



"And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire . . .  
And they were all filled with Holy Ghost, and began to speak as the Spirit gave them utterance."  
Acts 2:3-4

---

**Volume III Number 4**  
**Devoted to the Defense of Christ and the Church**  
**April 1986**

## **CALVINISM'S FIVE THEOLOGICAL ERRORS**

*Richard E. Black*

Calvinism has influenced denominationalism more than any other single theological stance. The reformer promoted five doctrines unique to himself among men and foreign to the Word of God. Truth has no reason to fear error, and the most complex of theological errors can be handily answered with simple texts. Calvinism's five doctrinal errors are:

***Hereditary Total Depravity*** - describing all men born in a sinful state, of Satan, by virtue of fleshly inheritance from the forefathers. The Bible says: "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father." (Ezekiel 18:20).

***Unconditional Election*** - free moral agency in man's salvation is removed by this doctrine which asserts that man is redeemed or condemned by God's arbitrary decision, not by man's decision and obedience. The Bible says: "He that believeth not is condemned already." (John 3:18).

***Partial Atonement*** - the non-elect are lost and the blood of atonement cannot reach such an one. The Bible says: "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." (Revelation 22:17).

***Direct Spirit Regeneration*** - man understands not the Word and

is incapable of obeying the gospel until regenerated by the Holy Spirit. The Bible says: "Evil men understand not judgment: but they that seek the Lord understand all things." (Proverbs 28:5).

***Sinless Sanctification*** - once saved, always saved, has been the familiar expression describing this tenet. The Bible says: "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." (1 Corinthians 10:12).

It remains true - *faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*

## **THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND THE CHURCH/STATE RELATION**

***Richard E. Black***

The Church/State relation has been contested in every era. Power is an inebriant, and power envies power. Civil authority historically covets religious power, and humanly controlled religion has as consistently sought political swat. The pilgrimage to America, consequent the desire to establish a society free of oppression, prompted the framers of the Constitution of the United States of America to incorporate within that document a statement expressing their twofold concern: (1) Oppression from religion, and (2) Oppression toward religion. Such was their first line of concern else the fact that the Constitution's Bill of Rights commences with that cardinal freedom is meaningless.

***Article I***

*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or of the right of people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.*

The peerless wisdom of our forefathers forged through dreadful experiences and dire circumstances a "Bill of Rights" whereby life in a new world would not be tyrannically dictated after the manner of European governmental interference in church matters and *vice versa*. The oppressions motivating the Pilgrim's migration to America were to be eradicated in the new society - it would be folly personified for a people to exodus one land due to oppressions only to reinstate those same tyrannies in a newly appointed government.

Interpretation of the freedom of religion, speech and assembly article has varied through the years. The gamut from ultra-conservatism to ultraliberalism has been both voiced and published. Variation exists as a result of men defining and pressing notions concerning the amendment in light of modern social attitudes rather than from the standpoint and viewpoint of the authors of the Constitution. It, the article, can only be accurately expressed when we consider the disposition and spirit of the pioneers - not in light of modern humanistic and secularistic concepts.

Recent court decisions at different levels have been contradictory in address of religious questions. In particular, the Collinsville, Oklahoma case in which the verdict turned against the church's effort to withdraw fellowship in an admitted case of adultery on grounds that an invasion of privacy had been committed as contrast with the current Supreme Court decision that the State of Georgia's sodomy law, requiring invasion of privacy to convict, is Constitutional. Secular bias determines matters on the basis of popularity and acceptability rather than whether an absolute standard of good and evil has been applied. Modern society has popularized and idolized adultery, but sodomy is, at least publicly, a matter of continuing repulsiveness; hence, the contradictions by the courts on the invasion of privacy question.

### ***Views Of A Liberal Jurist***

William O. Douglas was appointed to the Supreme Court by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1939. His long tenure was admittedly slanted to liberal philosophies insofar as political, civil and legal matters were concerned. We are stating no new thing for his biography depicts him as "one of America's outstanding liberal jurists."

The liberal philosophy of Justice Douglas is readily observed and substantiated in a sequence of questions and statements published in his work entitled *A Living Bill of Rights*, pages 67-68, in which he asserts that the freedom of speech aspect of Article 1 includes the possibility of dissemination of Socialism in the public school system:

"What encouragement do members of parent-teacher associations give a teacher who dares to raise a 'controversial' issue?"... "What encouragement do his students give him?"... "Do they enter eagerly into the discussion of new ideas or do they report to their parents that 'Mr. So-And-So' is a socialist?"... "Are students

encouraged to argue with their teachers, or is any disagreement treated as a disciplinary problem or an error which gets a low grade?"...“What support does this teacher get from the local press and the local churches?”

Those agreeing with Douglas' line of questioning on valid points fail to realize that such creates a vulnerability to his conclusions that socialistic, humanistic, secularistic and/or other immoral or indelicate ideas ought to be encouraged and advocated in the public school room.

On the other hand, the Justice has gone on record accurately when addressing the fundamentals of the first amendment. We have documented his liberal stance for the purpose of further quoting him on the interpretation of Article I so as to preclude any possible retort that an ultra-conservative has prejudicially read into the article a biased notion.

Douglas wrote: “The basic premise on which the *Declaration of Independence* rests is that men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights. That means that the source of these rights of man is God, not government. When the state adopts measures protective of civil liberties, it does not confer rights. It merely confirms rights that belong to man as sons of God.”

Furthermore: “The *Declaration of Independence* states That to *secure* these rights, Governments are instituted among Men...”The preamble of the *Constitution* says, ‘We the People of the United States, in Order to... *secure* the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

The Supreme Court jurist then amplified his definition and the determination of the word *secure* by stating: “To *secure* sometimes means to obtain, sometimes to *safeguard*. In the *Declaration of Independence* and in the preamble of the *Constitution* to *secure* means to *safeguard*, as in Shakespeare's passage, ‘Heaven secure him!’ The rights and liberties *secured* were those which American citizens already had, Government merely underwrote them.”

Finally, Douglas said: “Therein lies the basic difference between democratic and totalitarian governments. In fascist, communist, and monarchical states, government is the source of rights: government grants rights; government withdraws rights. In our scheme of things, the rights of man are unalienable. They come from the Creator, not from a president, a legislature, or a court.” *An*

*Almanac Of Liberty, 1965, page 5.*

Justice Hugo Black, whose liberal decisions on the high court might well predate liberalism itself, wrote: "That amendment requires the state to be neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and nonbelievers; it does not require the state to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them." *The First Amendment, 1964, page 189.*

Neither Douglas nor Black implemented their liberalism in defining the first amendment - their position adequately and fairly states the case - I cannot but accede to their terms of definition and application as herein stated. Conservatives cannot tighten the definition without succeeding in ramming it into a radical caricature totally misrepresenting the amendment's intent. Such over-restriction in definition characteristic the radical would necessarily be viewed as a fanatically imbalanced interpretation specifically employed for the purpose of being pro-religion.

We understand the first amendment to be a statement declaring the inability of Congress to legislate on religious matters - *pro or con.*

### ***An Eloquent Ethical Stance***

Justice Potter Stewart approaches the matter with simplicity and accuracy: "As a matter of history, the First Amendment was adopted solely as a limitation upon the newly created national government. The events leading to its adoption strongly suggest that the establishment clause was primarily an attempt to insure that Congress not only would be powerless to establish a national church, but would also be unable to interfere with existing state establishments."

Stewart backed up Black's opinion that state power is no more to be used to handicap religion than to help it, then argued: "It might also be argued that parents who want their children exposed to religious influences can adequately fulfill that wish off school property and outside school time. With all its surface persuasiveness, however, this argument seriously misconceives the basic constitutional justification for permitting the exercises at issue in these cases. For a compulsory state educational system so structures a child's life that if religious exercises are held to be an impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage. And a refusal to permit religious exercises thus is

seen, not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism, or at the least, as a government support of the beliefs of those who think that religious exercises should be conducted only in private.” Christianity is a life, not a liturgical or ceremonial observance limited to rites performed in sequestered assemblies. The issue relevant religious exercises in the public school room, a reference to prayers and Bible reading in the classroom, is really an issue as to whether men can pray in any public place! The sidelight issue of silent prayers being permitted is preposterously ridiculous - since when have we had to gain consent from a Congressman to pray in the heart? Some of them would not recognize it as a prayer in the event we blurted it out!

We are not herein pressing the Moral Majority philosophy or platform - the public school system is not equipped to instruct on or perform religious exercises. Our spirit consents to the meritorious statements of these jurists who, although at variance on other matters, totally agree that government should neither handicap nor favor religion.

## **INNOVATORS SELF-CONDEMNED**

*Guy N. Woods*

Out of the depths of a remote past there comes down to us a dictum whose truth has been proved again and again in the histories of men and religious movements. Said Eliphaz to Job in one of their colloquies: “Thine own mouth condemneth thee, and not I: yea, thine own lips testify against thee.” (Job 15:6) He who, out of his own mouth, announces his own condemnation is, surely, the most effectively condemned of all. Jesus said, “...and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.” (Matthew 12:37) It is a fact, not without its significance, that when men abandon the Scriptures as an all-sufficient rule of faith and practice, and, in their stead, erect human standards in religious matters, the very terms they use reveal their apostasy and tell of their abandonment of the primitive rule. A classic example of this is afforded in the present, pitiable condition of the Christian Church, a striking exhibition of the end to which men inevitably come who substitute human wisdom for a “Thus saith the Lord,” in matters religious.

The last two or three decades of the nineteenth century were

fateful ones in the movement to restore to the world the religion of the apostles. The pioneers who had labored so gloriously for a pure faith and faultless practice had already laid their battle-scarred armor down and found rest in the tomb. The work, so nobly begun, was committed to the hands of others, among whom were those who chafed under the restraints of their predecessors, and boldly sought to throw off the restrictions which thus far had served so wonderfully to preserve the unity of the movement. These restless spirits were considerably annoyed by the slogans of the Campbells and talked much of the "law of growth and progress." They sought to distinguish between the "spirit" of the gospel, and the "letter," urging that one pleased the Lord who worshipped according to the "spirit," even if the "letter" of the gospel was not followed. Of course they did not explain just how it is possible for one to follow the "spirit" of the gospel without adhering to the letter thereof; but neither does a prominent radio preacher among us today explain what he means by saying that he "prefers to have the spirit of Christ instead of the doctrine of Christ," in the event that one is lacking; and that it is better to be right doctrinally and wrong spiritually. It would be interesting to know just how one could be "right spiritually" and wrong doctrinally, or *visa versa*. The New Testament is silent on such matters.

The famous slogan of Thomas Campbell, "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent," was unhesitatingly abandoned as constituting a barrier to the progress which had become their watchword. They spoke freely of the "mistakes of A. Campbell," and talked of "reforming the reformation." Of these men, Moses E. Lard wrote as early as 1867:

"The sturdy love for the primitive faith which characterized the early preachers in the reformation is cooling in men who still linger in our ranks and call us brethren. They are yet with us, but they are not of us. Their name is not legion; still they are numerous enough to do no little mischief if allowed to remain. These men are known and watched, and while the wish is to save them, save them for their own sake and the sake of the cause, still the belief is deepening that it will not be done. They may be

easily known. In the first place, they are intensely sentimental; rather they are intensely transcendental. They are very clerical in bearing, soft in speech, and languid and effeminate in spirit. They are poets and ladies' men, and exquisites in parlors, and never condemn anything except their brethren...They are beautiful men and preach beautiful sermons...They have an enormous fondness for sects and sectarians; and scowl on no one so indignantly as on the brother who dares to speak against them...It is a favorite saying with them that we are as "sectarian as any other people." (Quarterly for 1867, page 347)

It was by such men as these that the seeds of apostasy, soon to spring up into the trees of liberalism and modernism, were sown. To Dr. L. L. Pinkerton belongs the dishonor of being the first man to corrupt New Testament worship by the introduction of instrumental music. In the *American Christian Review* (volume of 1860) Pinkerton himself wrote: "So far as known to me I am the only preacher in Kentucky, of our brotherhood, who has publicly advocated the propriety of employing instrumental music in some churches, and the church of God in Midway is the only church that has yet made a decided effort to introduce it." Moreover, it is a significant fact that Pinkerton was a Modernist and had no objection to sprinkling and pouring in lieu of baptism. In "The Disciples in Kentucky," a very fine book lately written by Dr. A. W. Fortune, Pastor of the Central Christian Church, Lexington, Kentucky and professor in the College of the Bible there, is the following remarkable statement concerning Dr. Pinkerton:

"In January, 1869, the first issue of the *Independent Monthly* made its appearance. This was a Kentucky magazine edited by Dr. L. L. Pinkerton and John Shackelford. Its purpose was almost the reverse of Lard's *Quarterly*. According to their own statement it was a protest 'against a fierce sectarianism and intolerant dogmatism which had grown up among the Disciples.' It was 'consecrated to the discussion of every question that enters into the di-



vine idea of a true and righteous life.’ In this magazine Dr. Pinkerton published an article on ‘Bible Inspiration’ in which he denied ‘the old theory of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures.’ He criticized Milligan’s Reason and Revelation and expressed the conviction that young ministers who were taught to accept the ninth verse of the one hundred and thirty-seventh psalm as inspired by the Lord would ‘perpetuate a great many follies of his name.’ In an article on ‘No Immersion-No Membership in a Church of the Reformation,’ he took the position that while he would only teach and practice immersion he would be willing to let a man settle the question of baptism for himself. He said he would not thrust his translation of a Greek word between a man’s conscience and his God.” (Page 377).

By such a man as this was instrumental music introduced into churches of Christ. We observed in the outset of this paper that men usually pronounce their own condemnation when they abandon the New Testament for the doctrines and commandments of men. We have a striking example of this in the phraseology characteristic of the Digressive movement. Their watchword has been, and is, Progress; in fact, they delight to style themselves as “Progressives,” meanwhile designating their erstwhile brethren as “Nonprogressives.” However, as the foregoing will reveal, it is not an unmitigated evil to be “Non Progressive” in some things, particularly in matters pertaining to the scheme of redemption. John said, “Who-soever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God.” (2 John 9) The words, “goeth onward,” are translated from the Greek, *proagoon*, present participle of *proagoo*, literally, to go forward. What is most significant of all however, is the fact that our English words, “progress,” “progressive,” “progression,” etc., are derivatives of the Greek *proagoo*, this is the parent from which they sprang. A free translation of the passage, therefore, would run thus: “He who becomes progressive and abides not in the teaching of the Lord, hath not God.”

The Lord nowhere has authorized the use of mechanical instruments of music in Christian worship. To introduce them is to go

beyond that which is written; it is to become progressive. It appears therefore, that our erring brethren have very fittingly applied to themselves the term "Progressive." They thus tell of their own doom. *The Bible Banner, February 1940, page 14.*

## **SIMPLISTICISM**

Recent years have witnessed too many preachers tussling over the so called intellectual conflict with the fundamentalist dogmas found in the churches of Christ, or so they say. One of the Doctors among us said: "For years it has been increasingly difficult for me to accept the simplistic assumptions of the hellfire and brimstone fundamentalisms which most preachers in this church teach." Another of this mindset inscribed across a Biblical research paper: "You have quoted too much Scripture, and not enough from the scholars!"

These statements are succinct confessions of unbelief. The conflict is a supposed one. It is not genuine. It has been concocted in an effort to create a spiritual intelligentsia to whom the remainder of the church must turn for counsel. It is our twist on the priesthood. It is sectarian. Herein lies the real charge of narrowmindedness. More so than the simplisticism with which they indict the rest of us.

A hippy once hit me with this: "I have *expanded* my awareness far beyond my intelligence." As with the hippies, I believe these erudite liberals who are so disturbed over the pure doctrine of Christ have "expanded" beyond their ability to comprehend!

Keep in touch with the "simplicity that is in Christ." -R.E.B.

## **THE APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES**

### ***P. W. Stonestreet***

*Further evidence that no new thing has been added to the arguments centered in the instrumental music- merger questions in over half a century is published in this treatise from Brother P. W. Stonestreet, nephew of M. C. Kurfees. -REB.*

On the ground that the use of mechanical instruments of music in the worship of God under Christ is not an indifferent act, it has been suggested that Paul's meat-eating principle intended to govern indifferent things, does not apply to such practice. If the discussion

had stopped short of the claim that such practice is an indifferent thing, the suggestion would be acceptable, for assuredly adding a kind of music not divinely authorized is not an indifferent act; but, according to the many Biblical warnings against the assumption of prerogatives that do not belong to man, it is a matter of serious moment.

But upon the hypothesis that the practice is an indifferent act, then, so far as those defending the practice on that claim are concerned, the principle hypothetically applies to their course. Since the practice with them is admittedly not a matter of conscience, and since they are free under their own conscience to worship “with or without” mechanical instruments, they are by their own claim logically obligated to worship “without” such instruments “for conscience sake.” “Conscience, I say, not thine own, but the other’s,” (1 Cor. 10:29).

Hence, those who use such instruments of music in the worship of God, under such circumstances, violate two divine principles - first, the law of inclusion and exclusion, ignoring the

fact that the Scriptures in specifying *singing* exclude playing just as they exclude *dancing* as a part of the worship, because singing can be engaged in without either playing or dancing. Had the Scriptures used the broader term *music*, then both vocal and instrumental would have been implied, but that word is not used with reference to Christian worship; second, the law intended to govern Christian liberty. The only way to escape responsibility for violating the latter principle is to actually believe as the late O. E. Payne claimed that playing such instruments is enjoined in obeying God. Perhaps none on earth claims that now.

All should profit by the experience of Nadab and Abihu, “for whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.” (Romans 15:4). How worshippers can even imagine that they have “comfort of the Scriptures” when violating the very principle that caused others to die, as set forth in the Scriptures, is one of the greatest of mysteries. Nadab and Abihu “offered strange fire before Jehovah, which He had not commanded them.” (Lev. 10:1). Of course a kind of music not commanded of Christians is *strange* for the same reason as worship to God. This is the reason why some of us cannot conscientiously worship God

“with” mechanical instruments, and we are not in the least apologizing for it. We are only surprised that all intelligent people do not see and obey the divine principle. So there is the highest authority in heaven and on earth for conscientious objections to instrumental music in the worship; and all who are free under conscience to worship “with or without” will have to answer for not worshipping “without” such instruments at the judgment bar of God.

For the same reason and in the same way, the principle intended to govern Christian liberty applies to teachers of speculative theories, whether they pertain to premillennialism or some other ism, when such teaching is claimed to be non-essential to salvation or indifferent. Instead of such a claim modifying the offense, it adds insult to injury by violating the principle under consideration. These observations are not intended for anyone who teaches such theories under compulsion of conscience, if indeed there are such teachers; other observations would be applicable to them. If all who teach such theories will identify themselves with respect to being bound or free under conscience to so teach, it would contribute to clarifying the issue. Since all who have been heard from can conscientiously teach “with or without” speculation, then, under this principle, they are obligated to teach “without” it for conscience sake.

In principle the division over teaching speculative theories is parallel to the division over instrumental music in the worship. In both cases an effort has been made, whether wittingly or unwittingly, to shift responsibility to the opposition. But responsibility for the division rests on those who drive the wedge and not on those who oppose driving it. It is easy to have the wrong slant on this important question, especially by those who have no special conviction on the matter or those whose anxiety for peace overcomes their conviction, but we should remember that even the Prince of Peace does not want it at any price.

If it were simply a personal matter between brethren on either of the two existing divisions, it would be an occasion for speedy compromise and for charity to reign supreme; but vital principles, of which God is the author, are at stake on both questions. In purely personal matters, where God has not specifically legislated, and no principle of righteousness is contravened, such as the difference between Abraham and Lot over their herdsmen, it is man’s duty to compromise for the sake of peace, but attempting such a compro-

mise on divine law is nothing short of rebellion against God. The most important distinction that any of us can make is between *our own notions* on the one hand, and *God's law* on the other.

There is just one scriptural way to fellowship the two factions herein discussed; that is for them to cease to be factions by ceasing their factious course manifested in the things already pointed out; things in violation of the two principles herein discussed. Manmade fellowship is the result of manmade laws; Christian fellowship is the result of obeying the law.

## **“THE BATTLE OF ARMAGEDDON”**

*Ted W. McElroy*

Over the radio and through the press much is being said concerning the so- called “battle of Armageddon.” Since it is a living issue, it is fitting that we study it. The theory about this battle is an essential phase of the premillennial doctrine. Russellites and other pre- millennialists teach that this battle will prepare the way and inaugurate the reign of Christ in the earth on the literal throne of David from Jerusalem. They differ on the details of the battle but most of them agree that this carnal battle begins the literal kingdom on earth.

From a little book by the late Judge Rutherford entitled “The Final War,” I will present the prominent points of his description of the battle. Other pre- millennialists will agree more or less with his view. He says, “Satan, the Devil is the god of this world and all nations form a part of his organization” (page 8), thus he plainly asserts that the armies of the world are under the devil’s control and hence will be used by him in this battle. On the other side of the battle of Armageddon, Rutherford describes the divine organization, “The 144,000 who are associated with Jesus Christ” (page 14) reinforced with a “host of angels” (page 48). Thus they imagine the stage is set for the battle, a carnal warfare in which much literal blood will be shed.

Even though the doctrine has no warrant in the scripture, and is contrary to common sense, it has gathered a multitude of followers through its fantastic, imaginative, and carnal appeal. Some have even forsaken the gospel and the church of the Lord to build their hopes on the sands of this speculation.

First let me emphasize that the phrase “battle of Armageddon” is

not in the Bible, hence, I am certain since the words are not there that the ideas conveyed by the words are not there either.

The word “Armageddon” appears but one time in the Bible, Rev. 16:16, and is the same place spoken of in the Old Testament as Jezreel, valley of Megiddon, the Great Plain. The Americana Encyclopedia, Vol. 10, page 497, gives the size of this place 36 miles long and 15 miles wide. The place is not large enough for the things the premillennial theory claims for it; there just is not room in the valley for all the armies of the world plus a host of angels to engage in battle there. The Crimean battle line of war between Russia and Germany was 200 miles long, and that is just one sector of the battle between those two countries; add to that the other fronts and battle lines of the World War, and you can readily see the absurdity of a theory that condenses the armies of the whole world and a host of angels to a battlefield in a 36 mile valley. The theory is a physical impossibility.

The name of the place Armageddon is used in Revelation because it had a symbolic meaning to the people of that time. Its symbolic meaning is derived from its history. Two great victories were won there: Barak over the Canaanites (Judges 5), and Gideon over the Midianites (Judges 7). Two great disasters are connected with the place: Saul was killed (1 Sam. 31), and Josiah was killed (2 Kings 23). Because of its history it had a traditional symbolic meaning of glorious victory, great slaughter, and terrible retribution.

In Rev. 16 the place Armageddon has no more a literal meaning than does the river Euphrates, vs. 12 of the same chapter. Both have a symbolic meaning derived from their history. The course of the river Euphrates was changed so that the conquering army might enter into Babylon and destroy the city, hence, the river Euphrates is used as a symbol in connection with the destruction of spiritual Babylon. Likewise Armageddon is used to denote victory and retribution because of what happened there.

The theory of which the imaginary battle of Armageddon is just a part is fundamentally wrong and contrary to the scripture. The theory is that when Christ comes again He will begin His reign upon the earth and will reign a thousand years. To the contrary, the scriptures teach that Christ is either reigning now at God’s right hand or he is still in the grave (Heb. 1:13; Acts 2:29-31), and that when He comes His reign will cease (1 Cor. 15:24-25).

Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world" in John. 18:36, and as long as these words are in the Bible all premillennialists are wrong whether they be Russellites or those that went out from us.

## **RULES OF LIFE**

The "Rules of Life" here reprinted from the *Millennial Harbinger* of a century and a half ago are well worthy of modern man's attention. An unnamed evangelist submitted them to Alexander Campbell, and they were printed with his commendation. The eloquence of form and integrity of content are such that no question arises as to the worthiness of their reproduction here and now. Adoption of these principles by soberminded men and women, boys and girls, will result in a finer world and a purer church. -R.E.B.

### ***Preface***

I consider it all important that every man not only should have principles of action, but that he is conscious of them, and that he have them always before him. I trust that, by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, I shall henceforth be enabled strictly to live according to the following rules and principles which I have communicated to you, and which, should you approve and judge worthy of the regard of any of your many readers, you may publish in your monthly periodical, withholding, if you please, my name:

### ***Rules of Life***

I. I am persuaded that soon I must make a voyage into eternity, and there appear before the judgment seat of a just and holy God, to receive a sentence according to my real character, which sentence is never, never to be reversed through a boundless existence.

II. The day of my life being far spent, I will consider time as most precious, and improve it as much as possible, without wilfully wasting one half hour.

III. So far as I can amend any thing said or done amiss to any person in my former life, I will do it to the utmost extent of my power.

IV. I will forgive all wrongs that men have ever done to me, and endeavor to remember always how much more the Lord has forgiven me.

V. Having always detested hypocrisy, and never knowingly guilty of it, yet I have sometimes felt that men have formed opinions

of me better, and sometimes worse, perhaps, than I merited; and that I may have been sometimes influenced by such opinions. Therefore, I shall constantly endeavor to be totally indifferent about the opinions and judgments of men about me, knowing that I must stand or fall at last not by their opinions, but by my own conscience and the judgment of an Omniscient God.

VI. I will endeavor to be more independent of the influence of external circumstances and relations - to remember that I am on a pilgrimage -that joy and sorrow arising from circumstances will soon be over. I will thus be thankful for all that gives me joy, and patiently endure what causeth grief.

VII. Regarding the world as lying under the Wicked One, I will be as retired from it and have as little to do with wicked men as possible.

VIII. The excellent of the earth have always been most dear and precious to me, and so I purpose it shall be till the end of my life; yet none of them shall possess my heart and occupy my affections, as too frequently they have done on former occasions. My heart belongs exclusively to the Lord, who always, and every where, has given me true and precious friends.

IX. I shall never forget that Christ is my master, and that I am his disciple. Primitive Christianity, as delineated by the Apostles, shall ever be my end and my aim. Thus the Messiah shall be infinitely more to me than Socrates was to Plato, or Plato to Aristotle and a thousand others.

X. I will always endeavor to feel that one most needful thing, the enjoyment of the Spirit of God - that if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his - that formality without spirituality avails nothing; and that the ultimate and final question will not be, *What was your name - What were you called?* but, *What was thy life,* or, *What thy character?* Men are not to be justified for their opinions, but for their affections and character.

XI. The Bible has long been, and it shall always be, my companion, my *vade mecum*. The day that I read not some portion of it I shall count as lost. True, there are a few good books... which I may occasionally read again and again; but these are not the Bible, and shall never occupy its place.

XII. I have dedicated my heart and my life to the Lord and to his service. Of course I must be fruitful in every good word and work. I



shall always endeavor to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit enumerated Gal. v. 22, 23, and to do what the Saviour commanded in his sermon on the mount, Matt. v. 48.

XIII. Especially and finally, I resolve to seek after more communion and fellowship with God - with the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. I shall, after the example of David and of Daniel, pray more frequently and more fervently - at least three times every day in secret, and thus seek after the image of Christ.

This is not the first time that I have adopted these principles - approved and admired them. But I have not so strictly and fully carried them out as I now resolve, by the help and assistance of my Redeemer, by his Holy Spirit, to do. I shall this day, while at the Lord's table, solemnly vow henceforth to live more strictly according to them. Now may the Lord, by his Holy Spirit, strengthen, uphold, and comfort me in this way, and I will praise him through a vast eternity!

## **HONORABLE HANNAH**

Excluding Mary, the mother of Jesus by divine begettal, Hannah is the Mother of mothers in Biblical context. Her desire for a son is only overshadowed by the dedication of that son, Samuel, to the Lord. Time had been antagonistic to Hannah. Barrenness was her lot. Upon a trek to worship she is found by Eli, the priest, so fervently praying of God for a son that only her lips moved. No voice was heard. He accused her of muttering drunkenly.

Eli, we must emphasize, was priest. A man of God. Righteousness was his every consideration. He erred greatly in his prejudiced judgment. The woman was not drunken. She was consumed in prayer. She should not have been rebuked. She should have been commended.

Truly, things are not always as they appear surface wise. Let the poet emphasize this truth:

“When you're forming your opinions,  
Do it carefully - go slow;  
Hasty judgments oft are followed  
By regretting - that, I know!” -R.E.B.

## THE VACANT PULPIT

*G.K. Wallace*

It is no secret that it is difficult to find enough preachers to fill the pulpits that are now vacant. However, this is quite different from many of the denominations. In the past few years the United Methodists have lost about eight percent of their churches by default. The Episcopal Church closed six hundred congregations in recent years. The United Presbyterians have lost about five hundred congregations. Major denominations are considering a “moratorium” on preacher training. If we continue to imitate the denominations we will also be closing churches. Yet, as of now there are more churches than preachers among us. In spite of this good men are leaving the pulpit. We ask why?

### *Why Preachers Quit*

1. Some are like Judas in that they are interested in money. They see the affluent business man and the head of large corporations and they long for the “flesh pots of Egypt.” They desire to go back to the old way of living... Some are like Esau and may be bought for a bowl of soup. Some are like Balaam and are for hire. The road of service in the kingdom is not and never will be a primrose path.

2. Some like Peter do not stay close to the Lord. Peter stayed in the outer court and warmed himself by the devil’s fire. (Luke 22:55). It was no trouble to deny Christ in the company of those who did not serve Him. Some like Samson go down to Gaza for a holiday. In his efforts to “paint the town red” he got mixed up with the lustful Delilah who took away his strength and punched out his eyes. The siren song of the sea-nymph leads some to a spiritual death.

3. Some like Jeremiah become tired and weary. Even though Jeremiah stayed in the pulpit he longed to leave it. He cried out, “Oh that I had in the wilderness a lodging place of wayfaring men; that I might leave my people, and go from them!” (Jer. 9:2). He said his people “walked after things that did not profit.” He did not like his people and over their condition he said he could weep day and night. (Jer. 9:1).

In some book, at some place and some time, I do not remember when or where, I read about a preacher who served such a congregation as did Jeremiah. He was so glad to leave that in his farewell

message he said, “This is my last sermon. I wish to remark in closing, that if everything you have said about your former preachers is true they all should be turned out of the church. If everything you have told me about one another is true the last one of you ought to be hanged. We will now stand and receive the benediction.”

### ***Why Stay In The Pulpit?***

1. It is the preacher’s duty to stay in the pulpit. By man shall the gospel be preached unto man. Paul said, “for woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel.” (1 Cor. 9:16). None of us have had the troubles the Jeremiah experienced. He was called a traitor and imprisoned. (Jer. 32:2; 37:14; 38:4). He was left to die in the mire of an old well and was rescued by a slave. (Jer. 38:7). He was ridiculed and the King cut up his book. (Jer. 36:22). He was never encouraged when he preached. No one congratulated his efforts. God gave Jeremiah a task to do and he did it. In our fight for the right it is not a question as to whether men applaud or hiss. It is not a question whether men throw mud or bouquets. It is a question of doing what is right.

2. Jeremiah stayed in the pulpit because he loved his people. If he had not loved them he would not have gone into the wilderness. He raged at them because he loved them. It is not narrow and little to tell people of their sins. What we sometimes call love is indifference parading in the garments of tolerance.

3. God will help and bless the preacher who does right and preaches the truth. He made a rock of the fickle Simon. He made a leader of the stammering Moses. He made a tower of strength of the shrinking Jeremiah. He can use you and he can use me. If our immediate work seems a failure; let us remember that God keeps the record and that one soul is worth the whole world.