

THE BRIEF FACTS ON THE ISRAELI CONFLICT TODAY...

Nationhood and Jerusalem

- a- Israel became a nation in 1312 B.C.E., two thousand years before the rise of Islam.
- b- Arab refugees in Israel began identifying themselves as part of a Palestinian people in 1967, two decades after the establishment of the modern State of Israel.
- c- Since the Jewish conquest in 1272 B.C.E. the Jews have had dominion over the land for one thousand years with a continuous presence in the land for the past 3,300 years. The only Arab dominion since the conquest in 635 B.C.E. lasted no more than 22 years.
- d- For over 3,300 years, Jerusalem has been the Jewish capital. Jerusalem has never been the capital of any Arab or Muslim entity. Even when the Jordanians occupied Jerusalem, they never sought to make it their capital, and Arab leaders did not come to visit.
- e- Jerusalem is mentioned over 700 times in Tanach, the Jewish Holy Scriptures. Jerusalem is not mentioned once in the Koran. King David founded the city of Jerusalem. Mohammed never came to Jerusalem. Jews pray facing Jerusalem. Muslims pray with their backs toward Jerusalem.

Arab and Jewish Refugees

- a- In 1948 the Arab refugees were encouraged to leave Israel by Arab leaders promising to purge the land of Jews. Sixty-eight percent left without ever seeing an Israeli soldier.
- b- The Jewish refugees were forced to flee from Arab lands due to Arab brutality, persecution and pogroms.
- c- The number of Arab refugees who left Israel in 1948 is estimated to be around 630,000.
- d- The number of Jewish refugees from Arab lands is estimated to be the same.
- e- Arab refugees were intentionally not absorbed or integrated into the Arab lands to which they fled, despite the vast Arab territory. Out of the 100,000,000 refugees since World War II, theirs is the only refugee group in the world that has never

been absorbed or integrated into their own peoples' lands.

- f- Jewish refugees were completely absorbed into Israel, a country no larger than the state of New Jersey.

The Arab - Israeli Conflict

- a- The Arabs are represented by eight separate nations, not including the Palestinians.
- b- There is only one Jewish nation.
- c- The Arab nations initiated all five wars and lost. Israel defended itself each time and won.
- d- The PLO's Charter still calls for the destruction of the State of Israel.
- e- Israel has given the Palestinians most of the West Bank land, autonomy under the Palestinian Authority, and has supplied them with weapons.
- f- Under Jordanian rule, Jewish holy sites were desecrated and the Jews were denied access to places of worship.
- g- Under Israeli rule, all Muslim and Christian sites have been preserved and made accessible to people of all faiths.

The UN Record on Israel and the Arabs

- a- Of the 175 Security Council resolutions passed before 1990, 97 were directed against Israel.
- b- Of the 690 General Assembly resolutions voted on before 1990, 429 were directed against Israel.
- c- The UN was silent while 58 Jerusalem Synagogues were destroyed by the Jordanians.
- d- The UN was silent while the Jordanians systematically desecrated the ancient Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives.
- e- The UN was silent while the Jordanians enforced an apartheid-like policy of preventing Jews from visiting the Temple Mount and the Western Wall. ☐

The devil is perfectly willing for a person to profess Christianity so long as he does not practice it.

THE BAPTIST PILLAR

"... The church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."

I Timothy 3:15



CANADA'S ONLY TRUE BAPTIST PAPER

Published by Bible Baptist Church
1203 4th St. Brandon, MB R7A 3J7
Vol. 9 No. 4 July/Aug. 2001

Independent

CLOSED COMMUNION

By R. M. Dudley, Georgetown, Kentucky,
1892

"And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"—Luke 6:46.

This sermon is devoted to a discussion of the question of Closed Communion. In one word, this is our plea:

We ask, for ourselves, the simple liberty to administer the ordinances of the Lord's House in such a way as our consciences tell us that His Word requires.

We ask the charity of others that they recognize our right to do this, and that they charge our course to this motive alone—not to bigotry, uncharitableness, or illiberality. We ask no more, and surely there will be granted no less, than this. We do not arrogate to ourselves a wisdom or piety superior to others; but, "with malice towards none, and charity for all," we ask that we be allowed to follow our conscientious convictions in all matters pertaining to the Kingdom of Heaven. As it is by the Word of God that we are to be approved or condemned, we feel bound to follow that Word just where it leads us.

There are many plausible objections to Closed Communion, which are persistently thrust forward with a skill and energy "worthy of a bitter cause." These have been answered over and over again; but as the thoughts of men are particularly occupied with the objections to Closed Communion, rather than with its true meaning and significance, there is no alternative but to expose their unsoundness once more. The strongest objections will be selected and their full force given to them.

First.—"It is the Lord's Table; you have no right to prevent the Lord's people from approaching it."

It is strange to see how differently different minds will reason and conclude from the same premises. To my mind it appears that, because it is the *Lord's table*, is the greatest of all reasons why we have no voice in the matter one way or another, to say who shall, or who shall not come to it. We can afford to be generous with what belongs to us, but with what belongs to another, we have no right to do anything at all, save what he has directed. If the Table were ours we might have some discretion as to what we would

(Closed Communion continued on page 4)

Missionary

EJV 1611

Phone
204-726-5806

Fax
204-728-0995

Email
baptistpillar@baptistpillar.com

Web Site
http://www.baptistpillar.com

Editor and Pastor: John Reaves Sr.

THE PURITY OF THE BIBLE

By Dr. Tom Malone, Sr.

No true believer could deny the purity of the scriptures. To deny the purity of the Bible is to deny the whole Bible as the inspired Word of God. The Bible claims purity for itself.

"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Psalm 12:6

"The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure making wise the simple."

"The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes." Psalm 19:7,8

"Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it." Psalm 119:140

Some people today are in such a battle of semantics about the Bible, that they are throwing off more heat than light. They try to answer questions that have not been raised, and deal with matters that confuse more than define. There is one matter however, I want made clear. That is, I not only believe in the inspiration of the Bible, but I believe in an impeccable and pure Bible.

I studied Greek for three of my four college years, but I sometimes get a little weary of hearing the expression "now the Greek says..." None of my people at Emmanuel Baptist speak Greek or Hebrew. I still study Greek to some small degree, but I want to spend my time in the English Bible.

God's Word is likened unto *"silver tried in a furnace."* This refining process was to remove all dross and iniquity and leave only pure silver. The Word of God has been heated in the fires of God's holiness and purity, and it is as pure as God Himself. It has been placed in the crucible of "science so-called," and heated by worldly scholarship and philosophic criticism, and has come forth as pure as it was when God spoke the word through holy men of God.

You might as well try to paint an orchid as to dress up or enhance the Bible by the "Greek says." Orchids do not need painting; God has already painted them. The Word of the Lord is pure. Some old time saint said, "It is a crime to add to it, treason to alter it, and a felony to take from it."

I know it is pure because it purifies. It is clean because it cleanses. It is holy because it produces holiness. It is perfect because its purpose is perfection. It is moral because it demands morality. It is right because it

produces righteousness. It is impeccable because its source is a perfect God.

What we need is a revival of powerful preaching of the pure Word of God. Preaching with fervor, and conviction for the purpose of getting people saved, and putting some spiritual meat on the bones of the saints.

I have read books of "higher criticism," and studied the alleged contradiction, and listened to the pseudo scientist try to explain creation. I have had a few good laughs, challenged a few people to present some proof of their evil criticism, and learned to hate modernism more and more. And when the dust all settle, I still had a pure Bible, and loved it more than ever.

We use only the King James at Midwestern Baptist College and Emmanuel Baptist Church. When we read it, we don't say that it says one thing, but means another. So while some people are talking about "copyist errors," we are trying to turn out some preachers every year who believe the Bible to be the pure Word of God, and preach it with a pure, clean heart.

The next time you hear some wild eyed, loud mouth, over pious pig-headed preacher say that Tom Malone does not believe in a pure and perfect Bible, you just grab him, and hold him until I get there!

If you get the idea that I am a Biblicist, a believer in the inerrancy, and a preacher with a pure Bible, then I have accomplished what I set out to do when I wrote this article. ☐

DEFINITION OF A CHRISTIAN

He has a mind, and he knows it,

He has a will, and shows it;

He sees his way, and goes it,

He draws a line, and toes it.

He has a chance, and takes it,

A friendly hand and shakes it;

A rule, and never breaks it,

If there's no time, he makes it.

He loves the truth, stands by it,

Nor ever tries to shy it,

Whoever may deny it, or openly defy it.

He hears a lie and slays it,

He owes a debt and pays it;

And, as I've heard him praise it,

He knows the game, and plays it.

He sees the path Christ trod,

And grips the hand of God.

that all those who learn it immediately become Jews."

Careful attention to this statement would note five things:

1. The Monks knew no Greek.
2. The Monks knew no Hebrew.
3. The "ancient heresy" is Biblical.
4. The Waldenses had many Greek N.T.'s.
5. The Waldenses had the O.T. Hebrew and must have believed it which means they were not Manichee. (c/f the Paulicians of the 9th Ct.).

Seventeenth Century

Hanserd Knowles – **An Exposition of the Whole Book of The Revelation:**

p.2–Hanserd Knowles, the English Baptist, shows his belief in the inspiration of the Scripture when he says, "In the first verse we have the title of this book, (the Revelation of Jesus Christ.). As the whole Scripture being given by inspiration of God, is the Revelation of His Holy will, Eph. 3:4,5. So this last part of the Holy Scripture is the Revelation of Jesus Christ..."

Note he evidently believed he possessed the book in his day!

William Kiffin – **Right To Church Communion:**

p.B2,3– William Kiffin confessed, the "...Scriptures, which were given for our own instruction, II Tim. 3:16, written by the immediate dictates of the Spirit; preserved by the gracious providence of God in the Church from the injuries of time, ignorance, and fraud, through all ages; they have been kept with much greater care, than any other Books..."

p.B5ff–He says, "Now it is no less than blasphemy to charge either of these (viciousness & defect) upon the pure and perfect Word of God."

Adam Blair – **History of The Waldenses:**

p.321, Vol.II–Adam Blair records of Wenceslas Von Budowa, a pastor who was beheaded for his faith, who said, "My hope is founded upon the unerring word of God."

William S. Gilly – **Waldensian Researches:**

p.80–Gilly records how Leger, a Waldensian pastor used the Diodati translation in Italian. This man was using a Bible the basis of which was the T.R.

This is our heritage...A Bible from God and preserved by God in His sovereign care. These men believed they had the Word of God; they never doubted its authority but preached its message with perfect confidence! **I believe I have the same Bible and am privileged to preach with the same confidence in the pure Word of God!** ☐

From Our E-Mail

Thursday, June 14, 2001

I thank God for your website. I read with great astonishment the alterations some publishers are making to the KJV. Can you advise me of a publisher who does not have an agenda and is true to the 1611 version?

Thank you and God Bless W.

Sunday, June 24, 2001

I am so excited to have found your web site. ...

Could you please put me on your mailing list to receive a hard copy of The Baptist Pillar? Just send me a note indicating the cost due and I will gladly send you a check.

... Thank you so much. God Bless You!
DE

(Preacher Rule According to the Scriptures continued from page 7)

their followers, leading them by example rather than by harangue and military-style commands.

Some charismatic churches have earned for themselves a bad press by their version of divine-right-of-pastors, which they call "shepherding" or "discipleship." It is time for Baptists to speak up and renounce such unspiritual and anti-scriptural tactics, and to let it be known that we respect the freedom, individuality and Christian liberty of those who affiliate with our churches. ☐

(Closed Communion continued from page 8)

reproach. Let us be careful to avoid bitterness and unholy strife. Let our lives abound in patience, forbearance, gentleness, goodness and truth, while we commit ourselves, not to men, but to God, who judgeth righteously. ☐

Editor's Note

*In **The Baptist Pillar** we use articles taken from many different publications and written by many different authors. Please realize that this does not necessarily mean we agree with the doctrinal position of the publication or the author of the article, but that the particular article presents a scriptural truth we do agree with.*

*If you would like to receive **The Baptist Pillar**, please write and request one. Also, feel free to copy it and hand it out.*

(History and Belief continued from page 9)

and there circulated the sacred Scriptures translated from the Latin into the Roman language.”

Benjamin C. Wilkinson – **Our Authorized Bible Vindicated:**

p.27–Wilkinson gives more evidence of what Bible was in use by the Waldenses at this time when he quotes Jacobus’ **Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared** and speaks of the Latin as the Old Latin of the Albigenses: “The Old Latin versions were used longest by the western Christians who would not bow to the authority of Rome–e.g. the Donatists; the Irish; Britain, and the Continent: Albigenses, etc.” (Jacobus p.200).

N.B.–This is not the Vulgate of 380 A.D.; it was the Old Latin or Italic which Jacobus (p.4) says was for 900 years the Bible of the Waldenses, Britain, Ireland, etc. They did not use the Vulgate but the Old Latin based on the T.R. Greek! Dobshuts (pp.61,62) in **Influence of The Bible on Civilization** (p.29 of Wilkinson) is quoted as saying: “Differences of Bible text had something to do with the pitiful struggles which arose between the churches and ended in the devastation of the older one.”

Fourteenth Century

John Christian – **A History of The Baptists:**

p.94–Christian quotes Erasmus concerning the Husites: “They deny orders and elect officers from among laity; they receive no other rule than the Bible.”

He quotes Frank, the father of German history, and states he says these Baptists are “**still living**” and “they held the Scriptures to be the **Word of God**.”

Robert Robinson – **Ecclesiastical Researches:**

p.527–Robinson traces the Bohemian Brethren’s steadfast stand for truth and religious liberty from 1100 to 1570 and reports a confession of a nobleman named Wencclslaus, Lord of Budowitz, who said, “My hope is not founded in my conjecture, but on the infallible Word of God.”

Fifteenth Century

Alexis Muston – **Israel of The Alps:**

p.27, Vol.I–Muston notes their opposition to the Church of Rome **was always founded upon the Bible**, f.n. - “In no polemical writing of the time will we find so large a number of quotations from the Bible as in those of the Vaudois.” (See also their own claim to base everything on the Word of God (p.32 in 1308).

Sixteenth Century

Adam Blair – **History of The Waldenses:**

p.567, Vol.I–In a confession of faith dated 1508 to Uladislous of Bohemia, the Bohemian Brethren

Waldenses confessed concerning the canonical Scriptures: They are “to be accounted true and most certain; and in all things, and upon all accounts, ought to be preferred before any other writings whatever, as for as holy things are to be preferred to profane, and divine to human. They are likewise to be entirely and absolutely believed...They were delivered and inspired by God Himself, as Peter, Paul, and others affirm. They are publicly read and recited, especially the epistles and gospels, in all our churches in our mother and vulgar tongue, after the manner and custom of the primitive churches, to the end, chiefly, that they may be understood by all.”

Antoine Monastier – **The Vaudois Church:**

p.156–Monastier records of a French pastor of the mid 16th century who was captured by the Catholics and challenged of his faith: “But when he required that the discussion be in due form and order, and offered to maintain it in Latin, Greek, or Hebrew, whichever they chose...these eager gainsayers withdrew in confusion...” Muston in vol.I, p.279, names this man as Hubert Artus, a Waldensian pastor of Bobi-1565.

Alexis Muston – **Israel of The Alps:**

p.263; Vol. I–Muston gives the testimony of ancient Baptists and their attitude of the Scripture and its preservation saying, “We promise to maintain the Bible, entire and without admixture, according to the usage of the true Apostolic Church, steadfastly continuing in this holy religion, although it should be at peril of our lives, in order that we may be able to leave it to our children intact and pure, as we have received it from our fathers...”

William S. Gilly – **Waldensian Researches:**

p.144–Gilly records a Waldensian confession of 1556 which says, “We believe in all that is written in the Old and New Testaments.”

William Jones – **History of The Waldenses:**

p.285, Vol.II–William Jones relates an account around 1551 concerning the University of Paris when, “The faculty of Theology at Paris declared before the assembled parliament, **that religion was undone, if the study of Greek and Hebrew was permitted.**”

One of the contemporary Monks was reported by Conrad of Heresback, an author of this period, to have said, “They have invented a new language, which they call Greek; you must be carefully on your guard against it; it is the mother of all heresy. I observe in the hands of many persons a book written in that language, which they call the New Testament. It is a book of daggers and poison. As to the Hebrew, my dear brethren, it is certain

HISTORY AND BELIEF IN INSPIRATION

CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE

Tenth Century

Peter Allix – **Ancient Churches of The Piedmont:**

p.87–Allix says, “This century was generally devoted to ignorance and debauchery...”

William S. Gilly – **Waldensian Researches:**

p.224–Gilly remarks, “If then, in those ignorant and gloomy periods, the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, the Waldenses had copies of the Scriptures in their native tongue, we may readily believe that they possessed such **previously to the tenth century, and that they have preserved this privilege through the course of successive ages, from their first reception of the Gospel** to the present time.”

Gilly also quotes one of Perrin’s notes of 1618 saying: “Perrin who published his **History of The Waldenses** in 1618, relates that he had in his possession a New Testament in parchment, in the Waldensian language, very well written, though in a very ancient letter. Leger makes mention of an ancient Vaudois Bible which he found in the mountains of Val Clusone.”

N.B.–It is important to note:

–In 1600 they used the Olivetan in French.

–In 1500 they used the Diodati in Italian.

–In 1200 and before they used the **Italic**.

All of the Bibles mentions are from the T.R. The Waldenses **never changed**–I identify them as Baptist; we still use the same Bible with confidence that we have the **Word of God!**

Alexis Muston – **Israel of The Alps:**

p.15–Muston records of the history of Peter Waldo, “In 1179 Waldo presented to Pope Alexander III a translation of the Bible into the Vulgar tongue...Waldo was condemned in the Council of Verona (by Lucius iii, in 1184), when the emperor engaged to exert himself for the extirpation of heretics. It was in consequence of this condemnation, between 1185 and 1188, that Waldo was expelled from Lyons with his disciples.”

Eleventh Century

Fred C. Connybear – **The Key of Truth:**

p.CXL–In the introduction Connybear quotes Ecbat, Abbot of Schonauge, 1160, saying, “When I was at Canar at Bonn, I and my like minded friend, Bertolphus, frequently disputed with such persons, and I paid great attention to their errors and defences.’ We learn from him (Schonauge) that these heretics were very numerous in all countries, and were called in Germany **Cathari**, in Flanders **Piphles**, in France **Tixerant**, because they were weavers. **They were well equipped with sacred**

texts to defend their own errors and assail the catholic faith: they taught that the true faith of Christ existed nowhere except in their own conventicles...”

Alexis Muston – **Israel of The Alps:**

p.19, Vol.1– Muston notes the Waldenses preachers were taught to speak in “Latin, the Romance Language, and in Italian.” (This parallels the Bibles they used in their mission work!)

Antoine Monastier – **The Vaudois Church:** p.77– Monastier records, “Among the original works of the ancient Vaudois, we must recon a translation of the Bible into the Romance Language.” This is quoted often in the “**Noble Lesson**” and has verses quoted that indicates the text is T.R.; this conclusion is based on Blairs copy of the Noble Lesson:

1. Quotes the last chapter of Mark (16) as the T.R. gives evidence. Vol.1, p.479.

2. Quotes their 1120 confession of faith naming the Bible books as we have our canon and comments on the Apocryphal Books as non-Scripture but read as a history book.

N.B.–The Apoc. is mentioned as being read as the O.T.; the N.T. is mentioned as following and read; thus, they had the Scripture in their own language and accepted it as authoritative in a translation.

3. In the exposition of the Apostles’ Creed, I John 5:7 is quoted showing their Scriptures carried in from their ancient past contained this **T.R. reading**. Blair, Vol.1, p.523.

Adam Blair – **History of The Waldenses:**

p.249, Vol.1 – Blair writes concerning Waldo and the Scriptures saying, “Some affirm that he was master of various languages, and translated the greater part of the books, adding a number of ancient testimonies. In this work he was aided by the writing of the Albigenses of Provence, whom we have mentioned in 1114. Having acquired considerable skill in the Scriptures, and in the works of the Christian fathers...”

William S. Gilly – **Waldensian researches:**

p.142–Gilly quotes the Noble Lesson: “If we would love Christ and know His doctrine–we ought to watch and read the **Scriptures**. (emph. mine).

Alexis Muston – **Israel of The Alps:**

p.73–Muston accounts for the Waldenses having the Scriptures saying, “They could say, indeed, like the Hebrews, setting out for the promised land, ‘The Tabernacle of the Lord shall go before us,’ for they bore

(History and Belief continued on page 9)

(Closed Communion continued from page 1)

do with it. Or, if the Table were the Lord's, but he had left the administration of it to our choice, still we might have some discretion about it. But the Table is the Lord's, and he has left the directions for the administration of it in the New Testament, and we must do as he has said, or prove recreant to our trust. I agree with those who urge this objection, that the Table is the Lord's. "Therefore," say they, "it should be open to all." My mind works in the exactly opposite direction. The Table is the Lord's ; therefore, I have no voice in the matter at all, except to follow the directions he himself has given us. The reader can decide which conclusion is right.

Moreover, a fallacy lurks under this specious plea in that it asserts what no recognized body of Christians, believes, that no other qualification is necessary but conversion; whereas it is almost universally conceded that baptism is a qualification for the Supper. The objection properly stated would be this ; "It is the Lord's Table; you have no right to prevent the Lord's baptized people from approaching it The objection thus stated (and it covers a fallacy when not thus stated), carries its own answer along with it; for it clearly implies that the Lord's unbaptized people have not the Scriptural qualifications for the Supper.

Second.—"The Scriptures say: 'Let a man examine himself;' from which it is inferred that, if he is satisfied with his own fitness and right to the Supper, we have no right to interpose a barrier."

The fallacy of the objection becomes apparent when we remember that altogether a different state of things exists among us today, from what existed when Paul penned these words. We have a score of different sects, each claiming to be the Church of Christ, and this language is so interpreted as to make it mean that if the members of one of these sects are satisfied with their fitness and right to the Supper, that that entitles them to admission to the Supper, whensoever and by whomsoever spread. According to this we may have intercommunion not only of Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Reformers and Baptists, but of Catholics, Trinitarians, Universalists, and so on; because, according to his own examination of himself, each one is satisfied with his right to the Table. But who, among evangelical Christians, believes in carrying intercommunion that far? Nobody! And so it turns out

that the objection is not believed by the very ones even in whose mouths it is formed!

Besides, let it be remembered that this language was not addressed to a score of sects, for the purpose of leaving the question of fitness for the Supper to the individual determination of each, as the objection supposes; but it was addressed to the members of one church, (Corinth), and was designed to prevent the very thing which this objection tacitly sanctions. At Corinth, the Supper had been greatly abused, and the *source* of this abuse was the idea *that each might act for himself*. Against this Paul protests. Hear what he says: "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord *unworthily*, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man *examine* himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep, [have died]." Instead of sanctioning loose communion, this language enjoins carefulness, strictness; and instead of leaving each individual merely to be satisfied with himself, it expressly commands him to *examine* himself lest he be guilty of a violation of the ordinance, and so bring condemnation, and perhaps sickness and death.

But passing all this by, is it pretended by those who urge this objection that the right of individual judgment, flowing from individual self-examination, shall supersede the right of judgment by the whole collective body of the church? Certainly not, I suppose. Then, if not, suppose there should be a conflict between the judgment of an individual as to his fitness, and the judgment of the church, which should yield? Does Jesus Christ expect *nothing* of his churches, and everything of individuals ? Should an individual override the conscience of the whole church? May a church seek refuge from the responsibility of having tolerated a known violation of the requirements of the Divine Word under the plea that every man must judge for himself? The answer is, When the requirements of the law are made known, churches are responsible for themselves, as well as an individual for himself. And it is as unmanly and as unfaithful in a church, as in an individual, to try to shirk the responsibility or performance of a delicate and unpleasant duty. The Lord's Supper is a church ordinance, and the laws governing that ordinance have been plainly revealed;

I WANT YOUR CHILDREN

I have come to visit your children
And I'm pleased with what I see.
They abuse all kinds of drugs,
And are getting drunk with me.

They live as in Gomorrah or Sodom,
Their minds perverse and blown.
I will claim their souls anytime now,
You shouldn't have left them alone.

I am glad you worked long hours,
I am glad you were busy a lot.
It would have been harder to sway them, if not.

At your schools I have been at work,
Making sex an acceptable game.
You slept while I fought to keep prayer out,
To add to your neglectful shame.

You don't seem to notice the witchcraft;
I broadcast on your own TV,
"It's just an innocent program,"
Twitch your nose as they follow me.

Add a couple violent sitcoms,
It's funny to see heads blown in two.
Now your little Tommy has his own gun
And there's nothing you can do.

They're mine and you cannot reach them;
Their hearts are cold, hard and black.
I've showed them how to party,
With pot, cocaine and crack.

You have been a tremendous help though;
I couldn't have done it alone.
If you hadn't forsaken your prayer life,
These seeds I could not have sown.

So stay away from the Bible's teachings;
Don't listen to what God has to say.
Your children are no longer your problem,
A price they'll eternally pay.

Without Christ they are mine to devour.
Without God, nothing you can do.
Today I will take your children.
Tomorrow I will be coming for you.

Sincerely,
Satan

People who drift without God's direction usually end up where they don't want to be.

(History and Belief continued from page 3)

with them their hereditary Bible, the gospel of consolation and of courage, that holy Ark of the New Covenant and of peace of heart."(The year noted is 1340).

George S. Faber – **The History and Theology of the Ancient Vallenses and Albigenses:**

p.51—Faber accounts for the purity of the Paulicians and their Scriptures indicating they were never Manichean saying: "Cedrenus, the copyist of Peter Siculus at a considerably later period, similarly admits, that the New Testament of the Paulicians, which they probably at that time had completed by the addition of the Apocalypse and the two Epistles of St. Peter, was precisely the same as the N.T. of the entire Catholic Church; but he states, that they interpreted it perversely.

In the days of Cedrenus who flourished during the twelfth century, any interpreting of the N.T., which ran counter to the prevailing superstition would be deemed a perversion. His testimony is important: in as much as it thence appears, that, in the course of the three hundred years which elapsed between Peter Siculus and himself, **no corruption** of the N.T., to serve the purpose of the **Manichean** heresy, had ever been attempted by the Paulicians." (Emph. mine). Yet to extract Manicheism out of the genuine and unadulterated N.T. is, I conceive, a moral impossibility."

p.55—Faber also points out they possessed and believed the O.T.: "For my own part, as they were indisputably acquainted with the O.T., so I think they likewise possessed it."

Thirteenth Century

Fred C. Conybeare – **The Key of Truth:**

p.165—In Appendix VI, Conybeare's translation of the "Albigenses' Ritual of Consolamentum," written before 1250 in the Proventual Tongue, gives evidence they used the T.R. Scriptures for they quote Mk. 16:18 which is the T.R. ending of Mk.

p.79—Evidence is present here that shows no acceptance of Manicheism: "...As the Spirit of God beareth witness in the sequel." (The book is referring to the fall in the O.T. and then goes on to quote Christ in the N.T. This is proof they had and believed both testaments and therefore were not manichean in theology).

Adam Blair – **History of The Waldenses:**

p.271, Vol.I—Blair reports evidence of the Waldenses spreading the Word of God saying: "About the **year** (Blair is quoting Sismondi and leaves out the word "year") 1200 the Albigenses made proselytes at Metz,

(History and Belief continued on page 10)

(Closed Communion continued from page 5)

sible for the separation? By just as much as conscience should be above convenience, as principle should be above preference, by just so much does the responsibility of the separation not rest upon Baptists.

Fourth.—It is objected that Baptists make too much of baptism. It is not a saving ordinance; why make such an ado about it?

If we were disposed to retort, we might say that the charge comes with bad grace from those who practice sprinkling or pouring; since it was the belief that baptism is a saving ordinance that first led to the change in the primitive practice, in such cases as the sick, when baptism was deemed impracticable and dangerous. Yet that they might not die without the regenerating fluid, in such cases sprinkling or pouring was substituted for baptism. Baptists have neither unduly exalted nor debased the ordinance of baptism. They keep it just where the Master put it. The same with the Supper. They do not seek to exalt the Supper above baptism. Both are divine ordinances, and were established by the same lips. **The Master placed one at the entrance of the church, the other within the church.** No one has the right to run over the one ordinance, baptism, to get to the other, the Table. All the commands of Jesus are full of power, sweetness and beauty. Obedience is the test of love, in small matters as well as great. A command to pick up a pin is as sure a test of love as a command to put out a fire that is burning down a house,—perhaps a surer one. To put out the fire is of so great importance that it would be done without a command; whereas, the command to pick up a pin carries with it no reason for obedience save that it is commanded.

But underlying this question about baptism is one that is not of minor importance,—the Headship of Christ. If Christ ordained immersion, have we any right to change it? The Catholic Church says, "Yes; and we have done it." Calvin says on Acts 8: 38: "They went down into the water. Here we see the rite used among the men of old time in baptism; for they put all the body into the water. Now the use is this, that the minister doth sprinkle the body or the head. . . . It is certain that we want nothing which maketh to the substance of baptism. Wherefore the church did grant liberty to herself since the beginning to change the rites somewhat excepting the substance." (Edinburg: by Calvin Translation Society, quoted by Jeter.) But if we claim the right to change

what Christ has ordained, where will the matter end? Where has it landed the Catholic Church, which arrogates to herself the right to change the laws of Christ? Look at her today and contrast her with the teachings of God's word, and let that be our answer.

Jesus Christ is the head of the Church and the King in Zion, and among the last words which, he caused to be spoken is a curse upon him who should "add to" or "take away from the words of the book." Rather let my hand or tongue be palsied than do or attempt such a thing.

Conclusion.—We conclude as we began. Baptists simply ask for themselves the liberty to administer the ordinance of the Lord's House in such a way as their consciences tell them that His Word requires. They ask their fellow Christians of other names to recognize their right to do this, and charge their course to this motive alone, not to prejudice, bigotry, uncharitableness, or an affectation of a superior piety or wisdom. The practice of Closed Communion is the logical result of the principles which they have learned from the Scriptures. If they are wrong, either in the principles themselves, or in their practical application, we think they have the candor and manliness to acknowledge the wrong, when it is pointed out to them. On a question like this, argument is more agreeable to them, and more becoming those who differ from them, than harsh words and bitter upbraidings. They desire to live on terms of brotherly kindness with all Christian people. They do not shrink from criticism and investigation. They would be glad to have the world study their principles in the light of God's Word, and will cheerfully abide the result.

To my Baptist brethren I say, we should remember that we have naught to gain, but everything to lose by compromising the principles which we hold. Should fidelity to God's Word lend us to separation from those we love as well as our own lives, we should still be firm; remembering that true love to Jesus, as well as to our friends, should lead us to stand firmly by the truth. Baptists have accomplished a noble work for the world. We do not believe that their mission is ended. Our fathers suffered imprisonment, stripes, banishment, death, that they might bequeath to us the rich legacy which we enjoy. Shall we barter that legacy for popular applause? The early Christians were the "sect everywhere spoken against." Our Master bore suffering and shame for us. If our principles bring reproach upon us, let us bear that

(Closed Communion continued on page 11)

and it is the duty of an individual to examine himself, and so eat and drink; and it is the duty of the church to enforce the laws which have been left to her to administer. In 1 Cor. 5:11, this duty of the church is distinctly urged and commanded: "But now I have written unto you not to keep company if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat." This means "not to eat at the same table with such: whether at the love feasts (Agape) or in private intercourse, *much more at the Lord's table.*" **That the communicant should he be a converted man, a baptized man, a church member, is as plainly declared in the Scriptures as that lie should be a moral man, and just in his deportment.** If it is the province and duty of the church to judge the communicant as to his possession of a part of these Scriptural qualifications, and the apostle distinctly asserts that it is, no less can it be the province and duty of the church to judge the communicant as to his possession of all the Scriptural qualifications. And if the church has not this right, aye, if this duty does not solemnly rest upon her, then the Lord's Table is a prey to designing men, and the church herself is impotent to determine or preserve her own character.

Third—Another common objection which we hear is this: I do not believe that it is right to separate Christian people. I think they ought to meet together at the Lord's Table.

1. It is difficult to see the consistency of the outcry against Closed Communion, while separation into different denominations is at once tolerated and justified. If the Lord's people can consistently come together at the Lord's Table, what reason is there for their living in and maintaining separate Church establishments? If their differences should not keep them apart at the Lord's Table, why should they anywhere? To say that there may be consistent intercommunion between the different sects is to brand them as being so many *schismatics*. Upon the basis of the consistency of intercommunion, one of the greatest sins of the Christian world is its division into so many sects; because there can be no consistent intercommunion except between those churches whose views of divine truth are so accordant that membership in the one may justly entitle an individual to membership in the other. But for two such bodies to live apart is not only schism, but it is a wicked consumption of talent and wealth which might otherwise be employed

in the evangelization of the world.

But if the diverse denominationalism of the Christian world is not a rank and crying sin, intercommunion is a sham, all the worse that it wears the cloak of piety and love. And such a sham it is when two persons sit down side by side at the Lord's Table, while in their hearts there is a lack of Christian confidence and fellowship, and so a betrayal of their honest convictions, and a moral cowardice that shrinks from the responsibility of standing by one's principles.

2. This objection seems to overlook the fact that Christians are already separated, and that independently of the Table, But for this separation, whether at the Table, or elsewhere, we allege that Baptists are not responsible. Let us look at separation at the Table. It has already been seen that the question between the bulk of the religious world and Baptists is not one of communion at all, but of baptism. Now there is a common ground between them, upon which they may meet and compose their differences, and that ground is the validity of immersion. Those who practice otherwise admit the validity of immersion, for they accept it without hesitation, and occasionally practice it. But they say that another act will suffice, and, as more convenient and popular, they prefer it. Baptists cannot see it in this light. It appears to them that immersion alone is baptism; that to speak of baptism by sprinkling is as much a solecism as to speak of running by crawling. Others can conscientiously practice immersion; Baptists can not conscientiously practice sprinkling. Which should yield? Should conscience yield to convenience, or convenience yield to conscience? Should principle yield to preference, or preference to principle? Now, as a Baptist, I am frank and bold to say that, if our positions were reversed, I would gladly yield to them. If we believed that either immersion or sprinkling was valid, and they could not conscientiously accept immersion, but sprinkling only, we would cheerfully relinquish our preference for immersion as the more beautiful and expressive rite, and practice sprinkling. Not for a moment would we allow our convenience and preference to weigh in the balances against their conscience and principle; but instantly they should be relinquished, that we might strike hands in fellowship and love upon this question. But while our brethren are in this position to yield without the sacrifice of principle, we are not. Which of us is the more respon-

(Closed Communion continued on page 8)

PREACHER RULE ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES

By T. Willamson

A nervous church member has just been asked to step into the pastor's office after church. He knows what the pastor wants to talk about. Recently, he privately expressed reservations about the pastor's plan to sell the church building and relocate the congregation to another community.

As they sit down, the pastor launches right into his subject. He declares that this church member, by questioning his plans, has been guilty of "challenging the authority of the pastor," and is "destroying the ministry of the church." For hours, he lashes into the culprit with angry, embittered, emotional accusations, epithets and putdowns. In conclusion, the member is admonished that he needs to demonstrate his repentance by doing whatever his preacher tells him to do.

The dazed church member mutters some weak apologies, staggers out and heads home, tail dragging behind his legs, while the pastor rubs his hands together in satisfaction - another recalcitrant follower has been brought under control. But in the weeks to come, his smug triumph turns to dismay and consternation as he realizes that the whipped church member has not returned to services, and will never return. He has joined a mass exodus of long-time members who have left that church, sending attendance and offerings down to dangerously low levels.

That church and its members have become casualties of the doctrine known among some Baptists as "preacher rule" - the notion that the pastor is to be an all-powerful dictator over the members, who are bound to follow and obey him fully in all matters of faith and practice, blindly and without question. Is this idea scriptural?

The favorite proof-texts for preacher rule are Hebrews 13:7 and 13:17, which are instructions to church members, that they should obey those who rule over them. Many commentators regard 13:7 as an exhortation to emulate the faith of Christian leaders who have died and "ended their conversation," while 13:17 clearly refer to living spiritual leaders.

The teaching of Hebrews 13:17 must be taken in context with all that the New Testament teaches on the subject. First, it is addressed to church member, and does not confer on pastors a divine right to be a dictator or a

bully. In Matthew 20:25-27. Mark 10:42-44. Luke 22:25-26 and 1 Peter 5:3, pastors are specifically forbidden to exercise lordship over their flocks, like worldly leaders do. The exhortation of Hebrews 13:17 is given with the understanding that those who receive it will be under a proper New Testament ministry of servanthood and example-setting, not a worldly, tyrannical, Hitler-type dictator.

Second, most Baptists will agree that church members are not under any obligation to submit to a pastor who is a false teacher of any kind. If we are not obligated to obey a liberal or Roman Catholic priest, surely we are not bound to abject servitude to a pastor using the Baptist label whose doctrine or practice has veered from the New Testament standards, including the command that preachers should not lord it over the flock.

Third, the Apostle Paul advised his converts not to submit themselves to an abusive ministry, 2 Corinthians 11:19-20. If the Corinthians were not expected to submit themselves to pastors who would bring them into bondage, devour their substance, exalt themselves and beat up on their followers, why should any Baptist church member today be expected to knuckle under to such tactics?

Fourth, if the pastor establishes himself as an unquestioned dictator and can say "I am the church" just as French King Louis XIV said "I am the state," then the New Testament principle of congregational rule is nullified.

If the pastor's will is to be taken as law and no church member can dare question it, then the cherished Baptist principle of congregational rule becomes a dead letter, and one has to wonder why God made provision for it in the New Testament, if the pastor is meant to decide everything anyway.

Today's Bible-thumping bullies and tin-horn tyrants in the pulpit claim more authority for themselves than the Apostles did. In doctrinal matters, the Apostles never said, "You must accept whatever I teach, no matter what, without question, based on my personal authority, because I say so." Paul specifically renounced such grandeur of authority in Galatians 1:8, and we are not told that he ever rebuked the Bereans who searched the scriptures to see if what Paul said was so. Acts 17:11.

What about the claim that a pastor must be obeyed in

THE CREED OF THE ALEXANDRIAN CULT

H. Schonhaar, Toronto

all his directives over the believer's lifestyle and personal actions? Peter disclaimed any authority over his members' finances and property. Acts 6:4. In 1 Corinthians 16:12, we find that Paul asked Apollos to go to Corinth on a special mission, and that Apollos refused he just didn't feel like going. Apollos was not rebuked by Paul, but he would have been bitterly denounced as a miserable rebel in some churches today which have embraced the lordship model of leadership which Jesus condemned. (If Jesus is the Lord and head of each true church, Ephesians 5:23, then who is in charge of a church where the pastor is barking commands and demanding absolute obedience? Has not that pastor usurped the Lordship of Christ?)

Preacher rule is a dangerous heresy that should be rebuked, reprovved and opposed whenever it rears up its ugly head within Baptist ranks. Most of the readers of this article will be personally aware of one or several churches that have been wrecked by pastors who attempted to establish a coercive, abusive dictatorship over their congregations. The dictatorial preacher is a self-centered man who caters to his worldly desires under the guise of true religion and feeds his own ego instead of his flock, thus negating by his way of life the central Christian principle of self-denial, Luke 9:23.

An even greater tragedy takes place on the foreign mission field, where some American missionaries, ostensibly sent to attract converts to true New Testament Christianity, instead drive nationals away from the truth and the true church by their unscriptural, domineering methods. Such false shepherds end up scattering the flocks that they were sent to gather at such great expense, and bring down reproach upon all Americans while sowing the seeds of bitterness against the Christian religion of which they have given such a false representation.

Some preachers would like to follow Elijah and Elisha as role models, calling down fire or wild bears to destroy those who rub them the wrong way, but we no longer live in the theocracy of the Old Testament prophets. We are now in an age where believers live under Christian liberty and where all citizens enjoy religious freedom, including the freedom to avoid preachers and religions that make themselves obnoxious. We would do much better to emulate the example of Christ and His Apostles, who while on earth dealt gently and tenderly with

(Preacher Rule According to the Scriptures continued on page 11)

1. There is no final authority but God.
2. Since God is a Spirit, there is no final authority that can be seen, heard, read, felt, or handled.
3. Since all books are material, there is no book on this earth that is the final and absolute authority on what is right and what is wrong: what constitutes truth and what constitutes error.
4. There WAS a series of writings one time which, IF they had all been put into a BOOK as soon as they were written the first time, WOULD HAVE constituted an infallible and final authority by which to judge truth and error.
5. However, this series of writings was lost, and the God who inspired them was unable to preserve their content through Bible-believing Christians at Antioch (Syria), where the first Bible teachers were (Acts 13:1), and where the first missionary trip originated (Acts 13:1-52), and where the word 'Christian' originated (Acts 11:26).
6. So, God chose to ALMOST preserve them through Gnostics and philosophers from Alexandria, Egypt, even though God called His Son OUT of Egypt (Matthew 2), Jacob OUT of Egypt (Genesis 49), Israel OUT of Egypt (Exodus 15), and Joseph's bones OUT of Egypt (Exodus 13).
7. So, there are two streams of Bibles: the most accurate—though, of course, there is no final, absolute authority for determining truth and error: it is a matter of "preference"—are the Egyptian translations from Alexandria, Egypt, which are "almost the originals," although not quite.
8. The most inaccurate translations were those that brought about the German Reformation (Luther, Zwingli, Boehier, Zinzendorf, Spener, etc.) and the worldwide missionary movement of the English-speaking people: the Bible that Sunday, Torrey, Moody, Finney, Spurgeon, Whitefield, Wesley, and Chapman used.
9. But we can "tolerate these if those who believe in them will tolerate US. After all. Since there is NO ABSOLUTE AND FINAL AUTHORITY that anyone can read, teach, preach, or handle, the whole thing is a matter of "PREFERENCE." You may prefer what you prefer, and we will prefer what we prefer; let us live in peace, and if we cannot agree on anything or everything, let us all agree on one thing: THERE IS NO FINAL, ABSOLUTE, WRITTEN AUTHORITY OF GOD ANYWHERE ON THIS EARTH. □