

The SCRIPTURE STANDARD

*Pleading for a complete return to Christianity
as it was in the beginning.*

VOL. 29. No. 4.

APRIL, 1962

"Be Ye Clean . . ."

ON March 7th the Report of the Royal College of Physicians on smoking and lung cancer was issued. We feel that we must take this opportunity of commenting on the Report while it is still in the public mind. Otherwise, if we leave comment only for another month we may seem to be unnecessarily raising a controversy rather than allowing it to die. To leave comment until later still might mean that the matter would be no longer of interest, and thus the case go by default.

For some years medical science has been making researches into the effects of smoking upon the human body. Six or seven years ago sufficient evidence had accumulated to demonstrate that smoking is a major cause of cancer of the lung: the heavier the smoking the more likelihood of developing lung cancer. Even when those first results of the experiments were made known, it was apparent to any unbiassed person that the evidence showed the relationship to be impossible of explanation by coincidence: facts and figures demonstrated the relationship to be cause and effect.

Yet by manufacturers and smokers the findings of the doctors were questioned, evaded, explained away, or even ridiculed. Yet, possibly for psychological reasons, some manufacturers attempted to counteract any tendency towards less smoking by producing "filter-tipped" cigarettes or other "harmless" varieties, which would give the same "pleasure" without involving any risks. Some manufacturers showed their public spirit and disinterestedness by making handsome donations for further research into this matter for the public good, and to cancer research societies. At the same time they set in motion a vastly increased advertising campaign, calculated to induce the smoking habit especially among young people. As the brewers succeeded in their campaign to get the young drinking, so that there is more juvenile drinking today than ever, so has the practice of smoking increased enormously among young people.

In these intervening years the Royal College of Physicians has continued its researches. The report it has now produced is a document more damning than ever of the practice of smoking. Let us remember that these researchers have no interest beyond a medical interest in the subject. They are quite unbiassed, have no axe to grind and stand to gain or lose nothing by their findings. In brief, these findings are summed up in the headings in "The Guardian" of March 8th: "**Overwhelming case against smoking. Doctors find relationship to lung cancer proved.**"

Most smokers adopt the habit during adolescence, but recent national surveys, published by the Tobacco Manufacturers' Standing Committee and several Independent surveys of schoolchildren, cashire, have shown that while there ranging from the Isle of Wight to Lan- are considerable variations from one

kind of school to another, in general 11 per cent to 15 per cent of boys—not infrequently with parental consent or

even encouragement—are already smoking small numbers of cigarettes by the age of 10.

SMOKING AMONG CHILDREN

In support of this statement we append the findings of a Medical Officer of Health:—

Dr. G. F. Bramley, medical officer of health for Gloucestershire, told a meeting of the county health committee yesterday, that 30 per cent. of school-children had acquired the habit of smoking by the age of 13, and 25 per cent. by the age of 12. The dangers of smoking had to be pointed out to children while still in primary schools and a booklet on the matter was available for teachers.

The chairman, Alderman Miss Ida Tiddler, said little could be done in schools when parents not only gave the children money to buy cigarettes but actually bought the cigarettes for them.

Alderman S. W. Hatton said he wished the same urgency could be shown by the public over lung cancer as was being shown about smallpox. Not more than 20 people had died from smallpox in this country but more than 30,000 a year died from lung cancer.

EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT

Lest we be accused of self-righteousness or interference with other people's pleasures and habits, or of making capital out of a case with which we agree, we give a few quotations from the Report:

ADVERTISING OF TOBACCO

There have been impressive increases in expenditure on the advertising of tobacco goods in recent years.

Advertisements with romantic allusions give the appearance of being addressed increasingly to young people who may not yet be addicted to the

habit or attached to any particular brand.

During a period (1955-60) when total expenditure on advertising has not quite doubled, expenditure on tobacco advertising has increased threefold. The total expenditure in 1960 was approximately £11,000,000.

To prove their statements regarding advertising, the compilers of the Report include a table of Estimated Annual Expenditure in the U.K. on Advertising Cigarettes, Tobacco and Smokers' Requisites, showing that advertising increased from £3.7 million pounds in 1955 to £11 million in 1960.

CHEMICAL EFFECTS ON THE BODY

Nicotine. The amount of nicotine that can be recovered from the main-stream smoke of one cigarette varies from 1 to 3 milligrams. Of this, smokers who inhale may absorb as much as 90 per

cent. and those who do not, as little as 10 per cent.

The chief effects of such a dose of nicotine are on the heart and blood vessels, the digestive tract, and the kidneys.

SMOKING AND LUNG CANCER

During the past 45 years lung cancer has changed from an infrequent to a major cause of death in many countries. This increase has been most serious in men and women in late middle age, when family and professional responsibilities are at their height. While death rates from lung cancer have been increasing, those from other forms of cancer, and other respiratory diseases have been declining or, like bronchitis, remaining stationary.

The report points to two different sources of statistical evidence on smok-

ing and lung cancer. There are, it says, comparisons of the smoking habits of people who die of lung cancer and the smoking habits of people who do not.

The Report points out that in the United States research has shown that even among smokers who do not die of lung cancer, but of some other disease, changes in the structure of the lungs are often to be found. "Such changes are possible precursors of some types of cancer and were most frequent in the men with lung cancer."

The Report raises the suggestion that some factor in human make-up may be independently associated with both smoking and lung cancer, and says that only an inherited effect is a serious possibility. It describes this explanation

of the evidence as "unsatisfactory," and points out that it does not account for such things as the almost complete absence of lung cancer in people who become Seventh Day Adventists.

OTHER CAUSES OF LUNG CANCER

The possibility that exhaust from motor vehicles might be partly responsible for the recent increase of lung cancer is rejected because there is no increase in lung cancer death rates among transport workers.

On the question of air pollution the Report says there is more room for argument. It says that further investigation is needed but that "it is clear" that at all levels of air pollution cigarette smokers are disproportionately prone to lung cancer. This is true even in rural areas.

As a result of all these arguments, the Report concluded "that habitual cigarette smoking over many years is a cause, in the ordinary sense, of lung

cancer. It is important to recognise that the hypothesis is not that cigarette smoking is the only cause of lung cancer. The fact that the disease does, rarely, occur in non-smokers and the effects of air pollution and various industrial hazards clearly indicate that other factors are concerned. Nor does the fact that only a minority of smokers develop lung cancer negate the hypothesis any more than does the fact that only a minority of persons exposed to tuberculosis infections develop tuberculosis negate the hypothesis that exposure to infection is a cause of the disease. The minority response only indicates that other factors determine susceptibility.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The strong statistical association between smoking, especially of cigarettes, and lung cancer is most simply explained on a casual basis.

The conclusion that smoking is an important cause of lung cancer implies that if the habit ceased, the death rate from lung cancer would eventually fall to a fraction, perhaps to one-fifth or even, among men, to one-tenth of the present level. Since the present annual number of deaths attributed to lung

cancer before the age of retirement is some 12,000, a large amount of premature shortening of life is at issue.

In its estimate of the size of the risk entailed in smoking the Report points out that this can be done in several different ways. So far as the rate of deaths each year in the population at large is concerned, the Report says that in young men the death rate appears to be four times greater among heavy cigarette smokers than among non-smokers.

The "Guardian" Medical Correspondent adds a note about the lack of effort on the part of public authorities to teach the truth on this matter. He writes:—

The reluctance of local authorities to play an active part in educating the public in the risks from tobacco is criticised by the Report. It appears that in the years 1956 to 1959 the authorities spent £3,424 on material for health education from the Central Council for Health Education. Against that, the tobacco industry spent £27 millions advertising their goods. In 1960 the local authorities spent a further £200 with the council, and the tobacco firms spent £11 millions.

There is also, according to the Report some resistance to the council's efforts.

With ordinary tobacco there is a strong link between smoking and the chronic bronchitis that is one of the major causes of disablement and death in Britain, particularly in middle-aged and elderly men. The Report says that in many people cigarette smoke appears

to act as a bronchial irritant causing coughing and increased secretion of bronchial mucus—the hallmarks of bronchitis—but fortunately these symptoms can be reversed if smoking is stopped. Pathological evidence of chronic bronchitis is found more frequently in smokers than in non-smokers at post-mortem examinations, and more often in heavier than in lighter smokers.

Among British doctors there is a steady increase of bronchitis death rates with increasingly heavy cigarette smoking, those smoking more than 25 cigarettes a day having a death rate from bronchitis six times greater than that of non-smokers. In the U.S.A. other workers have found that deaths from bronchitis and emphysema were more than three times as frequent in regular cigarette smokers as in non-smokers.

CHRISTIANS AND SMOKING

While refraining from comment upon the Report itself (it is its own best comment) we feel we must look upon this subject from the standpoint of Christians. Is it right for any Christian to be involved in so sinister and nefarious a traffic as this? Are doctors and scientists to point out the ill effects of smoking upon the body, yet those Christians who smoke still cling to their habit?

For a Christian, smoking is wrong from whichever angle viewed. It is **wrong financially**. When the cause of Christ and the claims of mankind call for our money, "will a man rob God" by literally burning his money and sending it up in smoke? Last year over £1,000,000,000 was spent on smoking. In figures the mind does not take it in. But set it out in words: One thousand million pounds! How much of that was contributed by those claiming to be Christians there are no means of knowing. But we venture to suggest that the cause of Christ throughout the world would not be crippled if the money devoted by Christians to smoking were to be channelled into the spreading of the gospel. To pay for smokes, something more vital, something that brings blessing to mankind, must be sacrificed.

For a Christian, smoking is wrong **physically**. The man who feels no responsibilities to God claims liberty as to what he does with his body. He regards it as his own business. If he wants to smoke or drink himself to death, he says, he has a right to. We deny that "right," even to non-Christians. But no such thought should enter the mind of a Christian. To him, his body is from God, to be a temple of the Holy Spirit, and to be used in all its relationships for God. God has no other hands, feet, tongues or other members, organs or faculties but ours "to lead men in His way." The body marred by smoking is no fit vessel in which the treasure of the gospel is to be contained. The fingers stained by nicotine are no fit members to be breaking the bread which speaks of the perfect holiness of the life of Jesus Christ.

For a Christian, smoking is wrong **morally**. How can a disciple of Jesus Christ bring himself to such a state that he must indulge in that which, as a Christian, he knows to be unworthy? He condemns himself every time he lights up. He is ashamed of his brethren seeing him, and must leave them while he takes a smoke. How much more ashamed in the presence of God, from whom he cannot flee? Paul says, "Happy is the man who does not condemn himself in that which he approves." (Rom. 14:22).

A habit should be developed by a Christian only when he is made morally better by it. Such expenditure of money can be justified only when by it one is made a better man (or woman). Not one, let alone a Christian, claims that one is improved in any way as the result of smoking. Many, even utterly worldly men, bemoan that they ever began smoking, and wish they could cut off. No-one ever started the habit without a certain feeling of shame, sneakiness or bravado. He thought he was showing himself a man, or at least "one of the boys." It is tragic to see even Christians who have grown to hate their smoking, realising what a grip the habit has got on them. They know that every cigarette they smoke is enslaving them more deeply; they are forging a chain for themselves which is binding them ever more closely.

And for a Christian, smoking is wrong **spiritually**. Of course, all the grounds enumerated above have their spiritual bearings. But on still higher grounds the Christian should be free from this habit. It is defiling to his body, and inevitably affects his spiritual life. We are familiar with the argument that smoking is not sin: that so soon as the smoker thought it sin he would give it up. All too often the smoker who argues thus knows that he is trying to make right what he knows cannot be justified. But the teaching of Christ and His apostles rises higher than simply abstaining from sin itself. The Christian is to abstain "from all appearance of evil" (1 Thess. 5:22). The Epistle to the Hebrews exhorts us not only to put off sin, but to "lay aside every weight." Even if smoking is not sin it is certainly a weight, a hindrance destroying the Christian's witness. Smoking is sin, in the sense that "whatever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14:23). If I indulge in that which has not my full consent, that which I question, that concerning which I am

in doubt, I sin. I offend my conscience, I violate it. That is sin. Read Paul's whole argument in Romans 14: these principles cover many of those doubtful practices not specifically named in the New Testament.

THE CHRISTIAN'S EXAMPLE

Not only for himself, but for others' sake the Christian should keep himself pure from anything doubtful. It has been said that "One of the noblest privileges of a Christian is to abstain for the sake of others." "Conscience," says Paul, "not thine own but of the other" (1 Cor. 10:29), or, as in the Rev. Stand. Vsn., "I mean his conscience, not yours—do not eat it." Refrain from smoking it. You Sunday School teacher, if only for the sake of your scholars, do not smoke. You older church member, if only for the sake of your younger brethren, do not smoke. You would be pained to see them starting the habit. Why should they not, if you do it? At what stage does the habit become right?

"Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord" (Isa. 52:11). On higher grounds than negative abstention, the Christian is to keep himself pure, as Christ is. "Everyone who has this hope in him purifies himself, even as Christ is pure." (1 John 3:3). Paul teaches us that in the most commonplace things, for example eating and drinking, we are to "do all to the glory of God." (1 Cor. 10:31). How much more in that on which we spend our money, and in any habit we cultivate.

We appeal to our Christian brethren who are smokers to break off now. We are grateful to God that so few among us do smoke. But we ought to stand absolutely as one in such things. Did you notice the reference to the Seventh Day Adventists in the quotations from the Report? Why should that not be so of members of the church of Christ? Why should it not be that to be such a member means that he is a non-smoker, non-drinker of intoxicants, refrains absolutely from war and its connections, and from everything else evil or doubtful? To be a Christian surely includes all these.

We do not wish to adopt a "holier than thou" attitude. We sympathise with our brethren who, before they realise it, have brought themselves under the power of any questionable habit. We realise the dreadful struggle it may take to win free. The habit of smoking will not just fall off, or leave you. It will be to some like plucking out an eye or pulling off an arm, and casting them from you. Christ warned us that to put away sin may be as painful as that. But we have seen non-Christians who were "chain smokers" cut off the habit instantly, for reasons of expense or health. "Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible." If they can do it by moral or will power, cannot you Christians by the strength which Christ gives? "I can do all things through Christ, who strengthens me."

Our prayers are for you. "God is faithful, who will not permit you to be tempted above your ability to withstand; but will with the temptation open up a way of escape." And not only do we pray for deliverance from the smoking habit, but from every defilement of the flesh. I am tempted in one way, you in another. Let us consider one another, pray one for another, bear one another's burdens, with love and understanding sympathy, considering ourselves, lest we also be tempted.

"He breaks the power of cancelled sin;
He sets the prisoner free."

EDITOR.

(God willing, next month we hope to write on the wider implications to Christians and non-Christians of the principles touched on in the above article.—Editor.)

WORKING FOR THE DEVIL

A mill, manufacturing goods during World War II, put the following sign over the gate: "When you take it easy, you are working for Hitler."

No-one could have successfully denied this. Applying the same principle to the church, the sign might read: "When you stay away from the meetings of

the church, you are working for the devil." Matthew 12:30 reads: "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad."

The devil has some workers among the children of God! You may not believe this is true, but a little serious thinking will convince you.

Reasons for Believing the Bible

THE CITY OF TYRE

Let me refer you now to Isaiah 23:13 and Ezekiel 16:7-11. In these passages we have mention of the city of Tyre, and the prophecy is made regarding its destruction. Tyre was a sea-coast city, a harbour city. But, said God, Tyre would be utterly destroyed and no more recognisable as a place of human habitation. The prophecy began to be fulfilled when Nebuchadnezzar attacked and desolated the city. But it was not altogether destroyed. It seemed that the prophecy had failed, for ruined as it was, Tyre was still recognisable as a place of human habitation. Seventy years later the refugees came back to the ruins, but, instead of rebuilding their old city, they decided to build on a small island, half-a-mile from the coast. They felt that with their strong navy (and the people of Tyre are said to have been the first masters of the art of navigation) they would be perfectly safe from all future attacks. Two hundred and forty years after Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander the Great came. The world empire of the Macedonians was developing. Alexander approached the coast and sent messengers saying that he wished to worship Hercules in their city. The people of the island of Tyre knew that this was only a trick, and they determined to fight.

They, like the Babylonians, felt safe. They were on an island and Alexander had no navy with him. However, Alexander knew that he must capture Tyre before daring to undertake a campaign against Egypt, and so he began to build a dyke, reaching out from the coast to the island. The Tyrians did all they could to prevent the dyke being built. When Alexander's men threw trees and rocks into the sea to build their causeway, the islanders shot arrows at them, and even sent divers into the sea to pull the dyke to pieces.

But Alexander was as determined as Cyrus had been. When material was hard to find, he sent his soldiers to the site of the old city and ordered them to pull down the old buildings. The stones and beams of the houses were cast into the sea to make the dyke. And when the building materials became really scarce, he ordered his soldiers to scrape up the very dust of the old city and to cast that into the sea. In this way, the dyke was made and Alexander took the island. In doing this, he thus had fulfilled the prophecy of the Bible to the very letter. Read it once again! Ezekiel 26, verse 12.

Now there are many other prophecies, just as arresting, not to mention the prophecies that have to do with the Lord Jesus Christ.

The force of these prophecies is undeniable. For this reason, the opponents of the Bible have always launched their strongest and most determined attacks on Bible prophecy. They have done all within their power to discredit the Bible at this point. But they have always failed. The witness of prophecy is as strong today as it ever was, and as time goes by new discoveries, made in the lands where these events took place, bring added confirmation of the truthfulness of the Bible record.

Here, then, are a few of many reasons that might be given for believing in the Bible. Let me sum up these arguments.

(1.) I believe in the Bible, because it exists! Its survival from the bitter attacks which have been made upon it cannot really be explained unless we see the hand of God in that survival.

(2.) I believe in the Bible because of its influence. When I consider that influence and see what it has meant to mankind and try to imagine a world without a Bible, I feel that I have reason to accept it as a message from God.

(3.) I believe in the Bible because, when I examine it, its amazing unity marks it out as a book written by inspiration of God. The hand that wielded the pen may have been human, but the mind that guided the hand was divine.

(4.) I believe the Bible because of the accuracy of its statements on the various aspects of science. The manner in which this book has anticipated the discoveries of science leads me to the conclusion that the source of its information was divine.

(5.) I believe in the Bible because **archaeology** gives historical confirmation to its statements.

(6.) I believe in the Bible because the **fulfilled prophecies** of the word of God leave me no other choice.

Finally, a more selfish and yet understandable reason for believing the Bible. I *want* to believe it when it tells me that the God it reveals—and the God who speaks to me—is a God who loves me and gave His Son to die for me. I believe in the Bible, because in this age of uncertainty and strain, I read in this book, of an eternal home which this loving God has prepared for those who accept his offer of salvation and obey the Gospel of His Son. This is the message I need. The message to which I can respond, for it speaks to my heart. And when a book so wonderful, with such an influence for good and so rich in wisdom comes to me with such a message, I should be foolish *not* to believe it.

(Concluded.)

FRANK WORGAN.

A Scripture and Its Interpretation.

Bro. McDonald begins his remarks in the March issue of the "S.S." with a question. "Why exclude the Gentiles from as many as the Lord our God shall call?" I am bound to think that this statement, put in one form or another, at several times, is a little lacking in honesty. I admit that an unfortunate omission on my part of the words "on that day" (Pentecost) does give a hair's breadth (but no more) of excuse for the misapplication of these words. I made mention of the two keys of the Kingdom; Pentecost saw the use of one of them only, so that any wrong meaning put upon my words by readers not taking into account that fact, is no real fault of mine.

Moreover, I did not exclude anyone. It was God, through the Holy Spirit, as the account clearly shows, who did the excluding, of set purpose and intention. If it is true, what I once read, that the "call" by the "Lord our God" of the Gentiles did not come until seven years after Pentecost, then they were excluded for a long time. As the apostles all the time were under the power of the Holy Spirit, the responsibility for that long exclusion—and it must have been a lengthy period—must remain with God. As Paul declared (Acts 14:46), "It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you [Jews]."

Bro. McDonald has three paragraphs dealing with conversions shortly after Pentecost, named to him as containing no reference of any granting of the Spirit *at baptism*, which he claims Pentecost teaches. Denying his claim, I had written that, if it were true, one would expect to see some reference to it, so soon after such a promise was made—"S.S." page 18). What we do read, however, is of the apostles praying for the converts, for **as yet the Spirit had "fallen upon none of them."** This is how our brother deals with that situation: He writes:—

"Many were baptised . . . they were therefore Christians."

But "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, they were none of His;"

"They had therefore received the Spirit."

which, let it be noted, is a direct denial of what scripture says (quoted above). Why does he stop where he does, and not say when and how the Spirit was received? Is it not because he cannot complete his statement without inserting the words in dispute. And that he dare not do, for he cannot find a line of scripture to support him in so doing. An impasse in which he has landed himself by trying to prove the unprovable.

With respect to the proposition put to him, based on Peter's words—with which he has made no attempt to deal, this is it, re-stated, "As Joel's promise contained miracle, and was fulfilled by things 'seen and heard' which necessitated miracle, so also the fulfilment offered by Peter must also have included miracle." This Bro. Eric finds too difficult to answer without disproving his words in the tract, so he

calls the problem a statement and an assertion of mine, and then declares, as though he had proved it, "The promise that the Holy Spirit would be given does not necessarily imply miraculous gifts." An assumption which he cannot justify, for it is not true.

Were it not that others, I suppose, besides Bro. McDonald, are interested and concerned in what is being discussed, for it is important, or should be, to every reader, I introduce statements from old-time books written by men long since dead, but whose writings, by their sincerity and understanding of the scriptures, still speak to us with authority. Their words are rendered the more powerful because of the sustained efforts they put forth at a time when the Churches of Christ were passing through their most successful period in this country. Evidently from what we read, the question in dispute now, they had also in their day.

Alexander Brown, in *Conversion to God* (1887, p.43) writes on Acts 2:38-39: "The gift of the Holy Spirit. What is meant by this promise? Does it mean what is commonly called the indwelling of the Spirit in the believer? Is it the presence of the Spirit of God to strengthen and give needful help to all saints? Is it the common heritage of all Christians? Or does the promise refer to such a possession of miracle power as the apostles had shown they possessed in the speaking of languages they had not learned? Everything narrated points to miracle power . . . It was miracle power that Peter and his co-workers possessed. The Holy Spirit as the abiding Comforter with every believer was not before Peter's audience. You obey the Lord, says Peter, and you will obtain the same gift that we have. You will receive the Holy Spirit as a gift, showing His presence with you in miraculous powers. This exposition of the gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38 in no way precludes teaching from other portions of the Scriptures respecting the help of the Spirit to all Christians. **But that is not taught in the passage under consideration, and I dare not import it.**"

That is, he dare not import to the words spoken by Peter the meaning that Eric insists they have.

David King, in *The Holy Spirit*, teaches the same. He writes: "3,000 on that day obeyed." What did they receive? "The gift of the Holy Spirit." What could they—what did they—understand by receiving the Holy Spirit? What but that which they had that day witnessed, and concerning which Peter had said: (first), "This is that spoken by Joel"; (second), "Ye shall receive it, for the promise is unto you and your children." This Peter again introduced before giving them the promise of verse 39, saying, of Jesus: Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, He hath shed forth this, *which ye now see and hear*. What can we understand them to have received? They were promised what the apostles, earlier in the day, had received, and what they were promised, they, without doubt, obtained.

David King has something to say on the gift of the Spirit at baptism. He writes: "But when and how were they to receive this gift? In baptism, answers a mistaken friend. Let those who bring infants to the water, that in baptism they may receive the Holy Spirit . . . and those who teach believers to look for a reception of the Holy Spirit in baptism, remember that **the inspired word gives no such promise**. The supposed proof is found in the text under consideration. But Acts 2:38-39 does not promise the Spirit in baptism. . . . Peter carefully distinguished between that which, as a result, necessarily followed repentance and baptism, and that which—though intended to follow in this particular instance, is not an invariable, and therefore **not a necessary result.**"

Alexander Brown, after writing on similar lines, states: "The receiving of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost by the many believers may therefore have been through the instrumentality of the onlaying of the apostles' hands." However it was received, it is mere assertion to tell an enquirer that he will receive the Holy Spirit in baptism more than in any other act of obedience.

On the evidence thus presented, I believe every unbiased reader will agree that the words of Peter, in the scripture in question, implied that the gift offered was of miraculous power. If that is so, then Eric's words in the tract are false. For even God cannot give miracle after miracles are ceased. If it is contended that

the words, as written, carry also the implication of a gift of the Spirit without power, then I say we have illogicality stretched beyond all bounds.

Suffer a homely illustration. As it is impossible to pour hot and cold liquid out of one vessel at the same time, so is it impossible for the same set of words to include two different, and distinctive gifts, one miracle and one not. We may be willing or desire to believe a thing, which may appear to us to be necessary, but, if we would be honest, we may not put into words a meaning they do not actually possess.

Paragraph three in the March issue, in its last three lines, says that I "seem to attribute to the scriptures, work which more truly belongs to the Holy Spirit." If I wished to deny that and Eric sought to prove it, where would we both go for ammunition? To the only place where it is stored: the one Book.

There is one passage, quoted by several writers (Bro. McDonald being one of them), supporting—as they appear to believe—the idea of an indwelling Spirit, a subject I have sought to avoid, as being outside the scope of this enquiry, hence the title chosen for this and each of the articles I have written. That which I sought to avoid, Eric has tried to introduce into the discussion. However, let us, for a moment, join issue on the words to which reference has been made, remembering that it is thought that I make too much of the Word at the expense of the Spirit. Here is the scripture referred to: "If any man has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." The question I ask of all readers is just this: What can any man know of the Spirit of Christ except from what the scriptures teach about Christ? To that question there is only one answer: precisely nothing. It is what one knows about Christ which produces the desire to be like Him, and such is the power of the Word of God, the "living Word"—possessing that inherent power which belongs to all living things, to reproduce itself—that makes it possible for a man to become possessed of the same Spirit, even that of Christ, and so become "one of His" [disciples].

Thus we see where Eric is wrong when he writes, "We are given the Holy Spirit to help us understand the Spirit-given writings." It is quite the other way about. It is by the Word which has been given to us that we know the things of God and of the Spirit. My words, said Jesus, "they are Spirit and they are life"—and that is the way of it. It has been by following the spirit that is in man into the byways of human philosophy (which shows itself a little, we think, in Bro. McDonald's language, above quoted and elsewhere)—that called into being the multitude of sects around us. It is only by turning back to the standpoint of the Churches of Christ at their beginning, of speaking only where the Bible speaks, which can bring unity out of dissension.

In spiritual warfare, the word is the sword of the Spirit, and in our warfare it is the only weapon we have. It is the weapon used in the greatest conflict for good or evil that was ever waged, won by three words, thrice repeated: "*It is written...*" He that would have the Spirit of Christ within must needs have recourse to the same means of strength.

An incident in the life of Paul and words used on the occasion shed a little light, I think, on questions which lie within this discussion. Granting that there is an indwelling of the Spirit, from whence does that Spirit come and how received? Though having said that I sought to avoid this subject, it does seem necessary that—in these final remarks—a short answer should be given to these two questions. I suggest we have in this incident a clue to an answer to them both. Paul, coming in contact with disciples of John, said to them: "Have ye received the Holy Spirit *since ye believed*? Doubtless the "receiving" to which he referred was that which came by the laying on of hands. What was wrong with these disciples was that they believed in the wrong person and in the wrong things. It was the wrong belief which had to be and was corrected. That done, the right kind of belief implanted in their minds, they were then ready for the next step, their re-baptism—which shows—as does Paul's question at the beginning of the conversation, that belief was the essential thing; for belief—belief in Christ—was the kind of life they now had to live. Thus, the only source from which the indwelling Spirit can come is from belief in and acceptance of the Spirit-given life

which is in the Word. There, as I wrote in my second article, is the secret of the indwelling Spirit, and how the Spirit life is received, and that is the answer to questions put to me by Bro. McDonald and several others.

To be explicit, I do *not* believe in the Spirit being given at the baptism of a convert. It is an idea that has the signature of its origin plainly stamped upon it. It is artificial and clumsy, being obviously man-made. Once seen for what it is, it can never satisfy the reverent mind. But as when a child newly-born is sometimes spoken of as a gift of God, in that sense—but more truly—I answer: "Yes, I do believe in the gift of the Spirit." While a babe is born by the operation of the human will, the birth of a newly-born convert is by the exercise of the Divine Will. James says: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth," and it is that Spirit of Truth operating on the human mind from inception to birth which makes **being born again** a gift of the Spirit. There is nothing artificial about that, and moreover it grants all that is necessary to Christian life.

W. BARKER.

P.S.—In the several articles I have written on the subject as above, I have aimed to write nothing but the truth, as I see it. If it can be shown to me personally or through the "S.S." I have erred in any statement so as to lead to misunderstanding of scripture, I will ask the Editor's permission to withdraw it as openly as the erring statement was made.—W.B.

Let's Not Be Tagged.

NOW comes an automobile tag bearing the word "Minister." But why wear a distinctive label as a preacher? Does it give the preacher some special privilege? What kind of a special privilege should a preacher have? Why a tag for "The Minister"? Why not a tag for each elder? And then there are a lot of deacons. Why not for the song leader, the janitor, the faithful members?—and the unfaithful ones?

Seriously, should not this latest slip awake all to the fact that we are applying the wrong term to our preachers? The term "Minister" can as well be applied to our deacons as to our preachers. After all we are all ministers, or servants, and there is no scriptural justification for calling any one man in the congregation "The Minister." Nearly all of the Protestant churches dress their preachers with a Roman collar. At an open-air question period I once asked the speaker, "Why do you wear a Roman collar?" His reply was that the people could tell that he was the minister. Roman collar or ministerial auto tag, where is the difference? Both designate a clergy class.

I doubt if we can fool our religious neighbours. If we have a man in a congregation who is master of ceremonies, business administrator of the church, and court of final appeal, our neighbours recognise a pastor when they see one, even if we camouflage him with the title "The Minister." One young preacher told me that he used the term "The Minister" so that the denominations would understand. But I pointed out it only helped them to misunderstand. We can't make them understand the Lord's Supper by accommodatively calling it "The Sacrament." We only confuse them more and miss a good chance to teach a New Testament distinction.

So we have men studying "for the Ministry"! We do not have "The Minister" only, but "Assistant Minister" (Assistant Servant?). Call us preachers, evangelists, teachers, etc., but remember that every Christian is a minister, and let us eliminate "The Minister" from our brotherhood vocabulary.

CLYDE P. FINDLAY ("Firm Foundation.")

A careless word may kindle strife;
A cruel word may wreck a life;
A bitter word may hate instil
A brutal word may smite and kill.
A gracious word may smooth the way;
A joyous word may light the way;
A timely word may lessen stress;
A loving word may heal and bless.

Repentance is faith turning.
Confession is faith speaking.
Baptism is faith obeying.
Sacrifice is faith giving.
Singing is faith praising.
Preaching is faith teaching.
Christianity is faith living.
—"Woodstock Church News."



(Conducted by
A. E. Winstanley,
43a Church Road,
Tunbridge Wells,
Kent).

HOW THINGS BEGAN

OPEN your Bible and read the very first verse: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Read the whole chapter carefully and you will learn how God prepared the earth as a wonderful home for man.

What God Did

On the first day, God made light appear, and separated the light from the darkness. This was the beginning of days and nights.

On the second day He made the "firmament," or, as we would say, the sky.

On the third day, the Lord made the dry land to appear. He called it Earth. He gathered the waters together and called them Seas. He made grass and herbs to grow on the earth.

On the fourth day, He arranged for two great lights to give light to the earth: the sun to "rule the day" and the moon to "rule the night." He also made the stars.

On the fifth day, God made the fish and the other creatures that live in the sea, and the birds to fly in the sky. He saw that all that he had done was good.

God Made Man

On the sixth day, He made cattle, creeping things and wild animals, but His work of creation was not yet complete. He wanted to make a being who would be different from all others, and who could be God's friend. He said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness..." Notice that the very first human beings were to be different from the animals in a very important way. "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female..." (verse 27). We know that all this happened just as we read in Genesis, because Jesus believed it, and He was God's Son. He once said, "Have you not read, that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female?" (Matthew 19:4).

The Image of God

Adam and Eve were made in the "image of God." What does this mean? That they were like God. How? God does not have a physical body like ours. Jesus said, "God is a Spirit" (John 4:24). The first man and woman were different from the animals in this: they could choose between right and wrong.

They could be God's friends. We read of them talking to God without fear. That was because they were innocent, without sin.

Why Jesus Came

As we travel through Genesis we shall see how man and woman did wrong, and were no longer God's friends. Then we shall learn that Jesus, God's Son, came into the world to help us back to friendship with God. We can all be God's friends now by being friends of Jesus. He said, "You are my friends if you do whatsoever I command you." Shall we make up our minds that we will always do what Jesus wants us to do? Then we shall be God's friends, as Adam and Eve were "at the beginning"?

A BIBLE QUIZ

- 1.—In how many days did the Lord make heaven and earth?
- 2.—How many doors were there in Noah's ark?
- 3.—How many times did the Israelites march round Jericho on the seventh day?
- 4.—How many days was Jonah inside the great fish?

(Answers next month.)

ANSWERS TO LAST MONTH'S QUIZ

- 1.—Matthew (also called Levi).
Matthew 9:9; Mark 2:14.
- 2.—Andrew. John 1:40-41.
- 3.—Philip. John 1:45.
- 4.—James and John. Mark 3:17.
- 5.—In Damascus. Acts 9:9-18.
- 6.—Paul. 1 Corinthians 15:8.
- 7.—Judas Iscariot. John 12:4-6.

SOMETHING TO DO

Here's a text to learn. It is the one mentioned in our talk on "How Things Began." Jesus said, "You are my friends if you do whatsoever I command you" (John 15:14).

Remember please that if we are to be followers of Jesus we must be like Him. We must always be helping others. So here's something rather special to do this month. Find a friend or chum who does not go to Bible School and ask him/her to come with you. You may ask one or two who won't come, but if you keep trying you will find someone who will. See if you can't help a friend to make friends with Jesus.

UNCLE ALBERT.

HUMAN CREEDS CANNOT BE DEFENDED

Any creed containing more than the Bible is objectionable, because it contains more than the Bible.

Any creed containing less than the Bible is objectionable, because it contains less than the Bible.

Any creed differing from the Bible is objectionable, because it does differ from the Bible.

Any creed precisely like the Bible is useless, because we have the Bible. This covers the whole ground. There can be no other creeds. A creed must contain more than the Bible, less than the Bible, differ from it, or be precisely like it. No man defends his creed on the grounds that it contains more than the Bible, less than the Bible, that it is different from the Bible, or is precisely like it. If a creed cannot be defended on any of these grounds, on what ground can it be defended? Certainly on no ground conceivable to man.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

DAE IT NOO

Hae ye said a little prayer th' day,
Doon on yer bendit knees?
Hae ye thanked the Lord for a' He's
daen
An' never asked for fees?
Hae ye thanked Him for the clear air,
The trees an' skies sae blue?
Hae ye telt Him that yer grateful?—
Jist gang an' dae it noo.

Hae ye opened up yer Bible?
Or is it grey wi' dust?
Hae ye read a portion o' God's word,
Or hae ye lost yer trust?
Hae ye thanked Him ance for dying
For a', for me, an' you?
Well doon ye go, it's nae too late,
Jist gang an' dae it noo.

Ye can tell Him a' yer troubles,
And the burdens that ye bear;
O' yer loved ones that He's taken
And yer life that's fu' o' care.
He is willing tae tak over
When yer tether end's in view;
Ye've only got tae ask Him—
Jist gang an' dae it noo.

And when ye open up yer heart,
Ye'll find a ready ear,
He'll clear the rubble frae yer path
And dicht yer fallen tear,
He kens and cares for every ane
I've proved His help. It's true.
Oh, dinna wait anither day—
Jist gang an' dae it noo.

—Selected.

A SATURDAY REFLECTION

One of the half-dozen great bells of the world hangs in the belfry of St. Paul's Cathedral. It is 12ft. high and is said to weigh 17½ tons. Named Great Paul, it bears the inscription, "Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel."

This week, when the Church commemorates the conversion of St. Paul, is a good time to consider what we owe to the great Apostle. From the moment Saul the persecutor became Paul the untiring exponent of Christianity, he suffered loss—loss of position, friendships, home and probably of family inheritance.

But he had won "unsearchable riches," a clear conscience and inward peace, he knew that he must preach the Gospel; he must share his spiritual riches with others: he must work for Christ and His Church.

The conversion of the arch-enemy meant an end to violent and fanatical persecution of Christians. More than that, it meant the gain of an ally whose brilliant intellect could interpret the historic facts of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus and justify Christian belief at the bar of reason.

St. Paul's influence on the world is, in short, incalculable. Christianity was born at a time when the old pagan religions were played out. But the need for God was as strong as ever and the search for truth was no less keen. St. Paul believed that Christ had come into the world at "the fullness of time," or, as we might say, at the psychological moment.

Humanly speaking, but for St. Paul, Christianity might have become just another Jewish sect. It was he alone who, at the call of the Risen Christ, proclaimed the universality of the Gospel and the solidarity of the human race. The inscription on Great Paul is a warning and a motto for the Church of today. It must preach the whole Gospel, not a diluted version without a cross: not a Christ who is more human than divine; not a sugar-coated Gospel which keeps on good terms with the heedless world.

"Evening News"

(Football Edition) Jan. 27th, 1962.

There is by God's grace, an immeasurable distance between late and too late.

SCRIPTURE READINGS

APRIL

1—I Kings 18:1-18.	John 11:45-57.
8—Zechariah 9.	" 12:1-19.
15—Psalms 110 and 111.	" 12:20-36.
22—Isaiah 52:13 to 53:12.	" 12:37-50.
29—Psalm 51.	" 13:1-20.

PRECEPT AND EXAMPLE

John 13:1-20.

For three years and more there had been the closest intimacy between Jesus and the twelve. His life had been utterly consistent with His teaching, and there must have been a growing development of character as lesson after lesson was taught and illustrated by the Teacher's own example. The same lessons must have been taught many, many times over. The "sermon on the mount" enshrines principles which arose continuously during the preaching and teaching of both disciples and teacher. Take as an instance the case of James and John wishing to call down fire from heaven (Luke 9:54)—against thought and word of the Saviour. Their attitude towards the Syro-Phoenician woman (Matt. 15:23), and to the children (Mark 10:13) illustrates their failure to grasp the significance of the new and holy spirit which animated their Lord. Then their relationship with one another was the problem which Jesus had dealt with before the last supper on several occasions, and finally took in hand on this last earthly opportunity.

John, looking back upon the incident with vivid recollection, and recording it by divine inspiration for us all, is very deeply moved. The astonishment experienced at the time is in some ways eclipsed by the subsequent fuller understanding, and so John emphasises the love and the condescension of the Son of God, putting beside these the slow-learning and even the traitorous disciples. We learn from Luke 22:24 that there had been a dispute among them, and this was a recurrence of previous disputes (Luke 9:46; Matt. 20:24). The supper had been laid and their places at the table would have to be settled. One of them was to betray and another to deny the Lord. Their minds were unsettled and they thought of themselves more than their Master—though His

dangerous position must have been much in their thought also. The hatred and opposition of the rulers was too obvious, and they must have shared His critical hours in Jerusalem.

However, the meal had begun; to some extent the dispute had been settled; probably the first cup had been shared (Luke 22:17), when Jesus rose from His couch (we must remember they all reclined facing one another around the central table and about a foot high). He thus interrupted His own and their eating and there would be a considerable pause for the washing of their feet. Not one of them had offered to wash His feet, nor one another's, although they had walked the dusty road from Bethany into the city and the washing would be both necessary and refreshing.

Jesus had used a little child to enforce this same lesson and had spoken the most solemn warnings against causing the smallest and humblest to stumble, and strong encouragement to gain both happiness and a high place in God's kingdom by the lowliest service. Pre-eminence was to be gained by giving service, and the very highest place by slavery for others. There is no doubt He had been always serving them without any ostentation, but this example at the last supper was the ultimate lesson on the subject, and we can try to imagine the shamed silence which fell on the gathering, broken only by the impetuous Peter. He would not allow his Master to do him this most menial of services—oh no! But he had not offered it to his fellow disciples or his Master. He must, therefore, submit humbly then and learn the lesson once and for all—for future practice. Phillips translates verse 17—"Once you have realised" (that you must wash one another's feet) "you will find your happiness in doing them." I cannot help thinking of Peter's deep experience of joy when he raised Dorcas and "presented her alive" to those she had been serving (Acts 9:41) as an example of the blessing to be enjoyed through serving others.

Turning to Luke's gospel we find Jesus pointing out (22:25) a great contrast between His kingdom and worldly kingdoms. The highest honour in the world is to have authority. The highest honour in the church is to do the most and lowliest service. Worldly kingdoms enforce their rule by violence—physical,

mental and moral, though they cannot ultimately survive by those means. Love must be the ruling motive in the church, love exercised according to truth towards all. Stinted, limited sentiment, based on whether or not the service will be appreciated, will not do; we must show the same persistent, patient, inexhaustible, free-flowing love which Jesus has Himself exercised, shown in full measure in washing Judas's feet, which were about to do the devil's bidding. How far have we as individuals come in this "being converted" or better "turning" (Matt. 18:3) from our natural human thoughts and feelings to that holy spirit of divine, self-denying, self-forgetting love which is in fact the Holy Spirit Himself working in us, and without which we are not truly or fully in the kingdom of heaven?

The apostles had heard Jesus denounce the scribes and Pharisees for this very spirit of striving for the highest places; they had had many lessons and much teaching with practical demonstration; and yet in the time of crisis they showed their failure to grasp the great lesson. Their subsequent history tells another story—the story of their humble obedience and submission to the Spirit of God. May we all develop increasingly the same characteristics, and so have the blessing promised (John 13:17).

R. B. SCOTT.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES

Newtongrange.—The church here were overjoyed once again to hear the good confession and to witness the immersion of another two who have returned to the fold and family of our God. We pray that our Sister Meldrum and our Bro. John Clark may be used by our Lord for the extension of His Kingdom here, and for the honour of His Name. May they be kept faithful until the end.

Newtongrange.—Once again there has been rejoicing over a sinner returning to the fold and family of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. On Saturday evening, March 10th, we beheld the manifestation of the power of the Gospel when our Sister John Wilson made the good confession and was immersed into the ever-blessed name of our Lord and Master. May the Lord bless her and keep her in all His ways.

W. H. Allan.

OBITUARY

Bathgate.—The church in Bathgate has lost another of its members in the death of Sister Baxter. Her death was on Feb. 14th at the age of 74.

Sister Baxter travelled from Armadale to Bathgate. She always tried to get to church every Lord's Day until she was taken ill. We miss her very much. She used her talents in the Master's service.
H. Houston.

Summer Lane, Birmingham.—It is our regret to report the death of Sister Mrs. Minnie Grognet, in hospital, in Mansfield, on February 11th. Our sister was immersed at Nuncargate, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, in the year 1899. She was an elder sister of Bro. G. H. Hudson, and we regret that she was the last of the family. With her son, she came to Birmingham in 1946 and took up membership with the church at Summer Lane, where she remained until her return to Mansfield. Her passing came at the age of 81 after an illness which had kept her in hospital for three-and-a-half years. We commend to our Father's love and compassion her son Harold and the other relations who are mourning her loss.

Hindley.—It is with heartfelt sorrow that we report the passing of our dear Sister Elizabeth Kelly at the age of 88 years. Her loyalty and faithfulness to the Lord has been a wonderful example to us all, for she was ever to be found meeting with her Lord around His table. Although very shaky and feeble outwardly, nevertheless inwardly she was a tower of strength, a remarkable testimony to the words of the Apostle Paul, "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." Most surely "Her seat will be empty and she will be missed."

We commend all her sorrowing loved ones to the care of our heavenly Father, who alone can heal the inner smart. "Having served her generation, she fell asleep."

Tranent.—The Church has sustained a further loss in the death of our aged Sister Malcomn. After a long illness she fell asleep in Jesus on February 2nd, in her 81st year. Sister Malcomn was one of our oldest members, being a member of the church for over forty years. During her early life she

was a faithful attender to all the meetings of the church. She was gentle and of a quiet disposition, displaying in her life many of the virtues of the Saviour she loved.

We commend to the grace of God her sorrowing family, and pray His blessing upon them at their sad loss.

The funeral took place on Tuesday, 6th February, at which Bro. Steele officiated both in the home and at the cemetery.

D. Scott.

Ulverston.—The Church here has lost a revered brother in the passing away of Bro. Levi Clark, who fell asleep in Jesus on March 16th, aged 84 years. He attended all meetings nearly to the last, never wavered in the faith, and stood for New Testament Christianity as it was at the beginning. "Where the Bible spoke" was his motto. We shall miss our Bro. Levi, as he had a cheery disposition and enjoyed meeting with his brethren.

He was interred at Barrow-in-Furness cemetery. The service was held in the cemetery chapel, conducted by Bro. Tom Nisbet, who also officiated at the grave.

We commend to our heavenly father his daughter and her husband, and all his loved ones.

James McF. Black.

VACATION BIBLE SCHOOL

July 28th—August 11th, 1962

The Place: the George Hostel, Bangor, North Wales.

Bookings: these will be on a "first come, first served" basis. Those intending to come should **write at once** to avoid disappointment.

Deposits: must be sent when booking. For adults £1, for children (under 14 years) 10/-, both regardless of period.

Periods: Bookings must be for one or two full weeks, not for shorter periods.

Prices: For adults £5 15s. per week. For children £3 per week.

Total number of beds available is 120 and as soon as this number is reached no further bookings will be accepted.

Bookings, enquiries, information, etc., to: A. E. Winstanley, 43a Church Road, Tunbridge Wells, Kent.

THE "SCRIPTURE STANDARD"

Balance Sheet for the year ending, March, 1962. An individual copy of the balance sheet will be available to subscribers, on request, early in April. Please enclose postage with your request.

List of churches and meeting house addresses. Please send to Bro. Paul Jones a note of the address of the meeting house, secretary, and times of meetings—Lord's Day and week-night. Be sure to include a telephone number if at all possible.

CHANGE OF SECRETARY

The overseers of the church meeting in Summer Lane, Birmingham, wish to inform the brotherhood of a change of secretary. It was in 1916 that Bro. Fred C. Day accepted the position of secretary to the church at Summer Lane, and for forty-five years he has served faithfully and well. We are sure that everyone is fully aware of the sterling quality of the work he has performed over these years. It is at his own request that a successor has been appointed. Please address all future correspondence to: Paul Jones, 41 Pen-dragon Road, Birmingham, 22B. Phone, BIRchfields 5559.

BRO. TOM NISBET'S SERVICES

WE are glad to confirm that the churches at Reading and Bedminster, Bristol have been strengthened by the labours of Bro. Tom Nisbet. His services have been much appreciated and early return visits are hoped for. Four were added at Bedminster.

Bro. Nisbet will be at home in Haddington during the winter months of December, January and February and available for mission work for nine months per annum. March and April 1962 are allocated to Ulverston and May to Peterhead.

Requests for the services of Bro. Nisbet should be addressed to A. Hood, Committee Secretary, 45 Park Road, Hindley, Wigan, Lancs.

A CALL TO THE BROTHERHOOD NUCLEAR TESTS

Are there any brothers prepared to witness at the Aldermaston March on April 21st, 22nd and 23rd? Fellowship on the Lord's Day with the small Assembly at Reading. Accommodation available.

A great opportunity to discuss with hundreds of young people and distribute our literature. Are there any volunteers? Please write to the address of K. Spencer, "Beauchlere," Shellwood Cross, Leigh, Reigate, Surrey.

COMING EVENTS

HINDLEY BIBLE SCHOOL

Saturday to Monday (inclusive), June 9th to June 11th. For hospitality write to: Bro. T. Kemp, 52 Argyle St., Hindley, Wigan. Further particulars later.

Doncaster.—We heartily invite the brethren to join with us in a Tea and Rally we intend holding on Saturday, April 28th. Tea at 4.15 p.m. Meeting at 6 o'clock. Chairman: Bro. C. Melling. Speaker: Bro. Frank Worgan.

Eastwood.—Seymour Road Anniversary Services, May 5th and 6th. Particulars will be sent to churches later.

Beulah Road, Kirkby-in-Ashfield.—We intend to hold a rally (D.V.) on Saturday evening, April 14th, at 6.30 p.m. Bro. Ernest Makin is to address the meeting and we warmly invite all who can to join us in fellowship on this occasion.

Hindley Mission.—Saturday, June 9th, to Lord's Day, June 24th. Speaker: Bro. A. E. Winstanley. The Church would be glad of support for this effort to extend the Kingdom.

Ince-in-Makerfield (Lancs.).—Gospel Campaign, 14th to 29th April (D.V.). Preacher: Bro. A. E. Winstanley (Tunbridge Wells). Meetings on Lord's Days, Tues., Thurs. and Sat. at 7.30 p.m.

Holiday Week - end, 20th - 23rd April. Gospel meetings, Fri. to Mon., at 7.30 p.m. Mon., 23rd April at 2.30 p.m. Forum. Subjects for Discussion: "The Devil," "How best to reach people with the gospel." Tea served between after-

noon and evening meetings. Monday evening's subject: "How can we attain Christian unity"? Visitors welcomed. Write for accommodation to Philip Parthington, 636 Atherton Road, Hindley Green, Wigan.

CONFERENCE AND RALLY

Ulverston, Burlington Street Hall.—On April 21st. Conference at 2 p.m., chairman, Bro. W. Smith (Newtown). Rally at 3 p.m. Three short addresses on "The Revelation of God to Man and of Man to Himself." (a) Before the law, (b) During the law, and (c) Under the Gospel; Speakers, Brethren A. Marsden (Albert Street, Newtown), G. Gorton (Hindley), J. Melling (Scholes). Followed by questions from the audience to the speakers who will form a panel. Tea at 4.30 p.m. The Gospel at 6.0 p.m. presented by Bro. Tom Nisbet (Haddington) under the chairmanship of Bro. W. H. Clarke (Hindley). The church at Ulverston is looking forward to meeting many brethren on April 21st. It will help in catering if brethren would advise the church secretary, Mr. James McF. Black, 37 The Gill, Ulverston, Lancs., in good time. Anyone intending to stay the week-end should make early application to Bro. Black to arrange for hospitality.

A. Hood (Conf. Sec.).

WRONG ADDRESS

Tranent.—I am still receiving letters and papers sent to the old address. Please put this address in any new list of church secretaries that is being compiled: D. Scott, 29 Ormiston Crescent West, Tranent.

THE SCRIPTURE STANDARD is published monthly. Prices: Home, one copy for one year, 10/; two copies 18/6; three copies 26/6 post free. Canada and U.S.A.: one copy, one dollar 50 cents. All orders and payments to the 'S.S.' Agent and Treasurer: PAUL JONES, 41 Pendragon Road, Birmingham 22B. Tel. Birchfield 5559.

Articles, letters, appeals etc. for insertion must be sent before the 10th of the month to the Editor, C. MELLING, 133 Long Lane, Hindley, Lancs. News items, obituaries, coming events, personal notices, change of address, etc., to W. BARKER, Station Road, Langley Mill, Nottm. Payments to PAUL JONES, as above.

EVANGELIST FUND: Contributions to R. McDONALD, "Aldersyde," 10 Mardale Road, Bennett Lane, Dewsbury, Yorks.

Secretary of Conference Committee: A. HOOD, 45 Park Road, Hindley, nr. Wigan.

NYASALAND Mission: Contributions to W. STEELE, 21 Niddrie Road, Portobello, Edinburgh, Mid Lothian.

Hymn Book Agent and Treasurer: FRED HARDY, 73a Bridge Street, Morley, Leeds, Yorkshire. Tel. 255.

"The Scripture Standard" is printed for the publishers by Walter Barker (Printers) Ltd., Langley Mill, Nottm. Tel. 2266 Langley Mill.