

**The Harding College Lectures**

**1951**



*CONTENTS*

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <i>The Lecturers</i> .....  | <i>vi</i>  |
| <i>Preface</i> .....  | <i>vii</i> |
| I. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF WISDOM IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD .....                            | 9          |
| II. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF FEAR IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD.....                              | 20         |
| III. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF GOSPEL PREACHING IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD .....                | 31         |
| IV. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF UNITY AMONG HIS DISCIPLES IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD .....        | 42         |
| V. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF AUTHORITY IN HIS CHURCH.....                                     | 61         |
| VI. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF MODERNISM IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD .....                        | 71         |
| VII. .... CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF THE HOME IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD .....                   | 85         |
| VIII. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF ORPHANS AND OTHER DEPENDENTS IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD .....   | 97         |
| IX. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE INDUSTRIAL WORLD .....                   | 108        |
| X. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD .....     | 119        |
| XI. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN PROGRESS AND WELFARE IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD .....       | 137        |
| XII. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS AND ACAD-<br>EMIC FREEDOM IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD.. | 150        |
| XIII. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF BIOLOGICAL EVOLUTION IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD.....            | 160        |
| XIV. CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF CREATION IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD .....                        | 186        |
| XV. CHRIST AND THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION .....  | 198        |

## The Lecturers

Dr. L. C. Sears is dean of Harding College.

D. D. Woody is minister of the Central Church of Christ,  
Little Rock, Ark.

G. H. P. Showalter is editor of the *Firm Foundation*, Austin,  
Texas.

Emmett Smith is minister of the Church of Christ, Paragould,  
Ark.

Dr. W. B. West is head of the Bible department, Harding  
College.

Harvey Scott is minister of the Church of Christ, Texarkana,  
Ark.

G. C. Brewer is minister of the church of Christ, Jackson  
Ave.,  
Memphis, Tenn.

Dr. F. W. Mattox is dean of students and professor of Bible,  
Harding College.

Dr. James D. Bales is professor of Bible, Harding College.

Dr. George S. Benson is president of Harding College.

Dr. A. C. Pullias is president of David Lipscomb College,  
Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. Paul C. Witt is head of the department of biological  
sciences, Abilene Christian College, Abilene,  
Tex.

Dr. Jack Wood Sears is head of the department of biological  
sciences, Harding College.

E. W. McMillan is president of Southwestern Christian Col-  
lege, Terrell, Texas.

## Preface

For twenty-eight years there has been an annual Biblical lectureship in November on the campus of Harding College. Many thousands have attended these lectureships who have received instruction and inspiration and who have enjoyed the fellowship of brethren. Various Biblical themes have been discussed and of recent years the lectures have been published. The annual lectureship has been the outstanding event of the academic year.

The 1951 lectureship last November was characterized by large audiences., great interest, splendid addresses, challenging inspiration, and brotherly fellowship. The theme of the lectureship—"Christ and Present Day Problems"—was very timely. The lectures on this theme were given by faithful preachers of the gospel and are published in this book. They are commended for your reading and study.

The theme—"Christ and Present Day Problems"—suggests a number of thoughts. Christ is the one and only solution to every problem. He is "the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6). The question and statement of Peter on one occasion is ever true: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life" (John 6:68). Christ is the only refuge for man and has the answer for all his problems. Man has never needed more to take his perplexities to Christ than in this present day.

Fifteen problems in the world today were discussed. They were the problems of wisdom, of fear, of Christian education, of human relations in the industrial world, of creation, of authority in the church, of orphans and other dependents, of religious and academic freedom, of unity among disciples of Christ, of the home, of modernism, of gospel preaching, of private ownership of property, of biological evolution, and of human progress and welfare. These give a wide coverage of present day problems. All these were discussed in the light of the present day with Christ and his teachings presented as having the only solution. No speaker

was an obscurantist but faced current matters pertaining to his subject with the conviction that Christ has the answer.

The lectures are sent forth with the hope that they will do much good. Being concerned with a number of problems, they should reach a large audience. It is the desire of those who gave the lectures that every problem presented will have for the reader its answer in Christ and his teachings.

W. B. West, Jr.

Harding College  
Searcy, Arkansas  
November 15, 1951

# Chapter I

---

## CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF WISDOM IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

by  
*Dr. L. C Sears*

*“But we preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God.” (1 Cor. 1:23-24)*

It is appropriate that a series of lectures on the application of Christianity to questions of our time should open with the problem of wisdom. If we are to answer the questions which the world now faces, we shall need wisdom of a higher order than the world has ever used, but a wisdom which is definitely available if we will use it.

By wisdom I do not mean mere information, facts, or data. These we have in abundance. But wisdom is more than knowledge. It is insight into the nature of things, the ability to weigh facts and arrive at a right sense of values. It is the capacity to apply knowledge to problems in harmony with principles of truth and right, and to adopt courses of conduct which contribute to the highest good, both of ourselves and of others. This is the nature of wisdom. But from what source are we to find it?

In the first chapter of First Corinthians the Apostle Paul distinguishes between two kinds of wisdom: the wisdom of the world, and the wisdom which is from God. Both are concerned with teaching men how to live. But they are often in conflict with each other, sometimes so radically that what

the world considers wise, good, or strong, God may consider foolish, base, and contemptible. And what the world considers foolish may be the very wisdom of God.

This conflict, even in Paul's time, was nothing new. Centuries before God had said through Isaiah that "my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways... For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." This difference in point of view often made it necessary, as Isaiah further says, for God to destroy the wisdom of the wise and bring to nought the discernment of the discerning. This does not refer merely to those who think they are wise. But it means those who are genuinely wise and discerning according to the standards of the world, but whose judgment finds itself in conflict with eternal wisdom.

Even with his knowledge of Isaiah, Paul's experience at Athens seems to have been a shock. It undoubtedly accounts for his emphasis upon wisdom in writing to the Greeks at Corinth.

When he came to Athens Paul found an intellectual ferment unknown anywhere else in the world. It was the great university center. From Athens had already gone out systems of philosophy which are still influencing the thinking of men. As Luke explains, "All the Athenians and the strangers sojourning there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing." Epicureans, Stoics, Platonists, skeptics, were ready to hear and to discuss any new idea. Surely in such an environment men would be eager to learn about Jesus and his teaching. True to form, therefore, when they heard Paul talking, the philosophers called a great mass meeting, including the city council, to hear all he might have to say. Apparently they listened with interest as he complimented their zeal in religion, and even as he emphasized the supreme greatness of God. But when he told of the death and resurrection of Christ, some arose mocking and broke up the meeting. Others, more polite, said, "We'll hear thee concerning this yet again,"—a courteous way of dismissing the subject. Only a few remained to learn

more. And Paul left Athens because there was little chance of doing further good.

What was wrong? These were the world's greatest philosophers. They were seeking for wisdom. They wanted to understand the nature of the gods. But when Paul introduced to them "the God who made the worlds," as he revealed himself in Jesus Christ, blinded by their own wisdom, they counted his message foolishness.

That was Athens two thousand years ago. It is still so in the world today, and will be to the end of time. As Christians we must recognize this fact and not be unduly impressed or swayed by the thinking of men. Today we have colleges and universities which would put Athens to shame. We have libraries and museums housing the knowledge, inventions, and achievements of man such as Athens never dreamed of. If you could read fifty pages an hour and never stopped to eat or to sleep, to read the collections in even one of our great libraries would take two thousand years, or more. In addition to these, however, are the countless thousands of books and pamphlets which pour from the presses of the world each year. Journals and newspapers, radio commentators and lecturers offer counsel and advice. There is no lack of the wisdom of the world.

But the strange thing is that with all this accumulation of wisdom the world is more confused today than ever before. On economic security many boast that we are all right. Our country leads the world in production and wealth. But others point out that underneath this apparent wealth we have the greatest debt any nation ever carried and lived. Is this prosperity a mirage which may easily fade? A bubble which may break in a moment? Under Solomon Israel achieved a prosperity such as few nations have ever known. From Sheba, Ophir, and all the countries around the wealth of the world's trade flowed into Jerusalem, until gold became common, and silver, like the stones of the street, was accounted as nothing. Yet in a single generation the kingdom was divided by the weight of its taxes, and its glory was a thing of the past.

On national security many point out that through the atomic bomb America has attained a strength no nation has ever achieved. Yet no one knows just when or how far to use this power, or to what ends it may lead; and the whole world is afraid.

Of human welfare many point out with pride that our country has attained materially the highest standard of living any nation has ever known. But this is undermined by a shocking spiritual decay, with greed, crime, and corruption leading even into high and responsible places. In spite of all we have, there is increasing unhappiness, discontent, and selfishness, erupting into crime, class struggles, and even conflicts between nations.

From all these and many other problems which you can name, what wisdom can deliver us? It cannot be the wisdom of the world. It is this wisdom which has created the problems.

I would not be misunderstood. I have no quarrel with the wisdom of the world if we recognize its place and its limitations. Jesus once said, "The children of darkness are wiser in their generation than the children of light." There is much we can learn from it. Certainly the Christian should be informed in all the realms of human thought—business, economics, science, government, history, the humanities, and the summation of them all in the various systems of philosophy. From the wealth of human wisdom the Christian can glean the things of genuine worth. As the Apostle Paul says, being spiritual, he "judgeth all things," understands their true worth, and is not blinded by false claims.

For the wisdom of the world is limited. It is based on human experience. If a thing seems to work well in human relations over a period of years or of centuries it is considered right and good. If it seems to fail, it is bad. The standard of right and wrong is therefore largely one of expediency, of what seems to succeed or fail. But the measure of success or failure is based largely on material outcomes. Hence the wisdom of the world is earthy, materialistic, confined to the things we learn through the senses, and skeptical of anything

that lies beyond. This has been true of the thinking of men from the skeptics of ancient Greece through Straus in religion, Karl Marx in economics to Thorndike, Dewey, and others in modern education.

But such wisdom ignores the realm of the spiritual. It leaves out God. It recognizes no principles of right and justice, mercy or truth as derived from him, and therefore eternal. When it treats the problems of the world, it too often looks only at the surface, as a man with smallpox might put salve on his sores and never recognize the disease beneath.

For example, a poll was recently taken in one of our states asking the people what they considered the two most serious problems the nation faces, and the two most serious each faced individually. A few answered that the most serious problem nationally was our departure from God and how to get back to him. But the great mass of people replied that the two most serious problems, both nationally and individually, were (1) the danger of inflation, or economic insecurity, and (2) the danger of war, or national insecurity. This is a vivid illustration of the superficial thinking of the world.

Certainly economic insecurity is a danger. As long as we are in the world we must have food, clothing, and shelter, and we shrink from hunger and pain. Whatever human wisdom can devise to provide security, if right within itself, is good. Laws, regulations, insurance—we try them all. But all these are external. The real source of security lies within the hearts and consciences of men, in convictions which come from God. A banker was showing a friend through his new bank. With great pride he pointed out the vault and the safe, with its impregnable steel walls, encased in solid concrete, its massive steel doors, burglar-proof, and boasted that its strength gave absolute security to his customers. The friend noticed an old man sitting near the door, and asked, "Who is this man?"

"Oh, he's the custodian of the vault," the banker replied.

"Does he have a key to it?" the friend asked.

"Certainly," said the banker.

"Then," said the friend, "your vault is no stronger than

the honesty of this man.”

How often in the past few months has that statement proved true. Fifteen bankers in Pennsylvania—four of them in one town—recently embezzled over \$3,000,000 people had entrusted to them. The same thing is happening in nearly all other states. These banks were strong, their safes impregnable, but the bankers themselves lacked character and conscience. Where do these come from? Not from the wisdom of the world. A prominent textbook in economics, I have been told, starts out with the statement that to be successful in business a man must divorce ethics and religion from his business practice. Whether this is actually the instruction in college classrooms, it is the impression many young people get. But when we divorce religious conviction, the principles of honesty, integrity, and truth, from practical affairs, what hope do we have of security? Laws and penalties may be used, but crime buys out the law. The only hope of economic security lies, not in things, but in the integrity of people, and this rests on a faith in God and his righteousness.

Inflation can be a national and a personal tragedy. When Brother Lowell Davis was in Canton, inflation in China became so extreme that it finally took 125,000 Cantonese dollars to mail a letter to this country. Other countries like Hungary and Germany, have gone through the same experience. If inflation gets out of control here your steaks could well jump from \$1 to \$100,000 a pound, and who among us could buy even the tenth part of a smell? So people may well be uneasy.

But what is the cause of inflation? Oh, there are many causes, of course, if you look at the externals. There are many remedies also which can be externally applied—price ceilings, taxes, restrictions on credit. These help within limits. But when the pressure beneath rises, lids blow off the ceilings. The basic cause of inflation is the greed of every man to get his share, no matter what the cost to others. And greed is a quality of the spirit. It must be spiritually controlled. But how often has the wisdom of the world encouraged it! How often has it placed the emphasis on getting, having, keeping,

the position at the top of the ladder, the chief seats at the feasts, to be called rabbi, doctor, master. In sports and competitions it is the winner who is crowned and flattered and toasted. No one regards the loser. In politics it is the victor who takes the spoils. Certainly we want to encourage each one to achieve the best that is within him. But with such constant emphasis from birth to death upon winning, usually at the expense of others, is it any wonder that men feel the prize is all-important? Win fairly if we can, but, right or wrong, win we must, whatever the cost to others. Arthur Clough expressed it long ago:

Each for himself is still the rule;  
We learn it when we go to school—  
The devil take the hindmost!

And when the schoolboys grow to men  
In life they learn it o'er again—  
The devil take the hindmost!

For in the church, and at the bar,  
On 'change, at court, where'er you are  
The devil takes the hindmost.

Husband for husband, wife for wife.  
Arc careful that in married life  
The devil takes the hindmost.

From youth to age, whate'er the game,  
The unvarying practice is still the same;  
The devil takes the hindmost.

And after death, we do not know,  
But scarce can doubt where'er we go  
The devil takes the hindmost.

So each one seeks his own, as Browning puts it, "at the whole world's cost." Husbands are selfish with wives; business cuts the throat of its competitor; labor demands all the market can pay; the seller, to save his profit, passes the cost on to the buyer; and the buyer, to get it when he can, pays higher and higher premiums. So the cost of labor and of

goods play leap-frog over each other. That is inflation. Hut it comes ultimately from our greed and selfishness.

I have used economic insecurity only as an example, and because it is one of the problems most prominent at the moment. But the same thing may be said of all the other problems that trouble us—war, crime, corruption. All these, and the others you may name, grow out of the self-interests of men, which breed jealousy and strife, and where “jealousy and faction are there is confusion and every vile deed.” These come, says James, from a wisdom which is “earthy, sensual, devilish.” It is bound about by time, and blind to eternal consequence. If the advantage now seems great, it would, like Macbeth, “jump the life to come.” This is the nature of the wisdom of the world. In spite of its purpose to tell men how to live, it misses the mark and leaves us in confusion.

But what is the remedy? Since our great problems grow out of the selfishness of men, they cannot be solved by iron and oil, labor, production, or multiplication of wealth. Selfishness belongs to the spirit, and must be spiritually controlled. Use the wisdom of the world for all it can offer. Increase production, raise the standards of living as high as we can, put three cars in every garage. No one could possibly object. But unless there is a spiritual development as well, we make our problems greater. When men had only fists with which to fight, hatred led merely to black eyes and bloody noses. But with billions invested in jet planes, bombers, and atom bombs, hatred can destroy the world. Our ultimate security must rest on a wisdom which reaches the heart of the problem by reaching the hearts of men. This is the wisdom which is from above, which James says “is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without variance, without hypocrisy.”

James's description of heavenly wisdom makes a beautiful description of Jesus himself. For Jesus in fact embodied the wisdom of heaven.

The Apostle Paul tells the Corinthians he “was made unto us wisdom from God.” This means that in Jesus Christ—his life, his teaching, his death—is embodied the very wis-

dom of God. The principles revealed in his teaching touch upon every problem we will ever face, and furnish the perfect solution. For they go straight to the selfishness of men from which all our conflicts come.

Contrary to the spirit of the world, the Wisdom of God says, "Let no man seek his own, but each his neighbor's good." And again he says, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them also." This principle, if followed, would place a proper restraint on selfishness and make the earth a heaven.

But again, Jesus points out as the greatest of all commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." And the second greatest, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor. Love therefore is the fulfillment of the law." The very purpose of the law is to effect justice and righteousness. Where people are selfish, however, laws are ignored. But where hearts are filled with a love of their fellow men, this very love fulfills the purpose of the law, and law becomes unnecessary.

But great as this commandment is, the Master in his last instructions to his disciples, bound upon us an even greater principle. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." And he left no doubt about his meaning, when he said, "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends."

Hence, in human relationships Jesus bound each one of his disciples, not only to love others as himself, as the Law had said, but, if necessary, to lay down his life for his brethren. In addition to giving the command, Jesus also set the example himself. When he went to the cross he gave to the world an understanding of the full meaning of love. He revealed its utter unselfishness, and in its unselfishness a power beyond all the conceptions of men.

But it is just here that the philosophers of Athens and the world part company with the Christ. The Apostle Paul says to the Corinthians, "the word of the cross is to them

that perish foolishness; but unto us that are saved it is the power of God.” And again, “. . . we preach Christ crucified, unto... Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called ... the power of God and the wisdom of God.”

Why is the cross foolishness to the world? Because it means sacrifice, unselfishness, and it is hard for the world to get rid of itself. And the spirit of the world more and more permeates the church. Some time ago a Christian woman declared, “I don't believe a person ought to sacrifice himself and what he wants for the sake of any one else.”

“But Jesus did just that!” I said. To this there was no reply. That is what his cross means, and all the world knows it. But why should he have done so? Or why should I follow his example? That is what the world with its wisdom cannot understand. If I want something and can get it, why should I deny myself? Why should I risk my life for the sake of others, when I could live safely and enjoy the luxuries of the world?

A young preacher some time ago stated that Stephen lacked wisdom. A preacher today would have better judgment than to anger his enemies with his teaching. I don't know about that. But I do know that in our love of ease few people have conviction enough to deny their own pleasures, risk life, or lose the favor of men for any cause. Stephen, on the other hand, died for a faith, a conviction, a truth, which he believed even his enemies needed. Such sacrifice is hard for the world to understand, because it is hard for the world to believe and to love as Jesus loved. And it is faith and love like his which move men to forget themselves, and be willing to sacrifice their interests.

But is the cross foolishness? Is it only the fool who is unselfish? No. The cross of Christ is the very wisdom of God. Many men have sought to rule the world by force. This is the world's way and the world's wisdom. So we have had our Alexanders, Caesars, Napoleons, and Hitlers. But how long did their tyrannies last? A puff of God's breath, and their empires disappeared like chaff from the threshing floor. Napoleon, defeated and a prisoner on Elbe, at last

recognized the tragedy of his and the world's way. "Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne and myself founded empires," he said, "But on what foundation did we rest the creations of our genius? Upon force. Jesus Christ founded an empire upon love; and at this hour millions of men would die for him."

No men in the annals of history had ever possessed such military power as Napoleon and the leaders he mentioned, and no men ever used their power with such brilliancy and perfection. But in Jesus Christ Napoleon recognized a power which, even after nineteen centuries, surpassed anything these men had ever attained. But it was the power of love and not of force, of unselfishness and not of greed.

The power of that unselfishness still reaches down through the centuries. It has sent missionaries to distant lands, to face hardships, suffering, and death. It has built hospitals and schools. After the ravages and the cruelty of war, it has bound up the wounds of enemies, cared for the fatherless and widows, fed the hungry and clothed the naked. It has overcome evil with good. If wars and the desolation wrought by hate and fear shall ever cease, it will be because enough men in all nations finally choose the unselfish way of love.

But this is God's wisdom—unselfishness, sacrifice, righteousness, justice, mercy. It is a wisdom of the spirit. It is his solemn charge to all who may come after. "He that would be my disciple, let him take up *his* cross, and follow me." The cross—the unselfish way—is the symbol of the Christian spirit. What shall you and I do about it? The world through the centuries has followed the wisdom of men—at heart, selfishness, greed, hate, fear, and force. Is it not time to try what God's wisdom can do? To let a love for men overcome our greed and heal our hates and fears? It is this wisdom alone which can solve the problems of our world.

## Chapter 2

---

### JESUS AND THE PROBLEM OF FEAR IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

by  
*Dr. L. C. Sears*

*“Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's  
good pleasure to give you the kingdom.”*

*(Luke 12:32)*

Fear is in no sense a modern problem. It is as old as the history of man. It is an instinctive emotion, ranging from vague uneasiness to shocks that may stop the heart and paralyze the power to act.

It is not an evil in itself. The capacity to fear is given for the purpose of self-preservation. It rolls the soldier into his fox-hole when the artillery opens up and the bombs begin to scream. It keeps people from stepping in front of cars, trying to swim Niagara, or violating the rights of others.

Some things are rightfully to be feared. A man lives longer if he is afraid to drive too fast, to become a slave to drink, to do wrong. Fearing God in the right sense is the secret of a long and happy life.

But our problem with fear is not to let it conquer and enslave us. People often fear things needlessly, and from their own imaginations create terrors that never exist. “Cowards die many times before their deaths.” But even when fear has cause, a constant feeling of dread and insecurity gradually destroys one's health and produces mental and spiritual depressions that break down nerves and fill our hospitals and asylums. But perhaps worst of all, fear of things actually to be feared may so overwhelm us as to prevent our

doing the thing we know to be right, and make moral and spiritual cowards of us all.

In spite of the great progress of civilization we have not yet removed the causes of fear. War through the centuries has been a perpetual cause. Describing the terror which would fill the hearts of men at his second coming Jesus says there would be "in the earth distress of nations... men fainting for fear, and for expectation of the things which are coming on the world."

Even now with the dark cloud of Russia covering a great portion of the earth men are already "fainting for fear." Our late Secretary of Defense, who leaped to death from his hospital window, was depressed with a feeling of helplessness at conditions which he saw coming and which he could not prevent. A physicist who had helped to develop the atomic bomb and understood its powers of destruction took his own life rather than see the consequences it would bring upon the earth. Living so far from the experiences of war, Americans cannot visualize the terrors which new weapons of warfare will bring. The last war cost more than 15,000,000 lives. But asked the cost of a third world war, Einstein, who helped discover atomic power and who knows its possibilities, said, "In another war three-fourths the population of the earth will be destroyed." If that figure is anywhere near correct, it means a billion and a half people will perish, and great areas of the earth be practically depopulated. In the face of such possibilities, many of the English people, who for seven hundred years have been the foremost champions of freedom, are ready to accept slavery in Siberian labor camps rather than suffer annihilation from a sudden rain of atomic bombs.

But an even more constant source of fear is the feeling of economic insecurity. A study costing thousands of dollars is now in progress to determine why so many promising young business men develop stomach ulcers and die of heart failure before their time. The cause is the strain and tension under which we live. In a world where men push and struggle to get ahead, we too often forget the rights of every one

except ourselves. Every man knows there is always another ready to take his place. Men no longer use the rough method of Joab when he was about to be supplanted by Amasa. He called him aside with a friendly greeting, "Is it well with thee, my brother?" and suddenly grabbed him by the beard, ripped his sword across him, and shed his bows out upon the ground. A bloody way of removing rivalry! Instead, men toil harder, haunted by the fear they may not be able to deliver the goods expected, meet payrolls when they are due, keep up production, find markets and buyers, and a thousand other terrors that turn men gray. The world which God created and pronounced good, which he filled with an abundance of wealth for every need, we have turned into a torture chamber where men sweat out their lives for "things," and break down nerve and brain in the terrific struggle to excel.

But what does Jesus have to say about the problem of fear? His answer is simple and makes complete sense: "Be not anxious... for your heavenly Father knoweth." "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

If God is our Father, what need is there of fear? As God, he has all wisdom. He knows the future and understands our needs. He has all power to do for us what should be done. As a Father, he has the love to be concerned about his children. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him." If it took the sacrifice of Jesus to give his "little flock" the kingdom, will he not, as the Apostle Paul says, "with him freely give us all things"?

The fact that God is our Father, once we realize the fullness of its meaning, removes all need of fear. This applies to everything that might make us anxious, both great and small. It includes wars, persecutions, and world disasters. In describing the destruction to come upon Jerusalem and the terrible suffering it would bring, Jesus says, "And except those days had been shortened, no flesh would have been saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." Jesus, looking

thirty years ahead, understands God's concern for his children. In the city which is to be destroyed, God has a "little flock" over which he is watching. Except for them the whole city would be destroyed, and no flesh left living. When the time actually came, Jerusalem was besieged for months; people were reduced to such hunger as to eat their own children, and many died from starvation and pestilence. When the walls were finally breached the remnant of the Jews were slaughtered without pity, or sold into slavery. But those who survived the siege and the slaughter did not realize that they owed their lives to God's "little flock." Yet except for this little group, over whom God was watching, all life would have perished.

But for the sake of his own, God can and does control armies and empires. Nebuchadnezzar learned from his own experience that "The Most High ruleth in the Kingdoms of men and giveth them to whomsoever he will." When Abijah came to the throne of Judah, he suddenly found himself at war with Jeroboam, King of Israel. Jeroboam was a strong and capable leader. His tremendous personal force had been able to wrest ten of the twelve tribes from Solomon's son, in spite of their love for David. When Abijah, with an army of 400,000 men, and with no military experience, found himself faced with 800,000 trained soldiers under Jeroboam, he did not want to fight. He pleaded with them to return to their own country and not oppose themselves against Jehovah and against his people, for, he said, "we keep the charge of Jehovah our God."

But while Abijah was yet speaking, with the military genius of a Napoleon, Jeroboam had sent an ambushment around to his rear. When I first read the story, I knew immediately what would happen. Abijah's faith in Jehovah was splendid. It revealed the goodness of his heart and the simplicity of his trust. But he was unaccustomed to the ruthless scheming of men like Jeroboam. The result could only mean disaster. But I was amazed at the outcome. When Abijah saw the battle joined on all sides of him, and his army trapped, he and his men cried to Jehovah, the priests blew

the trumpets, and "God smote Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah." Israel fled with the loss of more than half their army, and Jeroboam was never able to regain his strength. But the writer explains that "the children of Judah prevailed because they relied upon Jehovah."

I know we are living in perilous times, and no man can foretell the future. The power of Russia is growing larger and darker. But after all, no power can go farther than Jehovah will permit.

When Hitler's might was growing in 1938-39, an American ambassador in Europe warned, "There is no power on earth that can stop him! He can do what he will!" I think the ambassador was right. At that time there was no power to stop him. But every Christian remembers the great truth Paul wrote to the Corinthians, that the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men, that he takes the base things of the world, and the things that are despised, "yea, and the things that are not" to bring to naught the things that are. This was true in Hitler's case. The very power of the man blinded him with self-confidence until unnecessarily he made blunder after blunder, finally attacking Russia and creating a war on two sides—the very thing which he said doomed the Kaiser. His ruthlessness aroused the world, and suddenly from sources which had not existed unexpected powers sprang up to overwhelm and crush him. Out of his hate he even helped to create the forces which destroyed him. His scientists struggled frantically to develop the secret of atomic energy. Yet ironically his persecutions drove to America the very scientists like, Einstein, Lise Meitner, Bohr, and others, who could have given Germany this terrible new power which they actually helped to give America. So when his time was full, God spoke and Hitler's power was scattered like dust. Out of things that were not, God called forth might, and set a bound and limit to his tyranny.

Today no one can know how far God may permit Russia to go. Jerusalem was destroyed. It may be that three-fourths the population of the earth will perish. But whatever may

come, God will still keep watch over his own. The slaughter at Jerusalem was stayed "for the elect's sake." The mightiest force opposing the triumph of evil, the most powerful influence for peace in the world today, is the "little flock" who consecrate their hearts and lives to God. If the world is finally preserved from utter self-destruction it will be due to the consecration of these Christian hearts.

But with God watching over us there is no reason also to fear for daily needs. The Master taught Peter and the rest to pray for their "daily bread," and this meant "daily." These disciples were fishermen, earning a meager living day by day. They had no bank accounts, no life insurance, no old-age pensions, no price supports. They had their families, and food and clothes were cause for constant worry. Yet when

Jesus called them to leave the business on which their lives depended, they went out with a simple faith in his promise. For he had said, "Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." And again, how full of meaning are his final words, "And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

This is one of the most difficult promises for Christians to believe. Jesus understood how hard it was, and he emphasized it again and again in many different ways. God clothes the lilies of the field, who neither toil nor spin, and provides for the birds, who neither sow nor have store-houses and barns. How much more will he clothe and feed you, O ye of little faith?

The emphasis placed upon the freedom from toil of the lilies and birds is not intended to encourage the shiftless and lazy. The lilies with their beauty are fulfilling the function for which they are created. The birds live according to God's law, and are active in the purpose designed for them. Upon men is placed the responsibility of earning their bread by the sweat of their brows. While this is a penalty for sin, God expects us to live in harmony with his decree. The Apostle Paul in denouncing the shiftless in the early church said. "If

any man will not work, neither let him eat." That is still a wholesome doctrine, both religiously and economically, and is basic even to good health. But while Jesus expects his people to work and to set examples of industry and integrity, they are not to worry about the results or the income. This God takes care of. The Christian must be concerned only that he make God's kingdom first in his heart and life. If a man can advance God's kingdom best by preaching or by farming, by teaching or by merchandising, by remaining at home or by going to distant mission fields, let each one do the thing for which he is best fitted. God will provide his needs in food, clothes, shelter, and the other requirements of life.

But here comes one of the greatest difficulties. Most of us are not satisfied with necessary things. We want much more than we really need. The lilies and birds are content with the things God provides. But how much do we as Christians consider our necessities? Jesus, the Son of God, journeyed several times the hundred miles from Naphtali to Jerusalem. Though people of his day rode asses, horses, and chariots, so far as we are told he always went afoot, with the one exception of the few miles on his triumphal entry. Even then, though coming as a King, his humility is expressed in his choice of the ass instead of a chariot or a company of horses. Yet certainly the King of Heaven could have commanded any conveyance he desired. But his life was simple; his needs were few. "Things" made no appeal to him. We read of no adornments of silver or gold. He had one seamless robe, but apparently dressed with meager simplicity. He owned no house where he could lay his head. Since he is the Master, and it is sufficient, he says, that the disciple be as his Lord, how much of all the things you and I possess would he consider essential? In the light of his example can we justify as "needs" expensive cars when less expensive would serve as well? Expensive houses, clothes, vacations, hobbies, entertainment, habits, when his life was so simply lived?

But, you say, times have changed. The whole world lives on a different plane. True. Even in his day some dis-

ciples owned houses and fields, carried on their businesses, bought and sold. Many therefore possessed in "things" far more than the Master had. But Christ found no fault if they were things they really could use. The needs of men vary. But we ought honestly to examine ourselves to see if our "wants" are really "needs." God has promised to supply our needs but never all our wants, and there is a great difference between the two. The terrific strain of life, the nervous tensions, fear, and breaking down of health come from an unbalanced craving to excel in the possession of things. Our wants reach everywhere and include everything—houses, lands, cars, paved highways, antiques, expensive clothes, vacations, sports, insurance, old-age pensions, and all the rest. Many of these make life easier and more comfortable, but each must be paid for by some one's sweat and toil. It is possible that in our frenzy to possess we become slaves of the things we work for and wear out our lives in fruitless acquisition. But the point for Christians is not to worry. If the thing we want is not a need, toil for it if we will, but don't blame God if we never get it. And don't worry. If it is not a need, we can do without it. If it is a need, and we are faithful to the Lord, he will see that we have it.

The faithfulness of God to carry out his promises has been attested by those who have proved him through all times. David said, "I once was young and now I am old, but I have never seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." Thousands could bear similar testimony.

When J. N. Armstrong was president of Western Bible and Literary College, the doctor told him, "You will have to give up your work and spend a year at least in a higher and drier climate. . . go to New Mexico or Arizona." The sentence was a crushing blow. He and Mrs. Armstrong with their friends had hardly got the new college started. They had put into it everything they had. It was able to pay no salaries, and they had no savings. How they were even to reach New Mexico was a question, and how they were to live with no promise of support they did not know. But it was a matter of life and death.

When friends learned of it Brother Barker wrote from Las Vegas, New Mexico, offering them a house to live in. The little church, just struggling to keep going, offered what support it could, but far less than the bare necessities for a family of five. Occasionally Brother Barker brought in milk from his ranch, and Brother Turner meat from his shop. But food ran low. Hearing Brother Turner complain that he could not get workers to harvest his beans, Brother Armstrong asked if he might help. As a result he returned with a two-bushel sack of Mexican beans. The rest of the winter they ate beans daily. But by Christmas they had reached the last of their resources. There was wood for one more day and, except for the beans, food for only another meal or two. In spite of the New Mexico sunshine it was looking like a dark Christmas, when Brother Turner drove up and invited them to his home in the country. It was a wonderful visit. Christmas eve with the table filled with everything a ranch home could furnish. Christmas day, a tree decorated with stick candy and oranges, and a dinner of fresh venison with all the trimmings. But the journey back to town in the afternoon was filled with dread.

The Armstrongs had talked about the crisis they apparently were facing. But they agreed they could mention it to no one else. They felt that God knew, and he surely would provide. But when they thought of the cold house, the few sticks of wood, and the beans, a weight settled on their hearts.

As they drove in, however, they noticed tracks through the snow leading up to the house and away again. When they entered they found a letter some one had pushed beneath the door. It was from the church at Little River, Kentucky, where Brother Armstrong had preached as a boy. It explained that the church had learned of his going to New Mexico. They had been thinking of him near the Christmas season, and they wanted to send him a present. They inclosed a check for fifty dollars! The next day the wood was replenished, some other items were added to the beans, and the New Mexico sunshine was bright again.

It is experiences like that, multiplied in the lives of millions of people, that have added confirmation to their faith that Jesus meant what he said, "Your Father knoweth ... and these things shall be added unto you." What need therefore for fear? The Christian can let trust and peace take the place of fear in his life.

But finally, the greatest danger of fear is that it will make us moral cowards and prevent our doing the things we know we ought to do.

Jesus recognized this problem with his disciples and he warned them of the dangers they would face. He was sending them out as sheep in the midst of wolves. They would be persecuted and brought before councils for his name's sake. For brother would deliver up brother, the father his child, and children their parents, and they would be hated of all men. They were to be wise therefore as serpents and harmless as doves. But they were not to be "anxious." "Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? And not one of them shall fall to the ground without your father: but the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not, therefore: ye are of much more value than many sparrows." Men probably love themselves as much as anything in the world. But with all our self-devotion, I have never known any man who had numbered the hairs on his head, no matter how much concerned he was about them. It would be an endless task, for the number tomorrow would differ from the number today. But Jesus uses this strong expression to indicate how much God is concerned about even the least things in our lives, even more concerned than we ourselves. With such concern from one who is able to protect, why should we fear to do the thing we ought to do?

But again, thinking of the persecutions that might make them forsake the right through fear of men, he says, "And be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." The fear of death, as the Apostle Paul says, has held men in slavery through the centuries. It has made untold thousands forsake the Lord and his principles of truth and right. Save one, it is the ultimate terror. But there

is one thing more terrible yet—the fear of doing wrong, of failing to meet the responsibilities we recognize in our own hearts. For such failure leads to eternal death.

As Jesus knelt in the garden his body shrank with fear from the suffering ahead. Great drops as of blood fell from his brow. But he had come to do his Father's will. From this, nothing could terrify him, not even the cross with its slow hours of pain, cutting like knives through every nerve of his body. For not to do his Father's will was unthinkable, even in the face of suffering.

In the spirit of the Master thousands of his followers through the centuries have feared doing wrong even worse than death. The Apostle Paul on his way to Jerusalem knew that bonds and afflictions awaited him. No physical force compelled him to go. But he had a charge to meet, and faithfulness to that charge drove him forward even in the face of death. For the ultimate terror is not physical death but the failure to do right.

The Master's teaching on the problem of fear may be quickly summarized. His children are to fear only one thing—doing the devil's will, “him who has the power to destroy both body and soul in hell.” If we do the will of our Father, make his kingdom first in our lives, we are not to be anxious about the things we need, and even in times of danger and death we should fear no evil for he is with us “even unto the end of the world.”

## Chapter 3

---

### CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF GOSPEL PREACHING IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

*by*  
*D. D. Woody*

The solemn charge which the Lord gave to his apostles, and through them, to his church, was: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 15:15, 16). The apostles of our Lord received this charge seriously and, before the first century came to a close, Paul wrote to the Colossians and stated that this gospel "was preached to every creature which is under heaven..." (Col. 1:23). It is quite probable that this great accomplishment has not been repeated since the time of the apostles. Furthermore, with all our boasted progress and accomplishments of the twentieth century, we of the Lord's church have not, in our time, preached his gospel to the entire world. We have but touched the hem of the garment. We have never again covered the earth with the message of salvation in Christ. Why have so many generations failed? Why are we not making more progress in preaching to all men of our day? In spite of the fact that there are many hindrances, I doubt very seriously that we could justify our failure before God. The apostles had hindrances too. They suffered cruel persecution, and even martyrdom, yet they carried the gospel to the world within half a century. If we were called before the Lord, our Judge, today and asked to explain why we have not preached the gospel to more of the people of the world, what would we say? What excuse could we give? Would we be speechless, as was the guest at the

wedding feast who did not have on a wedding garment? Or, would we begin to offer excuses, as we usually do, and tell the Lord how many and how great had been the obstacles in our way? Well, we may not be called before him today to give this report, but we shall be some day, and "who shall be able to stand?"

Someone may suggest that the known world of today is much larger than it was in the days of the apostles, and that it is a much bigger task to preach to our world than to the one known to the apostles. True, but we have vastly improved facilities for covering it. These spectacular facilities of the present are a constant, mocking challenge to us, convicting us of neglecting to preach the gospel to the whole world.

Let us take stock of some of these modern facilities. (1) Modes of travel have been developed to a point far beyond the fondest dreams of our forefathers. Modern railroads have made travel faster, safer, and more pleasant than was ever thought possible. Also, automobiles and good roads are facilitating travel all over the world. Even in the land of Palestine, where Jesus and the apostles covered many a weary mile on foot, automobiles are traveling on paved roads. "From Dan to Beersheba" is no more a long journey. The trip which required days in ancient times is made now in just a few hours in modern vehicles. The modern ocean liners every day carry thousands of travelers across the seven seas. Then, too—wonder of wonders—the big mechanical bird, the modern airplane, can circle the globe in a matter of hours. No, we cannot justify our failure to preach the gospel to the world by saying that the known world is larger today than it was in Paul's day. We will have to look for another and more plausible excuse.

(2) Also, methods of communication available to us far excel those known to the apostles. Only two methods were available to them, viz: Personal visits and letters. Even the letters had to be delivered by some courier. No great postal system as we know in America was known to them. The letters of the great apostle, Paul, were carried to those addressed on the persons of faithful messengers, who sometimes,

no doubt, suffered much in delivering them. Telegraph, telephone and radio, unknown in those days, offer great opportunities to God's people today in proclaiming the gospel, both locally and abroad. The challenge of the present day, with all of its modern equipment for preaching the gospel, should stir our hearts to such a degree that we would rise up and tell the whole world of the crucified and risen Redeemer. Would that our God would give us a modern Nehemiah who would lead us out of our doubts and fears, and who would courageously say, "Let us rise up and build."

Yet, in these modern methods we have not only an opportunity; we have also a hindrance, in that, while God's people are using them in preaching the gospel, teachers of error are using them in the propagation of false doctrines. On the same train one preacher will be on his way to preach truth, while many others are on their way to proclaim the doctrines of men. On a ship, bound for Europe, Asia or Africa,

there may be one family going abroad to preach God's word and a dozen families going abroad to preach the doctrines of men. While one automobile speeds on Sunday morning to a place where God's people meet, carrying the preacher to his preaching appointment, other automobiles are hurrying away in other directions, carrying away from the place of meeting those who need to hear the gospel. The modern press—free in America, may publish a message of truth from the pen of one of God's servants while, at the same time, it prints false messages from a dozen teachers of error. From the same broadcasting station, on any Lord's day, will go out many messages, some of them truth, but most of them error. So, these modern developments, which could be used only for good, are being used for evil also. However, it has ever been thus. It was so in the days of Jesus and his apostles. While they preached the gospel, others were contradicting and condemning them. Are we better than they? Shall we expect to teach the world about the Savior without suffering a cross or a thorn? Then, as we view the situation today, the challenge becomes even greater and inspires us more, and we are moved to look toward heaven and say in the words

of the poet:

“Shall I be wafted to the skies  
On flowery beds of ease,  
While others fought to win the prize  
And sailed through bloody seas?”

As we consider the problem of gospel preaching in the present day world, it occurs to me that there are, at least, four major hindrances which constitute veritable road-blocks in the path of our progress. Furthermore, they are all disgraceful conditions of the human heart, and we should hang our heads in shame as we realize that the outstanding hindrances are within us. These four hindrances are IGNORANCE, PREJUDICE, SELFISHNESS, AND INDIFFERENCE! Not only do we find these vicious and hurtful conditions in the hearts of the unconverted world, but they have found reception and lodging also in the hearts of many of us who call ourselves Christians. Many times it is true that, if we are not ignorant, we are prejudiced; if we are not selfish, we are indifferent. What a shame that we should permit these anti-Christian attitudes to interfere with our efforts to save a lost world!

Every human being is ushered into a world of which he knows nothing. Ignorance plagues him from the cradle to the grave. It is necessary for him to engage in a constant study in order to adjust himself to his surroundings on the earth; and, in addition to that study, he must learn the will of his Creator in order to be prepared for the eternal state. Some learn much about *this world* but remain in ignorance about *the Living God*. To Timothy Paul wrote, “Wherefore be ye not unwise but understanding what the will of the Lord is.”

Since man often becomes infatuated with the world in which he lives, he often loses interest in eternity, and this leads him to neglect or refuse to learn God's will. Therefore, he grows up in ignorance of spiritual things. Generations may succeed him in this spiritual ignorance, and their ignorance may even develop into savagery. As a result of such

widespread ignorance of God and his will we find millions of people on the earth "who know not God" but who worship and "serve the creature more than the Creator." Since the Lord has made his church "the light of the world," the church must dispel this spiritual darkness, that "the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." The world needs teaching—teaching concerning the reality of God and the will of God. It needs teaching concerning the sacrifice of God's Son and the way of salvation. Because of ignorance people are worshipping idols. Because of ignorance people in civilized nations are trying to worship and serve the Living God without knowing how. Their teachers and leaders are instructing them in the doctrines and commandments of men and not in the will of God. Without a doubt, ignorance is one of the major hindrances in the preaching of the gospel in the present day, as it has been for centuries.

There was a day, not far behind, when Christians studied their Bibles diligently. They learned God's will and could teach it to others. They discussed it with their neighbors and led many to Christ. Is the average member of the Church of today interested in such things? Can he discuss God's word with his neighbor? Does he care how many Christians there are in Germany, or how many gospel preachers there are in Africa? Is he giving much thought to such things, or does he spend his time in business and recreation and remain content with his ignorance of the Bible and the work of the Church? Not until the churches of Christ all over this land are able to awake their members from spiritual slumber and interest them in saving lost souls—not until then will ignorance give way to intelligent planning that will cover the earth with the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea. If and when that day comes, another major hindrance in the path of Christ's work of redemption will have been removed.

Prejudice is the second hindrance which claims our attention at this time. The word, prejudice means: Prejudgment or bias; preconceived judgment or opinion, especially an opinion adverse to anything without just or sufficient

grounds. Such an unfair attitude might well be expected of the *untaught* and the *unconverted*, but we have reason to expect better things of those who have been "washed in the blood of the Lamb." However, even the Lord's people seem to have difficulty in keeping prejudice out of their hearts. Prejudice against other races has long been a hurdle difficult to clear. The Negro race, right here in our midst, has been neglected for generations, and the chief reason is prejudice. Who will deny this charge? What is true of the Negroes has also been true of other races. This same evil condition of heart hindered the early Church, mainly Jewish, in going to the Gentiles, and it has delayed the conversion of the oriental peoples for centuries. Prejudice has kept the east and the west apart so long that it has become necessary to establish again confidence in the hearts of the oriental peoples toward their western neighbors. Never again should we allow such a condition to develop.

Prejudice is one of the meanest and most hurtful attitudes that one can harbor in his heart. It robs a man of his sense of fairness, makes it impossible for him to distinguish between truth and error or between right and wrong. It defeats him in his efforts to be fair and helpful toward other people. Men and women who had many good qualities have shown a very unfair attitude toward those of distant lands because of prejudice. When the matter of giving money for the purpose of supporting a preacher of the gospel in some distant land is mentioned, some brother has often been heard to say, "We have all we can do right here at home without sending our money to countries across the seas." Or, one may say, "We haven't converted all the people in this country yet." Such statements usually reveal a prejudice within the heart as well as gross ignorance of God's plan. It is true that we have not yet converted all in this country, and it is probably true that we never will, but we cannot concentrate on one country for centuries and neglect all other lands, while their people are dying in ignorance of Christ. That is not God's plan for saving the world. Did the apostles and evangelists remain in Jerusalem until all the people had been con-

verted there, before going into other parts of the world? Certainly not. God had commanded that they go into all the world and preach, and they did just that. Every human being has a God-given right to hear the message of salvation, whether he lives in America, Europe, or Africa. It is our obligation to see that they hear the gospel.

The very moment you learned the truth you had two responsibilities laid upon you, whether you wished to have them or not. These two responsibilities were: (1) to obey the gospel yourself; (2) to help in every way possible to get the truth to every other person in the world. Whether or not you and I have endeavored to meet these two responsibilities, we and the Lord must decide. Are we going to permit ignorance and prejudice to keep us from sending the gospel to all the world? This question must either be answered correctly here, or we must face it in the judgment. We will not be condemned for not baptizing them, but for failing to teach them.

Another way in which prejudice is hindering the preaching of the gospel in the present day is that different brethren are prejudiced in favor of different methods of financing the work. Some are contending that many congregations, as well as individuals, may place their money in the hands of one congregation and authorize that congregation to forward these funds to the workers in the various parts of the world, subject to the wishes of the contributing churches or individuals. Others contend that each congregation must send its own funds directly to the workers in the various fields. This contention has waxed rather warm, and, without a doubt, the work is being hindered by such contentions. If the scriptures forbid churches to pool their funds before they are sent to the fields, let the contenders make those scriptures clearly known. If not, let them not permit their prejudice to hinder the work of the Lord. Such an argument can send brethren—even preachers—to hell. Where God has specifically given directions as to how an act of service or worship to him shall be done, it must surely be done that way, and no other way may be substituted for the Lord's way. If, however, the Lord

has commanded something to be done, and he has not designated how it is to be done, then he has left it to the judgment of his servants, and it would be wrong for us to try to bind a particular way upon our brethren. It would be making a law where God has made none. Such arguments, brought about by prejudice, hinder the preaching of the gospel. While we quarrel over methods, souls are dying without knowing about the Christ. Christian brethren ought to sit down and, in the spirit of Christ, discuss the matter and arrive at a safe, workable solution of the problem under consideration, and stop hindering the work of the Lord.

Selfishness is the third member of "the four horsemen" who are robbing successive generations of their right to eternal life. Selfishness means: "Caring unduly for one's self; putting one's own comfort, advantage, etc., before that of others." Christianity and selfishness oppose each other and, therefore they are not very compatible. Christ was unselfish, even to the point of giving his own life for others. Thousands of Christ's followers have gone the way of martyrdom because they had learned from their Lord the spirit of unselfishness, dying at the hands of those they sought to save.

Yes, selfishness is a very serious hindrance to the preaching of the gospel in the present day. Many people are not willing to follow Christ for fear of losing the pleasures and treasures and comforts of this world. They are unwilling to make the necessary sacrifices to be Christians. Not only are many in the *world* selfish, but many who are *members of the church* have not overcome their selfishness. They refuse to give their time, talent and treasures to enable the Church to shine the light of God's truth around the world. Many of them are so miserly that they do not contribute as they should on the Lord's day. Thus, there is not enough money available to support the great number of teachers needed to preach Christ to the world. At times there are many workers available, but not enough finances to support them. If the brethren could be persuaded to loose their purse strings, it would be a great day for the cause of Christ. There is enough potential wealth in the hands of members of churches of

Christ—wealth not needed by the possessors, to preach the gospel to the whole world, but selfishness steps in and interferes. This is not a work for just a few, who are fabulously rich; it is the work of all of Christ's followers.

Then, too, selfishness hatches a whole brood of sins, such as: lust, covetousness, avarice, extortion, cheating, lying and stealing. Selfishness alone in a person's heart is bad enough, but when it is accompanied by this sinful brood of its own hatching it removes from the individual's heart all desire to help preach the gospel to a lost world.

The fourth and last of this unholy quartet is indifference. This may not be the most vicious of these four sinful attitudes, so far as outward demonstrations are concerned, but it is, nevertheless, one of the most difficult to overcome. There are people in churches of Christ who are not against Christ, but they are not actively for him. They do not oppose the preaching of the gospel; neither do they encourage and support it. They are just indifferent toward the whole matter. And—pity of pities—this dangerous narcotic of indifference has them so completely under its power that it is impossible to arouse them from their sleep. Nothing we can say or do seems to make much impression upon them. Preach to them; sing to them; plead with them; pray with them—nothing seems to rouse them from their spiritual intoxication. Thus, they become stumbling-stones in the way of others who are trying to cover the earth with the knowledge of Christ as the waters cover the sea.

Can you not see that these four unholy attitudes—ignorance, prejudice, selfishness and indifference—constitute our most difficult problem in present day preaching? True, the Iron Curtain is a barrier, but ignorance, prejudice, selfishness and indifference have raised the Iron Curtain. There would be no iron curtain but for them. True, also, is the claim that Communism opposes the preaching of the gospel, but ignorance, prejudice, selfishness and indifference have brought Communism into existence. If the prejudice and selfishness of the western nations had not caused them to be indifferent toward the ignorance of the oriental nations, we would prob-

ably not have either Communism or the Iron Curtain barring the way of preachers of the gospel. Besides all that, we were not preaching Christ's gospel to the world before the coming of the Iron Curtain and Communism. Why should we blame them with our failure now? With all of our boasted freedom in America, we must admit that many professed Christians right here in this favored nation have not been true to the Book of God. Thousands have paraded before the public as Christians who were not Christians at all. Christ's plan for saving the world has been hidden under an avalanche of creeds and false doctrines of men, so that the average man has found himself walking in spiritual darkness in a land that boasted of its learning and its loyalty to Christ. **THOSE WHO CALLED THEMSELVES CHRISTIANS** have DEFEATED Christianity, *NOT those who opposed* it. What a shameful irony is this!

This ridiculous situation in America, where every zealot brands most anything he may wish to preach as the gospel of Christ, has produced shameful hypocrisy, which, in turn, has disgusted thousands with Christianity, although Christianity is not to blame.

Only within the last few years have churches of Christ in America put forth any appreciable effort to preach the gospel in other countries. Even now there are only a handful of gospel preachers south of the Rio Grande River—from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn. Although we are proud, indeed, of every inch of ground gained for Christ in Europe, all the workers there are but a handful in comparison with the great number needed. On the great continent of Asia there are even fewer, perhaps. You could, no doubt, count the gospel preachers in Australia on the fingers of your two hands. In Africa, the "dark continent," the work of several years has been slow and painful as it has been carried on by only a few patient, sacrificing workers. There are a few here and there among the islands of the seas, but the sum total is far too small. Brethren, why have we waited so long about carrying out the Lord's will? Why have we so long pitied ourselves and cried out that we are too few and too weak to preach the gospel to

the whole world? It seems to me that the time has come for us to stop pitying ourselves, to stop crying about how weak we are, to put an end to the shameful practice of endeavoring to shift our responsibilities to others, and to arise in the strength of our God and carry his great message of salvation to all the world. Let those who *will* go and preach. Let the rest of us hold up our hands and see that they have what they need as they work. Let us lay aside our disgraceful arguing and splitting of hairs and trying to make laws where God has made none and go to work in earnest. Let us conduct ourselves as MEN and WOMEN, and no longer as children in the market place. The opportunity is here. The responsibility has been laid upon us. We face the challenge of a lost world, as we hold the Bible in our hands, and as millions of souls cry to us from every continent: "Come over and help us." Will we answer the call and accept the challenge? How can we face the Lord if we fail? We determine our own reward in life. Life will give us whatever we seek—little or much. I close with the lines of the poet:

"I bargained with Life for a penny  
And Life would pay no more,  
However I begged at evening  
As I counted my scanty store.

"For Life is a just employer,  
He will give you what you ask.  
But, once you have set the wages,  
Why, you must bear the task.

"I worked for a menial hire,  
Only to learn, dismayed,  
That whatever wage I had asked of Life  
Life would have gladly paid."

CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF UNITY AMONG HIS  
DISCIPLES IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

*by*

*G. H. P. Showalter*

I fully appreciate the honor implied in the invitation from President Benson, for me to address you on this occasion.

I am not a stranger as to the origin, history and growth of Harding College. I am not entirely unacquainted with the record of the hardships and trials through which it has passed, the struggles it has undergone, the opposition it has encountered, the progress it has made, and the recognized success it has attained in spite of difficulties and adversities. If it is conceded that the ultimate ideal and goal of a great Christian educational institution has not, even at the present time, been fully realized, nor its fondest dreams come true, it must certainly be accepted that many of its most serious problems have been solved, obstinate difficulties have been surmounted, and formidable obstacles that once blocked the approach to progress and success have been removed. And

there is good reason for rejoicing over attainments thus far made and good reason for hope for the future.

I need not pause to lay claim to the possession of a deep and abiding friendship for all the efforts that have been made and all successes that have been realized, and for all prospects for the future in the interest of Christian education. My life is a sufficient testimony on that question. Of the fifteen years that I have spent as a teacher in the schools of Virginia, West Virginia, and Texas, ten of them were spent as the president of a Christian college, and the fruitage of Lockney Christian College in spiritual and religious character, as ex-

hibited in the lives of gospel preachers, and of professional men and women, and as teachers in the public and private schools of our country and several foreign countries, is as rich, sweet and fragrant as the flowers of the wilderness in the springtime, and abundant as autumn leaves. Bible study pursued and Bible knowledge acquired in those days in this great school has controlled the lives and determined the destiny of thousands, and its extending and expanding influence will touch, and sweeten, and beautify the lives of thousands more, yet unborn.

I trust you will not regard this in the light of a fancy, or imagination; to the contrary, it is the studied, matured and deep conviction of my heart. Many friends of Christian education are not aware that the enrollment in that school was large for that distant day reaching as high as 475 students, in at least one year. And this was 50 years ago, when no other school offered the same or similar opportunities anywhere in the great Southwest. This school and some other smaller ones—Lingleville, Thorp Springs, Portales, and Sabinal—were the foundation for Abilene Christian College where many of these students and their children went to attend school and aid in the organization of another greater Christian College and where their grandchildren and great grandchildren are today being educated. No one can rejoice more than do I, for the pronounced good that is being done at Abilene, Harding and other similar schools. And I am glad that Brother Jesse P. Sewell is present to hear this, and that in his declining years, he is identified with so worthy and influential an institution as Harding College.

I have been a not infrequent visitor at Harding for more than a quarter of a century, and it has always afforded me much pleasure, and left in my heart good lessons and fond memories. I have had the honor of being on the program as a speaker, several times at different places, Harper, Cordell, Morrilton and at Searcy. It is the same school, serving different localities, like a protracted meeting, and serving the great brotherhood of the whole country at all of these places. And it would not be strange that I would have registered

some interesting, and to me valuable recollections.

I was at Cordell, more than once, but I remember the last time I was there with particular satisfaction. Brother Armstrong and his helpers had selected the venerable and dearly loved James A. Harding, Joe Warlick and myself to claim the time and do the best we could to instruct and edify the people on Thanksgiving Day, and to help the church and the school as much as possible. I will say nothing about Joe Warlick and myself, except to say that at that time it was at the very height of my service in Christian education, and I studied long and hard to make a preparation consonant with the occasion.

But I have never forgotten the address of Brother Harding. He spoke on Divine Providence. The spiritually-minded are poorer, spiritually, who never had the privilege of listening to that great orator, that great man of faith, on this occasion, fit was the last time I heard him; he died not long after this. ) Brother Harding recited with intimate detail innumerable instances of heaven's providential care—the kindness, goodness, and love of God, in making ample provision for his own temporal as well as spiritual needs, during the long, long days of his busy, eventful life. Brother Harding took in a very real and literal way the heavenly promise: "My grace is sufficient for thee; I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." Life in the church is made richer, sweeter, and happier, and the world itself is made better by the strong faith, and the conspicuously unselfish life of men who are faithful in the church and are outstanding in leading lost souls to the cross of Christ.

#### *7. The Necessity and Importance of Unity.*

The necessity and importance of a real and genuine unity among the churches of Christ at the present time can hardly be overestimated. That this breaking, shaking, quaking type of unity at the present time among the churches and among individual members of the churches is, or in any important sense, tends to become, what God requires in his divine law, surely few, if any, would contend. That there are numerous infractions of the divine mandate relating to the

problem of unity among the people of God, *among us*, can hardly be questioned by any conscientious, thoughtful person. And the distressing phase of the whole matter is that far from its being some small thing among the more timid, hesitant, or unpretentious, among the churches, it is tolerated, and even urged and promoted, by preachers and other well known teachers and leaders among us. Surely the disastrous results of schism, strife, discord, and division, do not, in a sufficient measure, impress themselves on some of the prominent, capable, and successful gospel preachers and some other leaders in the church today.

**THE POWER OF UNITY:** Politically, and in the realms of the intellectual, moral, spiritual, and in the operations of war, there is strength in union. Was it Sallust who said: "In union many small states thrive and prosper; for the lack of it many great nations fall"? This illustrious Roman Senator and historian flourished in the first century B. C. His intimate relation to and association with Julius Caesar and other great statesmen and military leaders in the building of the mighty empire of the Romans gave him opportunity to observe the weakness and futility of division, rebellion and secession, among those nations whose populations were small and whose resources were inadequate to enable them to stand alone against the might and power of the combined forces of smaller or greater nations united in a common interest.

No one of the thirteen Colonies would have been even approximately able to have successfully resisted the autocratic oppressions and usurpations of the British Crown and the tyrannies of George III, so they all followed the dictates of wisdom, in subordinating their individual rights, and advantages, for the common good of all the people in the several colonies to one constitution and one supreme government in the Continental Congress.

Is it too much to ask that in the church of the living God our personal advantages and all our selfish interests be subordinated for the common good of all, according to the divinely arranged, constitutional law of our great, sovereign Leader and Lawgiver? In our own time we have the United

Nations designed to unite the nations of the world for their own good in a common cause; that all may survive, and that the nationals of all may, in their own way, live in happiness, peace and prosperity, free from the exploitation of stronger nations under the control and direction of power-mad ambitious leaders. Such measures, looking to the material and temporal happiness of the people, must be recognized as gracious consideration for the present and the future, for the perpetuity of the nations themselves, and the happiness of the people who make up the citizenship of these commonwealths. The temporal governments, as well as the spiritual, present illustrations and offers lessons for those who would please God in the way ordained for our life, happiness and hope.

In union there is power; in union there is strength. Division has weakened the church; the light of the glorious gospel has been obscured; there has been an eclipse of faith; and many precious souls have gone down to perdition directly on account of a lack of unity among the people of God. And the distressing thing about it all is that the leaders are the ones responsible for the failure.

**UNION AND UNITY:** One God and one nation of people was the order of things under the Old Testament. *Oneness* prevailed nationally among the people of God; those chosen of him for his divine purpose were forbidden to mix and mingle with other nations; neither were they divided up into several subordinate nations under one general *union* or coalition.

It was my pleasure to be acquainted with the late Dr. Rosenbaum, a distinguished Rabbi of Cincinnati. I was a student in several of his classes in Hebrew and Semitics in the University of Texas, at Austin. In several personal conferences. I inquired as to his explanation of the Hebrew prophecies relating to the Messiah, and their fulfillment in Jesus of Nazareth, in the days of the ascendancy of the Roman Empire, and in the days of Herod the King in Palestine. Many things of interest were of the usual routine in discussions with the Jews; but there was one thing urged by Dr.

Rosenbaum that has clung tenaciously in my memory. He urged that Jehovah was and is *one* and that it was utterly incompatible with the *Jewish psychology* to allow for a moment, that there could possibly be an *offspring of God*, called *The Son of God*. Their national administration and their national economy was a strict monotheism—a oneness of their God, the great Jehovah and Creator, and a oneness of his people, the children of Israel, a nation dear unto him.

Moses said to the people of Israel in his famous rehearsal of the law: "Hear, O Israel: Jehovah our God is *one Jehovah*: and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be upon thy heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." And the Savior quoted this with a peculiar emphasis in reply to the direct question of one of the scribes: "What commandment is first of all?" The first place in the law was the mandate from heaven *that God is one* and that Israel should love him with all the heart, soul, mind and strength. To do this is to render the life to God in wholehearted submission to his divine will, and to obey implicitly all his commandments, and observe all his ordinances, and keep his statutes. Here is set forth that *God is one*, and the necessity of *the oneness of his people* (Deut. 6:4; Mark 12:28-31).

But let us look a little more closely into the problem of unity among the people of God. To the law and the testimony:

"Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!

It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard: that went down to the skirts of his garments;

As the dew of Hermon, and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion: for there

the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore.”

(Psalms 133)

“Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling;

One Lord, one faith, one baptism,

One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.”

(Eph. 4:3-6)

Our Lord, in the intercessory prayer, prayed for his disciples who were with him, and he added:

“Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word:

That they may all be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

And that the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one even as we are one:

I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.”

(John 17:20-23)

## *II. Let Us Observe.*

1. It is good and pleasant for brethren to dwell together in unity—it is bad and unpleasant for brethren to be divided. The sweeter, higher, better things of life are unattainable, where there is strife, discord and division. Where there is one faith, and one hope, one aim, one purpose, one desire, one goal—and all this is benevolent and unselfish—where peace and harmony are enthroned in the human heart, and love reigns supreme, heaven is nearer and the souls of men are lifted above the unrest, disquietude, and suffering of the ways

of sin. It is good and pleasant to dwell together in unity, and this is certainly one of the very best reasons why brethren in the church of our Lord should in all things be united.

2. We have become united with him in the likeness of his death—one with him. “United” means to be made or to become one. It is in the “likeness” of his death. He died once for sin, and he was brought again to life in a resurrection to life. We die to sin, are buried with him in baptism, are raised again in the resurrection from the grave of water, and we are united—become one with Christ—our life is hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:1-4; 2:12, 13; 2:8-10).

3. In the intercessory prayer the Savior three times declared that he and the Father are one, and then he prayed that his disciples might be one, even in the manner that he and his Father are one (John 17:20-24). His prayer was not that the disciples form a union, in the sense of a general coalition—that they might all persuade themselves that they were on the way to heaven, though on different roads and going in different directions, that through the wondrous benevolence of heaven, all will finally reach the same destination through some mysterious and miraculous providence of God and enter the everlasting rest in the courts of glory. No such inharmonious amalgamation of discordant sects and parties, and denominational churches that cannot agree on any thing, is featured here. The Savior here refers to those who have one faith, with one origin—the word of God—those who were bound together in one mind and one accord, those who had accepted all that Christ has taught and were diligent to do all that he has commanded. And the glorious and triumphant result of this concord of heart and soul, and life and hope would be the conversion of the world—that the world would become believers.

4. Think of the power of faith when it is exemplified and applied in the unity of the people of God! Think of the potential of a mighty, conquering host when operating under the impulse of one mind, one heart, one soul! Nothing can stand before them; sin and rebellion against God yields to their invincible onslaught. Do we have any faith in, any

confidence in the words of the Savior? Well his words are true; they must be true. Is it too much to expect that the whole world could be led to Christ? Is there any limit to the possibilities of its effect on others, if all the saved in Christ were of *one mind*, and *one heart*? Its inconceivable working on others allows no limitation in its influence on the hearts and lives of men, and in its immediate effect and gracious results, and of its ultimate consequence. What it is impossible for us to know, understand, comprehend, or forecast, the gracious, loving Savior has told us, and as his trusting followers, we may accept it by faith. If we were perfectly united, and perfectly applying in our lives, truths of heaven as revealed through Christ Jesus, our Lord, the whole world would be converted. And what a triumphant and glorious consummation! And is this possible? If not why did our Savior require it, and so earnestly and anxiously pray for its realization? Yes, it is possible, easily possible, but poor, weak, sinful, distrustful, unfaithful, neglectful mortals, that we are! We just fail to believe the Savior, and neglect to apply the remedy—the faultless and unfailing remedy—that the Savior prescribes.

5. But we are so slow to learn. It was true in the days of the Savior. And when the people, either could not or would not learn, he used the simplest illustrations. Or as it would be expressed in the Greek vernacular “parables.” So I believe I will try a parable—one with which you are all familiar.

There was once an old man who had seven sons who were always quarrelling. The father observed it and worried about a situation that he so well knew would bring trouble to his family, and his own gray hairs in sorrow to an untimely grave. So one day he called to him these stalwart sons, all seven of them. They stood; the father occupied a chair, and in his lap he had a bundle of seven half green sticks which were tightly and securely bound together. To his seven sons the father exhibited the bundle of sticks, and each of the sons, upon the father's request, very carefully examined the bundle of sticks. “Well, what of it?” said one of the sons. The father replied: “I am going to give \$1,000.00 to

the one of you who can break this bundle.” So the sons, at their father’s request, undertook to break the bundle. From the eldest on down to the youngest, each of them took his turn and each of them strained every nerve and did his very best to break the bundle. When all of them had failed, they gave it up and said it could not be done. Then the father said: “And yet, my sons, nothing is easier.” He then took the bundle of sticks, untied each of the strong cords that bound them together, and took the sticks and broke them one by one. “O,” said the sons, “anyone can do it that way.” “Well,” said the father, “as it is with these sticks, so it is with you, my sons. As long as you hold fast together, and help one another, you will prosper, and no one can hurt you; but if you quarrel, fall out and destroy one another, it will happen to you as it has to the sticks which lie here broken on the ground.” As long as the church of our Lord is united, perfectly united, all the forces of evil and all the powers of darkness cannot overthrow her. Her conquering hosts are invincible; she goes forth conquering and to conquer, invulnerable against all the fiery darts of the wicked one.

### *III. Lack of Unity—Its Cause and Remedy.*

It is, of course, conceivable that a people may be united on a principle, or a doctrine that is wrong, and possible therefore, that churches of Christ may, realize a union, and even a unity that is not of the New Testament, and hence not acceptable to God nor to Christ our Lord. The oneness of God and of Christ, a perfect unity of mind and heart and soul in all things pertaining to the divine attributes, and things that pertain to the operation in the lives and hearts of men of that perfect law of Christ is the unity about which we are concerned.

1. When there is division in a church we must avoid the hasty conclusion that all the members of the church are to blame and the entire group are wrong. There may be among them the very salt of the earth, and for this very reason, division becomes a necessity. The church at Ephesus was commended in the letter written to them as recorded in the book of Revelation: “I know thy works... that thou canst

not bear evil men.” When strife arises, it is unfair to assume that both sides, or all sides are in the wrong. To undertake to settle a church trouble, by recommending that all just confess that they have done wrong, and forget and forgive, is not always safe, accurate, or scriptural. Yet I have known cases where for no apparent good reason this has been the recommendation, and a settlement made on this basis. First determine who is right and who is in the wrong; it is not just for one who is in the right to confess that he is in the wrong, or has done wrong. Division is sinful among God's people, and when it comes there is a cause, and the cause may be the work of wicked men. Paul said: “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are *causing the divisions* and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned, and turn away from them” (Rom. 16:17). Here the inspired apostle mentions certain men who were causing, bringing on, divisions and occasions of stumbling, *contrary to the doctrine, teaching*, which these brethren had learned. There was a lack of unity among these people; there was division, but it was caused by those who taught things contrary to the things that had been taught them by those who spoke by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Paul advised the good brethren there at Rome to turn away from these false teachers, and he adds: “For they that are such, serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the heart of the innocent” (Rom. 16:18).

2. Unity among the people of God cannot be maintained by receiving false teachers; and the same is true by rejecting these teachers who bring the sound doctrine of Christ. Either of these courses will break the unity of God's people and will result in discord and strife.

And herein is found one of the outstanding and very essential qualifications of those who serve as elders among the churches of Christ. Among the things Paul told Titus an elder “must” be, he wrote, “holding to the faithful word which is according to the teaching.” And the great apostle added: “For there are many unruly men. vain talkers and

deceivers. . . who overthrow whole houses teaching things which they ought not" (Titus 1:7-10). False teachers were not few in the days of Paul; they are not few in our day. Paul says there were "many. . . vain talkers and deceivers" in his day, and their "speech" was "smooth and fair," and that they deceived the people, and that they "overthrew whole houses." And how like the same class of teachers in our own time! If elders are weak in some of those things that qualify them as overseers in the church, please let it not be in the matter of a thorough knowledge of the sound doctrine of Christ and the ability and courage to safeguard the church of our Lord against false teachers, and to receive, uphold and defend those who come teaching the sound doctrine of Christ.

3. Not all the sons of the great preacher Diotrephes have departed from the earth. How many are preaching the doctrine of love as urged by John? If a brother preaches a great sermon on love, did you ever hear some big preacher say: "Yes, *soft preaching*"? Did you ever reflect that "soft preaching," if by that is meant Biblical teaching on the love of Christ and the love of brethren one toward another, requires far more courage than to preach "hard sermons," and especially where two preachers are so mad at each other that they will not even speak when they meet, and give no promise that they will speak this side of the judgment bar of God? Ah! Preachers that go wrong, can do the cause of Christ unutterable damage, and, on their way to perdition, can draw *away*, and draw *down* countless scores of better people and better thinking people with them. There were numerous types of this sort, in the days of the apostles, men who refused to receive even the apostles themselves, and who in their egotism, boldness, and "hard preaching," actually rejected the sound doctrine of Christ, and all the benevolent teaching of the gospel.

And what about their progeny in our own day and generation? Have they all disappeared from the earth? And do you suppose that the love for pre-eminence could possibly spoil preachers today? There were plenty of their class when John, Paul, Peter, James and Jude addressed their letters of

admonition and warning to churches, and to individual Christians, most of them a sacred quarter of a century this side of the ascension of the Christ. Do you suppose it is possible that we, as preachers may at times be fed too well, paid too well, complimented and flattered too much by thoughtless and excited admirers, and exalted just a little too much above the humility of Christ? Have we forgotten the Scriptures? "Let all that ye do be done in love." "Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility." "... and above all these things, put on love which is the bond of perfectness." "Humble yourselves, therefore, under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." (Read I Peter 5:5, 6; Col. 3:14; I Cor. 16:14. )

4. Caesar had his Brutus, Charles the First his Cromwell, Herod his "Angel of the Lord." Innumerable instances of summary justice (or at least supposed justice) have befallen autocratic tyrants in high places in the ruling and misruling of unwilling peoples in the history of nations, and in the spiritual realm, and on the high plane of heaven's justice, pride, arrogance, and hypocrisy will not go unnoticed nor unpunished. *Leaders have a tremendous responsibility.* It is a dangerous thing to assume this prerogative; obligations, new responsibilities and heavier judgments are faced and entered. Therefore, leaders in the position of bishops and ministers in the church should be careful, and prayerful, and discriminating as to whom they should encourage or permit to enter the responsibility of the teacher. Remember the Holy Spirit has given us the warning that it is possible for too many of us to become teachers. James has said: "Be not many of you teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive heavier judgment. For in many things we all stumble. If any stumbleth not in word, the same is a perfect man and able to bridle the whole body also" (James 3:1. 2). Those charged with the oversight of those who have the high honor to be known and recognized as members of the body of Christ, should be deeply impressed with the significance and importance of their position, and as Paul implored the elders of the church at Ephesus: "*Wherefore watch ye.*"

5. Paul had the knowledge, the interest in the cause of Christ, the foresight and the faithfulness to warn the bishops in the church at Ephesus in terms most deeply impressive. Tears fell from his eyes as he contemplated what might befall and what later did befall the church at Ephesus. He says he “shrank not from declaring unto you the whole counsel of God.” Then he adds: “Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them. Wherefore watch ye, remembering that by the space of three years I ceased not to admonish every one night and day with tears. And now I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you the inheritance among all them that are sanctified” (Acts 20:27-32).

Here then, again, are mentioned two sources from which the unity of the church might be impaired, or broken; there were those from without who might enter in and with false teaching disrupt and divide the church, through innovations. Many people are susceptible—they are easily led away by some new thing. These were preachers whose teaching destroyed and broke to pieces the church. They were described as grievous wolves. In the second place, there were those *in the church*, who would arise speaking perverse things, create factions and draw away disciples after them.

6. The instruction of the Lord as revealed to us through the Spirit, is that we give “diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Eph. 4:3). And just how much effort is put forth in the realm of diligence to effect so great and so necessary a consummation as this same unity, on the part of all who profess the name of Christ, is most certainly worthy of our most earnest attention. Remember the words of the Savior, that the unity of God’s people is the condition upon which the world may believe that Christ was sent of

God, and thus be led to salvation from sin. Most things worthwhile require effort. Are we putting forth the effort necessary to do what the apostle of Christ here enjoins upon the saints at Ephesus? Why the apathy and indifference of members of the body of Christ, of preachers, of elders, and of whole churches when division and strife prevail to the alienation of brethren and the disruption of churches? Is it a small thing when a large group withdraws from a congregation, organizes another church and are denounced by the congregation from which they came, as disorderly and a faction? The churches will not have fellowship with a faction; they will not preach for them, nor receive their preachers in exchange. They might as well have fellowship with the Methodist church as with a faction. Paul told Titus to refuse a factious man, after the first and second admonition. Things are in bad shape when in a strong, wealthy and influential congregation there are those who depart and form a faction. There should certainly be much love and forbearance exercised—much of the meekness and gentleness of Christ before such could be possible. *Has this been done?*

7. The unity proposed in the New Testament requires that we accept the Bible as our guide, the New Testament as our rule of faith, practice and action. No system of unity that does not adhere to this standard can possibly be acceptable in the sight of God.

8. Uninspired human creeds, articles of discipline, and confessions of faith, can not form a basis or standard for the unity of the people of God.

9. But among those of us who accept the Bible as our guide, or at least so claim, we find much confusion and lack of harmony. In many localities and in many congregations there is confusion and much evil work. There is a painful lack of brotherly love and cooperation for the common good. The Lord has a remedy; here it is: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and all evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake hath forgiven you" (Eph. 4:31). This is God's

remedy; it is God's formula for unity. And it is impossible that unity can be instituted or maintained in the churches anywhere, or in the church as a whole, without the application of the philanthropy and benevolence involved in this divine order of our Lord and King.

10. Unity is hindered and in many cases entirely prevented through *selfishness*. No one can be a faithful follower of Christ, or an imitator of Christ, or united with Christ when dominated by and under the control of selfishness. Here is the order given by Paul to the Church at Philippi (Phil. 2:1-8): "If there is therefore any exhortation in Christ, if any persuasion of love, if any fellowship of the spirit, if any tender mercies and compassions, make full my joy, that ye be of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind; doing nothing through faction or through vain-glory, but in lowliness of mind each counting the other better than himself; not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others. Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God, a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross." Herein we have expressed the most excellent exhibition of unselfishness from the beginning of time till time shall close! Christ left the exalted glories of the upper world, where, existing in the form of God, and being on an equality with God, he shared the unutterable effulgence of heaven's glory. He took upon himself the form of a servant, in the likeness of man. This gracious and unique exhibition of unselfishness was all for us, for you and for me, and was presented as an example for our imitation. Selfishness has no place in that unity that the Lord requires—that unity with God, with Christ, and with one another.

11. Notice the terms, "same mind," "mind of Christ," "*one mind*." Christians must have the same mind, not different minds, they must have one mind and this mind must be

the mind of Christ. They must think on the same things, which things are detailed for the "one mind" of all the members of the body of Christ. (Phil. 4:8. )

12. Finally, there cannot possibly be that unity prescribed in the spiritual law under which we live, without love, and that type of love that partakes of the nature and measure of that love manifested of God when he gave the unspeakable gift of Christ for human redemption (II Cor. 9:15). The prevalence of love, or the lack of it determines whether unity prevails among brethren and controls the church. The reign of love cannot possibly be effective where there is hatred. And this suggests the language of our Savior as he answered the question of his disciples regarding the awful overthrow and final desolation of Jerusalem, and of the end of the world. He said: "And then shall many stumble, and deliver up one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall arise, and shall lead many astray. And because iniquity shall be multiplied, the love of the many shall wax cold" (Matt. 24:10-12). Let us not fail to observe the big plurality, all in the wrong direction. "Many" shall stumble; "many" false prophets shall arise; "many" shall be led astray; the love of "many" shall wax cold.

A heart filled with hatred has no place or capacity for love. Christ loved the world with an unutterable love, and a Christian loves his fellow men. Those who have passed from death into life, love the brethren, and those who do not love their brethren abide in death. The apostle John declares plainly that he who hates his brother is not in the light but in the darkness; moreover he declares that such a one is a liar and a murderer; and before the book of Revelation is concluded, the appallingly awful and terrible statement is made that *all liars* and *murderers* shall have their part in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone. What must we say, then, when, in our day a state of bitterness is developed to such a pronounced degree between two men, yea two Christians, yes two preachers, that they will not even speak to each other? And this with no prospect or hope that there is likely to be any reconciliation, any repentance, confession

or forgiveness, before they close their eyes in death, and face eternal judgment. In our day the Scriptures are being fulfilled, that many will deliver up one another, and hate one another. And also it has come to pass in this our day that many are the false teachers, and preachers, and prophets who are leading many astray. It is hoped that you noticed the meaning of the word here rendered "iniquity," in connection with all of the many things that are finding their literal fulfilment in our day. Well, the word signifies in the original language from which it comes: "Absence of, or deviation from just dealing; gross injustice; wickedness. An offense; a heinous sin." And the record says that our Lord has declared that there will be a multiplicity of these evils. Can there be *unity in the church*, in Christ and in God, when all this discord, strife, alienation, schism and division shamefully persist and reign supreme among the people who profess to be the children of God?

Read the prophecy of Paul as given in II Timothy 3:1-13. He begins by saying "grievous times" would come and closes the paragraph with the statement that "evil men and impostors shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." The key words are "*for men shall be lovers of self.*" And these other terrible sins and professions in the ways of wrong doing, social and business unfaithfulness, and deception, and wickedness, are in logical sequence, the ungodly outcome of the operation of "men who are lovers of self, lovers of money... lovers of pleasure, rather than lovers of God." The present problem is to get people to love God. In no other way can they be united in Christ, as members of his body. Preachers are not the only offenders—far from it; but a tremendous responsibility rests upon all teachers, whether preachers, elders or others. The most serious clement in the apostasy of the church at Ephesus (See Rev. 2:4) was that they had left their first love. And the most serious trouble with the church today is that their love is not centered on Christ. They have become lovers of self, lovers of money, lovers of the pleasures of this life.

There is every inducement for the unity of the church

of our Lord, and its individual members. *1. The Savior has required it and prayed for its realization. 2. Paul, writing by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, commanded and urged it. 3. It will be the means of leading the world to believe.* There is not only strength, but joy, happiness, life and hope in the unity of the children of God. Every sane consideration, for time and eternity, would urge the wisdom of becoming and being one, as the Father and the Son are one, that the church might be influential, strong and happy, and that the world might believe.

Amen and Amen!

## Chapter 5

---

### CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF AUTHORITY IN HIS CHURCH IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

by  
*Emmett Smith*

The theme of this entire Lectureship is concerned with problems in the present day world; and this assignment for a discussion of Authority in the church of our Lord is indicative of the fact that there *is* such a problem! So, it is to be hoped that the remarks of the hour may be centered in, and limited to, a discussion of CHRIST and the PROBLEM of Authority in His Church; not of Christ and the Problem of AUTHORITY in His Church!

With the Apostle Paul may we all always say, “For I am determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified” (1 Cor. 2:2). A voluntary acceptance of such a determination upon the part of every individual would solve this and every other problem of the present day.

First, what is the problem and how does it relate particularly to the present age? Surely, that the problem of authority has always been of much concern, not only in the church of our Lord, will not be contested; but, how is it related specifically to this age?

It isn't deemed necessary to trace the origin of the problem too far back into history; but it might be well to discuss elements in the thinking of the people just preceding our own age—elements that might help in an understanding of the magnitude of the present day problem.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when men in different parts of the world were striving to

gain more personal freedom and were trying to break away from the last vestige of the Dark Ages, many found themselves groping for something to which to tie securely. Multitudes sought the leadership of men who were willing to assert themselves and boldly put forward their ideas. Without too careful consideration, they followed the leadership of men and ideas that appealed to their elation in their "new-found freedom."

Thus, it was possible for such teachers and philosophers as Rousseau to gain a wide and devoted following among multitudes, even of the learned. With a cry for individual liberty and freedom as opposed to the tyranny and oppression so common in those early days, it was easy for such a leader of thinking to gain an attentive audience, not only to his appeal for freedom, but for any related philosophy. Such made it possible for the succeeding transition to the philosophy that "liberty is license," in spite of Paul's admonition to the Galatians, "For ye, brethren, were called for freedom: only use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh, but through love be servants to one another" (Gal. 5:13).

Of course, with the advent of any popular notion or philosophy, the followers who espouse the doctrine usually carry it far beyond the limit to which the originator would have gone. Just as Luther, striving to escape the Roman doctrine of "work righteousness" by an appeal to salvation by faith, was carried on to the opposite extreme; so in every field those who oppose an extreme are likely themselves to adopt the opposite extreme or have their followers adopt it. So, in opposing the tyranny of the Dark Ages, many have been led to the opposite extreme of rebelling against any established authority.

With the French and American Revolutions for political freedom, there came the demand for personal freedom and self reliance that was the outcome of the "Age of Reason" sparked by men like Voltaire and Rousseau. Following the revolutions was the period in the nineteenth century when men began to worship the idea of personal "Liberty and Freedom." In such great works as Emerson's *Self Reliance*,

and from the minds of such great men as Emerson, again the masses could glean ideas palatable to their great thirst for liberty and freedom from the shackles and restraint of any power; even from the restraint of self in many cases.

So great did this thirst for, and worship of, freedom and liberty become that not even the pulpits of the country escaped. In order for the "great preachers" of the age to retain their prestige, they too must become worshippers of the same gods—and they did! From pulpits as well as from other platforms there sounded out the philosophy of "let your conscience be your guide," scotched by quotations such as this from the great liberator, Rousseau, who was said to have "fathered the French Revolution." The quotation: "O conscience, divine instinct, immortal and celestial voice, the unfailing guide of an ignorant and finite but free and intelligent being." He also said, "There is no sacred and inviolable charter binding a people to the forms of an established constitution. The right to change these is the first guarantee of all rights."

From such philosophy, based upon the exaltation of the individual, there gradually but surely arose the idea that there is no authority higher than those who are subjected to the authority. This has worked wonders governmentally, but it has played havoc religiously and spiritually! There must be no inhibitions or frustrations of the individual in his complete natural development! Such has permeated the entire educational system of most of the world. If morals and high ethical standards stand in the way of the liberty and freedom of the individual in his striving for full self-development, then morals and high ethical standards must go! "Liberty means license," whether expressed in these words or not, has come to be a dominant part of our thinking. Is it possible that herein lies the superstructure of our present day problem of authority, even in the church of our Lord?

If this is helpful in bringing us to a discussion of what is to follow, then good! We now come to the second, and most important, phase of the discussion of the problem; namely, what is the solution to the problem?

The answer to this, and to all of the other problems discussed, is JESUS CHRIST! When we know the Christ as he is presented to us, we will have solved the problem of authority in his church. In the past generations, however, we have had an increasing emphasis upon the knowledge of such writings as have been discussed; while at the same time we have had a decreasing interest in a knowledge of the Book! With the approach of the time when we may realize that illiteracy is gone from our land, there may be the approach of the time when nobody, generally speaking, reads the Bible. The home that may have an abundance of reading matter may have the Bible only for an ornament on the mantle. The time has already come that the home with daily devotions and Bible reading is a distinct oddity. The time was that the home without such was the exception.

Jesus said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" (Jno. 8:32). With an increasing neglect of the knowledge of the Word, we might expect an increasing neglect of Christ's authority. To know the Christ is to recognize his supreme power and authority. Even the unlearned Jewish disciples recognized the presence of divinity when the Lord taught on the Mount. "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished these words, the multitudes were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes" (Matt. 7:28, 29).

It might be well to introduce, for a basis of our thoughts, a few familiar and oft-used scripture texts relative to the supremacy of our Lord. In the marching orders to the apostles, the Lord said, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:18-20). Not only are we to know that he has all authority, but the command is to TEACH the converts to respect such authority.

To know the Christ is to love him! "I am the good shep-

herd; and I know mine own, and mine own know me, even as the Father knoweth me and I know the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep..." "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand" (Jno. 10:14, 15, 27, 28). The existence of such a relationship as is described by the Master in these verses will eliminate forever the problem of authority in his church. The writer of the Hebrew letter knew of such a relationship when he said, "Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep with the blood of an eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus, make you perfect in every good thing to do his will, working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory forever and ever" (Heb. 13:20, 21). Jesus said, "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments" (Jno. 14:15).

To know Jesus is to love him; and to love the Christ is to keep his commandments. So, when we have known the Lord well enough we will solve the problem of authority in his church! In John's Gospel chapter ten, verses two to five, is the record of the Master's statement, "But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice: and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out. When he hath put forth all his own, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice. And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers." How wonderful that it is possible for us to so know the Master's voice that we will not hear the voice of strangers! ". . . for they know his voice!" How know it? "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." With a life centered in the Christ and in a knowledge of his will there is no danger of our hearing a stranger's voice; and there is no longer such a pitiable situation regarding this problem of authority.

When those who have espoused the cause of Christ come to learn that in Jesus Christ there is want for absolutely noth-

ing, but that we can be complete in him, we will have come a long way toward the solution of our problem, not only in the Church but in every other phase of living. When our lives have been centered in Christ there will be full understanding that there can be liberty in complete harmony with obedience.

The word "obey" has taken on sinister proportions in our present day society. "Guidance" and "exploration of resources" and "proper direction of impulses" are terms with which our modern vocabularies are replete, but the word "obey" is a bit too harsh for the delicate fiber of our highly evolved constitutions long since having become accustomed to absolute personal liberty and freedom. Not even children are to be frustrated by the unpleasant introduction of it into their young minds!

A Christian school teacher ten years ago had become so thoroughly imbued with the principles of the wonderful liberty and freedom discovered by men that she determined never to frustrate her small boy in any way! Why, if the family were at the top of the church steps and the child of six or seven years decided, for some reason known only to him, that he didn't want to go to church that day, the whole family would turn around and go back home without so much as an inquiry into the reasons for the lad's sudden decision! I'm sure that the mother not even so much as raised an objection or asked a reason when the boy, now in his late teens, decided recently to become a denominational preacher!

Paul warned the Colossians to "Take heed lest there be any one that maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ; for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and in him ye are made full, who is the head of all principality and power." In the Christ we are made full. The King James Version says, "And ye are complete in him." Paul tells Timothy that "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for instruction which is in righteousness; that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely

unto every good work” (II Tim. 3:16, 17). The Christian is complete IN Christ and complete IN God's word! So then, naturally, “Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God; he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son.” To abide in his teaching one must obey his commandments. That obedience should be distasteful, in the light of its prominence in the Book, is difficult of understanding; except for a lack of knowledge of what the Book teaches. “Obey” is found in the Bible, in one form or another, over six hundred times; so it should not be terribly unpleasant to one well acquainted with the Bible's teachings. “... though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation.” To those who obey, he has become the author of eternal salvation, but those who go onward beyond the Word, just do not have God!

From Hebrews 1:1, 2 we learn that God speaks to us in this age by his Son, and in Matthew 17:5 we have the record of the Lord's transfiguration and of the Father's statement, “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.” In Ephesians 1:22, 23 and in Colossians 1:18 we learn that the Christ is head over all things to the Church, which is his body... the fullness of him that filleth all in all.” Christ is absolute, supreme head of the church, having been given all authority in heaven and on earth. The idea of democracy in matters religious is not compatible with the teaching of the Bible.

Paul admonishes the Colossians in chapter three, verse seventeen, “And whatsoever ye do in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him.” Everything that the Christian does is to be done by the authority of the Christ, and if we are not complete in him we must live an unbalanced life. However, we are complete in him! The verses already read abundantly show that we are complete in him and that nothing is lacking.

When religious people, in the Lord's church can say

with all of their hearts with Paul, "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith; the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me" (Gal. 3:20, 21); then we can all recognize the fullness of being in Christ and the problem of authority will be solved. Then, and not until then, can the world see the real beauty in the oneness of the Lord's Body, the church for which he gave his life. Otherwise, Christ died for naught and our lip-service to his authority rings out an echo of mockery that drowns out our pretended sincerity in his service.

Let us suppose that ten men of different backgrounds, different creeds, and even different nationalities all are seeking for salvation and spiritual life. By force of circumstances they are thrown into rather close association. Each is proceeding toward his goal, which is the same goal that the others have, in his own way, influenced by his particular background. Naturally, in their close association together, they will each be aware of the others' striving for spiritual development. And too, as they proceed toward their goals, there will be conflicts of personalities and of family and cultural backgrounds. Actually, there is only one hope that they will ever be one and that hope is CHRIST! As each individual loses himself in the Christ and truly seeks the favor of the Master, he will become more and more like the other nine who in like manner have become more and more like Christ. Their ideas and personality traits that had been so incompatible now are gradually worn away to a smoothness that will not allow for friction between them. Thus, they truly become one; and the reason is that they have all accepted the Christ as the supreme authority. They have found the unity for which the Lord prayed!

The same principle is applicable to ten Christians or to ten thousand Christians, all of whom are striving for the fullness that is in Christ. This, then, is the solution to the problem of authority in the church of our Lord. In family life, in social life, in business life, or in any phase of our

associations together if each is living a Christ-centered life there will never arise insurmountable difficulties. Each has an allegiance to the Christ that is greater than self and he will be willing to sacrifice selfish aims and desires, realizing that there are more important things.

A statement by Brother G. C. Brewer, made during this lecture program two or three years ago, is indicative of a sad condition existing in the church of our Lord. He said that in thirty-five years he has not known of a single case of church discipline, resulting in withdrawal, that had not caused church trouble. This is lamentable! Is it the sign of a demoralized group of would-be Christians still intent upon doing what we want to do regardless of the Savior's will in the matter? Have we sets of leaders that have become so unconcerned about our souls that they no longer "watch for your souls"? Or have we Christians so untaught that they do not know of Paul's statement to the Hebrews to "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit to them; for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account..

It is possible that herein lies the greatest problem of our day so far as the Church is concerned. We preach again and again on the supreme authority in religion and nearly always apply it to those outside the Church who have not submitted to that supreme authority. Are we unaware that we in the Church may not have submitted? Have we in the Body of Christ become so enamored of the new personal liberty that we respond to an inquiry of an elder of the Church that it is "none of his business"? Our personal lives have become so much a matter of importance to us that it will not do for a leader who watches for our souls to inquire as to the well-being of that soul. We still are living self-centered lives instead of Christ-centered lives if we are so sensitive of investigation!

With the home as the unit, or with the nation as the unit; if members of the unit are individually consecrated to the Christ with the full understanding that "each is not his own" there can never be serious danger of disintegration. When husband and wife each realize that he or she belongs

first to the Lord, and each realizes the same relation to the other, there will be no unreasonable demands, and peace and harmony can prevail. "Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have of God? And ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price; glorify God therefore in your body" (I Cor. 6:19, 20). Only when personal and peculiar interests are exalted above the interests of Christianity can real friction arise. Homes are broken, communities disrupted, churches split asunder, nation arrayed against nation, only when the principles of the Prince of Peace are cast aside and replaced with ideologies and contentions foreign to the Christ.

CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF MODERNISM IN THE  
PRESENT DAY WORLD

*by*

*Dr. W. B. West*

*Scripture Reading:* Acts 20:28-30; Jude 4:2; II Cor. 11:13-15.

No problem today is of more importance to Christ and his disciples than religious modernism, for it concerns itself with the foundations of our faith. Without the proper conception of God, of Christ, of Christianity, of the Bible, of the Church, and of the hereafter, we are building on sand and neither the foundation nor the structure of our building will stand.

Suppose one hundred of us were on the top floors of the Empire State Building and we were told there is a mob below dynamiting the foundations of the building. We would certainly be greatly and fearfully concerned. We would not say that we doubt if the law of gravitation is true and we feel sure that the attraction of the heavenly bodies will uphold the building, regardless of what may happen to the foundations. Modernism undermines the foundations of our faith and leaves us suspended in mid-air to fall on the hard pavement of their theology below. In the long ago, the Psalmist stated: "If the foundations be destroyed, What can the righteous do?" (Psalm 11:3).

*I. The Meaning, Origin and History of Modernism.*

*The meaning of Modernism.* Linguistically, modernism means an exaggerated love for what is modern, an inflation for modern ideas even to the point of worshipful devotion.



Modernists have little interest in antiquity. In this respect they are like the ancient Athenians and strangers sojourning in Athens, in that they spend their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing. They like to talk of "the consensus of present-day scholarship," which to them is the latest theories held by them and by those of like frame of mind. Other pet phrases of theirs are the "new scientific method" and the "assured results of Biblical Criticism" which they have in part created as criteria for themselves and for others.

*Claimed methodology.* Somewhat in keeping with a flare for the latest, modernism is further defined more as a method than a system of thought and a body of facts. It is practically synonymous with scientific-methodology and the evolutionary theory. Shailer Mathews, a modernist of a former generation, defines modernism as "the use of the methods of modern science to find, state and use the permanent and certain values of inherited orthodoxy in meeting the needs of a modern world." He continues by saying the needs themselves point the way to formulas. According to modernists, man is the criterion and modern science the methodology in ascertaining and satisfying the needs of a modern world. Dr. Newman Smyth defined modernism as "a certain attitude of mind corresponding to our times: it is a tendency of thought rather than a body of doctrine: a vitalizing spirit making all things new rather than a full-grown and completed theology: an intellectual method rather than a formulated creed.

The definitions of Dr. Mathews and Dr. Smyth were given a quarter of a century ago. Since that time modernism has developed a theology while keeping its worship of the so-called modern scientific approach with man and not God

---

<sup>1</sup> Shailer Mathews, *The Faith of Modernism*, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Newman Smyth, As quoted by H. A. D. Major, *English Modernism*, p. 10.

as central. Truthfully did Rollo May write in 1940: "It is significant that the chief religious movement in America in the last two decades has been the worship of ourselves."<sup>3</sup>

*The origin of modernism.* The word "modernism" as applied to a religious movement is a relatively late term in the course of Christian history. In the eleventh edition (1910-11) of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, there is no article on modernism. In Hasting's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (1915), there is an article, but it is confined to a religious movement in the Roman Catholic Church. These facts, however, do not give the origin of modernism but attest that as a movement large and united enough to gain separate recognition modernism did not warrant inclusion in such a standard reference work as the *Encyclopedia Britannica* even as late as 1910. It is difficult to state when the term "modernism" was first used. More important than this knowledge are the roots and background of its origin.

The roots of modernism go back many centuries to Pantheism and Gnosticism but proximately are to be found in the subjective philosophy of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries when there was an attempt to reconcile nineteenth century science and philosophy with historic Christianity. The belief of modernists that God is immanent and impersonal has its remote ancestry in Pantheism, but nineteenth and twentieth century modernism found more of its beliefs in first and second century Gnosticism than in Pantheism. The so-called Christian Gnostics of the early Christian centuries attempt to separate Christianity from its past by fusion with its environment. The early church fathers called Gnosticism "Greek wisdom," and the late eminent Berlin Church historian, Adolf Harnack, termed Christian Gnosticism, the "acute Hellenization of Christianity." Christian Gnosticism virtually repudiated the Old Testament and made Jesus an appearance and his death only apparent. The high "aeon" entered the body of Jesus

---

<sup>3</sup> Rollo May, *Springs of Creative Living*, p. 94.

at baptism and deserted it before the death upon the cross. Christian Gnosticism discriminated between creator-god and the Father of Jesus. The Gnostic god was a philosophical abstraction with mythical trimmings. But the chief tenet of faith of ancient Gnosticism which is found in present-day modernism is the gnosis which is derived from the Greek word gnosis, or "knowledge," which every ancient Gnostic felt he possessed in a superior sense which ultimately lead him to substitute reason for faith and to change Christianity to suit himself.

Coming now to more immediate origins of present-day modernism, we mention the names of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), Friedrich Jacobi (1745-1819), Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834). philosophers, who placed the essence of religion in interior feeling and sentiment. John Dewey a very influential American philosopher and educator, whose pragmatic scientific and humanistic approach has made man and not God the measure of the universe, has also had much to do with the origin and growth of modernism as seen during the past forty years.

In the realm of science. Charles Darwin, Henri Bergson and others had formative influence on modernism. Some persons would date the beginning of present-day modernism with the effects of the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859), which caused an upheaval in philosophical and religious thinking. It was seen at once that there was disparity between the Darwinian theory of organic evolution and the Genesis account of creation. Philosophical and theological attempts to read into the history of civilization and into the Biblical records the Darwinian theory of evolution and the Hegelian philosophy of history are definitely connected with the rise of modernism. Professor T. W. Manson of the University of Manchester in his chapter, "The Failure of Liberalism to Interpret the Bible." in *The Interpretation of the Bible*, edited by C. W. Dugmore. stated that Christianity got off the track when her teachers endeavored to spread

the quilt of Christianity on the frame of Hegelian philosophy.<sup>4</sup>

Modernism had been begotten but was not born until able minds and critical students of the Bible like Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Strauss, Baur, and others as Biblical scholars and theologians tried to fit the Bible into the framework of nineteenth century subjective philosophy and science and to make man and not God the center of things. Men worshipped at the feet of science, scholarship, and philosophy and not at the feet of God. It was what the ancient so-called Christian Gnostics did when they attempted to separate Christianity from its past by fusion with its environment.

Although the founders of modernism lived before 1900, modernism as a movement was not recognized until shortly after 1900. Let us sketch briefly the history of modernism during the last fifty years to see the road it has traveled and the present status of what may be called modernism and a new liberalism.

Between 1900 and 1920 modernism reached its height. Its believers and advocates were full of self-confidence. The law of inevitable progress, based upon Darwinian and Hegelian philosophies, was held by them. Modernists affirmed that science, education, and a new religion will save the world. Supernaturalism gave way to naturalism; the virgin birth of Christ was made incredible; Jesus was a son of God but not the Son of God in a unique sense; the miracles of our Lord were reduced to legends; religious education took the place of regeneration. The kingdom of God, which had been preached since the days of Jesus, was made a society of unredeemed men and women by the preaching of the social gospel, the dethroning of God, and the enthronement of man. A modernized, minimized God and inflated man, with God as the junior partner, set out to build a Utopian kingdom, which was to be called the kingdom of God, somewhat as an act of courtesy toward God. This so-called king-

---

<sup>4</sup> T. W. Manson, *The Interpretation of the Bible*.

dom of God became a socialized democracy, a form of regenerated communism whose members and preachers would make a new world, the like of which history had never seen.

In this new world the Bible would no longer be the guide for man. He would be his own chart and compass. Man was on the escalator of modernism, science, and humanism, which he believed were always carrying him higher and higher. War would be no more. Modernists affirmed we have reached the Utopian society. But, alas, intoxicated modernism, drunk on the new wine of the age, reeled on to its judgment. As yet it was unchastened by the harsh judgment of history. Modernists forgot the God of history and judgment and were hastening to their downfall.

World War I came. In such a great world crisis modernism had no message. It was bankrupt. Men trained for the ministry had been sent to preach with an interrogation point. Ministers no longer had a gospel message. Men and women in Europe and America already had their faith shaken in modernism. They wanted to believe in a sovereign and loving God, in Jesus as the Son of God and their Savior, the Bible as their guide, their souls as being immortal, and heaven as their home. Four years of world-wide bloody war in which millions of lives were wounded and lost increased this desire. D. R. Davies, a repentant English modernist, wrote:

“The great War caught liberal Christianity unawares. . . . It administered a nasty jolt to its whole scheme and outlook. . . . It took the lid off that human nature of supposed fundamental goodness... one thing stands out with tragic clearness: the complete and utter bankruptcy of modernism and liberal Christianity. . . . At long last the chickens are coming home to roost.”<sup>5</sup>

I shall never forget a morning in Zurich, Switzerland, during late July of 1948 when I spent one hour in the home

---

<sup>5</sup> D. R. Davies, *On To Orthodoxy*, p. 27.

of Karl Barth, the world's most influential living theologian. In my interview, among other things I asked Professor Barth: "How did you give up modernism and come to your present view?" He replied: "After World War I, I got to reading my Bible. ' I said: "Do you mean that you had been reading about your Bible and not your Bible?" He said: "Yes, that is what I mean." He continued by saying that he had studied under Adolf Harnack, Hans Lietzmann, and others at the University of Berlin, and he saw where they were wrong and had no message. Those acquainted with the life and work of Barth know that after he had graduated from the University of Berlin he went to a church in Switzerland as minister and when he came to prepare for his first service, he looked over all his University notes and found that he had nothing to preach.

The errors and short-comings of modernism were also sensed by religious leaders in America. In 1927 Reinhold Niebuhr, America's most influential theologian, stated: "Religion is not in a robust state of health in modern civilization."<sup>6</sup> In 1934, John A. Mackay, president of Princeton Theological Seminary, wrote:

"Part of the crisis of religion today is that it lacks an adequate message for the times. It does not understand God, it does not understand man, and does not understand the times we are living in... Christian faith has been eviscerated, Christian life has become enervated, and a general despondency has set in. "?"

Dr. Georgia Harness, outstanding professor of religion and authoress, wrote in 1939, referring to the old modernism: "We were in danger of selling out to science as the only approach to truth, of trusting too hopefully in man's power

---

<sup>6</sup> Reinhold Niebuhr, *Does Civilization Need Religion?*  
p. 1.

<sup>7</sup> John A. Mackay, *Christian Message for the World Today*, p. 95.

to remake his world. “<sup>8</sup> Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, who for many years was America's best known pulpiteer, after repudiating the old modernism a number of years ago said: “We must go beyond modernism.” Modernists left in large numbers a discredited modernism and called themselves liberals, but did not change materially their fundamental positions. They only got rid of some excess baggage. It was still in large part modernism although the term liberalism was preferred. Others abandoned liberalism for neo-ortho-<sup>9</sup>doxy.

We have all too briefly surveyed the history of modernism from 1900 to 1951, seeing how modernism was strong and self-confident shortly after the beginning of the twentieth century, how it came into crisis after the close of World War I and the depression which followed, and that its excess baggage was dropped for a newer liberalism and for neo-orthodoxy. We shall present the chief errors of modernism, which are also largely those of the new liberalism and in part of neo-orthodoxy. In all fairness, it should be stated that there are differences of belief among modernists but all of them hold to some general positions which we shall now discuss.

## *II. The Chief Doctrines of Modernism.*

*The doctrine of God.* Modernists believe in a God of their own creation whom they have made in their own

---

<sup>8</sup>Dr. Georgia Harkness, *Christian Century*, (March 15, 1939).

<sup>9</sup>Neo-orthodoxy is a large and influential religious movement of the last quarter of century led by Karl Barth of Basel University, Basel, Switzerland, Emil Brunner of Zurich University, Zurich, Switzerland, and Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary, New York. Neo-orthodoxy is in revolt against the older modernism and the newer liberalism. Although it is preferred to them, it is far from the New Testament in a number of its positions.

image. I shall long remember one morning in the summer of 1945 when I ate breakfast at the Commons of the University of Chicago with an elderly English professor, teaching in one of the great Universities of the South. I asked him if he went to church. He replied that he no longer did for after all he believed that God was a creature of man—somewhat of a Santa Claus. I asked, if man made God, who made man? He said: "I knew you would ask that" and to his embarrassment the conversation ended.

The creature modernists have made of God is immanent and not transcendent whereas he is both immanent and transcendent. By immanence they mean either partial or complete identification of God with the world. And the absolute immanence of God in the universe approaches Pantheism almost to the point of identity. God is in the world, in persons, in things, in history. Immanence makes all humanity a part of God, thus breaking the dualism of divinity and humanity. Mankind receives all revelation from the immanent God within himself and his own inner experience rather than from the scriptures. God is merely the soul of the world. The function of religion thus becomes the uniting of individuals everywhere through this universal soul. Proceeding from God, everything is good. Reality of sin, necessity for atonement, the fact of miracles logically fall away as irrelevant. Humanity, by being the best expression of deity, becomes an object of worship.

To the average modernist, God does not have personality as a separate entity, while the Bible presents God with personality as three persons in one—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit (Matthew 28:19). The trinitarian scriptural doctrine is absolutely necessary for a satisfactory revelation of God. Without a trinity, Christ is not God and is not capable of fully knowing and revealing Him. Likewise, if the Holy Spirit is not God, then it is impossible for Him through the word to communicate the love of God. In reality, the God of the Bible and the god of modernism are two different Gods.

*The doctrine of Jesus Christ.* Modernists believe in

Jesus Christ as a son of God, as you and I are sons of God, except that Jesus attained a greater degree of sonship by living closer to God and more in harmony with his will. They do not accept him as the holy, incarnate Son of God in a unique qualitative sense but quantitatively in that he lived the best life that has ever been lived. Modernists readily affirm in the divinity of Christ but deny his Deity. There is a vast difference between the divinity and the deity of Jesus. It is the difference between being a man-God and a God-man. According to modernists, Jesus was not begotten by the Holy Spirit and born of the virgin Mary as the scriptures clearly teach. (Matthew 1:18-25; Luke 1:26-38. )

Modernists deny the virgin birth because they cannot accept the miraculous and affirm that historical criticism has invalidated the Gospel records. Objective historical Biblical Criticism has confirmed and not destroyed the validity of the Gospel records of the virgin birth of Jesus. To the Bible-believing Christian the very character of Jesus demands pre-existence and a unique conception and birth. No man could have taught as he taught, spoke as he spoke, and have done as he did if he had been of time and had been begotten and born as other men.

To modernists Jesus is not an object of faith but an example of faith. According to them, he was the best man, morally speaking, who ever lived, a man whose example is to be followed. The modern liberal preacher reveres Jesus and has his name often on his lips but for him he is not a savior in the New Testament sense of the word. Modernists talk about the "Jesus of history" and the "Jesus of faith." To them the "Jesus of history" is the one they have found in the Gospel records through what they call objective study by the process of "pure" historical research, which takes away the virgin birth, the miracles, the resurrection, *et cetera*. The "Jesus of faith" was he whom the early Christians like Paul, John, and Peter created. Their religion was one about Jesus. Modernists state that they are interested in the religion of Jesus, which is a religion stripped of supernaturalism. The Jesus of the modernists is not the Lord

Jesus Christ of the New Testament. He is a Jesus made in their own image, beginning with Reimarus (1694-1768) and going to Semler (1725-1791), to Paulus (1761-1851), to Strauss (1835), to Baur (1792-1860) and ending with the "liberal" school of the twentieth century. The Jesus of the New Testament is uniquely the Son of God and Savior of the world.

*The doctrine of the Bible.* The Bible of modernists and of New Testament Christians are two different Bibles. The writers of the Bible of Christians were inspired of God in a unique sense, while those of the modernists were inspired in the sense that Shakespeare, Milton, and Browning were, or as a painter may stand on a plain to see a gorgeous sunset in the golden west and be inspired to paint a picture of great beauty. Inasmuch as the writers of the Christian's Bible were inspired of God (II Timothy 3:16), as no other writers were, it follows that the Bible is infallible and all sufficient in its teachings and eternal in its character. (Deuteronomy 4:2; Proverbs 30:5, 6; II Timothy 3:17; Matthew 24:35). To Bible-believing Christians who have experienced the truthfulness of its words in their own lives, the testimony of scripture to its character is sufficient, but to others this is not true. For them the spade of the archaeologist has made an important contribution to the study of the Bible. Time permits the naming of only two contributions when more than a score could be given.

There was a time when men held that the account of Israel living in Egypt given in Genesis and Exodus was untrustworthy, but testimony has been found of Egyptian writings and monuments which is in complete harmony with the pictures of ancient Egypt and the Egyptians as given to us by Moses. According to the Biblical record the king of Egypt, Ramses, compelled the Hebrews to build the treasure cities, Pithom and Ramses. The ruins of Pithom were uncovered in 1883 by Naville of the University of Geneva. On the great gateway was the inscription by Ramses the Great: "I built Pithom at the mouth of the East." On a steel inscription of Mernaphtah are these words: "And Joseph was not,"

indicating the former presence and the departure of the children of Israel.

One of the most frequently mentioned peoples of the Old Testament are the Hittites. Until the last quarter of the last century, nothing was known of the Hittites outside of Biblical references, and as usual modernists affirmed that inasmuch as this is true no such people existed. Through the archaeological work of Professor A. H. Sayce of Oxford University abundant corroborative evidence has been found for the existence of the Hittites.

Skeptics, modernists, and atheists have attacked the Bible. When these men are no more and their works are forgotten, the Bible of the New Testament Christian will be here. When the sun, moon, and stars are no more and this old earth has melted with fervent heat, the Bible will survive. Jesus said: "Heaven and earth will pass away but my words shall not pass away" (Mark 13:31).

We have briefly presented the doctrines of modernists concerning God, Christ, and the Bible which are the very foundations of our faith. We have seen that these doctrines are false. We have made reference to two of the basic errors of modernism—its disbelief in the supernatural and its high exaltation and worship of man. We could study other positions of those who believe in modernism but those stated are sufficient to show in essence what modernism is and its chief dangers.

### *III. The Problem of Modernism—What Shall We do About it?*

*The Dangers and Consequences of Modernism.* Although modernism has taken a back seat within the last twenty-five years and a new liberalism and neo-orthodoxy have somewhat taken its place, all three present serious dangers to New Testament Christianity. If one loses his faith in the Christ and the religion of the New Testament, he has lost all that is worth while. He is of all men most pitiable. It would be better that he had never been born. I saw a friend of mine, a former preacher in the church, whom

some of you know, cry like a baby after he had lost his faith, and was trying to regain it. There are others who were once in the church and have lost their faith. And there are many whose faith has been shaken and weakened.

Although all this is very serious, we cannot be obscurantists. We cannot bury our heads in the sand as ostriches. We are in the world. The standards of education are high and constantly being raised, especially for the ministry. No longer can a minister be so uninformed as one was some years ago who interpreted Martin Luther's appearing before the Diet of Worms as his being persecuted so much that he was forced to live on a diet of worms. Nor can a gospel minister have the attitude of another preacher, who when he was urged to study Greek, replied: "Me, study Greek? Why, English was good enough for Peter and Paul and it is good enough for me." As gospel preachers, we must be Biblical and prepare ourselves for the greatest work in all the world—the preaching of the glorious gospel of Christ. In that preparation we must become acquainted with all the issues of our day—particularly, the religious ones. The twelve apostles had three years of constant teaching and training under the world's greatest teacher—the Lord Jesus Christ, and were thus well prepared to preach and to meet the issues of their day. The great apostle Paul was one of the best trained and informed men of his day. He knew his Bible but he also knew the isms of his day—Judaism, Gnosticism, the Mystery Cults, *et cetera*. Paul was not only conversant with the issues of his day; he faced them. A few young gospel preachers have lost their faith in part because some senior gospel preachers have not met some of the issues of our day. Not only is modernism a current issue but there is denominationalism, premillennialism, the new liberalism, agnosticism, atheism, materialism, humanism, and neo-orthodoxy. Will gospel preachers be able to meet these issues today as Paul faced those of his day? The advocates of these schools of thought are well-trained, often graduates of theological seminaries and divinity schools. Will gospel preachers today and tomorrow be able to cope with them?

We need a taught, consecrated, and loyal membership, especially leadership in the churches of Christ, who can effectively teach and preach the word and be able to meet modernism and all isms. Our young people in the churches need to be well indoctrinated so they can withstand all error. When Dr. George L. Robinson, Old Testament scholar and Biblical archaeologist, was finishing Princeton Theological Seminary many years ago, in the days of Green and Warfield, he wanted to get his doctorate in Germany but feared he would lose his faith in God and the Bible in the modernist universities of Germany. He asked the advice of Green and Warfield, expressing his fear. They replied: "Why, George, when you finish Princeton you are so well indoctrinated you can study theology in hell." Our young people in the home, in the church, and in Harding College and other Christian colleges should be so thoroughly indoctrinated in their love for God, for Christ and his church, and in the teaching of the Bible, and have such an acquaintance with the isms of the day, that neither modernism nor anything else can lead them from the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. This is one of the greatest needs today in the home, in the church, and in Christian education.

CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF THE HOME  
IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

by  
*Harvey Scott*

In order for us to more correctly understand this lesson I feel that it will be necessary to know something of the changes in the world through the centuries that have affected the home.

We must also understand how these changes have complicated the problems which the home must face and solve if it is to function as ordained of God.

That the Christ makes some contribution to the solution of these problems of the home which without him would not be solved must be taken into consideration.

To the study of these changes which have affected these problems for the home and with the solution which the Christ has given to us in the gospel we now invite your attention.

*I. The Changes That Have Affected The Home.*

A careful study of the past with respect to the present in so far as the home is concerned will reveal some startling changes—conditions which man has not been prepared to meet. These changes have been so rapid and so radical as to all but sweep man off his feet and leave him floundering in his search for the solution.

When man was created and placed in the Garden of Eden, God said: "It is not good for man to be alone; I will make him an help meet for him" (Gen. 2:18). Woman was made as one worthy to stand by the side of man in all his

relations. Thus, the home was established in an ideal situation. But the Almighty placed one restriction upon these two in that they were not to eat of the "tree of knowledge of good and evil." A violation of this order brought a change which greatly affected this couple in that man must now hear the decree of God that "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." To the woman he said: "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee" (Gen. 3:16-19).

The sin of Adam and Eve has greatly affected the home, and has placed upon it some grave responsibilities as it has attempted to meet life's situations and keep it as God intended. The task has not been easy, nor has the path always been clear as man has traveled down the road of time. He has often found himself in the valley with a rough and rugged path up the mountain side as he attempted to climb back to the high plane intended for the home by the Lord.

The Industrial Revolution has changed the home from an economically independent group in the community to a single unit among the many. The home no longer has the dynamic force in regulating the life of the community; but, having lost its anchorage for those who constitute it, finds itself swept along with the tide and has lost much of its influence in its counsel with its members.

Through this industrial development time-saving inventions have been introduced into the home thereby giving its members extra time for which they have not yet learned to make wholesome use. This change has been more rapid than has been the development of the family for it. The home, therefore, finds itself without its balance staff, thus creating difficulties which our forefathers were not required to meet.

Inventions have saved so much of our time that we are faced with situations which were not seen in previous generations. These inventions include means of transportation, and the use of the radio and television. Thus, our present day realities are not those of yesterday, and this we must take

into consideration in order that we may know what these are that they may be met in a wholesome manner.

Thus, the major changes in history which have affected the home may be listed as follows:

1. *Political Changes*. In this we have the various forms of government which have been adopted by man from the rule of the father in the Garden of Eden to our own day as we see about us in the world the various systems of government which men have formed to govern themselves. These forms of government have affected the home in that they have placed certain responsibilities upon those who constitute the home, and at the same time they have given certain privileges to various members of the home that greatly affect its value and influence.

2. *Social Changes*. The life of the individuals in the home has been affected with respect to the regulations which have been placed upon its social life. The standing of the different members in the home has not been the same through the ages. Thus, we have changed from the absolute rule of the father to the lax supervision of the parents of our own time—a laxness which permits the children to be and to do as they please, forcing the parents often to regulate their lives in keeping with the wishes of the children.

3. *Industrial Changes*. In these the home has lost much of its influence in that it is not the center in the community, but often serves no more than a place to eat and sleep, yes, and often just a place to quarrel. The father, and often the mother, is found in industry outside the home while the children are left to those who care very little about the kind of character which is built within their lives. The home is thus affected and is no longer a great influence as a training ground for life in the building of character.

4. *Economic Changes*. Here we find the transfer of the home from a unit with the husband and father as the provider to a group wherein many of whom are working for gain, and who are rapidly becoming economically independent. Part of this training could be used to an advantage, but I fear that the change has been greater and more rapid than

has been our training for the new responsibilities which have been placed upon the home.

5. *Religious Changes.* These have been many through the centuries from the patriarchal type of religion to all the various forms which we find in the world of today. Some of these changes have been wrought by the Lord, while others have been brought about by man in his ecclesiastical councils and decrees.

In the midst of all of these changes the home has had to fight for its very existence, and in many of them it finds itself almost sinking beneath the waves. Many of the efforts to build a home have gone on the rocks and the two end up in the divorce court where they publicly declare that they desire no longer to make the effort to succeed. This is an admission of failure on their part to succeed in the establishment of the home as ordered of the Lord.

## *II. What Are The Problems Which These Changes Have Affected?*

This is an important question, one that cannot be treated lightly, but one which must be given our very best study and effort not only to understand the problems, but also to find the solution to those problems, and at the same time make an earnest effort to apply the solution that the home may be what God would have it.

In view of the changes which have taken place through the centuries that have greatly affected the home, I believe that we can list under three major headings all the problems of the home both for the present and the past. While these various changes have brought the home many influences which have made it more difficult for those in the home to meet and thus preserve the home as an institution ordained of God, and to carry out the mission which he had for it in the world, yet these three major problems which have been true through the centuries are still our problems of today.

1. *The Permanency of the Marriage Relationship.* God said in the foundation of the home that "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto

his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Gen. 2:24). Thus, God intended that marriage should be a union for life, and that separation is in violation of the arrangement of the Almighty.

Because of the hardness of the hearts of individuals through the ages, the Lord permitted them to put away their companions, but it was not well pleasing unto him who established the home as a permanent place of association of the two through life. Thus, the separation of the two individuals in divorce is a violation of the order of God, and cannot be followed without breaking up the home which he intended to be a unit. Read the story of Herod and the warning of John in Mark 6:14-29.

This problem has faced man and woman through the years—it faces them today, and it will face them tomorrow. It cannot be ignored without incurring the wrath of the Almighty, and those who ignore the law of God must pay the price both in time and in eternity. It is a problem which has been given entirely too little consideration; one which has been neglected too long from our pulpits as well as in the home. Many of us have not been preaching the whole truth on this question, because either we do not know it or we are afraid to declare it. It is either through ignorance or through fear. In either case we are not faithful teachers of the Word of the Lord. This is a problem presented in Christianity which we shall notice further as we study the problems of the home. (Read Ezra 10:1-44).

In this relationship of husband and wife we have the complement of the two. God in the beginning said that "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him." Man and woman were made for each other and not for themselves. They are incomplete without their mate, and even though they may live alone they will miss that which the Lord intended for them—that which cannot be obtained in any other relationship. God made us for each other, and that complement of each other should always be in our mind in the husband-wife relationship. God made us right, and our physical desires are not out of order.

We are in error when we attempt to satisfy them outside the realm ordered of the Lord. Many of these God-given desires can be satisfied in the marriage relationship and nowhere else.

2. *The Procreation of the Human Race.* In the beginning God said: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" (Gen. 1:28). The bringing of children into the world through this union of husband and wife is an order of the Lord, and any marriage without this as one of its major purposes is a violation of the order of God. It is not the only purpose, but it is one of the purposes which God placed upon this arrangement in his establishment of the home. The number of children that shall be born through this arrangement has not been ordered by the Lord, but that children are to be brought into the world, that the home may be what God would have it, has been definitely called for by the Almighty.

Through her deception and sin in the Garden, child-bearing has been made more painful for woman, yet the Lord told Eve that he would spare her in it. Because of her yielding to the influence of evil in her deception, woman was also placed under the rule of her husband and the Lord said that her desire would be for her husband. Today many women do not like this restriction, and they have rebelled against it.

3. *The Training of Children in the Statutes of the Lord.* This is an order of the Lord in all generations—an order that must not be ignored. Through all of the Bible history we find that where the father failed to bring up his children in the statutes of the Lord tragedy always followed. There is no exception to this rule even for today.

Concerning Abraham and his responsibility of bringing up his children in the ways of the Lord, God said: "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring unto Abraham that which he hath spoken of him" (Gen. 18:19).

To Israel the Lord said: "And these words, which I

command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shall talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up” (Deut. 6:1-7).

The stubborn and rebellious son who had refused the correction of his parents was ordered by the Lord to be stoned. (Deut. 21:18-21. )

Under Christianity, the apostle Paul told the saints that the fathers were to “bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and do not provoke them to anger” (Eph. 6:1-4). Children were commanded to “obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right.” This order today must not be disregarded.

There is a heavy responsibility placed upon the parents in the home with regard to this problem. Children must be trained in the right ways of life—the responsibility of this rests upon the parents of the home—a responsibility that cannot be escaped. They may arrange for others to assist them, but they cannot escape it.

These are the three major problems of the home, and the law of the Lord which is to govern the solution of them is for all generations. There are some additional admonitions under Christianity which we shall notice later. When these three problems have been met and solved under the order of the Lord all other relationships affecting the home will take care of themselves. The home has had these three major problems before it from the beginning and it will face them unto the end. We must accept them and face them as servants of the Lord.

### *III. The Contribution of Christ To The Solution of These Problems.*

The teaching of Jesus the Christ confirms the law of marriage which was given by God when he established the home in the Garden of Eden, for the home is neither Jewish nor is it a Christian institution. It is older than either one of them, and the law which is to govern the home in its sacred-

ness was given long before either the Law of Moses or the gospel of the Christ was given. Thus, the law governing the permanency of the marriage relationship, and the responsibility of parents with regard to their children, is a universal law—a law for all people for all time.

When Jesus was asked about putting away a companion, he said: “Have you not read that he who made from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this reason man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they two shall become one. So they are no longer two but one. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder” (Matt. 19:3-6).

But when asked for a reason for the permission of Moses to put away their companions, he said: “For the hardness of your hearts Moses allowed you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you: whosoever divorces his wife, but from the cause of adultery, and marries another, commits adultery.” (See Matt. 19:8, 9, The Revised Standard Version. Read Eph. 5:22-33. )

This is further confirmed in the record which Mark gives of the conversation between John and Herod in which Herod is told that “It is not lawful for you to have your brother's wife” (Mark 6:14-29). This is the application of the law under Judaism, for Herod was not a Christian. He was not permitted under God to marry this woman because she belonged to another man. Only in the case of death and the sin of adultery on the part of the other companion is one permitted to marry again. I fear that too many men today are living with women who belong to other men, and because of this they cannot be saved until they put them away as did Israel. (Ezra 10:1-44. )

This same teaching will be found recorded in Mark 10:2-12, and in Luke 16:16-18, without the exception however of the “implied conclusion” that the innocent person to a separation which has been caused by adultery on the part of the other may be free to marry again. Neither is this exception found in the teaching of the Holy Spirit through Paul as recorded in Romans 7:1-3, and in I Corinthians 7:39.

In these last two passages the Spirit of the Lord said that "a woman is bound by law to her husband as long as he lives; but if her husband dies she is discharged from the law of her husband. Accordingly, she will be called an adulteress if she lives with another man while her husband lives. But if her husband dies she is free from that law, and if she marries another man she is not an adulteress" (Rom. 7:2-3). And in I Corinthians 7:39, the apostle told the saints in Corinth that "a wife is bound to her husband as long as he lives. If the husband dies, she is free to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord." The Christian widow is not permitted to marry one who is not a Christian.

Thus, we see from the teaching of Jesus, and that of the Holy Spirit through the apostle Paul, that marriage is intended of the Lord to last until death—that it is a union for life and not a contract that can be entered into lightly and broken at will. This, we must remember and teach it to our children and to our children's children.

There is another exception to the law of God respecting marriage which is found in the teaching of Paul unto the church of God in Corinth. To them he said: "If a woman has a husband who is an unbeliever, and he desires to depart or separate, let it be so; in such a case the brother or sister is not bound, but God has called us to peace" (I Corinthians 7:15). Here we are told that the obligation which one sustains unto his Lord is stronger than that which is sustained unto a companion. If there must be a separation with either the companion or with the Lord then let it be with the companion and not with the Lord. But this would not permit another marriage—the person must remain single or be reconciled unto his companion. (See verse 11.)

Further in this seventh chapter of first Corinthians the apostle neither discourages nor does he forbid marriage. He tells these Christians that under the present circumstances they will assume heavy obligations if they marry—obligations which might tempt them to leave their Lord in order to remain with their companion. The apostle does not want this, therefore he tells them that in the face of their present

persecutions it might be better for them not to marry, and to remain single that they might give their all to the Lord. He does not tell them this because it is sinful to marry, but that it would be sinful to marry and then desert their Lord for their companion. Let us be sure therefore that in our marriage we establish the home as God would have it, and not interfere with our relationship with our Lord.

Thus, we see that all people are not free to marry when and whom they please. This teaching of our Lord we must remember, and conform our lives to it or we cannot be Christians. We cannot disregard it and escape the wrath of the Almighty. We must also remember that the law of God governing the marriage relationship is universal and that individuals who are Christians must conform to it or suffer the consequences regardless of what the laws of the land may say. Man cannot make laws to regulate the home in opposition to the laws given by God. The home is a divine institution and its laws were given in the beginning.

The teaching of the Christ in the solution of the problem of parents in teaching their children the statutes of the Lord may be studied under two headings; namely,

1. Jesus affirms the order of the Lord from the beginning in that parents are to teach their sons and their sons the way of the Lord. This was God's order to Abraham, to the Israelites, and it is his order for all parents of today whether they be Christians or not. We must remember that the law of the home is neither the Law of Moses nor is it the gospel of the Christ. Both of these contain special instructions unto parents, but it has been the order of God in all generations for all parents that they must assume the responsibility of teaching their children the way of the Lord and have them walk therein. This law is universal—it applies unto all generations.

Concerning this, the Spirit of the Lord through Paul said: "Parents or fathers bring up your children in the nurture and the admonition of the Lord" (Eph. 6:4). We, as parents, cannot escape this responsibility. We may call upon the schools to help us train our children for citizenship, and

we should. But what help will we obtain in training them for citizenship for heaven? This responsibility must be accepted or the Lord will hold us to the strict account. What answer will many parents in the judgment give unto the Lord for not training their children in the ways of the Lord? We preachers may be responsible for not teaching parents this responsibility.

2. Jesus, in the gospel which he gave, has directed that parents build into their own lives the Christ-like personality and then in turn build it into the lives of their children. I mean by personality, "the sum total of all our attitudes and reactions to life's experiences." The Christ-like personality is the building into our lives and in turn into the lives of our children the attitude toward persons and things which we find in the life of our Lord and in what he taught. That is, we cannot hate people, we only hate things. We must have the same attitude toward the world, toward people, and toward God and his word that we find in the life of Jesus and in what he taught in the gospel which he gave.

We must also react to all of life's experiences as did Jesus in all that he did and in what he taught. This we must do, that the Christ-like personality may be developed within our lives and then in the lives of our children as we "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." But in all of this we must remember that we react to all of life's experiences in keeping with what we are when we meet them. They neither make us, wreck us, nor break us; it all depends upon what we do with them.

This last point we see demonstrated in the lives of Judas and Peter. The crime of one of these men is just as great as that of the other, but their reactions to their experiences are not the same. When Judas saw what he had done, he went out and hanged himself; but when Peter saw his mistake he went out and cried out his heart unto his Lord—he made it right. The difference is in the two men who met these experiences. So it is with all of us. We must learn to react to all of our experiences in a wholesome manner, and if our children fail to do this in life, we may be held responsible

for not teaching them the ways of the Lord and for not building into them the Christ-like personality. The Sermon on the Mount and Peter's seven Christian graces will be of much help in your better understanding of what you are to do.

Parents seem to think that they have no responsibility here. Entirely too few members of the church of our Lord ever make any plans for the training of their children under Christian influence either in high school or in college. They seem to think that their children are immune to the influence of evil, and give it no consideration until their children have lost their faith in the Bible as the authoritative word of God and are no longer interested in the Church and its work. They then become alarmed and want the preacher to do something about it. He has already preached his heart out to them in an effort to get them interested in sending their children to some school where the Bible is the daily text book, and where their children will have for their associates boys and girls who are Christians, and where they will be taught daily by those who are giving their lives for Christianity. The tragedy of all this is that parents wait too late to do something—they should begin this training in childhood and continue until their children are ready for college so that they will think of nothing else than of attending a school where they can continue the development of a Christ-like personality.

Many times the Christ is not the ruling influence in the home, either in our daily association with other members of that home, or as the counselor in our planning for life. We forget that he should be the silent listener to every conversation in our home, and that he should be our assistant in all of our planning, not just for ourselves but also for the future of our children. Then, and only then, will we permit the Christ to make his contribution toward the solution of our problems in the home.

## Chapter 8

---

### CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF ORPHANS AND OTHER DEPENDENTS IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

*by*  
*G. C. Brewer*

#### *EXORDIUM*

Every subject announced on the program of this 1951 Harding College Lectureship begins with the word *Christ*. Dr. Benson and the other members of the program committee evidently want all those who hear or read these lectures to understand that we—Harding College and its selected speakers—desire to do all that we do “in word or in deed in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Col. 3:17). That means that we look to him for authority in all matters of faith or practice, of teaching or of living. We honor his name, promote his cause and glorify the Father who sent him when we teach as he taught and live as he lived, to the best of our ability. We do not for a moment delude ourselves by thinking that preaching the gospel and obeying its precepts can be accomplished by merely announcing the historic facts concerning Christ and by a ceremonial avowal of these facts by those who hear them announced. Christianity is not a creed, though it is based upon facts that must be believed. It consists not in commands and duties, though it contains commands that must be obeyed and duties that must be performed. Christianity is not a philosophy of life, though its teaching concerning life and death, time and eternity dispels the darkness that shrouds the earth and which no philosopher has ever been able to penetrate. It is not sociology, though an application of its principles would solve all the social problems of any age of time.

Christianity consists of living, active, formative and transforming principles. The Gospel carries a power divine by which the soul is reborn. The regenerated soul possesses the nature and manifests the disposition of the Holy Father of whom he is an off-spring. The will of his Father he will do and the character of Him by whom he has been created in Christ Jesus he exhibits. He is God's workmanship; a product of God's divine wisdom and an exemplification of the regenerative power of the Holy Spirit in the word of God. The God-likeness of the child of God is seen in his attitude toward his sinning and suffering fellow men. As God has loved him he loves his neighbor. As God has helped him he extends his hand to his burdened brother. As God has had compassion on him he shows sympathy for his suffering fellows. As God has saved him he shouts the glad tidings of salvation to the lost of all nations. Of a truth and without slang his desire is to "tell the world."

The child of God does all this not from a sense of duty but from an instinct divine. Not from a motive of obeying commands or fulfilling requirements but as an expression of an inner urge. He thinks not of legal enactments and of ecclesiastical authority but acts upon the sympathy of his soul and from the divine nature that controls his being. It is God that worketh in him both to will and to do of his own good pleasure (Phil. 2:13). He does not keep books with God and plan to put in his claim and demand his reward at the last day, but in self-forgetfulness and with a view to meeting the immediate need and relieving the suffering of even "these least" he entertains angels unawares and comforts the very Prince of Life before whose Majesty he will exclaim in astonished joy: "Lord when did I these things?" (Matt. 25).

It is because the Christ-saved, spirit-born son of God acts upon this principle and works in this manner that we have announced *Christ* as the theme of this lectureship, and related every problem of Christian service to *Christ*. If we know Christ and if we are known by Christ we will do all things without murmuring and questioning that we may be

the children of God, blameless and harmless and without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation (Phil. 2:14-16).

The instincts of a true Christian revolt at the Pharisaism of our day as Christ held in contempt the Pharisees of his day. The Pharisees who were utterly indifferent to a man who lay helpless and suffering in their sight for thirty-eight years but who were ready to take violent action against him who showed miraculous mercy, because he commanded the man now made strong to take his bed in off the street on the Sabbath day! The Pharisees who gave a tenth even of their garden herbs but showed no mercy to the suffering, cared nothing for *justice* in their decisions and had no real *faith* in God. The Pharisees of any age are the antipodes of the real servants of God. In Christ's day they would strain out a gnat and swallow a camel. In our day they will boil out a microbe and swallow a menagerie! If, therefore, we could turn all our own people into Christians, the remaining part of this lecture would not be needed. Especially, if we could convert all our preachers and papers we would not have to engage in the distasteful work of exposing Pharisaism.

\* \* \*

### I. "Whatsoever He Saith Unto You, Do It" (John 2:5)

We recognize Christ's authority as supreme and any word from him is a sufficient warrant for anything we wish to do. Any principle that is involved in either his precepts or his example is claimed by us as a basis of faith and life. If our attitude is in accord with his attitude or if our behavior is consonant with the pattern of his life we are true Christians, our service will be acceptable to him and we should not be disturbed by the casuistry of our Pharisees.

We recognize Christ as the one through whom God speaks to the world in this age (Heb. 1:1-14; 2:1-4). He is the head of the Church (Eph. 1:21-22; 5:22; Col. 1:18). He

is the One mediator between God and man (I Tim. 2:5). He is the mediator of the New Covenant (Heb. 9:15; 12:23). He now has all authority in heaven and on earth and we are to observe all things he has commanded even unto the end of the world (Matt. 28:16-20). Some things he had not commanded while he was upon earth were to be revealed to the apostles by the Holy Spirit, for the Holy Spirit was to take of the things of Christ and show them unto the apostles. They in turn, taught them to us (John 16:12-14; II Tim. 2:2). Therefore whatever he commanded the apostles to do applies to us and whatever they wrote as commands or admonitions for us is included in his will concerning us. We are free, therefore, to search the entire New Testament in our effort to find Christ's solution of the problem of the poor.

*II. "The Righteousness of the Law Is Fulfilled in Us"*

*(Rom. 8:4)*

Christ has abolished the law as a system of salvation and has provided a righteousness for us which is "apart from the law" (Rom. 3:21; Acts 15:11; 26:22; Heb. 11:4; I Pet. 1:10). So that our righteousness—our right acts—does not form a basis upon which we are saved. Yet we cannot be saved unless we do righteousness (I John 2:29; 3:7, 10; Acts 22:14; Rom. 2:13). This is not because our deeds merit salvation, but because they manifest the faith by which we are saved and kept saved (James 2). Christ did not abolish the moral and social principles of the law and many of the things we are to do as Christians were also enjoined on the people of the Old Testament. This is especially true in reference to what we are to do for the poor and for widows and fatherless children. A few quotations will give us an impressive lesson on this point. Job's earnest defense of his character and of his own attitude toward the poor and the needy shows clearly what was then required and expected of a man who would be approved of God and of God's servants.

Hear Job:

"If I have withheld the poor from their desire,  
Or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail;

Or have eaten my morsel myself alone,  
And the fatherless hath not eaten thereof—  
And if I have seen any perish for want of clothing,  
Or that the needy had no covering;  
If his loins have not blessed me,  
And if he were not warmed with the fleece of my sheep;  
If I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless,  
Because I saw my help in the gate:  
Then let mine arm fall from my shoulder blade,  
And mine arm be broken from the bone.”

(Job 31:16-22)

When Christ told us that the poor would always be with us he was simply repeating what Moses had told the people in the long ages before Christ came. And Moses also told us what to do about it. Hear him: “For the poor shall never cease out of the land: therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land” (Deut. 15:11). Job tells wherein the wicked were wicked: “They drive away the ass of the fatherless, they take the widow's ox for a pledge. They turn the needy out of the way: the poor of the earth hide themselves together. Behold, as wild asses in the desert, go they forth to their work; rising betimes for a prey: the wilderness yieldeth food for them and for their children. They reap every one his corn in the field: and they gather the vintage of the wicked. They cause the naked to lodge without clothing, that they have no covering in the cold. They are wet with the showers of the mountains, and embrace the rock for want of a shelter. They pluck the fatherless from the breast, and take a pledge of the poor. They cause him to go naked without clothing, and they take away the sheaf from the hungry:” (Job. 24:3-10).

Jehovah himself is represented as the helper of the fatherless (Ps. 10:14); as the father of the fatherless and as the judge of widows (Ps. 68:5). “The Lord preserveth the stranger; he relieveth the fatherless and widow; but the way of the wicked he turneth upside down” (Ps. 146:9). Christ certainly did not abolish the nature and character of God.

He is still, therefore, the Father of the fatherless and the judge of widows.

The great prophet Isaiah called upon the sinful sons of Israel to “cease to do evil” and to “learn to do well” and in doing well he specified these things: “seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow” (Isa. 1:16-17).

The solicitude for, the provision concerning and the pleadings in behalf of the fatherless and the widows run like a refrain through the entire Old Testament.

*III. Christ Came Down From Heaven Not to Do His Own Will But the Will of the Father Who Sent Him.  
(John 6:38; 4:34)*

Our Lord repeatedly told us that he was sent from heaven to the earth by the Father and that his message was not his own but that the Father had given him the words that he spoke. He also declared “It is my meat to do the will of Him that sent me, and to accomplish his work” (John 4:34). We might ask now, what was the will of the Father that Christ came to do and what was the work that he wished to accomplish? The average Bible student would reply, “It was to die for our sins and come forth from the tomb for our justification” (Rom. 4:25; I Cor. 15:1-4). That of course is correct. Without the death and resurrection of Christ we would have no hope. But before he died for men he first lived among men, and we are saved by his *life* as well as by his death (Rom. 5:10). He revealed the Father and manifested the Father's nature the same as he declared the Father's will (John 14:10-12). He was “the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance” (Heb. 1:3). Christ relied upon his works to prove his claim (Matt. 11:2-6; John 5:36). And these very works that proved that he was divine were the works that the Father had sent him to “finish” or to “accomplish” and Jesus so declares.

We are accustomed to think of these works as miracles, and they included miracles certainly, but they did not consist wholly in miracles. The climax of the evidence that he

brought to the attention of John the Baptist was that “the poor have the gospel preached unto them.” When he refused to eat the food which the apostles offered him saying “I have meat to eat that ye know not” he was so engaged in teaching the will of the Lord to a poor sinful Samaritan woman that he forgot his personal needs. And this was the work that the Father had sent him to do, and to accomplish this was his meat and his drink, his breath and his life. Peter declares that he “went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil” (Acts 10:38). For this reason the common people heard him gladly and publicans and sinners came unto him because they saw in him a sympathetic friend and a willing helper: One in whom they found healing and hope. Our Lord claimed and fulfilled the prophecies which said:

“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,  
Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the  
poor:

He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,  
And recovering of sight to the blind,  
To set at liberty them that are bruised,  
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord”

(Isa. 61:1; Luke 4:18)

“The people that sat in darkness saw a great light,  
And to them that sat in the region and shadow of death,  
To them did light spring up.” (Isa. 9:1-2; Matt. 4:16).

#### *IV. We Fulfill the Law of Christ When We Bear One Another's Burdens (Gal. 6:2).*

When we study either the life or the teachings of Christ we will reach this conclusion independent of Paul's statement that we fulfill or fill full the law of Christ in bearing one another's burdens. The apostle then confirms our conclusion. The apostle James emphasizes that our faith is fruitless and dead unless it expresses itself in action, and he specifies the acts that we as Christians are to perform in order to make our faith profitable: we must supply the needs of those who are naked and hungry. And as Paul summed

up the law of Christ in one sentence James gives us an epitome of the social aspects of true religion in one statement: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." (Jas. 1:27)

How any one who has any acquaintance at all with the word of God can convince himself that the law of Christ and the religion recognized of God consists in or can be proclaimed by the mere doctrinal declaration a creedal contention is more than some of us can understand. Especially we can not see how honest men can nullify the whole teaching of God's word by caviling about methods of execution; quibbling about the incidentals of operation. It is inexplicable that they can make brethren content to do nothing and let the commandments of the Lord go by default because of the criticisms of casuists about "*how*" we are to carry out the will of God. Such Pharisaic caviling and caterwauling make void the word of God, make a mockery of Christianity, divide churches, destroy fellowship and stab love dead at our feet.

*V. Christ Did Not Command Us to Build And Operate  
Orphan Homes, Say the Cavilers.*

Sober minded men should be able to see that this is a quibble and your speaker feels like apologizing to the audience for answering it, but we do know that some good brethren are being confused and misled by this quibbling and it is the purpose of this lecture to clarify the matter for them. They should remember that we have been answering and refuting this type of false reasoning from other sources and on other points for a century with the common sense observation that *the command to do a thing includes the means necessary for the doing of that thing*; the authority for a practice is also authority for the means and the method—any convenient or successful method—of the practice. Christ did not tell us to ride on trains, in automobiles or on airplanes, but he told us to "go," and the authority for "going" is the authority for the means and the method of going. Christ did not tell us to build meeting houses, but he

does tell us to *meet*, and the command to meet and to worship includes the place of meeting and the convenience for worshipping. Christ never intimated that there would ever be a radio, a wire-recorder, a televising machine, or even a printing press. But the Lord docs tell us to "*preach the word,*"

and we all agree—even the casuists confess—that the command includes and supplies authority for the use of all these inventions and methods in preaching the word. Even the most squint-eyed scribes of our times are prolific users of the printing press. They also establish publishing houses, organize companies and incorporate them for the purpose of "preaching the word"—*the very thing God ordained for the Church to do!* Yet they claim that these means, these methods and these organizations or *institutions* are *scriptural and right!* We agree that they are and we contend that orphan homes are scriptural and right for the same reason and on the same basis or principle.

*VI. But An Orphan Home Is an Institution Separate and Apart from the Church, Wail the Caterwaulers!*

Certainly, an orphan home is not *the Church*, or even *a church*, if we are considering only the organizational aspect. (Those who operate the home and many of those who live in the home being members of the body of Christ compose a church. Without question, they do). Any effort to make *a home*—any home, *as an institution, a church* or even *part of a church* is vain and hypocritical. Your publishing house is an institution separate and apart from the Church also! But it is not unscriptural because it does *not displace the Church and act in lieu of the Church!* It is merely a method of doing the thing commanded: *it is a means* or an instrument in the hands of the Church, (that is, of Church members; *the Church* itself is not an *institution* or an *organization* in any denominational sense), for the doing of the will of the Lord. This is precisely true of an orphan home or an old people's home. But the homes for children and for the aged take the place of the Church the critics contend! One moment's reflection would refute that quibble. *A home*

for the *homeless* takes the place of the *home* of which they are “less” or lacking. That which takes the place of a *home* does not take the place of the Church. The *home* and the *Church* are institutions separate and apart from each other, yet they exist side by side and are both scriptural, even though they do overlap in their respective functions. Under normal, scriptural conditions children will have a home and parents to care for their needs and to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Aged people will have a home and children and grandchildren to care for their needs, to comfort their failing bodies and to smooth the way down to the tomb. But when normal conditions do not exist, when children do not have a home and parents; when aged people do not have children or a home, then we—all Christians—have an opportunity of exhibiting the character of our Father and practicing the teaching of our Savior. And if we are beguiled by the Pharisaism of cranks and critics and fail to care for these homeless and dependent ones we disgrace our profession, betray our Savior and forfeit our right to claim his salvation! He will say to us, “Inasmuch as ye did it not”! Ah, my brethren, this is serious.

*VII. But An Orphan Home I Parallel to the Missionary Society, Fulminate the Factionists.*

Yes, and that fallacious and false fulmination scares the sanity out of conscientious but unthinking brethren. We saw in the consideration of another point that a home for the homeless is just a *home*; it takes the place of the home of which the children and the aged have been deprived. Now is the missionary *society*—notice that word *society*—parallel to a *home*—*your home*? If it is, then it is scriptural and we should all line up with the *United Christian Missionary Society* at once! If it is not parallel to a *home*, then it is not parallel to the *home* that is supplied for the *homeless* and this bogey should no longer frighten the innocents.

Furthermore, if an orphan home is precisely parallel to the Missionary Society then those who operate these homes and all of us who co-operate with these homes must be

treated exactly as we treat those who are affiliated with the Missionary Societies; we must be disfellowshipped. How can you escape from that conclusion? Yet those who are contending for this “deadly parallel” send up a vehement protest and a lugubrious wail when we call them *factionists*, charge that they are making the orphan home issue a test of fellowship and seeking to divide the Churches! They are so confused and lost they do not know which direction is straight up!

The Missionary Society *is a society*—an association of churches; a combination of congregations! The society thus formed has governing officials who choose for and act for and direct the congregations in all missionary endeavors. They also assess the congregations and exact from them their assigned quota. This society as an *institution* with *resources* and appropriative and legislative function builds and supports orphan homes and Missionary Menages. How can a *home* be parallel to that which builds, operates and controls homes—dozens of them? You would as well say that a state school or state asylum is parallel to the State. Or that an orphanage owned by the Catholic Church is parallel to the Catholic Church!

A *home* is parallel to a *home*; and a *home* for the *homeless* takes the place of the home which these unfortunates do not have.

Yes, my brethren, *Christ* is the answer. If we will let the Sun of Righteousness fill our souls with light all this quibbling and quarrelling, doubting and disfellowshipping will slink away like creatures of darkness before the glory of the morning.

## Chapter 9

---

### CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE INDUSTRIAL WORLD

*By*  
*Dr. F. W. Mattox*

There is today no more applicable consideration than the theme of this lecture series. Applying the principles of Christianity to practical problems is the number one need of the hour.

This particular problem, "Christ and the Problem of Human Relations in the Industrial World," of necessity plays an important role in the solution of the problems that are facing America. The United States is more and more becoming an industrial nation. Whereas throughout the history of this country, more than eighty percent of the nation has been rural; now more than eighty percent of the population have their livelihood from the many industrial phases of our industrial economy. The most pressing problems facing this great nation can be solved only in this industrial setting.

It is generally understood that the technical problems of industry through scientific developments are being well handled. Industry is becoming more and more efficient, the number and diversity of products are increasing continually, and more and more of our population is being drawn into this industrial endeavor. Accordingly, the industrial future of the United States is limited only by its human relations problems and to the extent that these problems are solved, industry will become more effective and its usefulness to humanity increased.

The problems of human relations in industry all stem

from what might be called the depravity of man. Greed, the love of money, the desire for power, etc., are conditions out of which these problems grow. It is not that man is born into the world depraved, but the fact that sin is so prevalent on the earth and as R. L. Whiteside expressed it on one occasion, "Sin is catching; it is worse than the measles." Accordingly, people in this sinful world become contaminated with the weaknesses of humanity to such an extent that they constitute the gravest problems to themselves as well as to their fellow man. Industrial leaders have come to recognize these problems and are trying courageously to cope with them. This is easily seen by consideration of the increase in industrial counselors and psychologists.

It is now nothing uncommon for big industry to have a staff of completely trained personnel workers to give their entire time to such problems. There have also been set up programs of safety, health, recreation, etc., which tend to alleviate the human relations problems. Plants also have inaugurated programs of insurance of all types and have even installed dentists, doctors with X-Ray equipment, nurses, and competent medical clinics as a regular part of their industrial establishments. Also, profit-sharing plans and increased pensions for old age are all attempts to improve the human relations problems. Although these developments are commendable, they cannot be expected to reach the heart—which is the seat of the trouble.

In approaching this problem from the viewpoint of the contributions of Christianity, we will note first that there is an idea in the world that Christianity does not deal with such problems. Some have thought that Christianity dealt only with man's relationship to God and that it was too individualistic to apply to our industrial world. Others who have taken the materialistic point of view, such as Karl Pollanyi, the Austrian economist, claim that Christianity has no over-all plan for society and this is called one of the blind spots of Christianity.

May it be said in the very beginning, however, that there is no area of human relations which is not covered

by two fundamental Christian concepts. These concepts are found in the statement of Christ that man is to love God with all of his heart, mind, soul, and strength, and that he is to love his neighbor as himself.

These two viewpoints, looking at man in his relationship to God and in his relationship to his fellow man, cover all of the relationships that can be involved in human existence. The golden rule which states the principle that we should treat others as we would desire them to treat us, also is an all-inclusive solution to the problem of human relations. There are other passages of scripture that deal specifically with the Christian teaching on human relations. The essence of this teaching could be found in the following passages:

“Servants, be obedient unto them that according to the flesh are your masters, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not in the way of eye service, as men-pleasers; but as servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as unto the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that whatsoever good thing each one doeth, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And, ye masters, do the same things unto them and forbear threatening; knowing that he who is both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no respect of persons with him.”

(Eph. 6:5-9)

“And we exhort you, brethren, admonish the disorderly, encourage the fainthearted, support the weak, be longsuffering toward all. See that none render unto any one evil for evil; but always follow after that which is good, one toward another, and toward all.”

(I Thes. 5:14)

“Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which they received of

us. For yourselves know how ye ought to imitate us; for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; neither did we eat bread for nought at any man's hand, but in labor and travail, working day and night, that we might not burden any of you; not because we have not the right, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you, that ye should imitate us. For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, if any will not work, neither let him eat. For we hear of some that walk among you disorderly, that work not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread. But ye, brethren, be not weary in well-doing. And if any man obeyeth not our Lord by this epistle, note that man, that ye have no company with him to the end that he may be ashamed.

(II Thes. 3:6-14)

“But godliness with contentment is great gain; for we brought nothing into the world, for neither can we carry anything out; but having food and covering we shall be therewith content. But they that are minded to be rich fall into a temptation and a snare and many foolish and hurtful lusts, such as drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil: which some reaching after have been led astray from the faith, and have pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

(I Tim. 6:6-10)

“Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters, according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord.”

(Col. 3:22)

It is not sufficient, however, to quote such passages and say that here is the solution to the problem. What we need

is to point out definite principles that apply both to management and to labor. In order to do this, first let us state some of the underlying truths of Christianity that point up these applications.

First, both management and labor (every human being) should live with a consciousness that God is present in all that we do. This means that all we do should be unto God and for the glory of God. In our service, we are not to serve as men-pleasers with eye service but whatsoever we do is to be done as unto the Lord.

The second underlying truth is that there are eternal consequences for life's decisions. In the great judgment scene (Matthew 25), the basis of judgment was not whether individuals had believed certain dogmas or had complied with certain theological requirements but the judgment is based on man's treatment of man. Jesus said, "Inasmuch as ye do it to the least of one of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me." This principle of eternal consequences will cause every human being to treat his fellow man as he himself would want to be treated.

The third underlying truth is the principle of stewardship. Each human being is a steward of the manifold grace of God, both in regard to possessions and in regard to abilities, and accordingly, possessions should be used with the recognition that we must give an account of our stewardship. Likewise, human abilities must be used with the recognition that we must give an account of the way we use our mental power and physical strength.

Next, we come to specific principles of Christianity that apply to both management and labor in human relations. The first principle is truth. This should be obvious to all preliminary considerations that the great need of human relations is for man to deal with his fellow man in truth. The apostle Paul says, "Lie not one to another, seeing we have put off the old man with his doings." Furthermore, he says, "Let each one speak truth with his neighbor." A lack of honest dealing has been an underlying cause for lack of harmony in human relations.

A second specific principle is love. The scriptures reveal that any man who says that he loves God and hates his neighbor is a liar for we cannot love God without loving our fellow man, also. It would be impossible to truly love God without practicing the principle of the Golden Rule. In First Corinthians, 13, the Apostle Paul says that love "suffereth long and is kind; seeketh not its own, is not puffed up; taketh no account of evil." These principles, when applied to human relations make it impossible for unkindness or selfishness to dominate a person's life. Accordingly, if the principles of truth and love could be applied to industry, we would witness a very smooth operation of human relations. There would be fair dealings, understanding, and sympathy characterizing all that is undertaken by all parties.

Now becoming more specific, we call attention to Christian concepts that apply to management alone. For management to apply Christianity to the affairs of a business, specific instances would immediately come to mind in regard to the payment of wages. The first principle is the application of justice. In James 5:1-5, James talks about management who keeps back wages by fraud. Christianity would require that in every case, management be entirely just and fair in the payment of wages.

Charles Sheldon in his notable book called *IN HIS STEPS*, in a very interesting way, gives the story of an industrialist who was trying to put into actual practice the teaching of Christ. There is continually throughout this treatise, the question asked, "What would Christ do if he were making this decision?" With this in mind, let us picture an industrialist with a plant which hires one hundred workers.

What would the manager of this plant be thinking if he were continually putting Christian principles into his human relations problem? First, he would say, "This plant with all of its machinery and possibilities, has been entrusted into my hands as a steward. As a good steward of Christ, I must manage this plant in an economical, business-like way. There are one hundred workers in my employ; one

hundred families, therefore, looking to me for sustenance. I must manage this plant in such a way that there will be sufficient profit to pay wages regularly, at a living scale, and provide as many essentials and luxuries of life as possible for these one hundred families. To do so, I must look to their future and plan for the replacement of machinery so that if a man's machine wears out, he will not be forced out of work, but his machine can be replaced and his job continued. I must also make the business so profitable that there can be a replacement of the entire plant, carrying necessary insurance, and having a backlog of profit that will successfully carry through periods of depression or of increased competition. I also must be able to take into consideration the sons of these families who will be calling for employment. This will require a backlog of venture capital for plant enlargement and expansion even into new products and new services. Not only must I make this a paying business for my employee's sake, but there must also be a fair return to the many stockholders who have invested their savings to make this venture possible. There are widows with children who look to the stock left by their husbands for their sole support. For me to ignore their investment or manage so poorly there will be no dividend is ignoring justice and is un-Christian." These are thoughts that must go through the mind of the Christian industrial manager. It can be Christian only so long as such manager is providing for the welfare and security of the business for the sake of all concerned, making possible continuous employment at high wages under good working conditions.

In dealing with the specific cases, each Christian manager must realize that he also has a Master in heaven who will deal with him on the same basis that he deals with his employees.

Next, let's turn to a view of Christian concepts for Christian employees. The first principle that should be noticed is that labor is honorable before God. In the very beginning, God has said, "Six days shalt thou labor." To work with our hands is right and proper and all labor is

honorable that is for productive purposes. God further said, "by the sweat of your face shall ye eat bread," and considering this principle, man should realize that the more he sweats, the more he will have to eat. It is also stated, "He who will not work, neither shall he eat."

Excluding the principle of charity, it is a well established Christian principle that no individual shall receive more than he actually earns. There is an idea in our generation that we can get more through less work. It is an eternal principle that production is the only source of wealth and that a person cannot justly receive something that he does not produce.

In the second place, labor should recognize the principle laid down in the 20th chapter of Matthew when Jesus gives the parable of the laborers in the vineyard that each laborer should have respect for his word and for his contract. In this parable, laborers went into the vineyard to work early in the morning and agreed to work for a penny a day. In the reckoning that afternoon, some who had worked only one hour received the same wage that others received for working all day, and when they complained, Jesus stated that they had agreed to work for a penny a day and accordingly, should respect that contract.

This parable also sets forth the principle of the right of private ownership of property. The vineyard belonged to the owner in the sense that it was his private property. He had the right to do with it as he pleased. It is set forth in the parable that the master could give one who worked only one hour as much as the one who worked all day, if that should be his desire.

A third concept for employees is that we must respect the property of another. There is no sin among men that is more strongly condemned than the sin of stealing. Stealing either goods or time is the same offense. An employee working for another should respect his property and as a good steward, use that property according to the owner's desire. Also, when an employee takes a job, he sells his time, he must not steal the time that he has sold to his employer. In

the same way he sells his energy and ability. Accordingly, to shirk his work is to act contrary to Christian principles.

Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5) agreed between themselves to sell their property and hold back a part of the price and give part to the apostles while claiming that it was the whole. In condemning this act, Peter, by inspiration, makes the statement that as long as the property was theirs, it was completely under their control. After they sold their property, they were under no obligation to give the whole of it but could have given only the part they desired. Their condemnation was not because they did not give it all but because they lied about the part that they did give.

The fourth principle that would apply to employees is the Christian concept that we are not to resist him that is evil. If we are working for an employer and conditions are unfavorable, we have no right to retaliate or to destroy any of the property of another because of wrong done unto us. As Christians, we have the right to quit his employ and even go into competition with him but not to destroy his property.

Going back to the description of the Christian manager applying Christian principles to his case, let us now look at the Christian employee. If for instance, the employee receives \$1.00 per hour for his work he must say to himself, "Since I receive \$1.00 a hour for my services, I must produce enough during that one hour that it will be just for me to receive the \$1.00 back in reward. In order to do so, I must produce enough to earn the dollar, but more than this, I must produce enough to pay for the machine I am wearing out, to take care of the insurance necessary on the plant and its equipment. I must also produce enough to take care of advertising expenses, to have a backlog for plant expansion and improvement, to carry on investigation for improvement and experimentation for new products. In other words, I must produce in my time sufficiently to make this a paying business and if I do not do my part to make it a paying business through my production, I do not deserve the recompense that is given to me." These are Christian concepts that will

make for happy human relations in industry.

Jesus pictures definitely that the servant has an obligation to his master and whether this was a hired servant, or whether it was a slave, the principle is still the same. Immediately, upon application of these principles to a Christian in modern industry, the question is raised as to a Christian taking part in labor union activities. In a solution to this problem, there is nothing stated in these principles that would prohibit a Christian from taking part in union activity as long as these principles themselves are not violated. There are labor unions that have been of real assistance to management and to the development of many industries, as well as bringing many advantages to the employees. These advantages have been gained both to the employee and to management without strikes and violence. I want to state however, very emphatically, that it is my personal conviction that under no circumstances, could Christians take part in violence against a company, either by forming picket lines that would prohibit the company from carrying on business or in destroying company property of any kind. Violence is in opposition to every Christian concept.

It is my recommendation to Christians who are working under adverse conditions that they reconsider their relationship to God, their stewardship, their Christian principles, and make these great principles the guiding light of their lives. This will deter one from seeking to satisfy self at the expense of another.

In conclusion, it must be understood that these Christian principles must be made a part of actual conduct. There are many people who profess Christianity who fail to make Christian application to their own lives. This is evidenced even among preachers and editors of religious papers who professing the highest principles of Christianity, are unable to apply these Christian principles to their relations with other preachers, and other editors. Is it any wonder, then, that if the spiritual leaders themselves fail to make application that there would be difficulty in human relations in industry where human nature is struggling for its very

existence?

If modern society, with its scientific know-how, would work seriously to make Christian applications to its social and economic problems, we would experience the dawn of a new day in which standards of living and human satisfaction would reach levels undreamed of in past generations. The challenge is to you to apply Christianity where you are today.

## Chapter 10

---

### CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

*by*

*Dr. James D. Bales*

The scope of my topic is being enlarged somewhat so as to include the problem of whether or not the free enterprise system is in harmony with scriptural principles. For if it is not right to own property, and thus to dispose of it according to one's own judgment, the free enterprise system is impossible. If there is the right of the private ownership of property the free enterprise system naturally follows.

It is maintained by some religious leaders that private property and the free enterprise system are utterly out of harmony with the Scriptures. They maintain that the land and the tools of production ought to be controlled and operated by the government for the good of all the people. Instead of the predominant emphasis or force in production and distribution having its origin with the individual, they believe that it ought to come from the State. Instead of the individual having the freedom to work where he can and chooses, to own property, and to buy and sell as he sees fit, they believe that all ought to be under the centralized control and oversight of the government.

The individuals who maintain that we ought to have such a "planned society" do not deal with two very fundamental problems which, since their system will not solve the problems but aggravate them, will wreck their system and hurt the very people whom they want to help. First, they do not show how that the transfer of power from the hands of the many to the hands of the few will work such

an intellectual revolution in the few that they will have sufficient intelligence and information to rightly administer all things for the good of all.

Second, the mere transfer of property and means of production from the control of the many to the control of the few will not work a moral revolution in the few so that they will not exploit the people. It is not shown why that a few men, who will have no competitors and against whose decision there is no appeal, will work more for the good of the community than the system wherein the means of production are owned by many men, and against whose decisions, when unjust, there is a court of appeal today.

The purpose of this speech is not to defend all that every individual in our system has done. I do not defend all that some have professed to do in the name of Christ, for there are some who have not understood and there are some who have not cared.

My purpose is not to maintain that Christianity cannot exist under any system other than the system of private enterprise. The Christian faith was born when a dictator was in power. It was persecuted at other times and places. It is my conviction, however, that our system of private enterprise has provided the best possible environment for its free proclamation, and the greatest measure of freedom for its adherents.

In speaking of this system, which involves what is commonly called capitalism, we do not have in mind just a few big business men. Also included are the millions of farmers who in many cases own their land which, along with their tools, is their means of production; millions of small businesses, home owners, those who own stock, those who draw interest on money in banks.

Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, has well observed that industry should not be classified as representing the rich, because: (1) Its ownership is broad. Many individuals, who are not wealthy, often hold stock in it. (2) There are industries which are in debt. (3) The net capital from the industry is not hidden somewhere, but

is often put back into the business itself and thus helps in producing more goods for more people.

Christianity does not present a blue print for an economic and political system. It is world-wide in its nature, and it calls on men to return to God through Christ regardless of the system under which they live. But this does not mean that a system which embodies one set of principles is not more in harmony with its nature and influence than a system which embodies an entirely different set of principles. My purpose is to show, in the words of Dr. Clarence Bouma, that "The economic system of free enterprise, far from being anti-Christian, is more in harmony with the high ethical demands of the Christian religion than any collectivistic alternative, whether it be Socialism or Communism."<sup>1</sup>

As Dr. Bouma pointed out, "We believe this claim can be substantiated along three distinct lines of thought, viz., first, with a view to the right of private property; secondly, with a view to the protection of human personality; and thirdly, with a view to the preservation of liberty.

"Stated differently, every collectivistic system is an attack upon (1) the right of private property, (2) the sacredness of personality, and (3) the enjoyment of true liberty."<sup>2</sup>

Private property is recognized in the Old Testament. Abraham bought ground in which to bury Sarah (Gen. 23:16-18). Jacob worked for Laban for wages. Although it is true that he had some difficulties with Laban (Gen. 31:6-7), it was not due to the system itself. Could it have been due to the fact that Laban was twice Jacob's father-in-law! The right of the ownership of property was so sacred that even a king did not have the right to force an individual to sell a vineyard to him. Ahab, the king, and his wife Jezebel were punished for obtaining the property by foul means, when Naboth the owner refused to sell (I Kings 21).

---

<sup>1</sup> Bouma, "Is Free Enterprise Anti-Christian?" *The Calvin Forum*, Jan. 1951, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 113.

When God gave Israel the promised land, he did not set up a socialistic or communistic state, but one in which private ownership of property—flocks and lands which were their principal means of production—were strictly guarded. One was not to covet his neighbor's house and flocks, or anything that was his neighbor's. This is included in the passage which stated that he was not to covet his neighbor's wife (Exodus 20:17). "Thou shalt not steal" (Exodus 20:15) implies that ownership of property is not wrong. As J. P. Flowers said: "If theft be wrong, then the institution of property must be right."<sup>3</sup>

The right of private property is likewise upheld in the New Testament. "Thou shalt not steal" is repeated in the New Testament (Matthew 19:18; Romans 13:9). The right to own property, and sell it, is clearly stated in Acts 5:4. In speaking of some land, the apostle Peter said, "While it remained, was it not *thine own?* and after it was *sold*, was it not in *thine own power?*" (Acts 5:4). Ananias, to whom Peter was speaking, was punished by the Lord, but it was for the sin of hypocrisy and not for owning or selling property.

Does the case of the rich young ruler show that it is wrong to have possessions, even great possessions? If not, why did Christ tell him to "sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor," and "follow me?" (Lk. 18:22-23). These instructions were not given to any other individual. The rich (In I Tim. 6:17-19) were not told to sell all that they had, but to use money for the good of mankind. Jesus knew, however, that covetousness was keeping this rich young ruler from heaven. The account given in Mark indicates that this young man was trusting in his riches. "And Jesus looked round about, and said unto his disciples, 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God.' And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answered again, and saith unto them, 'Children, how hard

---

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Bouma, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

it is for *them that trust in riches* to enter into the kingdom of God" (Mk. 10:23-25). There are, of course, those who are not rich but who trust in riches; but in either case one cannot enter the kingdom of God through trusting in riches.

Jesus did not tell the young ruler to turn all of his property over to the state, or put it in some common fund. The property was *his*, as is clear from the fact that Jesus told him to it, and to distribute it to the poor. As Bouma said: "When he is told to sell all that he had and give to the poor, he is charged to do so not because that was the only economy which our Lord approved, but because this was in his particular case the only radical cure for the evil of having set his heart upon riches."<sup>4</sup>

It is to be doubted that the Socialist government in England in eliminating the wealth of the rich, is doing so that it may be easier for those men to enter the kingdom of God! *In fact, their leaders have shown too much trust in Uncle Sam's riches!*

To meet a special need at Jerusalem, disciples "sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need" (Acts 2:45). Why was there a special need at that time? Multitudes had come to Jerusalem for a certain Old Testament feast, had been converted to the Christian faith, and had remained in Jerusalem for at least a period of time. They were in need, and Christian love led those who *had* to share with those who *had not*.

It was not compulsory. Love, not *coercion*, was the motivating factor. *It was voluntary*. The right of private property is expressly declared in connection with this sharing. This right included the right to sell and to keep the proceeds. "While it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" (Acts 5:4).

It was an affair of the church, and not an order of the government.

No one was disfellowshipped, much less killed or his

---

<sup>4</sup> Bouma, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

property confiscated, for not selling what he had.

It was not an effort to place all on the same financial level. It was for a daily meeting of the needs of various individuals. It was "as every man had need (Acts 2:45); and daily administered ("daily ministration," Acts 6:1).

There is no evidence that this was a fixed custom in Jerusalem or that it long continued.

Churches outside of Jerusalem did not practice it. Dorcas did relief work as an individual, and this would have been impossible if all was put in a common fund (Acts 9:36-39). The instructions to the churches of Galatia and Corinth show that the individuals had the control over their own property and profits. They were told to give on the first day of the week as they had been prospered: as they had purposed in their hearts; cheerfully, and not of necessity (I Cor. 16:1ff; II Cor. 9:1-7). Acts 11:29 shows that the disciples in Antioch had their own goods; that all were not on the same economic level. "Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea" (Acts 11:29).

If everyone sold all that he had when he became a Christian, we would all be on relief soon; but the church would not have means to continue to meet our needs. Welfare, as Mr. High has pointed out, is not a system but the results of a system. Individuals have to have and use means of production to make a profit in order to be able to give to the work of the church.

Certainly we are not against Christians sharing when there is need, but there is no justification (from Acts 2) for an economic system such as Socialism or Communism. These systems are not like Christianity in purpose or in the means which they use to accomplish their purpose.

The duty of working, and the right to profit from one's labors, is clearly taught in the New Testament. Wages, of course, are a form of private property. And labor, one should not forget, may be done with the brain as well as with the brawn. The Scriptures teach that one should work, not only to help himself and his kindred, but also to help those who

are in need. The private enterprise system encourages men to work more than a collectivistic system does, and thus is more in harmony with the demands of Christian faith concerning working.

The apostle Paul wrote: "Let him that stole steal no more, but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may *have* to give to him that needeth" (Eph. 4:28). The principle of helping the needy surely can and should be extended to include working so as to provide the needy with means of helping themselves, through providing jobs for them.

Again Paul wrote: "But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his house (kindred, margin), he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel" (I Tim. 5:8). This included, as the context shows, provision for the aged of one's family (I Tim. 5:4).

Paul was a tent-maker by trade (Acts 18:1-3), and he sometimes labored not only to support himself, but to support others also. "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me" (Acts 20:33-34).

The fact that the needy were to be helped did not mean that parasites were to be supported by the church. To the Thessalonians Paul wrote: "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread" (II Thes. 3:10-12). This was such an important matter that Paul said that "if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother" (II Thess. 3:14-15).

It is my conviction, and I find it borne out by history, that the system of private enterprise does encourage men to

be willing to work, *more so than does any other system*. It gives less encouragement to those who would be parasites. And thus it is more in harmony with the spirit of the above passage, than any system which does not encourage work, and which may even encourage waste as some have done even in our own country.

John Smith, in writing of the experiment at Jamestown wherein individuals had a common storehouse, recognized that it encouraged idleness. "When our people were fed out of the common store, and labored jointly together, glad was he could slip from his labour, or slumber over his taske, he cared not how, nay the most honest among them would hardly take so much true pains in a week, as now for themselves they will do in a day; neither cared them for the increase, presuming that however the harvest prospered the general store must maintain them so that they will reap no so much come from the labors of thirtie as now three or four do provide for themselves."

Responsibility to use rightly what one has, as well as the right to own property, is set forth in the Scriptures. The abuse of wealth is condemned, and the proper use of it is commanded.

There is condemnation of the wanton, oppressive rich (James 5:1-6). That James speaks of the unjust, oppressive rich is shown from verses 4 and 6. "Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth (host)." "Ye have condemned and killed the just; and he doth not resist you."

This passage does not say that it is wrong for one man to employ another man. It does not say that it is wrong to work for wages. But it does teach that the employer should not deal with the employee on the basis of injustice and fraud.

That it was the *abuse* of wealth which is condemned, is shown from the fact that the wealthy were not told that it was wrong for them to possess the wealth. They were told

to properly use it. The stewardship attitude is inculcated. "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life" (I Tim. 6:17-19).

The apostle James also presented a situation in which some boasted of their plans to buy and sell, and get gain. In dealing with a business situation, which very distinctly embodied the profit motive, he did not criticize it. The only thing which he criticized was their boastful attitude which left God out, and which presumed that their own future was so completely in their own hands that they could guarantee at least a year of life to themselves. "Go to now, ye that say, Today or tomorrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain: whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away. For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this, or that. But now ye rejoice in your boastings: all such rejoicing is evil" (James 4:13-16).

These men were presumptuous. "The word for 'boastings' is the same as that translated 'the pride of life' in John 2:16—i. e., it's braggart boastfulness, not the innocent gladness of living."<sup>5</sup> It is important to notice that in a passage in which business, and the making of profit, were under consideration there was no word of rebuke for the making of profit, but only for the presumptuous attitude which left God out.

The system of private enterprise, as Bouma pointed out, is more in harmony with Christian teaching than any collectivistic system, since collectivism leads to the disregard of

---

<sup>5</sup>Charles J. Ellicott, *A New Testament Commentary for English Readers*, Vol. III, p. 374.

the sacredness of human personality. Collectivism does “not consider society as made up of persons, with individual rights, abilities, and possibilities... (they are a) mere part of a larger whole, (they are) as a cog in a wheel.” “In a collectivist system, the system is the thing—not the men who constitute the system.” This is an inherent part of collectivism, and history confirms the fact that collectivism regards individuals as tools of the State, rather than as persons who have rights with which the State should not interfere. The more a State moves toward collectivism the less it regards the individual. And yet if the man as an individual is of no value, mankind is of no value for there is no “collective man.” Individuals alone exist.

God *has made sacred the individual*. Thus we would expect Him to show His greatest approval to the system which gives the most emphasis to the *dignity* and *value* of the *individual*.

In “the preservation and enjoyment of true liberty” the system of private enterprise is more in harmony with Christian teaching than is any collectivistic system.<sup>6</sup> In every effort toward collectivism, the more collectivism is actually accomplished the less freedom the individual possesses. Regarding the individual as a cog within the machine, the important thing is not that the individual has liberty but that he perform his assigned task. *His welfare* is not really taken into consideration. He must work for the community, which in a collectivistic system really means *for the benefit of those who are in control*.

If it is a danger to concentrate all economic power in the hands of a few corporation “monopolists,” how much more so is it dangerous to put all economic and political power in the hands of a few political figures!

Christianity emphasizes freedom of choice. Its invitation is that whosoever will may come (Rev. 22:17). Its invitation is not: We shall *force* you to come whether you will or not.

---

<sup>6</sup> Bouma, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

Its spirit, therefore, is not in harmony with a *coercive* system, but with the system which allows the individual the fullest measure of freedom.

Let us illustrate how that under our private enterprise system Christianity itself enjoys more freedom. The Scriptures teach love for truth, and that *truth makes men free* (John 8:31-32). Primary reference is here made to Christ's word of truth, but the good and honest heart, which a Christian is to have, is open to truth from any realm. The Christian is also interested in the spread of truth. By its nature Christianity is missionary minded. Private enterprise gives Christians the greatest opportunity for the spread of truth. Where there are many individuals engaged in private enterprise—say printing, for example—there is more opportunity for the spread of truth than when all printing is controlled by one group. Radio, as a means of spreading religious teaching, is freer under private enterprise than under governmental ownership. In England, for example, it is my understanding that time for religious programs cannot be purchased by various religious groups. Religious programs are presented, but what is presented is controlled by whatever group the government has appointed to look after such matters. Of course, where there is opportunity to buy radio time some undesirable things may get on. A religious program may ask you to send them a dollar, but you can tune them out, and you do not have to send the dollar. But if the government controls the radio, and decides what religious programs are to be carried, your tax money supports it whether you like it or not.

If the State owns all, it means that even church property is subject to the will, and even whims, of those who are in office. It is easy to see how the right to assemble could be interfered with through depriving a church of a place of assembly.

The sacredness of human personality, and the right of the individual to hear and spread truth, is more and more taken away as Socialism, with its high degree of controls, grows. Sometimes this interference with freedom may be

gradual, but it is deadly none the less.

In answering questions which may be raised concerning Christianity and free enterprise, it is necessary to bear in mind at least three important considerations. *First*, will a change in the system eliminate evils which are in our country, or only accentuate these evils, and bring in other evils? Is the evil in the system itself or can the system be more and more perfected?

*Second*, the shortcomings and sins of the individual must not be overlooked. Our system will never work perfectly because human beings are not perfect. Yet the free enterprise system does not allow to imperfect man the absolute control over the lives of others that is found in a system which is completely collectivized.

*Third*, it is the *systems* which we are talking about. And the free enterprise system both in theory and in practice is superior to all others in the freedom, opportunity, and goods which it offers to the individuals, and to the largest number of individuals. What individual among us, for example, would want to trade place with the business men, college professors, or working men in even the best socialistic country in the world?

Whatever may be the point under consideration, it ought to be clear that the free enterprise system is the best, since it gives the fullest measure of freedom to the largest number of people, and has the most effective system of checks and balances.

Questions such as the following are sometimes asked:

(1) *Why are some ministers critical of the free enterprise system, and why do they think that socialism is preferable?*

In some cases at least it is due to uninformed idealism. Some of them have dealt with the poor, and have not had any contact with industry. Some have generalized on a few cases, and have acted from their emotions rather than from emotions guided by knowledge. They assume that the evils cannot be dealt with within the framework of the system itself, and they turn to a system which in reality would ruin

the very people whom they want to help. These ministers lack the knowledge as to how people would fare under socialism. They fail to realize that it would not correct, defects in our society. Instead it would accentuate these defects as well as introduce other evils.

These ministers seem to overlook how much private property is owned by churches. They also fail to realize that the Bible teaching on giving is based on the idea of the individual's right to dispose of his property and money as he sees fit. This includes giving to the work of the church. Socialism more and more cripples the power of the individual to give.

(2) *Is interest wrong?*

Some passages in the Old Testament told Israelites not to lend upon usury to their brother. The majority of these passages are clearly talking about assistance given to the poor (Exodus 22:25; Lev. 25:35-37). In such a passage as Lev. 23:19-20 where the poor are not mentioned, it is not indicated that usury was immoral within itself. For although they were not to lend upon usury to their brother—who was of the same race *and religion*—they could lend upon usury to a stranger, i. e. to one who was not of their race and religion. This indicates that usury within itself was not immoral, or otherwise it would not have been allowed on things which were loaned to strangers.

“... the New Testament is silent on the subject; the passage in Luke (6:34-35), which some persons interpret as condemnation of interest, is only an exhortation to general and disinterested benevolence.”<sup>7</sup> This passage did not have reference to business transactions, but to benevolence. The New Testament does not teach against charging interest.

There is absolutely nothing in the New Testament to indicate that capital loans are wrong. “This type of loan is made for the purpose of creating greater wealth, and *justice would require* that the person furnishing the money should

---

<sup>7</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. XVI:235.

share in the increase which his money makes possible.”<sup>8</sup>

(3) *Is the appeal to profits, to reward, un-Christian?*  
No. A man who will not work is not to be fed. His idleness was not to be rewarded with anything profitable—food in this case (II Thess. 3:7-14). A man must make something in order to provide for his kindred (I Tim. 5:4-8).

Jesus used the appeal to rewards even in reference to spiritual things. Although He did not teach that man could merit eternal life, He certainly showed that man must do something in order to inherit eternal life. Those who follow Him will be rewarded. “Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee. And Jesus answered and said, Verily, I say unto you. There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mother's and children (notice it did not say wives! JDB), and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come, eternal life” (Mk. 10:28-30). A man who has left all for the sake of the gospel will find hundreds of hearts and homes open to him. The man who endureth persecution for Christ's sake, will receive great reward in heaven (Matt. 6:11-12).

To take away the principle of rewards and punishment is to kill incentive. John Smith in his account of conditions in Jamestown well illustrated this truth. It kills incentive for it means that your labors do not make a change in the outcome. It encourages the parasite for he feels that he will be supported whether he works diligently or not. To abolish rewards (and profits are one form of reward) and punishments one would have to abolish all outcomes of conduct, both desirable and undesirable. But this is impossible, for conduct has consequences, and these consequences may be good or bad depending on the conduct. If conduct does not

---

<sup>8</sup> F. W. Mattox, *Christian Solutions to Modern Problems*, p. 12.

produce consequences there would be no need or reason for action. And if different courses of conduct did not produce different consequences, there would be no reason why one course of conduct should be chosen over the other.

This would rob man of responsibility. For if my effort does not change the situation, if my greater work and productivity does not produce greater rewards, why should I put forth extra effort.

This is not to say that all rewards are material, this is not to say that there is no work that a man may do for the love of the work but it is to say that the principle of rewards, and thus profits, is neither unscriptural nor unreasonable.

The principle of rewards and of profits is also illustrated with reference to spiritual things, in the parable of the talents and of the pounds (Matt. 25:14-31; Lk. 19:12-26). In the spiritual realm one must produce or have taken away from him that which he already has. "And he said unto them that stood by, Take from him the pound, and give it to him that hath ten pounds, and they said unto him, Lord, he hath ten pounds. For I say unto you, that unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away from him" (Lk. 16:24-26). By *hath not* Christ did not mean that that person had nothing to start with, for he had started with something, but he had not used it. He had not even obtained interest on it (verse 23).

I realize that the parable is used to teach those in the kingdom of God that they must be faithful in what has been committed unto them. One must produce. He must not just hold what he stalled with, he must make progress.

However, it is just as true in business, from which realm the illustration or parable is drawn. If a business does not produce, if it does not make a profit, it sooner or later (likely sooner) goes out of business and may lose that with which it started.

Dr. Mattox has emphasized that the responsibility of the employer to the employees requires that the employer make a profit. It is not merely permissive, *it is his duty to*

*make a profit.* He is not faithfully discharging his stewardship responsibility if he does not make a profit.

*First*, one must make a profit in a business in order to maintain the confidence of the stockholders and to assure the future of the business. If its present stockholders lose confidence in it, and if it cannot attract new stockholders, it will lack some of the capital which is necessary for replacements and expansion.

*Second*, it is necessary to make a profit in order to improve and expand the business, and the services which it renders, so as to maintain its position in a competitive society. All of us can see the advantages of money spent for improvements. Who, for example, would want to standardize production on the Model-T level, or the Coal Oil Lamp level?

*Third*, a business must make a profit in order to create a reserve for emergencies. Otherwise an emergency may put it out of business, and the employees and the entire community will suffer.

*Fourth*, a business must make a profit in order to expand and to make jobs for the employees' children. Every year, with the increase of our population, there are many new job seekers. Unless the expansion of present industries and the creation of new industries take place these new jobs will not be available. And without capital the necessary research and improvements cannot be undertaken.

*Fifth*, industry must make a profit in order to pay its part for the support of educational work, local and national government, and the common welfare.

This should make it clear that a company which does not make a profit is not only unsafe for its employees, it is also failing to do its duty by them and its stockholders, and to the community, state and nation.

When Christianity first came into the world, a great deal of the work, in the pagan world, was done by slaves. It was out of harmony with the spirit of Christianity to advocate a violent, bloody revolution of the slaves against the masters. If this had been done, Christianity would have been a political and social movement instead of primarily the way

of salvation. If it had advocated such a rebellion it is likely that one or the other of the following would have taken place:

*First*, the slaves would have been slaughtered in the rebellion; or, *second*, the slaves likely would have enslaved those of the masters whom they did not slaughter. But the spirit of neither would have been changed.

Instead Christianity spread a spirit of brotherhood which sought to change, and did change, the attitude of slave and master. A slave and a master who were both Christians were brothers in Christ. This spirit gradually undermined the institution of slavery, as J. W. Bready has shown in *This Freedom—Whence?*

What principles were to operate, with reference to work, between the master and the slave? Since these principles operated in a relationship which the slave had not entered into voluntarily, how much more so should they characterize the employer-employee relationship which is entered into voluntarily.

“Servants (slaves), obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; *not with eyeservice, as menpleasers*; but in singleness of heart, fearing God; and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons. Masters, give unto your servants that which is *just and equal*: knowing that *ye also have a Master in heaven*” (Col. 3:22-4-1). “And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening; knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him” (Eph. 6:9).

Both had a responsibility to God. And both were to give an account for their attitude toward and their treatment of the other.

It is my conviction that there is need for greater integrity in America, both in our business and political life. A Christian should speak truth (Eph. 4:25). He should not lie. He should endeavor to carry out faithfully his promises and

agreements. This means that he should keep his word. For example, he should keep his contract. Any change made in it should be mutually agreed on.

The roots of our convictions concerning the dignity of the individual are religious, whether we recognize it or not. There are non-religious individuals who have been so influenced by religion that they continue to cling to certain of its values long after they have denied the validity of all religion. The man of no faith is the child of centuries of faith. But it is still true that in our society *the roots of our conviction of the sacredness of human personality are religious.*

Since there can be no real and lasting freedom without the recognition of the rights, as well as the responsibilities, of the individual, it is my conviction that the very roots of our freedom are religious. For it is religion which gives to human personality sacredness. "Where nothing is sacred nothing is safe."

Some today have dug up or neglected the religious roots, and are amazed and dismayed when the tree begins to wither away and the fruits begin to disappear. Can we long continue to have the fruits without the roots?

In coming to this country, our forefathers put *morality, religion,* and *freedom* first. They did not even put economic security first. And yet, these material things have been added unto us.

*We should recognize our need for God, and not for just his material gifts.*

# Chapter 11

---

## CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN PROGRESS AND WELFARE IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

*by*

*Dr. George S. Benson*

God's care and concern for man has never been limited to the spiritual only. On the contrary, God has always manifested a keen concern in the welfare and progress of mankind on the earth.

For instance, in the Garden of Eden God gave grain and fruit for man to eat. Following the flood man was given grain, fruit, and meat to eat. In the wilderness God gave Israel the manna which for 40 years was found regularly on the ground where it could be conveniently gathered up for food. God also provided that man's clothing through those 40 years should not fail. In Palestine, God gave to Israel fields, vineyards, and orchards, with divine assurances that so long as Israel remained faithful to God and kept his commandments and observed his statutes, they would continue to enjoy the fruit of the land and their enemies should not make them afraid.

God's ability to fulfill his promise in protecting Israel from her enemies was demonstrated in the days of Isaiah and Hezekiah. Sennacherib encamped about the city of Jerusalem and demanded its surrender. The angel of the Lord smote such a multitude of his soldiers during the night that in chagrin he fled to his own country.

Jesus manifested a keen concern for human welfare and human progress. He defended his apostles for eating grain as they walked through the fields at harvest time. He fed the 5000 when they were hungry and weary in the wilder-

ness. Jesus confirmed the same fundamental principles that God had ordained for man's maximum welfare and progress in the world.

God had recognized the right of private ownership of property when he said "Thou shalt not steal." Nothing can be stolen from a man who owns nothing. The commandment forbidding stealing was an affirmation that man has a right to private property and that no one has a right to steal that which another owns.

When Israel entered the land of Palestine, God decreed that the land should be divided by lot according to tribes. Inspiration further instructed that the tribes should divide their tribal lands by lot on a family basis. God not only decreed that the land should be given to families individually but established a Jubilee Year for the purpose of having returned to each family at the end of each 50 years any land that they might have lost. For instance, even though some might mortgage or sell their land, the mortgage or sale could be effective only until the next Jubilee Year when it must be returned to the family which originally possessed it. So God not only arranged for private ownership but also arranged for the continuation of private ownership of property.

The principle of ownership is today one of the great incentives that urges men forward. A father is interested in providing for his family. He attempts to obtain possession of adequate property to safeguard their welfare. In countries where individuals are permitted to own property, there is much greater prosperity than in lands where individuals are not permitted to own property.

God likewise emphasized the principle of thrift and hard work. For instance, in Ecclesiastes 9:10, the writer declares "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." Paul, speaking by inspiration, emphasized the same principle when he declared in I Thessalonians 4:12, "We beseech you, brethren that ye . . . do your own business, and to work with your hands as we commanded you that ye may have lack of nothing." And again in II Thessalonians 3:10, "Even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any

would not work, neither shall he eat." The Holy Spirit has thus urged that men be industrious and thrifty to the end that they may supply their own needs. So important was this principle that a man who would not work was not to be considered a subject of charity by God's children who did work with their hands and who were able to give to the needs of others.

It is through observing this principle of thrift and hard work that American individuals have accumulated the capital to develop manufacturing plants, to purchase farm machinery, to develop electricity and power to the end that men are able to produce far more than they could when working with their bare hands. In this way, the American standard of living has grown to a higher level than is known anywhere else in the world.

Inspiration has likewise encouraged freedom of individual opportunity. God made no man to be the slave of another and no people to be the servants and slaves of a government. Freedom of individual opportunity means that a man may live in any part of the country he chooses, may work for another or undertake a business for himself, may choose to work indoors or outdoors, may choose to spend his time attempting to develop an invention or a discovery, or he may follow in the grooves that have long been followed by others.

God also dignified the employer-employee relationship. In the Old Testament God gave strict regulations about the payment of wages to employees, thus recognizing the dignity of the relationship. Jesus likewise dignified and honored the principle of contract in the parable of the householder who went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard and when he had agreed with the laborers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard. Others he hired about the third hour and still others about the sixth hour and still others about the eleventh hour.

At the end of the day he paid them all alike—each one a penny a day. When those who had worked longer complained, the householder said: "Friend, I do thee no wrong. Didst thou not agree with me for a penny? Take that is

thine and go thy way. I will give unto this last even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil because I am good." No nation can prosper that ignores the sanctity of contract. From cover to cover the Bible teaches the importance of people keeping their agreements and honoring their word and Jesus in this parable applied that principle to the employer-employee relationship and particularly to the subject of contract.

Jesus gave a great fundamental and basic principle in human relations likewise when he said: "Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you." This great principle should be applied in employer-employee relations and in all other human relations.

These five principles constitute a formula that is workable for human progress and human prosperity anywhere in the world. Moreover, these principles constitute the only formula that is really workable and the only one that has yet succeeded during 6000 years of human history.

David was a man after God's own heart. It was under David and under his son, Solomon, that the Jews reached their greatest measure of prosperity. It was during the days of Solomon that silver became like stones in the street and that the Queen of Sheba journeyed from afar to behold the wealth of Solomon's kingdom and having beheld it, cried "The half had not been told."

It was living in harmony with the will and purpose of God and enjoying the great providence of God that brought this marvelous and unequalled prosperity to the Jewish race in the land of Palestine in the days of Solomon.

It was a departure from God's word and from this great pattern of conduct that interrupted their welfare, led to the division of the kingdom, and finally to the enslavement of the people of Israel.

Into an almost totally heathen world, Christ re-introduced these great principles. As a result, a new type of thinking entered the Roman Empire and the greatest measure of human welfare that had yet been experienced under a human government was created.

With the fall of Rome however, and the tyranny of Roman Catholicism these principles were lost. Heathenism and the corruptions of Romanism overflowed the Roman Empire and ushered in the Dark Ages, lasting for 1000 years.

With the introduction of the great reformation in the days of Calvin and Luther came a revival of a Christian conscience and one by one these great divine principles for the welfare and progress of mankind were in some measure restored in Europe.

The Bible was translated and given to the people of Europe in their own tongue. As people read the Bible and taught it to their children and as Western Europe attempted to observe the teaching of the Master, a new period was introduced known as the Renaissance. And it was in those nations that had greatest respect for God that the greatest measure of progress developed—England, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, and Germany.

People who had been deeply touched by this revival of religious conviction constituted the greatest majority of those who moved to the new world and created on this continent a new nation, dedicated to religious freedom on a still greater scale, and who brought forth a government which they believed would permit the people of this new country to live in harmony with the teachings of the Bible.

The Constitution established firmly the right of private ownership of property, encouraged the principle of thrift and hard work, guaranteed freedom of individual opportunity, maintained sanctity of contract between employer and employee and in this nation more people sought to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them than had been known in any other country. Early schools were built fundamentally to train religious leadership.

Free trial by jury was ordained in order that influential people should not be able to take advantage of the poor. Each man was ordained to enjoy the same measure of dignity and freedom.

On that foundation, America rapidly developed the

greatest measure of human welfare and human progress ever known. For instance, since 1940 we have enjoyed a national income as great as that of any other six countries combined. Wages paid American employees in the steel mills, the coal mines, the manufacturing plants, for clerking in stores, teaching school, etc., permits those employees to enjoy a standard of living two times as high as is known in any country in Europe, three times as high as in England after six years of Socialism, and five times as high as in Russia after 35 years of Communism.

America has only seven per cent of the world's population but she sends more young people to high school and college than does all the rest of the world. That seven per cent of the world's population living in America drives more automobiles than do all the rest of the people living in all the rest of the countries. In fact, Americans drive four times as many cars than does the other 93 per cent of the people combined. America has more farm machinery and each farmer produces far more, thus contributing to our higher standard of living. Each employee in a manufacturing plant produces two times as much as in the best countries of Europe, thereby contributing his part to our higher standard of living.

Americans likewise enjoy more individual freedom, more religious freedom contributing to a greater measure of happiness.

This welfare is a result of the foundation upon which Americans built. It is not our stock of people. We are not superior. In fact, we are chiefly of European origin. It is not merely the presence of our great resources, because other countries have had far more. For instance, England long boasted that the sun did never set on her empire. She had her share of the world's resources. Russia today has two times the territory per person that we have in America and has two times the quantity of resources. Yet, she has a standard of living only a fifth as high. Little Switzerland has no resources at all—no coal, iron, oil or gas, and not even a seaport. Yet, she has the highest per capita wealth and the

highest standard of living to be found in Europe.

The prosperity of America is the result of our freedom to dream our dreams; our freedom to own property; our freedom to compete with the dreamers. It is our private enterprise system which screens management through competition and leaves only the best. It is our high investment in tools—\$10,000 for the average American industrial job. It is freedom of labor because only free labor can for long be efficient.

Around the world and for 6000 years freedom and human progress have gone hand in hand while regimentation and poverty have likewise gone hand in hand. A glance at our own hemisphere is very significant. For instance, South America, Central America, North America, Canada, have all been settled during the last 400 years and chiefly by people from Europe. Yet, there are tremendous variations in the measure of human progress and welfare. Central America has the least freedom for the individual and the greatest poverty. The United States has the greatest measure of freedom for the individual and the least degree of poverty.

Today, this entire system in America is under direct attack and seriously jeopardized.

For 30 years shrewd calculating Communists have been at work in America aiming at the infiltration of every important segment of American life. Today it is estimated that America has some 1500 foreign Communists, some 50,000 American Communists, and some 500,000 fellow travelers.

The Communists have definitely declared their aims. Their actions well demonstrate their declarations. They aim at the destruction of our freedoms and our liberties. They aim at the destruction of our religion and our religious freedom.

The Communists declare their enmity against the very belief in a higher power. They are atheists. They declare their belief in a government that controls totally the lives of its people permitting no ownership of private property, no freedom of individual opportunity, no sanctity of contract,

no sacredness of the individual, and no freedom for the individual.

The trial of eleven leading Communists which closed some two years ago in New York City and which convicted them of *teaching and working for the overthrow of our government by force*, should be sufficient to open the eyes of the entire public to the intentions and purposes of this great Communist conspiracy.

Professor Louis Budenz, who was for ten years a leading Communist and who now has turned against the Communists and was the chief witness of our government in convicting the eleven leading Communists referred to above, affirms that the Communists constitute a tremendous threat to our future and that they are much stronger even now than they were in 1945.

Bakunin, an early and revered Russian Communist, stated well the Communist creed when he said, "Brethren, I come to announce unto you a new gospel, which must penetrate to the very ends of the world... the old world must be destroyed and replaced by a new one... the Lie must be stamped out, and give way to Truth.

"The first Lie is God; the second Lie is Right... and when you have freed your mind from the fear of a God, and from the childish respect for the fiction of Right, then all the remaining chains that bind you, and which are called science, civilization, poverty, marriage, morality, and justice, will snap asunder like threads... Let your own happiness be your only Law... Our first work must be destruction and annihilation of everything as it now exists; you must accustom yourself to destroy everything, the good with the bad; for if but an atom of this old world remains, the new will never be created."

The chief method of Communist attack in America is through undermining our faith in our religion; through dividing employees against employers; through destroying confidence in private ownership of property, particularly private ownership of the tools of production; through antagonizing our own people against our own industrialists, to

the end that they may interrupt our high productivity and our high standard of living. Then it is their intention finally to establish a dictatorship by force to serve under the Red Army and in obedience to Russia.

Great numbers of our people have been so deceived that they are antagonistic toward the men who operate the American industries which produce our radios, telephones, refrigerators, automobiles, farm machinery, clothing and food. These things are being produced on a basis that permits individuals to buy them with less days of labor than is known anywhere in the world. Yet, our people are being made to believe that the people who produce all of this machinery and equipment are the enemies of the common people. So effectively have our churches, our schools, our labor organizations, been infiltrated and affected that we are growing up a new generation who do not understand our American way of life and who are not dedicated to its preservation. Thus the welfare and prosperity and progress of the American people is very seriously jeopardized.

We could easily follow the road that England has followed, thus voting out private ownership of property and voting in a dictatorship in the name of the common people but over which the common people would actually have less influence than before.

The consequences are terrific. The fall of freedom in America would usher in a period comparable only to the Dark Ages, for America is today the hope and the only hope of freedom-loving people throughout the world. Not only would the failure of freedom in America blast their hopes but it would also reduce our own standard of living by at least 50 per cent within 15 years, and perhaps much more thereafter.

On the contrary, if we will keep the freedoms and liberties that are God-ordained and that Jesus Christ encouraged and supported, we can not only maintain our present standard of living but we can within a generation move to a standard of living 100 per cent higher than even America knows today.

I say this because of the fact we have increased our per capita productivity by about three per cent a year over the past 25 years. Since this is based each year on the preceding year, it is compounded and means that we have more than doubled our standard of living in the past 25 years.

Now, with the discovery of atomic energy, with the possibilities of solar energy and with the electric possibilities little more than scratched, it is probable that we are standing on the brink of the greatest era of progress yet witnessed. Certainly, we can go on up three percent per year in productivity or even faster. Consequently, we can double our standard of living again within the next 25 years or less provided we keep these fundamental God-ordained principles which have made America great and provided we continue to believe in them and to work together harmoniously under them.

Christians must take the lead in the fight against the powers of darkness. For instance, only Christians can understand what is really at stake. Only they know the importance of faith in God and the importance of enjoying the providence of God. Only Christians can understand the darkness of heathenism and the hopelessness of heathenism. Only Christians really have the answer in this present crisis, and Christians must be concerned because we are our brother's keeper. We must be concerned about the welfare of our children and our children's children. We must be concerned about the welfare of people around the world. The greatest service we can render them is by keeping alive this great God-given formula for human progress and human prosperity. The greatest disservice we can render is to lose this formula.

All professing Christians should be informed of the facts involved. Otherwise, they may not know how to guide their own steps or the steps of others. Great numbers who make no profession of being Christians still want to do right and still want to see the human race progress and advance but they must be informed. They must be guided.

How shall Christians work in this critical hour?

1. In the first place, they should work to make more and more Christians. Unless we can maintain a reasonable percentage of devout Christians there is no hope of maintaining this God-given formula for human progress and human prosperity; no hope of retaining the great providence of God. You remember that Sodom would have been saved if there had been found there as many as ten righteous. Jesus is looking now to the righteous to serve as the salt of the earth and the light of the world.

2. Christian people must place emphasis upon God's pattern for human welfare and human progress, a pattern that is just as definite as the pattern for spiritual welfare. We are teaching the latter. To be balanced we must also emphasize the former.

3. Christians should seize every opportunity to expose these enemies of righteousness and even to meet in public discussions those who are willing to be so met. It was through this method that the IWW 30 years ago was defeated in America. With the same method, we can today defeat current Communism.

4. From their own writings and their own teachings, the purposes and plans of the Communists in America must be exposed in order that people will understand the real danger that faces this nation. A good source book for this purpose is: "Men Without Faces" by Louis Budenz. Another reliable source of information is through the Committee on UnAmerican Activities, of the United States Congress, at Washington, D. C. Write and ask for "One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism." A copy will be sent without cost. Also read "The Key To Peace" by Clarence Manion, published by the Heritage Foundation, Inc., 75 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois.

Even though in America we have attempted to follow those divinely ordained principles for man's welfare and progress, of course under the weakness of human nature we have not been able to operate perfectly. This will always be true of any political or economic system under which any segment of mankind may live from now to doom's day. It

is not possible for imperfect men to live perfectly under any system. For example, marriage is of divine origin and the home is the essential unit in all civilized society. Yet, marriage doesn't always work out perfectly. We all know of unhappy marriages. We all know of broken homes and we are all aware of the fact that the worst of our criminals come from our broken homes. However, we are not ready to throw overboard marriage just because it can be criticized. On the contrary, we want to work for a better understanding of marriage and for more permanent homes.

Likewise, the church is of divine origin but it hasn't worked perfectly among imperfect people. On the contrary, many unfortunate things have been done in the name of religion. Moreover, there is probably not a single perfect church in America today where the preacher is perfect, all the elders perfect, and all the membership perfect. Should we then throw overboard religion because we can't find even one single perfect congregation? Certainly not. Religion is still absolutely essential to man's welfare and progress. The Christian religion offers the only hope of developing that unselfish character for which this old world is starving and dying. Therefore, instead of throwing overboard religion we must work for a better understanding of the Nazarene, must undertake to interpret His teaching more faithfully, and to live it out more effectively in our lives.

Likewise our American way of life which we have tried to build on divinely given principles doesn't work perfectly. There are people who take advantage of it here and there, but it still is doing 100 per cent better than any system that Europe has yet discovered. Therefore, until something better is actually found, we want to hold fast to this American way of life.

We should also remember that our freedoms are in one bundle. I have heard religious people say: "Oh, I can't get much excited about economic freedom or political freedom but I would give my life for religious freedom." This reminds me of the father who in his final illness called his six sons about him and handed to the eldest a bundle of sticks, tightly

bound together, and asked that he try to break the bundle. When the oldest son failed, the bundle of sticks was then passed to the second son, then the third, the fourth, the fifth, and finally, the sixth. When no one of the sons could break the bundle of sticks, the father said: "Hand the bundle to me. I can break them." The bundle was passed to the father, who drew out one stick and broke it. Then another, and on to the last. The sons understood that the father was trying to teach them to stand together to the end that no man would be able to overthrow them.

Likewise our freedoms are all in one bundle. If people interested in religious freedom stand by until economic freedom is gone and political freedom is gone they will next find religious freedom disappearing too and it will be too late to do much about it. When Hitler had established his grip on the political and economic life of Germany it did little good then to die for religious freedom. Likewise when Stalin established political and economic control of Poland, it did little good for people then to die for religious freedom, although in both countries some did. Today we should all stand in one solid phalanx to fight the battle for all of our freedoms on the front line where there is every hope of winning, rather than waiting to fight for religious freedom alone on the last line where there is every chance of losing it.

Our freedoms are now mortgaged in America. But we had better keep the right to redeem these freedoms and to bum the mortgage. Then we will be preserving the best foundation yet known for human progress and human welfare, based upon a recognition of divinely-given principles and upon obedience to a God who cares about our physical welfare even as he cares about our spiritual welfare.

## Chapter 12

---

### CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

by

*Athens Clay Pullias*

On the great seal of David Lipscomb College these words are written, "The truth shall make you free." This statement of the Master has become Lipscomb's living motto. It represents a perfect educational ideal. The truth is as wholesome as the sunlight. There is never any solid reason for righteous men to fear the truth in any area or to dread the effects that a knowledge of the truth will bring.

Through the ages continuing attempts have been made to shackle the mind of man. Dictators, both political and religious, have sought in every generation to suppress and destroy those who dared to question what these oppressors themselves said or did. The iron chains of superstition, ignorance, and bigotry have enslaved nations and peoples by controlling their minds and thoughts. These dark forces of evil have spread fear, persecution, and suffering across the entire face of the earth. Men have been imprisoned without trial or hearing. The common rights of free speech, press, religion, and assembly which Americans take for granted have often been denied on penalty of imprisonment or death. Tyrants and dictators in the realm of government have not hesitated to kill, or to imprison, those who questioned their authority or the wisdom of their decisions. The Medieval Roman Catholic Church sought through the desperate means of the Inquisition to silence or annihilate every person who dared to lift a voice against her false teachings and moral

corruptions. Ecclesiastically approved teachings in science could be questioned only by running the risk of excommunication, imprisonment, or possible death. For example, Galileo was summoned before a tribunal of the Inquisition and compelled to renounce as false what he knew to be true. He had simply questioned the long standing assumption that the earth was the center of the universe and dared to suggest that the earth moved around the sun instead.

It should be remembered that truth cannot be created or changed by force, decree, or man-enacted law. Galileo's famous whisper which is supposed to have followed his denial, "nevertheless it does move," is probably fiction, but the earth does move and the wrathful pronouncements of the Roman Church did not change that fact. The flashing fires of the Inquisition were lighted to silence those who could see these evils. John Huss was put to death for questioning certain doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church. Men blinded by their own greed and lust for power have used relentlessly the imprisoning power of superstition and ignorance to place and keep their comrades in mental slavery in a multitude of forms and places. The last twenty-five years has produced the largest and worst series of tyrants since the Dark Ages. Their deeds have shattered the peace of the world.

In spite of these enemies of truth and enlightenment there have always been some who were willing to speak out. Their mouths could not be stopped. Men like Galileo, Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Huss, John Wycliffe, and a host of others have helped to break the chains of mental slavery and opened the way toward the light of truth. The Protestant Reformation, which was in reality a rebellion against the dictatorial papal system, was one of the great forward steps in human history. The battle against vested, and often corrupt, privilege in Western Europe and in England in particular led to the birth and present stature of the House of Commons. Had it not been for these pioneers who sought to free the mind of man, our own blessings of liberty as a nation might never have been achieved.

The mighty advances in medicine, sanitation, transportation, communication and constructive production have resulted from the free mind of man functioning unhampered by state control or ecclesiastical control—a mind that can reach out for truth, find it, and embrace it. The establishment here in America of a republic which guarantees to its citizens freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, and freedom to worship has been a glorious achievement of the unfettered human mind. The fathers of our own country dared to oppose oppression and tyranny. Dictatorships, with book burnings, merciless blood purges, and countless other oppressive measures, could never have produced such a favored land. The Protestant Reformation and Restoration broke the vicious chain that had fastened the Bible to the corrupted pulpit and gave it back to the people. These events placed upon each person the grave responsibility to study the Bible for himself, obey it for himself, and accept the consequences in the eternal judgment.

Slowly and painfully man has crept out of the Dark Ages. The caged mind of the medieval age has, in most of the western world at least, been set free to study, to think, to learn, to invent, to grow, to improve, and thus to better serve God and man. Progress was impossible when “the truths of Science” were determined in committee rooms by politicians or clerics rather than in research laboratories by conscientious students. Progress was impossible when religion and right were regarded as matters of state or papal decree. When Hitler drove Albert Einstein and others like him out of Germany he knocked out the brains of the German nation. It should frighten us that in this twentieth century Russian Communism, which personifies these victorious measures of suppression and destruction, should hold dominion over half the earth and through subtlety and guile has penetrated the very heart of our own nation. Truths in religion are to be learned from the study of God's eternal word. Listen carefully to Jesus: “Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. . . . If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed” (John 8:31-32, 36).

What then is this freedom that Christ has brought to us from God which no man has the right to deny? This freedom rests upon these basic truths:

1. That each human being is a potential son of God.
2. That each is a priceless soul made in the image of God.
3. That each soul has great and eternal dignity and worth in the sight of God.
4. That each responsible human being has the intelligence to learn the truth and the responsibility to accept and obey it.

Therefore, no government, man, organization, or other earthly power—political or ecclesiastical—has the right to destroy, or curtail, man's freedom in learning and obeying the truth of God. Any attempt to violate this freedom is a violation of Christ's teachings concerning man and his responsibility to God. No government, man, or other earthly power—political or ecclesiastical—has the right to assume the authority to make truth a matter of legislation or decree, or to force acceptance of such legislation and decree upon one's fellows. God has revealed his full and final will to man in the sacred scriptures, and no one has a right to stand between the people and this source of revealed wisdom and truth. The earth, the skies, the seas, and all that in them is stands before each man, and no earthly power has the right to deny to any the privilege of study, learning, and understanding.

### *I. The Results of Freedom in Religion.*

Now let us look for a moment at what results of this can be in religion, in academic studies, and in government. In religion this freedom results in the right to a full knowledge of, and obedience to, the gospel as the revealed will of Christ. Such a knowledge, and such obedience, produces in turn other freedoms sorely needed in this modern and evil world.

1. *Freedom from false faith in teachings and idols of all sorts which destroy men's lives.* Matthew 7:24-29—“Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And he 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 rains descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it. And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.”

2. *Freedom from sin, its power, and its consequences.* Jesus said in John 8:34—“Whosoever committeth sin is the bond-servant of sin,” and in verse 36, “If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.” Writing to the Romans Paul said in Romans 8:1-2—“There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.”

3. *Freedom from hatred, ill-will dissension, ignorance, and fear.* These evils could not exist where man knew the true nature of God and where they established the brotherhood of man under God in Christ as taught by Christ.

4. *Freedom from man-formed religious dogma, creeds, and traditions.* The major bulwark in the way of the spread of New Testament Christianity is the deadly grip which man-made teachings have upon the hearts of men. Each human being has the inalienable right to drink from the fresh original fountain of God's truth as revealed in the Bible.

5. *Freedom from self-centered despair in the light of the eternal truth:* “all things work together for good to them that love God” (Rom. 8:28). The man who is free under Christ and in Christ can walk the earth with firm tread and

face the future with unwavering confidence. He can say with the writer of the Hebrew letter, "The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me." (See also Psalms 27:1. )

God grant that men of faith and courage will never cease to rebel and speak out against the entrenched forces of false teaching, sectarianism, Romanism, and any other form of religious dictatorship that may ever arise within or without the church of our Lord. This spirit of rebellion against man-made controls must be accompanied by a companion spirit of willing submission to the wisdom of God—submission to the truth which has the power to make us free.

## *II. The Results of Freedom in Academic Fields.*

What has this freedom meant in the academic fields of study?

1. *This freedom has resulted in a continuous advance of knowledge concerning the physical world, which if guided by the spirit of Christ would bring tremendous blessings to the children of men. It is a bitter commentary on the morality and the intelligence of man to point out the use that man has made of the tremendous forces unleashed in our time and generation through study and invention. The careful research and inventive skill of modern man has unfolded a million marvels climaxed by the discovery of atomic energy. I like to think of the progress that has been made in this respect during the lifetime of my father who is still living. Since that June day in 1874, when he came into the world, the entire face of the earth has been changed by the mind and skill of free man. The breath-taking progress that has been made in communication, transportation, production, and all their varied consequences have outstripped anything that the wildest dreamer could have imagined in 1874. These developments have come from the free exercise of man's God-given intelligence made possible by the freedom and liberty guaranteed to us in the great country in which we live. It is stark tragedy to see these liberties gradually being devoured by an ever-increasing government regulation.*

2. *This freedom has allowed man to develop to the*

*fullest his creative abilities* in music, art, and literature—in the production of beauty in many forms. These are all God-given gifts, and if properly used, will glorify the Creator and bless humanity. The control of the human mind, as in the totalitarian countries, dries up talents and creative ability. Again even in America one can feel the cold breath of regulation and standardization. Russia has sought to control by government decree the output of her composers.

3. *Such freedom constantly reviews old beliefs in government, in all phases of human life and demands that they stand the test of careful analysis and study.* Without freedom to think and to study such manifest evils as the divine right of kings in government, human slavery, polygamy, and the like remain unchallenged for centuries. Those forms of government, and those practices in social life, which are in keeping with the will of God as revealed in the scriptures have nothing to fear from this practice of constant re-study and re-consideration. Truth does not fear examination or investigation. The truth shines brighter and clearer the more it is studied and considered. No truth need ever hide behind a cloak of darkness or of ignorance.

4. *Unless there is the general freedom to study, to learn, and to think there will not long remain the blessing of religious freedom.* Those who would take away the general right to study, to learn, and to obey the truth in general would not long leave the right to study, learn, and obey the gospel of Christ untouched. This has been demonstrated beyond question by events in Nazi Germany and more lately in the spreading orbit of Soviet Russia. The religion of Christ has absolutely nothing to fear from freedom in religion and freedom in learning, for Christ is eternal truth from God.

### *III. What does this Freedom Mean Politically?*

Those of us who live in the free and prosperous land of America have little conception of the vast and true values involved in the liberties that we daily enjoy. The right to speak our minds, the freedom of the press, the right of peaceable assembly, and above all the freedom of worship are so commonplace in our lives that we are guilty of forgetting

that these have been denied repeatedly to people all over the world. The Bill of Rights added to the American Constitution, in the form of the ten amendments, should be memorized and often repeated by every American citizen. May I read to you the first of these ten articles added to the original constitution of the United States. It deals with personal freedom. "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 the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." There can be no Hitlers, Stalins, or papal despots in America as long as the Bill of Rights is respected and enforced as the law of the land. To put it better, there will be no oppression, or slavery of the mind as long as the principles of Jesus are respected and followed.

In speaking of academic freedom as the right to study, learn, and teach the truth it is extremely important to remember that those who enjoy this freedom must be guided by a proper spirit of humility and responsibility. Freedom in every sphere—religious, political, and academic—has been often and gravely abused. This abuse can, and frequently has, led to the loss of freedom. It is not the function of scholarship—certainly not of Christian scholarship—to fling cynical question marks at every accepted principle of truth and righteousness. It is instead the first responsibility of every Christian to respect the Holy Bible as the inspired word of God and upon this premise to study respectfully and diligently *to know* God's will, and *to do* his will in *every* relationship and activity of life. This too is freedom. Freedom is not license. Freedom is not synonymous with lawlessness. Rather it is the exact opposite. It must be remembered too that men can only be free within the law of God. They cannot be free from it. There is no such thing as being free from the truth. The chemist is not free *from* law. The physicist is not free from law. They are free to learn and apply God's laws but not to change them. The same principle applies in the spiritual realm. Those who seek what they choose to call

freedom in that sense (freedom from law) will find themselves the slaves of their own misconceptions and convictions.

Christian scholarship, accepting the Bible as the inspired word of God and its eternal truths as the north star of life, will approach the study of all other things in the light of this revealed truth. There will never be any hindering conflict between the *truth* of God's word and *truth* in any other area of learning or study. There cannot be conflict of truth with truth. There has often been bitter conflict between the conclusions that men have reached *which were not true either* in religion, or science, or both. Christian scholarship builds faith in God and his word.

Freedom in general cannot disregard particular obligations. For example, postal employees are forbidden to take active part in elections. Suppose an employee, nevertheless, should take an active part in an election and then be called upon to explain his action. Would he be able to say that it is his constitutional right that no man can deny to take a part in elections. Yes, but it is not his constitutional right to hold a position in the post office department, while at the same time refusing to cooperate in the achievement of its purposes. He must choose whether he wants to insist on his constitutional right to participate in elections as he may see fit, or to serve in the postal department. There are limits in any particular situation, and that is true even under the most generous interpretation of these limits.

Academic freedom does not grant to the individual teacher in a particular college the right to make shipwreck of the ideals and purposes of that college. When the teacher accepts a position in a college he also accepts the responsibility of cooperating in the achievement of the purposes to which the college is dedicated. Honesty would require this of every teacher. When a teacher is unable to give this cooperation the path of honor is immediately clear. In the statement of principles in the standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools the following statement is found: "This (that is academic freedom) does not preclude special arrangements between institutions and

teachers, nor is this to be interpreted to mean that one has the right to be protected by this principle if he teaches the overthrow of the principle or of the system out of which it springs." Some teachers under the guise of academic freedom have sought to wreck the very principle upon which they claim to rely. It is the Christian evaluation of the individual soul which forms the entire basis for civil rights and personal freedom as we know these values. In collectivist countries the individual has neither rights nor power—he is totally subordinate to the state. The individual in these countries is no more regarded than an animal. Freedom does not give the right to any man to undermine and sabotage the moral principles and faith in God of young men and women which compromise the warp and woof of decent society. Education cannot be godless and without principles without wrecking this nation. The Communist agitators who announce their intention to overthrow the American system by force and violence have no right to be protected by law while they gather strength to accomplish this destruction of our free institutions.

I repeat, the religion of Jesus Christ has absolutely nothing to fear from freedom in religion, freedom in learning, or freedom through government from oppression and dictatorship. The more free men study Christ the more they will be drawn to him. The world, as the visible universe, is a creation of God through Christ, and whatever *truths* the free minds of men learn about God's material world can only serve to throw a better light on the glory of Christ. Long ago the Psalmist said: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge" (Psalms 19:1-2). Men through persecution and fear have ceaselessly sought to chain the minds of men and at times even in the blessed name of Christ. They have not understood him, or his words when he said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Christ is truth; truth is inexorable law; freedom is learning and doing the will of Christ.

## Chapter 13

---

### CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF BIOLOGICAL EVOLUTION IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD

by

*Dr. Jack Wood Sears*

I am happy to have this opportunity to discuss with you the subject that has been assigned to me, "Christ and Biological Evolution." The theory of evolution, as we shall use it in this discussion, is that theory which attributes all living organisms as they exist today to a process of descent with change from some simple cell or primordial mass of living matter. By the term *simple* we mean undifferentiated or without special structures or organs. By the expression *primordial mass of living matter* we mean that hypothetical first speck of living material which the evolutionist holds existed on this planet. The theory of biological evolution does not extend beyond this point but begins with that first life. We shall have more to say of this later.

The importance of this problem can be seen when we realize that the theory of evolution has been responsible for much of the evil of our day. It has shaken the faith of many in God and the Bible and has apparently given aid to the atheist and skeptic in the name of science. In the social realm it has had its effect, for it was in the Darwinian theory of the survival of the fittest that Nietzsche found support for his doctrine of the superman, the idea that might makes right, which led Germany under Hitler to the brink of destruction and the rest of the world to so much sorrow. The materialistic ideologies of communism and socialism are given support and are motivated by this philosophy. The blood purges of Russia and more recently of China are

terrible examples of its influence. Under such a philosophy the individual becomes unimportant; it is the species, the race, society that counts. But by specious reasoning rulers and governments identify themselves as the "race" to be preserved, and have advanced themselves at the expense of others. On a smaller scale the Nietzschean philosophy is seen in the dog-cat-dog competition sometimes found in business and at times in the attitude of labor organizations toward employers. Clarence Darrow, in his defense of Leopold and Loeb, also indicted the universities of our land for teaching Nietzschean ideas which, when put into practice, produced crimes like theirs in the torture and murder of Bobby Franks.

The doctrine of evolution has even invaded the home and the grade school. We speak of the development of the child as a recapitulation of the history of civilization. We dare not correct him for he is really not responsible. He is the little savage today because he has to pass through the savage state of evolving civilization. So our children receive little correction and become delinquent, their young lives often hopelessly ruined.

We speak of the evolution of thought and the evolution of truth, even the evolution of religion. Much of what is called "modernism" grows out of the philosophy of evolution. If man is the product of evolution, the result of the interaction of environment and matter, surely he is not responsible for his actions and cannot be condemned for them. The idea of sin is eliminated and with it the need of a Savior and the Word of God. Thus the theory of evolution sends out its arms of influence into every phase of our modern world. But Jesus said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." What is the truth about evolution?

The theory of evolution is not new, nor did it start with Charles Darwin. The Greek and Roman philosophers expressed the idea in their day. Evolution began in philosophy, not in science. Thales (640-546 B. C. ) spoke of water as the material from which all things arose. Anaximenes (588-524 B. C. ) spoke of the primordial terrestrial slime, composed of water and earth, from which arose, under the influence

of the sun's heat, plants, animals, and even man. Aristotle (384-322 B. C. ) gave credence to the idea of an evolutionary change by gradual steps from the imperfect to the perfect. Epicurus (342-270 B. C. ) emphasized the natural as opposed to the supernatural, and Lucretius (96-55 B. C. ) emphasized the mechanistic interpretation of life rather than a vitalistic.

In more modern times, both before and after Darwin's work was published, many have written and spoken on the theory of evolution. George Louis Buffon (1707-1788) believed in the mutability of the species. Chevalier de Lamarck (1744-1829) proposed a theory to explain the mechanism of evolution, generally called the theory of inheritance of acquired characters. This theory held the attention of the biological world until well after 1900 and the discovery of Mendel's work in genetics. Charles Lyell (1797-1875) in his *Principles of Geology* opposed the geological theory of Catastrophism,<sup>1</sup> which was generally accepted until that time. He introduced in its place the theory of Uniformity,<sup>2</sup> which had first been proposed by James Hutton in 1785 and expounded by John Playfairs in 1802. In this Lyell made a decided contribution to the thinking of Charles Darwin who later produced *The Origin of Species*. Thomas Malthus published his *Essay on the Principle of Population* (1837) in which Darwin found the expression "*struggle for existence*." Darwin's grandfather was a believer in evolution, and expressed some ideas about the struggle for existence while Charles was still a young man. Alfred Russel Wallace had read Lyell's geology, and in 1858 sent to his friend, Charles Darwin, a copy of a manuscript in which Darwin found expressed his own ideas concerning evolution and its mechanisms. When he found that others shared his ideas, he brought out in 1859 *The Origin of Species*. Wallace was

---

<sup>1</sup> The doctrine that changes in the earth's crust have generally been effected suddenly by physical forces.

<sup>2</sup> The doctrine that existing processes, acting as at present, are sufficient to account for all geological changes.

content to let Darwin take the lead, for it seemed to him that Darwin, through his extensive travels, had collected much more evidence to support his theory than he had been able to amass. He became, with Thomas Henry Huxley, a staunch supporter of the Darwinian theory. There is little doubt that these two made possible the general acceptance of the theory of natural selection, or the "survival of the fittest," as Spencer called it.

Other theories have been advocated since the appearance of *The Origin of Species*, but to most people Darwin remains the exponent of evolution. It was his book which resulted in the fierce controversy between men of science and the churchmen of that day. Perhaps this controversy between science and religion would have been less severe had the leaders on both sides been less dogmatic and more honestly open minded. It began, not so much as a conflict between science and the Bible, as a reaction to the tyranny of the medieval theologians who had abandoned the scriptures for the "doctrines of men." George Bernard Shaw<sup>3</sup> credits the Calvinistic idea of God, as held by many in that day, with having much to do with the ready acceptance of Darwin's book; for evolution was accepted, not because of the abundance of proof, but because of a theophobia. It was considered the only feasible alternative to creation. It was this attitude that lead T. H. Huxley to become the great protagonist of Darwinism. He realized that Darwin's theory was not the explanation of existing organisms, but he took it as the best yet proposed, if one were unwilling to accept creation. Although, strictly speaking, evolution and Darwinism are not synonymous, they have become so to the average man, and most biologists who believe in evolution could be classed as Neo-Darwinists. It is Darwin's theory, as it has been revised and combined with those of DeVries and others, that is still the most feasible alternative to creation. There

---

<sup>3</sup> Douglas Dewar and H. S. Shelton, *Is Evolution Proved?* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1947), p. 4.

is little wonder, then, that Darwin's book was so readily received by atheists and skeptics.

It should not be concluded from this discussion that all men of science have accepted the idea of evolution. In fact much and serious opposition to the theory has been brought by men of science. Linnaeus (1707-1778), the father of our present system of classification, believed in the fixity of the species. He completely rejected the idea of evolution and believed in creation. Today men say our classification means nothing if evolution is not true. They argue that the fact that we can classify living organisms testifies to the fact of evolution. Yet Linnaeus, the founder of our system of classification, did not think so. Neither did Louis Agassiz (1807-1873), the Swiss-born naturalist of world renown. Professor of Zoology at Harvard and founder of the Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology, he never accepted the idea of evolution but fought it effectively during his lifetime. He saw, both in the forms of living things, and in the geological record, the stamp of God's creation. Cuvier (1769-1832), the French naturalist and authority in comparative anatomy, saw the creation of God in the structure of the animals he dissected. He was not unaware of the arguments of the evolutionists of his day, essentially the same as those put forth today; yet he was led by his study to see the falseness of their claims.

Lest someone say, "But these are men of long ago, before evolution was proved," let me say that the evidence has not essentially changed since their time. What changes have been made are more detrimental to the theory than helpful. Let it be noticed also that there are many who refuse to accept the theory of evolution today. Professor S. J. Holmes of the University of California says, "Sir Arthur Keith has remarked that even our leading biologists and masters of history are evolutionists only from the lips outward."<sup>4</sup> Indeed, many men of science are being led by the facts of

---

<sup>4</sup> S. J. Holmes, *Science* (Aug. 11, 1939), p. 117.

science to doubt the validity of the theory.

That this is no small movement is made plain when one examines the most recent discussions of the subject. The Evolution Protest Movement, in England and America, is growing rapidly. This is true despite the difficulty confronting the biologist today which is well put by Professor Paul Shorey of the University of Chicago: "... there is, in fact, no cause that is so immune from criticism today as evolution... An ambitious young professor may safely assail Christianity or the Constitution of the United States or George Washington or female chastity or marriage or private property or the defense of your native land... But he must not apologize for Bryan. . . It is not done."<sup>5</sup> Scientists in England and America arose in horror and indignation at the decrees of the Russian state, which bound upon Russian scientists the absurd genetic theories of Michurin and Lysenko because they are thought to harmonize with communistic dogma. Yet these same scientists brand as unscientific any who would dare to express doubt about the "fact" of evolution. They will at once question his integrity and his scholarship. In England this suppression of opposition to the evolution theory has proceeded to the extent that the protagonists of creation are denied the basic right of free men, the right to speak. It is time for all who believe in God and in God-given freedom to speak out against this dictatorship of science, so called, in order that all of us may start once more that search for truth and God for which we were created. "And he made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he is not far from each one of us: for in him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:26-28).

In the short time given to me it would be impossible to discuss fully the evolution theory. I shall therefore limit my

---

<sup>5</sup> Paul Shorey, *The Atlantic Monthly*, (Oct. 1928), p. 478.

remarks to such facts and broad principles as seem most essential to an understanding of the subject. At the outset I feel it necessary to say that we who believe in creation do not have to find fault with, or take exception to any of the fact's of science. Our criticisms are aimed at the *interpretations* of the facts, for we believe these often to be erroneous. The conclusions we must draw as to the correctness of one of the ideas and the falseness of the other must be based upon an accumulation of evidence. In examining evidence, however, it is important to remember that any fact which can be equally well used to prove either of two hypotheses can in reality be used to prove neither. It is often the oversight of this principle that has led honest seekers for truth to accept erroneous conclusions.

The *a priori* evidence for creation is found in the very existence of God. If God exists, and his existence has never been successfully denied, then of course creation is possible. With God in the picture the miraculous can not be ignored but must be considered not only possible but highly probable. Add to this the fact that the Bible, both in the Old and in the New Testament, attributes all to the creation of God and you have a strong case for creation.

The *a priori* evidence for evolution is the existence of variation. No two things, with perhaps the exception of a few identical twins, are alike. Every leaf is different from every other. Every animal differs from every other of its species. Variations are often produced, as in the case of albinism in man, or the hairless condition of the chihuahua, the Mexican hairless dog. Men have used the possibility and the occurrence of variation to improve varieties of corn and breeds of chickens. If such variations should continue indefinitely, evolution as defined a moment ago could conceivably have occurred.

Our discussion today must focus on two points. First, what facts, if any, can be found that could be explained rationally on the basis of one hypothesis but not by both? Second, can and did variations continue to the extent that evolution occurred?

In the field of biology evidence can be sought in the following areas: comparative anatomy, embryology, serology, anthropology, genetics, paleontology, or the study of fossils, and biogeography, or the study of the distribution of animals on earth. At once it is apparent that all of these fields cannot be exhausted in the present discussion, or in fact any one field.

Let us then begin our examination with the field of comparative anatomy. That similarity in structure occurs in animals and in plants is not to be denied. There is much similarity in structure for example between a monkey and a man. There is much more similarity in structure between a man and a monkey than between a man and an earthworm, and even less similarity between a man and an amoeba. It is possible to arrange in an apparently orderly fashion all the animals from the simplest one-celled organism to those deemed the highest or more complexly developed, with man generally placed at the top of the list. This family tree is commonly seen in our textbooks of zoology. When we examine the arrangement, however, we notice two important things. First, this order is not as orderly as it would seem. Organism after organism is found that does not fit the family tree. They appear on cursory examination to belong in a definite position, but when further studied they are found not to fit at all. The brachiopods, rotifers, hemichordata and the onychophora are a few examples.

The second thing we notice is that this arrangement, designed to show relationships, actually shows nothing of the kind. The idea of homology is taken to indicate genetic relationship. Dr. H. H. Newman states the case in this way: "The Principle of Homology is almost a corollary of the Recapitulation Theory. Any two or more structures in different groups of animals that have similar embryonic origin and parallel each other in development for a reasonable length of time are by definition homologous. So the only sure test of homology must come from a study of embryology. What is implied in the principle of homology is that two or

more forms possessing truly homologous structures must have been derived from a common ancestor that possessed the characters in question. In other words, homologous structures in different groups imply a certain common genetic origin for these groups. Thus the wing of a bird, the arm of a man, the flipper of a whale, the one-toed fore leg of a horse, and even the pectoral fin of a lobe-finned fish, are regarded as homologous because they start out in development from similar rudiments and follow for some time the same plan of differentiation, only diverging in relatively late stages to produce very different end products.<sup>6</sup>

The whole case of comparative anatomy stands or falls with this idea of homology. But T. H. Morgan has said, "If, then, it can be established beyond dispute that similarity or even identity of the same character in different species is not always to be interpreted to mean that both have arisen from a common ancestor, the whole argument from comparative anatomy built upon the descent theory seems to tumble in ruins."<sup>7</sup>

Let us address ourselves to this problem. If homology, that is, similarity in structure and development, is to be taken as an indication of genetic relationships, it would follow as a necessary conclusion that each phenotypic or "observable" expression of the hereditary factors or genes must be distinguishable. If the observable expression of gene "a," for example, can at any time be confused with the phenotypic expression of gene "b," we can never be sure, except after careful genetic tests, that the phenotypes we are observing in two different organisms are due to the same genes or to two different genes. But it is plain from the study of genetics

---

<sup>6</sup> H. H. Newman, *The Phylum Chordata: Biology of Vertebrates and Their Kin* (New York: MacMillan, 1939), p. 47.

<sup>7</sup> T. H. Morgan, *Scientific Monthly* (March, 1923), p. 246

that two entirely different genes often have indistinguishable expressions. For example, there is the condition known as albinism. In a man it is known that this is generally due to recessive genes. But one case of albinism is known that is attributed to the action of a single dominant gene. Two different genes, then, are known that produce human albinism. As a second instance, a condition of the eye called *Retinitis pigmentosa* is known to be due to the presence of one of several different genes. The only connection between these genes is that they happen to be in human beings. But if we cannot be sure which gene is responsible for a given phenotype in organisms belonging to the same species, how can we be sure that similar phenotypes occurring in different groups are due to the same genes? As a third instance, Julian Huxley and G. R. de Beer in their work on certain closely related "species" of frogs found that, in the embryological development of the lens of the eye, these two "species," although seemingly developing "alike," in reality develop under the influence of two entirely different organizers. Evidently different genes are responsible in the respective "species" for the apparently identical development. To be certain that structures are homologous, therefore, we would be forced to go further than has been done, or can be done, for we would be forced, by our newer understandings, to go back to the genes themselves.

To add further to the difficulty of accepting the "implications of homology," let us notice that within any one phylum of animals, which according to evolution contains only organisms that have a common ancestry, there is no agreement among taxonomists as to the exact relationships. Family trees of each phylum are difficult to derive because there is conflict in homologies. If, for example, one should use the characteristics of the skull to draw up a family tree, and then beginning again use the characteristics of the internal organs such as the circulatory, digestive, or nervous system to draw up another tree, it would be seen that these trees do not agree at all. Homologies in one set of characters disagree with homologies in another set of characters. This

cannot be if they are all derived from a common ancestry.

Osborn confesses the weakness of the argument from homology by saying: "From comparative anatomy alone, it is possible to arrange a series of living forms which, although structurally, a convincing array because placed in a graduating series, may be, nevertheless, in an order inverse to that of the actual historical succession."<sup>8</sup> Alfred Sherwood Romer, Alexander Agassiz Professor of Zoology and Director of the Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, after discussing the characteristics of the skull in the bony fishes and tetrapods says, "It is difficult to give a generalized description which will hold in all cases. And the task is further complicated by the fact that in most living groups considerable degeneration and specialization have taken place, obscuring the true phylogenetic story."<sup>9</sup> Because the task is complicated for Dr. Romer and other evolutionists, they are forced to postulate degeneration and modification ad infinitum, for the phylogenetic picture is not there.

It can be safely concluded, then, that homology does not imply genetic relationships, nor does it indicate evolutionary changes, but if we should agree for a moment that homology is an indication of genetic relationships we would not have helped greatly the case for evolution, in spite of Huxley's statement to the contrary. We would still have our difficulties in the evolutionary picture. Dr. Newman<sup>10</sup> has shown very clearly that the characteristics supposedly shared by the invertebrates (those animals without back bones) and the vertebrates (those animals with back bones), which have been used to indicate the origin of the vertebrates from the invertebrates, are not homologous characteristics at all. The gap between the invertebrate and the vertebrate

---

<sup>8</sup> *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 20. p. 580.

<sup>9</sup> A. S. Romer, *The Vertebrate Body*, (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1949) p. 217.

<sup>10</sup> H. H. Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-9.

is wider now than ever before in the history of biology. Other gaps are likewise broader than ever. The gaps between the one celled animals and the many celled animals and between man and the lower creatures go unbridged, in spite of all homologies and other implications which evolutionists might add to them.

How much simpler it is to explain the likeness among animals upon the basis of creation! I drove through Little Rock with a friend of mine who is a contractor. He pointed out house after house designed by a certain architect. In all of them certain common characteristics were at once noticeable. Did this mean that one house had been derived from another? Certainly not. The likeness is explainable by the fact that the same architect drew each plan. Certainly there is likeness among animals. The same great Architect designed them all. But we may be asked, "Why are they so alike? Is it not a bit confusing and misleading, as if the Creator intended to confuse us by making us think that evolution was true?" Of course not. Let me ask how else would you make them if you were the Creator? What would you substitute for the fore limb of the horse that could not be made to appear similar to the flipper of a whale or the arm of a man? How else would you have it develop embryologically? In all of God's creation the principle of least effort seems to control. Organs develop embryologically in the most direct manner possible under the circumstances and to accomplish the purposes for which they were designed.

This brings us to the arguments from embryology. Ernest Heinrich Haeckel (1834-1919) defended the Theory of Recapitulation. This theory as it is now held by evolutionists, is that animals in their embryological development relive their evolutionary history or, as some one has said, the individual climbs its own ancestral tree. This theory has been modified from time to time and is today recognized by embryologists of note to be essentially untrue. Professor Huettner of Queen's College states, "As a law, this principle has been questioned. It has been subjected to careful scrutiny

and has been found wanting. There are too many exceptions to it. <sup>11</sup>

The idea was formerly held that the human embryo passed through development resembling the adult stages of various organisms and that a human embryo could not be distinguished from the embryos of other vertebrates. Professor Waldo Shumway of the University of Illinois, however, states, "There is never a time in the development of a mammal when it could be mistaken for a fish or a reptile." <sup>12</sup> Even if we could not tell the difference between embryos, the embryos always "know" the difference. Never does a pig embryo turn into a cow. The more closely we examine the embryos the more different they are found to be. As H. H. Newman has said, <sup>13</sup> it is a confused picture. For example, teeth were, according to the evolution theory, evolved before a tongue, yet in the embryological development of the individual, the tongue appears first. Again, in the development of the mammal, the first skeleton to appear after the notochord is made of cartilage. In the adult, however, the skeleton is of bone. Yet in the phylogenetic picture, drawn by the evolutionists themselves, bone is said to have come first. Such is the inconsistency of the much vaunted Recapitulation Theory.

It is alleged further that gill slits are examples of recapitulation and that the mammalian embryo, yes, even man, has aortic (or blood) arches and gill bars like the embryo of the fish. Actually these are blood vessels. They are not hang-overs from the fish stage, but instead are there to supply blood to the rapidly developing head and neck regions of the embryo. The cartilaginous bars mentioned in the pharyngeal region are in reality the beginning of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Alfred H. Huettner. *Comparative Embryology of the Vertebrates* (New York: McMillan, 1945). p. 48.

<sup>12</sup> W. Shumway, *Introduction to Vertebrate Embryology*, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1942). p. 4.

<sup>13</sup> See *Addendum*.

jaws, the hyoid apparatus, and the bones of the inner ear. At no time are there gill slits or gills. The resemblance to the fish is more imagined than actual, and is coincidental. How else and where else would you develop these structures in the process of embryology if not in the region where they are needed and in the most direct way possible under the circumstances?

Again, we are asked about the three kidneys of the mammalian embryo. Are these not indications of evolution? Certainly not. These three kidneys, called the pronephros, the mesonephros, and the metanephros respectively, are the Creator's answer to the excretory needs of the embryo. It is true that the pro- and mesonephric kidneys which develop in the human embryo are similar to the simple kidneys of the lower animals, though more perfectly formed, but they are there because of need. When the human embryo first needs some means of eliminating waste, it is very small and poorly developed; only the head end has been formed. It is at this time that the first and simplest kidney is developed. This is sufficient, and yet is easily and quickly supplied. The final kidney, the metanephros, is complicated and takes time to develop embryologically in its place in the lumbar region of the body. The time required for the metanephros to grow to functional proportions is so great that without the pronephros the embryo would have died from the poison of the accumulated waste of its own metabolism long before the metanephros could be formed and become functional. Here again we see the law of necessity in action. This law, the evolutionist is forced to agree, is pre-eminent, since things that are not necessary are said by them, to disappear and necessary things are "interpolated," to use the expression of Dr. Newman.

A discussion of vestigial organs would properly be placed here, but there is little time. As our knowledge has increased, the number of so-called vestigial organs has dwindled until no biologists will dare call any structure vestigial unless he thinks his hearers ignorant. At one time the thyroid gland was called vestigial. We did not know its function. Today we

know there is nothing vestigial about it. Just because we know nothing about the function of a structure does not mean that it is vestigial. It must be proved to have no function. Even the removal of the structure from the body without noticeable effect is no indication that it is vestigial. Certainly we can live without an appendix, but we can also get along without the gall bladder, which we know is not vestigial. It is doubtful if the former is.

Someone says, "What about a tail? I have seen pictures of babies with tails." So have I. I have some pictures of "tailed babies" in books in my office. The truth of the matter is that these are all hoaxes. The first I have a record of was from the Philippine Islands and was shown in court to be faked. In fact, the Dr. Keen who first published it in the book, *I Believe in God and Evolution*, denounced it as a hoax and withdrew that edition of his book from the market. <sup>14</sup> Other and later pictures have been of sacrococcygeal tumors or the condition called *spina bifida* and are not tails at all. In fact such abnormalities are not in any way indications of ancestral conditions, as Professor Rendle Short of Bristol University, a noted British surgeon, has shown. <sup>15</sup> Indeed, recapitulation is a dead letter for all who open their eyes that they may see.

When we look to the field of serology and examine the evidence that is presented by the blood precipitation tests, the picture is even more confusing. In 1904, George Nuttal of Cambridge University conducted a series of tests using the blood serum of different animals and man. He testified to the crudeness of their methods; yet from his data he drew the conclusion, often repeated, that man was descended from an ape-like ancestor. When his tables of data are examined, however, it is seen that the actual results are not so plain. For example, the tests showed that man is just as

---

<sup>14</sup>Harry Rimmer, *The Law Suit Against the Bible*, (Grand Rapids: Erdmans Publishing Co., 1940), p. 80-81.

<sup>15</sup>See *Addendum*.

closely related to the whalebone whale as to one species of baboon. Obviously this is erroneous. In more modern tests carried on by workers at Rutgers University, cases have already been found where the serology tests conflict with the relationships derived from homologies. Which is correct? Both are said to be based on genetic factors inherited from ancestors. This conflict is devastating to the doctrine of evolution. Such conflict is not surprising since, when properly done, the serological reactions can "prove" that a child is more closely related to a total stranger than to its own mother. If, for example, the mother has type "A" blood and the child has type "B," the blood of the mother will precipitate that of the baby, but the blood of a total stranger, whether white or black, red or yellow, if of type B, may be found to mix perfectly with that of the child. Does this mean that the child is related less closely to its own mother than to a stranger, perhaps even of a different race? Of course not. So much for the blood precipitation tests. They prove nothing except that under the mental set of certain theories, even scientists can become cloudy in their thinking.

The field of genetics is basic to this whole discussion, for it is only through the inheritance from one generation to another that life can continue. At first it might seem that genetics does not contribute so much to the question of whether or not evolution occurred as it does to the question of how it occurred; for if evolution did occur, the changes must have involved hereditary factors. Actually, however, since the rediscovery of Mendel's papers in 1900, genetics has contributed much to the answer of the problem. Genetics has made it plain that the scheme of Lamarck was wrong. Acquired characters are not inherited. We should have known that without genetics. Dogs have had their tails bobbed and their ears clipped for centuries; yet each new puppy has just as long a tail and just as floppy ears as ever. Evolution cannot happen through the accumulation of acquired characters.

Genetics has shown also that the mutation theory, as first expressed by DeVries, is not enough. Mutations do

occur but they cannot explain the how of the supposed evolution. Professor Sewell Wright of Chicago University says, "The one systematic effect of mutation seems to be a tendency towards degeneration."<sup>16</sup> Professor Muller, a Nobel prize winner in medicine and physiology and one of the leaders in the field of genetics, said, "Most mutations are bad. In fact, good ones are so rare that we can consider them all bad."<sup>17</sup> J. B. S. Haldane, a leading geneticist and mathematician of Great Britain, when debating with Douglas Dewar and Merson Davis, was hard put to name one single mutation that was good.<sup>18</sup> Indeed with Wright we can say they are degenerative rather than constructive. They tend toward disintegration.

If, however, we should for argument's sake agree that there are some good mutations, the theory of evolution would still be hard put. Professor Richard Goldschmidt of the University of California wrote that the limits of the species had not been transgressed and the gaps between them cannot be bridged by postulating a series of subspecies.<sup>19</sup> Concerning the idea that mutations can be responsible for evolution, he further says, "This viewpoint... must take it for granted that somehow new genes are formed, as it is hardly to be assumed that man and amoeba may be connected by mutation of the same genes..."<sup>20</sup> The Neo-Darwinist thesis is that evolution is the result of the accumulation in time of many "micro-mutations," individually or collectively subjected to the decisions of natural selection, with genes that are good tending to be kept, others tending to be discarded.

---

<sup>16</sup>Sewell Wright, *The New Systematics*, Edited by Julian Huxley, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1948), p. 19.

<sup>17</sup>H. J. Muller, *Time Magazine* (Nov. 11, 1946), p. 138.

<sup>18</sup>Douglas Dewar, Merson Davis, and J. B. S. Haldane, *Is Evolution a Myth?* (London, 1949).

<sup>19</sup>See *Addendum*.

<sup>20</sup>*The Material Basis of Evolution*, (Yale Univ. Press, 1940), p. 6.

This survival of the fittest sounds good, but as Dr. Goldschmidt has pointed out it just will not work.<sup>21</sup>

While disagreeing with Goldschmidt's own evolutionary schemes, I must agree with his arguments against the Neo-Darwinists. There are too many difficulties. We will recall only a few. According to the evolutionary theory, the birds were supposed to come from reptiles; yet no satisfactory explanation has ever been given to show how a creature, half bird, half reptile, with half wing, half fore-limb could ever compete for existence in nature. Such a situation is beyond conception. If evolution is to be proved true, there must be some way to change the reptile into the bird immediately, but such a change would in itself be miraculous. Other examples could be mentioned, such as the spider that constructs a diving bell under the water for its nest and brings into it air in the form of bubbles caught among the bristles on its body. No intermediate state could be conceived for that. The first diving bell and the first spider to use it had to be perfect. Evolution could not have occurred gradually, as Darwin postulated, for the struggle for existence would have removed such half-way creatures.

On the other hand, genetics has shown that each organism reproduces after its kind. The "kind" of Genesis is not the "species" of men. Man's "species" are subject to the whims of the taxonomist. But God's "kinds" stand firm. Certainly there are varieties due to new mutations and chromosomal arrangements. God made it so. But the "kind" of God still stands.

Let us look next to the geological record. It is here that the evidence should be found, if it is to be found at all. The evolution of living organisms is assumed to have occurred in the past. Some claim it is continuing now. If it did occur in the past, it should be found imbedded in the rocks. There is written the history of the past.

Geologists have examined the earth's crust and have

---

<sup>21</sup>See *Addendum*.

arranged the layers of sedimentary rock in their supposed time schedule. Romer of Harvard University lists three eras in which fossils definitely appear:<sup>22</sup> the Paleozoic, beginning about 550 million years ago, the Mesozoic, beginning 190 million years ago, and the Cenozoic, in which we are now living, beginning about 70 million years ago. This time schedule, however, is by no means certain. Geologists cannot agree upon it. The methods of telling the age of strata are not without serious faults, admitted even by geologists. The radio-activity method and the method which makes use of the helium content of the strata are not yet reliable. They are based on certain doubtful assumptions and are subject to the opinion of the investigators.<sup>23</sup> For the sake of our discussion today, I will not argue about the assumed ages of the strata. For, even with the extended period of 550 million years, there is not time for evolution to have occurred according to their schemes. Dewar has shown that at the rate of the supposed "evolution" of the horse it would take 500 to 1000 million years to develop one *order*; yet according to the geologists, the first fossils occurred only 550 million years ago.<sup>24</sup> But from the first living form must have developed not only orders but whole families and phyla of organisms. For such a development even 550 million years could not have sufficed.

It must be remembered, of course, that the Proterozoic and the Archaeozoic eras preceded the Paleozoic. But the Cambrian period of the Paleozoic, 550 million years ago, is the first in which fossils are definitely found. Attempts have been made to interpret scratches and discolorations in the "older" formations as fossils, but up to now no authentic pre-Cambrian fossils have been discovered. No evidence proves life then existed. In the early Paleozoic strata, how-

---

<sup>22</sup> Romer, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>23</sup> See *Addendum*.

<sup>24</sup> Dewar and Shelton, *Is Evolution Proved?*, p. 129, and Dewar and others, *Is Evolution a Myth?*, p. 23.

ever, all the great animal groups suddenly appear except perhaps the vertebrates. But the astonishing fact, so deadly to the theory of evolution, is the complete lack of intermediate or transitional forms. When genera first appear in the fossil record, they are not the simple organisms assumed by evolution, but they are as definite, as fully formed, as any today. No incipient genera have been found. Darwin argued that the geological record was fragmentary and that these gaps could be expected. He was confident we would find them through future exploration. In nearly a hundred years since the appearance of *The Origin of Species*, these gaps have only broadened. The more we study the fossils the more apparent it is that links are definitely missing. Was Darwin right? Is the fossil picture fragmentary? If it is, then is it not dangerous to draw conclusions from such imperfect data? What if it is not fragmentary? Then the whole case for evolution from paleontology is destroyed. Let us check the completeness of the record.

Douglas Dewar and his colleagues have shown that the fossil record is far more complete than Darwin and his followers supposed.<sup>25</sup> Dr. Austin Clark of the United States National Museum said, "No matter how far back we go in the fossil record of previous animal life upon the earth, we find no trace of any animal forms which are intermediate between the various major groups or phyla."<sup>26</sup>

But some one may be ready to object, "Look at the evolution of the horse, or the elephant, or even the evolution of man. Surely the fossils reveal that these have evolved through intermediate stages." We have the pictures in textbooks of biology claiming to portray the evolution of the horse. In reality they do not. The fossils have been arranged by man in an order for the specific purpose of giving support to the theory of evolution. I could arrange the pictures of

---

<sup>25</sup>See *Addendum*.

<sup>26</sup>A. Clark, *The New Evolution* (New York: Williams & Wilkins, 1930), p. 196.

automobiles built in the past in such a way as to indicate the "evolution" of the automobile, but you would know there was no organic evolution there. One car did not evolve from a former one. Each was a special creation of the manufacturer. To be sure all had certain things in common. All had wheels, axles, and some sort of chassis. The horse pictures arranged to teach evolution to our students misrepresent facts, and evolutionists know it. For example, authorities cannot agree about the ancestry of the horse at all. Some derive *Equus*, the modern horse, from *the little four-toed Eohippus*; others believe this is impossible. The Baroness Wentworth, a breeder of thoroughbred and Arabian horses and authoress of several classical books on the subject, wrote of the exhibits of the horse in the American Museum of Natural History, "This pictorial Evolution series... has been subjected to such wholesale fancy reconstruction of missing parts, that, as presented to the public, its evidential value amounts to little more than that of a pictorial historical novel. . . . If we accept the reconstruction of *Eohippus*, his ribs were eighteen, *Orohippus* dropped to fifteen, *Pliohippus* jumped to nineteen, and *Equus Scotti* is back to eighteen. *Eohippus* starts at six or seven lumbar, *Orohippus* shows eight, and some five million years later, *Equus Scotti* is back at six. Where scientists differ, ordinary men may stand by their own reasoning till more proof is forthcoming."<sup>27</sup>

Dewar has further shown that the fossils included in this supposed series are all bones of animals of the horse family. Consequently no great boundary has been crossed. There is no evolution there.

Actually fossils cannot show genetic relationship at all. We can see likenesses among skeletons, but we cannot prove relationships. Two human skeletons cannot be proved by examination to be of related individuals. Neither can the skeleton of one kind of animal be proved by skeletal exami-

---

<sup>27</sup>Baroness Wentworth. *Thoroughbred Racing Stock*, Scribners, (1938), p. 79.

nation to be actually related to the skeleton of another kind of animal. All paleontologists understand this. All they can do is to compare bones and group those that are alike or similar together and separate them from those that are structurally different. We must go elsewhere for our proof of evolution and genetic relationships.

I shall not spend your time discussing the other series put forth to support evolution. The anthropologists are in greater difficulty than the students of the horse. They cannot at all agree on the proper lineage in the "evolutionary tree of man." They have built various and conflicting theories, including *Pithecanthropus*, Neanderthal, Heidelberg, and others. Besides the fragmentary nature of the evidence (only the jaw bones of Heidelberg, the skullcap, a femur, and two teeth of *Pithecanthropus erectus*, etc. ), one of the difficulties is that we have authentic records of modern man in deposits older than those of his supposed ancestors. We shall not argue further until the evolutionists decide among themselves the order they think right, and even whether these were men or merely the remains of some anthropoid ape.

Hence we may conclude with Dr. Clark, "Since we have not the slightest evidence, either among the living or the fossil animals, of any intergrading types following between the major groups, it is a fair supposition there never have been any such intergrading types."<sup>28</sup>

Lest some one say Dr. Clark was writing twenty years ago, let us quote from Dr. George Gaylor Simpson of the American Museum of Natural History, who wrote in 1944, "This regular absence of transitional forms is not confined to mammals, but is an almost universal phenomenon, as has long been noted by paleontologists. It is true of almost all orders of all classes of animals, both vertebrate and invertebrate. *A fortiori*, it is also true of the classes themselves, and of the major animal phyla, and it is apparently also true of analogous categories of plants." He adds further, "In the

---

<sup>28</sup> Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

earlier days of evolutionary paleontology, it was assumed that the major gaps would be filled in by later discoveries, and even, falsely, that some discoveries had already filled them. As it became more and more evident that the great gaps remained, despite wonderful progress in finding the members of lesser transition groups and progressive lines, it was no longer satisfactory to impute this absence of objective data entirely to chance. The failure of paleontology to produce such evidence was so keenly felt that a few disillusioned naturalists even decided that the theory of organic evolution or of general organic continuity of descent was wrong, after all."<sup>29</sup>

And well they might. Even the fossils repudiate the doctrine of evolution. Professor Theodore Schwarze, Emeritus Professor of New York University, said, "The doctrine of evolution would be an insult to anyone's intelligence today and is only accepted by scholars and scientists because it categorically denies the Word of God, which they hate. "^^°

Much more could be said. This is sufficient. The Theory of Organic Evolution remains unproved. It is based on a distortion of facts without any conclusive evidence to substantiate it.

In contrast with the theory of evolution, creation is the only logical answer to the problem of origins. All known facts can be harmonized with creation, but many are in direct conflict with the evolution hypothesis. In the beginning I called attention to the fact that biologists refuse to take evolution back further than the first life. In the words of Haldane they have "no very firm conviction" about the "origin of that first life." Even if evolution could be upheld by evidence, it would still be necessary to account for the beginning of life. Only creation can explain this. Try as

---

<sup>29</sup> G. G. Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), p. 107.

<sup>30</sup> T. Schwarze, *Fighting to the Death for the Bible* (William Jennings Bryan University, 1944)

hard as they will, the atheistic evolutionists cannot get rid of a need for God. This is one reason many biologists are theistic evolutionists. Biologists of centuries past went through a long struggle to establish the fact that spontaneous generation does not occur. Redi (1668), Spallanzani (1777), Schultz (1836), Schwann (1837), Schroder and Dusch (1854), Pasteur (1860), and Tyndall all worked, experimented, and proved that life comes only from life. Spontaneous generation does not occur. All bacteriology and the science of disease are based on this fact. Materialists squirm under the truth of this statement, but the truth remains.<sup>31</sup> Only life begets life. Everywhere we turn we face God. Mind cannot come from matter. Organizations cannot come from chaos except through the action of some intelligent force. Yet in all the universe we find the law of disintegration working.<sup>32</sup> We must go beyond the universe to find the integrating power in God. Yes, "in the beginning God." Evolution does not get rid of God. In God is life, energy, and intelligence. All the biological world unites with the physical universe to bear testimony to the great Designer.

Finally, another fact which evolution cannot remove is the fact of sin. We have but to look around us to see the evil in our world. The discord in our homes, in our schools,

---

<sup>31</sup> In an attempt to avoid this dilemma, atheists have often resorted to an assumption that is damaging to their cause when properly understood. They theorize that in the distant past, as the earth began to cool (if it ever were hot), the conditions became just right and life evolved from non-life. But it does not do so today because conditions are not right. The difficulty here is that if one accepts this theory he is forced to abandon the doctrine of Uniformity upon which all the theory of mechanistic evolution is based. In avoiding one pitfall, the atheist falls into another equally disastrous.

<sup>32</sup> The reader is referred to the Third Law of Thermodynamics.

in our industries, in our nation, and in our world, hatred, war, immorality—all these are evil. Evolution has tried to ignore sin, to say that we are the products of our environment and not responsible. We are just glorified apes. But just as evolution does not get rid of the fact of God, so it does not do away with the fact of sin and the need of a savior. Jesus stands after all these centuries, the one transcendent life, undeniable, explainable except as God. Christ is one of the greatest facts of all history. He cannot be explained on the basis of evolution. Just as in the beginning God created the first man Adam and into him breathed the breath of Life so that he became a living soul, so today through Christ God's spirit gives life and energy to his new creatures. As it is impossible to explain the natural world without creation, so creation is necessary to change us from men of sin to saints of God. Christians are his workmanship, and bear indelibly the stamp of his creation.

#### ADDENDUM

<sup>13</sup>“If then the ontogeny of a higher form completely paralleled that of a lower form through the developmental period, except for the adult stages, the higher form would differ from the lower only in the last stage. But this is not the case, for there are differences between the two somewhat parallel ontogenies at all stages. There is a general tendency for higher forms to condense the early stages, some structures being pushed back to earlier and earlier stages. Moreover, some stages in the ontogeny of lower forms may be omitted altogether or appear as transitory structures that soon disappear. Also new structures frequently appear in the middle of ontogeny that have no parallel in the ontogeny of ancestry. Thus various kinds of adaptive structures that have value only for the larval or fetal life are interpolated into the ontogeny of higher forms. These interpolated structures are sometimes so prominent as to obscure the true ancestral conditions and thus tend to confuse the picture of recapitulation.” *The Phylum Chordata*, p. 42.

<sup>15</sup>“Common human deformities, such as hair lip, cleft

palate, club foot, supernumerary fingers or toes, webbed fingers, spina bifida, and a score of others, are in no way characteristic of any possible ancestor. The statement is often copied from book to book that babies may be born with a tail. It is safe to say that of a thousand babies with congenital malformations, not more than one in the thousand will show the alleged tail, and when it does occur, it will usually be a fatty or sacrococcygeal tumor, and quite unlike the tail of a monkey. Apes, of course, have no tails." *Modern Discovery and the Bible*, London, 1949, p. 107.

<sup>19</sup>"No where have the limits of the species been transgressed, and these limits are separated from the limits of the next good species by the unbridged gap, which also includes sterility.... This gap cannot be bridged by theoretically continuing the subspecific gradient or cline beyond its actual existing limits. The subspecies do not merge into the species either actually or ideally... subspecies are actually, therefore, neither incipient species nor models for the origin of species. They are more or less diversified blind alleys within species." *The Material Basis of Evolution*, Yale University Press, 1940, pp. 168, 183.

<sup>21</sup> "The decisive step in evolution, the first step towards macro-evolution, the step from one species to another, requires another evolutionary method than of sheer accumulation of micromutations." *Ibid.*, p. 183.

<sup>23</sup>"Astronomical, meteorological, climatological, paleontological, general biological, and anthropological factors have so far been combined by individual workers to suit their own purposes in too many cases." J. P. Marble, *Report of the Committee on the Measurement of Geologic Time*, (Washington: National Research Council, April, 1947), p. 6.

<sup>24</sup> For example, in the Tertiary period fossils have been found of every genus of land mammal now living with the exception of a few genera of bats. Three fourths of the marine mammals have been found among the tertiary fossils. Ninety-four percent of the living genera of British Mollusks having external shells have been found among the fossils of the Eocene epoch of the Tertiary period.

## Chapter 14

---

### “CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF CREATION IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD”

*by*  
*Dr. Paul C. Witt*

People of every generation have been confronted with the momentous question of beginnings, but in our age of prodigious research and unparalleled scientific achievement it is posed with unusual vigor. Many centuries ago Moses, a faithful servant of God, wrote: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (Gen. 1:1). Although this simple, forceful declaration has been doubted, questioned, discussed, ridiculed, and denied, it has never been disproved. Despite the fact that critics have assailed it, infidels and modernists have scoffed at it, and some investigators have sought to make it unacceptable, many of our most thoughtful and learned men accept it as sublime truth.

As we contemplate the question of origins, we are immediately aware of the reality, the magnitude, the orderliness, and the grandeur of the universe. Its vastness, and fullness, and potentialities, amaze us; its systems, and precision of transformations, and completeness, astound us. Furthermore, not only must we be aware of the magnificent, extensive inanimate universe, with its manifold, intricate governing laws, but also we are vividly aware of the myriad forms of life known to exist in it, and of ourselves.

Whence and how came this universe, and life within it? Did it come from nothing, without external purpose or force? Did life come spontaneously, in simple form, non-living to living, as a result of coincidental sequence of fortuitous circumstances? Or did all come as the result of thought, and purpose, and power, on the part of a Supreme Being; come as

the result of a Supreme Intelligence exercising Creative Power?

Few, if any, have ever asserted that the universe just happened, something out of nothing, without definite plan or external power, but some have tacitly assumed it. However, a number of investigators have assumed some sort of primordial substance and undirected, but natural, laws acting to develop or transform this substance into our present cosmos. Such assumptions do not really get back to origins at all, but they do illustrate men's efforts to please themselves, and to avoid the impact of the truth of sacred writ. Take, for example, the view of the origin of matter expressed by Huxley<sup>1</sup>: "The whole world, living and not living, is the result of the mutual interaction, according to definite laws, of the powers possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was composed." This "primitive nebulosity," whatever that may be, is assumed to exist, and to interact "according to definite laws," also assumed to exist. The "mutual interaction" of already existing substances, according to already existing laws, hardly satisfies any desire to get back to origins.

Or, let us note the idea of Spencer<sup>2</sup>: "One stable homogeneity only is hypothetically possible. If centers of force absolutely uniform in their powers were diffused with absolute uniformity through unlimited space, they would remain in equilibrium. This, however, though a verbally intelligible supposition, is one which can not be represented in thought, since unlimited space is inconceivable. But all finite forms of the homogeneous, all forms of it which we can conceive or know, must inevitably lapse into heterogeneity." A vast assumed "sameness," according to the idea expressed, "inevitably" lapses into a vast "differentness;" "homogeneity" lapses into "heterogeneity." No effort is made to account for the existence of this "homogeneity," or for

---

<sup>1</sup> Huxley, *Life of Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 210.

<sup>2</sup> Spencer, *First Principles*, p. 429.

forces or laws causing or guiding its lapse into "heterogeneity."

Or, again, take the words of Buckner <sup>3</sup>: "Nature has developed itself organically out of itself, from beginning to end, and continues to develop itself unceasingly." Does such a statement offer anything tangible, or tenable, or convincing?

Several theories, each assuming prior existence of matter and force, have been set forth to offer possible explanation of the beginning of "the heavens and the earth." Three of these—the ones most vigorously promulgated and most generally espoused by those who have rejected the record of special creation—will be briefly reviewed here: (1) The Nebular Hypothesis, (2) The Meteoric Theory, and (3) The Planetsimal Theory. The first of these, widely accepted and tenaciously held for more than one hundred years, embodies the following assumptions: (a) That vast space was filled with highly heated nebulous gas—so hot that even such elements as platinum and tungsten were in the vapor state, (b) that by some natural process, assumed to exist, this nebulous mass became separated into divisions, one of which came, ultimately, to be our solar system and others came to be other sun-star systems, (c) that these individual masses, because of uneven cooling, were set into spiral motion and rotated around their centers, (d) that the velocity of rotation became so great that great ring masses were thrown off from the main body and that these ring masses collected, cooled, condensed, and contracted into a spherical body—a planet, (e) that continued repetition of this process, as it pertains to our solar system, and starting with Neptune, finally produced Earth, and that the original mass—what was left after the successive throwing off of the planets—is our Sun, and (f) that as the outer area of the mass which came to be Earth cooled it gave rise to a dense outer layer or crust which we inhabit, and which still encloses an inner molten-hot center.

---

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Cole, *Creation and Science*, Sec. 8, 222.

It is striking to note that this theory, so widely accepted and so long maintained as valid by those rejecting creation by God, has, comparatively recently, been rejected itself. Its inconsistencies have appeared to the very same class of scientists who, hitherto, accepted it most completely. These words of Dr. T. C. Chamberlain<sup>4</sup>, head of the department of Geology, University of Chicago, are typical: "The theory seemed to accord well enough with an ice age, if the ice age came only in the later stages of the earth's history, but it was ill suited to explain an ice age in the earlier geological eras. Unfortunately for it, there began to appear signs of ice ages far back in time, and, besides, some of these had their seats much nearer to the equator, and in other respects were even stranger than the latest great glaciation." "When the inquiry was pressed still farther back, and support for the postulate of a molten globe was sought in the crust of the earth itself, it was not forthcoming. With strange perversity the supposed granite foundations proved to be granite intrusions. Thus in a literal sense the very foundations of the old view proved illusive." "Could the earth ever have had the vast hot atmosphere postulated? Was the earth's gravity sufficient to hold so vast and vaporous an envelope at such high temperatures and in such an intense state of molecular activity as the old mode of genesis assigned? Was the gaseo-molten genesis a reality?"

Carefully, step by step, he proceeded to investigate and evaluate every point of the hypothesis according to known laws of physics and astronomy, and concluded: "When, therefore, the results of this ultimate test had been duly pondered, one of two alternatives seemed imperative: either to conclude the kinetic theory of gases was seriously wrong or that such a ring of gas as the Laplacian hypothesis postulated could not have held in gaseous relation the water of the oceans, or the constituents of the air, or perhaps even the rock substances of the earth." Thus physical and mathemati-

---

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Cole, *Creation and Science*, sec. 274. p. 133.

cal calculations and measurements proved the inconsistencies, if not impossibilities, of the major assumptions of the theory.

The Meteoric Theory assumed an original nebula-like parent mass, with a swarm of smaller meteor-like bodies or masses moving in diverse directions about it. By gravitational forces and consolidations these formed planets, and the neutralization and synchronization of their movements gave rise to their present motions. This theory was never widely accepted.

The Planetesimal Theory, promulgated and championed by Chamberlain and Moulton, is probably the most widely accepted at the present time. In brief, this theory assumes that a vast central mass, now the sun, ejected clouds of matter in relatively small units, called planetesimals, and that these units aggregated, the larger gathering in the smaller, forming the various planets.

We note again that all of these theories begin with the material from which the solar system was supposed to be formed as existing in some definite form. All deal with development or rearrangement—none with origin. All leave out Intelligence, Purpose, and Special Creative Power. All, therefore, are out of harmony with the Biblical account.

Let us now note some statements from scholars who not only believe the Genesis account true, but believe it conflicts with no established fact of science, and are confident it will never be found in conflict with any fact science may discover.

Sir William Dawson<sup>5</sup>, in defending the Mosaic account of creation of the universe and the creation of man, says: "The order of creation as set forth in Genesis is faultless in the light of modern science, and many of the details show the most remarkable agreement with the results of science born only in our day."

James Clerk Maxwell<sup>6</sup>, in an address before the British

---

<sup>5</sup> Quoted by Cole, *Creation and Science*, sec. 82, p. 46.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, sec. 87, p. 48.

Association for the Advancement of Science, declared: "The fitness of atoms to be built up into the structures of the universe is a proof of their having been made fit; and, as natural forces could not have made them so, they must have been made so by the Creator. Every atom indeed seems to be full from center to circumference of the power and wisdom of God." These words, spoken in 1870, before our present knowledge of the "center to circumference" structure and behavior of the atom, seem particularly striking and timely, seeing that we are keenly aware of the fact that discovering and utilizing the power of the atom is our most urgent and significant task of the hour.

Robert Grant Aitken<sup>7</sup>, in closing a discussion on "Behold the Stars!" in which he has considered "gigantic dimensions," "bewildering complexities of structure," "endless variety of contents," "underlying structural symmetry," and "great laws," says: "It is a universe, in my belief, with thought and more than thought within it; a universe that is the expression of the thought of an immanent infinite Spirit."

James Arnold Crowther<sup>8</sup> closes his treatise on "Radiation" with the words: "Science since its beginning has traveled many paths, and explored many territories. It has asked many questions, seeking to sift gold from dross, truth from illusion, and by its quest has brought to light many wonderful and precious things from the rich storehouse of nature. Now the wheel seems to have come full circle, and modern science, face to face with the mystery of the act of creation, finds no words more appropriate than those of the great Hebrew poet, 'And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.'"

Peter W. Stoner<sup>9</sup>, in a discussion of "Astronomy and the First Chapter of Genesis," says early in the discussion: "If Genesis is only a book of human origin and its allusions to

---

<sup>7</sup> Aitken, *The Great Design*, pp. 36-37.

<sup>8</sup> Crowther, *The Great Design*, p. 37.

<sup>9</sup> Stoner, *Modern Science and the Christian Faith*, p. 10.

astronomy reflect the knowledge extant at the time of writing we would expect it to be full of gross scientific errors. If, on the other hand, we find Genesis to be in agreement with the latest developments known to modern astronomy, such agreement would be evidence that God supplied the information just as the book claims. Today there appears to be considerable harmony between astronomy and Genesis. This does not mean that all astronomers believe the Genesis account, although it seems to the author that astronomers as a group often possess a more reverent attitude toward God than do other scientists. It means that a careful study of the facts and well-established hypotheses of astronomy reveals a striking consistency with the outline of origins found in the first chapter of Genesis.

This agreement has not always existed. In fact, thirty-five years ago astronomy and the account of creation as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis differed in many points, making it quite impossible to correlate the two. But year after year advances were made in science which resulted in an improved agreement between Genesis and astronomy. Within the past generation not a single instance is known where astronomy that has once agreed with Genesis has later revealed itself so as to disagree. There are many instances, where subsequent developments have greatly strengthened earlier partial confirmations."

This astronomer, near the close of his discussion, states: "Although Genesis was written thousands of years ago, every reference to astronomy in the first chapter is corroborated by the best of our present scientific information. And yet we note that books of astronomy, written 25 year ago or more, are full of serious errors and anything written more than a few hundred years ago would be suitable only for the entertainment of the reader."

Glenn Gates Cole<sup>10</sup> strikes a very important note in his statement: "There is significant relationship as to the first

---

<sup>10</sup> Cole, *Creation and Science*, sec. 250, p. 124.

things enumerated as the objects of this creative work. The expression, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth... ' states not merely the objects but also the order of the creation. Moses here shows that the creation of the heavens preceded the creation of the earth. This is not mere chance, but a part of the inspired plan."

Many other quotations could be included here, but one more will be deemed sufficient to our purpose for the time. It is a summarization of the faith of many outstanding scientists expressed in the words of one of the most eminent of them, Professor A. H. Compton,<sup>11</sup> Chancellor of Washington University. He says: "For myself, faith begins with the realization that a supreme intelligence brought the universe into being and created man. It is not difficult for me to have this faith, for it is incontrovertible that where there is a plan there is intelligence—an orderly, unfolding universe testifies to the truth of the most majestic statement ever uttered—'In the beginning God.' "

But what about Christ and the problem of creation in this present world? In the first place, let us remember the inspired words of John 1:1-3: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him; and without him was not anything made that hath been made." Let us consider the inspired declaration: "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in diverse manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds. . ." (Heb. 1:1-2). Let us weigh carefully the all-comprehensive principle: "... for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things

---

<sup>11</sup> Compton, *Chicago Daily News*, Apr. 12, 1936.

consist” (Col. 1:16-17).

Logos existed. All things were made by him. Without him was not anything made that was made, in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible. He is before all things and by him all things consist. He upholdeth all things by the word of his power (Heb. 1:3). These sublime, all-comprehensive declarations challenge our reason and merit our faith.

When we consider the problem of creation we realize that Causation, Purpose, Design, and Activity are involved. Causation and intelligence are associated with personality. The supreme personality is God. God is eternal, omniscient, and omnipotent. The universe, in its every aspect, witnesses intelligent causation, direction, and stabilization. When we consider this we are impressed with the words of Sir James Jeans<sup>12</sup>: “If the universe is a universe of thought, then its creation must have been an act of thought.” Likewise, we ponder the words of Roger J. Voskuyl<sup>13</sup>: “Most men feel that good sound logic requires a First Cause and this first cause must have eternal existence, for if in the distant past nothing at all existed, out of that nothingness nothing could come.” When we meditate on the marvelous extent, the undeviating precision, and the matchless glory of the universe, we are mindful of the words of the great psalmist:

“The heavens declare the glory of God;  
And the firmament showeth his handiwork.”

(Psalms 19:1)

and grasp with fuller appreciation the inspired words: “By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear” (Heb. 11:3).

There are numerous things that have a sobering and stabilizing effect on our thinking in connection with the problem of creation in the present day world. First of all, it

<sup>12</sup>Mason, *The Great Design*, Preface.

<sup>13</sup>Roger J. Voskuyl, *Modern Science and Christian Faith*, p. 2.

is a widely recognized and accepted truth that what science has proved does not contradict what the Bible says. Theories of man and men's interpretations of sacred writ may be incompatible, but never proved fact and plain statement. In the second place, it is strikingly significant that, even though the Bible is clearly not a book of science, Bible statements concerning science are always found to be accurate and consistent. In the third place, even though the Bible is a very old book many statements made in it suggest scientific truths not discovered or fully understood or appreciated by men until comparatively recently. For example:

“... the circle (roundness) of the earth...”

(Lev. 17:11, 14)

“... the life of the flesh is in the blood; “

(Isa. 40:22)

“... drops of water, which distill in rain...”

(Job 26:27-28)

In the fourth place, the sequence of the creation is perfectly consistent, and in harmony with all the known facts of science in our day. In the fifth place, it is eminently significant that the universe is sufficient unto all of man's needs. Man is an inventor, a deviser, a discoverer, an appropriator, a utilizer, a masterer, and a recoverer, but man is not a creator. God gave him dominion over other creatures and bade him “subdue” the earth. Man has progressed far, but has not exhausted all the resources of the earth. In the sixth place, though man has marvelously achieved and progressed, his every achievement has been the result of discovery and mastery of already created and acting materials and laws. When we consider, for example, radar and television, rocket and jet propulsion, and atomic fission, we swell with pride. Sober thinking, however, makes us realize that all are the result of man's coming to a fuller understanding of, and devising means of appropriating, certain natural laws. In the seventh place, the more man learns the more he realizes how much he has yet to learn, and the more fully he achieves the wider becomes his vista of possibilities.

Let us meet this present day problem with assurance

and courage. Let us be ever conscious of the fact that the word of God is true, and tried, and abiding. Let us be challenged and strengthened by the fact that we have the encouragement and support of many eminent scientists, and the confirmatory evidence of numerous modern scientific discoveries, to fortify our faith in the Genesis record. Men who have a thorough knowledge of and richer faith in, the word of God, and who, at the same time, have gained recognition in the field of science, have a vast opportunity and a grave responsibility in this present day world. Those who have been trained in both areas are best fitted to cope with the problem. There is one God. His Word is truth. He made the worlds. He gave us the Book.

But the problem of creation does not end with "... faith that the worlds were framed by the word of God," absolutely necessary though that is. Actually the problem includes a greater, more abiding principle: our own creation in Christ Jesus, unto salvation and glory.

God made Jesus both Lord and Christ (Matt. 17:5; Acts 2:36). In him is salvation; eternal life (Acts 4:11-12; II Tim. 2:10; I John 5:11-12). All are sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus:

"For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ."

(Gal. 3:26-27)

"We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life."

(Rom. 6:4)

In Christ we are new creatures (a new creation):

"... the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new."

(II Cor. 5:17)

A new creation:

"... created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk

in them.”

(Eph. 2:10)

Created unto fullness, victory, and glory:

“... thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

(I Cor. 15:57)

“When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory.”

(Col. 3:4)

## Chapter 15

---

### CHRIST AND THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

*by*  
*E. W. McMillan*

In the study of Christ and the future of Christian education it is necessary to understand the meaning of education, then fit that meaning into the ideals and influence of Christ.

The word "education" means, "to lead out," but the important consideration is what we are led out of, and what we are led into. Early American education was prompted largely by the religious urge. Communities of neighbors grouped themselves together and hired a teacher, who taught their children daily, but they hired teachers largely from their knowledge of the teacher's devotion to God. That was the urge which led our forefathers to stamp "In God we trust" on the United States silver dollar. The influence of that religious urge, so tragically waning in supposed statesmen of today, had more real security in it than the average man of today knows. The full meaning of it was impressed on me more in my recent travels than ever before. Leaving the remote parts of India, where cultures of heathen gods prevailed, and coming through the cultures of Korea, China, Japan, then the small islands nearer home, arriving finally on the West Coast, the improving culture was as a dawning light from the first peep of day to the blazing glory of a morning sun.

General education in America has progressed in its skills and techniques until it has made of our world a group of comparatively small communities, through its fast transportation systems. A business man today can circle the earth

and return home, with important business transacted in Tokyo, Hong Kong, Calcutta, Paris, London and New York, quicker than George Washington could have traveled from Mount Vernon to Knoxville, Tennessee and returned, with no business transacted. But the tragedy of this educational advancement is that it has all been in the skills and techniques of mechanical things. This welding of the world into a group of neighboring communities has not been accompanied by the welding of these communities into one common brotherhood. And this failure is due in part to the turn in educational emphasis from its original religious urge to a purely mechanical and materialistic urge.

General education today has in it three outstanding and dominating urges, or motives.

The first of these is *materialistic*. Education tries to account for the Original moving Cause in terms of unknowns, chance, and unintelligent processes. Left to the influences of general education today, the student would never imagine a thought akin to, "In the beginning God created." Often this view is positively ridiculed in general education for which the believer's tax money pays the teacher. Moreover, the curriculum content is materialistic in its aims and ultimate goal.

The second of these contributing urges in general education is *secularism*. General education in all its plans, purposes and techniques, seeks to prepare for better mechanical skills in order to gain more and more dollars. Secular pursuits, for secular gains, in purely secular callings—these are the bases of secular teachings. It is not sufficient for general education to disclaim all responsibilities in spiritual training. For general education has so encouraged the purely secular motive, it has so discouraged all religious teaching in connection with its curriculum content, and it has allowed so much teaching that is positively against the original faith which instituted public education, that it has betrayed completely the original primary motive in public education.

The third prompting urge in general education today is *atheism*. General education has so completely lost sight of

the original urge of our forefathers in education that it not only has eliminated all religious teaching from the curriculum; it also has outlawed religious teaching from the curriculum. A teacher is considered a scholar worthy of large remuneration if he is highly skilled in teaching subjects in the name of science which completely destroy faith in God; but if he takes time out to give a lesson on simple faith in that God he is a law-breaker; he may be either stopped or fined and fired. The original schools, such as Harvard, Yale, Chicago University, and dozens of others, which began for the purpose of preserving this faith, have become little more than research centers where scholarly men try to decide how much of the ancient faith we may retain and how much we must discard if we are to be considered real scholars.

During this long struggle more than 11,000 religious schools have arisen and now exist. Those which have not gone entirely astray are left as objects of pity in many instances, because they refuse to accept the radical teachings of those which have departed entirely. Many of these have gone so far that what they teach and what they question amounts to a betrayal of the principle in faith, which affirms a foundation authority in religious faith.

This is the identical point at which Christian education has its largest responsibility. Education can not be all purely religious; but no education is worthy of being called Christian education if it fails to make Christ the center of its curriculum. When Christian faith is placed on defense, or when Christian practice has to take a side track for secular things, or when campus entertainment dwarfs the religious stature of the campus and chills religious zeal, the purely Christian element in the education of the campus has started to die. While avoiding fanatical manifestations, every campus worthy of the name "Christian" is worthy because it has made respect and love for Christ the dominant urge of people on that campus.

In overcoming the weaknesses of modern education I would name three large essentials, the first of which is this: *Christian people must demand more and more consideration*

*for the Christian ideal in education.* This does not mean that general education should sponsor some form of religious teaching. It does mean that more respect must be given for men who have retained a devout faith in God through their education. More honor must be bestowed on them for retaining that faith, and more consideration must be given to religious faith when teachers are being employed. There would be fewer young teachers who think it is a mark of brilliance to challenge faith if they knew it would be hard to get a good job while challenging faith. This is another way of saying that much in so-called doubt is little more than an effort to feed one's own pride. Some people just feel lifted when they think they have found some flaw in established customs or standards, and they find pleasure in the martyr complex when a few people denounce them, especially if the majority approve them. When Christian people rise up in demand for more teachers with unwavering trust in God before they can be paid to "teach our children," there will be fewer and fewer teachers who supposedly have lost their faith.

And while we are considering administrators in education, let the same consideration extend to the administrators in Washington. Lincoln said, "I have been driven to my knees many times because there was no other place to go;" but men of that label have ceased to occupy the White House. "God being our helper" has become too much a slogan with which to close a dramatic, political speech; it is not enough a prayer. Instead of arguing over whether a Christian can afford to vote, Christian people should accept some responsibility in who is chosen to decide the destinies of our nation. The public ballot is not the solution to national morals, but it is a mighty law against corrupt men who otherwise would reach the decisions. If the men who are elected in Washington were sent there by people whose ballots were determined through prayer, those men would first meet God in long seasons of prayer, instead of cocktail parties, before meeting Joseph Stalin in Yalta.

A second essential in the improvement of public educa-

tion is that *Christian people should more and more support existing Christian schools*. They should support them with money and with students. They should support them with prayers. And strange as it may seem, they should support them with their adverse criticisms. Why should anybody who is honest resent having the defects of his administration pointed out? How could a teacher believe he is Christian when he resents being criticized in his teaching merely on the ground of "academic freedom," or "religious freedom"? There is no exception in educational history, known to me, to the rule that when religious schools become financially independent, they also grow independent of the judgment of their friends. And this independence, within years, has led them entirely free of the original purposes of the founders of those schools. True it is that critics often are wrong, and they often are unjust or untruthful. But, even so, it still remains that the best safeguard for simple trust in God, maintained through education, is the tribunal of public opinion among those who financially support the given schools. God preserve for Christian faith on the part of all now engaged in Christian education, a feeling of need for the financial and prayerful support of those who may at times criticize us adversely.

A third essential in preserving Christian faith through education is for *the schools themselves to maintain a more devout Christian life in themselves*. This is not an indictment in any sense; it is merely an admission that we are all human. Secular subjects should be taught from the Christian viewpoint. When scholarship and faith conflict, faith must win every time. Maintaining apostolic faith must supersede gaining association recognition. Religious studies must nurture faith, as the mother's breast nurtures the infant in her arms. There is today too much study *about* faith, *about* inspiration; *about* God and Christ. There is not enough study which creates and inspires faith, inspires hope, and produces true love for God and men.

Religious subjects need to be more subjective, and less objective. By this I mean that our studies need to be more

designed to create out of the Bible text itself greater understanding of Christian ethics, and more intelligence about the text as God's living word. In I Corinthians 2:1-5 Paul drew the line broad between these two types of learning. The word "wisdom" in this text means "Mental excellence at its best." That is the world's definition of scholarship. Paul makes it plain that his eighteen months of preaching in Corinth was not from the viewpoint of scholarship in the wisdom of men, though he could have so spoken out of his great education. But his preaching was with trembling and fear, couched in simple words, "That your faith may not stand in the wisdom of men but in the power of God." In Corinth Paul met the Jews from many parts of the world, come there for the material gain which thriving Corinth could give them. He met the Gentile scholars who had journeyed to Athens and Corinth as centers of great learning. With these he could have been at home in conversing about the world's wisdom, so called. But he laid aside all this in his preaching; and with child-like simplicity he preached, "Nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified."

Let us observe these two elements—the greatest life that ever lived, and the most noble death ever endured.

Somewhere in every life there is something more influential and more powerful than anything else. With many people that something is a life. When I was a child of six years we lived a half mile from my "Aunt Mandy," we called her, and Uncle Mark. They had no children. Every Saturday afternoon I wanted to go and spend the night with them. Yes, I loved the red apples and candy which she always had. But more by much I loved to have her at night tuck me in her soft bed, tuck the covers around my neck, kiss me good-night, then whisper to me, "God bless you, son; Aunt Mandy will see you in the morning." In her long talks with me she set trends in my life and gave me the desire to be all I have ever tried to be that was good. Two years ago I went to the old cemetery and stood at the front of her grave. With hat off in a hot sun, as the tears coursed down my cheeks, I closed my eyes in loving memory of her; and somehow I thought I

could see a cluster of stars above the time-worn head stone of her grave—a sort of token of what her crown will be hereafter. Lives like that live on as long as the world stands.

It was Paul's great portrayal of the superior virtues in Christ which later enabled Luke to say, "Many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized." And when their twelve gross sins developed, Paul corrected every one of those sins by presenting that same great Lord and Saviour—his self-mastery, his unparalleled use of prayer, his boundless faith, and his perfect life. The greatest scholarship today is that learning which goes deep into this sacred text and brings from it the riches of wisdom, knowledge, and virtue so abundant everywhere. And the school campus which most portrays the inspiration of these Christian ideals is the one which most faithfully preserves in its teachers and students these ideals.

I can not forget an experience with General Douglas MacArthur in his office in Tokyo, 1949. Before me sat the General who led an army to victory over Japan, who at that moment was in charge of the Occupation Forces in Japan, who later became the Commander in Chief of all United Nations forces in their fight with the corrupt system of Communism. And yet, as he sat talking for forty minutes to me, he spoke not of armed might or political force, or of diplomatic wisdom. As I watched the tears moisten his eyes, heard the trembling in his voice and felt the compassion of his soul, he went along saying, "The hope of the world is not in armies or armed might; it is not even in conference tables, important as all these are. The hope of the world is spiritual. There can be no hope of permanent peace until all the minds of world leaders are filled with the ideals of Jesus of Nazareth." All education today should preserve this emphasis; it is the special duty of Christian education to leave in its teachers, its students, and everywhere on its campus this impression: "The hope of the world is spiritual."

Curriculum studies should include human relationships from the Christian viewpoint. Bible studies should include international and inter-racial emphasis from the Christian

viewpoint. The study should not be so much what to do after war comes as what to do toward converting the world before war comes.

The study of sin is not as important from the viewpoint of what some great theologian said about it as from the viewpoint of what it will do in a human life. It is not as important to do something with people because they have sinned as it is to build buffer zones in their consciences against sin. Life's greatest scholarship does not consist in knowing from memory Luther's theology, Calvin's theology, or some religious philosopher's viewpoints and theories. The greatest learning is that which conforms to Paul's meaning when he spoke of faith in terms of knowledge—"I know," he said. His word "know" is not mere intellectual, factual information. It often means "experience." When he spoke of knowing God, he meant that he had experienced God. But this learning is deeper than the mind; it is the deepest depths of soul and experience. In these thoughts Paul has in mind those unspeakable urges in which "deep meets deep," and they recognize each other as unfailing friends. The world heart, which prompted Jesus to empty himself of all that heaven gave, take on himself human flesh, submit of his own will to death for all sinners, then go back to heaven and pray for faltering mankind—that is the meaning of Paul when he said he preached Christ. A school campus is Christian only to the extent that it preserves these qualities.

There is no greater trust than having a mind turned over to you to be led somewhere in its understanding. There is no greater privilege or joy than accepting such a trust and leading a mind out of confusion, sin, and doubt into an understanding which brings it face to face with its Lord and blessed Redeemer, and hearing it fall at his feet to exclaim, "My Lord, and My God." An education which does that is Christian education. That kind of education is the hope of the world, and its only hope, whether it is taught in a Gospel pulpit or a college classroom.