THE INSTRUCTOR



"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Timothy 3:16

Volume 9

FEBRUARY, 1972

Number 2

WHY RELIGIOUS DIVISION?

HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED why our society is divided religiously? Did you ever stop and try to determine the one basic cause of religious division?

RELIGIOUS DIVISION WAS BORN of and is promoted by rebellion against God's law—man's desire to have his own way instead of God's. Men exalt their uninspired opinions above divine law by formulating them into doctrinal systems and making their acceptance a condition of entrance into their denominations. The basic cause of all religious division is not man's inability to understand what the Bible says, but his unwillingness to abide by what he understands it to say. One illustration of this should convince the honest hearted of its truthfulness.

THE ACTION OF BAPTISM: Twice Paul says baptism is a burial. (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12). There has never been any difficulty understanding the meaning of the word burial, and the leading scholars of all denominations admit that immersion or burial was the action of baptism in apostolic days. But, while admitting this, they contend that sprinkling and pouring are just as acceptable to God. Did they read this in the Bible? A thousand times NO! At no time in all the Bible was water and water only sprinkled or poured upon any person for any thing. So we can easi-

ly see that we are all agreed upon what the Bible says **about** the action of baptism. Division comes when men try to bind something upon us which even they admit cannot be found in the Bible.

WHEN ALL MEN BECOME SATIS-FIED to do what the Bible commands—nothing more, nothing less, and nothing else—then and only then will religious unity prevail. We are commanded to "speak as the oracles of God" (1 Pet. 4:11), and "speak the same thing." (1 Cor. 1:10). We are forbidden to "go beyond the doctrine of Christ," (2 John 9), or stop short of that which is written. (Deut. 4:2; Rev. 22:19). Whenever all religious people decide to obey these passages, we will have religious unity—disobedience of them is the one basic cause of division.

—James P. Needham in SWORD & SHIELD

HEAR A FORMER BAPTIST PREACHER PREACH THE GOSPEL EACH LORD'S DAY MORNING AT 8:35 OVER WBSA, 1300 on the dial.

THE INSTRUCTOR

Published monthly in the interest of truth and righteousness by the congregation of Christ, meeting on Highway 431 South in Albertville, Alabama.

CARROL R. SUTTON EDITOR

Send all questions, comments, and criticisms to the editor, Route 3, Highway 431 South, Albertville, Ala. 35950.

Second-class postage paid in Albertville, Ala. 35950.

EDITORIAL....

IN DEFENSE OF THE TRUTH (NO. 13)

In previous studies it has been shown conclusively that James 1:27 and Gal. 6:10 set forth obligations of Christians as individuals. R. W. Gray and others have desperately tried (but in vain) to show that these passages set forth obligations of churches. Failing to prove church action from these passages, editor Gray then tries to justify churches contributing to HUMAN SOCIETIES on the basis that individual obligations as set forth in Gal. 6:10 and James 1:27 can be discharged through collective action by the church. Let us consider some of his arguments along this line.

ARGUMENTS OF THE EDITOR

ARGUMENT NO. 1 — In commenting on Gal. 6:10 editor Gray said: "But even if it could be established that the command is directed primarily to the individual Christian this would not, in itself, preclude collective action in obeying the command. This ought to be quickly recognized by those who so view the passage." (N. B. Bulletin, not numbered or dated).

ARGUMENT NO. 2 — While discussing James 1:27 the editor said: "Seeing the force of the foregoing matters objectors to the orphan homes argue, 'James specifies the individual when he says, 'keep himself unspotted' They then conclude, 'James 1:27 refers to individual action ONLY.' Most expositors admit an application to the individual Christian

EXCLUDE the church from the passage Professor J. W. Roberts observes, "The fact that the responsibility is individual does not mean it may not be collectively discharged. In the Jerusalem church the individual kept themselves unspotted from the world and also individually gave to the church The result of such individual discharge of responsibilities was that through the church (Acts 6) they discharged their responsibilities. but one was discharged singly and the other collectively.' Comparable language found elsewhere in the New Testament is sufficient to indicate that the use of a singular pronoun is not EXCLUSIVE in application. In 1 Cor. 11:28 Paul wrote. 'But let a man examine himself, and let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.' Paul does not preclude congregational activity in eating the Lord's supper. The language is the same in James 1:27, but it is clear that congregational action is under consideration. The church was to observe the injunction-collectively and individually." (N. B. Bulletin, not numbered or dated).

but none of whom we have consulted

OBSERVATIONS

- 1. Surely the editor can see that individual obligation does NOT obligate the **church** nor give the **church** authority to engage in collective action. Does **church** action fulfil individual obligation?
- 2. The church is authorized to act ONLY if the passage sets forth collective action.
- 3. It is not enough to allege that church action (collectively) is not EX-CLUDED (specifically mentioned as not involved) in Gal. 6:10, James 1:27 or any other passage. One is obligated to PROVE that church action is INCLUDED if he is going to contend that it is authorized. Consider this:
- (a) If editor Gray's argument has any merit whatever, it proves that a thing must be specifically EXCLUDED in order for it to be eliminated.
- (b) It would necessarily follow that Noah could have built the ark out of gopher wood and pine since pine was not specifically EXCLUDED. (Gen. 6:14).
- (c) Since JOSEPH H. THAYER and W. E. VINE do NOT specifically EX-(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 2) IN DEFENSE OF THE TRUTH (No. 13)

CLUDE the mechanical instrument in their definition of PSALLO, then the mechanical instrument must be INCLUDED in "making melody" in Eph. 5:19, according to R. W. Gray. Is he (and others) ready for this inescapable conclusion?

(d) The truth is this: A thing is NOT authorized simply because it is not specifically EXCLUDED. It is authorized when it is INCLUDED. When God specifies a thing, others (co-ordinates) are eliminated!

FURTHER OBSERVATIONS

- 1. The editor attempts to prove that an individual can discharge his responsibilities through the church (collectively). However, he does not prove it. The quotation from J. W. Roberts does not prove the allegation. Acts 6 does NOT indicate that individuals were meeting their responsibilities as individuals when the needy widows were served or relieved, but it indicates that the church (collectively) was meeting its responsibilities. Individuals gave money into a common fund. They "laid it at the apostles' feet" (Acts 4:37). Peter told Ananias that "whiles it (a possession) remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" (Acts 5:1-4). Obviously after it was "laid at the apostles' feet," it no longer belonged to the individual. When the church acted in Acts 6:1-6, it (not the individual) chose the methods used in relieving the needy and it (not the individual) had the oversight of the work done. The church was meeting its responsibilities.
- 2. The editor's reference to the singular pronoun "HIMSELF" in 1 Cor. 11: 28 does NOT prove that "HIMSELF" in James 1:27 includes the church. The singular pronoun "HIMSELF" does NOT include the church in either passage! Paul said: "But let a MAN examine HIMSELF, and so let HIM eat of that bread" (1 Cor. 11:28).

The MAN is to examine HIMSELF. Does this prove that the CHURCH (collectively) it to examine the MAN? Does this prove that the MAN can examine HIMSELF through church action? If not, down goes the editor's "singular pronoun" (HIMSELF) argument! Is it any

wonder that the N. B. church does NOT want an open discussion of these matters?

- 3. The truth is this: The INDIVIDU-AL is to EXAMINE HIMSELF and eat of that bread and drink of that cup. We learn from the context of 1 Cor. 11 (and other passages) that the Lord's supper is to be observed "in the church", i.e., in the assembly. We do NOT learn this from the "singular pronoun" HIMSELF. So editor Gray's assertions have "fizzled." He needs help.
- 4. If the individual can discharge his responsibilities to "visit" and do good unto all men" as taught in James 1:27 and Gal. 6:10 through the church (collectively), i.e., by giving into the church treasury, please consider the following:
- (a) Can the individual discharge his responsibility to "pray" as taught in 1 Tim. 2:8 and 1 Thess. 5:17 the same way? If not, why not?
- (b) Can the individual discharge his responsibility to "sing" as taught in James 5:13 by giving into the church treasury or by allowing the church to sing for him? Or must the individual sing for himself?
- (c) Can the individual discharge his obligations to civil powers as taught in Romans 13 the same way? Why not?
- (d) Can the individual discharge his responsibility to "keep himself unspotted from the world" which includes "fleeing fornication" as taught in James 1:27 and 1 Cor. 6:18 the same way? If not, why not? Maybe the editor will tell us!
- (e) Can the individual fulfil his obligation to "be filled with the Spirit" as taught in Eph. 5:18 through the church (collectively)? Can he?
- (f) Can the individual discharge his responsibility to "understand what the will of the Lord is" as taught in Eph. 5:17 the same way? Can he? Please explain.
- (g) Can the individual discharge his responsibility to "honour his father and mother" as taught in Eph. 6:2-3 through the church by either giving into the church treasury or by allowing the church to do it (collectively) for him? Please tell us why?
 - (h) Can the individual discharge his responsibility to "eat at home" as taught (Continued on page 4)

Four Versions of Mark 16:16

The Universalist says: "He that believeth not and is not baptized shall be saved." All are going to be saved.

The Roman Catholic says: "He that believeth not and is baptized shall be saved." Whether it be a new born baby or an adult at the point of death, the "sacrament" of baptism has validity to take away sins.

The Protestant says: "He that believeth and is not baptized shall be saved." Salvation is by faith only, without baptism or anything else.

The Lord said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Which of these "versions" are you willing to accept?

-Roy E. Foutz in THE RESTORER.

THINK ON THIS

These are the days that TRY men's souls, but there is a day coming that will FRY men's souls.

(Continued from page 3) INDEFENSE OF THE TRUTH (No. 13)

in 1 Cor. 11:34 by either giving into the church treasury or by allowing the church to "eat at home" for him? Will the editor please tell us?

CONCLUSION: The individual can NOT shift his personal responsibilities off on the church (collectively). Please read Gal. 6:5; Rom. 2:6; 14:12.

We earnestly and sincerely plead with editor Gray and the N. B. church to accept **God's will** in these and all other matters.

(CRS)

A PUBLIC DEBATE

A DEBATE IS SCHEDULED TO BE CONDUCTED MARCH 27-30 AT THE EAST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BUILDING IN CULLMAN, ALA D. L. WELCH OF THE UNITED PENECOSTAL CHURCH OF PENSACOLA, FLA., AND CARROL R. SUTTON WILL BE THE DISPUTANTS. THE SUBJECT TO BE DISCUSSED WILL BE HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM, TONGUES, etc.

The time will be 7:30 p.m. PLEASE COME!

Sentence Sermons

The church is full of willing people—a few are willing to work and the rest are willing to let them.

The emptier the pot, the quicker it boils; so watch your temper.

When the Bible is closed the fountain of faith is cut off. (See Rom. 10:17).

Most people know how to say nothing, but only a few know when.

Gossips are like vacuum cleaners—always picking up dirt.

CHURCH OF CHRIST Route 3, Highway 431 So. Albertville, Ala, 35950