiration and plenary authority of the Scriptures, in the doctrine of the Trinity, in the deity, the virgin birth, the vicarious death, the bodily resurrection and the coming again of the Lord Jesus Christ. We believe in the deity and personality of the Holy Spirit. We believe in the total depravity of man by nature and in redemption by grace, through faith in the shed blood of Christ. We believe in the eternal blessedness of the saved and the eternal punishment of the lost.

But unlike them, we believe in the absolute distinctiveness of Paul's apostleship. We believe that to him *alone* was first committed that greatest of all commissions, "the dispensation of the grace of God," in which water baptism and the signs of the *so-called* "great commission" have no place. This too, is a fundamental of "the faith" to which the apostle refers again and again, so that to go back to the former commission, with its baptismal salvation and miraculous signs is to depart from "the faith." On this matter our brethren of the *Scotfield Revision Committee* take anything but a clear stand.

We ask our readers to join us in earnest prayer that the Holy Spirit will use our feeble efforts to awaken our leaders and the Church in general to a renewed interest in sincere, unprejudiced study of the Word.

²⁸ *Our Hope* has charged: "Doctrinally they are the heirs of Bullingerism," but the fact is that we were led into our present position, not through the teachings of such men as Bullinger and Welch, but through the teachings of such men as Darby, Scofield, Gaebelien and Ironside.

THE SCOFIELD REVISION COMMITTEE AND DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH

A REPORT

"If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching..... "-John 7:17, R.V.

What caused God's blessed message for this dispensation to be buried, during the dark ages, under ecclesiastical dogma? What has caused its recovery to be resisted and fought every step of the way? What, still today, causes the leaders of the Church to hinder its full recovery by opposing truths that are so obvious and clear in the Scriptures?

It is true, to be sure, that many of the leaders among Fundamentalists do not clearly understand the great message revealed to and through the Apostle Paul, but why do they not understand it? Are they lacking in intelligence? Have we not yet come far enough along in dispensational truth for them to understand "the mystery"? Is God unwilling to grant to His saints the light on His Word so sorely needed in these crucial times?

No, Our Lord gives the answer in the passage cited above. It is self-will that always has, and still does, stand in the way, for even the hosts of darkness cannot bar the entrance of light into the heart of the one who seeks to understand the truth *in order that he might do God's will*. There it is in the words of Christ on earth, which we are frequently charged with repudiating: Let a man be truly desirous of doing God's will and the knowledge of the doctrine will not be withheld.

It is well more than a year now since we began our efforts to induce the members of the *Scofield Reference Bible Revision Committee* to consider important dispensational truths 1.) which are finding ever wider acceptance among Bible-believing Christians, 2.) which we claim to be the answer to the confusion that has gripped the Fundamental Church and 3.) which the Scofield dispensational movement itself led us up to.

Since considerable time has now elapsed and since inquiries keep coming in as to the results of our efforts, we feel that a somewhat detailed report is due.

AN ARTICLE IN "OUR HOPE"

Our part in the matter began when an article by Mr. Ray C. Stedman appeared in *Our Hope*,²⁹ containing several misrepresentations of our views, including the charge that by our dispensational teachings we belittle the person and work of Christ.

We are by now, of course, accustomed to such misrepresentations. As we look over the slanderous charges that have been made through the years against those of us who stand for the glorious message revealed through Paul, we are amazed at God's grace

²⁹ The chairman of the Revision Committee was then the editor of *Our Hope*.

and faithfulness in seeing us thus far safely through the storm.

Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse has called our teachings "Bullingerism," "Satanic," "carnal," "hellish heresy," "a horrible thing," and has charged us with views we have never held, warning the Christian public: "Those who arrange Bible Conferences and who select special speakers should be on guard and refuse to invite those who hold these false views."

Dr. James R. Graham has called us "a fifth column" within the Church, "modern Gnostics," "Bible choppers," "Satan's latter-day masterpiece" and "Twentieth-century higher critics." He has charged that "as one of old betrayed the Incarnate Word, so these betray the Written Word with a kiss." He has called our teachings "the cleverest masquerade to date of: 'Let us sin that grace may abound,' " charging that we neglect "no fraudulent method" to prove our case and "assail the very words of the blessed Son of God Himself."

Dr. John R. Rice has labelled us "hyper-dispensationalists" and "subtle Modernists" such as "Dr. Fosdick" and "Dr. Matthews," and has charged us with "discrediting much of the Bible for present use."

The Omaha Bible Institute (now Baptist) included us in their course on False Cults, charging us with propagating Bullingerism under a new name, and with teaching that "Paul received his special revelation of the mystery of the Body while imprisoned in Rome," so that "his prison epistles alone are for the Church" and "all other epistles by Paul have no permanent value for us."

Religion Analysis Service, a Fundamental antiheresy organization, has labelled us as ultra-dispensationalists" and "Bullingerites" and has associated our teachings with Universalism.

And it is only a few months ago that *Dr. Martin R. De Haan*, in his international broadcast, called us "these Paulites" and "these Bereans" and charged us with "usually" quoting only the first part of 1 Cor. 1:14 to prove that "Paul never baptized any one at all."³⁰

These are but a few examples of the many slanderous charges made by outstanding Fundamentalist leaders and organizations against those of us who stand for the distinctive message committed to Paul for us, and *though all of them have been confronted with the facts from our published literature, not one of them has yet had the grace to retract the misrepresentations.*

While we are, of course, disappointed that men in God's service should do such things, this substitution of slander for Scriptural argument has nevertheless confirmed and encouraged us in our stand for the truth, for could these men silence us *by the Scriptures* they would surely do so. The fact is that because they *cannot* do this they

³⁰ This broadcast was published in booklet form.

have set up their own straw dummies to make it appear that they are answering heresy.

This is what makes us ask: "*Do they really want to know the truth about these things?* Do they want to know it earnestly enough to be willing to admit previous error and revise their present stand? It appears that those referred to above do not. As to the *Scofield Revision Committee*, it does not yet appear that they do, though we pray - and many are joining us - that they will yet be convicted and yield to the Holy Spirit and His Word in this matter, for there is so much - so very much, at stake.

A TALK WITH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE

Shortly after the article in *Our Hope* appeared, this writer learned that Dr. E. Schuyler English, Editor of the magazine, was in Chicago. Since Dr. English is also the Chairman of the *Scofield Revision Committee*, we felt that a heart-to-heart talk with him might produce results, so we called him by 'phone and suggested a luncheon date.

As we met the next day, I explained to Dr. English that my purpose was not to take him to task for publishing the adverse article in *Our Hope*, but rather to discuss the *Scriptures* as to Paul's distinctive message and apostleship, especially since he was Chairman of the Committee for the revision of the *Scofield Reference Bible*, a project that would vitally affect the Church at large.

While certain details of the conversation must be kept in confidence, the important point is that Dr. English freely stated that while he was not well informed as to the dispensational position of the "grace movement" he was convinced that no one had as yet succeeded in answering it.

After some discussion of the subject I promised to send him a copy of our first volume of *Acts, Dispensationally Considered*, and asked him if he would agree to read it through prayerfully in the light of the *Scriptures*. He took my hand, promised earnestly that he would, and thanked me for my kindness to him.

THE "BRUSH OFF"

Within the next few days we sent copies of our *Fundamentals of Dispensationalism* and the first volume of *Acts, Dispensationally Considered*, not only to Dr. English, but to all the members of the *Scofield Committee*, along with a letter, reading in part:

It is our conviction that the so-called "Grace Movement" is the spiritual heir of the *Scofield Reference Bible* and that this movement is "everywhere spoken against" only because our spiritual leaders have condemned it without giving its claims serious consideration.

We have wondered whether the Revision will remain truly representative of what Dr. *Scofield* taught and, if not, whether it will still bear his name. If there is to be any change

from his views we pray God that it will represent progress in the recovery of truth rather than a retreat from truth already recovered.

With this in mind, we send herewith two volumes, which represent the basic views of a growing number of sincere believers who claim that they have the answer to the confusion which grips the Church at present, especially with regard to the signs and baptism of the so-called "great commission."

I realize, Dr.-----, that you are a busy man, but since such confusion does exist, and since so much is involved for us all in this revision, may I request that you read at least one of the books sent herewith, prayerfully and at leisure?

Sincerely, your brother in Christ,

S/ Cornelius R. Stam

The reader can imagine our disappointment at reading in Dr. English's acknowledgment to our communication: "As I told you when I was in Chicago, I shall give very careful reading to the book of Acts and other portions of the New Testament" and only incidentally "promising" to read the books I had sent him. We would not, of course, place our writings above the Word of God, but Dr. English has read the book of Acts a hundred times with his own dispensational glasses on, and he had earnestly promised that he would read and consider prayerfully what we had written on the book of Acts. I am certain that he understood this; indeed, he later stated in a letter that this had been his promise.

Most of the other responses (or want of them) were similarly disappointing. After eight months three of the nine members had not even given us the courtesy of a reply. Four of the remaining six did acknowledge receipt of the books but failed to respond to our earnest appeal that they read at least one of them prayerfully. In fact, they gave the distinct impression that they would not trouble to do so. One was "extremely busy" and not physically well. Anyway, he was "quite familiar" with our "general position." Another also had a "very heavy schedule," and questioned whether he would have time for "outside reading." At that, his letter was more respectful than the one he had written some years previous regarding the *Berean Searchlight*, in which he said: "I do not care to have my mail cluttered up with all this trash concerning an erroneous teaching which I long ago thoroughly looked into....."³¹

Only Dr. Charles L. Feinberg, along with Dr. English, had thus far agreed to give these views the benefit of their study.

After writing some of the members of the Committee again and receiving no indication of a desire to look into the matter, we published in the September, 1955, *Berean Searchlight* an appeal to our readers to join us in prayer that the members of the Committee might not close their eyes to this issue.

³¹ This was Dr. Wilbur M. Smith, in a letter to me, dated Sept. 7, 1943.

In October, after still further inaction, we added works to our prayers, asking our readers to send in postal cards petitioning the members of the Committee to give these truths prayerful consideration. This card read in part:

Since there has been a retreat from Scofield's dispensational teachings among many Fundamentalists and we fear that this will affect the revision of the notes in this beloved and God-honored Reference Bible, we earnestly beseech you, each one, to READ AT LEAST ONE OF THE ABOVE NAMED BOOKS THOUGHTFULLY AND PRAYERFULLY BEFORE PROCEEDING FURTHER WITH THE REVISION.

The Committee received the signatures of several thousand people making this request.

After still more fruitless waiting for further response, we sent a letter on January 11, 1956, to all members of the Committee, expressing our disappointment that most of them evidently were not even willing to *consider* this issue, "which, like it or not, is coming more and more to the fore to demand your attention." We wrote further:

Eight out of the nine of you are prominently connected with Christian institutions of learning. All of you are associated in the revision of a reference Bible which is pre-eminently dispensational in character. You ought therefore, to be thoroughly acquainted with every phase of dispensational teaching.

For these reasons I beg to be given the opportunity to meet with you, in company with some Christian friend, to discuss such questions as "the great commission," the distinctive character of Paul's apostleship, water baptism and the work of the Holy Spirit, in brotherly love, for one day or at least for several hours, at the earliest possible opportunity perhaps when you next meet as a committee.

I am sending this letter to each one of you individually rather than to the Committee, through your secretary, with the hope and prayer that you may read and consider its contents the more thoughtfully.

Again, I know you are all busy men - so am I - but is it not a compelling fact that if you are too busy to give full consideration to every phase of dispensational teaching, you are too busy to revise the *Scofield Reference Bible*?

May I hear, through your secretary, without undue delay, whether or not the Committee has agreed to grant the above request?

God bless you all in your labors for Him.

Yours in His blessed service,

s/ Cornelius R. Stam

In response to this request we received, on February 1st, a letter from Dr. English, writing for the other members, in which he stated:

Frankly, while your proposal may be discussed at our next committee meeting, I comprehend neither the necessity for, nor the propriety of the Committee's discussing with you the matters designated in paragraph 4 on page 2 of your letter.

To this we replied on February 14th:

. . . is it morally right to go ahead with the revision of Dr. Scofield's great dispensational work with one of the most important dispensational views still unconsidered? Have you so definitely settled it in your minds that what we have written will make no significant change in your dispensational views?

One of your members, Dr. Smith,³² wrote as follows in the December, 1955, *Moody Monthly*:

"This whole question of speaking in tongues urgently needs at this time unbiased, scholarly, historical and exegetical reinvestigation, by capable, trained men, and by our larger Protestant groups corporately."

This is a statement of Dr. Smith's opinion as to an obvious *need*, but does it represent his - and your - earnest desire? Will you accept the solution to this problem if it is presented? Will you accept it even if it affects your present views as to the character of Paul's apostleship, water baptism and the so-called "great commission"?

For years outstanding Fundamentalist leaders have been *going* to write detailed refutations of our position. They have never succeeded in doing so. They have committed themselves rather to a delaying action, hoping against hope that the matter will die out of itself. But if it did die out it would leave the Church at large, and you nine brethren - outstanding Christian leaders all - still confused and disagreed as to some of the most important doctrines of the Word of God.

You say, dear brother, that you see neither the necessity for, nor the propriety of, granting me a personal interview on these matters. To this I reply that you yourself have written that these views are "making noticeable strides in conservative circles," and as I recently wrote to one of your members: "Whether we wish it or not, the issue of the absolute distinctiveness of Paul's apostleship is coming more and more to the fore and demands consideration by our spiritual leaders - as surely as did the issue of Premillennialism thirty years ago. It would be a pity if the members of the Revision Committee, of all men, closed their eyes to it."

In the light of all this these teachings surely deserve better consideration than you men are giving them. I am therefore still prayerfully hopeful of a favorable response to

³² Dr. Wilbur M. Smith.

my request without undue delay. I am certain that you realize that my desire would not be to discuss personal matters, but simply and only the Scriptural subjects referred to above.

In closing I repeat that I appreciate that all of you are busy men - so am I - but IF YOU ARE TOO BUSY TO GIVE CAREFUL CONSIDERATION TO EVERY PHASE OF DISPENSATIONAL TEACHING YOU ARE TOO BUSY TO REVISE THE SCOFIELD REFERENCE BIBLE.

With sincere prayers for God's best upon you all, I am,

Yours in His blessed service,

s/ Cornelius R. Stam

In the meantime we had received one more noncommittal acknowledgment of our books and original letter, along with another very unkind one. To date we have never received an acknowledgment from the final member, nor any reply from the Committee to the letter above.

In addition to these appeals from us and petitions from thousands of signers, the Committee has also received letters from individuals regarding the matter, one of which reads in part:

... wouldn't it be wise to place a man on the committee who is undoubtedly closer to Dr. Scofield's position than many of the men now on the committee, namely, C. R. Stam ... ?

If, Dr. English, you do not see fit to place C. R. Stam as one of the members of the Scofield Revision Committee, would you be so kind as to urge the members of the present committee to prayerfully consider the two books that have been forwarded to each of them by C. R. Stam? If that is done, I am sure your Christian grace and integrity can never be questioned by those who follow you and study the results of your work.

To this Dr. English replied: "I am afraid that it is not possible to add another man to the Committee, which, by the way, was chosen by the Oxford University Press."

But this was not quite the whole truth, for to another friend Dr. English wrote: "Although it was necessary for Oxford University Press to approve every committee member, it was I who made the suggestions . . ."

A place on the Revision Committee is, and has been, the farthest thing from our thoughts, but the important fact to be noted is that Dr. English did not respond to our friend's *alternate* request that he urge the other members of the Committee to prayerfully consider the books we sent them -and this after all the earnest appeals and petitions to all the Committee members to stop and consider these things.

IS THERE A SHIFT AWAY FROM DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH?

All this, along with many more facts contained in our files, indicates that there has been a retreat from Dr. Scofield's dispensational position among recognized Fundamentalist leaders and that they do not wish to consider the possibility that they may be going in the wrong direction.

They are more determined "orthodox" than to be Scriptural. They have determined not to go beyond the teachings of the "fathers": Darby, Scofield, Gaebelien, Ironside - and thus have actually departed from the best that these men taught.

The March, 1956, issue of *Christian Life* bears testimony to this condition. Under the heading: "Is Evangelical Theology Changing?" Warren Young and Dr. Wilbur Smith are quoted as making the following statements respectively:

The trend today is away from dispensationalism - away from the Scofield notes....

I am sure that there is a growing repudiation of extreme dispensational views. In fact many who are absolutely conservative in their eschatological beliefs rarely use the word dispensational now.

Christian Life itself labels the "Scofield notes" as "*extreme dispensationalism*" in its sub-heading, and Dr. Smith seems to place as the favorable alternative to extreme dispensational views the omission of any mention of dispensationalism. Is Dr. Smith, then, qualified to take part in the revision of the Scofield notes? Dr. English, in his correspondence, keeps insisting that there has been no retreat from Scofield's position among the members of the Committee. Do Dr. Smith's words confirm this contention? Is the *Scofield Reference Bible* in safe hands?

As to the "trend away from dispensationalism - away from the Scofield notes," we wrote the Editor of *Christian Life*, requesting him, in the interest of publishing all the facts, to inform his readers that concurrent with the shift away from dispensational teaching among many leaders, there has been a growing emphasis upon dispensationalism and an increasingly widespread interest in it among others, as is evidenced by the rise and growth, in recent years, of the *Worldwide Grace Testimony*, the *Grace Gospel Fellowship*, the *Milwaukee Bible College* and the *Berean Bible Society*.

The response from *Christian Life*? The same old thing. The Editorial Director replied that after we had published this information in the *Berean Searchlight* he would "consider" part of it, "although I cannot guarantee publication." To date *Christian Life* has carried not one word of this, though the September issue does contain a sizeable report of an interview with Dr. English about Dispensationalism and the *Scofield Reference Bible* revision.

Thus we must ask again: Do they *wish* their readers to know all the facts? In the report of its interview with Dr. English, *Christian Life* calls him one of the foremost authorities on the dispensational view of evangelical theology today," yet we know from his own testimony that until some months ago at least, he was *not* well informed on the dispensational issue which of all issues is *the* issue that confronts Fundamentalists today and which is honey-combing Fundamentalist churches on every hand.

The trend, of course, *must* be away from dispensationalism among those who, though themselves divided, are determined to cling to an unscriptural water ceremony and who continue to try, vainly, to carry out a commission not given to them. But among those who recognize the distinctive character of Paul's apostleship and message, dispensational truth is becoming increasingly precious. As they rightly divide the Word of truth, seeming discrepancies are resolved, seeming contradictions reconciled and difficulties axe overcome as the truths of all dispensations fall into their proper places and assume their proper proportions. Best of all, the person and work of Christ and the infinite grace of God are glorified as they could not otherwise be.

HOW WILL THE SCOFIELD BIBLE BE REVISED?

While little information has been given out as to the type of changes to be made in the revised *Scofield Reference Bible*, Dr. English does say in his interview that there will be "a revision of certain inaccuracies" and has also written that "There are certain things in Dr. Scofield's notes which . . . are not wholly clear." Also that the publisher and the committee are "of the impression that some of the just criticisms of the Scofield Bible can be overcome without changing in any degree the Scofield system of interpretation. . . ." This effort, he says, would include "clarifying certain notes."

Now, to be specific, what will the *Revision Committee* do with such "inaccuracies" as the following:

A footnote on Page 1252, referring to the mystery revealed to Paul, reads in part: "The mystery 'hid in God' was the divine purpose to make of Jew and Gentile a wholly new thing-'the Church, which is His [Christ's] body,' formed by the baptism with the Holy Spirit ([I Cor. 12:12,13](#)) and in which the earthly distinction of Jew and Gentile disappears ([Eph. 2:14,15](#); [Col. 3:10,11](#))." Yet in another footnote, on Page 1304, he has this Church beginning at Pentecost, when the distinction between Jew and Gentile in the program of God had certainly not disappeared (See [Acts 2:5,14,22,36](#)) and when Jews and Gentiles had certainly *not* been baptized into one body. Furthermore, while this mystery revealed to Paul had been previously "hid in God" and was "a wholly new thing," as Dr. Scofield says, he also has Christ foretelling, though not explaining it in Matt. 16:18 (See again his note on Page 1252).

Certainly here is something which needs clarifying, but what, we wonder, will the *Revision Committee* do with it? Will they leave it as it is? If not, will they say that the mystery of the Body really was "hid in God" until revealed to Paul and therefore "a wholly

new thing," or will they try to prove that our Lord had the joint body in mind when He said "I will build My Church"? Will they say that this "wholly new thing" was formed as the Spirit baptized Jewish and Gentile believers into one Body, or will they try to prove that it began at Pentecost with Jews alone? Which way will they go?

On Page 1044, with reference to the commission to the eleven, a footnote reads: "With the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ begins the 'dispensation of the grace of God.' . . ." Yet on Page 1150 we read: "The theme of Peter's sermon at Pentecost is stated in Verse 36. It is that Jesus is the Messiah." Furthermore, in [Acts 20:24](#) Paul clearly states that "the gospel of the grace of God" had been committed to him, while Peter at Pentecost demanded repentance and baptism "for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38).

What will the *Revision Committee* do with this inconsistency? Will they close their eyes to it? If not, which way will they go? Will they take their stand with the Scriptural assertion that "the gospel of the grace of God" was committed to *Paul*, or will they try to prove that Christ sent the eleven (later made twelve) forth with the gospel of the grace of God? And if they try to prove this to be so, what will they do with Mark 16:16? Will they alter it, as so many have done, or will they suggest that probably it is not found in the original? And how can they possibly prove that Peter, at Pentecost, proclaimed the gospel of the grace of God when he demanded repentance and water baptism "for the remission of sins"? The Committee will certainly find themselves on the horns of a dilemma here, unless they take a firm stand on the absolute distinctiveness of Paul's apostleship and message.

Indeed, they will find themselves in many impossible positions in revising this great dispensational work if they continue to reject the further light which God has so graciously given on these very subjects so vital to us all. God grant that they may yet seek and accept this light for, where *any* truth is concerned, what indictment could be more solemn, or fraught with more serious consequences than the words: "*Their eyes have they closed*"?

How Can We Expect a Revival?

Chapter XV

HARDEN NOT YOUR HEARTS

Perhaps the Scriptural appeal, "Harden not your hearts," can be more appropriately directed to Christian leaders than to any other segment of the Church.

After all my personal contacts with Dr. English, all my correspondence with him and all the evidence he had by now received as to what we do and do not teach he again published in *Our Hope* two articles by Mr. Ray Stedman, which contained further misrepresentations of our teachings and more false charges.

I wrote Dr. English about this, listing briefly the false charges Mr. Stedman had made, and closing with the words:

If you continue to place confidence in one who can make such wild and extravagant accusations, how can the Christian public continue to give you the same measure of respect as Editor of *Our Hope* and Chairman of the *Scofield Reference Bible Revision Committee*?

Do you not feel before God, dear brother, that this is the time to publicly repudiate Mr. Stedman's articles and promise that no more of them will be published?

What was my disappointment to receive in reply a letter in which Dr. English said in part:

I do not feel any inclination to repudiate Ray Stedman and his writings. I have no less confidence in him now than before. He has, in my judgment, dealt intelligently and Scripturally with the Grace Movement in the three articles that appeared in *Our Hope*.

In the light of all the evidence presented, even in this volume, that Mr. Stedman did, again and again, misrepresent our teachings and falsely accuse us, Dr. English's course of action cannot win him the continued respect of thoughtful believers.

We dealt with Mr. Stedman's new attack in the *Berean Searchlight* of April, 1958, but rather than weary our readers with our answering of false accusations we close this chapter with only the introduction and the conclusion to this article.

THE DEFENSE OF THE GOSPEL

If ever a glad gospel message was proclaimed in this dark world, it is that which Paul, by divine inspiration, calls "*this mystery among the Gentiles*," the glorious good news that the Gentiles, so long cast out of God's favor, may now find salvation and blessing,

not, indeed, *through Israel's instrumentality*, according to covenant and promise, *but in spite of her obstinacy*, according to God's secret purpose revealed through the Apostle Paul - all by grace through faith, on the basis of the finished work of Christ at Calvary.

How it should touch our hearts with gratitude that we Gentiles, to whom God had never made a single commitment; who were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise," can now join in songs of salvation and praise to *Israel's* Messiah even though she, through whom the blessing should - and some day will - flow, rejects Him! How it should thrill us that the rejected Messiah has become the Head of the joint body composed of believing Gentiles and the remnant of God's ancient people who accept Him as their Savior and Lord!

How unfathomable are the wonders of this message of grace! How eager we should be to search its depths, especially since the apostle declares so plainly that "the mystery ... hid from ages and from generations . . . is now made manifest to His saints:

"TO WHOM GOD WOULD MAKE KNOWN WHAT IS THE RICHES OF THE GLORY OF THIS MYSTERY AMONG THE GENTILES "³³ (Col. 1:27).

Yet this loving message of grace, rather than being accepted with thanks by all, is rejected and opposed on every hand. The arrows continue ever to fly in the battle which our adversary has so long waged against this most blessed truth-arrows, alas, sometimes shot by those who should be using "the shield of faith" against them.

As always, the devil opposes the Word of God, not by *answering* it - for it cannot be answered, but by *perverting* and *misrepresenting* it. And, pity of pities, he often deludes even believers into helping him accomplish this base purpose.

A PERPLEXING QUESTION AND A SCRIPTURAL ANSWER

What should we, who stand for the truth, do about this? What should we do when the very truths we proclaim are twisted and misrepresented *by brethren*? What should we do when *men of God* charge us with heresies we do not teach, so as to keep others from learning about the truths we do teach? What is our responsibility in such matters? We have asked ourselves this question prayerfully in the light of the Word again and again, and can find but one answer.

The course of action we are sometimes *tempted* to take is also probably the most popular in this soft and irresponsible age. "Just pray about it," they say; "leave it with the Lord," for "the servant Of the Lord must not strive." But as we examine the Scriptures, especially those Scriptures relating to the present dispensation, we are convinced that this perversion of Paul's words in II Tim. 2:24 is but another of Satan's tricks to keep us from objecting when he obscures the grace and glory of our blessed Lord.

³³ The passage continues: "Which is Christ in *you* [Gentiles] the hope of glory," i.e., rather than in *Israel*, as predicted in the Old Testament Scriptures.

Were we to follow this course of action where God's truth is at stake, how would the Church make the least spiritual headway - for, remember, the Church has never made one step of progress without controversy; the devil has always seen to that. And what about those sincere believers who will not even consider these glorious truths because they have heard so many false reports about the "heresies" of those who teach them? Shall we leave these saints in darkness rather than protest that the reports are false? And what about the millions of the lost who remain unreached because so many fine Christian young men and women, afraid to examine these teachings, remain confused about God's message for today and never fulfill their privilege and responsibility to go and proclaim God's grace to the lost? Have we no greater obligation to these heathen millions than to *pray* for them and leave them with the Lord? And what about those who spread these false reports? Shall we, by our silence, encourage and help them in their sin? Is it not rather our responsibility to reprove them, privately at first, but "before all" if necessary?

Granted, no believer should be *contentious*, and certainly not where personal interests are concerned, but where God's truth is concerned he must, as its representative, stand and fight, if necessary, to defend it. We can see no other possible interpretation to the apostle's appeal to the "man of God" to be "a good soldier of Jesus Christ" and to "*fight the good fight of the³⁴ faith*" (I Tim. 6:12; II Tim. 2:1-3). We can see no other reason for his exhortation to "*put on the whole armor of God*" and to "*stand ... stand ... stand*" (Eph. 6:10-20) especially since he closes this very exhortation with the words:

"PRAYING ALWAYS WITH ALL PRAYER AND SUPPLICATION IN THE SPIRIT, AND WATCHING THEREUNTO WITH ALL PERSEVERANCE AND SUPPLICATION FOR ALL SAINTS:

"AND FOR ME, THAT UTTERANCE MAY BE GIVEN UNTO ME, THAT I MAY OPEN MY MOUTH BOLDLY, TO MAKE KNOWN THE MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL

"FOR WHICH I AM AN AMBASSADOR IN BONDS; THAT THEREIN I MAY SPEAK BOLDLY, AS I OUGHT TO SPEAK." (Vers. 18-20).

What would have happened at Syrian Antioch if Paul had not rebuked Peter for his hypocrisy? ([Gal. 2:11-14](#)). What would have happened at Rome if he had allowed the false rumors of his religious enemies to gain ground instead of protesting: "*We be slanderously reported*"? ([Rom. 3:8](#)). What would have happened at Thessalonica if he had not warned the believers there against the false brethren who would have deceived them as to Paul's teachings? ([II Thes. 2:1-3](#)).

Had Paul refrained from replying in each of these cases, confusion as to the truth, and consequent blindness to it, would inevitably have resulted.

³⁴ The original contains the definite article: "*the* faith." i.e., *the things to be believed*.

We point all this out because the same Deceiver who has deluded some believers into opposing truths they should be proclaiming, has lulled others to sleep, until all they ask is not to have their peace disturbed. Their sense of responsibility to God and His truth has been progressively dulled, until they feel that any controversy over the truth is divisive and wrong. They cannot see that it is the only hope of unity in a Church now almost hopelessly divided in doctrine and practice.

Let men call us "divisive," then, for standing for the truth; we thank God for one who was ever ready to engage in "the defense and confirmation of the gospel" (Phil. 1:7) who, even when brethren opposed his ministry, still stood firm, "*set for the defense of the gospel*" (Phil. 1:15-17) and we mean, by God's grace, to follow in his steps.

The leaders of Fundamentalism have so long, and with so little conscience, opposed the proclamation of the unadulterated gospel of the grace of God; they have so long played into the hands of Rome on the one hand and Russia on the other; they have so long hindered a true awakening in the Church, that it is high time for us who know and love the glorious truths which alone can meet the crisis of our times, to draw the Sword of the Spirit and throw away the scabbard.

To those who claim - and sincerely - that they love the glorious truth of the mystery, yet will not stand up to defend it, or who claim close fellowship with their Lord, yet stand passively by while religious leaders rob their followers of the riches of grace He *died* to bestow -to these we say, it is high time for you to awaken and enlist in "the good fight of the faith."

Pastors and Christian workers should heed the words of Paul, that courageous and faithful leader in the fight:

"BE NOT THOU THEREFORE ASHAMED OF THE TESTIMONY OF OUR LORD, NOR OF ME HIS PRISONER; BUT BE THOU PARTAKER OF THE AFFLICTIONS OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE POWER OF GOD" (II Tim. 1:8).

Businessmen and working people should get behind the cause with their finances. Wives should encourage their husbands to stand for it. Young people should ask the Lord: "*What wilt Thou have me to do?*" and should study the Word eagerly, so as to be ready for the conflict; all alike remembering the apostle's words of encouragement:

"FOR GOD HATH NOT GIVEN US THE SPIRIT OF FEAR; BUT OF POWER, AND OF LOVE, AND OF A SOUND MIND" (II Tim. 1:7).

Only in this way can we possibly hope to see a true, heaven-sent awakening in the Church - an awakening which the *Great Commission Prayer League* has prayed for in vain for more than forty years, an awakening which the Graham meetings, with all their financial backing, intense organization and apparent success have failed to bring, an awakening which can come *only* through a *renewed interest in what God has said* and a

recovery of *His message for us today*.

Meanwhile let us pray for those Christian leaders of our times who, like many of the earlier Church fathers, have set themselves against truths which run counter to accepted tradition - and let us pray for the multitudes whom they are depriving of light and blessing. Not least, let us pray for ourselves; for "open hearts" to receive the truth and "open mouths" to proclaim it. Let us pray for a deep insight into the Word and much of the power and liberty of the Holy Spirit, "that through us the preaching might be fully known, and all the nations might hear."

As for any sufferings we may have to bear, we know that "the servant is not greater than his Lord, nor he that is sent greater than He that sent him." If He who is the Truth was rejected and opposed even by the spiritual leaders of His day, we should be ready to bear reproach for *proclaiming* the truth. But for these slight sufferings we shall receive rich rewards - *grace upon grace!*