

KJV 1611

"...THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH."

I Timothy 3:15

THE BAPTIST PILLAR

Published by Bible Baptist Church
1203 4th St. Brandon, MB R7A 3J7
Vol. 5 No.3 May/June 1997

Independent

Missionary

J.W. Reaves
Editor & Pastor



CANADA'S ONLY TRUE BAPTIST PAPER



Phone 204-726-5806
Fax 204-728-0995
E-mail bkjv1611@comlink.net

PRESBYTERIAN BAPTIST

by Pastor John Reaves

Romans 8:27-32, "And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God. And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"

There are some strange things going on among Baptist today, head coverings for women, liquor in the Lord's supper, and Baptist calling themselves Calvinist.

Liquor in the Lord's Supper

I hear that there are some Baptists in the southern United States who will not even take on a missionary if he doesn't use liquor in the Lord's table. Call me simple minded if you wish but to me it is very clear what we are to use. Jesus himself said in Matthew 26:29, "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." There's no doubt in my mind that Jesus was speaking of the pure fruit of the vine as being pure grape juice. The Lord's

table is full of symbolism, we know according to I Cor. 11:23-25, the bread speaks of his flesh, and the drink spoke of his blood. I Peter 1:18 & 19 says, "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." The precious blood of Christ... it is pure, without sin. There is no way possible that liquor could be a symbol of Christ's blood.

According to Habakkuk 2:15 there is a curse on those that "giveth his neighbour drink." There is not an Alcoholic alive who would not say, "I wouldn't be an alcoholic if I had not had that first drink." And yet we have some so-called Baptists putting liquor to their young people's lips when they observe the Lord's table. God help us.

Head Coverings for Women

We have those that like the Galatians are trying to put themselves under the law by observing some man ordained invention. Galatians 3:1-3, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" They tell us that women should wear head coverings, which they say is based on I Cor. 11:1-16. There is no doubt that this chapter is dealing with hair, verse 14, it is a shame if a man have long hair, (Presbyterian continued on page 2)

CONSCIENCE, PROOF OF MORAL

LIBERTY

The operations of the principle of our nature called conscience, just considered, appear to me of itself to prove conclusively the moral freedom of man, without entering into any other considerations for this purpose. Conscience, I should define to be a power which passes judgment upon our actions, as being right or wrong, good or bad, and punishes us with its condemnation, or rewards us with its approval, according as these

are, or are not, conformed to the moral standard which is created by our Reason. In this view of it then it is evident, that it implies both a knowledge of our duty, and an ability to perform it—and when it gives us its approbation, it is because we have exercised this ability in conformity to this knowledge, and when it punishes us with its disapprobation, it is because we have neglected, or refused, to exercise it in this way. Instances (Conscience continued on page 6)

(Presbyterian continued from page 1) and verse 15 tells us, "for her hair is given her for a covering."

A woman can wear a covering over her head but that is not dealing with the real problem. The problem was headship and submission. A woman with long hair shows forth her submission. Most feminist groups today crop off their hair, why? We will not have man to rule over us. But verse 3 of I Corinthians 11 says, "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God."

I believe what is happening today is that Baptists are leaving the simplicity, in their so-called education they are becoming fools. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Romans 1:22.

Calvinists

To my biggest surprise today, we have **Baptists** who call themselves Calvinist. Calvin and his followers burned Ana-Baptist at the stake. They made laws against them, they mocked and lied about them, and yet we have Baptists calling themselves Calvinist. You might as well call yourself Romanist or Protestant.

"Oh," I can hear it now, "Pastor Reaves must be an Arminianist, he must practice Arminianism." Not on your life. I am not an Arminianist or a Calvinist, I am a Baptist and I can trace my roots back to the time of the Apostles, and to that first Baptist. In this message I would like to speak of what Calvinism and Arminianism are, and to answer two questions pertaining to Calvinism and Arminianism. First question will be, is Calvinism and Arminianism Baptist doctrine? And should Baptists be aligned with Calvinists?

Where Did They Begin

Many believe that Calvinism began with John Calvin when he wrote, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* in 1535, of which brought about the spread of Calvinism all over Western Europe. Many believe this book was the most influential work of the

Protestant Reformation. And yet even in their own writings Calvin tells us, "It (Calvinism) might with equal justice be called 'Augustinianism.'" After no other than St. Augustine a Romanist Priest and is no church father of mine.

The one who Arminianism was named after was Jacobus Arminius, born in Holland in 1560. By this time, the majority of the **Protestants** in the Netherlands were Calvinists.

Later in life "Arminius went to Geneva, where he was greatly influenced by Beza. After Calvin's death, Beza assumed Calvin's mantle and took full leadership of the Academy at Geneva. It was Beza who developed the doctrine of predestination a step further than Calvin. Arminius came to doubt the whole doctrine of unconditional predestination and to ascribe to man a freedom which, however congenial to Melancthon (a disciple of Martin Luther) had no place in pure Calvinism. The essential dispute that Arminius had with Calvin was regarding the doctrine of predestination. He did not deny predestination altogether, but denied that predestination was **unconditional**. A bitter controversy sprang up between Arminius and his supralapsarian colleague at the University of Leyden, Franz Gomarus, who was later the leading spokesman for the Calvinists at the Synod of Dort. The conflict between the two men resulted in a schism affecting the whole church of Holland."

What do the Calvinists and the Arminianists believe?

In the book, *The History of the Reformation*, 1720, by Gerard Brandt, states: "The difference between these two Professors consisted briefly in the following points, that Arminius was of the opinion, that God being a righteous judge, and at the same time a merciful Father, had from all eternity made this distinction between the fallen offspring of man, that those who should forsake their sins and put their trust in Christ, should be absolved from their evil actions and should enjoy everlasting life; but that the obdurate and impenitent should be pun-

(Presbyterian continued on page 3)

DOCTRINE OF

FOREORDINATION

Having, in a former article, explained in what manner *foreknowledge* on the part of the Deity was consistent with *moral liberty* on the part of man, I come now to the doctrine of *foreordination*.

By foreordination is meant the bringing to pass all the results desired, in the progress of events, *so far as they are in accordance* with the system of government God has framed, and exercises over the universe; which system embraces *moral freedom* on the part of man, and a *superintending providence* on the part of Deity. In this sense it is the necessary *consequence* of his foreknowledge, and not the *cause* of it, as has been generally supposed. The Deity did not, from the beginning of time, *decree* that certain events should take place, and that his creatures should act in a *certain* way in reference to them, making them mere machines in accomplishing his purposes. But he foresaw what would be their conduct in relation to the events which he should order, and what course it would be necessary for him to pursue, to assist or counteract this conduct, as it might, or might not, be conformable to his will. He first determined upon the wisest plan by which he should govern his moral creation, and then determined to regulate his own proceedings by this plan. He did not *arbitrarily* determine that he would accomplish certain purposes at all events, whatever measures should be required, and even though they should go to infringe or destroy the moral liberty of his creatures; but he determined to accomplish such purposes only as should be *consistent* with his own plan *first laid down*, and should in the *progress of events* develop themselves. In other words, he bound himself by the system of government he prescribed to himself, and cannot deviate from it without impeaching his own character and attributes. For as this system is the best, which infinite

wisdom, power, and benevolence could conceive and execute, it would be in derogation of this wisdom, power, and goodness, were he to depart from it. And this view of the subject is no more a limitation of the power of the Deity in the moral universe, than it would be in the natural one to say that he could not make two hills without a valley intervening between them. For, as, in the latter case, it is a *physical* contradiction, and only a declaration of the impossibility of a thing existing and not existing at the same time; so in the former, it is a *moral* contradiction, and only a declaration of the impossibility that he should, and should not proceed, according to a certain plan, at the *same* time.

This explanation of the doctrine of *foreordination*, and that it is the *consequence* and not the *cause* of foreknowledge, is strictly in accordance with scripture. Thus in Acts 2:23, "Him being delivered by the *determinate counsel* and *foreknowledge* of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." *Determinate counsel*, because of the *foreknowledge*, and not *vice versa*. Again, Romans 8:29. "For whom he did *foreknow*, he also did *predestinate* to be conformed," &c. Here the *predestination* is mentioned as the consequence of the *foreknowledge*. It *follows* it, and does not *precede* it.—Again, Romans 11:2. "God hath not cast away his people whom he *foreknew*." He hath not cast them away, because he *foreknew* he should not cast them away. Or, in other words, because he *foreknew* they would not conduct in such a manner, as to make it necessary that he should cast them away. So too, 1 Pet. 1:2. "*Elect* according to the *foreknowledge* of God the Father." *Elect*, because God *foreknew* or *foresaw*, that they would render themselves *worthy* to be elected. And this is the only rational, and of course the only scriptural notion of the doctrine of *election*. Whether a man be one of the *elect*, will depend *altogether*

(Foreordain continued on page 6)

(Presbyterian continued from page 2) ished. Besides, that it was pleasing to God, that all men should forsake their sins, and having attained to the knowledge of the truth, continue stedfast in it, but that he compelled no man.

“On the other hand Gomarus maintained, that it was appointed by an Eternal Decree of God, who among mankind should be saved, and who should be damned. From whence resulted, that some men were drawn to righteousness, and being so drawn, were preserved from falling; but that God suffered all the rest to remain on the common corruption of humane nature, and in their own iniquities.

“In consequence of these positions, Arminius charged Gomarus with making God the author of sin, and with hardening men in their rebellion, by infusing into their minds the notion of Fatal Necessity.”

The Five Points of Arminianism

Many are not aware, that the Arminians have 5 points of which are called Arminian Articles of Remonstrance and actually the five points of Calvinism were given to answer the Remonstrants in a document known as The Canon of Dort.

The five points of Arminianism are as follows:

1.) God has decreed to save through Jesus Christ those of the fallen and sinful race who through the grace of the Holy Spirit believe in him, but leaves in sin the incorrigible and unbelieving. (In other words predestination is said to be conditioned by God's foreknowledge of who would respond to the gospel.)

2.) Christ died for all men (not just for the elect), but no one except the believer has remission of sin.

3.) Man can neither of himself nor of his free will do **anything** truly good until he is born again of God, in Christ, through the Holy Spirit. (Though accused of such, Arminius and his followers were not Pelagians.)

4.) All good deeds or movements in the regenerate must be ascribed to the grace of God but his grace in not irresistible.

5.) Those who are incorporated into Christ by a true faith have power given them through the assisting grace of the Holy Spirit to persevere in the faith, but it is possible for a believer to fall from grace.

The Five Points of Calvinism

The 5 points of Calvinism are:

1.) That fallen man was totally unable to save himself. (Total Depravity)

2.) That God's electing purpose was not conditioned by anything in man. (Unconditional Election)

3.) That Christ's atoning death was sufficient to save all men, but efficient only for the elect. (Limited Atonement)

4.) That the gift of faith, sovereignly given by God's Holy Spirit, cannot be resisted by the elect. (Irresistible Grace)

5.) That those who are regenerated and justified will persevere in the faith. (Perseverance of the saints)

Is Calvinism and Arminianism, Baptist doctrine?

Again, taken out of the book entitled, *The History of the Reformation*, 1720, we read, “Though Gellius does not agree with us in every respect, (concerning Predestination) yet, Paul says, I Cor. 14:29, *Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge.* And again, verse 32, *The Spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets.* To which rule I make no doubt but all Ministers of Jesus Christ will readily submit themselves, since we are all of us men, and may err; that so we may give no occasion to schisms and divisions on this account, like our adversaries, (meaning the Anabaptists) who, being hurried on by the spirit of discord and quarrels, do daily and for small causes rend and separate themselves more and more from each other; and with unheard of tyranny, mutually deliver one another to Satan.”

Notice it says Gellius an Arminianist, “does not agree with us” (Calvinists), and on down in the paragraph it says, “like **o u r** [both]

adversaries,” [meaning the Anabaptists]. They are the ones who practice separation and church discipline, I Cor. Ch. 5.

So really what we just read was, that the Anabaptists were the adversaries of both. They were neither Arminianist or Calvinist, they were **Baptists**.

Neither Calvinism and Arminianism, are Baptist doctrine, even Spurgeon says of Calvinism, “the old truths that Calvin preached, that Augustine preached, is the truth that I preach today, or else I would be false to my conscience and my God. I cannot shape truth; I know of no such thing as paring off the rough edges of a doctrine. John Knox's gospel is my gospel. And the gospel which thundered through Scotland must thunder through England again.” Simply even Spurgeon said that what Calvin preached was from a Romanist priest, and that John Knox, a Protestant, a Scottish Presbyterian preached it.

Spurgeon on speaking of the term Calvinism said, “We only use the term “Calvinism” for shortness. That doctrine which is called “Calvinism” did not spring from Calvin; we believe that it sprang from the great founder of all truth. Perhaps Calvin himself derived it mainly from the writings of Augustine.” No, I don't believe Calvinism is a Baptist doctrine, neither is Arminianism, even the Calvinists say that Arminianism goes back to Rome.

Gerald Brandt, a Calvinist, writes in *The History of the Reformation*, 1720, “But it may be amiss, in order to illustrate matters, to trace this affair a little higher, and to show what the Primitive Christians and the first Reformers thought and taught concerning it, together with the rise of the disputes about it.

“Tis well known to those who have studied the writings of the Ancients, that all the Greek Fathers, and among the Latins, all such as lived before St. Austin, were of opinion, that all those which God foresaw would lead good and godly lives, were ordained to eternal life; or, as others have it, which God foresaw would believe and persevere. From those writings likewise it ap-

pears, that the Primitive Christians ascribed free-will to men.”

The Primitive Christians were not Calvinist; they were Baptist. Does believing that mankind has a choice make one an Arminianist? I think not, I don't believe we can fall from grace, according to John 10:27-29, this is impossible.

Arminianism at It's Worst

Arminianism at it's worst is found in Hammond, Indiana. A recent letter from one of its missionaries in Mexico reads, “God blessed us in many ways this month. We have a new soul winner in (our) clan,... my five year old son, won his first sixteen souls to the Lord this month. We broke a few other records this month. In personal soul winning: I won ninety-nine people to Christ, (my wife) won seven, (and daughter) won fifty-five, and (daughter) won twenty-five, and (son) won thirty-six. That is a record of 238 people saved with twenty-two baptisms.”

Lord help us. A five year-old supposedly winning 16 souls to the Lord. That is the ultimate of Arminianism, just “say this prayer after me” gang. They go all over the country closing the doors to those who are seeking to truly bring others to Christ. They never mention repentance, even though we are told by our Lord in Luke 24:47, “*And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.*”

Luke 13:3 says, “*I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.*” I was recently told by a missionary, who went to school in Hammond, that while they were out visiting on their bus route, they pulled into an area and as soon as they got out of the bus kids came running up to them and said we want to get saved. He could not believe his ears. But then they started arguing who was to be saved first. One said, “I want to be saved first, you were saved first last time.” My, oh my, what a mockery of salvation. This my friend is the ultimate of Arminianism.

(Presbyterian continued on page 6)



NEWS



More Common

Statistics Canada says common-law unions are increasingly commonplace and that the number of couples living together without a marriage licence more than doubled between 1981 and 1995. According to Stats Can officials, 1 in 7 couples lived as partners or mates instead of husband and wife in 1995. Analysts say the major reason for this phenomenal increase is that there is now less of a stigma attached to living together. **The rate of common-law unions was highest in Quebec—where 1 in 4 couples were living together.**

Under Watch

The Children's Aid Society in Ontario is under a careful watch after a coroner released child death statistics in the province. During 1994 and 1995, 100 children in the province died as a result of accidents, suicide or murder while under the supervision of provincial Children's Aid Societies—a higher percentage than that recorded in the general public. 12 of the deaths were attributed to murder.

Pope Invited to Visit Israel

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu invited the Pope to visit the Holy Land and said such a historic trip would help cement peace between Jews and Arabs. The Israeli leader said he has also told the pontiff at their Vatican audience that he was adamant that Jerusalem, a city sacred to Muslims, Christians, and Jews should remain Israel's united and eternal capital. "We look forward to receiving you in Jerusalem," Mr. Netanyahu said as he left the Roman Catholic pontiff's study after a 20-minute private audience at the Vatican. The Pope responded, "God Bless Israel."

Pope's Vision for New Millennium

The 3/97 *C.E.C. Journal* had an ad from the 3/96 *New*

Covenant by Franciscan University, Steubenville, OH (where Dr. James Dobson received an honorary doctorate). It read (emphasis theirs): "THE HOLY FATHER has a sweeping vision for the new millennium: a Church **HEALED** of *division*, **BOUND** together by *love*, and **CELEBRATING** a Eucharistic unity... See how Mary, the Mother of Mercy, is leading the Church into the third millennium."

Mary has Role in Salvation

Pope John Paul stated in his 12/18 general audience: "Mary intensely and mysteriously unites her life with Christ's sorrowful mission: She was to become her Son's faithful co-worker for the salvation of the human race." (2/17 *Chr. News*).

Anglican Priest Says O.K. to Steal

Church of England priest Rev. John Papworth suggested last month it was no sin to shoplift—as long as the victim is a big supermarket (3/16 *HT*). But the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," is an absolute one and makes no exceptions for giant corporations that "have run little stores out of business..." as Papworth says.

Tobacco and Booze

Tobacco products kill over 400,000 people each year. That's more than the combined deaths due to AIDS, car accidents, alcohol, homicide, illegal drugs, suicide and fires (1/16 *USN & WR*). Tobacco causes approximately 115,000 "spontaneous abortions" every year. If it doesn't get the fetus in the womb, it may get the baby in the crib. Maternal smoking alone is responsible for an estimated 1,200 to 2,200 deaths each year from Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (3/97 *Christian View of the News*). Meanwhile, alcohol is the leading cause of death for young people ages 15 to 24 (*Indiana Bap.*). They die in alcohol related car crashes, drowning, fires,

homicides, and suicides.

Falwell Gearing Up for Graham

Dr. Jerry Falwell's 3/97 *National Liberty Journal* said a 1000-voice "Crusade" Choir will join Dr. Billy Graham for Liberty University's 1997 commencement. It said the LU class of 1997 will "be honoured to hear Dr. Billy Graham as their commencement speaker on May 3rd." Billy Graham's grandson (Will Graham) is one of the nearly 2,000 graduates, and Franklin Graham will offer the invocation.

NRB, LaHaye, Moon

In perusing a draft of ACCC exec. sec'y Dr. Ralph Colas's NRB report, we note: Speakers included Franklin Graham, MBI pres. Joseph Stowell, Max Lucado (Church of Christ pastor), John MacArthur, Beverly LaHaye, and David Jeremiah. Plain Truth Ministries sponsored a breakfast at the NRB (Nat'l Religious Broadcasters), and is already as associate member of the NAE. The pace of evangelical acceptance of Herbert W. Armstrong's former cult seems imprudent. LaHaye, in private, shared her discomfort in being a keynote speaker at a recent conference sponsored by followers of Sun Myung Moon's Unification Church. She indicated she did not know it was a "Moonie" conference until a few days prior, and felt that by then it was too late to cancel. She was joined on that "Moonie" platform by Ralph Reed (Christian Coalition), Gary Bauer, and Robert Schuller. Jerry Falwell has spoken at Moonie conferences in recent years.

Abortion is Justifiable Homicide?

A new book praised by NOW president Patricia Ireland and feminist abortion crusader Eleanor Smeal says: "Even in a medically normal pregnancy, the fetus massively intrudes on a woman's body and expropriates her liberty. If the woman does not consent to

this transformation and use of her body, the fetus's imposition constitutes injuries sufficient to justify the use of deadly force to stop it." (2/15 *World*). The book, *Breaking Abortion Deadlock: From Choice to Consent*, is by Eileen McDonough who concedes the humanity of the unborn child "just as a homeowner concedes the humanity of a thief in the night but shoots him dead." But when a woman consents to conception, the unborn baby is an invited guest, not a freedom-stealing burglar.

New Technology

Under the strange but true category, IBM introduced the PAN—Personal Area Network. As a product it is only in its demonstration phase. In brief, the technology uses the human body as a medium to transfer electronic data between PDAs (personal digital assistant). For example, let's say you encounter an old friend on the street and you would like to give him your address and phone number. You would set your PDA to send the corresponding files to his PDA. By shaking hands, the information would pass from your body into his and into the PDA at a transfer rate of 2.4 Kbps. The actual current transferred across the body is one billionth of an amp, lower than the natural currents in the body.

IBM suggests the potential for such a system would include patient identification, electronic commerce, security, and transferring information between cellular phones.

Soul Concern

As you walk on the sands of time,
Take care what your footprints reveal;
So that the imprint you leave may be
That of a soul,
and not that of a heel!

THE UNIVERSAL INVISIBLE CHURCH VS.

THE LOCAL NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH

By R. Reaves

When Jesus came to this earth he had two purposes. He came to start HIS church and he also came to die for the sins of the world. He fulfilled both of these intentions. Other religions have invented theories trying to disprove this. The most prevalent of these is the Universal, Invisible Church theory. The writer will attempt, through this paper to refute this theory and to defend Jesus Christ's Local Church.

The Universal, Invisible church is the "(so-called) Body of Christ into which all believers are baptized by the Holy Spirit at the time of conversion." This makes every one who has ever accepted Christ as their Saviour, a member of a "World Church", regardless of doctrine or beliefs, which is totally unscriptural. This theory can only be proved by taking Scripture out of context, or by changing Scripture altogether. The Universal, Invisible church theory began to emerge as early as the beginning of the Catholic Church around 300 A.D. It was officially presented as a new theory of the church at the end of the Reformation. Therefore, this theory does not have a biblical foundation, but was, rather, conjured up by men, to back up their Protestant doctrines.

The Local New Testament Church, on the other hand, is defined as "an assembly of baptized believers, organized to carry out the Lord's work." This is the definition of a fundamental, independent, Baptist Church today. The Local New Testament Church and the Body of Christ are identical as proved in Col. 1:18, 24, and Eph. 1:22, 23; but we are baptized by water into a local assembly, not by the Holy Spirit into a world-wide, invisible "church".

One of the foundations of the Universal, Invisible Church theory is the Pentecost Birthday theory which states

that the church began at Pentecost and was started by the Holy Ghost. These theorists believe that there was no church prior to Pentecost. The Universal, Invisible Church theory, according to the definition, holds that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is what places you in the "Church". Therefore, in their reasoning, there was no church until the Holy Ghost "baptized" the apostles at Pentecost. This is a very unstable foundation, however, because Christ said in Mat. 16:18, "I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." If the Pentecost Birthday theory is true, then Christ never built HIS church, for He died, rose again, and ascended before Pentecost, and the Holy Spirit built the church. This theory cannot be true though, because Mat. 18:17 says, "...tell it to the church." There had to be a church in existence for this Scripture to be applied. Acts 2:41 also supports this statement, it says "...the same day" (The Day of Pentecost) "there were added unto them about three thousand souls"; and verse 47 says, "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." You can't add something to nothing. If the church didn't exist before Pentecost, it couldn't be "added to". Jesus Christ came to this earth, was baptized of John the Baptist and built HIS church, the Baptist church, with the twelve apostles as the first members. He completed the work which He came to earth to do.

This theory was concocted mostly by confusing the Local New Testament Church with the Kingdom of God. Note the differences as shown in the

chart below:

The attributes of the Kingdom of God are very similar to the attributes of the Universal, Invisible Church. However, the Kingdom of God is NOT the Church and its characteristics should never be attributed to those of the church.

The ramifications of the Universal Invisible Church on the Local New Testament Church are severe.

First, it destroys loyalty to one's church. Local assemblies of the "Church" are not as important as THE Church, Universal and Invisible.

Second, it promotes church-hopping. Since every local assembly is just a small part of THE Church, you can, technically, go to any church you desire and still be in THE Church.

Third, it gives rise to substitute organizations to do the work of the invisible. With every variety of religion still being a part of THE Church, other organizations can carry out the duties given to the church. For example, the church was given the duty of caring for the widows, Acts 6:1, but now welfare does that. The church was also told to take care of the poor and needy, Gal. 2:10; but now the Salvation Army has taken over that role.

Fourth, it promotes compromise. Just so that every one can get along, other religions will compromise their beliefs and doctrines. They yield up what they know is right and accept what they know is wrong. They surrender and stop fighting and battling. They make concessions for the sake of settlement and unity. They push aside anything that can't be agreed upon.

Fifth, it erodes Scriptural church discipline. In Mat.

18:15-17 matters are to be taken ultimately before the church. If the church is Universal and Invisible, who is the matter going to be presented to?

Sixth, it downgrades Bible baptism for Holy Spirit baptism. According to the Universal, Invisible Church theory, proper Biblical baptism by immersion is not necessary, because Holy Spirit baptism places you in THE Church.

Seventh, it promotes ecumenism. The unity of all religions, or the One-World Church, is the very substance of the Universal, Invisible Church theory. They must cater to ecumenism or their entire theory crumbles.

Lastly, it releases Christians from church related responsibilities. An excuse or a way out can be found for every task assigned to church members, because the members are not accountable to a local assembly, but to Universal, Invisible Church.

Each of these eight categories are extremely important to the Local New Testament Church.

1. Loyalty is a must. Without it you have divisions within the church and ultimately you end up with a church split.

2. Church-hopping is never acceptable. You are a member of a specific, local church that God has established, and you have obligations to that church until your membership is transferred to another Local New Testament Church.

3. Substitute organizations should never take over the duties given to the church. The Church is responsible for carrying out these duties, and must give account for its conduct, concerning them.

4. Compromise is defined as "a settlement of differences by yielding up what you know and believe is right and allowing certain things which you know are wrong so as to allow some settlement to make a combination possible". This is totally against all we stand for. If we as a Local New Testament Church do not stand for truth and doctrine, we have no foundation to stand on and we are no better than the Universal, Invisible Church theorists.

5. Church discipline is absolutely necessary to keep mem-

(UIC continued on page 8)

Kingdom Of God	New Testament Church
Universal	Local
One	Many
Invisible	Visible
Membership by new birth	Membership by baptism
All members saved	Some members unsaved
No discipline	Discipline practiced
Theocracy	Democracy
No Officers	Pastors
No ordinances	Baptism and Lord's Supper

(Conscience continued from page 1) where a *knowledge* of duty was *necessarily* wanting, and so where the conscience would fail to punish conduct proceeding from this *involuntary* ignorance, as in the case of the Hottentots and Spartans, &c. I will proceed now to consider, therefore, cases, where the *ability* to do our duty is called in question.

Supposing then mankind in any way under the control of an *extraneous* influence, compelling them to certain actions, as some have contended; it is clear, that *conscience* could neither decide them to be right nor wrong, could neither reward nor punish them, since by the supposition, they would be wanting in the *ability* of acting in a *different* manner, even if they *could* have a *perception* that such manner was right. *All* our actions would be as much beyond our control, as those which are now called *unintentional*, and we should be no more accountable for the former than the latter. Should a person inflict an injury upon another in a way termed *accidental*, as by discharging a fowling piece at a bird and hitting a man, who might be concealed by the trees, although the circumstance would be a source of very great regret to him, he could in no way *reproach* himself for it, since he had not a *knowledge* that the person injured was there, and so not an *ability* to avoid it. His conscience would not therefore punish him for it. Or if one ran against me and pushed me against a third, and in this way the last should receive any hurt, although I should be very sorry for it, I should not consider myself culpable, since I was impelled by a superior force, which I could not withstand, and the injury occasioned would, as respects me, be *involuntary*. I should not blame myself, or, in other words, feel the compunctions of conscience, for this circumstance. So would it be with *all* our conduct, if we were under the dominion of any thing like *necessity* in respect to it. It would at once occur to us, that we could not have avoided acting as we have done, and we should no more pass censure upon ourselves in respect to it, than we should for the injury we might sustain in

running against a post, or falling into a hole in the night, of which we were entirely ignorant. It therefore involves a perfect absurdity, to say that a man may be made the creature of *necessity*, or have his actions inevitably controlled by a superior power, and still may be under the dominion of a power called *conscience*, since the latter presupposes, in its very nature, *freedom of action*, and could not exist without it,—and is nothing more nor less, than a consciousness that he might have conducted in the way he did, or differently. If he could not have helped doing as he has done, why does he blame himself, why does he experience any of what are called the *stings of conscience*, or *remorse*. The very fact of experiencing this remorse, proves his own consciousness that he could have acted *differently*, and it is the blame he casts upon himself, because he did not.

This view then of *conscience* proving the *moral freedom of man*, and other reasoning upon the *foreknowledge* of God proving not only its existence, but the absolute necessity that it should exist, for the government of the world, and the progressive advancement of his rational creatures towards perfection, it follows that these two doctrines must be reconcilable with each other, though the *manner* in which the Deity may be able to *foresee* actions which are in themselves contingent and free, and over which he exercises no compulsory influence, may be a *mystery* to us, as indeed the *nature, extent, and operation* of *all* his attributes in a great degree are. We can form no conception of *Omnipresence* extending to a universe *without limits*, or of *Omnipotence* commensurate with the former. Why then should we expect to be able to understand the nature of his *Omniscience*, or of his *Prescience*, as being a part of this, and flowing from it. All we can be assured of, is the actual *existence* of these attributes as proved by the evidence of *reason* in conjunction with *faith*; but the *mode of their exercise* is at the present time beyond our comprehension.

by William S. Andrews, 1829

(Foreordain continued from page 2) upon himself, although the fact whether he will or will not make himself so, is foreknown by the Deity.

And agreeably to this explanation of the plan of government pursued by the Deity, in adapting his own conduct to that of his creatures—may all his proceedings be accounted for, in which he is said in Scripture to have *caused* certain actions to be done, which very actions were made the objects of his displeasure and punishment. As in the case of the *plagues* which he sent upon Pharaoh and the Egyptians, because they would not let Moses and the children of Israel go out of Egypt;—it is said, that the Lord *hardened* Pharaoh's heart so that he would not let them go. But all that is here meant, without doubt, is, that he suffered Pharaoh's heart to continue hardened, that is, that he did not exert an *irresistible* force at once to subdue his obstinacy and *compel* him to let them go,—but permitted him to act according to his own pleasure for a certain length of time, subjecting him to repeated punishments, which, not effecting the desired object, he and his host were finally overwhelmed in the Red Sea. In this way the government of God was vindicated, and an impressive lesson of his *superintending* Providence was taught the children of Israel, by their own signal deliverance and the destruction of their enemies.—This explanation will, I apprehend, apply to all the events related in the Bible of a similar kind.

Editor's Note:

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

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

You can also access *The Baptist Pillar* on the World Wide Web at <http://www.common.net/~bkjv1611>

(Presbyterian continued from page 3)
Neither are Baptist

What I am saying is that neither, Arminianism nor Calvinism belong to the Baptist, it is not Baptist; it is Protestant in nature. It was strange when I was doing my research for this message, I found it with all kinds of Presbyterians, and the Reformed, and they used other versions, and used verses out of context. These are Protestants. Baptists are not Protestants. If any of their doctrine is good they got it from Baptists including the Calvinists in the matter of closed communion, but you can count on it they didn't get their ideas of Baptism from us. We will talk about that later.

True Baptists have never believed a little prayer can save anyone. We believe as Jesus said in John 6:44, "*No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.*" The Father has to draw, has to work in the heart of man and bring them to salvation. But here's the difference, we believe that God wants and desires all to be saved as found in II Peter 3:9, "*The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.*" We believe as John 3:16 says, "*For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*" Whosoever, and that sure doesn't mean they all will, few there be that find it. If all cannot be saved and there is a limited atonement, why then are we told in Mark 16:15, "*...Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.*" Why, if they don't have a choice?

Irresistible grace, if that is so, why did my father-in-law shake in his boots, literally, under deep conviction and walked out of church without being saved? As we have seen many others in our services at the Bible Baptist Church in Brandon?

Calvinism, Baptist doctrine, I think not.

Was Spurgeon Calvinist?

Many like to claim Spurgeon as a staunch Calvinist, all the way through, but listen to what he said concerning free-will, and I quote: "I do not think I differ from any of my Hyper-Calvinistic brethren in what I do believe, but I differ from them in what they do not believe. I do not hold any less than they do, but I hold a little more, and I think, a little more of the truth revealed in the Scriptures. Not only are there a few cardinal doctrines, by which we can steer our ship North, South, East, or West, but as we study the Word, we shall begin to learn something about the North-west and North-east, and all else that lies between the four cardinal points. The system of truth revealed in the Scriptures is not simply one straight line, but two; and no man will ever get a right view of the gospel until he knows how to look at the two lines at once. For instance, I read in one Book of the Bible, "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." Yet I am taught, in another part of the same inspired Word, that "it is not of him that willeth, or of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." I see, in one place, God in providence presiding over all, and yet I see, and I cannot help seeing, that man acts as he pleases, and that God has left his actions, in a great measure, **to his own free-will**. Now, if I were to declare that man was so free to act that there was no control of God over his actions, I should be driven very near to atheism; and if, on the other hand, I should declare that God so over-rules all things that man is not free enough to be responsible, I should be driven at once to Antinomianism or fatalism. That God predestines, and yet that man is responsible, are two facts that few can see clearly. They are believed to be inconsistent and contradictory to each other. If, then, I find in one part of the Bible that everything is foreordained, that is true; and I find, in another Scripture, that man is responsible for all

his actions, that is true; and it is only my folly that leads me to imagine that these two truths can ever contradict each other. I do not believe they can ever be welded into one upon any earthly anvil, but they certainly shall be one in eternity. They are two lines that are so nearly parallel, that the human mind which pursues them farthest will never discover that they converge, but they do converge, and they will meet somewhere in eternity, close to the throne of God, whence all truth doth spring."

Should Baptists Align Themselves with Calvinists? Or Should They Say They are Calvinists?

Most Calvinists focus on predestination even though the word predestinate only appears twice and the word predestinate twice. Also the word foreknew once, and foreknow once. And yet the Calvinist like to hold to John Calvin as being a great learned scholar.

My problem is that you can't just pick and choose, you take all or nothing. Do you know what else John Calvin and other Calvinist believe? In section 9 of *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, by John Calvin, Calvin declares that those who despise the baptism of infants under the new covenant would have despised circumcision under the old, since they accomplish the same thing. He reminds us of the precious benefits of Paedobaptism which, like circumcision, ratifies and confirms the promise given to the pious parent, declaring that the Lord will be a God, not only to him, but also to his seed, and that he is determined to exercise his goodness and grace, not only towards him, but towards his posterity even to a thousand generations.

He argues that the mere promise of eternal life is insufficient for us: because of our weakness God has given Christian parents a sign, which will "Animate their minds to a stronger confidence, when they actually see the covenant of the Lord engraven on the bodies of their children." Moreover, it assists the children who, when they come to years, will be stimu-

lated thereby to worship; and it will warn them of the penalties of departing from their God.

Baby baptism, that's not Baptist, that's Protestant. And also along the line of babies, what did Calvin believe concerning where do babies go when they die? "That not only the adult, who believe in Christ, and walk worthily according to the Gospel, are to be deemed the Elect Children of God, but likewise all the children of the covenant, as long as they do not actually show the contrary; therefore believing parents have no cause to doubt of the salvation of their children who die in their infancy," book 20, page 3, volume II, *The History of the Reformation*. But what about those babies who are not of the elect? Some, who believe in God's sovereign election of the 'few,' also believe that non-elect babies who die will spend eternity suffering in hell. John Calvin said, "there are babies a span long in hell."

Babies in hell? To me that makes a Just God into an unjust God, or as one notes Calvinist said concerning this matter, and I quote: "Apparently, many Christians believe that there is a magical split-second in time before which a child, if they die, will go to heaven, and after which, if they die will spend eternity suffering in hell. They call this the 'age of accountability.'"

"If I believed this **nonsense** I would take a gun into the largest maternity ward in Toronto and, before the police arrived, kill every infant who had just been born. This would cause an enormous amount of suffering to the parents, but this wouldn't matter much in the long run, because probably most of them (according to the evangelical theology) are destined to suffer forever in hell anyway, so why not save their babies from the same fate?" What a sick way of looking at things.

Well, Calvinist, if you believe Calvin is so right, I guess you will have to be a baby baptizer. And by the way, you had better throw out your musical instruments in the church too, because Calvin taught, "to sing the

praises of God upon the harp and psaltery," says Calvin, "unquestionably formed a part of the training of the law and of the service of God under that dispensation of *shadows and figures*, but they are not now to be used in public thanksgiving." He says again: "with respect to the *tabret, harp, and psaltery*, we have formerly observed, and will find it necessary afterwards to repeat the same remark, that the Levites, under the law, were justified in making use of instrumental music in the worship of God; it having been his will to train his people, while they were yet tender and like children, by such rudiments until the coming of Christ. But now, when the clear light of the gospel has dissipated the *shadows* of the law and taught us that God is to be served in a simpler form, it would be to act a foolish and mistaken part to imitate that which the prophet enjoined only upon those of his own time."

And what is the conclusion of the whole matter? Calvinism and Arminianism, neither are Baptist, their roots come from Protestantism and Romanism, I am not Reformed nor Presbyterian. I am Baptist and what I believe can be traced back to the Primitive Christians not some popish priest. Is Calvinism Baptist? No, and we should not align with it. □

READY?

Another day, and Jesus has not come!

Why does He tarry?

Perhaps that we may carry the news of His first coming unto some who have not heard, who have not yet believed. Oh, are you ready for that coming day?

Perhaps it is for you He doth delay.

Author Unknown

(UIC continued from page 5)

bers in subjection and in obedience to God's Word. Without church discipline there is chaos.

6. Scriptural baptism by immersion is the only way to gain membership in a true, independent Baptist church. This is an ordinance given by God, (Matthew 28:19) and must be adhered to.

7. Ecumenism is out of the question. If others do not believe as we do, we separate from them, for, as the Bible says in II Cor. 6:17, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate" and in Amos 3:3 "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" If two "faiths" can't agree, they shouldn't be fellowshiping together.

8. Christians cannot be released from church-related responsibilities. Whether it be teaching a Sunday school class or sweeping floors, God has placed you in that position and you have a responsibility to carry it out until you are told otherwise. You will be held accountable to your Pastor and to God for what you do or don't do.

The Universal, Invisible Church cannot be the "church" defined in the Scriptures. The Greek word for church, *ekklesia*, means "a called-out assembly". To be an assembly, you must fit four criteria. First, you must be local. People cannot assemble if they are all over the world. Something universal cannot assemble in one place. Second, it must be visible. People cannot assemble and not be seen. To carry out the duties given by God, the church must be visible. Mat. 5:16 says, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven." Men can't see you or your works if you're invisible. Third, it must be organized. People cannot assemble and be in complete disarray. An assembly cannot operate if it is in total confusion and chaos. I Cor. 14:40 says, "Let everything be done decently and in order." If the assembly is unorganized, the purpose is defeated, for nothing will get done. Local New Testament Churches have organized leadership; God and the Pastor. The Universal, In-

visible Church has no leadership at all, therefore it is unorganized. Fourth, it must be constituted. There are qualifications for membership in any assembly. The qualifications for membership in a Local New Testament Church are, Salvation, Baptism, Membership. Not just any Christian may belong to a New Testament Church (as the Universal, Invisible Church believes), they must fit the qualifications.

A Local, Visible New Testament Church fits all of these criteria. A Universal Invisible church doesn't fit any of them. This theory is just that, a **theory**, not fact, not truth, just a theory that has no foundation. Believe what God says, not what man can dream up in his own mind.

Jeremiah 5:31 "The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye have in the end thereof?"

Jeremiah 14:14 "Then the Lord said unto me, The prophets prophesy lies in my name: I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake unto them: they prophesy unto you a false vision and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart."

Matthew 7:15 "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

Matthew 15:9 "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Matthew 24:11 "And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many."

Galatians 2:4 "And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage."

Colossians 2:8 "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."

Hebrews 13:9 "Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines."

II Peter 2:1 "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you,

who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."

I John 4:1 "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." □

From The Mailbox

Dear Editor:

Please tell me how much a subscription to *The Baptist Pillar* is for one year and where to send subscription information. I am a librarian for a newly established Landmark Theological Seminary in OK and would very much like to include a hard copy in our periodical collection. Thank you.

L.A. OK

Dear Brother in Christ,

I came across your home page and was impressed with the content. It is good to know of churches like yours who are taking a stand in these days of apostasy. I am a Christian who has been saved for some 60 years and am saddened by the departure from the "Old Landmarks". I have spent many years studying the version issue and am convinced that this is one of Satan's greatest weapons that he is using against the Church today. Acceptance of modern versions is the first step to general liberal tendencies. The next step is the use of worldly music in the church. May I encourage you to keep contending for the faith in these difficult days. Yours sincerely in Christ's service.

H. A. Brantford, Ont.

April 27, 1997

Ellen "DeGenerate"

Friday on "20/20" Ellen DeGeneres announced that she is a lesbian. Five days from then her hit TV comedy "Ellen" will announce that her character, Ellen Morgan, is a lesbian also. A lot of controversy has surrounded this episode.

Not to be outfoxed, Fox Broadcasting wants to be the one that receives publicity by introducing a lesbian cousin

on "Married... With Children." This episode, called "Lez Be Friends" just adds another shovel to the dung hill that is typical of "Married... With Children."

Ellen's lesbianism is not really an "announcement." She gave singer K.D. Lang a passionate kiss at the podium of last month's Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center. The focus of this event is that a main character on a much watched program has "come out of the closet." A great victory for the gay and lesbian communities. There will be numerous other big stars on the sitcom that night to show their support.

Mark Johnson, the media director for the Gay and Lesbian Task Force in Washington, D.C., (which is also one of the nation's biggest lobbying groups) is really more upset by ABC cutting two commercials that were scheduled to be aired. The first commercial was from the Human Rights Campaign and was very anti-Republican without saying as much. The second commercial was for Olivia Cruise Lines; cruises for lesbians. The commercial showed two women kissing on board their cruise ship.

Thank goodness for some people taking a stand. JCPenny (972-431-8500), Chrysler (800-992-1997), and Wendy's have pulled their sponsorship from the program. However JCPenny's admits that the homosexual community was making 10 calls to complain to every one to commend. We need to voice our support. One station in Birmingham, Ala. has had the nerve to cancel airing that episode of Ellen. (Say, isn't that the state with the Governor that threatened force if they try to take the 10 Commandments out of the courtroom?)

So, here we are, broadcasting Ellen's depravity all around the country. It's just entertainment? Romans 1:32 talks about people that know better but have pleasure in them that do them. That would be all the people across America who say they are against it, but sit on their couches and turn on such garbage. Is that you?

By James R. Love
Associate Pastor