

# The SCRIPTURE STANDARD

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

VOL. 29. No. 9.

SEPTEMBER, 1962

## *The Reasonableness of Belief in God and the Genesis Record.*

ONE of the problems facing our young people as they receive their education training to-day is the infiltration of modernisation into text books and classrooms. It is common for textbooks and educators to set forth as facts statements which discredit the existence and personal being of God. It is in order, then, that we present evidences which will strengthen the faith of both young and old and which will enable parents to better equip their children to overcome modernistic teaching.

### THEORIES OF EVOLUTION

First let us present some of the theories of evolution which are advanced as ways in which the world and life originated, and show their weaknesses.

*Causal Evolution* is that theory which holds that evolution itself has been eternal, and that it is a cause adequate to explain the present universe. This theory is usually held in connection with a materialistic theory of the universe and stands or falls with it. It defies evolution, and makes it into a self-running, automatic god, and gives us the absurdity of the personal, intelligent and moral creature, brought into existence by an impersonal force.

*Modal Evolution* is the theory which says that evolution is merely the instrument which God uses to create the universe, or the mode of His activity in bringing to pass the events of creation. This theory recognizes God and that He was the force which set evolution in motion, but denies the record of creation by the word power of God—that God having set the laws of forces in motion to effect the evolution of the universe, has not since interfered in the evolutionary process.

*Cosmic Evolution* is a theory which usually starts with the supposition of matter already in existence, spread out in space in a condition of "primitive nebulousity," governed by certain laws, and acting under certain forces, chief among which are gravitation and chemical affinity. These forces gradually collected the spreadout matter into the solar systems, and the worlds came into existence. This theory does not account for how matter came into existence, how it came to be spread out through space, how it came to be possessed of the powers called gravitation and chemical affinity, or what set these powers in motion.

*Organic Evolution* is the theory that holds that all existing life, in whatever form, has evolved from a primordial cell or cells, and is usually associated with the names of Darwin and Wallace, the co-authors of the theory called "natural selection." There are five principles laid down by Darwin in his explanation of the causes of evolution. They are: over-production, struggle for existence, variation, natural selection or survival of the fittest, and heredity. The fallacies of this theory have been shown many times, and many books have been written in so doing, but suffice it to say here that this theory does not account for the existence of the primordial cell or cells. From whence did they come? From whence did they possess life? By what power was their evolution or development set in motion?

### BELIEF IN GOD AND CREATION

With these theories and some of their weaknesses before us, let us now consider some of the reasons why we must believe in God and the creation record in Genesis, chapter 1.

First, it has not been and cannot be proven that matter is self-existent and that it has existed from all eternity. The materialistic concept of the universe must believe in the eternity of matter. Something has always been here, because something is here now. Out of nothing comes nothing. Thus, since something is here now, something has always existed. All evidence point to God as that which is self-existent and which has existed from all eternity.

Second, the design or order of the universe proves that it is the product of intelligent causation. The materialistic concept of the universe must believe that the order of the universe is to be accounted for by disorder—by mere chance. That mere chance is insufficient to account for the order of the universe is evident from a number of considerations. The fact that cells in plants and animals divide according to plan points to a rational Cause. The working together of rain and sunlight, soil and air, in the production of food to sustain life, is one of the most powerful proofs of a Cause who is a planning, rational being. The fact that the universe is so arranged as to provide the right temperature for life to exist on the earth and the fact that if the temperature of the earth's surface were to rise only a relatively few degrees, life would be impossible, indicates design by a Cause who thinks. A question: How would you account for the order and intelligence which are manifested in such a being as man, if the universe is a product of non-intelligent forces?

Third, the fact that there is a realm in which intelligence operates in the universe, is proof of an intelligent Causation. There is a realm in which intelligence operates. That is shown in that men can be taught; that facts and arguments can be presented; that men can be influenced and changed by reason, by thought, and by argument. Materialism cannot account for mind, reason, or intelligence. The realm of the mind points to the realm of divine mind as its source or origin. Materialism must believe that intelligence, and thus the ability to weigh and to mould matter, and even to argue, has come from non-intelligent forces. A question: How did matter become intelligent enough to deny that the universe is governed by intelligence? How could that which neither thinks nor wills produce that which thinks and wills?

Fourth, the existence of life proves the self-existence from all eternity of a living being powerful enough to give life. Materialism must believe that matter gave birth to life—life from non-life—organic matter coming from inorganic matter. Not one form of life can be named which can begin and complete its life cycle without receiving anything directly or indirectly from some other living thing. In other words, not one form of life can be named which is entirely dependent for its food, etc., on the inorganic environment. There is an axiom that the cause must be adequate to produce the effect. How could lifeless matter ever, by chance grouping of the particles, produce that which is not matter, but a soul?

Fifth, the fact that man is a conscious being is proof of the self-existence from all eternity of a personal conscious cause which could produce the effect. Materialism must believe that consciousness is the product of mere matter in motion—that consciousness is just the chance combination of atoms. How could impersonal spirit, with no self-consciousness, and consequently no purpose, ever produce that which is self conscious and which shows the result of purpose?

Sixth, the fact that man is a normal being proves that he is the product of an intelligent, moral Causation. There is a moral realm. Man has moral standards, standards of right and wrong. In the moral realm there is freedom of choice. If materialism be true, there is no moral realm. Materialism has no place for a realm of freedom, for all is mere matter in motion. If this were true then one could not say that a thing was either good or bad. If materialism be true, and there is no moral realm, no freedom of choice, then the one who believes in God is as much a product of matter in motion as is the one who does not believe in God. Hence, he is just as well off as the materialist. But there is a moral realm and room for freedom of thought, and for its source we must look to something beyond matter. Materialism cannot consistently believe that man is anything other than a mere matter-machine without any power of choice, thus without any moral responsibilities. We would do well to consider the influence of this materialistic thinking upon the society in which we live.

In conclusion, let it be noted that if the materialist is right and we are the accidental by-product of the working of the laws of nature, we, who believe in God, shall drop out of this life upon even scores with them. We cannot lose. We have lived this life in hope of a life to come. We have had joys that they cannot know.

We have had a hope that has sustained us in difficult times, that they cannot have; and finally we drop out of life on even scores with them even if they are right. On the other hand, if we are right and they are wrong they would have to admit that they are teaching a doctrine horrible in its consequences—that which would rob man of a hope and purpose for life, and when we drop out of this life it will not be on even scores. We have everything to gain and nothing to lose. The materialists have everything to lose and nothing to gain.

HOWARD SEE.

(The paper, *Apostolic Doctrine*, June, 1962, from which the above article is taken is an excellent monthly publication edited by Bro. Irvin Himmel, P.O. Box 5803, St. Louis 35, Missouri, U.S.A. We have been receiving it these past few months, in exchange for the *Scripture Standard* and recommend it for its teaching and expository articles. It is beautifully printed and produced, and could well be handed to religious friends not members of the church of Christ.

At the same time we call attention to "Evidence Quarterly." Its sub-title describes its contents. "A Conservative Journal of Christian Evidences." It is a scholarly and at the same time sound publication setting out the evidence for and the truth of controverted parts of Scripture, especially the Old Testament. It demonstrates that our faith in God's word is not based upon "cunningly devised fables," but upon well-attested and firmly established foundations. The "Quarterly" is published from P.O. Box 8182, St. Louis 3, Missouri, U.S.A., and edited by Bro. Ferrell Jenkins.

We are sorry that at present we cannot receive subscriptions for these publications. We suggest that interested readers write for particulars to the editors.

We are grateful, too, to Bro. Ted Cline, Church of Christ, Erick, Oklahoma, editor of "Erick Church Bulletin," for generous space in his publication given to the *S.S.*, recommending this paper and appealing for subscriptions. We hope that Bro. Cline's efforts will receive warm response!

## *This Outrage Against Mankind.*

By MALCOLM MUGGERIDGE.

(Reprinted from the "Daily Herald," August 3rd, 1962, by the courtesy of the Editor.)

SOME six centuries ago Europe was devastated by the Black Death or bubonic plague. It swept over towns and countryside alike, destroying whole populations, and making orderly life and government next to impossible.

Ships at sea drifted aimlessly with all their crew dead. The afflicted were abandoned even by their nearest relatives, so quickly and devastatingly did the infection spread.

Last week, after a long interval, a single individual, Geoffrey Bacon, succumbed to this same Black Death.

His solitary demise also has its place in history. He caught the infection as a result of being employed in the Microbiological Research Department at Porton, in Wiltshire.

**Deliberate.** The earlier large-scale catastrophe was, in the circumstances then prevailing unavoidable.

No-one wanted it to happen or sought to protract it. It was just a collective misfortune, like an earthquake or sudden death, against which prayers were regularly offered. The Wiltshire death, on the other hand, was a direct consequence of human endeavour. It was a by-product of preparations for biological warfare.

The germ which infected the unfortunate victim had been carefully and deliberately cultivated. The same science used to rid the Western world of the Black Death is being applied to prepare the means to spread it on a vaster and more destructive scale than ever before. The same techniques which abolished bubonic bacilli now serve to procure the most deadly varieties as a potential weapon of war.

I happened to be in the company of Mannie Shinwell when the news of this distressing episode broke. He is in his late seventies and pretty tough, besides being as sympathetic a human being as one could hope to meet, especially among politicians. As a former Minister of Defence he had visited the Porton establish-

ment. The horror of it remained with him still—brilliant scientific minds disinterestedly dedicated to investigating the ghastly possibilities of germ warfare, and the sad, caged animals on whom their experiments are practised.

No doubt all the major Powers have such establishments, and the others would ask nothing better than to be in a position to set one up. No doubt, too, at Porton the accent is on defensive measures against germ warfare rather than on its offensive uses.

**Horror.** It is even possible that valuable discoveries in preventive medicine may result from what is done there. It is also true that germ warfare is intrinsically no more shocking than chemical or nuclear warfare, for which preparations are known to be in progress in this and other countries.

Yet the fact remains that preparing to wage war with germs has a horror all its own. It turns one of the most notable achievements of our time—the virtual elimination of many hitherto fatal diseases—into a new means of scourging mankind.

**Danger.** The plagues and pestilences from which we have been delivered stand merely stored to be again discharged upon us, this time with malign deliberation. Merely making preparations for such an eventuality displays a dangerous lack of respect for life. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, one of the few truly noble spirits to be produced by the late squalid war, speaks of this in his "Letters and Papers from Prison" (Fontana Books, 2s. 6d.), a work of inexhaustible interest and inspiration. Those who fail to respect life, he points out, will in the end be involved in the disrespect for it that they have inculcated.

The Nazis who killed Bonhoeffer were themselves destroyed in a catastrophe of their own making. For him, he said, when he was taken away to be shot\*, it was the beginning of life. For the Nazis, on whose orders he was taken away, it was the end.

Similarly, it is at our dire peril that we amass germs, even though with no present intention of using them in aggressive warfare. It may make a Black Death in our souls more devastating than the one which afflicts the body.

**Broiler.** Germ warfare is only an extension of myxomatosis from rabbits to humans. There is every argument in favour of rearing chickens away from the light of the sun and the sight of green grass, and trees. So reared, they are cheaper, more sheltered and more productive. Yet the same argument could be used in favour of rearing human beings on the broiler system. If chickens, why not also us?

All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword, it says in the New Testament. The same principle, we may be sure, applies to germ warfare.

\*This appears to be incorrect. The Editor of the book quoted from expressly states, in his foreword, "he was hanged."—W. B.

## *Denominations Tested by Scripture.*

### IV. ROMAN DOCTRINE AND ITS AUTHORITY

MANY Christians hold the erroneous view that the basis for Roman doctrine is the authority of the Bible, plus Tradition. However, we should never forget that there is a vast difference between the Roman attitude towards the Bible and our own. If we are not careful, we might be deceived by the homage which, in discussion, she pays to the Word of God. In reality, she has long since abandoned it as her standard, because she knows that it cannot be called upon to support what she teaches.

This rejection of the Bible as the standard of faith was brought to light at the time of the Reformation, when the Council of Trent was convened to try to combat the work of Luther and his associates. During the meetings of this council (1545 to 1563), one Roman scholar urged that it was folly to try to meet the reformers with arguments from Scripture, because Luther could not be confuted in that way, and, besides, it only caused the Catholics to lose ground. Another speaker, in backing up this line of thought, said that the doctrine of the Church (of course, he meant the *Roman Church*) had been so completely determined by the Schoolmen that there was no further need to recur to Scripture. Yet a third, the Cardinal of Cusa, claimed that the Scriptures must be interpreted variously, according to necessity. This is merely another way of saying that the Church of

Rome has the right to make a passage of scripture mean whatever she wishes it to mean at any given time!

If you ever wondered why even the priests of the Church of Rome are so appallingly ignorant of the Scriptures, this is the reason. Their church has reached the stage in her development when she has virtually no use for the Bible.

### TRADITION

Then what of Tradition? Listen to the statement of the Council of Trent, on traditions. "Traditions have come down to us either received by the apostles from the lips of Christ Himself, or transmitted by the hands of the same apostles under the dictation of the Holy Spirit; these traditions ... have been preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession, and are to be received with equal piety and veneration with Scripture; and whosoever shall knowingly and deliberately despise these traditions is accursed."

Think about this statement for a while, and you will realise that it is simply a hollow attempt to give an appearance of authority to things which are done by Rome, without the support of the Scriptures.

The best way to deal with this argument on Tradition is to say to the Church of Rome; "If you claim to have evidence concerning things done and taught by the Lord Jesus and His apostles, which is just as authoritative as the New Testament, let us see your evidence and we will consider it." When we turn to history to see in how far it supports the Roman claim, we discover what a pretence that claim is. The fact is that so many of her "traditions" are of recent origin! If a doctrine or practice is based on tradition, we should expect that tradition to become clearer the farther back we traced it. We should expect to find the Christians of the first century virtually unanimous in accepting the doctrine in question. But this is very far from being the case. Take the doctrine of Purgatory to which we briefly referred last month. Rome claims that this doctrine is based upon the clear testimony of tradition. Yet we find that Augustine, who died in the year 430 A.D., knew very little about it! He records that someone suggested to him that, since good men suffer in this life for their sins, it may be possible that in the next life there is suffering. Augustine commented that he would not venture to say that it could not happen, because perhaps it may.

Now, wherever the doctrine of Purgatory originated, it is plain that there was no clear "tradition" concerning it in the days of Augustine. In his day it was still a "perhaps," and we cannot believe that such a doctrine was generally accepted without the knowledge of one of the greatest of the "Church Fathers."

Another thing; it is common knowledge that, when the Church of Rome has not been able to produce genuine historical evidence to support her doctrines, she has not scrupled to manufacture evidence. Throughout the centuries, books bearing respected and revered names have been forged for the purpose of supplying authority for new practices.

Where Rome has had no tradition to appeal to, she has invented one, and, whilst she may be able to acquire a new doctrine, there can be no such thing as a "new" tradition.

### AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH

But really, all this is purely polemic. In fact, the faith of a "Catholic" rests neither upon the Bible, nor Tradition, but upon the authority which his church claims she possesses. Talk of Scripture and Tradition is intended for Protestant ears only, because the Church of Rome requires her children to believe her doctrines, not because they are based upon the Bible, or because they are rooted in Tradition, but because she **says** that they are true.

Bellarmino, one of her greatest apologists, puts the matter plainly when he says, "A doctrine must be true if the church believes it, without any warrant from Scripture." Another writer, Petavius, says that "... Scripture may be silent and Tradition contradictory, but the Church is independent of both. Any doctrine which Catholic divines commonly assert, without proof, to be revealed, must be taken as revealed."

When we reach this point we see that the matter has at last been brought right out into the open and we realize that the Church of Rome claims to be her own authority in settling questions of faith and practice. She does not regard herself as obliged to sustain anything she does or says by offering proof.

On the question of Indulgence one writer says, "We have not the authority of Scripture, but we have the higher authority of the Roman pontiffs." In other words, the Popes and the Councils which have been convened from time to time, determine what shall be the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome.

## THE GENERAL COUNCILS

Altogether, the Church of Rome recognizes twenty of the many councils which have been held in the course of history, as being authoritative. The first was held at Nice in 325, as we said in our previous article, and the latest was held at the Vatican in 1870. Rome likes to pretend that they were all convened on the authority of the Popes, but this is obviously untrue. In the first place, there was no Pope until the year 606, and, in the second place, the first seven councils were convened by Roman Emperors. Only these seven councils are regarded as official by the Greek Orthodox Church. Here is the list most commonly used in the Church of Rome.

	Year		Year
1. Nice .....	325	12. 4th Lateran .....	1215
2. Constantinople .....	381	13. 1st Lyons .....	1245
3. Ephesus .....	431	14. 2nd Lyons .....	1274
4. Chalcedon .....	451	15. Vienna .....	1311
5. 2nd Constantinople .....	553	16. Constance .....	1414—1418
6. 3rd Constantinople .....	680	17a Basle .....	1431
7. 2nd Nice .....	787	17b Florence .....	1438—1442
8. 4th Constantinople .....	869	(Continuation of Basle)	
9. 1st Lateran .....	1123	18. 5th Lateran .....	1512—1517
10. 2nd Lateran .....	1139	19. Trent .....	1545—1563
11. 3rd Lateran .....	1179	20. Vatican .....	1869—1870

If the question is asked; why has there been no Council held since 1870, a very simple answer can be given. The purpose of the Vatican Council, in spite of all the attempts of the Italian bishops to conceal it, was to declare the Pope infallible.

Once that had been done, authority was transferred from the Council to the Pope himself and the need for the Council no longer existed. Incidentally, there were many months of intrigue and plotting, backed up by argument and debate, before Pius 9th was finally declared to be infallible. When the vote was taken 88 bishops voted against the doctrine and 60 simply abstained from voting. It was made known that the doctrine would be publicly announced on the 18th of July, 1870, and all bishops who were present at that time would be required to sign an act of submission.

Some of the bolder men proposed that the opponents of the doctrine should attend in a body and refuse to sign, but many had not the courage for this. It was finally decided that they should all renew their objection in writing and leave Rome before the final session of the Council, which they did.

To underline how new the doctrine of papal infallibility is let me point out that when Alexander Campbell debated Bishop Purcell in 1837, the Roman Bishop said, "No enlightened Catholic holds the Pope's infallibility to be an article of faith. If Bishop Purcell had only lived until July, 1870, he would have either been excommunicated as a heretic, or he would have joined the ranks of the many eminent Catholics who had to perform an intellectual somersault.

However, these Councils are worthy of note because it was during their sessions that the doctrines of the Church of Rome were determined and pronounced.

## DOCTRINES OUTSIDE SCRIPTURE

In order to make it plain how impossible the so-called "Apostolic" Church of Rome is, here are the dates upon which her doctrines became authoritative.

**The Use of Images**, 787, at Nice. Also at Trent, Session 25. **Celibacy of Priests**, 1123, 1st Lateran Council. Also Trent, Session 24. **Transubstantiation**, 1215, 4th Lateran, and again at Trent. **Sprinkling for Baptism**, 1311 at Vienna. **Confession to a Priest**, 1215, 4th Lateran and also at Trent. **Communion in One Kind**, 1414, at Constance. **Purgatory**, 1439, at Florence. **Indulgences**, 1431, at Basle. **Prayers to Saints and Angels**, Trent, about 1550. **Doctrine of Original Sin**, Trent. **Immaculate Conception of Mary**, defined by Pius 9th in 1854. **Infallibility of the Pope**, Vatican, in 1870. **Assumption of Mary** (that Mary ascended bodily to Heaven), 1950, during the so-called "Holy Year."

With regards to this last doctrine, it is remarkable that, before the Pope pronounced it, an encyclical was sent to Roman bishops all over the world with the question, "Do you consider it wise, prudent and desirable to proclaim this doctrine at this time?" This, from a man who is supposed to be able to make infallible pronouncements on matters of faith!

We see from these dates how the doctrine of Rome has been formed and developed throughout the centuries, so that she bears no resemblance whatsoever to the simple, spiritual body that we read of in the New Testament. Before the Councils defined the doctrines referred to above, a Catholic was at liberty to hold whatever view he pleased. But once an official statement of doctrine was made, no matter how unscriptural, superstitious or incredible it might be, the faithful Catholic was required to declare his acceptance of it.

Of all these Councils, the Council of Trent was perhaps the most important. Not merely because its sessions covered a period of almost twenty years, but because this was the Council that attempted to offset the effect of the Reformation and rally the forces of Romanism. It was during these sessions that Rome reviewed the doctrine which had called forth the Reformation. She defined and published her teaching, branding the "protestants" as heretics.

It was in this way that the Council of Trent destroyed any possibility that may have existed of reaching an understanding with the reformers.

FRANK WORGAN.

## *The Revelation of God to Man and of Man to Himself*

### THE REVELATION OF GOD TO MAN UNDER THE LAW.

(The second of three short studies given at the Conference at Ulverston, April 20th, 1962. The first appeared in our August issue.)

**The Beginnings of Revelations.** The background to revelation under the Law begins in Egypt. The children of Israel are in bondage to an idolatrous nation whose practices were abominable to God.

The children of Israel see the "gods" of Egypt confounded in the plagues and signs before their release. In these demonstrations of the power of God we see a beginning of the revelation of God to man. The Israelites see that they are not forsaken and that God cares for His people and demonstrates his power against falsehood. The one true God is the only one whom they trust. He leads them from bondage and so to Mount Sinai.

The experiences of captivity are hard to remove even from a people freed by God. We still see the lingering influence of Egypt in the making of the golden calf—dedicated to God. "Tomorrow is a feast to the Lord" (Ex. 32:5). It is a people who recognise God, but who are not fully acquainted with His will concerning idolatry.

**The fuller revelation.** Whilst the people are engaged in their improper celebrations, God reveals Himself through Moses: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians" (Ex. 19:4). Then Moses is given a wider revelation in the establishing of a covenant (Ex. 19:5). The result is to be "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."

In the ten commandments and the ensuing instructions we see God laying down standards which revealed His nature to the recipients and made them responsible for their own conduct. No more now can there be any excuse for clinging to the idolatry of Egypt. There is a positive command: "Thou shalt

not make unto thee any graven image . . ." (Ex. 20:4). No longer can they be ignorant concerning God. He reveals Himself as a just and holy God who cares for his children, punishing the wicked, and "shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments."

There is a widening of personal responsibility to God under the Law. Man is shown his obligations to his fellow man (Ex. 20:12-17), which he must carry out if he is to please God. The whole pattern of the Law of Moses is designed for the enlightenment of man. In the outworking of the Law's requirements, apart from direct revelation, God speaks to man. Many revelations in symbol are given. The very requirements of sacrifices remind man (a) that he is a sinner; (b) that God is holy and is offended by sin; there must be an atonement for sin.

**God and Man.** The need for personal dedication to God and holiness is brought before man. We see this continuing under the law as the prophets of God shepherd, admonish and direct the children of God's choice. These prophets culminate in the appearance of John the Baptist, the herald of the great Messiah of God.

Under the Law, then, man learned that God was supreme, holy and merciful, and that he (man himself) needed to react as a responsible individual before God. Thus the Law revealed two sides: God and man. Jesus summarised the revelation (Matt. 22:35-40) thus: "Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the Law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it; thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." G. A. GORTON.

# SCRIPTURE READINGS

—FOR SEPTEMBER 1962

2—Psalm 1.	James 3.
9—Proverbs 3:1-20.	” 4.
16—1 Kings 17.	” 5.
23—Genesis 15.	1 Peter 1.
30—Isaiah 28:1-22.	1 Peter 2.

## What I say!

Have any of us ever appreciated how important it is to speak properly?

Our parents probably gave us careful instructions as we gradually developed our powers of expression—from saying “Ta!” for “Thank you” to framing sentences to express an idea. It is a great handicap to be dumb, and to be deaf as well almost prevents a person from having intellectual contact with his fellows because he neither speaks nor hears others speak. Fortunately the efforts of Christ-minded people have greatly reduced the handicap, but the deprivation remains very serious. Man's superiority over the other animals depends so largely on ability to communicate ideas that we do not need to emphasise its importance.

However, here in James's letter we have exceptionally strong instruction and warning about the use of our tongues for speech. We can summarise them in this way:—

1. It is the easiest thing to make mistakes with;
2. It is under our control—no-one else can control it for us;
3. Its power is out of all proportion to its size;
4. It can blight and poison the whole life;
5. Its use should be consistent.

There is a disposition in all of us as we grow older to look back and think things were better then. So we must be careful and humble in speaking harshly of present trends. However, scarcely anyone would deny that speech has deteriorated in quality since, say, the first world war. Many factors have contributed to this. There are words used in everyday speech now which were used only by the lowest of the low in those earlier days. Clipping words and so turning them into slang was regarded as wrong and distasteful then, but the same habit is now universal, and is popularised by radio and television. I was recommended to read a popular novel with some quite good points in it, but every page was soiled with words forbidden to Christians by their Saviour: “Let your nay be nay, and your yea be yea.” A corruption of the oath, “By our Lady” has become with many a necessary adjective to

describe anything and everything. Is it unnecessary to write these things in a paper for circulation among lovers of Jesus? My answer: “We all make mistakes. Have we all become perfect? (James 3:2). The word perfect here indicates maturity in character. That is something we ought all to be continuously seeking—“Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father . . .” (Matt. 5:48).

We have daily and continuous contact with wrong speech and we just cannot make the world's conversation. Unless we are on the watch (not to mention prayer) we shall get loose in our talking, but we have an express instruction that our speech as Christians be always with grace, so flavoured with good as to inspire good in others (Col. 4:6). Our ability to explain and express our faith requires right use of speech.

James warns his readers that teachers have a great responsibility, and ambition to be one wants thinking about. He cannot mean that teachers are not wanted, or that a person must not teach, but the warning is against setting oneself up without proper thought and preparation. We need humility and grace because of our weaknesses and the particular weakness in view is speaking hastily and boastfully. We must remember what very serious effects can follow one wrong word. How much misunderstanding and strife can result from unwise speech! The safe plan is not to speak without thought (James 1:19 and 26) and this is by no means a new teaching (Psalms 34:13; Prov. 21:23). Nehemiah prayed before he spoke (Neh. 2:4).

We read of Jesus, “Neither was guile found in his mouth” (1 Peter 2:22), and He is the supreme example of right speech. He had perfect control of His words, for they are indeed the words of God Himself. Each of us has to answer for our words—yes, for every idle word we shall give account (Matt. 12:36), which makes us almost despair to say, “Who is sufficient for these things?” Surely, were it not for the giving of the Saviour, we should have no hope in the day of judgement. The effort required must not deter us from making it with the confidence that He who gives the commands also provides the strength to obey, and the sacrifice for the atonement (1 John 1:9). Let us then avoid idle words as well as wrong words, and purify our speech.

The power of small things is often overlooked. We are assured that things which men despise may fulfil the purposes of God. Only the Day of Judgment will reveal the truth of this. We may use our small member to do much for God by exercising it for good always—not for good one day and for evil the next—but always for good that it may give grace to them that hear. It may convey



the Word of God which liveth and abideth (1 Peter 1:23). The spark can result in a forest fire but the seed in which is life produces and maintains the forest. How good to construct and uphold, rather than to destroy!

True Christianity brings purity and refinement into the life because it is the adoption of God's standard of behaviour as manifested in the life of His

Son. New Testament Christianity is not so, unless it is manifested in our speech and, unless that is mere hypocrisy, it must be the outcome of real submission to divine standards deep in the heart. The Lord make David's prayer truly mine and yours, dear reader, "Let the words of my mouth . . . be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord!" (Psalm 19:14).  
R. B. SCOTT.



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

**Sin: that biggest little word**

SOME people have the strange idea that "sin" is something we "inherit." They say that it is a rather mysterious thing that we have when we are born because our parents had it before us. They had it when they were born, and they got it from their parents—and so on, right back to the first man and woman on earth. Well, that idea is not in the Bible. Let's ask a question:

**What is sin?**

Do you remember what we learned, in earlier lessons, about Adam and Eve? They sinned. How? *They disobeyed God.* Just that: God told them not to do a certain thing. They disobeyed Him. That was wrong—sin. They were not guilty because someone else did wrong. They were guilty because they themselves, knowingly, disobeyed the Lord. God's Word says that "sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4). In other words, if you know what is right, but do what is wrong, that's sin.

**Doing nothing**

Is it possible to sin by doing nothing? It is. God's Word also says, "Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin" (James 4:17). So there it is: if you know something you *should* do, but don't do it—that's sin too. That is something to make us "sit up and take notice" isn't it? Let's remember it next time we have a chance to do a real kindness to someone—and wonder if we can spare the time for it.

You see then that we can sin (a) by doing something we know we should not do; or (b) by not doing something we know we should do. From this you will see how silly it is for anyone to say that little babies are sinners. Nothing could be further from the truth than that.

**What sin does**

One reason God gave us the Bible was to show us what sin does. Read Genesis 3 and you will see that sin (a) gave Adam and Eve a feeling of guilt or shame; (b) made them afraid of God; (c) made them suffer; and (d) separated men from God. Because the first human beings had done wrong, God "sent them forth from the garden of Eden." Sin spoils the most wonderful of all friendships, that between God and man.

**How sin is treated**

"It serves them right! It's their own fault, and they deserve to suffer!" Have you heard things like that said about people who have acted foolishly—then suffered for it? I am sure you have. Well, God might have spoken like that about Adam and Eve—if he had been like you or me. They had only themselves to blame. I know that Satan had tempted them—but they knew that what they were doing was quite wrong. But in spite of that they did it. So they were to be shut out from the presence of God. But God is love, and although the man and woman had to suffer for their sin, they were not left without hope. The Lord God said that "the seed of the woman (one to be born of woman) would bruise the serpent's head (crush Satan)." That was the very first of many promises of

**The Saviour**

When Jesus was born the angel of the Lord said, "I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born . . . a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." A Saviour is one who delivers from danger. Sin is dangerous indeed. It can rob us of a friendship with God. It can shut us out of heaven. But here are the "good tidings" (or gospel) that the Bible brings to us: Jesus loved us, and came to live, and to die, to save

us from sin. When He died on the cross it was *for* us. If we really and truly love Him we shall give our lives to Him. I'm glad, very glad that Jesus is *my* Saviour. Let Him be yours too.

### Something to do

For a whole week try to do "one good turn" every day. You know—go looking for something you can do to help someone else. For instance, Mum will be delighted to have someone wash up for her without being asked! There are lots of jobs we can all do, which make life happier and easier for other people—and bring us a lot of pleasure in the doing of them. Get busy for God!

UNCLE ALBERT.

## Sermon Preparation.

**Substance of a lecture given at the Vacation Bible School, Bangor, to a men's class, Monday, July 30th, 1962.**

In presenting the first lecture in this series on sermon preparation, there are one or two most important things to bear in mind. One is, in preparing ourselves for public service in the church, in preaching and teaching, we are seeking to interpret the mind and will of God to others; and to do so it is most important to know that mind and will ourselves. This is only possible by reading and informing the mind to know ourselves what is God's will.

My first advice, then, to any young preacher is: *know your subject*, and only preach or teach subjects you understand.

Recalling one's own early efforts in this direction, the first address I gave was on the subject of baptism, to a mid-week cottage meeting. On being asked why, I could only reply, "It is the only subject I know anything about."

### Types of sermons

Let us now consider the various types of addresses we may be called upon to present. They can be classified as follows: talks, discourses, expositions, exhortations, edifications, sermons, addresses, lectures.

In selecting a text or topic, bear in mind the type of audience you are about to address, your own limitations, and what will be most advantageous to your hearers.

**Talks:** These are best given to children, or to certain types of adult or teenage classes. One can take any story out of the Bible, say a parable, or one of the well-known Old Testament stories and talk about it in general terms.

**Discourses** are talks given in greater detail, the story being enlarged upon somewhat.

**Expositions**, as the word suggests, are designed to *expose*, or bring to light, hidden truths.

**Exhortations** are messages designed to encourage or to urge to greater efforts those already engaged in Christian work.

**Edifications** are designed to build up faith in the hearers.

These three latter are most suitable for the Lord's Day service at the Lord's Table.

**Sermons:** Basically, these are addresses on Christian doctrine. In some respects, those previously referred to are sermons, but we wish to emphasise the thought of seed-sowing: sowing the seed of the Word of God in the hearts and minds of our hearers, with the object of its bearing fruit in the lives of others.

**Addresses:** These are usually given at gospel meetings or at church gatherings, and centre round a subject or text, or both, set out to a specified pattern.

**Lectures:** What we are hearing this morning; a discourse designed to impart knowledge to others; specialised teaching.

Having touched upon the various types of address, we decide which we are to follow, and seek a text or subject accordingly.

Do not commit the cardinal error, so often made by prospective preachers, of first deciding the subject, then wracking one's brains to find a text to fit it. Rather let the text suggest the subject. To illustrate, take Hebrews 1:1 and 2: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." Underline the words "God hath spoken" and you have the subject suggested by our text. "God hath spoken."

H. BAINES.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### A CRY FROM THE HEART

Bro. Paul Jones has received and sent us the following letter, which speaks for itself:

"Dear Brother Jones,—It is Sunday night. Quiet, reading 'Scripture Standard'; good work being done. Tell Bro. Scott, Bro. Melling, Bro. Winstanley, Bro. Worgan, a brother sits himself in Bathgate Church, Sunday after Sunday, longing to break bread with someone else. I have to take bread home again. I read 'Scripture Standard' from cover to cover. I am holding the fort, but waiting on reinforcements. I would like you to ask these brothers what I should do. Two sisters in Bathgate too old to come; another sister does not like sitting just two of us there.—I am, yours fraternally, H. Houston, 2 Avon Road, Bathgate, West Lothian. Bathgate growing in population. Church been here over 100 years."

Bro. Jones has forwarded a copy of the letter to the brethren named. I am sure each one of us will write Bro. Houston to give any help we can to encourage him. It would, too, be a nice gesture for many readers of the 'S.S.' to write him, to let him know he is in our thoughts and prayers, and that we sympathise with him in his loneliness, and admire his faithfulness. We are sorry there is so little tangible we who are far away can do.

Bro. Houston is a faithful supporter of the "S.S." Some years ago, when the paper was in financial difficulties, Bro. Houston sent on behalf of the Bathgate church a handsome gift to the funds.

His is a cry to "come over into Macedonia and help us." He yearns for fellowship; if possible, let us visit him, or bring him to meetings where he can enjoy that desire of his heart.

EDITOR.

**Peterhead.**—The church has had a period of refreshing, during June and a part of July. We have had with us Bro. David Dougall, evangelist, kindly loaned by the Slamannan District churches. The word has been faithfully preached; many non-members came in to hear, and much interest has been aroused. Three have been restored to fellowship, one a sister who has been away from the fold for many years. We pray that God will richly bless them, and all who trust in Him.

We have also had the services of Bro. E. Jess from the church at Dalmellington for two weeks. To all who have helped us in the work of the Lord, we tender our sincere thanks; but to God we give all the glory.

James Buchan.

## NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES

**Hirdley.**—A successful Bible school and mission was held from June 9th to June 26th. Bro. Albert Winstanley was the gospel preacher and he gave many inspiring addresses, confirming the saints, and encouraging sinners to come to the Saviour.

Our hearts were gladdened to see Kathleen Bourne and Emma Davies obeying the gospel as a result of this effort. We pray they may be faithful life's journey through.

We appreciated the sympathetic co-operation of visitors from near and far some not of the household of faith.

Tom Kemp.

**Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Beulah Road.**—The church here were happy to celebrate another year ending in the Master's service and to look forward to a further year if the Lord tarries. We met together with many brethren from local and distant churches, on Saturday, July 14th, gladdened by the numbers responding to our invitation. Over a hundred sat down to tea, and the evening meeting was even larger to hear Bro. David Dougall. Our faith was strengthened and our hearts touched by the deeply thoughtful address of our brother on God's sacrifice for men in His Son Jesus.

We were further served by our brother on Lord's Day, and the church here give thanks for the words imparted to us. Bro. Charles Wood presided ably at the meetings. We feel that this was a time of spiritual building to all who took part.

T. Woodhouse.

### IT IS EASY, SO EASY

So easy to say what another should do,  
So easy to settle his cares;

So easy to bid him be brave and be strong,

And to make all his shortcomings known;

But oh, it's so hard when the care and the wrong

And the dangers we face are our own.  
The need of another it's easy to see,

When *our* own wants are all satisfied,  
And bold and courageous it's easy to be,

When it isn't *our* souls that are tried;  
But oh, it's so hard, when we're

stumbling along,  
To keep ourselves steadfast and true;

It is easy to tell someone else to be strong;

It's easier to talk than to do.

—Selected.

### THE FOOTPATH TO PEACE

To be glad of life, because it gives you the chance to love, to work, to play, and to look up at the stars; to be satisfied with your possessions, but not contented with yourself until you have made the best of them; to despise nothing in the world except falsehood and meanness, and to fear nothing except cowardice; to be governed by your admirations, rather than by your disgusts; to covet nothing that is your neighbour's except his kindness of heart and gentleness of manner; to think seldom of your enemies, often of your friends, and every day of Christ; and to spend as much time as you can, with body and with spirit, in God's out-of-doors—these are little guideposts on the footpath to peace.

—Henry Van Dyke.

## COMING EVENTS

## AUTUMN RALLY

**This year at Hope Chapel, Kentish Town.** Afternoon 3 p.m. Subject: "Causes of division and how to prevent them." Forum and discussion with Bro. A. E. Winstanley. Tea in the chapel at 5. Evening meeting 6.30 p.m. Bro. Winstanley. Visitors expected from all parts are requested to make their own arrangements for accommodation, or may write R. B. Scott, 96 Chetwynd Road, London, N.W.5.

**Kentish Town anniversary, Saturday, Oct. 6th.** Meetings as for Rally. Bro. Harold Baines speaks.

**Kentish Town.** Special meetings on Saturday, October 27th, with Bro. Nisbet concluding his work with us October 28th. Meetings as for Rally.

**Visitors warmly welcomed to all these meetings.**

**Loughborough:** Anniversary weekend, Saturday, Sept. 22nd, gospel meeting at 6 p.m., preceded by tea at 4.30 p.m. Sunday, September 23rd, breaking of bread 11 a.m. Gospel meeting at 6.15 p.m.

The church at Loughborough ask for your prayers and, if possible, your personal support at the special mission meetings to be held during the week preceding the anniversary. Saturday, September 15th, gospel meeting, 6 p.m. Sunday, September 16th, breaking of bread, 11 a.m.; gospel meeting, 6.15 p.m. Monday, Wednesday and Thursday, September 17th, 19th and 20th, gospel meetings at 7.30 p.m.

All the above meetings to be addressed by Bro. Winstanley, and on September 22nd also by Bro. Worgan.

**Pitldown (nr. Uckfield), Sussex:** A rally has been arranged for Saturday, September 22nd, 1962, to which all are invited. A gospel meeting will be held (D.V.) at 4 p.m., followed by tea at 5.15 p.m. approx. No evening meeting can be arranged as there is no lighting in the meeting-house. No definite speakers can be announced as yet; but all further details can be obtained by writing to Bro. W. Hewitt, 2 Albert Rd., Uckfield, Sussex.

Note: Any travelling by train are advised to travel by way of Haywards Heath, to pick up bus No. 89, which leaves at 31 minutes past the hour to Pitldown Pond. **Derek L. Daniell.**

## CHANGE OF SECRETARY

**Wallacestone:** Gerald Fox, 45 Kirkwood Avenue, Redding, Falkirk, Stirling-shire.

## A DOUBLE CORRECTION

News from the Churches, Blackburn, Park Road (p.99 col.1, line 2 of notice): "rejecting" should read "rejoicing." Also 2nd paragraph should read: "The church at Park Road appreciate the kindness of their brethren at Hindley, who loaned them use of the baptistery."

\* \* \*

He couldn't speak before a crowd;  
He couldn't teach a class;  
But when he came to Sunday school,  
He brought the folks *en masse*.  
He couldn't sing to save his life;  
In public he couldn't pray,  
But always his "jalopy" was  
Just crammed on each Lord's Day.  
And though he could not sing nor  
teach,  
Nor could he lead in prayer;  
He listened well, he had a smile,  
And he was always there—  
With all the others whom he brought  
Along from near and far.  
And God's work prospered greatly  
Through that consecrated car.  
Can this be said of your car, or mine?

---

**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**, 31 Niddrie Road, Portobello, Edinburg, Mid Lothian.

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

---

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