

# The Medical Missionary Articles (1903-1909)

The Medical Missionary, Vol. 12 (1903)

January 1903

"The True Way to True Greatness" *The Medical Missionary* 12, 1 , pp. 4-6.

ALONZO T. JONES

IT is not wrong to desire to be great, any more than it is wrong to desire to be free. It is not wrong to desire power, any more than it is wrong to desire to be free. And to desire to be free is absolutely and eternally right.

Indeed, so entirely right are all these desires, that it is but the simple truth to say that they are true gospel desires. The impulse of each is from God; and the desire itself is right. The thing that is wrong in connection with them is that men take the wrong way and employ wrong means to attain to the thing rightly desired.

The call of Christ is the call to freedom, to liberty. Of him it is written: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath anointed me to . . . proclaim liberty to the captives." Therefore it is written: "Ye have been called unto liberty." And his word to all is: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." "I am the . . . truth." "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." And to all who have received him, the exhortation is: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

It is therefore most certain that it is absolutely and eternally right to desire to be free. And God in Christ by the gospel has established the true and only way to satisfy that desire. But instead of taking this way, and so attaining to perfect freedom forever, men take their own way; and by confederacy and combination, even to battle and war, and by "eternal vigilance," attain to only a precarious temporal freedom during the fleeting space of this world.

A leading American writer has defined life as "a seeking for power." There is much truth in that definition, as witnesses the whole history of the world. As the world seeks for it, it is

5

a vain search, as also witnesses the whole history of mankind. Yet the desire for power, even for unlimited power, is wholly a right desire - a true gospel desire. And God in Christ by the gospel has established the true and only way to satisfy this desire. So it is written: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is *the power of God*. . . to every one that believeth." "I cease not to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be . . . strengthened with *all might* according to this glorious

power." "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know . . . what is the *exceeding greatness of His power to usward* who believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come."

This is the way, and the only true way, to power. This is the way to power that is really power - power that perfectly satisfies, always in all things, and in all circumstances; power that is unlimited and all mighty; for it is the very power of God unto "all the fulness of God." But instead of taking this way to the power that perfectly satisfies in all things and forever, men will take the way of crushing out their fellowmen, wiping out nations, and wading through seas of blood, to attain to a power that is wholly precarious and wholly unsatisfactory, and which, at the very best, is only "for a moment." The desire for power is a wholly right desire; men taking the wrong way to attain to that right thing, miss it altogether. The way of "Christ the power of God" is the only Way to power.

It is entirely so, also, as to greatness. It is wholly right to desire to be great. To desire to be great is a true gospel desire. In the word of the gospel it is presented as an incentive that ye "shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Read it: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the *same shall be called great* in the kingdom of heaven."

It is altogether right to keep the commandments of God and to teach men so. There is no more righteous thing than that. Indeed, there is no greater thing than that. In the nature of things, a person must be great, to do great things. A man, therefore, must be great to be able to do the great thing of keeping the commandments of God and of teaching men so. And being great, and doing that great thing, that he should *be called* great, is but the simple thing of calling him what he already is. And since it is supremely and eternally right to desire to keep the commandments of God, and to teach men so; and since, in order to do that, we must be great, it follows that it is eternally right to desire to be great. Accordingly, concerning John the Baptist, the forerunner of the model Man, it was spoken by the angel of the Lord: "He shall be great in the sight of the Lord." And of Christ, the model man himself, it was also spoken by the angel of the Lord: "He shall be great." And it is everlastingly right for every man to desire to be like Him, the model man. Therefore it is everlastingly right for every man to desire to be great.

This truth is strikingly emphasized and strongly illustrated in the life of the twelve disciples and Christ's dealing with them. Those disciples were almost constantly querying in their own minds "Who shall be the greatest," or "Who shall be called greatest" in the kingdom which they were expecting Christ to establish. Time and time again, these queryings broke out into discussion and even contention among them. More than once their anxiety in this matter led them even to ask Jesus openly the question. Once two of them had it so far settled in their own minds that they two were the greatest, that they put themselves forward

and actually asked openly that they two should be given the two places of chief honor, one on His right hand and the other on His left, in that kingdom that they had in mind. And yet, though invariably speaking to them on the subject, never by as much as a

6

hint did Jesus reprove their desire to be great or even the greatest; never once did he even suggest to them that greatness was an altogether unbecoming subject for them as his disciples to even think of aspiring to. NO. Yet while this was so, he never missed an opportunity, he seized every occasion, to show to them that they had in view the utterly wrong way to greatness, and to point out to them the true way to greatness.

What, then, is this way? "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying: Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them and said: Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." Conversion, then, - a changed life and humility, - is essential to greatness. This is indeed the entrance to the way of true greatness.

The rest of the way is made plain as follows: "Jesus called them unto him and said: Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. *But it shall not be so among you*; but whosoever will be great among you let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servants; *even as the Son of man* came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many;" and "I am among you as he that serveth."

The world's way, the human and false way, to greatness, is for a man by an assertion of power, dominion, or authority, to exalt himself to a position of lordship and have as many as possible to serve him and be subject to his beck and nod. But in the true way of greatness it is not so; here it is humility to the emptying of self and becoming himself the servant of all, being "at the call of every one."

Service, then, service of our fellowman, freely chosen by a free man, this is the true way to greatness. He who, being free from all, freely chooses to be servant to all, and at the call of every one, is in the way of true greatness. And he who thus serves most people, who is at the call of the most people, *is the greatest*; even as the Son of man, the model man, came not to be ministered unto, but to minister; not to be served, but to serve; not to have all people at his call, but to put himself at the call of all people, and to devote his life and pour it out for mankind.

Free service to mankind, ministering to their needs, answering their calls, ready ever to do them good in whatever possible way, seeking to perform and striving to be able to perform, all this in the most efficient way, to do the most possible good in service to the greatest possible number of people - this is the true way of greatness. So it is perfectly proper to desire to be great, and even to be the greatest in this the right and true way. It is totally unlike the world's way;

and also, totally unlike the world's way, it is impossible for any one ever to become proud of the greatness so attained.

And this is the greatness that accomplishes that truly great thing of the keeping of the commandments of God and teaching men so. For it is written: "Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion of the flesh, but *by love serve one another*. For all the law is fulfilled in one work, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Since, therefore, loving service to others by those who are free, is the fulfilling of all the law of liberty, the law of God; and since those who do this great thing are called great simply because in the nature of things that is what they must be and what they are, it follows that loving service to others by those who are free in Christ is true greatness.

Oh, then, let us all aspire to greatness in this the only right way. In the world's way only a very few can ever attain to greatness. In this the true way every soul can attain to it; every soul can be like the model man, who, anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him. And he shall be great.

**February 1903**

**"The Revelation of God" *The Medical Missionary* 12, 2 , pp. 29-31.**

ALONZO T. JONES

I

GOD in creation is God in revelation. This, for the simple reason that creation itself is the revelation of God. This is plain from the fact that Christ is the revelation of God, and he is the One by whom God created all things. He is the Word of God. Words express thoughts. Christ, being the Word of God, he is the expression of the thought of God. Any one desiring to know the thought of God on any subject, must look to Christ, for he is the expression of the thought of God. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." "By him were all things created, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him and for him and he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

This is plain also from the further fact that "by *the word* of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth," "for *he spake*, and it was done."

Creation being produced by his word, and words expressing thought, creation is the expression of the thought of God. God's thought expressed in revelation. From this it is plain that the proper reading of creation, or nature, is the finding of the thought of God, which is expressed in each created thing. This was man's

reading of creation, or nature, when he stood in his native image and glory of God, in the unmarred world, in the midst of God's creation.

To the man, the word of God came directly, and so was a direct revelation to him in that sense. To the man there came also the word of God through the creation that was round about him; and as he read it, he received the thought of God, and so received the revelation of God in that sense.

How certainly and how completely this is so, is illustrated in the record in Genesis 2. When God had finished the creation up to the making of man himself, he said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him." The man himself had not yet discovered that he was alone; and in order that he might see that he was truly alone, and that there was no one fitted to him, that there was no companion for him, the Lord caused every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, to pass before the man, "to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof."

Many people read this passage as if it said that God caused all these creatures to come to Adam, or pass before

30

him, that he might give names to them; that is, that they had no names before, and as they passed by before him, he gives to each a name; and that has been its name ever since. For instance, here came an animal walking nobly up. As to name, it is nothing yet; but as Adam looks at it, he says, "I'll name that a horse;" and a horse it has been ever since. Another comes lightly springing by. As to name, it is nothing; but Adam said, "I'll call that a gazelle;" and a gazelle it has been. And so on, through the whole list of beasts and birds. But that is neither the word nor the thought of Scripture.

Was not each one of these animals the same precisely before Adam saw it as afterwards? Was not its nature, and were not its characteristics, identical before with what they were afterward? Assuredly. But the record is not that God brought these unto Adam to have him give names unto them, as though they had no names as yet. The record is, that God brought them unto Adam, "to see what he would call them." It was a test of Adam's unity and harmony with the creation which God had formed, and not a means of getting names for the animals.

And Adam's unity with God and the creation which he had produced, was completely demonstrated. For as all the beasts and birds passed before him, at a look Adam read the thought of God expressed in each; at a look he caught the special characteristic that made each what it was; and without hesitation he spoke the word which described the essential nature and characteristics of each. And this he followed through the whole range of the animal creation; and in not a single instance did he miss. "For whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof;" that was exactly what it was. In the word which he spoke, that creature was defined.

This therefore demonstrates that the range of his knowledge was as wide as creation; that his mental vision was so clear that at a look he could read the nature of each creature; and his mind acted with such precision that he could, without hesitation, correctly read the essential nature of each creature as it came.

This shows also that the mind of the man was so perfectly in harmony with the mind of God that in the created things he could catch the thought of God expressed in each. And this he did so completely that it is not too much to say that his mind itself was but the expression of the divine mind.

And so would it ever have been with man had he not sinned. Had he not sinned, man, as he might multiply to the filling of the world, would have ever been able correctly to read, and would ever have delighted himself in reading, the thoughts of God expressed in creation. And thus, whether in the word spoken directly to himself or in the word spoken through creation, he would ever have been receiving the revelation of the thought and character of God.

Man, as he was before sin entered, standing in unity with God, and with the creation of which he was a part, receiving the thought of God, in his word expressed, whether directly or through creation to him, *saw things as they really were*. He saw them in their true light. He saw them as they were in the thought and according to the mind of God. And thus would it have ever been had he remained in unity with God. And submission to the word of God as spoken directly to himself was the means of his remaining in unity with God.

One word of God spoken to him directly, was, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Submission to this word was the means, and the only means, of man's remaining in the place, condition, and character in which God intended that he should abide.

But there came another word, the opposite of this word of God, first insinuating deception. This word said: "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree

31

which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The suggestion was believed. This word was accepted, and, as the consequence, "The woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise;" and "she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat."

Now that tree was not good for food. It was not a tree to be desired to make one wise, yet "the woman saw" that it was. That is to say, she saw what *was not so*.

When the holy pair in Eden received the word of God, they received the thought of God, and in that they received the mind of God, which produced the thought expressed in his word. On the other hand, when they received the word of Satan, they received the thought of Satan, and in that they received the mind which produced the thought that was expressed in that word. Thus they received another mind altogether from that which was their own native mind, from that which was the mind of Christ, who was the Word, the expression of the thought

of God. And this other mind caused them to see the creation of God in exactly the reverse order; caused them to see as good that which was not in any sense good; and to see as that which was desired to make one wise, what was not, in any possible sense, the truth of the case. And this is how it is that "the carnal mind the [mind of the flesh] is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither can be."

And this difficulty of the mind of man now seeing things as they are not, was not limited to the seeing of that one tree; it extended to the erring of all creation; for it was thus that it came about that darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people. But note: the change by which man came to see the things of creation in reverse order, came to see things as they are not - this change was not at all in the creation, but solely in the mind of man. And so long as man remains in that mind and in that darkness, he never can see creation as it truly is.

But God did not leave the man in that darkness, and possessed of that mind, without hope. Into that darkness he caused the light to shine. He said, even that very day, to the deceiver who had drawn man to his mind and into the darkness, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and here seed." That promised seed is Christ, the desire of all nations. And there, through him, there was opened to man the way back from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God, and from the mind of Satan unto the true mind of man, the mind of Christ.

And from that day to this the word to man has ever been, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." This is otherwise expressed in another word, which from that day to this has ever been rung out from God to man, - "Repent;" that is, *change your mind*.

Christ is the gift of God to man, to lead him out of the darkness into the light; from the mind of Satan to the mind of God. He is the Way, and the only way, out of the darkness and into the light, from the power and mind of Satan to the power and mind of God.

(To be continued)

**March 1903**

**"The Revelation of God" *The Medical Missionary* 12, 3 , pp. 61-67.**

ALONZO T. JONES

II

WE have seen that, possessed of the mind that is in Satan, and so dwelling in the darkness, man sees the things of God, the things of the creation of God, in directly reverse order. The things that are not in anywise so he sees to be the only things that are really so. And with that mind, and in that darkness, he never can see otherwise. But the gift of Christ has been made, that man might escape from this false mind and its darkness. In the mercy of God, he is called to change

his mind, to "let this mind be in you which is also in Christ Jesus." This change, from the darkness to the light, from the mind of Satan to the mind of Christ, places man where he can again see the creation as it is. And the word of God spoken directly to man is the only means of maintaining this proper standing and relation to God, and to the creation of which he is again a part. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus." "If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creation." And from the darkness unto the light, from the power and mind of Satan to the power and mind of God, Christ alone is the Way. And Christian growth is nothing else than under the brooding power of the Spirit by God, the transformation of the Spirit of God, the transformation of the man by the renewing of his mind, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, where he stands again in perfect unity with God and the creation of which he is a part, and wherein again he shall be able to correctly read the thought of God in the word of God to him directly, and the thought of God also to him through his word in creation. And from the darkness where the light meets him, and from the subverted mind which is supplanted by the true mind, the mind of Christ, - from there unto the standing in his native place in perfect unity with God and the creation, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, the word of God, spoken directly to him, under the brooding power of the Spirit of God, is the true guide. Thus Christ, as the word of God, and the word of God in Christ, is the only way to the correct reading of the word of God in creation.

The necessity of man's having another than the natural mind in order to do right thinking, is emphasized in Lord's call, in the words, "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near: Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

As near as any man can come with his own native, natural mind, to think-

62

ing correctly concerning God, is no nearer than earth is to heaven. But the expression, "as far as earth is from heaven," is the very expression of ultimate, infinite distance. Then, since man's natural thoughts concerning God are as far from being correct as earth is from heaven, so as near as a man can come with his own natural mind to thinking correctly concerning God, is as far as he could possibly get away from it.

The only true thoughts concerning God are the thoughts of God himself. The only true thoughts, then, that any man can have concerning God, are God's own thoughts. And since these thoughts are as far from man as the heavens are from the earth, the only way that ever a man can possibly get them is for the Lord to give them to him. And the only way in which the Lord can give to a man his thoughts, is for him to speak to the man; for only words express thoughts. And this demands that there shall be a revelation of God, from God direct to man. God has spoken to man, and this in order that man shall know.

Yet to think what God is, and to define or even give shape to his thoughts of what God is, has been one of the chief occupations of man in all ages since sin entered. And the gods which in all ages men have made, are a striking demonstration of the revealed truth of the impotence of the natural mind of man to think correctly on this subject.

Accordingly, God has always forbidden man to think on this subject: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."

No man in this world could ever have made any graven image or any likeness of God, if he had not first thought upon this subject, and formed in his imagination a mental image. The graven image, or the likeness which man made to be seen with the eyes, was but the reproduction of his idea of God which he had already mentally imaged. Accordingly, when God came down upon Mount Sinai, to speak to the people the great things of his law, he so arranged it that it was impossible for the people to see anything at all of which they could by any possibility make any image or likeness, even mental.

And so it is written, "Ye came near and stood under the mountain, and the mountain burned with fire, unto the midst of heaven, with darkness, clouds, and thick darkness. And the Lord spake unto you, out of the midst of the fire, ye heard the voice of the word, but saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice. . . . Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire; lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female, the likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air, the likeness of any thing that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth; and lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations under the whole heaven."

Though the heavenly host of angels, cherubim, and seraphim, and the Lord himself, were all there, yet no sort of similitude or form of any kind was allowed to be seen by any of all the people of Israel, - not even the brightness of his glory; lest, when their eyes should see anything that in any wise reminded them of it, even though it be only the sun or the moon shining in brightness, they should say that this was like it, and should use this as a

63

means of aiding their thoughts in worship; or lest, by thinking upon what they might have seen, they should be led to reproduce their mental image in a form, or likeness, as an aid in worship.

Thus, in the strongest possibly way, the Lord has made it clear that he is not to be worshiped under any human conception. But that they who worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.

*In spirit:* in total absence of any form or likeness of any kind whatever, mental or otherwise. For as a matter of fact no form or image can ever be otherwise until it is first mental.

And in truth: in the truth of God, according as that truth is in the word which he has spoken. For if I think of God differently from what he has said; if my thought of him is other than his own thought; and I worship him as that, - or, more exactly, worship that as him, - then I am not worshipping him at all, but instead am worshipping only my conception or idea of him. But when I worship him in my thought of him, instead of in his thought of him, I simply worship myself instead of him. Therefore, to be a true worshiper of God, I must worship him only in his own thought concerning himself, which, in his truth, he has given to me.

## II

Not only has the Lord, in his word that he spoke from Sinai, excluded all possibility of anybody's making any image, likeness, or similitude, but in another place, he has beautifully shown the impossibility, in the nature of the case, of anybody conceiving a correct likeness of God. Read carefully and thoughtfully, Isaiah 40:12-25: "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance."

"Hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand." Open your hand as wide as you can, and hold it level, palm upwards. Note the depression in the middle of your hand. That is the hollow of your hand. Fill it with water and see how much it will hold without running over. And all the waters are measured in the hollow of God's hand as easily as those few drops of water lie in the hollow of your hand. Then if only his *hand* is so great that all the waters lie in the hollow of it, how large is he himself? It is simply impossible for any human mind to conceive of the size that such a hand would have to be. Then if it would be impossible for any human mind to conceive of a true likeness even of the hand of God, how much less a true likeness of himself?

"Meted out the heaven with a span." The span is the measure from the tip of the thumb to the tip of the second finger. What is the compass of the heaven? Conceive it if you can. Yet the whole compass of the heaven is by him measured simply with the span. Then again, what is the size of that hand? No human mind can conceive of the compass of heaven. Then no human mind can conceive of the compass of the size of that span by which he meted out the heaven. And when no human mind could possibly conceive only the size of the hand, the reach of the span with which he meted out the heaven, how infinitely beyond all reach of human thought is any true conception of the form of God.

Therefore, the pointed question is asked, "To whom then, will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare unto him?"

Next, he pictures a workman melting a graven image, and a goldsmith spreading it over with gold, and casting silver chains, or choosing a tree, and seeking a cunning workman to prepare out of it a graven image. Then he asks of such and of others, "Have ye not known? have ye not heard? hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth? It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers, that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in?" And even then the heaven, the very heaven of heavens, cannot contain him. How

64

can it be possible for any finite mind to conceive any likeness of him?

Therefore again he appeals to all, "To whom then, will ye liken me, or shall I be equal, saith the Holy One?"

It is perfectly plain then, that God has made no revelation of himself, as to his exact or even relative form or size or shape. Yet he *has* revealed himself. Wherein, then? - In *character*. He began it by revealing himself, as "I AM." That is *existence*. But existence only is not enough. Therefore, he extended his revelation to "I AM THAT I AM," I am that which I am; I am what I am. This is a revelation of both existence and character. Next he enlarged this revelation by proclaiming his name. And his name is the expression of what he is. And in that he said that his name is, "the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." That is again existence and character, and that only.

Again, it is written: "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." This again, is a revelation of existence and character.

This is his word to men, his thought as to what he is. And true worship is to receive this thought as it is, in his word; and to worship him for what is expressed in that thought alone. God has revealed himself to men in character only, because this is that which most of all, and first of all, man needs. And in this lies perfect assurance of true worship, and perfect security against all image worship; for it is impossible ever even mentally to image *character*. In worship, man always becomes conformed to the character of that which he worships. Whosoever worships God according to the word and in the thought God has revealed, will worship him for what he is, - merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin. He who worships God as being that, will by his worship become conformed in holiness of life and character to the image of him who created him; and when the man, in thus worshipping, shall have grown in mind and character unto that perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, then will be rent the dimming veil that is between, and we shall see him "face to face," and shall know even as we are known. We shall know him then as he knows us now. Our knowledge then will be as full as God's knowledge of us is now.

And then even we ourselves shall be so far beyond what we are now, that it would be impossible for us now to conceive it, even if it were revealed. Therefore it is not revealed. And accordingly "it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." What we shall be doth not yet appear. But when this does appear, it will be that we shall be like him. Then it is perfectly plain that what he is like doth not yet appear. We cannot conceive what we ourselves shall be. Yet what we shall be is consequent entirely upon our seeing him as he is. It is perfectly plain then that we cannot possibly conceive him as he is: we cannot now "see him" with the mind's eye, in any mental likeness, similitude, or image, "as he is." And to conceive him as he *is not*, and so to worship him, can be nothing but false worship. But he seeks true worshipers; and true worshipers worship him only in spirit and in truth.

The reason then, that man must not make any graven image or likeness or similitude concerning God, is *not* because God has no form, likeness, or similitude; it is simply because of man's all-round incapacity rightly to comprehend it or correctly to appreciate it. Therefore, instead of making any revelation in that respect, he reveals to man that concerning himself which man most needs - character; and which received, and worshiped in the truth of that revelation, will bring man to the point in every way in which he will be qualified to know and appreciate all that may ever be revealed when he shall appear, and we shall see him as he is. The worship of him in that which he has re-

65

veiled is the only true way to man's ever being capable in any sense, of worshipping him in that which is not revealed. The true worship of him in his *character*, is the only way in which man can ever become capable of truly worshipping him in his *person*.

I

Christ is the Word of God. Being the Word of God, he is the expression of the thought of God. In this, he is the revelation of God. Therefore, it is written: "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." And this is true in all things. Christ is the revelation of God in creation. He is the revelation of God in redemption. He is the revelation of God in the universe of light. He is the revelation of God in this world of darkness. He is the Word of God, whether that Word be expressed in creation, or in the Bible, or in human flesh, and in all this that which is expressed of God is invariably character.

Before he sinned, man could read this revelation perfectly everywhere and in all things. When he sinned, having received the directly antagonistic mind to that which he had with God, he could not correctly read any of it anywhere. Everything was seen in the reverse. Therefore God's revelation had to be repeated to the man. Yet under the power of sin mankind went further and further into the dark, and in repeating his revelation to man that revelation had to be given the form of a written word, in order that man might be led back to a knowledge of the thought of God, and to unity with the mind of God. But in spite

of this, under the power of sin man went yet further into the dark. The word was not received truly by man. The word was not given its place as the formative power in the life of man. Then, in order to reach man, the revelation of God must be given the shape of *humanity itself*. The Word was made flesh and dwelt among men.

Thus, Christ, as the Word of God, is the universal revelation of God. Would any man see God? He must look at Christ. And whosoever would see Christ, must look in the place where Christ has appeared. And where is it that Christ has appeared? - In the flesh where man is. Not where man was, but where he is, for though man was made a little lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honor, and was set over the works of God's hands with all things put under his feet so entirely that God left nothing that was not put under him, yet that is not where man is. He did not remain where God thus put him. He fell. And whereas he was at first only a little lower than the angels, he fell to a condition far below them, to a condition of sin, of suffering, and of death. There is where man is.

And now Christ, the Word of God, as the revelation of God, taking the form of humanity where man is so that man cannot fail to see him, must be revealed thus where man is. And so it is written, "It became him, for whom, are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. . . . Wherefore it behooved him to be made in all things like unto his brethren, that he might be merciful, and a faithful high priest in things pertaining to God." And therefore it stands written, "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that he, by the grace of God should taste death for every man."

Would you see God? Look at Jesus, for he is Emanuel, - God with us. Would you see God? Look at Jesus, for he is "God manifest in the flesh." Would you see God? Look for him where he has appeared closest to man, - in humanity, all around you, everywhere. Indeed, he identified himself with humanity. Christ, who is God manifest, the thought of God expressed, is the last Adam; and in this fact of his having become the last Adam, he is just as certainly allied to, and identical with, every human being as is the first Adam.

66

Whoever looks for Christ will see him. This never fails. Then when I look for Christ in the flesh, Christ in the other man, Christ in *you*, I shall see him wherever I look. And when I see him wherever I look, I shall be always beholding him, and worshipping him. And the worshipers always become conformed to the worshiped. "By beholding we become changed." In always beholding him, I shall become like him, and so I, with open face, thus beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, am changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord.

We then, seeing him in humanity everywhere, will treat every human being as we should treat him; for it is only him that we see. And when you thus treat every human being as you would treat Christ, because it is Christ that you are looking for and that you see, then the other man too will see God manifest in the flesh; he, too, will see Christ in you the hope of glory. He will see the gospel, and he,

thus seeing as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, will also be changed into the image of the Lord; he will become like Christ, and always so beholding, will continually be changing into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord. And so, "we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord." Thus, in seeing only Christ in the other man, we make it that only Christ shall be seen in ourselves. In seeking only for the good in the other man, we make it that only good shall be seen in ourselves. In seeking the advancement of the other man, we find ourselves advanced.

And this is the gospel: the emptying of self. And this is the gospel: the emptying of self. Accordingly, it is written, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus. . . . who emptied himself." In making himself the least that he might advance and exalt lost mankind the most, he himself is most advanced and most exalted. Of the holy angels, it has truly been written that they find the irsupreme joy in helping sinful human beings to a nearness to Christ such as they themselves can never know. And in thus helping sinful human beings, they themselves are advanced to a nearness to Christ, and are exalted to a standard of life which, without this, they never could know.

This is the only way of good. Therefore it is that Jesus, who, as the sole revelation of God is the only Way, when he in the flesh was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, went about doing good.

And this is ever the only way. This is the way to-day. This is only Christianity. This is only medical missionary work. For when he, anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, went about doing only good, this included "healing all that were oppressed of the devil." And all this, only because as the consequence - that "God was with him."

Would you do good to Jesus? Would you help him if you had a chance? In needy, suffering humanity you can see him, for "it became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffering;" and "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death."

Then there is no lack of opportunity to do good to Jesus and to help him, for he is one of mankind - "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." He who sanctifies and those whom he sanctifies, are all of one, "For which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." And of your kindness to the hungry, the thirsty, the stranger, the poor, and the prisoner, he says: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me." And of any neglect of all these he says: "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these, ye did it not to me."

Here is the way to see God, and to know him by personal acquaintance. And so, becoming one with him there, it is easy to see him both there and everywhere else - in his word, written in the Bible, and in his word expressed in creation.

And so to mankind, where mankind is, and as mankind is, the gospel is preached: "God manifest in the flesh," "Christ in you the hope of glory." Man having gone far away from the word of God as expressed directly to him and to

him in creation, having gone far away from the word as expressed in writing, that word came to mankind in the flesh, where mankind is, "the Word was made flesh." This is the final revelation of God, and as such is the key and the open door to the finding of the revelation of God in the written word, in the word expressed in creation, and in the word expressed direct to the mind and heart of man. This is the way of the redemption of man, and of his complete restoration to his originally intended place of unity with God and with all the creation which the Heavenly Father has produced.

**April 1903**

**"Divine Prescriptions for Health" 11 *The Medical Missionary* 12, 4 , pp. 94-99.**

"I WISH above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health." How can the Lord record a greater wish for us than when he states it in so many words: "I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health." What a blessed thing it is, what a blessed thing it must be, to be a company of people engaged wholly in the endeavor to make that wish of God effective to people. He has called to himself a people, he has planted institutions, in order that that wish may be fulfilled, to carry into effect this his highest possible wish. Do you see the highly exalted position that he has given to you in connecting you with a sanitarium? In making choice of you to be an instrument of his in his great work of perfecting this his highest wish?

We cannot afford to overlook the proper estimate of this statement. We must not let anything come into the heart or life, into thought or conduct, that would hinder, that would frustrate, that wonderful wish of the Lord, - that the people shall have health. We must rise to the full height that God has set before us in this, and let him have full control of every faculty for the accomplishment of the greatest wish that he has recorded. Now what are the means by which the Lord would accomplish this great desire? What are the means that God designs to use? I shall not attempt to define them all, but I shall touch on the chief ones. He has established institutions; perhaps he has called you into one of them to be instrumentalities, and people have come to find health. Now what are the means that you are to receive from God as his called ones, through which to work for the people who have not health and who have come to the institution to get it?

I am not stating it too strongly when I say that whoever comes to one of our sanitariums for health should get it. The situation should be such that if they do not get it, the only possible reason

95

to be offered is that they refuse to take it. This is the truth. Do not think that this is extravagant. It is only sober truth. Think of it, - God expresses the highest wish that he possibly can; and establishes an institution and calls together a score, a hundred, and even hundreds of people to make that wish effective, - and then it cannot be done? That will never, never do. Then this requires first of all that each one who is connected with a sanitarium shall simply put everything out of his life

that can possibly keep back, hinder, or frustrate God's purpose of giving health to those who come.

Those who are in these institutions as God's instrumentalities can frustrate that thing. God's wish is as strong, his will is just the same, but by our lack of consecration he may not be able to reach with health the persons who come for health. Why was it that the light and salvation that he intended for the world did not reach the nations around Israel? Simply because the people to whom it was given as the means of reaching them, did not let the light shine forth. When the electric current is turned on, the light bulbs are full of blazing light; but if they are all smoked or covered with dust and cobwebs you know what the result would be. The light would be just as strong inside as it could be, but it could not get through. Clean them up; then the light can shine through.

God has health for the people who come to our sanitariums. His health can reach them only through his instrumentalities there. You can have your life so darkened with unbelief, so befogged with evil things, that God's health cannot reach them through you at all. God has health for the people, and it is his wish "above all things" that they shall have it. And shall the only reason that they do not have it, be that your attitude toward him hinders its reaching them? No, no. Brighten up that the light may so shine that the only reason for their not having it shall simply be that they will not take it. This calls for holiness on the part of every individual connected with these institutions. Holiness, - that is, wholeness: the whole being, body, soul, and spirit, devoted to this blessed work.

Now to present the Lord's prescribed means to health. Ex. 15:26: "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord that healeth thee." This was immediately after the crossing of the Red Sea. The first part of the chapter down to the twenty-first verse, is the song of their rejoicing at the Red Sea after their deliverance from Egypt. That physical Egypt is only a symbol of another and deeper Egypt. There is a spiritual as well as a physical Egypt. And this word to them who were brought out of Egypt is good for all time to the people whom God would bring out of Egypt: "Out of Egypt have I called my son."

Health signifies more than merely that I am not sick to-day. Health signifies more than merely freedom from disease at the present moment; it signifies also defense, security against disease. The Lord Jesus took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses, yet he was never sick. They brought the sick to him time after time; Sabbath days were constantly spent in healing the sick. There was something in that to the Lord Jesus; these were something that drew upon him. The record is, and it is true, "he took our sicknesses."

He also took our sins. Did he really? Or does his taking our sins signify that they go off into the air somewhere? Was he touched with the feeling of our infirmities? Did he feel that which was upon us? Surely he did. Then when he took our sins, that was real; he felt it. When my sins and your sins, the sins of which we were conscious, were upon me and upon you, there was a reality to them. There was condemnation upon us, there was guilt, and we felt it. Now

when my sins, the condemnation of which I realized, were laid upon him, did the condemnation and guilt burden him as really as they did me? Did he feel that? To be sure. Otherwise it was a mere figure. But

96

it did reach him; he took it and made intercession for it.

Now note: he took your sins, he took my sins, actually themselves, and yet he never sinned. He as really took our sicknesses, and why was he never sick? I call your attention to this that you may see the philosophy of Christian health; because there is as much difference between Christian health and heathen health as there is between Christian morals and heathen morals. God says in this verse, "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord that healeth thee." Now that does not signify that if we do his commandments, then the Lord *apart from that* will come in on the side and do something for us. No. Do this which the Lord directs, do this which is right in the sight of the Lord, and that itself is the way to health: health is found in that very thing and is the consequence of that thing.

Prov. 4:20-22 says in so many words that this is all so: "My son, attend to my words; incline thy ear unto my sayings. Let them not depart from thine eyes; keep them in the midst of thine heart. For they are life unto those that find them, and health to all their *spirit*"? - No; To all their *mind*? - No, but "to all their *flesh*." What is it that disease takes hold of? - The flesh. Sickness strikes the flesh. Then what is the way to health? - God's word received into the life, treasured in the heart, and allowed to be indeed the life because the word is life, - this is health to all the *flesh*. That is the Lord's own prescription, therefore it is a correct prescription.

## I

In the medical treating of disease what is it that does the curing? Suppose that on my hand there is a cut, a gash clear across and into the bone; and I come to the physician to have it bound up and mollified, and he does this. Does that heal it? - No. What really does the healing? - It is the wonderful working blood. But what is the particular thing in the blood that God uses to do the healing? - Life, life. If my blood is full of corruption, of poison, of death, because of the things I have been eating, will it heal? It will be an open, inflamed, and vicious sore for weeks, if it does not result in blood poisoning. But if the blood is a pure, bounding life current the cut heals in a very short time without being inflamed or sore at all. It is the life in the blood that does it. This is as true of a fever as any other disease as it is of a cut. As certainly as there is a sufficient supply of life, the disease is defeated. And this "sufficient supply of life," is simply another way of expressing the thought of the "power of resistance of disease."

Another verse, Prov. 14:30: "A sound heart is the life of the flesh." Very good. But the heart is not truly sound unless it is free from sin, and is bound up and is made whole in the holiness and righteousness of God.

Let us read those words again: "My son, attend to my words, . . . For they are life unto those that find them, and health to all their flesh." For they are what? "They are life unto those that find them, and health to all their flesh." Then that tells us that devotion to God, holiness of life, life derived from God through receiving his word and spirit of life - that is the true way to true health. Then when the people come for health to you or to the health institution where you are, what are you to give them that they may have health? - Life, life, the word of life. That is not too much to say. Oh, it is true that you and I, being called to be Christians, are literally to stand as channels of life from God to men.

And since life is health, and it is literally true that we are to stand between God and men, we shall be chan-

97

nels by which health shall reach them, and they shall know that it is come. To illustrate: John 5:24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." What is that for? What does he give eternal life to you and me for? - Not only for our own sakes, but also that we shall pass it on to them that have it not. For his life is the fountain of health and his word is "the word of life."

There is another passage that tells this same thing in another way. Deut. 7:12-14, "Wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these judgments, and keep, and do them, that the Lord thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers: and he will love thee, and bless thee, and multiply thee: he will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep, in the land which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee. Thou shalt be blessed above all people: there shall not be male or female barren among you, or among your cattle. And *the Lord will take away from thee all sickness*, and will put none of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, upon thee; but will lay them upon all them that hate thee."

He says, hearken to the word of God, and "thou shalt be blessed above all people." Now did he expect them to do that thing and then he would, apart from the word, do this thing? - No. In that way comes the blessing. Take that course and the consequence is that you will be blessed above all people. The way of the word of God, is the way to the things which God promises. So that those things which he promises are, in the nature of the case, consequences of our expecting the thing that he says and putting ourselves into the attitude to which he calls us.

"Without faith it is impossible to please God." "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." That which the word of God speaks to me cannot come to me unless I believe that thing in the word in which he speaks it. Now in this word, "the Lord will take away from thee all sickness," that blessing cannot come to me unless I take that word which says it, and expect that *through the word that says it*, that thing will come to me. That is faith.

To illustrate: the centurion came to Jesus one day saying, "Lord, my servant lieth at home, sick of the palsy." Jesus said "I will come and heal him." The centurion replied, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." His servant was miles away across the hills and valleys, and Jesus was here. But the

centurion said, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." Jesus said, "I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel." The centurion did not expect Jesus to go over there and speak to his servant. No. Speak the word *here*, and *there* it would be done. What would do it? That man expected that the word which Jesus would speak, should do the thing which Jesus would speak; that is faith.

We must not read in the word the precious promises of God, and then ask and expect him to send down to us, apart from that word, the thing promised. No. We read in the word the promise, and then we are to expect the things promised to come to us by that word in which it is spoken. Therefore, when he prescribes here the way to be free from all sickness, that is the way: and that thing can come to us only in the way that he has expressed, and our faith can receive it only through the words that he has spoken in which he tells that thing.

Why, then, are there so many Christians who are sick? Is it the fault of God, or the fault of those who are wondering why they do not have health when it is simply because they do not take it? The physician gives a prescription, and the patient usually takes it. When the physician makes a prescription, and the patient refuses to take it, he then takes the case into his own hands. Here our God gives prescriptions for good health. If people will not take the prescription, they take their cases into their own hands; and, of course, are responsible for the consequences. And there is no true ground

98

for their queries as to why they are continually sick.

This is true faith cure. For this truth of the forgiveness of sins and the peace of God as elements in the true treatment of disease, does not in any sense sanction the quackery of the so-called faith cures; that is too prevalent. Faith is in it: indeed it is all of faith, because the forgiveness of sins and the peace of God are known only by means of faith. But it is the "faith which works:" not an airy pigmentary notion called faith that prays and "believes" and then sits around and does nothing. It is the true faith which upon the word of God and the love of God teaches the forgiveness of sins, and there works most vigorously to reduce fevers, to eliminate poisons, and diligently to search out the physical causes of the sickness in order that these causes shall with the sins be forever abandoned, and the true way of true health, which is inseparable from holiness, be faithfully followed in the future.

The scriptures cited are sufficient upon that one thought, that God's word contains the remedy for disease. Another one will I repeat: "He sent his word and healed them." Ps. 107:20. That emphasizes the fact that God's word, in the prescription that he has given, is the way to health.

## II

Suppose that Adam and Eve and all mankind from the beginning, had received the word of God as it is, and had not turned aside to the right or to the left, had set their thoughts and hearts upon it, had received it and continued to conform to it, would there ever have been any sickness in the world? -

Impossible. Then since it is literally true that if men had conformed to God's word from the first there never could have been any sickness in the world, it follows that the way from sickness and disease to health is in receiving the word and conforming to every item of it. That is the truth.

The history of the deliverance of the children of Israel is altogether different from what it should have been. Well, then, since that is so, and he gave to them precisely the same thing that he gave to man in the beginning, if Israel had received it the results would have been far different.

Another prescription: "And the inhabitants shall not say, I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." Isa. 33:24. That says that the forgiveness of iniquity is the way to deliverance from sickness. The forgiveness of iniquity is an element in the recovery from disease.

Another prescription: "I create the fruit of the lips; Peace, peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord; and I will heal him. But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." Then the peace of God which comes in the forgiveness of iniquity and the restoration of the soul to righteousness, to holiness, - that peace which comes thus is shown by this verse to be an element in the recovery from disease, is an element in health, is a right of way to health.

"Peace, peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord; and I will heal him." There is not a physician in this world, though he be a downright atheist, who will not say to you that a disturbed mind, a troubled heart, a perplexed life, is a hindrance to success in whatever he may do to help a person to recover from disease; and that peace of mind and quietness of heart is a positive help. Very good; that which every physician admits to be a positive help, God provides in perfection: "Peace, peace, saith the Lord, . . . and I will heal them." And when a person has that "peace of God which passeth all understanding," and it is necessary to take treatments, then all the treatments that are prescribed after God's way will be a means to health.

"The peace of God which passeth all understanding shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."

99

Again it is written, "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life." The peace of God can keep your heart in order that out of it shall be indeed the issues of life and peace and health. Thus Bible health means not only that I am not sick to-day, but that I am defended against disease.

Another divine prescription [*sic.*]: "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine." Prov. 17:22. The marginal reading of medicine is "healing." "A merry heart," does not mean a foolish, giddy heart. It means the heart that is cheerful, peaceful, and glad in the Lord - the heart that God gives. "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." "In me ye shall have peace." He has met the perplexities; he has met all the difficulties that there are in the world. He has conquered them all, and in him ye shall have peace. Thus a merry heart, Christian good cheer, doeth good like a medicine.

God's way of healing is a sound one: "Physician, heal thyself." God's way of treating disease is such that the doctor can take the medicine first and then recommend it to others. How many of the physicians of the world can first take the medicine which they prescribe? God's medicine can be taken by the physician [sic.] so that he can stand before the people and recommend it for the value that he personally knows is in it.

Another prescription: "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh? Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily: and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward." Isa. 58:6-8. This is a divine prescription for health; for sick people who want to get well. Receive the word of God, receive forgiveness of sins, receive the peace of God, then the good that you have received, pass it on to the people who know it not. Thus your health shall spring forth speedily.

Jesus was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, and went about doing good; for God was with him, to undo heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke. See how exactly that is what Jesus did. He went into the synagogue; he opened the Book and found the place where it was written, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." Isa. 61:1. Then he closed the book, gave it to the minister, sat down, and said, "This day is the scripture fulfilled in your ears." And they brought their sick unto him, and he healed them every one.

Brothers and sisters, fellow-workers, all people, please study this for your life; for it is your life. Study these scriptures and receive them; for this is for your health. Then recommend it and by Christian ministry pass it on to all people. "God be merciful unto us, and bless us; and cause his face to shine upon us." What for? What is the object? "That thy way may be known upon the earth, thy saving health among all nations." Ps. 67:1, 2. What is his saving health? - His blessing unto his people, and the light of his countenance upon us. That gives saving health.

Then God be merciful unto us and bless us, and cause his face to shine upon us to-day, that his way may be known by us on earth, and his saving health to all people on the earth.

**June 1903**

**"Address by Alonzo T. Jones" *The Medical Missionary* 12, 5 , pp. 145-147.**

"EVERY house is builded by some man; but he that built all things is God." When God had built all things, as the crown of creation he formed man. This creation of man was nothing less than the building of a temple in which the Lord himself might dwell, which he might fill with his glory, and in which he alone should be glorified.

But, as illustrated in that other and typical temple of later times - the temple built by Solomon - this first temple was perverted to base and idolatrous uses, to defiling and profane purposes. Man yielded himself to the service of sin and Satan. And thus the temple which God had built to the glory of himself, and to be the place of his own recognized and supreme presence, was debased and defiled by the presence of the spirit of the evil one. But God had not built this temple for any such use. Therefore he gave himself to redeem mankind, to restore to its true place and uses the desecrated and debased temple, that it should again stand in the true Light reflecting the glory of the real presence of him who would dwell within.

As man was created he was perfect and upright: perfect in mind and body, as well as upright in soul and spirit. But sin subverted and destroyed it all. With sin there came sickness and disease as well as death. And when the Creator would redeem, he became the Redeemer from sickness and disease as well as from sin and death. Accordingly when he came down to deliver his people from Egypt, the land of sin and bondage, and so to show to benighted mankind the way of deliverance from all sin and bondage, the very first revelation that he made after their son of deliverance at the Red Sea, was the revelation of the way of deliverance from disease, the revelation of himself as "the Lord that healed thee." This thought was ever held and continued throughout his revelation, even to the latest writer of the Bible by whom he has recorded this best of all possible wishes: "I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth."

Christ, the great center of divinity and humanity; Christ the Saviour of the world, struck this same blessed note, for "himself took our infirmities and bear our sicknesses;" and he set this blessed example for his church to the ends of the world, for "anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power," he not only "went about doing good" but also "healing all that were oppressed of the devil." And so "the whole multitude sought to touch him, for there went virtue out of him and healed them all."

Thus God's gift of saving health - the knowledge of the way of deliverance from disease, of the true way of health, and of God as the true healer - was at the beginning bestowed upon his church for all mankind, and in Christ

146

was confirmed unto his church for all mankind and for all ages.

But courting and adopting the so-called philosophy and science of the world, the church forgot this mighty truth, and lost this gracious, precious gift of God. Instead of prizing or even remembering the wonderful work of God in building this temple of the human body, or his revealed will and wish concerning the care and preservation of it, the soul was made the all in all, while the body was despised, neglected, afflicted, and starved as the base and wicked chief hindrance to the

"immortal soul" in its philosophic heavenly aspirations. This to the extent that the chiefest saints were held to be those who most despised, neglected, and afflicted the body, and had the least possible respect or use for it.

But such is not the way of God. Such is not Christianity. Such is not the truth and the gift committed to the church of Christ. No. "Ye are the temple of the living God, for God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them . . . Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean. . . Wherefore . . . let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. . . . Wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these judgments, and keep, and do them, that the Lord thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he swore unto thy fathers. . . . And the Lord will take away from thee all sickness, and will put none of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, upon thee." "I am the Lord that healeth thee."

This divine truth which God gave to his church immediately upon delivering her from Egypt - from sin and bondage - he will never allow to be lost nor perpetually to be made little of. God still has a church - a special people - in the world: and by that church he will still make known the truth and the gift of his saving health among all nations. And this building in which we are here assembled to-day to dedicate to God, this building with all who shall be connected with it, and the church which is back of it, is intended to be only the means of making known to all people, even to the ends of the earth and the end of the world, God's message and blessing of saving health.

And so, to-day, as we stand here to dedicate this grand temple of health, let all understand, as we are only glad to announce to all, that the only purpose of its being on earth, the only purpose for which it is dedicated to God, is that to the fullest possible extent it shall be a means of bringing every soul on earth to the place where he will stand with God in Jesus Christ, a living temple of health to the glory of God.

Prof. M. V. O'Shea, of the University of Wisconsin, gave a masterly address showing the intimate relation that exists between the physical, mental, and moral nature of men, and pointing out the development that is taking place in methods of education as well as in the treatment of disease. He claimed that cheerfulness of spirit was a necessary condition in restoring or retaining health. A high tribute of appreciation of the spirit that pervades the Sanitarium and touches all who come within its reach, was paid by the speaker, who closed by wishing for the institution even greater prosperity than in the past. He said: "One feels the better side of things here; he feels the unselfishness of those who seek to help him, and their genuineness, he feels their devotion to higher ideals, and their trust in things good and true, and this healthful, harmonious feeling becomes contagious. Out in the world are struggle and tension, selfishness and avarice, and one whose soul is afflicted with these diseases will have a corrupt body as well. Health is simply the harmony of the organism with its environments. This is the lesson taught by this institution and practised by all who have adopted its principles."

Prof. F. N. Scott, of the University of Michigan, was in early young manhood a member of the Sanitarium family as private secretary to Dr. Kellogg. He

147

improved this opportunity to discharge what he considered a twofold debt laid upon him by the benefits of the institution and by a personal association with its principles and those who cherish them.

Hon. E. C. Nichols, one of Battle Creek's leading and most honored citizens, spoke at some length in high appreciation of what had been achieved from so small a beginning. He spoke feelingly of the triumph of the principles embraced in the work of the Sanitarium, in that they had risen from a place of ridicule and almost contempt to command the respect of all classes, and had made the name and reputation of Battle Creek famous throughout the world. Mr. Nichols adduced the testimony of a celebrated scientist, a familiar friend of his own, who had often referred to the work done in the analyzing and demonstrating laboratories of the Sanitarium as being in advance of anything accomplished elsewhere either in the New or Old World.

Mr. Nichols was followed by another prominent citizen of Battle Creek, Hon. S. O. Bush, who spoke in terms of warm congratulation to those who had wrought so successfully in erecting the splendid edifice which they were now dedicating for service. He also congratulated the city in having such an institution in its midst. He exhorted his fellow-citizens to do all in their power to encourage those who have such a noble work in hand. "Let us each," said the speaker, "have goodly words to say in its favor instead of ill-omened words."

Mayor Webb spoke kindly words of appreciation on his own behalf as well as that of the city. What seemed at first to be an irreparable disaster had proved to be a blessing in disguise since it had resulted in the erection of a building so superior to the old one, so in advance of any other of its kind. He referred to the heroism displayed by the employees on the night of the fires as a record that any city should be proud of. He bade the Sanitarium God-speed in its work.

Hon. Washington Gardner addressed the people at some length in his usual telling manner. He perceived coming into our public and private life a spirit of compassion as manifested in the beneficent care of the State for its dependent and unfortunate classes. There is more regard of man for man. "We are," said the speaker, "now in the presence of an institution unique in its character for disinterested benevolence, that has built up its work and carried it on without money or profit to the individual. We have with us those who have labored to carry on this work until it has become known in every part of the world. What an inspiration for a young man! The opportunities are not all in the past. They are still here. They lie all along the pathway of our youth. Seize them, young man."

Judge Arthur spoke from the standpoint of a member of the Sanitarium family. He told us of his dismay and tears at seeing the destruction of the former building when it seemed that the angry flames would not leave anything from which the work could have a resurrection. And then he told how hope and faith sprang up at the thought that the sanitarium was not burned and could not be burned, as it was the work of God, and God's work could not perish. In the midst of the destruction a frail woman waited in here room for someone to come to her

rescue. At last the faithful nurse came and said with surprise, "Why, are you still here in the building?" And the feeble patient answered calmly, "I was perfectly assured, for I knew God is here, and that I should be taken care of." They went to the fire-escape and out of the falling building, and she was probably the last lady to come out of the fire. "The knowledge of this faith strengthened me," the speaker said. And as he looked upon the platform of truth upon which the work of the Sanitarium is built he saw it could not be devoured by fire.

Dr. J. F. Morse of the Sanitarium faculty spoke briefly of the comfort and encouragement that had come to the workers in the hour of their great trial, and in times of the severest anxiety, from the helpful words and generous deeds of those who were their friends.

148

"The things we are doing and saying to-day do not dedicate this work. The completeness with which the work and principles here represented enter into our hearts determines to us the meaning of dedication day. If from this time forth our lives shall contain more that is helpful, the loving word, the kindly greeting, the deeds that lift up the down cast soul, then this will indeed be a day of dedication."

Dr. Chas. E. Steward made a clear statement concerning the destruction of the old building and the construction of the new. He spoke of the providential deliverance of the helpless people from the fire and of the task of reinstating the broken-up family. Notwithstanding the great calamity the work had gone forward with much greater success than had been expected under such circumstances. Dr. Steward as a member of the building committee gave an interesting account of the vast amount of material and labor required to construct the building, and concluded with a hearty expression of thanks to those who had so nobly assisted in the great task.

The concluding speech of the occasion was by J. H. Kellogg, M. D., the superintendent of the Sanitarium. Of this we are pleased to present quite a full outline: -

## **August 1903**

**"Religion and Health" *The Medical Missionary* 12, 8 , pp. 198-200.**

A. T. JONES

THE relationship between religion and health as it truly is, is to-day very little understood, even by the religious. In this, of course we consider only the religion of the Bible, and I intend to call attention to just a few statements that have a direct bearing upon this subject, and that announce the very principles that are recognized by physicians everywhere as being an essential to recovery from disease, and to good health.

For instance, one passage of scripture reads: "Peace, peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord; and I will heal him. The wicked are like the troubled sea which cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked," thus showing that peace - the peace of God - has a place and a bearing in healing. "Peace, peace, . . . saith the Lord: and I will heal him." Isa. 57:19-21.

Another: "The inhabitant shall not say, I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." Isa. 33:24. Thus the Scriptures reveal to us the fact that forgiveness of iniquity has a place in recovery from sickness, - "The inhabitant shall not say, 'I am sick:' [because] "the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." The forgiveness of sin and the peace of God which come to the heart, each of these, and one with the other, are both announced in the Word of God in direct connection with health. What physician is there in the world, even though he be an avowed atheist, who does not hold and teach that peace of mind, quietness of heart

199

and a quiet life are a direct element in recovery from sickness? What physician will not tell you that a disturbed mind, a restless heart, and unquiet life are a direct hindrance to any one's recovery from sickness? Consequently the Bible presents it to us that there is a direct, specific connection made by the Lord in his Word between his religion and health.

Then, the Scriptures say to us, "Take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? Or What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? . . . your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." "Take . . . no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought . . . of itself." "Casting all your care upon him, for he careth for you." These words teach us this very trust in God, this perfect rest in the Lord, which takes away all anxiety, and that itself is an element of good health in recovery from sickness.

Again: What is a greater element of health in recovery from sickness, even, than good cheer? What has the Lord said? - "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." So, in all the perplexities of life, under all the burdens that may come, in all the distresses that we may meet, here is this prescription by the Lord, "Be of good cheer." And when that is received by each one, the good cheer which comes by that word of the Lord, the blessing of the Spirit of God which brings good cheer, peace, quietness, rest in the Lord, the peace that passeth all understanding, - when these reign in the life, you have the way to health.

Another scripture: "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine" - not a silly, giddy, thoughtless heart, but, as I once saw it expressed in an inscription in a dining-hall, "Eat, drink, and be merry, but not foolish." That is the thought, - not a foolish heart, not a silly, giddy, thoughtless heart, but a heart of good cheer, - "it doeth good like a medicine." And that is the "medicine" that the Scripture prescribes for us. I could occupy much more space citing scripture after scripture, all revealing to us the fact that the Word of God, the religion of the Bible the religion of Jesus Christ, is intended to be the direct way, the "open sesame" to health. And all show that over and over in the Scriptures, the Lord has united religion and health.

Another scripture: "I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health." And the Lord represents himself as "The Lord that healeth thee." What higher wish could possibly be presented to the human mind than this, "I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth."

But the great mischief with the professed religious world is, that they do not enjoy good cheer, they do not have as an element in life that peace which passeth all understanding, that lifts the Christian above all troubles and distresses, that connects him with heaven, and that brings down the joy of the Lord from heaven, giving the peace that passeth all understanding, and thus making it a privilege and a blessing only to live.

See how many professed Christians go about with downcast eyes, with long faces and doleful voices. Anybody can do that, - a heathen can do that, especially in this world where we have troubles, trials, and distresses. But Christians are connected with the Source of joy, the Fountain of peace and of good cheer, and consequently Christians are, in this world, to receive from heaven a constant flow of peace, joy, and good cheer, and, with cheery voices, bright eyes, and pleasant faces, to pass it all along to those who do not know this heavenly connection, so that these can see that there is an everlasting blessing and only good in the religion of Jesus Christ, so that they shall want it. It is open and free to everybody.

And so, in conclusion, I will quote a verse that tells the whole story in a few words, - Romans 15:13. "Now the God of hope fill you with joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost." There are multitudes of people who go through the world downcast and despairing. But there are Christians on every hand whom the Lord has placed in the world for the

200

express purpose of being filled with all joy and peace and abundance of hope, that they shall pass these along to the hopeless, the sorrowing, and the despairing.

O then, Christians, let us all rise to the position that belongs to us as Christians, receiving from the Fountain of life in heaven the joy, the peace, and good cheer that belong to Christians, and pass them on to a sorrowing world in order that God's saving health may be known among all nations and kindreds of the earth.

**October 1903**

**"The Power of His Word" *The Medical Missionary* 12, 10 , pp. 250-252.**

A. T. JONES

IT is the Word that makes a Christian. Without it there can be no Christianity; we cannot warp ourselves around or dress ourselves up so as to be Christians;

Christianity comes by the Word of God. It was the Word of God that made Jesus what he was in the world, in the flesh; and that Word received, will make people just like Jesus in the world, and in the flesh. We should not think that there is any less for us in the world than there was for Jesus when he was in the world. Everything that God ever gave to Jesus when he was in the world, is just as freely given to you and me, and we are never to think that God loved him any more than he loves you and me. It would not help us any for Him to come down and live in this world on a plane that we never could reach.

"In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." (Heb. 2:17, 18.) "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." (Heb. 4:15.) This certifies to every one of us that He could be tempted in all points just as we are tempted, and yet without sin, and that is no more true of him than of you and me. The power that enabled Jesus to live without sin in this world, is a power that will protect us in this world in the midst of all these temptations.

But what was he in the world? - "The Word was made flesh." The Word of God was here, in the Scriptures before Christ came, - it was in book form. When Jesus came, the same Word was here in human form; that is all the difference. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." In the seventeenth psalm, fourth verse, we read his own words: "By the word of thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer." Now that is no more to Him than it is to you and me; that word belongs to you and me exactly as it did to him, and it is for you and me to say to the Author of the Word of God, "By the word of thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer."

251

Not only that, but in 2 Thes. 2:13, is this word: "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." Jesus answered the question of the man who asked him, "What shall I do that I might work the works of God?" This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." When we believe on him whom God has sent, that Word effectually works in us; that is the work of God, working by his word. Do not forget that God never does anything except by his word; he cannot do anything in your life except by his word.

Note this word a little further: "When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God." Suppose I receive the Word of God as the word of man; what would it be to me? Only the word of man; when I receive the Word of God as the word of man, it becomes simply the word of man, and that is all I get out of it. The word of man has no power; it can do nothing for us; it is the Word of God that has power, and therefore we must receive the Word of God, not as the word of man, but as the Word of God.

Let us see what is the distinction: The Word of God, we say, is creative. "He spake, and it was done." In the first chapter of Genesis we read that when he said, "Let there be light," it was so; when he said, "Let there be a firmament," it was so; when he said, "Let the earth bring forth seed," it was so. Every word that He spoke was so.

That is the virtue of the Word of God; when that word is spoken, it is so. But you know it is not always that way when a man speaks. You have heard men say things that were not true. Therefore you see that the reason why men can lie is that they say things that are not so, and the reason that God cannot lie is that he cannot say anything that is not so, for his very saying it, produces the thing.

God does not say that the thing shall be, and then take some other means to accomplish that thing. A man can speak and say that such and such a thing shall be, but he must do something to make that word produce the thing that is spoken. Not so with the word of God; when the word of God is spoken, that word produces the thing in itself.

Suppose a man had said to you, "I will do so and so." You say, "Very good, I accept that; now be as good as your word, - do it." This is right when spoken to a man; but perhaps you have said that same thing to God. You have read in the Bible where God said he would do certain things for you. You said to him, "Be as good as your word, - do it." Haven't you?

It is written, "The entrance of thy word giveth light." And again, "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." (2 Cor. 4:6.) God hath done it. How did he do it? - For he "commanded the light to shine out of darkness." Shall we ask Him to do a thing that he says he has done? Let me illustrate this: It is written in the Scriptures that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son." How would it do for you to ask God to do that. It would be implying that God would not do what he says he has done. When he says the light which shined "out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," that is so. We can say, "Amen, Lord," and let the light shine in. Then your life will be full of light shining in the face of Jesus Christ - reflected light; then you will delight in his light. And so, "We all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." (2 Cor. 3:18.) By the way, that says, "Beholding as in a glass" - as in a mirror - "the glory of the Lord." When you look in a mirror, and look straight before you, you see

252

everything that is behind you. Now, looking in the face of Christ, as in a mirror, you do not turn around to see anything; you see the whole thing by looking straight in the mirror. I would a good deal rather see what is behind me by looking straight ahead in the face of Christ Jesus than to turn my back on Jesus Christ, - look at self alone.

Further, as to what he has done; and remember that when he says he has done it, it is so. "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light." Does it read, will make "us fit to

be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light"? No; he "*hath* made us fit." Are you fit to be a partaker of the "inheritance of the saints in light"?

"Let God be true, though every man become a liar;" because a man can lie, and God cannot. Then why should you not accept it? Christianity does not come by what we do, or what we say, or how we fix things up to better ourselves. Christianity comes by what God has done for every soul on earth, and he has done sufficient to save every soul on earth. When he gave Jesus Christ, he gave everything; when that was done, everything was done; and he never had to do a single new thing to save very soul on earth. There is nothing new to be done; it is only what he has done; when he says he has done it, that is eternally so.

## November 1903

**"God's Spell" *The Medical Missionary* 12, 11 , pp. 272, 273.**

A. T. JONES

THE influence of sin is hypnotic. People who are sinners, in the face of all that God has given them, act as if they were hypnotized, and that is what they are; because a person that is hypnotized, imagines he sees things that are not so. I once saw a man come down off a platform, walk through the audience, snapping his fingers in people's faces, and one after another got right up and followed after him, - a whole string of people followed him right up on to the platform, and there he had them all circled round him like a ringmaster. One would go through a trapeze performance, and another would sit on the back of a chair; they were in a circus, and having a most gleeful time, until he brought them out of the spell. Now there was nothing in all this but imagination, but they saw all that they acted out.

Come back to the beginning of that thing in this world. God set man in the garden of Eden, and said to him, There is a tree, and "thou shalt not eat of it." Then came another, and said, "Has God told you not to eat of the trees of the garden?" The woman said, "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die; for

273

God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat." (Gen. 3:2-7.) She saw what was not so; she was hypnotized. So we see that the influence of sin is hypnotic, and it is hypnotism that has ruined this world. This world was hypnotized by sin, and Satan is the great hypnotizer. The whole system of mesmerism and hypnotism and all its performances are simply phases of the same Satanic work that came in with sin in the beginning.

People act directly against themselves. When God has spoken, it is so, whether man will accept it or not. Often he will not accept it and have the benefit of it, when it is there for him all the time, whether he believes it or not. Now where is this hypnotic spell of Satan - the spell of sin - and mankind is under it. But God has a "spell," and that spell has broken Satan's spell. God's spell is the gospel (originally "God's-spell"). God's spell was brought to bear to break Satan's spell, - and God's spell is the gospel, which is given in Christ, and through Christ the hypnotic spell of sin is broken, and men are delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Satan's spell is bondage, while God's spell is life and liberty and eternal joy and glory. Satan's spell is death and eternal ruin.

There is creative power in the word of God, - "He spake, and it was." When the Bible is to us, by faith a creative power, it works in us the thing it says. Then reading the Bible becomes a glorious pleasure, for we are reading life into ourselves. We are reading life into our souls, for "the word of God worketh effectually in you that believe." "For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." (Isa. 55:10, 11.) It is not *you* shall accomplish that which I please, but "*it* shall accomplish that which I please."

You know of some failing in your life that you have been trying to overcome, but you have failed, and you have almost despaired, and do not know what to do. Read in the Bible till you find the word of God that speaks to you on that subject, - and you will find that word speaking to you on that subject, - and there is your deliverance; for that word spoken, produces in you that divine power which delivers you from that failing. That is the perfection of the Bible. The Bible is human experience written out, and there is not a single experience of man that is not written out in the Bible. You should study the Bible from beginning to end, and then, if you find something in your life that comes short, the Word of God will bring it out, and that very word will deliver you. There is the word of God spoken, and there is new life created by divine power, and you have victory over that besetment. That is the power of God through Christ, and thus we are created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works.

**December 1903**

**"Living for God" *The Medical Missionary* 12, 12 , pp. 302-305.**

A. T. JONES

"AND all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are

ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. 5:18-21.

This scripture represents us as standing in this world in Christ's stead. He was here in the flesh; he fulfilled God's purpose and ascended to heaven, and left the believers to occupy the place which he occupied while here. That is what it means to bear the name of Christian, to profess the name of Christ.

Christ was sent as the Saviour of the world, to show to the world what God is: that it is his work to save, not to destroy; to life up, not to cast down. It is therefore proper for us to study what God is, how he acts toward men, in order that we shall know what disposition must be manifested toward men by us in this world.

When Christ was born into the world in Bethlehem, the fact was announced to the shepherds by the angel in these words: "Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people, for unto you is born this day in the city of David a

304

Saviour which is Christ the Lord. And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, *peace, good will* to men."

Then the first words spoken concerning Christianity, the first enunciation of it in the world, was in these words, "Peace on earth, good will to men." And only that is Christianity forever. Since that is God's mind, his thought, his will, his wish, and we are his representatives in the world, it follows that the only disposition that should ever be found in any person bearing the name of Christian, is peace - peace on earth, good will - good will to all mankind wheresoever he may meet them, either inside or outside the church.

According to the text, the commission give to us, his disciples, is "the ministry of reconciliation;" and that alone. But how can we carry to men this ministry if there be found in our works, in our disposition, our conduct, anything that would repel, that would offend, that would act otherwise than to reconcile to God?

In the second verse of the text there is another thought introduced: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, *not imputing their trespasses* unto them." Then since God so manifested himself in the flesh of Christ, and we are here in Christ's stead, it follows that there is not to be seen in me or you or anyone professing the name of Christ, anything that would imply or suggest to any man that we are imputing his trespasses unto him, counting him guilty, or treating him as if condemned.

God is love, and only love, so when God is manifest in the flesh, - *in us*, - only love will be manifested by us. And God so loved the world, wicked and sunken as men are - from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot filled with wounds and bruises and putrifying sores so that there is no soundness whatever in them; all gone out of the way, their throat an open sepulcher and under their tongues the poison of asps, no fear of God before their eyes - he so loved them in this condition that he gave his only begotten Son to save them, trusting, depending

upon that true and pure love to win from those enemies all the returns that could come. That is true love always, whether it be human or divine. It has enough confidence in itself to spend itself, and depend upon its own power to win returns. That love is the love of God, and by the Holy Ghost it is given to every believer, shed abroad in his heart, to be manifested to the world.

One day there came to Jesus come Pharisees, professors of religion (the religion of self, though professedly the religion of God), seeking to entrap the Saviour in his words. They had, by spying about, discovered someone guilty of an overt act of transgression, and they brought the guilty one to him - a woman, guilty, self-condemned, ashamed. They quoted scripture: "Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned; what sayest thou?" The answer came, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." Then he stooped down to write in the sand, and one by one they went out, and when only himself and the guilty one were left, he asked, "Hath no man condemned thee?" She replied, "No man, Lord." "Neither do I," was the answer of compassion.

Now remember we are studying the gospel, we are studying what you and I are by our profession, what we should practice, and what by our example, thank the Lord, we can be. Did Christ rail upon the woman and charge her to beware how she committed further offense? No. "Hath no man condemned thee?" "No man, Lord." "Neither do I condemn thee. Go, sin no more." And there was more power in his words thus spoken without condemnation, but in genuine mercy and love, to save that woman from sinning and to encourage her in the way of right than in all the condemning words of all the Pharisees in Jerusalem and the United States put together.

Again: There were twelve disciples. One of them was a devil from the beginning. For three and a half years he was with Jesus, and Jesus knew his heart, and knew what at the end he

305

would do. That last night when they sat together at the table when Jesus said, "One of you shall betray me," not a single one of the other eleven even suspected Judas, but suspected themselves instead; and when at last Jesus said to Judas, "What thou doest, do quickly," and he got up and went out, they thought he had gone to buy something for the feast. The lesson in this is, that Jesus, while he knew the guilt of Judas, yet in all his association with him had never by word or look or intimation given the other disciples ground even to suspect that Judas was not as straight as anyone. And when at last Judas did finally wrench himself away from such treatment as that, and did plunge over, he was compelled by that very life of Christ which he knew, to go to the very ones into whose hands he had betrayed the Saviour and say, "I have betrayed innocent blood; I have lied, this whole thing is a fraud; that man is not what I have told you he is." But suppose that Jesus had by intimation or word or by a single act revealed to the others the character of Judas, then Judas would have said, "I know I am not right - I know I have done wrong, but he didn't treat me right." He would have had that justification of his course; but as it was, he stood without excuse.

These lessons are written as an example of what Christianity really is. They are written for our understanding, and let us understand them. The trouble with Christians is that they have not enough confidence in the love of God which they profess, to put their dependence upon that love to win guilty people to a better course. If that love will not win them, nothing else will.

We are in the day when we know it is promised that the mystery of God shall be finished, and with no more delay. The mystery of God finished, is God fully manifest in the life of the believer. Only God is to be seen there, none of our own ways; only peace, only good will to all mankind; only the treatment that Christ gave to men.

## **The Medical Missionary, Vol. 13 (1904)**

**January 1904**

**"Address to the Graduating Class of Missionary Nurses" *The Medical Missionary* 13, 1 , pp. 302-305.**

ALONZO T. JONES

(December 22, 1903.)

IN the little time through the busy affairs of the day that I had in which to think of what would be best to say to you to-night, it occurred to my mind that somewhere in one of Paul's letters, the nurse had been mentioned, and I took up my Bible to find the place where the nurse is mentioned, and I found that it gives such an excellent description of what the nurse is, what the character of the nurse must be, that I concluded I could do nothing better to begin my address this evening than to read that description, and if any remarks need to be made a little further upon it afterward, then let that follow. And, by the way, this is a description, you will see as I read, of the missionary nurse, the Christian nurse. It is in First Thessalonians, second chapter, fourth verse to the eighth: -

"But as we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts. For neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a cloak of covetousness; God is witness: nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor yet of others, when we might have been burdensome, as the apostles of Christ."

All that they were not; this is what they were: "But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse."

There is what the nurse is not, and there is what the nurse is; what the nurse does not do, and, with the following words, what the nurse does

16

do; what the nurse is not in the world for, and what the nurse is in the world for. Let me read again:

"For neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a cloak of covetousness; God is witness: nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor yet

of others, when we might have been burdensome, as the apostles of Christ. But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children; so" - even as a nurse - "being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were dear unto us."

That shows the care, the affectionate air, the devotion, that characterise the nurse - such devotion as stops not for life; such devotion as will wear out the life and given even the life itself for others, helping them in the way, and working that they may be benefited. I know of no profession, apart from that of the physician, that calls for such absolute devotion of the whole being, all the time, as does the profession of the nurse. The profession of the physician requires such devotion as that the call of need, the call of humanity, the call of the wick, the call of the suffering, takes precedence of everything else; and it can never be refused for any reason short of absolute inability to go. The physician who is called at night, or at all hours of the night, must go if he is at all able to go. So with the nurse; no nurse can any more refuse the call of sickness or suffering than can the physician. And the profession of the nurse, as the profession of the physician, calls for just such devotion as that, when the profession is taken up.

And now that these persons have taken the profession of the nurse, have finished the course that prepares you to be nurses, now is the time that you have to put yourselves, and are putting yourselves, on record before the public that you in taking that profession have devoted yourselves absolutely to the calls of the suffering and the needy. You never can refuse a call to go, when it is possible for you to go. To do so would be unfaithfulness to the extent of treason to the profession to which you have given yourselves. And this being so of the nurse, whatever his standing may be as a Christian, that is the call that is made upon the person who takes upon himself the profession of the nurse.

But who can fulfil that call of devotion that devolves upon the profession of the nurse, but the Christian? As I read here, the very symbol, the very chief characteristic that is given to the nurse, is gentleness. Oh, how gently must the hand be moved; how gently must every motion be made in the sick room. As one dying of consumption, who had called me to visit and to pray with her in the long period of suffering, in her last talk said: "Oh, I would like to recover from this sickness; I would like to be made well; for if I could I would give myself to be a nurse. I should know so well just how to do. I should know just where to put my hand. I should know so well just how to lift a person in my condition, for instance. It seems to me I could do it so well, since knowing where the aches are and where the tired place is, and I could put my hand there and soothe it."

Now that was the right conception of the place of the nurse. It has been an illustration to me ever since, of just what is the nurse's work. And, as I say, when I read here, the very symbol of the nurse, and the only fit phrase that the Bible could use is "gentle among you even as a nurse" is gentle and cherishes, gently touches, kindly smooths and soothes the brow, moves about gently, kindly, with all Christian spirit - who can be so true a nurse as the Christian who is connected with the very Fountain of gentleness, the very chief, yes, the One of whom it is

written that He "loved the church and gave Himself for it, and nourisheth it and cherisheth it" in the same way.

You may have almighty power at your disposal, at your call, to assist you, to aid you, to carry you through, in your devotion to the needs of humanity. And so I can ask no better thing for you than this which I read: -

"For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . that he would grant you according to the riches of his glory, to

17

be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the length, and breadth, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Never for a moment forget that this is your gift; this is the wish of God for each one of you, that you may be equipped, made strong, and supplied always and in every crisis with that which will carry you through without failing, and to make you efficient, thorough helpers all the time and in every time of need.

## **April 1904**

**"How to Will, and to Do" *The Medical Missionary* 13, 4 , pp. 113, 114.**

ALONZO T. JONES

TEMPERANCE is self-control. The word of God inculcates temperance "in all things." To be temperate, a man must have self-control, he must be master of himself in all things. It follows from this that if a man will be master of himself in all things, he must have the full use of his own will. Paul simply expressed the experience of the human race when he said, "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." Rom. 7:18. Every man is ready to, and does, will to do certain things, but he can not hold himself up to the height of his will. He resolves to do many things, but can not hold himself to his resolution. To will to do better is ever present with every man, but they do not do better. How to perform that which their own better judgment, and their honest convictions, tell them is the right thing to do, is what they do not find.

The sole trouble about all this failure is that men have not the full use of their own will. Evil habits and intemperate practices destroy the strength of the will; they render impotent the power to perform that to which the mind readily assents as being right and proper. To convince men of what is right is ever the easiest task of the reformer; while the hardest task is always to bring them up to the place where they will do that which they know to be right. With temperance workers, it is not at all difficult to convince men that the use of alcohol is injurious, and that the only right thing to do is to let it entirely alone; but the great task is to let it entirely and forever alone. It is not at all difficult to convince men that the use of tobacco is only injurious and that continually, without one redeeming

quality; but it is the hardest kind of a task to get them to quit it, even when they themselves confess that they ought to quit it. It is so also with the man or woman who uses tea, coffee, arsenic or morphine, or who is addicted to any wrong habit whatever.

And yet all are ready to say, "Oh, I *could* quit it if I only would!" Yes, that is true, but they don't. As one old gentleman expressed it, who had been an inveterate user of tobacco, and had at last really quit: "I always said I could quit it if I would, but I *couldn't would*." In that single expression there lies couched whole volumes of philosophy. Men can quit evil habits if they will, but they can't will. Men can do right if they only will, but they can't will. They can say "I will," but they can't *do* "I will."

This truth was excellently illustrated in an article in the sanitary columns of the New York *Independent*, a few years ago. In discussing the subject of "Stimulants and Narcotics as Related to Health," the writer referred to those who have become enslaved by the use of these things, and then remarked: -

"If ever we have seen sadness in this world, it is in the case of those who are conscious of this enthralling enchantment and yet feel unable to extricate themselves from the wiles of the adversary. . . . We do not believe anything has happened to us over and above the experience of most practitioners; yet we almost shudder to recall instance after instance where life has been burdened with this direful deceit, and whole families involved in this secret malady. The remedies are few *unless the will itself is rallied to a high determination, and then for a time fortified and affiliated with another will stronger than itself*."

This is true. And whether the remedies be many or few, this is the *only* one that is sure. But it is also true that with no human will can any will be fortified or affiliated in any adequate degree whatever. A stronger human will may be found, and by it the weak will may be fortified in a certain sense by personal encouragement and watchful influence; but this, only while that stronger will is present. But even then there can be no such affiliation of wills as that the weaker will shall be really

114

vitalized from the energy of the stronger. That is an impossible relationship between human wills. Under such circumstances the most that can possibly be done, is that the weaker will shall be encouraged and guarded by the stronger until it shall of itself recover its wasted energies. But that is not enough, by far, and therefore such a remedy can never be certain in its results.

Far more than that is required if the wasted energies of the will are ever to be restored. What is required is that the stronger will shall be one that can be ever present; and which, at the same time, can be so affiliated with the weakened will that the weaker shall be actually vitalized and renewed by the very energy itself imparted from the stronger. It is evident that such a remedy would prove effectual and permanent. And there is such an one offered willingly to every enthralled soul. It is found alone in the will of the Lord Jesus Christ. *There* is a will with which by faith every weakened and enthralled will on earth may be fortified and

affiliated; and that to such a degree that whereas it was a struggling, despairing victim, it may be transformed and translated into the glorious liberty of a conqueror: to such a degree that whereas the enthralled soul could only cry, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" he may freely and gladly exclaim, "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

*Then*, and so, God, in Christ, "worketh in us both *to will* and *to do* of his good pleasure." Jesus is the great Physician, who will supply strength for every weakness, a remedy for every ill, freedom to every slave, and victory to every soul who will fight the good fight of faith. Through Jesus Christ alone every man may become master of himself: and so, alone, can he be "temperate in all things."

**May 1904**

**"Why Do Ye Such Things?" *The Medical Missionary* 13, 5 , pp. 129, 130.**

"WHEREFORE do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labor for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness." (Isa. 55:2). It is true that in the direct connection in which this scripture is used, the subject of bodily ailment is not the one under consideration; it being used as a figure in the great invitation to the gospel board, spread with the bounties of God's grace. Nevertheless, the importance of the questions here asked is none the less in a material sense, but is the rather increased; because if the prophet of God, in inviting men to provisions of God's house, could find a fit simile only in these things, it shows as nothing else could the immense importance of the things themselves.

That this view is just, is proved by the fact that God gave to his people explicit directions as to what they might eat, and what they should not eat; and even in the gospel times gave by inspiration the express "wish" that his people might "prosper and be in health," even as their souls should prosper. And there is nothing more certain than that, the soul of such a one will prosper better than when the conditions are otherwise.

We do not say that to eat and drink and breathe that which is good will make a person a Christian; but we do say that the person who does it can be a better Christian than he can if he does not do it. It is evident, on the mere statement of the case, that the person whose vital forces are all properly performing their regular functions, being properly supplied with the right materials - such a person is better and can be better in every way than he can otherwise.

"Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread?" Bread is here used for food in general. Why, then, do people spend money for hashish, or opium, or tobacco, or alcohol, or beer, or coffee, or tea? None of these things is food. The tendency of them, one and all, is only to impair the vital functions.

Some may think that we have gone too far in including tea and coffee in this list, along with beer, and alcohol, and tobacco, and opium, and hashish. But we have not gone too far; in that list is exactly the place where they belong. We shall give fuller proof of this in a later article, but we give here on authority on the subject, and the reader who is inclined to doubt the propriety of the above classification can think of it till we come to these articles in their order. In the "Encyclopedia Britannica," in the article "Drunkenness," we have this statement: -

"From tea to hashish we have, through hops, alcohol, tobacco, and opium, a sort of graduated scale of intoxicants, which stimulate in small doses, and narcotize in larger."

These things, therefore, all being both stimulants and narcotics, can have, when habitually used, no effect upon the system but that which is injurious. We repeat: Their only effect is to impair the vital functions. And to do anything which impairs the vital functions is to

130

strike at the life, for our word "vital" comes from Latin *vita*, which means *life*. And this will be readily enough agreed to in the matter of hashish, opium, and alcohol; and in fact it will be agreed to in the matter of the other things named - except by those who use them.

Though a person uses a thing and likes it, even though he may have used it for years without any apparent injury to himself, that is no proof that it is not an injury to him.

The person who is practicing an evil is not always the one who is best qualified to decide the question as to whether he is being injured or not. Many a person who uses whisky, yet who never was drunk, will say, "Whisky does not hurt me," while everybody else knows that it does hurt him. Thousands of men who are addicted to its use, will say, "Tobacco does not hurt me," while everybody but a tobacco user knows that it does hurt him; and that its *only* effect is to hurt the one who uses it.

It is so with all the elements that are set down in the list above. We do not by any means intend it to be understood that all the things named in that list are equally injurious. Tea is not so injurious in its effects upon the system as is opium, or tobacco, or alcohol, but its effects are *of the same kind*, though less in *degree*. Tea is the lowest in the list, but the whole list, from tea to hashish, forms only "a graduated scale of intoxicants," and "the physiological action of all these agents gradually shades into each other," so that it is impossible to tell where the effect of any one in the list ceases and where that of the next higher begins.

It matters not how poisonous, nor how injurious to the vital organs a thing may be, if it can be taken in any perceptible quantity at all without causing death, the repeated use of that thing will create an appetite that can be satisfied with nothing else, while every time the thing is taken, the appetite is increased, until at last, in the case of the most poisonous, the terrible habit will absorb the whole being and bring its victim to a horrible death. This is well known in cases of delirium tremens, of opium fiends, arsenic eaters, etc. The principle of this is shown in the following definition of "vitality," by Baron Liebig: -

"Vitality is the power which each organ possesses of constantly reproducing itself. For this it requires a supply of substances which contain the constituent elements of its own substance, and are capable of transformation. When the quantity of food is too great or is not capable of such transformation, or exerts any peculiar chemical action, the organ itself is subjected to a change."

The organ may at first raise the whole system in rebellion against that which is given it, as in the first chew of tobacco, or the first cigar, but if the wicked stuff be pressed upon it again and again, the organ is forced to undergo a change, it adapts itself to the persistent demands that are made upon it, and becomes perverted, so that that against which it at first utterly rebelled, it now must have; and not only that, but it will have *nothing* else. This is the secret of the formation of all the evil habits of appetite that are known to the human race; and these habits unchecked soon dominate the life.

"God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." Every organ and every function of the physical system God made for good; and only good can come from their proper use. On the other hand, it is safe to say that there is hardly an organ or a function that has not been perverted by the abuse that has been heaped upon it by men; and the result is seen in the mass of misery that fills the world to-day.

Yet from it all Christ will redeem and save every soul if we will but yield our selves, both soul and body, to his gracious control. "Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? . . . hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness."

ALONZO T. JONES.

**June 1904**

**"Use Food and Not Stimulants" *The Medical Missionary* 13, 6 , pp. 167, 168.**

ONE of the best definitions ever given of a stimulant is that by Dr. Emunds, of London: "A stimulant is that which gets force out of a man without putting it into him." This is precisely what a stimulant is, and that is exactly what it does. The only occasion, therefore, on which it is proper to use a stimulant, is that which is spoken of in the Bible, when it says, "Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish." If, for instance, a person be about to perish from cold or privation, it is necessary to make a sudden call upon the vital forces, and to rally them to as strong an effort as possible as quickly as possible. At such a time a stimulant of some kind must be used, if life is to be saved, because the vital functions are so prostrated that it is impossible to get force out of the system by putting it into it; therefore, if the force which must be developed in order to recover is to be aroused at all, it must be by something that will get force out of a man without putting it into him, and that is a stimulant.

At such times and in such cases only is it proper to use a stimulant upon the human system. At all other times stimulants are only robbers, and the habitual use of them is only the persistent robbery of the human system of its vital forces.

On the other hand, *food is that which gets force out of a man (or beast) by first putting it into him.* He who takes food supplies himself with force; while he who takes a stimulant robs himself of force. In other words, he who takes food, lives and works upon the food; while he who takes a stimulant, lives and works upon his constitution.

If you are on a journey, and your horse grows tired, give him a good feed and he will go on as freely as when you started; and by keeping this up he will carry you any number of journeys with no more wear than that which is the natural effect of age. But when he first begins to grow weary you can get him to go on more briskly without feeding him; that is, by application of whip or spur; that is giving him a stimulant. By the use of whip or spur you can get him to make extra exertions, you can get force out of him, but it is force that he cannot give without drawing on his constitution; while by giving him food you also get him to make extra exertions, you get force out of him, but it is force which the food gives him, and he is himself still preserved. By giving him food you get extra wear out of him, but it is only *wearing out the food*; while by the use of whip or spur you also get extra wear out of him, but it is only by wearing out the horse.

It is the same way with men and women. Men in cold weather, starting on a journey, take whisky along; and when the heat from the food which has been eaten, begins to run low, they take whisky, which stirs up the vital functions to greater exertion and causes an expenditure of more heat. But that is only to rob the very constitution of its neces-

168

sary heat, and so the more to weaken the body in its power of resistance to the cold. Better a thousand times would it be to take food, than whisky or any other stimulant drink - this, too, without any reference to the duty or the question of total abstinence. On the single question of maintaining warmth to the body on a cold day, food is a thousand times better than any stimulating drink. Food will supply additional heat to the body; a stimulant will only the sooner exhaust the already failing heat which the body has. That contrast is equally true between food and stimulants, in the matter of the supply of strength to a man in his daily labor.

And in this thing women wear themselves out fully as much as men; in fact, it may fairly be questioned whether they do not do so *more* than do the men. Because the women, being in the house, are always within easy reach of stimulants, while the men, working out-of-doors, or in the shop, are not so. With the housewife, it is, perhaps, wash-day. There is a large washing to do, besides a workingman's breakfast, dinner, and supper to get for husband and his hired hands. She soon begins to feel languid and weary, or perhaps a little faint, and goes straightway and gets herself some strong tea or coffee, that strengthens (?) her for a while, and by frequent repetition of it she gets through the work of the day. She would a great deal better eat some good nourishing food, and not touch a drop of tea or coffee or any other stimulant. The food will give her strength - the

tea or coffee will rob her of it. By the use of whip or spur she may urge herself through the work of that day, but she is only so much the more unfitted for the work of the following days.

No man or woman should attempt to do any amount of work which cannot be done upon the force derived from the food which he eats. The amount of work that can be so done is all-sufficient, and is, in fact, greater than can be done by drawing upon the constitution by the use of tea, coffee, whisky, or any other stimulant.

The principle touched upon in this article is a sound one, and if carried out, it cuts up by the roots the use of every stimulant from tea or hashish. We only hope the reader will make the application of the principle.

A. J. JONES.

## July 1904

### **"Do Not Drink Tea" *The Medical Missionary* 13, 7 , pp. 205-207.**

TEA and coffee belong in the list of narcotics and stimulants, along with hops, alcohol, tobacco, opium, and hashish. It has been proved that the physiological action of all these gradually shades into one another, all producing, or being capable of producing, consecutive paralysis of the various parts of the nervous system. It is perfectly certain, therefore, that users of tea are in the same line with the users of alcohol, tobacco, opium, etc. (that they all belong to the same dissipated family), the only difference being that in the use of tea the dissipation is not generally so dense as it becomes in the use of alcohol or opium. We say it is not *generally* so dense; because *occasionally* there are cases in which there is but little difference. "Positive intoxication has been known to be the result of the exclusive use of strong tea" (*Encyclopedia Britannica, art., Drunkenness*).

There are tea-sots as well as whisky-sots. Yet, because tea-drunkards and tea-sots are not so numerous as the whisky-drunkards and the whisky-sots, tea-drinking is considered by most people as a very respectable sort of dissipation, and it is altogether fashionable. But though this or anything else be fashionable, it is none the less harmful; it is rather the more dangerous. True temperance will never be successfully cultivated so long as the children and youth are brought up in the daily use of the contents of the tea-cup. It is of little use to teach the children to avoid alcohol, wine, and beer while they are continually supplied with tea. It is of little use to tell them to beware of strong drink while constantly supplying them with strong drink; because strong tea is actually a stronger drink than is mild beer or light ale, and it is more injurious. That temperance teaching is hardly the dreadful evils of strong drink and then invites them to attend a fashionable afternoon "tea."

It is not alone as an excitant to stronger drink that tea is injurious and to be avoided. This of itself, of course, would be sufficient to condemn its use, but in addition to this, it is such a persistent destroyer of the nervous system that it

ought never to be taken into the human stomach. The same eminent authority before quoted, says: -

"Tea-sots are well known to be affected with palpitation and irregularity of the heart, as well as with more or less sleeplessness, mental irritability, and muscular tremors, which in some culminate in paralysis."

If palpitation and irregularity of the heart, sleeplessness, and mental irritability are the characteristics of tea-sots, then how many such sots are known to the readers of this article, among those who use tea? It is [sic.] true that persons who do not use tea may have palpitation and irregularity of the heart; or may be afflicted with sleeplessness; or may be irritable; but it is as certainly true that no person can use tea any considerable length of time without being affected in some or perhaps all of these ways. The stuff itself is conducive to these very disorders. If there were no tea nor anything as strong used in any family in the land, there would be much more peace in families than there is; there would not be a thousandth part as many weakly, nervous, headachy wives.

We know that nearly every one of these will answer, "If I should *not* use it, I would just be sure to have the headache almost to distraction." Of course you would, for a while, and the more you have used of it, the worse will be your headache when you first stop using it. Many and many a time, perhaps, you have been sure you were going to have the headache, but by the timely (?) use of a cup of strong tea you have so benumbed your nerves that they had not life enough in them to ache. And, now, when you cease to outrage them with the paralyzing drug, and give them a fair opportunity to recover their natural condition and their proper functions, the task is certain to be painful for a little while; but when nature has once recovered herself, the pain will be gone for good - yes, for good in more senses of the word than one.

To illustrate: After one of the limbs is placed in a slightly cramped position and gets "asleep," no inconvenience at all is experienced from it so long as it is "asleep," but as soon as the temporary paralysis is broken, then the sensation is exceedingly unpleasant until the arteries, the veins, and the nerves have resumed their natural condition and sway. The longer that limb remains in that cramped position, the more painful will be the reaction when the limb is released. Just so it is with the nervous system from the habitual use of tea; and this is the philosophy of headaches and excessive nervousness if the use of tea is stopped. But what would be thought of a person whose arm was just released from a cramped position in which it had got "asleep," who, when his fingers would begin to tingle in the reaction, would force his arm again into the same cramped position to stop the unpleasant sensation?

Nobody would think for a moment of doing such a stupid thing as that with his limb; but thousands of people do just that same stupid thing with the whole nervous system. They paralyze the nerves with tea or tobacco, and then, if they are without it long enough for the reaction to begin, the sensation, of course, is very comfortable, perhaps painful; but instead of allowing nature to recover, they get some more of the drug as quickly as possible, and *renew the paralysis*. It would be ruinous to treat a cramped limb in such a way; and it is no less ruinous

to treat the whole nervous system thus. It is well known that the only way to recover the proper use of a limb that is "asleep" is to release it and let the unpleasant sensation go on, however uncomfortable it may be, until the normal condition of the limb is restored;

207

and it ought to be as well known that that is the only way in which to recover the proper use of the nervous system when it has been paralyzed by the use of tea. Stop the paralysis and let nature have her course. If pain follows, bear it till it is over, doing what you can to assist nature in her recovery; but above all things, do not re-inflict the paralysis upon both yourself and nature's efforts.

We have not confined this article to the consideration of the effects of tea because there is nothing to be said about coffee. We have a few words to say about coffee, also, but must defer that subject till our next issue.

A. T. JONES.

## August 1904

### **"Do Not Drink Poison" *The Medical Missionary* 13, 8 , pp. 236, 237.**

THE habitual use of any kind of stimulant is only an injury. The sole effect of a stimulant upon man or beast is to get force out of him without putting it into him; while the effect of food is to get force out of him by first putting it into him. As expressed by another, the effect of a stimulant is not exactly to rob Peter to pay Paul; it is to rob Peter to pay Peter himself. It should not be necessary to argue with men to convince them that the human system has no need of the habitual use of any such thing. To show that a certain thing is a stimulant, ought to be enough to cause any rational being to refuse the habitual use of it. The great trouble, however, is that so many men allow habit to rule their reason.

Coffee is a stimulant, and therefore should not be used. This is the property upon which, for many, its value depends. Says an eminent authority: -

"Coffee is solely valuable for its stimulating effect upon the nervous and vascular system. It produces a feeling of buoyancy and exhilaration comparable to a certain stage of alcoholic intoxication." - *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

In view of this, how anybody can either preach or practice true temperance and yet use coffee is more than we can understand. It simply can not be done. The tendency of that which produces a feeling "comparable to a certain stage of alco-

237

holic intoxication," can only be toward the use of alcoholic intoxicants themselves. We can neither teach nor practice temperance while using or consenting that it is right to use any stimulant, much less a stimulant the effect of which is so closely allied to that of alcohol as is the effect of coffee.

And millions of people will go on day after day, and year after year, brewing this poison and drinking it, and giving it to the little children! And yet they will say, "Oh, coffee does not hurt me!"

But poison hurts everybody that takes it. When we meet people who use tea, and coffee, and pork, and tobacco, etc., and who say that these things do not hurt them, and that they have good health, we are reminded of a circumstance that occurred once where a gentleman was lecturing on the principles of health and temperance. In the course of his remarks one evening he had stated that a person could not enjoy a proper degree of health without frequent bathing - at least once a week in winter and twice a week in summer. When he had dismissed the audience, an old woman of nearly seventy went to him and told him that he had said one thing that she did not believe at all. He asked her what it way. She said: "You said a person couldn't have good health without bathing often. Now look at me; here I am, and I have just as good health as anybody in this town, and *I haven't had a bath for fifty years.*" Poor woman, she had never been clean enough to know what it is to be dirty. She had never been clean enough to know how a person feels when he is clean; nor had she lived healthfully enough to know what it is to have good health. It is much the same way with the people who use all these things, and yet insist that they have good health, and that these things "don't hurt" them.

Tea paralyzes; coffee poisons; pork debases; and tobacco paralyzes, poisons, and debases; flesh foods have stimulating properties, and also make the blood sluggish; and yet there are multitudes who use them all, and will say, "These things don't hurt me. I have good health." But the truth is they have not lived healthfully enough to know what good health is. They have never been free enough from injury to know what it is not to be hurt.

The sum of what I have said is that nobody should use tea, or coffee, or alcohol, or tobacco, or opium, or hashish. They all belong together, and no person can tell where the influence of any one of them stops, and that of the next begins. "Every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible." "Beloved, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth."

A. T. JONES.

## September 1904

**"Eat Ye That Which is Good" *The Medical Missionary* 13, 9 , pp. 266, 267.**

"EAT ye that which is good," is the word of inspiration. As it is the wish of the Lord that we should "be in health," it is only to be expected that he should want us to eat that which is good. But this does not mean that we shall eat that which simply *tastes* good, because that which tastes good may not really be good, and because our sense of taste may be perverted because our sense of taste may be perverted so that things the most injurious may taste the best, while that which would be the very best for us may be, to the perverted sense of taste, the most unpalatable. It is evident then that the advice is to eat that which *is* good rather

than that which, by its pleasant taste, *seems* to be good; that is, that we should eat that which will make the best blood and through that the best physical fiber, whether of bone, muscle, flesh, or brain.

Physically, we are made of what we eat, and, other things being equal, we shall be in the best condition physically, accordingly as we eat that which is best. Nor does it state the whole truth when we say that by such means we shall be in the best condition *physically* - it is equally true that we shall be in the best condition *mentally*, because clear, vigorous thinking requires quick, active exertion of the brain; and in order that this may be, there is required a bountiful supply of good blood. If the blood be heavy and gross, its course will be slow and sluggish, and the mental activity correspondingly so; while if the blood be pure, composed of the best particles, and vivified by pure air, it goes bounding through the arteries, carrying not only life and vigor to the whole physical system, but to all the mental powers as well. Few people realize how much the power to think easily, clearly, and well, depends upon the condition of the blood. But the condition of the blood depends almost wholly upon what we eat, and the kind of air we breathe; therefore, if we will be in good condition, either mentally or physically, we must have good blood; and to have good blood we *must* eat that which is good. Even the wonderful mechanism of the human system can not make good blood out of bad material.

Nor is it yet enough to say that the physical and mental conditions depend so largely upon what we eat, the *moral* condition is also deeply involved in this. Because, says the great apostle, "With the mind I serve the law of God." Our service to the law of God is the measure of our moral condition. Therefore, as with *the mind* we serve the law of God; as the condition of the mind is largely dependent upon the condition of the blood; as the condition of the blood is largely dependent upon what we eat - it inevitably follows that our moral condition, our service to God, is largely dependent upon what we eat.

By many it may be thought that this is bringing a singular sort of element, not to say aliment, into the field of morals. But whatever may be thought of it, the principle is correct. This very element belongs in the field of morals, and the sooner we recognize it and act in accordance with it, the better it will be for us. God made the whole man to serve and glorify him wholly. It is impossible to separate the mental from the physical,

266

or the moral from the mental, in man. God has made and combined all together. The Lord Jesus died to redeem it all unto God. Because we are bought with this wondrous price, we are required to glorify him in our bodies and our spirits which are his. The whole spirit and soul and body is to be preserved blameless unto the coming of the Lord. 1 Thess. 5:23. And when he comes he shall change our *bodies*, that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body. "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God. . . . Thou shalt not eat any abominable thing." Deut. 14:2, 3.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**November 1904**

**"Battle Creek Sanitarium Day at the St. Louis Exposition" *The Medical Missionary* 13, 11 , pp. 334, 335.**

THROUGH the wholly voluntary, and even unexpected efforts of former patients at the Sanitarium, the management of the St. Louis Exposition gave to the Battle Creek Sanitarium the whole day, September 29. This was one of the greatest possible opportunities that could be given to present our principles and work. This was realized as soon as the opportunity was offered. Endeavor was therefore made to make the most of the occasion; and it is only proper to say that it was a grand success. The management of the Exposition cheerfully acknowledged that the attendance at the hall where the exercises were held was much larger than was that at any of the other congresses that had been held on the grounds; and congratulated the presiding officer on this fact.

The forenoon meeting began at ten o'clock, and was devoted to demonstrations of the foods and the treatments of the Sanitarium system. The afternoon meeting, from half past two until seven o'clock, was devoted to the presentation of the principles, - medical, dietetic, temperance, and Christian. The subject was presented under the following topics: "The Battle Creek Sanitarium System: Its Principles, Origin, and Development," by Kellogg; "Rational Food Reform," Dr. Mabel Howe Otis; "The Philosophy of Healing," Dr. E. J. Waggoner; "The Free Foundation of Temperance Reform," Alonzo T. Jones; "The Value of the Battle Creek Sanitarium System in the Battle against Stimulants and Narcotics," Dr. David Paulson; "The Sanitarium Principles in the City Slums," W. S. Sadler; "The Sanitarium Methods in Foreign Missions," Dr. A. J. Read; "The Sanitarium Ideas in a Great Factory," Dr. B. N. Colver; "The Battle Creek Sanitarium as a Factor in Medical Progress," Dr. C. C. Nicola; "The Sanitarium: Its Status and Province in Scientific Medicine," Drs. S. P. S. Edwards, Moline; W. A. George, College View; O. M. Hayward, Nashville; J. E. Colloran, Des Moines; J. E. Heald, Peoria; H. B. Weinburgh, Boston; H. Ossig, Berlin.

Some idea of the interest manifested in the proceedings may be gained from the statement of the fact that the majority of the large audience that filled the hall remained during the whole time from ten o'clock in the morning till seven o'clock in the evening, and then many of them went directly from the hall to the Christian Endeavor Hotel to the Sanitarium banquet that the hotel management allowed us to spread in their dining-room, and which closed at ten o'clock.

Among the attendants were United States senators, prominent men from England, Italy, South Africa, and Japan, besides representatives of vegetarian, temperance, and similar bodies of the United States.

No phase of the great truth that the Battle Creek Sanitarium represents was kept back or concealed. Every speaker exercised perfect freedom in presenting his subject. The Christian faith was openly and freely claimed to be the only basis, and the Christian aim of the Kingdom of God the only goal, of the movement represented and the work done by

the Battle Creek Sanitarium. And although all that was presented was received with hearty approval, yet every time *this* thought was touched by any speaker, it received from the audience the most hearty approval of all.

Preceding Sanitarium Day, on September 26, 27, 28, there was held in the same hall the International Vegetarian Congress. And on the last day of the Congress, September 28, there was passed unanimously and with applause the following resolution: -

"That this Convention hereby tenders grateful thanks for valuable aid, co-operation, and assistance rendered the vegetarian movement to -

"The Battle Creek Sanitarium and its numerous branches, and to all other sanitariums and hospitals that have adopted the vegetarian principle in their treatment of patients.

"The vegetarian restaurants, boarding houses, and hotels that have demonstrated vegetarian practice.

"The inventors and manufacturers of health foods, nut butters, and health beverages.

"Those churches and religious and moral and scientific organizations who from a study of the Bible and other ancient systems of religion have been induced to adopt vegetarian principles and are now advocating the same."

And in presenting that resolution the Seventh-day Adventist denomination was distinctly and thankfully named; and it was the only denomination that was specifically named; doubtless for the reason that it is the only denomination that holds such an attitude that it can as a denomination be specifically named in such a connection. For this we can all be thankful, and can constantly pray that we as individual members may so conduct ourselves that the denomination may ever prove worthy of the distinction and the expectation that earnest hearts in the world are bestowing upon us!

Sanitarium Day at the Exposition most assuredly impressed upon us all who were there, as it had never been before, that there is not only a needy and suffering world waiting for the help that the Sanitarium and its workers can give; but also a longing and appreciative world that is grateful to receive what we have to give, and that is glad that there is such a grand and noble institution and movement for such blessing of the world. And this only the more deeply impressed us that there must be in our lives a deeper consecration to God, and a fuller allegiance to the principles and the truth that are given to us for the blessing of mankind, so that this light shall the most clearly and effectually shine forth to the needy, suffering, waiting, expectant, and appreciative world.

A. T. J.

**The Medical Missionary, Vol. 14 (1905)**

**July 1905**

**"Baccalaureate Sermon" *The Medical Missionary* 14, 7 , pp. 194-198.**

[Delivered by Elder Alonzo T. Jones in the Tabernacle, June 17, 1905.

THE Medical Missionary Class of 1905 is about to finish its college course and to pass on to its work in the great field of the world.

Strictly and literally a missionary is any one who is sent on any kind of a mission. But since Christ came to the world on his great mission, for the salvation of man, and since he sent his disciples upon the same great mission as that upon which he himself was sent, the word "missionary" is now everywhere recognized as applied pre-eminently to those who are thus sent by Christ, and who go in his name.

This is the thought of the word "missionary" in its connection with the services held this day as a part of the commencement exercises of the Medical Missionary Class of 1905. The members of this class are to go forth into the world as *missionaries*. To this end they have studied through all the years of the course which they are now finishing. This object has been held before them constantly during these same years. With this purpose they entered the school, knowing that the school exists for this great purpose. And having entered this school for this purpose, having this object constantly before them, and studying to this end, throughout their whole course, now that the time has come for the actual entering upon the work for which they have thus prepared themselves, now in the commencement exercises, and as they are to enter upon the

194

real work for which they have prepared, it is not for a moment to be supposed that this thought should be eliminated, this object forgotten, or this purpose abandoned. For though these are *medical* students, and have finished the medical course, and have earned and presently shall hold the medical degree; yet, that they are and are to be *missionaries* is still the predominant thought, and this the predominant purpose. They are *medical* missionaries. They have taken the *medical* course, and have become efficient *medical* scholars only that they may the more effectually be *missionaries*.

Christ is the only true, the great, the model missionary. He is the one who has to be constantly looked to as the guide and ever to be followed as the great exemplar in all missionary work. And to every one of his he speaks the word, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." And as the Father who sent him was ever with him, so *he* gives to us the same word, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

As Christ was sent to reveal the Father, so we are sent to reveal Christ, and in him the Father. In order that he should truly reveal the Father, "He emptied himself, and took upon himself the form of a servant;" and to us who are to reveal Christ, and in him the Father, the word is spoken, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who . . . emptied himself, and took upon himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men."

He was made in the likeness of men, that he might the more fully and certainly enter into the hearts' experiences of men, meet them where they are,

appreciate their difficulties, and be the true helper and Saviour. So fully is this true that it is written, "In all points it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren." And being in all points like us, he was in all points tempted like as we are. And though he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet he conquered all temptations, and triumphed over it all, and so has made sure to every one who trusts in Him the triumph over every temptation. And all this he did "that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God;" and that he might "have compassion on the ignorant and on them that are out of the way;" to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. "For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted."

This is the model missionary, who forgets, indeed, who utterly abandons, *self*, and who enters with a true sympathy into the hearts' experiences and the life's troubles of those whom he would reach and help and save. This is in turn the view held by the greatest of all under-missionaries, - Paul, - who declares that he made himself all things to all men that by all means he might save some.

Now of all missionaries, who is so well qualified, to whom is the door so wide open, to know, and to enter into, the hearts' experiences and the life's troubles of the children of men as it the *medical* missionary?

And was not Jesus equally the medical missionary? Did they not bring their sick to him in crowds? Indeed, the knowledge of him as the great medical missionary was so widespread, that even "the whole multitude sought to touch him," because "there went virtue out of him and healed them all." And did he not use this great field of medical opportunity in all its great fulness to accomplish his great and transcendent missionary purpose?

In this connection it is important to note how largely the word of God entered into Christ's curing of diseases and healing the sicknesses of the people. Yet, in truth, this was nothing new. It was new only to the people then. And it was new to them only because they had so far forgotten and wandered from the word of God. For this truth of the large place of the word of God in the healing of disease has ever been a vital element of that word. Christ in this world was but the Word made flesh. That word was in the world before he came in the

196

flesh; but it had never been given its intended place in the flesh. He came that the word of God might have its true place in human flesh. In him was fulfilled the original intention concerning the word of God: that it should be truly manifest in the flesh. Thus he was the Word made flesh. And this fact only illustrates that which was always the truth, that to the word of God there had always of right belonged this large place in the healing of disease.

God had no sooner delivered his people from the bondage and darkness of Egypt than he revealed to them this great truth. The very first subject upon which he made for them a "statute and an ordinance," after the deliverance from Egypt, was this one: "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, *I will put none of these diseases upon thee*, which I have brought upon the Egyptians; *for I am the Lord that health thee.*"

This truth was continually kept before the people through the ages following. It is forcibly expressed in the words of Solomon: "My son, attend to my words; incline thine ear unto my sayings. Let them not depart from thine heart. For they are life unto those that find them, and health [Heb. medicine] to all their flesh." After the time of Solomon this truth is still continued to the people in the writings of the prophets. In Isaiah it is revealed that iniquity is the great cause of sickness, and that the forgiveness of iniquity is a vital element in the recovery from sickness.

The whole story is excellently told in a single passage in the book of Job. And in this connection it is well to remember that the experiences related in the book of Job occurred long before even the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. In this place to which I refer, it is written of the sick man that "he is chastened also with pain upon his bed, and the multitude of his bones with strong pain: so that his life abhorreth bread, and his soul dainty and his soul dainty meat. His flesh is consumed away, that it cannot be seen; and his bones that were not seen stick out. Yea, his soul draweth near unto the grave, and his life to the destroyers. If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter, one among a thousand, to show unto man his uprightness: then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom. His flesh shall be fresher than a child's: he shall return to the days of his youth: he shall pray unto God, and he will be favorable unto him: and he shall see his face with joy: for he will render unto man his righteousness. He looketh upon men, and if any say, I have sinned, and perverted that which was right, and it profited me not; he will deliver his soul from going into the pit, and his life shall see the light. Lo, all these things worketh God oftentimes with man, to bring back his soul from the pit, to be enlightened with the light of the living."

You will note that the essential thing in this connection is that to the sick man there shall be a messenger, "an interpreter." Now the office of an interpreter is to make plain to a person that which is spoken to him in language which he does not understand. In the sickness God is speaking to the man. The man does not understand that language. Not one in a million understands the language of sickness. God is calling for messengers, whom he can send to the multitude of the sick to be interpreters to them of this language in which, as the consequence of their transgressions, he is speaking to them. And of all people, who is so well qualified to be such an interpreter as is the medical missionary? Has he not studied every bone, every muscle, every nerve, almost every fiber of the human system? Has he not studied sicknesses and diseases to the number of hundreds? Has he not studied the relationship between health and the human system, and between sickness and the human system? Has he not sought out the causes as well as the effects of disease? Has he not thus become as thoroughly acquainted with disease and the language of it, and with the human

system, as is possible in such a length of time? Have not these also in these same years studied the Bible that they may know the word of God? And now being acquainted with the word of God, which he is speaking to the souls of men; being acquainted with the human body in its fearful and wonderful workmanship

from the hand of God; and being acquainted with disease and its language, are not these, of all people in the world, best qualified to be the messengers and interpreters, the ones of thousands, whom God will send to the sick in this world, to enlighten them with the light of the living?

Please do not fall into, nor fall in with, that mistake that is too often made in connection with the thought of being a missionary: the mistake of thinking, that to be a missionary a person must get as far away as possible from where he is, and from the country where he was born.

Please note this: We have found that Christ is the great model missionary, and the great model medical missionary, and yet in this world he never went more than one hundred miles from the place where he was born. And yet, again, he did in this world a missionary work that will continue until the end of the world, and throughout eternity. Within a hundred miles from where he was born in this world, he did a missionary work that has reached the ends of the earth, that holds the world under its power still, and that will so hold it until the world ends.

That simply tells to us that he who would be a missionary must be a missionary just where he is. Wherever he may find himself, there he is to be a missionary, if he is to be a missionary at all. This is not to say that no one is ever to go more than a hundred miles from the place where he was born. If God calls him to go far away, he can be a missionary there. Yet he must be a missionary before he does, or he will not be a missionary when he gets there: for when he gets there that will be where he is, and the only place where any one can ever be a missionary is just where at the time he is. And this truth needs to be emphasized, because it has been so largely forgotten.

Now, in this world, how far does any one need to go, any day of the week, from where he happens to find himself when he awakes in the morning, without finding a world full of opportunities to be the medical missionary? And to you, brethren and sisters, to this class of 1905, to all who are yet in this medical school, and to all others who are connected with this work, I say this: If there is one thing that we, with heart and soul, should everlastingly thank God for, it is that there is established in this world a medical college that makes it [*sic.*] chief aim so to instruct people that they shall be God's messengers and interpreters to the sick and the afflicted. There are not many such schools in the world; indeed, I am not sure that there is another one; but there is this one, and we can thank God for that, for the work that it has done, for the work that it is doing, and for the work which, thank the Lord, under God, it is yet to do.

Then let us all, with true hearts and sincere spirits, join our hearts and our hands with this noble enterprise, that it may do still more effectively and still more largely, that blessed work of educating the messengers and the interpreters for whom God is calling, that he may send to the sick and the diseased, to bring back their souls from the pit, to be enlightened with the light of the living.

Since, then, it is true that no medical missionary ever needs to go three steps from where he awakes in the morning anywhere on this earth, to find a large and abundant field for his medical missionary operations; and these being graduates of the medical missionary college, we can safely trust that true medical

missionaries is what they will be wherever they shall find themselves in this world full of opportunities to be medical missionaries.

When, then, does this say that the members of this class of 1905 will do? In brief, it says that they will be always, heart and soul, enlisted in every work, and in every movement, carried on in this world for the help, the blessing, and the benefit of mankind. It says that they will be fellow-workers, true heart-and-

198

hand-helpers, everywhere in all the interests of temperance, of right living, of health, and of holiness, for health and holiness are inseparable.

I will close by simply adding the words, in which I am sure you will all join, wishing for each one of this class of 1905 only the richest blessing of God, the fulness of his Spirit, and the precious presence of Christ, to go with him in his work day by day, to make him everywhere and always the true medical missionary; that when the day shall come that Christ shall appear and call us to receive the reward that is prepared for all who follow him, these shall be gathered, and shall come saying, even as he has given us to say, "Behold I and the children whom thou hast given me." And not may "the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do is will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever;" and "the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost;" that the world, to which he calls you, the world to which you go, shall receive by your presence and by your work, only blessings, upbuilding, and salvation now and in the day when He shall come.

## **The Medical Missionary, Vol. 15 (1906)**

**March 1906**

**"Medical Missionary Religious Liberty" *The Medical Missionary* 15, 3 , pp. 76-84.**

[The first Sunday night of each month there is regularly held a meeting of the Sanitarium family - the Helpers' Meeting. Sunday night, February 4, Elder A. T. Jones spoke on the subject of religious liberty. The thoughts presented are so well worth permanent preservation and a wide circulation that we here present the greater part of the study. These are the principles that we entertain, and that we hope shall ever prevail, in the Sanitarium and all its work and workers. - EDITOR.]

WHAT we desire to-night is to have a fair, plain, open talk with the family. Recently there was read in the Tabernacle a testimony dated Jan. 12, 1906, and addressed to the "Brethren and Sisters in Battle Creek," in which are several sentences that fitly introduce the subject which I desire you to study to-night.

"I wish to say to every soul, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged, for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.'"

"In magnifying the Lord, be sure that do not condemn and make charges against others."

"While we are to call error, error, and withstand delusive sentiments that will continue to come into our ranks to palsy the faith and assurance of the people of God, we are to make no tirade against men and women."

I read these sentences to introduce the subject, and upon them to ask this question: Does it not seem very strange that people who have the Bible, who profess to be Christians, and to study the Bible and believe it, and to be acquainted with the Bible, should need to have such things as that said by a direct revelation from heaven? [Voice: "We do."] The brother says, "We do, though." Yes, there is no question of that.

And that is the thing that I wish to appeal to the family upon, that we get to the Bible, that we put ourselves upon the Bible, and let the Bible be our instruction.

Another thing that comes with that is this: Those who have done these unrighteous things have claimed that they were doing them out of loyalty to the testimonies. Thus the situation illustrates this truth: nobody can be loyal to the testimonies and go contrary to the Bible. Nobody can disobey the Scriptures and be loyal to the testimonies in doing it. No man can be loyal to the testimonies, and put himself on the ground of the testimonies, and stand for the testimonies, and in the doing of it violate the plain, everyday words and principles of the Bible. But that is what has been done in this situation, else this testimony never would have needed to be given.

And that is another thing that I wish to ask this family to get hold of and to hold fast: that the more loyal you want to be and the more loyal you are, and the most loyal that you can possibly be, to the testimonies, will only cause you to live more fully, more closely, and more truly every precept of the Bible.

And that brings me to this, that no person in the world can ever rightly and in loyalty to the testimonies, use them as club upon any soul on earth. And more, no person ever can, in loyalty to

77

the testimonies, use any testimony to rein up another man and require that other man to answer to *him*, as to his standing on that testimony.

And that brings me to this: that every man's *faith* stands between him and God alone; not between him and any other man, or any set of men. No man is ever answerable to any man or set of men for his *belief* on any question whatever, Bible or testimonies. The Scriptures say on that, "Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself, before God," - not before some other man, nor before some set of men. You are to have it to *yourself*, and to yourself *before God*. And when any man by a question on the testimonies or on the Bible, or with the testimonies or with the Bible, puts himself in between you and God as to your *faith*, then in that he is putting himself in the place of God to you and your faith. He is usurping the place of God, and seeking to

have you stand to *him* as if *he* were *God* and you were his servant, to worship and to serve *him*. I think that is plain enough.

And that brings me to this: "So then, every one of us shall give account of *himself* to God." And again in the same chapter, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make his stand."

This brings me to the thought of religious liberty, which I wish to talk with you about to-night.

Shall we have religious liberty here, or not? Do you want it here or not? Every one of you wants religious liberty for yourself, and you want others to let you alone in that thing. And if you want religious liberty for the other man too, then will you let *him* alone on his faith, on what he believes as to this, that, or the other thing?

"By their fruits," *not* by their *faith*, "shall ye know them." Do you see the difference? The man's faith lies between him and God. And as certainly as that faith is true, even though there be only so much of it as is compared in the Scriptures to the smoking flax, the *fruits* will correspond; and you will have no difficulty with that person. If his faith is not true, if he has none, if he thinks he has faith and hasn't, and is making a mere pretense: then the fruits, his conduct, the things that he does, will

78

be open, will be perfectly plain. And there is the place for you to speak to him - about his conduct, the wrong way of his life in things that he is acting and doing. But you will have nothing at all, night or day, by testimonies, Bible, or anything else, ever to do with his faith or with *him* concerning his *faith*.

You can never know where you are by trying to find out where some *other man* is. Where the other man is, has nothing to do with where I am. Neither can you ever inquire into the other man's faith for his good, nor for his "soul's salvation." Why, brethren, do you not know full well that the other man's "good" and his "soul's salvation" was the sole aim of the Inquisition always? No heretic was ever tortured or burned at the stake but for his "good" and for his "soul's salvation." In many cases there may be a question as to whether the heretic was right or wrong; but with the inquisitor there is never any possible ground for any question; it is certain that in his inquisition he was always wrong. And so is every other inquisition, and every other inquisitor.

Now, that is the question in this family. And not only in this family; that is the question all over the United States, and it is fast reaching to the ends of the earth and all over the world. The question is, whether man shall dominate man, whether man shall regulate a man's faith, or whether God shall have his own place, and man be free, with God in his own place.

The question that I am asking you to consider is that fundamental question of all the ages, ever since sin entered into the universe; ever since Lucifer started to set himself up in the place of God and require that others should yield to him as to God, - the fundamental question from that moment in heaven until this hour has been, Shall God be God to man? or shall some man, or some combination of men, take the place of God by stepping in between the man and God, to

dominate him and regulate his faith, and demand how he stands on this matter of faith, and that matter of religion, and so on?

You all know that that has been the greatest curse of all the ages; and you all know that in this time in which we live the greatest issue before the world is whether there shall be an image to that master-thing in this, the papacy, which, with the papacy, shall dominate all the earth, and compel all the world to accept the will, the dictates, and the mark of the beast. We all know that is going to be done and that we are to land eternally against it.

But now, brethren and sisters, such things as the making of the beast and the making of the image of the beast, do not come by a few. They do not come by a few doing the things that accomplish the evil. They come by the very *spirit of things*, in *the age* in which they are developed. And while you and I stand in this world as opposed to the making of the image to the beast, and opposed to the beast and his image, and his mark, and the number of his name, and all there is of it - while we stand thus in the world, opposed to all that, the reason that that thing is growing and developing so fast, is because of the very *spirit of things* that pervades the world in this age. And of all places in the world that spirit of things pervades this nation most in this age. And while we are opposing the making of the image of the beast, we must watch ourselves, even more strictly than we have been watching one another lately, lest we fall in with that pervading spirit, and against our own wishes be deceived into the very spirit of the beast and his image. That is the danger.

If that spirit of things of this age be partaken of by us, then the image of the beast could be made in the Seventh-day Adventist Church and among Seventh-day Adventists just as easily as elsewhere. And you and I are constantly to watch ourselves - not *the other man* - watch *ourselves* that we do not indulge, and are not partakers of that spirit at all, in any sense or in any degree, at any time or anywhere, or for any purpose on any occasion.

Now, allegiance to the Bible - each one holding fast to the Bible, courting the Bible, using the testimonies to more of the Bible, - *not to know more of your brother* - that is the only thing that becomes us now or ever.

79

In this I am not asking anybody to abandon the testimonies. I am calling everybody possible away from a *perverse use* of the testimonies, such as is referred to in the pages from which I read at the beginning of the meeting.

I will read some passages from a discourse by Sister White that was delivered in the library room of the College building in 1901, just the day before the General Conference of that year. It is too long to read the whole of it to-night. It was delivered to a room full of ministers: -

"You need not refer, not once, to Sister White. I don't ask you to do it. God has told me that my testimony must be borne straight to this Conference, and that I am *not to try to make a soul believe*; that *my work* is to leave the truth with human minds and these, *having found the truth in the word of God, will appreciate it, and will appreciate every ray of light* that God has given for poor lame souls that they should not be turned out of the way. And I want you to

make straight paths for your feet lest the lame be turned out of the way."

Is that sufficient for you and me? Is it sufficient for you and me to leave the truth, even the truth of a testimony, with the person concerned? and leave him alone with God and the testimony? Is it?

Further: "Now for instance, some one may tell you that 'Sister White does not eat meat; now I want you not to eat it, because Sister White does not eat it.' Well, I would not care a farthing for anything like that; if you haven't got any better conviction that you won't eat meat than just because Sister White doesn't eat it, I wouldn't give one farthing for your health reform. But I want that every one of you shall stand on your individual dignity in your individual consecration to God, that the soul temple shall be dedicated to God. 'If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy.' Now I want you to see these things, and not to make any human being *your* criterion."

Again: But don't you quote Sister White. I don't want you ever to quote Sister White until you can get your vantage ground where you know where you are. *Quote the Bible. Talk the Bible.* It is full of meat, full of fatness. Carry it right out in your life and you will know more of the Bible than you do now.

Again: "I don't ask him to take my word I don't ask him to take it. Lay Sister White right one side. Lay her to one side. Don't you ever quote my words again as long as you live *until you can obey the Bible.* When you *take the Bible*, and make that your food, and your meat, and your drink, and make that the elements of your character when you can *do that* you will know better *how to receive some counsel from God.*"

Do you see the key of the situation? Do you see the way laid out before us? Loyalty to *the Bible* is the only true way to receive or to know the testimonies. When you are disloyal to the principles of the Bible, and when you go contrary to the precepts of the Bible, and then quote testimony to this man or that man or the other man, and demand of him whether he "believes the testimony," and "I have got some questions to ask you on this, that, and the other," you are the most disloyal to the testimonies that you can possibly be.

I read again: "When you take the Bible and make that your food and your meat and your drink, and make that the elements of your character, when you can do that, you will know better how to receive some counsel from God."

Then she took the Bible in her hand as it was lying on the table before her, and held it up and said: -

"But here is the Word, the precious Word exalted before you to-day. And don't you give a rap any more what Sister White said - 'Sister White said' this, and 'Sister White said' that, and 'Sister White said' the other thing. But say, 'Thus saith the Lord God of Israel,' and then you do just what the Lord God of Israel does and what he says."

And the very last words of that address that day were as I have read before. "I don't want you ever to quote Sister White until you can get upon vantage ground where you know where you are.

Quote the Bible, talk the Bible. It is full of meat, full of fatness. Carry it

80

right out in your life, and you will know more of the Bible than you do now. You will have fresh matter, you will have precious matter, and you won't be going over and over the same ground; and you will see a world saved. You will see souls for whom Christ has died. And I ask you to put on the armor, every piece of it, and be sure that your feet are shod with the preparation of the Gospel."

Please do not think that this is something new. This that I have just read was given in 1901. But twelve years before that, in 1889, Testimony No. 33 was published. And in that Volume, pages 191-196, there is reprinted, for all, an extract from a testimony that was published thirty years ago, in which are these words: -

"Brother R - - would confuse the mind by seeking to make it appear that the light God has given through the testimonies is an addition to the Word of God; but in this he presents the matter in a false light. God has seen fit in this manner to bring the minds of the people *to his Word*, to give them a clearer understanding of it."

Also the following from a testimony of thirty-five years ago: -

"You are not familiar with the Scriptures. If you had made *God's Word* your study, with a desire to reach the Bible standard and attain to Christian perfection, you *would not have needed the testimonies*. It is because you have neglected to acquaint yourselves *with God's inspired Book* that he has sought to reach you by simple, direct testimonies, calling your attention to the words of inspiration which you had neglected to obey, and urging you to fashion your lives in accordance with its pure and elevated teachings.

"The Lord designs to warn you, to reprove, to counsel, through the testimonies given, and to impress your minds with the importance of the truth of his word. The written testimonies are *not to give new light*, but to impress vividly upon the heart the *truths of inspiration already revealed*. Man's duty to God and to his fellow-man has been distinctly specified *in God's Word*; yet but few of you are obedient to the light given. *Additional truth is not brought out*; but God has through the testimonies simplified the great truths *already given*, and in his own chosen way brought them before the people, to awaken and impress the mind with them, that all may be left without excuse."

And the following from a testimony of thirty-six years ago: -

"The *Word of God is sufficient* to enlighten the most beclouded mind, *and may be understood* by those who have any desire to understand it. But notwithstanding all this, some who profess to make the Word of God their study, are found living in direct opposition to its plainest teachings. Then, to leave men and women

without excuse, God gives plain and pointed testimonies, bringing them back *to the Word* that they have neglected to follow."

Now I shall read to you the definition of liberty. I will read it slowly: "The state of being exempt from the domination of others or from restricting circumstances."

And we may just as truly put in there "exempt from restricting" *people* as well as from restricting "circumstances." "In ethics and philosophy," that is as to character and conduct, morals, religion, religious liberty is this: "In ethics and philosophy, liberty is the power in any rational agent to make his choices and decide his conduct *for himself, spontaneously and voluntarily* in accordance with reasons and motives."

Do you believe in liberty? Do you believe in liberty for *the other man*? Do you believe in allowing other people here to be exempt from domination by you, and exempt from any questioning or inquisition from you that would suggest that thing?

Now let me read to you the definition of religion: "Religion is the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it."

Do you catch that? "The duty which we owe to our Creator, and the *manner of discharging it.*"

And liberty is the "state of being exempt from the domination of others or from restricting circumstances." It is "the power in any rational agent to make his choices and decide his conduct for himself spontaneously and volunta-

81

rily in accordance with reasons and motives."

The definition of religious liberty, then, is plainly this: "A man's exemption from the domination of others or from restricting circumstances. Man's freedom to make his choices and decide his re conduct, for himself, spontaneously and voluntarily, in his duty to his Creator and in *the manner* of his discharging that of duty."

The testimonies belong to the realm of religion: and a man's believing them and following them, rests between the man himself and God. This readiness to put ourselves in charge of the other man and his faith, as soon as testimony comes concerning him or to him, all comes from our over-anxiety that he will not do just the right thing, and that he will not take just the right course, and so we put ourselves in to make sure that he shall do things exactly right.

That thing can be solved ten thousand times easier, and much quicker, by leaving that man utterly alone with God and that testimony than by any of your meddling or mine, or any of your interference and questioning or mine. If he rejects it, let the results work out and demonstrate it, rather than for you and me to advertise, that he rejects the testimonies," "he does not believe the testimonies," and "he is not straight on the testimonies," and all that program.

It is not given to you or to me to pronounce when a man believes the testimonies or when he doesn't. That is between the man and the Lord. And you and I can do him far more good by seeing that we ourselves are straight on the testimonies, and especially on the Bible, as the testimonies have directed, and thus showing him how to be straight on that. When a man is crooked, it is not much of a help to him for me to be as crooked as I can and then come to help

him to get straight. Therefore the Scripture tells you and me in Hebrews 12:14: "Make straight paths for *your* feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way."

Neither you nor I nor any other man, or set of men, that was ever in this world, have any commission to make straight paths for *other men's* feet. That isn't the record: "Make straight paths for *your* feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way" by your crooked course.

It is written by Jesus that "a bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench." Now you know that flax is one of the most inflammable of things. And if there is enough fire to make flax smoke, and yet *only* enough to make it smoke, then a breath can cause it to live or cause it to die. And whether it shall live or die depends altogether on how the breath is applied. It is written of Christ, and you and me, that "the smoking flax shall he not quench." Whenever he sees in any person only as much faith as can be compared to that smoking flax, he is not going to put his breath upon it in such a way that it will be put out. When a breath will put it out, a breath will also revive it *if* the breath is breathed the right way. And Christ came to breathe upon that fading, failing faith the breath that will give it life. And you and I must be careful that we do not breathe upon it the breath that will extinguish it. The faith of souls is too delicate a thing for *man* to deal with. Only Christ belongs in the field of a man's faith. He is the Finisher, as well as the Author, of faith, and *no one else is*.

I read another scripture in the Gospel according to John 21:12-22 - Christ's words to Peter: "And when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, Follow me. Then Peter, *turning about*, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved *following*. Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord and what shall this man do?"

What was he doing? - "Following" Jesus, is the record. What was Peter doing? - "Peter, *turning about*, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved *following*." Do you catch it? What was Peter doing? Was Peter following Jesus? No: he was worrying about what the other man was going to do. He had "turned about," turned his back on Jesus, and was looking the other way. How is it with you?

And what about that disciple who was *following Jesus*, that Peter turned around, and stopped following Jesus, to

82

to look at? Who was he? - Oh, he was "that disciple whom Jesus loved."

There was that disciple whom Jesus loved, already following Jesus. Peter was told by Jesus, "Follow me." Instead of doing it, he stopped following Jesus, turned about, and set his attention on the man who *was* following Jesus, and very concernedly asked, "Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" And what do you say? Let us all say Amen to that.

And don't forget, Peter had to *turn about* to see that brother. Then before I can put my eyes on the other brother to see what he is doing and see what he is going to do, I have to turn about from following Jesus myself. And when I do turn about from following Jesus to see what the other man is doing, lo, the record is that he is *following Jesus*. Brethren, what was that written for? Let us learn it. There are people in this family who need to learn it. They have not been doing it

lately; they have been watching other people, questioning others on this, that, and the other. But that is not religious liberty, - it is not following Jesus. It is not Christianity; it is not loyalty to the Bible; it is not loyalty to the testimonies.

"Then went this saving abroad among the brethren that that disciple should not die." Did Jesus say that? He said, "If I will that he tarry till I come." But even then that is not *your* affair: "Follow thou me."

Let me give you a little practise lesson. Just watch, and practise on yourself and see how downright hard it is to tell a thing exactly as you hear it. Brother Corliss and I were passing along the street in Walla Walla. A man stepped from his door down to the sidewalk to a little gate, hailed us and said to us, "Do you gentlemen know Mr. Rev. Whatever-it-may-be, who used to preach in Walla Walla?" "Oh, yes," we replied, "we both know him well." Then the man said something very complimentary of him, that "he is the best man that I ever saw," or something of that kind. We hadn't gone six steps till one of us said to the other, "Well, that was a fine thing that he said about Brother - - , wasn't it?" and the other one said. "Indeed it was. What was it he said?" And for the life of us we could not tell exactly what he had said. We "had the idea," the "general thought" of it, but we could not tell what that man *said* at all; and we have never been able since, when we have met. Just take that for a task, brethren, and practise trying to tell, not to other people, but to yourself, just the words that were said. When you get it so that you can do it exactly, by that time you will have enough practise that you will not try to do it at all. And then you will have a good deal less to say of what this, that, or the other one said; and you will also be a good deal farther from believing rumors of which this, that, or the other person "said."

Do not forget it, that in Romans 13 and 14 is presented the subject of religious liberty - the relation of the Christian to the powers that be, to one another, and to God, in this world. I read now Chapter 14:10: "Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother, for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

Every one of us shall give account of *himself*, not of the other man. And he gives account of himself to *God*, and not to any man or set of men. And because of this, the exhortation is, "Let us not therefore judge one another any more. But judge this rather that no man put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way."

Even Paul wrote this: "Not for that we have dominion over your faith." Could not even an apostle have dominion over people's faith to be a judge and to decide for people on their faith? *No, sir.* Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy." [Voices, Amen.] Another translation reads: "I do not mean that we are to dominate over you with regard to your faith; but, on the contrary, we work with you for your true happiness." That is what we are in the world for, to be help-

ers of every man's joy. If he hasn't any joy, we are to get him in connection with the joy of the Lord, and then be everlasting *helpers* of his *joy*, and *never judges of his faith*.

Toward the beginning of this study I quoted the scripture, "By their fruits ye shall know them." And here is another place where many go wrong: they take this as if it read, By their fruits ye shall *judge* them. It does not say so; nor is there in it any such suggestion or thought. "By their fruits ye shall *know* them." And when you know them, then what? Are you then to judge them, and condemn them? Not at all; for if there is any one thing that the Scriptures make plainer than all others, it is, "judge not," "Condemn not." Even Christ on earth declared, "I judge no man."

There are many, many passages of Scripture on this: but I have time for only three here.

In 2 Peter 2:9-13 is the first one: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government." "Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities. . . . These, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, *speak evil* of the things that they *understand not*."

The people who speak evil of the things that "they understand not," are here specified as among the *chiefest ones* that God is reserving unto the day of judgment to be punished. And please let me say, with all respect and with all love for every soul, I personally know that a whole lot of persons here within the past month in this family have spoken evil of things that they do not understand, things which, if they did understand, they would no more say what they are saying, and no more do what they are doing, than they would jump into the river. Brethren and sisters, that is not the Christian way.

What of this, then? Listen: "Whereas angels which are greater in power and might" than any of us "bring not railing accusation against them before the Lord." Here are we, brethren and sisters in the same company, going on our way the best we can in this dark and dismal world to that world of light, children of His body, all loved by Him, yet finding fault with one another, speaking evil of one another, one reining tip another. And while we are doing this, what are the angels doing toward us, who know you and me through and through? They know every meanness that we ever committed, and know it in a good deal deeper measure than you and I ever shall; and yet they do not bring railing accusation against you and me before the Lord.

Then when we do that against one another, where do we put ourselves with respect to the angels of God? Are not we putting ourselves above them, and doing things which they themselves would not do?

But more than this: there is One of whom God said, "Let all the angels of God worship him." And what of Him? Listen: Jude 8, 10: "Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion and speak evil of dignities. . . . These speak evil of those things which they know not." These are the same ones of whom Peter spoke. But here whom does Jude cite? Peter cites the "angels," that they do not do such things against us, when they know us so much better than

we can know one another. What now? Listen: "Yet Michael, the archangel." Who is he? He is the One of whom God said, "Let all the angels of God worship him." "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation." "Durst not." "*Durst* not." What is that? He did not dare to do it? That is what it says. "Durst not bring against him," even against the devil, "a railing accusation."

Brethren and sisters: If there is anybody in this universe against whom a railing accusation could properly be brought, would it not be the devil? And if there is anybody in this universe who could properly bring a railing accusation, wouldn't it be Christ? And yet when the devil was actually disputing Christ in the commission which God had sent him to accomplish, even the Lord Christ did not *dare* to bring against

84

the devil a railing accusation. Yet here in this world it can be done very glibly against *our own brethren*. When we bring accusations, railing accusations, against a brother, against one another, we are putting ourselves above Christ and doing against our own brethren and his own blood-bought souls, what he himself did not dare to do even against the devil. May the Lord save us from this thing.

Elder Taylor: That reminds me just now of this word from the testimonies: "When we are better than Christ and the one of whom we speak is worse than the devil, then it will be time for us to find fault and criticize."

James 4:11: "Speak not evil one of another, brethren." Listen. "He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of *the law*," the law of God. "And judgeth *the law*. What? Judgeth the law of God? - That is what it says. You and I are shocked to hear others speak evil of the law of God. We are afraid of it. For our soul's sake, let us be shocked and afraid of that same thing in ourselves.

"But if thou judge the law, thou art in not a doer of the law, but a judge." There is one law-giver who is able to save and to destroy. Who art thou that is, judgest another?" Peter tells us that when we do it, we put ourselves above the angels, and do what they do not do. Jude tells us that when we do it, we put ourselves above Christ, and do what he did not *dare* to do, even with the devil. And James tells us that when we do it, we put ourselves above God, above the law of God, and in the place of God. Ah, but that is "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called to God, or that is worshiped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God showing himself that he is God," who changed at the law of God and demands that everybody shall obey the law as dictated and changed by him, and demands that everybody's faith shall be dictated and regulated by him.

Come, brethren and sisters, let us cease that. Come now, let us let one another alone. Let there be some religious liberty. Let us not any more be of the man of sin. Let us be only of the Man of Righteousness. Let us be Christians.

**May 1906**

**"The Divine Call to True Temperance" *The Medical Missionary* 15, 5 ,  
pp. 133-135.**

WE have studied the principles of Christian fellowship and spiritual right-living that are given to us in the Bible for the guidance of Christians in their church relationship; and which are therefore the principles that must actuate us and be our guide in our relationship in this institution, in order that the institution shall be what it was planted to be and do the work that God has from the beginning designed that it shall do.

We shall now for a while study the principles of temperance and *physical* right-living which must actuate us and be our guide, in order that this institution shall be what it was planted to be and shall do what God from the beginning designed that it shall do: the principles that are the very life of the institution.

I begin by reading two texts of scripture: -

"In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain and Darius the Median took the kingdom." Dan. 5:30, 31.

"These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever." Dan. 7:17, 18.

In the sense that it is the kingdom and dominion of the earth, these two texts refer to the same thing. And in this sense the kingdom which the saints of the Most High are to take is exactly the same that Darius the Median took. For you see in the second text, that the angel speaks of the four great world-wide kingdoms that in succession have ruled the earth, and then without any break of either thought or connection he says, "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom" - the same kingdom which in succession these four have held.

Babylon was the first of these. In that night when Belshazzar was slain, and the kingdom of Babylon passed away forever, "Darius the Median took the kingdom." Afterward, in its time, the kingdom of Medo-Persia passed away forever, and Grecia "took the kingdom." Then, in turn, the kingdom of Grecia passed away forever, and "Rome took the kingdom." Rome passed away forever, and ten kingdoms took its place, that could never cleave one to another in a great world-wide dominion as the four that had come and gone; so that the *next* universal kingdom will be that which God shall set up and which the saints of the Most High shall take when "the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom," and which the saints shall possess "forever, even forever and ever."

Thus you see that "the kingdom" which Darius the Mede "took" and that which the saints of the Most High are to "take," are the same kingdom - the kingdom and the dominion of this earth, each in its place in the succession.

What I now in this study ask your attention to is, the principles upon which this kingdom has always been taken; and upon which, only in a far fuller and most

intense degree, it must yet be taken, when "the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom."

134

Upon what principles was it that Darius the Median took the kingdom that night when Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans was slain? To ask the question in another way, what were the principles by which in that awful night the kingdom of Babylon lost the dominion and sank to everlasting ruin? What was Belshazzar doing that night? Oh, you all know: "Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand." Nor was it only the intemperance of feasting and drinking that there prevailed, but also of a general confusion of male and female relationships in lascivious excesses: for the feast was the annual celebration "in honor of the god Tammuz, the Babylon Adonis, who married their Venus, or Ishtar; and the 14th of Tammuz was the regular time to celebrate their union with lascivious orgies." And the intemperance there indulged, and which caused Babylon to sink, was intemperance in both the quantity and the kind of eating and drinking, and which carried with it intemperance and wickedness of other kinds.

What principles alone then could it have been upon which Darius the Median took the kingdom that night? If Darius the Mede with his people had practised the style of eating and drinking that the Babylonians did, would he that night have taken the kingdom? Impossible. Then it is perfectly plain that as certainly as it was the principles and practise of *intemperance* by which the kingdom of Babylon was lost that night, so certainly it was the principles and practise of *temperance* upon which alone Darius the Mede took the kingdom.

Such is the record in the history. For though Darius the Mede, being the older, took the throne and the kingdom, it was Cyrus the Persian who led the forces that took the city, and destroyed the kingdom, of Babylon, and who took the throne and the kingdom in full right at the death of Darius the Mede two years later. It was the Persian element which dominated in the kingdom. And the history declares that "the only food allowed either the children or the young men [of the Persians] was bread, cresses, and water. For their design was to accustom them early to temperance and sobriety. Besides they considered that a plain, frugal diet without any mixture of sauces or ragouts [high seasoning] would strengthen the body and lay such a foundation of health as would enable them to undergo the hardships and fatigues of war to a good old age." - *Rollin*.

Therefore, by both logic and historical fact, we find it true that it was upon the principles of temperance, sound and true, that Darius the Median took the kingdom. And now to all of you and I present this proposition: *The saints of the Most High can not take the kingdom on principles of temperance any less true than those upon which Darius the Median took the kingdom.*

Indeed, we have a scriptural illustration of this. For it is a fact that in that night when Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans was slain, and the kingdom of Babylon sank forever, a saint of the Most High took the kingdom before even Darius the Mede received it. And this saint of the Most High took the kingdom upon the principles of temperance, identical with those of the Persians and by virtue of which Darius the Median took the kingdom.

Note it: When Belshazzar saw on the wall the handwriting that announced the doom of himself and the world-empire of Babylon, he proclaimed that whosoever would read the writing, and tell the meaning of it, should be clothed in scarlet, and have a chain of gold about his neck, and be "the third ruler in the kingdom." The reward that was to be bestowed was the highest that could be bestowed by him. And so make him the *third* ruler in the kingdom was the highest position that could be given, for the reason that Belshazzar was king in association with his father, and so himself was the *second* ruler in the kingdom. If Belshazzar had been king alone in his own right, then the highest position would have been the second ruler; but when there were *two* kings already ruling, the *third* ruler was the highest honor that could be given to another. And so it was.

Then in the campaign of the Medes and Persians against Babylon, Nabonadius was

135

taken prisoner and Belshazzar was slain. Thus both kings were taken away; and Daniel being "the third ruler," possessed the kingdom at least for the little time until Darius the Median sat on the throne. And this saint of the Most High in the royal apparel and insignia, Darius and Cyrus found in possession of the kingdom when they came to take it into their own possession and with him they consulted in taking over the kingdom and settling the affairs.

And it was the principles of temperance that Daniel, this saint of the Most High, had lived in Babylon by which he took the kingdom, and by which he had become qualified to take the kingdom. For when he with his brethren was seated at the royal table in Babylon, he refused the king's meat and the wine which he drank; and asked that they be given "pulse to eat and water to drink." The word "pulse" in Daniel 1:12 corresponds exactly to the word "cresses" which the historian used in describing the dietary of the Persians, each word signifying a vegetarian diet.

And the time has now come for the kingdom of God to be established on this earth, in the place of the kingdoms of this world. This is the truth: people may not believe it, but that makes no difference. That kingdom will be established in the earth whether people believe it or not. And the thing to do is to believe it and have the benefit of it. And because the time has come when the kingdom of God is to be set up on the earth, now is the time when the saints of the Most High must be diligently preparing to take that kingdom. And as a part of this preparation, the espousal of true temperance upon divine principles is all-essential. And the purpose of this institution of which you and I are a part, is to spread abroad and inculcate these very Christian principles of temperance and right living.

Shall we not answer to this call of God in this time, and in this place, and for this all-glorious purpose?

A. T. JONES.

**June 1906**

**"True Principles of Temperance" *The Medical Missionary* 15, 6 , pp. 163-167.**

BABYLON lost the kingdom of this world and so sank into everlasting ruin by intemperance.

From Babylon the Medes and Persians took the kingdom of this world, upon the principles and practise of temperance. For of the Persians the history declares: -

"The only food allowed either the children or the young men was bread, cresses, and water; for their design was to accustom them early to temperance and sobriety; besides, they considered that a plain, frugal diet, without any mixture of sauces or ragouts, would strengthen the body, and lay such a foundation of health as would enable them to undergo the hardships and fatigues of war to a good old age."

The Medes and Persians knew that Babylon was sinking by intemperance; and that it was the principles and practise of temperance that gave to themselves such su-

164

periority over the Babylonians that with good heart they could go against that mighty power of Babylon with the expectation of destroying it. For before they started, Cyrus of Persia, who was their commander said to them: -

"Do you know the nature of the enemy you have to deal with? They are soft, effeminate, enervated men, already half conquered by their own luxury and voluptuousness: men not able to bear either hunger or thirst; equally incapable of supporting either the toil of war or the sight of danger: whereas you, that are inured from your infancy to a sober and hard way of living; to you, I say, hunger and thirst are but the sauce, and the only sauce, to your meals; fatigues are your pleasure, dangers your delight."

This character of temperance and the advantage that it gave, was so well known among the other nations that it was a material consideration in their councils. For when Crúsus, king of Lydia, was planning war against the Persians, he was cautioned by one of his counselors in the following words: -

"O prince, why do you think of turning your arms against such a people as the Persians, who, being born in a wild, rugged country, are inured from their infancy to every kind of hardship and fatigue; who, being coarsely clad and coarsely fed, can content themselves with bread and water; who are absolute strangers to all the delicacies and conveniences of life; who, in a word, have nothing to lose if you conquer them, and everything to gain if they conquer you; and whom it would be very difficult to drive out of the country if they should once come to taste the sweets and advantages of it? So far, therefore, from thinking of beginning a war against them, it is my opinion we ought to thank the gods that they have never put it into the heads of the Persians to come and attack the Lydians."

And yet, knowing so well the true principles of temperance, and knowing the blessings and advantages of it - after all this, when the Persians had obtained the kingdom of the world, they went over the same course which the Babylonians had pursued to their ruin.

And it was comparatively only a little while before, by reason "of their excessive magnificence and luxury," they were so changed that "we can hardly believe they were the same people. This luxury and extravagance rose in time to such an excess as was little better than downright madness. The prince carried all his wives along with him to the wars; and with what an equipage such a troop must be attended, is easy to judge. And his generals and officers followed his example, each in proportion to his rank and ability. Their pretext for so doing was that the sight of what they held most dear and precious in the world would encourage them to fight with the greater resolution; but the true reason was the love of pleasure; by which they were overcome and enslaved before they came to engage with the enemy."

Such was the condition of the Persians when Alexander made his mighty expedition and so easily destroyed the Persian empire, and Grecia took the kingdom. And how was it that Grecia rose to the point where she could take the kingdom? "To go barefoot, to lie on the bare ground, to be satisfied with little meat and drink, to suffer heat and cold, to be exercised continually in hunting, wrestling, running on foot and horseback, to be inured to blows and wounds so as to vent neither complaint nor groan - these were the rudiments of education of the Spartan youth." And this placed Sparta where she taught all Greece. In addition to this, there were the great national games of the Greeks, in the preparation and training for which "at first they had no other nourishment than dried figs, nuts, soft cheese, and a coarse, heavy sort of bread. They were absolutely forbidden the use of wine, and enjoined continence." And though it be true that Alexander and the Grecians were far from practising such strict temperance as were the Persians when *they* took the kingdom, yet it is true that, *as compared with the Persians at the time when Grecia took the kingdom*, the Grecians could be counted as fairly temperate people. For although

165

Alexander himself so shortly ended his career by intemperance, yet the Grecians through his successors were able to hold the kingdom of the world for one hundred and sixty years longer before "the transgressors came to the full" and another people must take the kingdom.

The other people to whom now fell the kingdom of the world were the Romans. And still the great truth holds that it is upon the principles and practise of temperance that the kingdom is taken. For of the Romans at this time the history records that their principles and practise of temperance were as true as was that of the Persians when *they* took the kingdom. For, thirty-two years after the destruction of the last vestige of the Grecian kingdom, the Roman senate sent throughout the East on a tour of inspection a "famous embassy, consisting of three of the most eminent men of Rome." And of the simple manners and

temperate habits of these "most eminent men of Rome" the history speaks as follows: -

"The first place which they came to in the discharge of their commission being Alexandria in Egypt, they were there received by the king in great state. But they made their entrance thither with so little that Scipio, who was then the greatest man in Rome, had no more than one friend, Panastius the philosopher, and five servants, in his retinue. And, although they were, during their stay there, entertained with all the varieties of the most sumptuous fare, yet they would touch nothing more of it than what was useful, in the most temperate manner, for the necessary support of nature, despising all the rest as that which corrupted the mind as well as the body, and bred vicious humors in both. Such was the moderation and temperance of the Romans at this time, and hereby it was that they at length advanced their state to so great a height."

And still the course of history holds on the same. When Rome in the practise of the splendid principles of temperance had reaped the benefit in the domination of the world, she too went over the same course which Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Grecia had pursued to deepest intemperance and utter ruin. And the history well shows that to the great height of world dominion to which their practise of the splendid principles of temperance had carried them, "would they have still continued could they still have retained the same virtues. But, when their prosperity, and the great wealth obtained thereby, became the occasion that they degenerated into luxury and corruption of manners, they drew decay and ruin as fast upon them as they had before, victory and prosperity, till at length they were undone by it. So that the poet said justly of them, -

"Luxury came on more cruel than our arms,  
And did revenge the vanquished world with its  
charms."

In the time of the very depths of Rome's enormous intemperance came Christianity, preaching to all people, and planting firmly in the lives of all who believed it righteousness and temperance in view of judgment to come. Thus was Rome saved from ruin at that time.

But there was an apostasy from Christianity by which there was made to prevail a false profession of Christianity. This false church became in turn a kingdom of this world by uniting in both politics and religion with the corrupt and vicious Roman State. And still the course of world-power held on the same. This church-dominion swiftly grew rich, magnificent, luxurious, and vicious. The failing empire that she proposed to save, she only the more speedily and irretrievably destroyed, and new peoples, wild but temperate, in the Ten Kingdoms, occupied the place of the successively overturned world-kingdom which was now to "be no more till He come whose right it is," when it shall be given Him. For it is "in the days of *these* kings" that "the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and which shall not be left to other people; but it shall break in pieces all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."

We are now in the "days" when the God of heaven shall set up that kingdom. The great nations of to-day - the nations

166

that hold the power and dominion of the whole world - are the ones in whose "days" this kingdom is to be set up. And how stand these nations, even now, on this mightiest of all national questions? Are they practising the temperance which enabled the former nations to take and to hold the kingdom? or are they indulging the intemperance that has already lost the kingdom and sunk the nation in ruin?

It is only the sober truth to say that these nations are even now indulging in intemperance in more things, and in far more fiery and vicious things, than were ever indulged in by the people of the great world-kingsdoms of history. No Babylonian, no Median or Persian, no Grecian, and no Roman ever drank, or even had a chance to drink, a drop of whisky, nor of brandy, nor of rum, nor of gin, nor of champagne - every one of which is indulged in to a wickedly intemperate degree by the people of the greatest, the most powerful, the most influential of the nations that to-day hold the dominion of the world. This being so, how, then, is it possible for these to escape the ruin that overtook the world-empires of the past? Those ancient empires knew only one kind of intoxicant, that was *wine* - fermented grape juice. Yet with only that one intoxicant and its accompanying vices those powers sunk themselves in such intemperance as to end only in annihilating ruin. How much more then, and how much more speedily, must these great nations of to-day sink themselves in ruinous intemperance, in the indulgence of their many intoxicants, all of which are more fiery and fierce than was the single one that was known to the ancients!

More than this: No Babylonian, no Median or Persian, no Grecian, and no Roman ever used tea, coffee, or tobacco, all of which are vicious stimulants and narcotics, - intoxicants, - and all of which are excessively indulged in by all the nations of to-day; to say nothing of the more deadly poisons, opium, morphine, cocaine, absinthe, and hashish. For "from tea to hashish, through hops, alcohol, tobacco, and opium, we have a graduated scale of intoxicants which stimulate in small doses and narcotize in larger. The physiological action of all these agents gradually shades into each other: all producing, or being capable of producing successive paralysis of the various parts of the nervous and vascular systems." - *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

Again it must be asked, How can the nations of to-day survive the intemperance which they are indulging in *all* the things of this double list of vicious intoxicants, when the ancient nations all so easily and so effectually destroyed themselves in the indulgence of only *one* - and that one not the most vicious nor the most destructive?

And when by this intemperance these nations of to-day do sink themselves in this perfect certainty of destruction, where, then, shall be found the people to take and perpetuate the kingdom and the dominion, as there must be; for God "created not the earth in vain." He formed it to be inhabited. There are now nowhere on earth any new, mild, and temperate people to rise up and sweep away these sinking world-powers and take the kingdom, as in all the great crises

of the past. All the world is now actually possessed and ruled by these very nations of to-day. Where alone can there be found, and therefore where alone shall there be found the people to take the kingdom? Our study has already told us this - "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom ;" and "the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever."

And since there are no new nations to rise up and take the kingdom as in all the crises of the past, it follows that those who shall take the kingdom must be called out and gathered out of the nations, tongues, kindreds, and peoples that now compose the kingdoms and the dominion of the world. But the kingdom and dominion of the world has never yet been taken and possessed, except upon the principles and practise of temperance. It follows, therefore, that to all the nations and peoples of the world there must now be given a call to temperance: and only to such temperance as shall take the kingdom.

167

And since it is the kingdom of God that is now to be set up on the earth in the place of all these kingdoms of men, and since it is in this way that the saints of the Most High are now to take the kingdom, it follows that all these who shall be called to this temperance, must also be called to be saints of the Most High. It also follows that the temperance to which people from all nations must now be called must be such temperance as becomes not merely an earthly, human, and temporal kingdom, but such temperance as is fitting only to saints of the Most High and the divine and eternal kingdom. It must be such temperance in both morals and manners, such temperance of both flesh and spirit, as will perfect, in the fear of God, that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord.

Such a message, such a preaching, such a call, is in the nature of things just now due to all the nations and people of the world. Are not the conditions already such as to make it now high time that this message and this call be proclaimed with mighty power? And will not such a message be effectual to its full intent? Did not those ancient nations who in succession took the kingdom of the world, practise temperance? They did it to obtain a corruptible crown, while these are to be called to do it to obtain an incorruptible. Those did it *voluntarily* to obtain a corruptible crown, a fleeting glory and a perishable kingdom. Can not these be *persuaded* to do it to obtain an incorruptible crown, immortal glory, and an imperishable, because a divine and an eternal, kingdom?

And just this is the great purpose of the existence of the Battle Creek Sanitarium and this sanitarium system, whether as found in this Sanitarium itself, or in the related institutions that now exist or the thousands of these that may, and that certainly should yet be. This is why we are all here. May the Lord arouse us to, baptize us in, and imbue us with, such a genuine and thorough espousal of these principles in their very spirit as shall cause us, whether here or elsewhere, ever to be both in principle and in practise, in flesh and spirit, so truly temperate that we shall be of those who, in the days of these kings, "shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever."

A. T. JONES.

**July 3, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question: Its Origin" *The Medical Missionary* 15, 1 , pp. 1-3.**

**THE EASTERN QUESTION IS THE WHOLE WORLD'S QUESTION**

ALONZO T. JONES

EVERYBODY knows of the Eastern Question; though not everybody knows just what it is. Briefly and bluntly stated, the whole Eastern Question springs from Russia's design to possess Constantinople, and the efforts of the other great powers of Europe to keep her from it.

For more than a thousand years Russia has been wanting Constantinople. In this time she has made a number of attempts to gain it. Once she practically had it, but a brilliant move of Britain with other Powers prevented her from keeping it; and thus arose the Eastern Question in fact.

The first set attempt of Russia to take Constantinople was by a naval expedition in 865. An entrance into the very port of the city was gained; but a tempest, joined to the resistance of the city, caused the Russians to retreat. A second attempt, also by sea, was made in A.D. 904. This also was unsuccessful. A third attempt, again by sea, was made in A.D. 941; but this was defeated by the Greeks, through their employment of the Greek fire. The next attempt, the fourth, was in an expedition by land in A.D. 955-973. The armies marched successfully as far as Adrianople, about one hundred and twenty-five miles from Constantinople. There the Czar was summoned by the Greek emperor to "evacuate the country. Sviatoslaf, who had just taken Philippopolis and exterminated the inhabitants, replied haughtily, that he hoped soon to be at Constantinople." The tide of war turned however. The Russian armies were driven back to

2

the Danube, there encompassed, assaulted, and starved to surrender, and were then released upon the solemn bond under oath to "relinquish all hostile designs," "never again to invade the empire;" and if they broke their word, might they "become as yellow as gold and perish by their own arms." Yet only seventy years afterward, A.D. 1043, another attempt was made by sea. This was also defeated - at the entrance of the Bosphorus by the Greek fleet with Greek fire and the aid of a tempest.

Though for centuries no other attempt was made from Russia to take Constantinople by force of arms, yet "the Russians were always dreaded by Constantinople. An inscription hidden in the boot of one of the equestrian statues of Byzantium announced that the day would come when the capital of the empire would fall a prey to the men of the north." - *Rimbaud's "Russia," Chap. V., Par. 7.*

"The memory of these arctic fleets that seemed to descend from the polar circle, left a deep impression of terror on the Imperial city.

By the vulgar of every rank, it was asserted and believed that an equestrian statue in the square of Taurus, was secretly inscribed with a prophecy how the Russians, in the last days, should become masters of Constantinople. In our own time [1769-1774] a Russian armament instead of sailing from the Borysthenes, has circumnavigated the Continent of Europe; and the Turkish capital has been threatened by a squadron of strong and lofty ships of war, each of which, with its naval science and thundering artillery, could have sunk or scattered an hundred canoes such as those of their ancestors. Perhaps the present generation may yet behold the accomplishment of the prediction, of a rare prediction, of which the style is unambiguous and the date unquestionable." - *Gibbon's "Rome," Chap. LV., Par. 13.*

Throughout the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, the forces of the Russians were kept busy at home by their own internal necessities, the invasion of the Moguls and Tartars of Zingis Khan and Tamerlane, and by the power of the Turks who from 1299 onward, possessed the territories of the Eastern Empire, and from 1449 all of that empire itself, except the city of Constantinople alone, and who in 1453 took even that city.

But, though the Turks possessed Constantinople, this did not quench the Russian purpose to possess that city; it only added another item to the problem. For since that time Russia has "regarded the destruction of the Ottoman Empire as the great object of her existence." - *"Historian's History of the World," Vol. XXIV., Page 426.* Her first set attempt at this was made by Catherine the Great in 1769-1774. In 1769-'70 her armies were successful against the Turks in their possessions of the north of the Black Sea and the River Danube. In 1770 she also sent a mighty fleet from the Baltic around Europe to attack the Turks in Greece and the Mediterranean. "Her designs were truly gigantic - no less than to *drive the Mohammedans from Europe.*"

That year's operations were of such brilliant success that it was thought the following year would see the full accomplishment of her purpose. "The position of Turkey was, indeed, critical; not only was one-half of the empire in revolt, but the plague had alarmingly thinned the population. Fortunately, however, for this power, the same scourge found its way into the heart of Russia; its ravages were as fatal at Moscow as at Constantinople; and it no more spared the Christians on the Danube, than it did the Mohammedans."

The calamity of the plague so weakened both powers that through the war continued nearly three years longer, the issue was so uncertain that it was concluded in July, 1774, by the peace and treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji by which "Russia obtain the free navigation of the Black Sea, the right of passage through the Danube, a large tract of land between the Bug and the Dnieper, with the strong fortresses of Azof, Tagarog, Kertch, and Kinburn. The rest of the Crimea was ceded - not, indeed, to the Turks, but to its own khan, who, though declared independent, must of necessity be the creature of the empress, [Catherine] in whose hands those fortresses remained. They were the keys to his dominion, and even to the command of the Black Sea. A sum of money sufficient to defray

the expenses of the war was also stipulated; but it was never paid. The advantages which Russia derived from the other articles were ample enough; among them, not the least was the commerce of the Levant and of the Black Sea." - *Id. Vol. XVII., PP. 380-383*. Thus though the empress Catherine's design "to drive the Mohammedans from Europe" was a failure, there was begun the dissolution of the Turkish empire which from that time has gone steadily forward little by little unto to-day very little of it remains in Europe.

In 1787 the empress Catherine of Russia in alliance with the emperor Joseph II. of Austria, planned the "partition of the Turkish empire," with the absorption of Poland by Russia and the grand duke Constantine, second grand-son of Catherine, to be established in Constantinople as "Emperor of Byzantium." "Joseph II. was invited to meet the Empress in Kherson in order to consult with her upon a partition of the Turkish empire;" into which city "Catherine made a magnificent entry. . . passing under a triumphal arch on which was inscribed in the Greek tongue, 'The way to Byzantium.'"

"After the meeting at Kherson, the two imperial allies prepared to direct their forces against the whole extent of the Turkish frontier, from the Adriatic to the Black Sea." Turkey was systematically provoked into a declaration of war, in order to give to Catherine an excuse for open hostilities. The war was desperately fought on both sides. The allies steadily gained, however, and "became masters of the whole line of fortresses which covered the Turkish frontier: the three grand armies, originally separated by a vast extent of country, were rapidly converging to the same point, and threatened by their united force, to overbear all opposition, and in another campaign to complete *the subversion of the Ottoman empire in Europe.*"

But just at this point Britain, Prussia, and others incited Poland to revolt; encouraged discontent in Hungary; materially aided the king of Sweden in his war against Russia; fomented troubles in the Netherlands; Prussia even "opened a negotiation with the Porte for the conclusion of an offensive alliance, intended not only to effect the restoration of the dominions conquered during the existing war, but even of the Crimea, and the territories dismembered by the two imperial courts of Poland;" and "laid the foundation of a general alliance for reducing the overgrown power of Austria and Russia." - *Id. pp. 398-409*.

France which was the only power that might have helped the allies "was in the throes of her great revolution, and Joseph was left without a resource." Just then, also, February, 1700, the emperor Joseph died; and his successor concluded with Turkey a separate treaty which also separated Austria from the alliance with Russia. Russia continued the war on her own part till 1792, when finding it impossible to succeed against Turkey and at the same time hold her own in Poland "resolved for this time to give up her conquests in Turkey in order to indemnify herself in Poland." Russia therefore, accepted "the intervention of the friendship Danes" and the peace and treaty of Jassy between Russia and Turkey was concluded January 19, 1792.

When in his own behalf, Napoleon I. was playing all the powers of Europe, under pretense of friendliness to Turkey he secured war between Turkey and Russia; and in negotiations with Russia he caused everything in reference to Turkey to bear upon "a scheme of partition" of that empire. A truce was arranged

3

August 24, 1807, which held till 1811 when Napoleon's war with Russia compelled that power again to conclude a peace with Turkey and to "abandon the *long coveted prey, when it was already in its grasp.*" - *Id. pp. 466-468.*

In 1828 Russia again brought on a war which was openly declared June 3. In June, 1829, one Russian army had gained Adrianople once more; another had taken Erzeroum in Asia; "and the two generals would doubtless have joined hands in Constantinople, but for the efforts of diplomacy and the fear of a general conflagration. . . . Austria was ready to send her troops to the help of the Turks and the English also seemed likely to declare for the vanquished. It was therefore necessary to come to a halt. Russia reflected that, after all, 'the sultan was the least costly governor-general she could have at Constantinople,' and lent an ear to moderate conditions of peace." - *Id. pp. 544, 545.*

In 1831 Mehemet Ali, Turkish Pasha of Egypt, had attained such power that he decided to strike for independence. In October of that year he sent an army of fifty thousand men for the invasion of Syria. This army made an easy conquest as far as to Acre, but that stronghold had to be besieged. It was taken however, May 27, 1832. A Turkish army that had been sent for the relief of Acre was defeated, as were all other forces that were met by the Egyptians; and by a decisive victory December 21, 1832, "The victor was free to march upon Constantinople; nothing could impede his progress."

The advancing army reached Brusa, "and was menacing Scutari," the city only across the strait from Constantinople. The western Powers had witnessed all of this without offering to the Sultan any aid whatever. Indeed their sympathies, if not their encouragement, were with the rebellious and invading forces. Here was a grand opportunity for Russia; and she seized it. She offered aid. The Sultan "Mahmud, being frightened, accepted the offers of aid made him in the name of the Czar by General Muraviev." France advised further parley with Mehemet Ali, but he now asked so much that the Sultan could not consent. The invaders "marched upon Scutari. Mahmud then summoned the Russians, who landed fifteen thousand men in the city, and prepared to defend it." Thus at last with fifteen thousand armed men in the city, Russia had practical possession of Constantinople.

But, "The French and English ambassadors, frightened at this intervention, pointed out to the Sultan the danger of letting Russia gain a footing in the heart of the empire; it would be better, said they, to capitulate to his rebellious subjects. The Sultan allowed himself to be persuaded, and on May 5, 1833, the viceroy consented to evacuate Asia-Minor in return for the Pashalik of Acre, Aleppo, Tripoli and Damascus, with their dependencies."

But again the pendulum swung toward Russia: "Mahmud, blinded by resentment, and misled by the promises of St. Petersburg, signed with Nicolas a

treaty of offensive and defensive alliance . . . Turkey put herself at the mercy of the autocrat of all the Russians."

This, however, was too much for the other Powers to bear. Russia must not be allowed to hold this mighty advantage, which in a crisis could so easily be turned into absolute and irresistible possession. The arrangement of May 5, 1833, between the Sultan and Mehemet Ali, was merely an arrangement, and not a conclusive peace; and the quarrel went on, with the Powers shifting their sympathies or their favor, advising settlement or urging war, as advantage seemed to invite.

This continued for six years, when, June 30, 1839, died the Sultan Mahmud, and the Sultanate fell to his son who was but sixteen years old. The tide still ran full in favor of the rebellious Pasha. The Turkish fleet sent from the capital to attack the Egyptian fleet, went over bodily to Mehemet Ali. "Fortune seemed to be emptying its horn upon the Egyptian."

The case was desperate for Turkey, and, in that, for all the Powers - *except Russia*. For her, as well as for the Egyptians, it was Fortune's own bounty. But the other Powers must act, or Constantinople and the Turkish empire would be gone forever, and Russia alone would be the fortunate possessor. This was certain: and as certainly a general confused war, if the Powers were to hold up their heads at all. Therefore, the four Powers - Britain, France, Austria and Prussia - suddenly, and for the occasion, *sunk all differences*, and made the original, bold, and high and mighty stroke, of *assuming absolutely all the responsibilities of Turkey and the whole case*. "In order to prevent Turkey from again throwing herself into the arms of Russia, the four great Powers, in a collective note of July 27, 1839, declared that *they would take the settlement of the Eastern Question into their own hands*."

This bold lead checkmated Russia by the single move itself. She could not suddenly, without any preparation whatever, war against all Europe; nor could she afford to be completely left out and have the other Powers go on and settle all the matters involved, without any recognition or consideration of her in any way whatever. She was therefore forced to abandon every advantage that she possessed, either by position or by the late treaty, and, with the bare saving of her face, enter the "concert" upon original conditions with the other Powers. Accordingly, "Russia, in order not to be entirely left out, had to give her assent, and to support the convention as fifth Power." - *Id.*, pp. 451-453.

Such was the origin, and thus arose, The Eastern Question.

Primarily therefore, the Eastern Question is, The Responsibility of the Four Great Powers of Western Europe for Turkey. And this responsibility was assumed from the necessity of keeping Russia from permanently possessing Constantinople.

How the Eastern Question has become the whole world's question, will be told next week.

**July 10, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question - How It Became the World's Question" *The Medical Missionary* 15, 2 , pp. 10, 11.**

ALONZO T. JONES

AS already related, to break Russia's hold on Constantinople and thus avoid a general war, the powers of Western Europe assumed the responsibility for Turkey July 27, 1839.

To do this they had suddenly sunk all their differences. But after they had done it they immediately discovered that the *responsibility* was all that they really did have. For when they began to act under the responsibility, all their differences were just as real as before. At the very first approach to the immediate question to be settled - the pacifying of Egypt - this appeared with force.

First of all, France was striving for "Supremacy in the Mediterranean." Ever since Napoleon's expedition into Egypt and the East, in 1798, she had counted that Egypt should rightfully be hers. Mehemet Ali was friendly to France. This was therefore such an element in her favor, that she desired only such a settlement as would leave Mehemet Ali the "full right" that he had gained.

England was now as much opposed to French influence in Egypt as she had been when Napoleon was there. And therefore, could not agree with France in supporting the ambition of Mehemet Ali; and also because of the danger that to support Mehemet's claims would so weaken Turkey that Russia might regain her lost advantage.

Russia, still indulging her ancient ambition and hope to gain Constantinople, and with it as much of Turkish territory as possible, would not favor Mehemet's claims because that meant alienation of Turkish territory.

"Austria and Prussia upheld Russia and hence France stood alone."

These four powers standing for the integrity of Turkish territory and therefore against all claim of independence for Mehemet Ali, caused France now to be left out of the "concert" as Russia had been at the first. And in the settlement of the difficulties of Turkey, these four powers now went forward without France, just as, without Russia, the original four had originated the "concert" and assumed the responsibility for Turkey. Accordingly, July 15, 1840, these four powers, without France - Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia - with a plenipotentiary of the Turkish government present, concluded the treaty of London which fixed the terms of settlement for Turkey and Mehemet Ali. "In this treaty the hereditary tenure of the Pashalik of Egypt was assured to Mehemet Ali, together with the life-long possession of a part of Syria, *in case he submitted within ten days to the decisions of the Conference.*" Mehemet Ali on his part was to evacuate all other parts of the Sultan's dominions that were occupied by his troops, and must return to the Sultan the Ottoman fleet. - *Historian's History of the World, Vol. XXIV., pp. 453, 454.*

These terms without being subject to any change or qualification, were handed as an ultimatum to Mehemet Ali in Alexandria by the Turkish Minister for

Foreign Affairs on August 11, 1840. Also on *that same day*, in Constantinople, in answer to a question by the Turkish government as to just what would be done, and how, in the event of Mehemet Ali's refusal, the ambassadors of the four powers gave the collective and official information that there was no ground for any anxiety on the part of the Divan as to any contingencies: the powers were now responsible for all these things. Thus on August 11, 1840, *the independence of the Turkish empire vanished*; the Powers had taken full control; and the Eastern Question had become a fixture in the world's affairs.

Against the settlement made in the London Treaty, and the ultimatum presented by the powers, there was "a wild cry of protest in France" which indeed assumed at least the show of "war-like preparations." Mehemet Ali thus encouraged refused to comply with the terms of the powers. Force was applied by the powers. "An Anglo-Austrian fleet sailed for the Syrian coast; Beirut and Acre were taken, and Alexandria was bombarded by the English commodore Napier." A change of ministry in France robbed Mehemet Ali of all shadow of help; and out of all the terms offered, he was glad to be allowed the one item of the hereditary Pashalik of Egypt, with even this "subject to the right of investiture and appointment" by the Sultan, and with the payment of an annual tribute to Turkey. And even this favor he owed to England alone who had in it, as will be seen, a far reaching purpose.

The formation of the "concert of Europe" in the assumption by the Powers of the Responsibility for Turkey did not by any means quench Russia's ancient purpose to possess Constantinople. It only united [*sic.*] the other powers of Europe in such a way as the longer, and possibly the more surely, to keep her from getting it. Russia, however, still kept this great object ever before her; and the prospect became apparently so bright for "the speedy extinction of Turkey" that "in 1853 the Czar proposed to the British ambassador, Sir H. Seymour, a plan for the division of 'the sick man's' inheritance as soon as he should expire." And this was the cause of the Crimean War, 1853, September - 1856, February 1.

France and Austria had gained from the Sultan certain concessions: upon which "Russian jealousy immediately awoke" and a special envoy was sent to Constantinople to make demands that "amounted to nothing less" than the granting to the Czar by the Sultan, "the protectorate over all the Sultan's subjects professing the Greco-Russian worship - that is to say the great majority of the inhabitants of Turkey in Europe."

This enormous claim was urged by Russia because the Czar could not think that, just at that time especially, the Western powers were in a position to come to an understanding and to act in common," and "he hoped to triumph over the Divan by audacity." And if audacity should not win, then if Turkey should dare to go alone to war, the result would be the certain "conquest of Constantinople, the deliverance of Jerusalem, and the extension of the Slavonic empire." But the Czar was mistaken all around. The Sultan seeing that Russia's demands meant practical conquest anyhow, resolved on "making a supreme effort to sell her life dearly, if it were impossible to save it."

The Sultan therefore, declared war and in his desperation the king of the North went "forth with great fury to destroy and utterly to make away many." Dan. 11:44. Also "by an almost miraculous concourse of circumstances, an alliance was formed between France and England; those two ancient and ardent rivals. And, further, this "almost miraculous" alliance for the purpose of aiding Turkey was immediately sanctioned by both Austria and Prussia in "a protocol signed at Vienna by the four Powers."

All this was an astonishment to the Czar. But it was too late now to stop and in going on, the Czar attempted to draw the sympathy of the people by the pretense that it was a war of religion with Russia as the champion of Christianity. He actually published a manifesto in which he exclaimed: "Again Russia fighting for Orthodoxy, England and France enter the lists as champions of the enemies of Christianity. But Russia will not fail in her sacred vocation. . . . Fighting for our oppressed brothers who confess the faith of Christ, Russia will have but one heart and voice to cry 'God, our Saviour! Whom have we to fear? Let Christ arise and let his enemies be scattered!'" - *Id. Vol. XVII., pp. 562, 563.*

The successive events of the war continued the Czar's astonishment. And

3

when peace was finally granted him, both the power and the prestige of Russia were greatly reduced.

In 1877-'79 Russia again began hostilities against Turkey. Turkey was so manifestly in the wrong that the Western powers allowed events to take their own course - till Constantinople was endangered. Russia was eminently successful; and her armies reached a point less than seven miles from Constantinople. Yet Russia did not dare to attempt to take the city; for, to do so, would be to throw Europe into war, as the English fleet had already been "directed to pass the Dardanelles." Therefore in the treaty of San Stefano, peace was arranged between Russia and Turkey. But this treaty was not allowed to stand; the Western powers in the Congress of Berlin supplanted it with a treaty composed by *all the powers*; thus the powers till asserting their supremacy and sole responsibility for Turkey. Yet it is recognized that the war of 1877, more than ever "renewed Turkish dominion in Europe an impossibility." - *Id., Vol. XXIV., p. 433.*

It is singular that while all the other Powers solidly unite to keep Russia from having Constantinople, none of them has ever made any attempt, nor has even manifested any desire, to have it for herself. When the Emperor Joseph II. of Austria met Catherine II. at Kershon, and she first opened to him the plan to take Constantinople *then*, he exclaimed, "What will we do with it?" There seems to be a sort of fatality of conviction that only Russia can ever really have it when Turkey goes; and that the only proper course of the other powers is simple, as long as possible, to keep her from it.

This has led to another curious course of procedure, that has caused the question concerning Constantinople and the Turkish possessions - Eastern Question, - to become the World's Question. That is: that while all have solidly united to preserve Constantinople and the Turkish *power*, and also the Turkish territory *so far as any actual alienation of territory* is concerned, yet each power has been untiring in its watchfulness and its effort to gain control, and even to

occupy, as much as possible of that territory by *influence* of whatever sort; so that to-day the Turkish territory outside of Europe is practically distributed among the three powers, Russia, Germany and Britain, by what is recognized and known as their "*spheres of influence*." It is as though the integrity of the Turkish power and of Constantinople, were systematically held before themselves as a mere foil to their furtive grabbing, by each one, of all that she could possibly gain. And the plain endeavor is that each one shall have her sphere of influence so well established and so clearly defined, that when the inevitable day shall come when Constantinople falls and Turkey fails, they can each look one another in the face and say, Here we all are; what is the use of any fighting? Let our respective spheres of influence, be now held as permanent division and possession of the Turkish territory!

And the conditions are now such that this could easily be done. Russia's sphere of influence is recognized as embracing all the northern and north-eastern parts of Asia Minor. By means of railroad concession and possession, beginning at Scutari, Germany's sphere of influence embraces all central Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia clear to Bagdad on the Tigris. Britain's sphere, which is already largely actual possession and sovereignty, embraces Cyprus and the southern coast of Asia Minor, Egypt and Arabia. France's sphere is commercial rather than territorial, yet it is sufficient to make her a power to be considered and reckoned with, when the day of decision and division shall come.

This drawing of spheres of influence, as to Turkish territory has led to another curious thing; that is, that these spheres of influence especially as between Britain [*sic.*] and Russia have gradually but irresistibly been extended clear across Asia to the Pacific Ocean and now actually embrace the whole East. So that the same powers that stand, chiefly, face to face in Turkey stand also, chiefly, face to face in China.

Indeed, with only small spaces or petty states between them as "buffer states," Britain and Russia actually stand face to face clear across Asia from the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles to the Pacific Ocean. Great Britain's sphere embracing Cyprus and the southern coast of Asia Minor, Egypt, Arabia, India, Thibet, the whole of the heart of China, and, *by her present offensive and defensive alliance with Japan*, even to the point of Kamchatka; and Russia's sphere embracing northern and north-eastern Asia Minor, Persia, and Siberia to the very point of Kamchatka. From Scutari to Bagdad, Germany stands between Britain and Russia; and until Japan's victory over Russia, in China at Kiao-chau, she also stood close in with Britain and Russia. And France holds southern China as her sphere of influence in the extreme east.

And it must be borne in mind that while these powers have been extending their spheres of influence from the Bosphorus to the Pacific Ocean, they have not hesitated to absorb amongst them all Africa also. Thus the powers that are responsible for Turkey are to-day the powers that control all Europe, all Africa, Australia and most of the islands of the Pacific; all Asia; with Britain extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific in the British possessions of North America.

And this is how it is, and as plain as A B C, that the Eastern Question has become and now is, and to the end will be, the World's Question.

**July 17, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. Why Does Russia Want Constantinople?" *The Medical Missionary* 15, 3 , pp. 17-19.**

ALONZO T. JONES

LET any person look at a map of the Russian possessions in Europe and Asia, and note where lie all her ports. It will readily be seen that with the exception of the ports in the Black Sea, they all lie in the very coldest regions; and these with the exception of St. Petersburg, Riga, and Vladivostok lie even in the arctic regions. And even St. Petersburg, Riga and the Baltic Sea itself, are ice-bound for nearly half the year. It is so also with Vladivostok.

At a glance, therefore, it is seen that for nearly or quite half the year, Russia's navies are ice-bound and absolutely shut away from the world's waters. And plainly this prohibits Russia from having any effective power on the sea; and excludes all prospect of her making successful war. And so long as this condition shall continue, - it matters not how strong she may be in herself, in navies and material, - as for real effectiveness she will rate only as a second-class power or less.

The Black Sea is the only water that Russia has that is open the year round. There she can build and float her navies always in free, warm water. But lo! the only door from the Black Sea to the world's waters - the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles - is in the power of the Turk, and in addition by terms of specific treaties of the concerted powers is absolutely closed to war-vessels. Thus in effect the Black Sea, though warm water the year round, is rendered as valueless as though it were ice-bound the year round.

Is it, then, any wonder that Russia should have so long "regarded the destruction of the Ottoman Empire" and the possession of Constantinople, and thus the control of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, "as the great object of her existence?" It was to make the conquest of Turkey, that Peter the Great

18

spent time in Holland and England to learn ship-building. He wrote: "We labor in order thoroughly to master the art of the Sea; so that, having once learned it, we may return to Russia and conquer the enemies of Christ, and free by His grace the Christians who are oppressed. This is what I shall long for, to my latest breath." - *Rimbaud's History of Russia, Chapter XXII., Sec. 2.*

But in spite of all, there still hangs tenaciously the hated Turk, in full possession of the key to Russia's only door. More aggravating still, the European "concert" persists in maintaining the Turk in that aggravating position. And yet aggravating above all, Russia herself is obliged to play a part in this harassing "concert."

From the tantalizing tedium of this situation Russia sought relief in the far East, on the coast and waters of China. Little by little she pushed herself into

Manchuria, and through Manchuria to the possession of the Laio-tung peninsula with its splendid harbors of Port Arthur and Dalny. *There*, all the year round she had open ports to the world's waters. Now she would come into her own. Now she would be a world power indeed: on the sea as on land. There, accordingly, she proceeded immediately to establish docks, arsenals, and one of the mightiest strongholds in the world.

But in the Far East there were watching eyes, as well as in Europe. And even these eyes Russia herself had opened. In 1895 there was war between Japan and China. When peace was made the Laio-tung peninsula, with other territory was ceded to Japan. But Russia, France, and Germany united in protest against the cession of the Laio-tung peninsula. And the threatening protest of those three powers was supported by Britain to the extent of "advising" Japan to yield to the protest. To avoid a new war Japan yielded: and the *territory in question* fell immediately *under Russia's "influence;"* and this "influence" very shortly became established possession under cover of a twenty-five year lease.

This opened wide the eyes of Japan to the fact that Russian power in the Far East meant only mischief to Japan. And when Russia not only spread her power over all Manchuria and built her mighty fortress and naval bases at Port Arthur and Dalny, but began openly to encroach upon Korea, and actually though "by secret diplomacy" sought "to obtain the important port of Masampo in southern Korea" at the very doors of Japan itself, then Japan plainly saw that soon she must fight for her very existence. The only question was whether she should wait longer and fight at home, at every disadvantage and with prospect of only defeat; or take the initiative at once and fight in foreign territory with prospect of success.

Japan did the wise and timely thing and grandly won. She took Port Arthur, Dalny, and the whole peninsula; destroyed Russia's power in Manchuria; made sure of Korea; and by an offensive and defensive alliance with Britain, shut away Russia forever from any warm water port, and from all hope of any effective power, in the Eastern seas; and threw her back to the former conditions in which *the taking of Constantinople is her only hope.*

Russia instantly realized this. Indeed it was impossible for her not to realize it. And with her *the whole world realizes it:* and to the degree that no other calculation is now made; and to the certainty that admissions, and even preparations, are being made accordingly.

And the conditions for it are practically ready. At every step that Russia has taken in this course from the time of Catharine II. she has in some way met Britain. In every attempt that she has made on Constantinople she has found herself checked in such a way that she could plainly see the hand of Britain as predominant in it. So repeatedly and so long has this been evident, that now the whole world recognizes that the issues of the Eastern Question lie preeminently between Russia and Britain; and that the Eastern Question itself is now more than anything else a diplomatic and strategic contest between Britain and Russia.

In this contest it must be confessed that though Russia has sometimes made what seemed to be a master stroke, yet in the long run the permanent advantage has been with Britain. Of this the map of Europe and Asia as it stands to-day, politically, is a most remarkable and eloquent witness. In the preceding article on

this subject, it was told how that, beginning at Constantinople, the "spheres of influence" of the powers has been extended clear across Asia to the Pacific Ocean. Britain and Russia have been the chief ones in this. And it is their mutual rivalry and jealousy that has been the cause of it.

It was there shown that Russia's possessions and spheres of influence comprehend the northern and north-eastern parts of Asia Minor; Persia; northern Afghanistan; Siberia and North China, except Manchuria, to the Pacific; while Britain's spheres of influence comprehend Cyprus and the southern coast of Asia Minor, Egypt, Arabia, India, Thibet, the heart of China, and, through her alliance with Japan, all from China to the point of Kamchatka. It will be seen by this that in no place does Russia reach any available water, while Britain does so everywhere.

And details only make this the more emphatic. Beginning at the point of Kamchatka, Britain's offensive and defensive alliance with Japan gives to her against Russia all the waters of the far East. By definite understanding with Russia, the whole valley of the Yang-tse-kiang, which in every sense is the heart of China, is Britain's sphere of influence. By Colonel Younghusband's expedition into Thibet and the treaty made at the capital there, British influence must ever be predominant there. All India is British possession. Islands inside the Persian Gulf, by which she can control the Straits of Ormuz, are British possessions. Aden on the north and Somaliland on the south, of the mouth of the Straits of Bab-el-mandeb are both British. All Egypt with the Suez Canal and the mouths of the Nile, is British. Cyprus at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, is British. Gibraltar at the entrance of the Mediterranean is British.

Nor does the story stop at Gibraltar: the English Channel is British. And yet more, and, if anything, more remarkable still as against Russia the Skager Rack, if not also the Cattegat, is safely British. For in the winter and spring of 1906 Norway became independent. The great question then was whether she should be a republic or a kingdom. It was finally decided that the form of government should be a kingdom. And the man who was chosen as king, is the nephew and son-in-law of the king and queen of England. Under all the circumstances of that affair of Norway, can anybody doubt that this selection of the nephew and son-in-law of Britain's sovereigns was brought about by British diplomacy?

To any who might be inclined to doubt it, it might be well to say that Sweden was on the brink of war with Norway to bring her under. Norway was thoroughly prepared and ready to resist. The night of the last day for the Swedish decision, Norwegian troops were all waiting, with horses harnessed and saddled-ready to spring to action on the instant of telegraphic notice. But that night, in the last minutes as it were, the British minister to Sweden went to King Oscar and made such representations as secured the recognition of Norwegian independence, and therefore peace. This and kindred facts put it fairly past all question that British diplomacy put Britain's nephew and son-in-law on the throne of Norway.

And it is easy to see that this may well be only a part of Britain's long contest with Russia. For the king of Norway who is nephew and son-in-law of the sovereigns of Britain, is the son of the king of Denmark. And the king of Denmark

is brother to Britain's queen. Nor with this strong British connection in . . . Denmark and Norway, it might well

19

easily come about that in a general war in which Britain and Russia were the chief antagonists, Norway and Denmark would stand with Britain. And by this Britain could absolutely close the Cattegat against Russia. And if this be so then Britain would have *the key to every door of Europe and Asia*, and could shut every one tight against Russia. And if Britain can make sure of the friendship of France, for which she is working hard and which she has been fast gaining, then she can shut tight and hold all these doors against all the rest of the world.

Let any one take a map of Europe and Asia, and, beginning with Norway and Denmark, draw a chain along Britain's points of vantage - the English channel, Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, the Mouths of the Nile, the Suez Canal, the Straits of Bab-el-mandeb, within the Straits of Omuz, all India, Thibet, the heart of China to Shang-hai, Wei-hai-wei, on the point opposite Port Arthur, Hong-kong, then, by her alliance with Japan, Formosa and the isles of Japan to the point of Kamchatka, then along the fiftieth parallel through Sagalien, then down and across the Sea of Japan to the northern line of Korea, then down the Yalu and over the peninsula to Port Arthur. Let anybody do this and then say, if he can, that British diplomacy and statesmanship have not magnificently triumphed over Russia in the contest of the Eastern Question. In all the history of the world there has never been a longer-headed problem, nor one more wisely worked out, than this one so splendidly perfected by the statesmen of Britain.

And now the bearing of this on Russia's getting Constantinople: Russia is now pleading that since Britain has gained so much as she has, and is so secure in it all, she can *well afford to let Russia have Constantinople* - without any further disputing.

More than this, a leading British journal has openly advocated *Britain's doing this very thing*; of saying to Russia, Take Constantinople whenever yet get ready; we shall not object. It is not worth our contending for now.

In addition to this the latest history on this subject, issued only last year, gives the following two ominous sentences: -

"Never has the outlook in Turkey been so gloomy and deplorable as to-day." "Danger looms large from all quarters; everywhere the sword of Damocles hangs over Ottoman rule." - *Historians of the World, Vol. XXIV., pp. 433, 434-5.*

And such is the prospect, yea such is the bright prospect, of Russia's very soon possessing Constantinople. And when she takes it, then what? - That will be the next study.

**July 24, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. The Loss of Constantinople: Then What?"**  
***The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 4 , pp. 25, 26.**

ALONZO T. JONES

AT the close of the Eastern Question last week, it was stated that now since the British alliance with Japan, public opinion is expressed to the effect that so far as Britain is concerned, Russia should be allowed to take Constantinople whenever she chooses to do so.

The following from the London *Spectator* is sufficiently open and expressive to make the situation perfectly plain to everybody.

"If we are wise, we shall strike while the iron is hot, and endeavor to come to an understanding with Russia under which she will frankly abandon her policy of menacing India, while we, on the other hand, shall make it clear to her that we now realize, as Lord Salisbury said, That in supporting Turkey against Russia, we 'put our money on the wrong horse.' In our opinion, we should tell the Russians plainly that we have ceased to consider the maintenance of the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire, an essential British interest, and that, though we could not view with independent kingdoms in the Balkan Peninsula, we should not regard the presence of Russia on the Bosphorus as injurious to us, nor resent the absorption of those portions of Asia Minor which naturally go with the possession of Constantinople. Russia would, of course, have to make her own terms with France, Austria, Italy, and Germany in regard to Asia Minor and Syria; but we, at any rate, should make it clear to her that we have ceased to look upon Constantinople as a portion of the earth's surface which could not be occupied by Russia without involving war with Britain. . . . Though what we have written may seem to read somewhat like a scheme for partitioning the Turkish Empire, we by no means suggest that we should invite Russia to enter immediately upon any sensational or adventurous line of action. All that it would be right or wise for us to do would be to point out to her that she need no longer regard us as the power which holds her in check on the South and stands in the way of Russian aspirations in respect to Constantinople. We must give her assurances that the Sultan is no longer our ally, and that, provided France, Austria, and Italy receive proper consideration, and integrity of the existing Balkan States is respected, we shall make no objections to the secular aspirations of Russia in regard to Turkey being fulfilled." -  
*Quoted in "The Literary Digest" of October 7, 1905, page 496.*

Plain spoken as all of that is, we have never found any dissent expressed anywhere. It is evidently accepted as the plain logic of the case as it now stands.

Indeed, the *Spectator's* proposition has met an open response from Russia. The *Novoye Vremya* of St. Petersburg says: -

"Since England's occupation of Egypt, Constantinople and the Bosphorus have lost their importance to the former country. In Asia Minor we shall encounter the Germans before the English. In any case an agreement with England is inevitable for the future

settlement of the unavoidable difficulties which will accompany the break-up of the Ottoman Empire." - *Quoted in "The Literary Digest," May 19, 1906.*

And that the "understanding" with Russia which has been advised by the *Spectator*, and counted as "inevitable" by the *Novoye Vremya*, is near, if indeed it has not already come, is indicated by the fact that it has already been arranged for a British fleet to visit Russia in the waters of the Baltic Sea, about the middle of this present month; but on account of Russia's home troubles the visit had to be postponed. And with such an understanding as the accepted view in Europe and by the concerted powers, it is certain that the course indicated will be followed. And upon that it is equally certain that the taking of

26

Constantinople by Russia will be actually, as it is logically, the next move to be made; and that it will not be long before Russia's cherished desire for the possession of Constantinople will be satisfied. And for this the way in European Turkey is as fully prepared as it is between Britain and Russia on the map of Europe and Asia.

From the whole history of the original Eastern Question it is evident that the question as to the division of the territory of Turkey has been a greater one than has been the question as to who shall possess Constantinople. It was this question of the division of the territory, that forced the concert of the powers in 1839-40. And we have seen how that between that time and now, under cover of maintaining the integrity of the Turkish empire by the European concert, each power that is a party to the concert has constantly been doing all that it could by "spheres of influence" to gain control of as much as possible of that very empire. But it will be noticed that this has been carried on outside of Europe. Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and Egypt have all been preserved intact as of the Turkish empire; yet all are almost entirely covered by the "spheres of influence" of Russia, Germany, and Britain. But in Europe it will be readily observed that instead of the Turkish territory being apportioned under "spheres of influence," nearly all of it has actually been divided up by the establishment of the petty States of Roumania, Servia, Bulgaria, Eastern Roumelia, Montenegro, and Greece. These have all gained independence from Turkey, but are dependent for their existence upon the concerted powers.

While the greater part of the Turkish territory in Europe has thus been lost by the organization of these semi-independent States without any specific spheres of influence of the great powers, it still remains that the setting up of all these petty States is distinctly favorable to Russia; because all of them are of the Greek religion, which is the religion of Russia. And because of this, Russia claims, when she does not positively assert, the protectorate over them all. In addition to this the Greek religion is first of all political. And with the grand center of that religion in Russia, and with its priests forever the chief political agents of Russia everywhere, it is certain that every move that is made in these States, or that shall be made for freedom in the remaining Turkish territories in Europe, will be under Russian auspices and will be distinctly in the furtherance of the designs of Russia.

There now remains undivided comparatively a small section of Turkish territory in Europe. Of this that remains Macedonia and Albania comprise the largest part and these are persistently demanding, conspiring and fighting for, the freedom that has been obtained by their neighbors. In their struggles for this freedom they have more than once succeeded in bringing between the powers and the Turkish government such a crisis, as left to Turkey only the single choice of granting reforms or risking expulsion from Europe. The latest of these crises was as late as in the spring of the present year 1906. Other like crises will be forced; for Macedonia and Albania will never rest until they shall enjoy equality of privileges and freedom from their neighbors.

It was by the direct efforts of Russia that all these peoples of the Danubian and Balkan Provinces were freed from the Turkish power. The opportunity that was offered for Russia's interference in behalf of the religion of these peoples was the sole ground for Russia's war with Turkey in 1876 to 1878. For "the astute and watchful policy of Russia promptly took advantage of the indignation of Christendom against the Crescent;" and "inflicted on the Ottoman Empire the severest wounds it has ever suffered; for that war rendered Turkish dominion in Europe an impossibility, and made it a matter of far greater difficulty than before even on Asiatic soil." - *"Historian's History of the World," Vol. XXIV., p. 433.*

And now the "internecine quarrels in Macedonia and among the Albanians bid fair to put an end to Ottoman rule in European Turkey." - *Id. p. 434.* And thus it is that while "danger looms large from all quarters" to Ottoman rule in Europe, all these dangers are just as distinctly favorable to Russia's possession of Constantinople as they are dangerous to Turkish rule any longer there. And just as real and as imminent as is the danger to Turkish rule in Constantinople, just so real and so imminent is the prospect of Russia's possessing Constantinople.

And when Turkey shall lose, and Russia shall possess, Constantinople - then what? It must be borne in mind that the ending of Turkish rule in Europe does not mean necessarily the ending of Turkish rule everywhere. The possessing of Constantinople by Russia does not necessarily involve in that one stroke, the ending of the Ottoman Empire itself. It has been to avoid a general war that the European concert has for sixty-six years diligently worked to keep the Ottoman empire in existence. In November, 1895, Lord Salisbury, then prime minister of Britain, said: -

"Turkey is in that remarkable condition that it has now stood for half a century, mainly because the great powers of the world have resolved that for the peace of Christendom it is necessary that the Ottoman empire should stand. They came to that conclusion nearly half a century ago. I do not think they have altered it now."

Those powers are not yet ready for the Ottoman empire to come to an end. Britain is practically ready for Russia to possess Constantinople and the coasts of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles; and everything indicates that such move will ere long be allowed by the concerted powers only because, as suggested by the London *Spectator*, they, with Britain, "Have ceased to look upon Constantinople as a portion of the earth's surface which could not be occupied by Russia without involving war."

What then is the only alternative of this so-long-dreaded war of Christendom when the Turkish government shall be forced out of Europe?

This question is clearly answered in the latest history, and by the best living authority, on the subject - Arminius Vambery, in "The Historian's History of the World," 1904. In expressing the one only remaining way of hope for "the regeneration of Turkey" he says: -

"If Europe were seriously disposed to prevent the outbreak of the great war which would be likely to follow on the heels of a collapse of the Ottoman Empire," then "all that Turkey would have to do would be to concentrate her forces, by casting off the foreign elements in Europe, and establishing a new center in Asia Minor, where she commands more than twelve millions of Turks." *Vol. XXIV., p. 436.*

With any one who has followed these studies; with any one who is acquainted with the perplexities and dangers of the Eastern Question; with any one who knows of the endless anxieties of the Powers to avoid as long as possible that "great war;" can there be any doubt at all that this one only remaining way of hope will be taken? Under all the circumstances, there can be no kind of doubt that the powers will hold for themselves such further breathing space of peace as shall be possible in allowing the Turkish government to find "a new center" in Asia Minor, or in Syria, or in Palestine, or in all three in succession, as might present the best prospects of longer peace and safety from "the great war."

It is worthy of note that this indubitable sequence of the Turkish loss of Constantinople, is precisely the expectation of the Turks themselves. In 1895 when, because of the Armenian troubles, there was in England and America such a loud demand for the abolition of the Turkish power, a Turkish magistrate in discussing the subject said in substance: -

"Yes, we expect nothing else than that the Christian powers will take Constan-

27

tinople from us, and force us to leave Europe. This may not be done just now; but there is no doubt that sooner or later they will do it. Then we shall establish a new capital somewhere in our possessions in Asia; and, if not immediately, it will be ultimately *at Jerusalem.*"

And it is yet more worthy of note that this indubitable sequence of the Turkish loss of Constantinople, and this acknowledged expectation of the Turks themselves, is the very thing that form of old, by the word of the Angel of God, has been "noted in the scripture of truth," concerning Turkey, in the words: "He shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain." Dan. 10:21; 11:45.

Constantinople itself is between seas; but it is not "in the glorious [*sic.*] holy mountain." The only place in the world that corresponds to the term "the glorious holy mountain," is Jerusalem. Among the Mohammedan peoples - Turks and Arabs - of that whole region, Jerusalem is called by the name *El-Kuds* - The Holy. And Jerusalem is "between the seas" - the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. It is

therefore plain that after the loss of Constantinople the Turkish capitol will be established ultimately, if not immediately, *at Jerusalem*.

*And then what?* This question will be answered next week.

**July 31, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. Turkish Capitol in Jerusalem: Then What?"**  
***The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 5 , pp. 34, 35.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the preceding study we found that when the Turkish government must leave Constantinople, a new capital will be established in Asia at Jerusalem.

And to the question, What then? the answer, given by the angel of the Lord, is, "He shall come to his end."

In full, the angel's word is: "He shall plant the tabernacle of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." Dan. 11:45.

The facts given in the preceding articles show how systematically and how continuously the Turkish power has been positively helped. These show also that long, long ago, he would have come to his end if he had not been so powerfully helped. This was strongly expressed in the discussions in 1895 in an article in the London *Times* by the Duke of Argyle, as follows: -

"It is not too much to say that England has twice saved Turkey from complete subjection since 1853. It is largely - mainly - due to our action that she now exists at all as an independent power. On both these occasions we dragged the powers of Europe along with us in maintaining the Ottoman government."

Thus it has been hitherto. Thus it is now. Thus it will be *once more*. When he loses Constantinople he will be helped till he shall "Plant the tabernacles" - the temporary habitations, moveable dwellings, - "of his palace" in Jerusalem; and *that* will be *the last*. After that, he will be helped no more. And so "he shall come to his end."

And then what?

This is the greatest question of all. It has been the one great question, all along. And there is just one answer to it. That answer is, *A war of the powers*.

If any other answer than this could have been found, there would be no Turkish power in existence to-day; it

35

would have been ended long ago. But no other answer than *a general war*, could be found. And it is the certainty of such a war, and the dread of it, that all these years have kept the European powers constantly in such intensity of anxiety and perplexity to keep the Ottoman Empire in existence.

We have seen that it was "The fear of a general conflagration" that kept that empire from falling in 1829. In a speech in the German parliament in 1888 Prince Bismark declared that it was only the Berlin Congress that prevented the war of

1877-78 "from putting the whole of Europe in a blaze." In 1895 when in a council a certain move was proposed, the emperor of Austria exclaimed, "No! that would set fire to the powder." And November 9, 1895, Lord Salisbury, then prime minister of Britain, in his speech at the Mansion House - a speech, which, in the then conditions in Turkey and the general unrest elsewhere, was made, to the world and for the information of the world - told the whole story and defined the situation in the following remarkable passage: -

"Turkey is in that remarkable condition that it has now stood for half a century, mainly because the great powers of the world have resolved that *for the peace of Christendom it is necessary that the Ottoman Empire should stand*. They came to that conclusion nearly half a century ago. I do not think they have altered it now. The danger, if the Ottoman Empire fall, would not merely be the danger that would threaten the territories of which that empire consists; it would be the danger that the fire there lit should spread to other nations, and should *involve all that is most powerful and civilized in Europe* in a dangerous and calamitous contest. That was a danger that was present to the minds of our fathers when they resolved to make the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire a matter of European treaty, and *that is a danger which has not passed away*."

When it is "for the *peace of Christendom*" that the Ottoman Empire should stand; then, when that empire falls, what can follow but the *war of Christendom*? When more than sixty years ago, the danger was that if *then* the Ottoman Empire should fall, the fire thus lighted would involve all that was "most powerful and civilized in Europe in a dangerous and calamitous contest;" and when that is a danger that "*has not passed away*;" then when *now* the Ottoman Empire shall fall, what can possibly follow but that "all that is most powerful and civilized in Europe" will be involved in a contest that will be as much *more* "dangerous and calamitous" as these powers are greater and more powerful *now* than they were sixty years ago? That is to say therefore, What can possibly follow the fall of the Ottoman Empire, but the *mightiest war that has ever been known*?

And what is the secret of this certainty of such an awful war, upon the fall of the Ottoman Empire? Why cannot the powers agree on some course that will avoid that dreadful thing? The answer is: It is the same old ambition for world-empire. It is simply because the determination of each great power to be *the one greatest* power. It is simply because that each one of the great powers is eager to possess the most possible of the earth's surface; and therefore, the most possible of the territories of the Ottoman Empire.

It has been openly stated, and permanently with the Ottoman Empire, "Political ambition and territorial greed" have been "the mainsprings of European policy;" that "The rivalry of the great powers of Europe is solely responsible for the fact the catastrophe predicted centuries ago has not yet overtaken the Ottoman Empire;" and that "the regeneration of Turkey" would have been possible, "if Europe were seriously disposed to prevent the outbreak of the great war which would be likely to follow on the heels of the collapse of the Ottoman

Empire." - *Arminius Vambery; in Historian's History of the World,* pp. 428, 433, 436.

War then - a "great war;" a "general conflagration;" "the whole of Europe in a blaze;" the war of Christendom; "a dangerous and calamitous contest involving all that is most powerful and civilized in Europe;" - this is what follows when the Ottoman Empire comes to its ends.

Such is the only logic of the situation; such is the only expectation of the nations; and such, only expressed in other words, is the statement of the angel - "He shall come to his end and none shall help him. *And at that time* shall Michael stand up, the great Prince that standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, everyone that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." Dan. 11:45, 12:1-4.

More concerning this greatest of all wars, and What then? will be the study next week.

**August 7, 1906**

**"Saving Health" *The Medical Missionary* 15, n.s. 6 , p. 52.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"BELOVED, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health." 3 John 2.

This is a wonderful wish; and there is a wonderful reason for it, though many Christians seem to think that this wish is one of minor importance. Let us study it a little.

The word "health" is an abstract noun, derived from the word "whole." The thought is expressed in the words of Jesus, "They that are *whole* need not a physician." Matt. 9:12.

The word "whole" was formerly spelled *hole*, and comes from the original Anglo-Saxon *hal*, same as present German *heil*, which means hale, hearty, sound, whole, *saved*; and *saved* because of being hearty, sound, and *whole*.

This word *hal*, through *hole*, *holeth*, is our present word "health," which, from its origin, signifies happiness, safety, *salvation*. This thought is also expressed in the Scriptural phrase, "thy *saving health*."

To this original word *hal*, there was added the expressive *ig*, making the word *halig*, present German *heilig*, signifying *salvation*; from this, in descent, is our word "holy."

To the word *halig* there was next added the suffix *nes*, or *ness*, expressive of quality, thus forming the word *halig-ness*, which, in descent, forms our word

"holiness." This seems to be the surest descent of the word "holiness," though from the word *hole* (whole), with the qualitative *ness*, - holiness, - the descent is easy to holiness.

In any case, however, the root-word of "healthy" is actually the root-word of "holiness." This is positive, also, from the fact that the root-word of "health" - *hal* - signifies saved, and saved because of *hal-ness*, which is *hole-ness*, which is *wholeness*, which is *halig-ness*, which is HOLINESS.

Therefore when the Lord wishes "above all things that thou mayest prosper and be *in health*," he wishes that "thou mayest prosper and be in *holiness*." And why should he not wish this "above all things?" Can any higher point be attained than *holiness* according to God's wish, which is *perfect* holiness?

Men themselves know that perfect holiness is the highest possible attainment. This is the one thing "above all" that *they* wish. But this thing of perfect holiness can not be attained without health. This the Lord perfectly understands, though men to not; and therefore he has recorded this word, "Beloved, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health."

Do not question the statement that perfect holiness can not be attained without health? How can you, when the very root idea of *health* is *holiness*? But if you are not ready to accept this from the words themselves, then read the same thing in the word of God: "Dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the *flesh* and *spirit*, *perfecting holiness* in the fear of God." 2 Cor. 7:1.

This is also expressed in the full text cited at the beginning of the article: "Beloved, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be *in health*, even as *thy soul* prospereth."

Perfect holiness embraces the flesh as well as the spirit; it includes the body, as well as the soul. Therefore, as perfect holiness can not be attained without holiness of body, and as holiness of body is expressed in the word "health," so perfect holiness cannot be attained without health.

And "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Heb. 12:14. Since this is so, and as perfect holiness includes the body, and holiness of body is expressed in the word "health," do you not see in this the whole philosophy of health reform? Do you not see by all this that in the principles of health for the body, and righteousness for the soul, both inwrought by the Holy Spirit of God, the Lord is preparing a people unto perfect holiness, so that they can meet the Lord in peace, and see him in holiness?

Can you, then, despise or slight true health reform, and expect to see the Lord in holiness?

God would make us acquainted with his great name, - *Jehovah-tsidkenu*, the Lord our Righteousness, - and also with his great name, - *Jehovah-rophekho*, the Lord our Healer.

"God be merciful unto us, and bless us; and cause his face to shine upon us; that thy way may be known upon earth, thy *saving health* [thy perfect holiness] among all nations." Ps. 67:1, 2.

**August 14, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. The Great War. And Then What?" *The Medical Missionary* 15, 7 , pp. 58-60.**

ALONZO T. JONES

BY the evidence in the preceding article on this question, it is plain that upon the coming to an end of the Ottoman Empire a general war of the great powers is the only logic of the situation, is the only expectation of these powers themselves, and is that which is declared in "the Scriptures of truth."

We have seen that it was to avoid such a war in 1839-40 that the concert of the powers was created; and that this is a danger that "has not passed away."

However, it is not enough to say merely that this danger has not passed away. To think of it as the danger that *then threatened, still abiding as that danger then was*, is to miss the real situation. For not one of the powers most vitally concerned, stands to-day as it did in 1840. It is safe to say that of the five powers - Britain, France, Prussia, Austria, and Russia - that were involved in that danger in 1840, any *one* of them is stronger now than all of them together were in 1840.

With these powers only as strong now as they were in 1840, a war involving all of them would be dreadful enough. But, with any one of these powers as strong now as all together were in 1840, the danger is as much greater now than it was in 1840, as these powers are all greater now than they were then. Therefore it is perfectly plain that the danger that could not be risked in 1840 not only "has not passed away," but it has grown as the powers involved have grown; and that the danger is now as much greater as all these powers are now greater.

Think of the armaments, both military and naval, of 1840, as compared with them now. Think of the guns, whether small arms or artillery, of 1840, as compared with those of to-day. Think of the warships of 1840, both in numbers and in kind, as compared with those of to-day. It is scarcely too much to think that a single ship of to-day of the type of the *Dreadnaught*, or the *Mikasa*, or the *Oregon*, could defeat all the warships that were afloat in the world in 1840. Think also of the size of the armies in 1840 as compared with those of to-day.

And think of the mighty expansion of all these powers, in point of territory and empire to-day, beyond what they were in 1840. Look again at our second study on this question, and note the "spheres of influence" of these powers as they have extended from Constantinople over all Africa and all Asia to the farthest east; until now, in this present hour, these very powers meet face to face in the extreme East, and are now as deeply involved in maintaining the power, or partitioning the territory, of China - "The Sick Man of Asia" - as they were originally in that of Turkey - "The Sick Man of Europe."

It is thus strictly true that the perplexity of these powers with respect to China to-day, is the direct resultant of the perplexity of those very same powers with respect to Turkey in 1840. And the greater Eastern Question as it centers in Peking to-day, is but the extension and enlargement of the original Eastern Question as it has centered in Constantinople since 1840. In the nature of the case therefore, there can be no solution of the greater Eastern Question as it

centers in China, which shall in any way exclude the original Eastern Question as it centers in Turkey.

More than this: It was the powers of the West - Britain, France, Prussia, Austria, and Russia - that, in 1840, became the responsible ones in the original Eastern Question as it centers in Turkey. And through the extension and enlargement of that original Eastern Question as it centers in Turkey, four of these identical powers are the ones chiefly involved in the ultimate Eastern Question as it centers to-day in China. Thus it is the powers *of the West* that have become the chief ones *of the East*. Even Japan, which has become the one power of the East itself, by her alliance with Britain, is the splendid means of extending and fastening in the East this power of the West. And the United States, the one power of the *extreme West*, by her possession of the Philippines has become one of the chief powers of the *extreme East*.

Thus it has come about that the powers of the West are now equally the powers of the East. And, with the exception of Japan, these powers of the West are the *only* powers of the East. And they are also equally the powers of all the spaces between the West and the East. It is literally true, therefore, that these powers of the West, being also the powers of the East and of all between, are thus also the powers of the *whole world*. Look on a map, at the holdings of these powers - Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Russia, America, and Japan - and see how truly each one is literally a power of the whole world.

*This* is how it is that the war that must certainly follow upon the fall of the Ottoman Empire, can be nothing less than a *world-war*. And this is why it is, that in referring to it, those who are best informed can speak of it only in such terms as "the great war," "a general conflagration," "all Europe in a blaze (1878)," "all that is most powerful and civilized in Europe in a dangerous and calamitous contest (1840)," the war of Christendom. That which in 1878 would have been even "all Europe in a blaze" can now be nothing less than *all the world* in a blaze. That which in 1840 would

59

have been all that was then "most powerful and civilized in *Europe* in a dangerous and calamitous contest, can *now* be nothing less than all that is most powerful and civilized in *the world* in a *more* dangerous and *more* calamitous contest. And when in 1840, and since, it has been "for the peace of Christendom" that it was resolved that the Ottoman Empire should stand, it is now literally the *war* of Christendom that must follow "on the heels of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire."

No wonder that the powers dread it! No wonder that the world's statesmen stand aghast at it, and labor most strenuously to avoid it! No wonder that publicists contemplate it only with perplexity! If ever there was a time when prayers should be made "for kings and for all that are in authority," it is now. If ever there was a time when those who know what it is to pray, could with sincerity of heart pray "for kings and for all in authority," it is now.

And yet, the present situation of the powers of the world, and the condition of things now prevailing, is only that which the Scripture says would be. Read it in Rev. 16:12: "And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river

Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the East might be prepared."

As for the literal river Euphrates that flows from the mountains of Armenia and empties into the Persian Gulf, it has been crossed and recrossed many times, even at the flood, through all the ages, without any special difficulty, by kings and armies both of the East and the West. It can not, therefore, be the literal flowing waters of the river Euphrates that is here spoken of. But since waters are plainly stated in the very next chapter to signify "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues," (Rev. 17:15), it is evident that the word "water" in this place signifies the people or the power that dominate the territory of the Euphrates. And this is none other than the Turkish power, which comes to his end when none helps him.

This coming to an end of the Turkish power is declared to be in order "that the way of the kings of *the East* might be prepared." And, with the exception of America and Japan, these "kings of the East" are the identical kings that have been the principal cause and the very substance of the Eastern Question from its origin, August 11, 1840, and in all its bearings, unto the present hour; and that "for the peace of Christendom" have literally kept the Ottoman Empire in existence unto the present hour. "The kings of the East," whose "way" is to be "prepared" by the extinction of the Ottoman power are the very kings who are solely responsible for the existence of that power. How, alone, then, can the Ottoman Empire come to its end? How, alone, can the "water" of "the great river Euphrates" be dried up?" - "Evidently only by the consent and concert of these very powers, whose concert alone has so long given to that Empire even existence.

And then comes the world-war of the world-powers.

And then what?

This is now the one great question; and it is the only remaining question. There is no question of the fact of the Turkish Government's leaving Europe: as to that there remains question only as to *the time* when it shall be. And all know that it must be soon; for all things are now almost ready. There is no question as to *the fact* of the Ottoman Empire's coming to an end: upon that there remains question only as to *the time* when it shall be. There is no question anywhere as to either *the fact* or *the character* of the great war that must follow the collapse of the Ottoman Empire: as to that there is now only the question, What shall follow this great war?

In answer to this question there are two views presented: and yet two views only from a certain point. Among all who have studied the question enough to be really acquainted with it, there is general agreement that this war will be the utter breaking up and breaking down of the present order of things on the earth. It is agreed that all definitions, alignments, and boundaries, of the powers and the nations as now existing will be annihilated. The map of the world will be gone.

But beyond this, on the one hand it is argued that out of what shall remain after the great war, there will be evolved a new order of things as to society, States, and nations, whose definitions, boundaries, etc., of course, can not now be known: there must be a new map of the world.

It is evident that the foregoing view is founded on a confidence in humanity that springs from the theory of evolution and that shuts the eyes to plain and important considerations. For when the highest result of the civilization and society of the world in the present order of things, is just this mighty war that breaks to pieces all that has been built up, then it must be a very blind confidence indeed that would look to the remains of this very civilization and society for such a regeneration as would give to the world any new order of things that could possibly be of any permanent value. If the present civilization and society can not bring about such a new order of things when it is in the fullness of its strength and glory, and has everything its own way, how can it be expected to do all this when its strength and glory shall have been annihilated? Such hope is evidently "a spider's web."

On the other hand there stands the very important truth that the whole history of the world teaches that in every instance of the break down of the dominant civilization and society, the people by whom it was destroyed have been, without exception, new, simple, rude, and physically and civilly vigorous nations, untried in the experience of empire. Invariably it has been such as this to whom has fallen the task of restoring the equilibrium, renewing society, and maintaining government and civilization. But nowhere are there *now* any such new peoples in the world, to do the like thing again after the crisis that comes in the world-war that now impends. The supply has been long ago exhausted: and, as already made plain, the powers now involved in this mighty question are strictly all-embracing powers of the whole world.

Further, throughout history it has always been that the decayed civilization and society was swept away as with a flood by the new and vigorous peoples, in tides of war *rolling upon it*. But *now*, instead of any such thing as that, and instead of there being even any room for any such thing, the highest developments of society and civilization embracing the whole world, actually *sink themselves* in a perfect maelstrom of war with *one another*.

Wherefore, since it is both morally and physically impossible for either that destroyed civilization, or that exhausted society, to renew itself, it is perfectly plain that there is absolutely no prospect and no hopes of any revival, or any new order of things, from *this world*, after that war. Therefore we are simply shut up to the one thing - the one inevitable thing - that this awful maelstrom of the world's war will be nothing less and nothing less than the very *end of things* in this present world. This is as certain as that that war shall come. And that war is certainly coming. There is no escaping it: and equally there is no escaping the truth that with it, and in it, comes the end of all things in this world.

And even so says the Scripture: Even to the very particular of this expected war itself. Read again from Rev. 16:12, the words already quoted and those which follow in immediate connection: -

"And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared. And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false

prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the

60

battle of that great day of God Almighty. Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame. And he gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon. And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, IT IS DONE. And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts, and *the cities of the nations fell.*" Verses 12-19.

Note the order here given: -

(a) It is "the way of the kings of the East" that is "prepared" by the drying up of the "water" of the Euphrates - the ending of the Ottoman Empire.

(b) When these kings of the East are gathered into that "way" that is thus "prepared," they are "the kings of the earth and of the whole world" that are gathered to battle; and this battle is the battle of Armageddon, "the battle of that great day of God Almighty."

(c) Next comes the "great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, IT IS DONE."

(d) Then there is the great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth; the cities of the nations fall; and every mountain and island are moved out of their places. Rev. 16:20; 6:14-17.

These items make it perfectly plain that the impending war culminates only in the battle of Armageddon, which is the battle of that great day of God Almighty, with which comes the end of all things in this present world.

This one passage in Revelation is not by any means all the Scripture that tells of this. This great event is one of the things about which most is said in the Bible. Note that in the Scripture quoted from Rev. 16 this awful whirlwind of a world-war is immediately caused by "the spirits of devils," the "unclean spirits" of every kind of evil, destruction, and devastation, going forth to the kings of the earth and of the whole world to gather them to battle. As long as the days of Jeremiah this very thing was told. Read it: "Behold evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a *great whirlwind* shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth. And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth." At that time also it was said "The Lord shall roar from on high and utter his voice from his holy habitation." Jer. 25:30-33. [*sic.*] Read it also in Joel 4:9-16; and Isa. 2:19-22.

Note also that in the midst of the statement quoted from Rev. 16 concerning the fathering of these powers to that battle, there stand the words of the Lord Jesus himself, saying, "Behold I come as a thief." And Rev. 19:11-21 describes the fact of his coming at the time of that battle. There he is seen coming "upon a white horse" as "King of kings and Lord of lords" with the armies of heaven following him, also "upon white horses." "And I saw the beast and the kings of the

earth and their armies gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army." The end of the world has come.

There is, therefore, no room for any question at all that the end of that great war in its ultimate battle is only the end of the world. And this is now near enough to make it important that the people should be getting ready for it. Are you ready?  
"Get ready, get ready, get ready!"

**August 21, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. The Seven Last Plagues" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 8 , pp. 66-68.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THERE is no room for question that the collapse of the Ottoman Power prepares the "way" for "the kings of the East," which are "the kings of the earth and the whole world," to be gathered to the battle of Armageddon.

It must not be overlooked that the drying up of the water of the Euphrates - the fall of the Turkish Empire - takes place under the *sixth* of the "seven last plagues." The scripture that tells this says "And the *sixth* angel poured out his vial upon he [*sic.*] great river Euphrates, and the water thereof was dried up that the way of the kings of the East might be prepared." Rev. 16:12. And we have seen that it is in the midst of the battle of that great day, that the seventh and last plague from heaven, from *the throne*, saying, "It is done." Thus the seven plagues are the last plagues that will ever be on the earth; because with the *seventh* one, comes the end of the world.

It is said that in these seven last plagues there is "filled up" - completed, - "the wrath of God" which in judgment falls upon the finally apostate and rebellious world. Read Rev. 15:1; 14:9, 10.

These plagues are "The wine of the *wrath* of God," "*without mixture*," "in the cup of his *indignation*." It is "the wine cup of this *fury*." Jer. 25:15. The seven vials that are given to the seven angels to be poured out on the world, are "*full of the wrath* of God;" there is nothing else in them.

These expressions show of themselves that the day of salvation is past before there begins this time of "indignation," "wrath," and "fury" "without mixture." This is confirmed in other scriptures. The mystery of God, of which the gospel is the revelation, is "finished," before this day of indignation and wrath begins. Rev. 10:7. The service in the temple of God in Heaven, before the *first* of the plagues is poured out; and there is *no service there*, while they are being poured out. Heb. 8:1; 9:24; Rev. 15:5, 8. In every respect therefore, it is true, and from every evidence plain, that "the seven last plagues" are the final judgments incurred by an atheistic and anarchistic world.

The first plague is "a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which have the mark of the beast and upon them which worship his image."

The second plague is, that the seas become "as the blood of a dead man."

The third is, that "the rivers and fountains of waters" become blood.

The fourth is, that the sun's heat becomes so intense as to scorch and burn men.

The fifth is poured upon "the seat of the beast," and his kingdom is filled with darkness.

The sixth is the drying up of the Euphrates - the ending of the Turkish power - and the gathering of the kings of the East, and of the earth and the whole world to the great battle.

The seventh is poured into the air, and the heaven departs as a scroll when it is rolled together; the great voice from the throne, in the words "It is done," declares the end; there is the great earthquake such as was not since men were upon the earth; and the cities of the nations fall.

Again let it be noted that it is under *the sixth* of these plagues that the Ottoman Empire comes to its end. The *five* preceding ones fall before the Turkish Empire falls.

But the mystery of God is finished, the service in the heavenly temple is ended, probation is closed, *before* the plagues *begin* to fall; before the *first one* is poured out.

There is no room for any question that the fall of the Turkish Empire is very near. And just as certainly as that is so near, so certainly the finishing of the mystery of God, the ending of the heavenly temple service, the closing of probation, is *nearer*.

It is certain that the end of the whole world is now so near that it is time to prepare for it. It is equally certain that the finishing of the mystery of God, the ending of the heavenly temple service of intercession for sinners, the closing of probation, is so much *nearer*, that of all things it is now high time to be prepared for this.

Does any one say that now we are leaving the ground of history and of current events, and becoming alarmist? If so, let us tell him something: On the desk before me as I write this, there lies a two volume work of five hundred and sixty-four and five hundred and forty-five pages, respectively, entitled "The Reshaping of the Far East." It is a history and a presentation of the re-shaping politically of the far East by the great powers that are the powers of the East as of the West and of the whole world. It gives the history and the present standing of Britain and China, of Russia in China, of Japan in China, and of the United States in China; as well as the condition of things in China itself. The work was closed early in 1905 in the midst of the late war, and was published shortly after the close of that war in 1905. It is not in any sense a religious work. There are no indications that the author is a religious man. There are no indications that the author is a religious man. It is wholly a secular and political history. And yet in this wholly secular history, that treats only of the political and diplomatic relations and influences of the great powers of the West in the far East, the very first words that are printed, except the mere words "The re-shaping of the Far East" - even before the title page - on a page otherwise wholly blank, are the following lines printed there exactly in the form as here copied: -

"And the second . . . poured out his vial upon the sea and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living soul died in the sea.

"And the third . . . poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters; and they became blood.

"And the fourth . . . poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given him to scorch men with fire.

"And the sixth . . . poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates, and the water thereof was dried up, that the ways of THE KINGS OF THE EAST might be prepared . . . .

"And I saw three unclean spirits . . . for they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth to the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them together to the battle of that great day . . . into a place called in the Hebrew tongue ARMAGEDDON. . . ."

There, then, is a two volume work on this great world-question, circulating by the many thousands throughout the whole world, giving the bearings of the Eastern Question as it is in the farthest East. And as each reader picks up the book and opens it at the beginning, the very first thing that he reads is this quotation on the plagues and the kings of the East and Armageddon.

That is, the author of that important work on the re-shaping of the far East under the diplomacy and rivalries of the great powers, would have his book to be read in view of what the scripture says concerning the last plagues, the preparing of the way of the kings of the East, and the gathering of the kings of the earth and the whole world to Armageddon. Therefore, at the very threshold of his book, on a page all by itself, he prints these striking verses from Rev. 16, in order that the first impression that the reader shall receive shall be that the re-shaping of the far East means the seven last plagues, the preparing of the

67

way of the kings of the East, and the gathering of these kings, by the spirits of devils, unto the battle of the great day and Armageddon.

Now what can be the meaning of that? In a work treating wholly of the secular, political, diplomatic, and commercial relations of the great powers in the far East, why should the author print first of all in the book for the reader's attention, this passage from the Scripture relating to the last plagues, the preparing of the way of the kings of the East, and their being gathered to Armageddon?

In answer to this question there is one thing that is certainly clear; that is, that the Spirit of God is saying to men and to the world, that the last plagues, the preparing of the way of the kings of the East, and the gathering of these kings to the world-war, and the world-battle of Armageddon, is the *final meaning* and the *only culmination* of the Eastern Question.

All this is the truth as to the meaning and the culmination of the Eastern Question. From the many evidences on every hand, it is plain that this final meaning and culmination of the Eastern Question is soon to be accomplished. This being the truth, and the Spirit of God being "the Spirit of Truth," it is only to be expected that the Holy Spirit should witness to men and the world that such *is*

the truth of the events that are now constantly re-shaping the far East, and finally shaping the Eastern Question which is the whole World's Question.

And when the Holy Spirit, in his own person, is telling this *directly* to men and the world, what else than this can possibly be done by those who have the Holy Spirit, and who in their words and works would harmonize and co-operate with the Holy Spirit? What *should* be done by all these, but, in harmony with the Holy Spirit, to tell "with a loud voice" this same thing to men and the world; yea, "to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people?"

And in the fact that the Spirit of God is already telling it *directly* to men and the world, what divine assurance there is in this to every soul who, in harmony with the Spirit, will also tell it to men and the world! what divine assurance that the Holy Spirit will witness with the spirit of him who tells it, that it is the truth, that it is the present truth, and that he is right in telling it!

Who, then, will not tell it? Who that knows it, can keep from telling it? The Holy Spirit is telling it; who will refuse to join with him in the telling of it? The Spirit of God is speaking; who will refuse to speak with him?

"The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?"

**August 28, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. Preparation to Escape" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 9 , pp. 75-77.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WHO shall escape the battle and the destruction, of that great day and of Armageddon?

For, though the kings of the earth and the whole world, and their armies, go to the battle; and though all the remnant of the nations will meet destruction in the awful earthquake and "with the brightness of His coming;" yet there will be those who will escape it all, and who in the midst of the terrors of universal upheaval and destruction will, in perfect Christian calmness, "sing for the majesty of the Lord," and will gladly exclaim: "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation."

Who, then, are these? Who are they who can be so sure of this safety and deliverance? - They are those, and only those, whose names are in the Book of Life. For it is written: "At that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy

76

people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time; and at that time, thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be *found written in the Book.*"

But we have found by the Scriptures that the seven last plagues are inseparably connected with that great day of battle and war - and this "time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation." And we have found that these plagues begin, and give of them pass, before the kings of the East and of the earth and the whole world are gathered to that battle. Who shall escape the plagues? is therefore a question of equal importance with that of Who shall escape the battle and destruction of that great day?

Who then shall escape the plagues?

Notice that the first plague falls "upon the men that had the mark of the beast and upon them that worshiped his image." To escape the worship of the beast and his image therefore, is in itself to escape the plagues.

This is confirmed in the positive words of the Scripture in the world-wide message of the Third Angel of Revelation 14: "The Third Angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, *the same* shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured without mixture into the cup of his indignation."

We have seen that the ending of the Ottoman Empire, and the preparing of the "way" of the kings of the East and of the earth and of the whole world to be gathered to the battle of that great day and Armageddon, *is near*.

We have seen that since this gathering to the battle occurs under the sixth plague; and that since five of the plagues are past before this one comes; it, therefore, follows that the falling of the plagues is *nearer*.

And now, since the very first plague falls on them that had the mark of the beast and that worshiped his image, we see that the domination and the worship of the beast and his image is *nearest of all*.

Therefore, the *first question of all* is, Who shall escape the worship of the beast and his image? for, whosoever escapes the worship of the beast and his image, escapes the seven last plagues; and whosoever escapes the seven last plagues, escapes the battle and destruction of that great day and of Armageddon. The battle and destruction of that great day and of Armageddon, is inseparable from the seven last plagues; and the seven last plagues and this battle and destruction are inseparable from the worship of the beast and his image.

Therefore, the first consideration of all, both in time and in importance, the nearest of all these things to us, is "the beast and his image," their domination and their worship. And the first of all questions, both in time and importance, is, Who shall escape the worship of the beast and his image?

And to this all-important question, again the answer is, Only they whose names are in the Book of Life. For it is written: "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Revelation 13:8.

But the worship of the beast and his image, is an *enforced* worship. The mark is an *enforced* mark: enforced by governmental power, under pains and penalties of imprisonment, confiscation of goods, and death. Therefore, to have our names in the Book of Life, just this one single item, is not all that there is of the story. The *loyalty* of all these to God and the Lamb will be tested to the uttermost. And

while the worship of the beast and his image and the receiving of that mark, is being enforced upon all by all the force of governmental power and deceiving miracles, those whose names are in the Book of Life stand true and loyal to God and the Lamb by worshiping Him who made Heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters and by keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. For the scripture that gives the world-wide warning against the worship of the beast and his image, tells also that those whose names are in the Book of Life of the Lamb, and who are faithful and true, get "the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name," and says of them, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."

In preparation, therefore, to escape the plagues and the battle and destruction of that great day and of Armageddon, the first of all things is a *spiritual experience* that *knows* that our name is in the Book of Life of the Lamb; and that manifests unswerving loyalty to God and Christ in the keeping of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, against all pressure and all penalties of all opposing powers.

But this preparation cannot stop here. The plagues strike the *physical*, as the false worship of the beast and his image, which *brings the plagues*, strikes the *spiritual*. There must therefore, be a preparation *physically*, as well as spiritually.

Anybody who will read Joel 1, 2 and 3:9-16, and Isaiah 24, with Revelation 16, can readily see that the seven last plagues are the last throes of the dying world, - everything on the earth is perishing, the very air is sick with pestilence, death is everywhere and in all things of earth. This, therefore, demands of everyone, such a physical preparation as shall cleanse flesh and blood from all possible impurity, excess or intemperance; and build up a sound, clean, healthy body, capable of passing safely through times of pestilence, dearth and death.

For in that time, of nothing that is of the earth will it be safe to eat; because death will be in everything earthly. Then it will be that those who are loyal to God shall be fed from Heaven as of old; for it is written: "He shall dwell on high: his place of defense shall be the munitions of rocks: bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure." "When the poor and needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I the Lord will hear them, I the God of Israel will not forsake them. I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys: I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. . . . That they may see, and know, and consider, and understand together, that the hand of the Lord hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it."

In that time, when the wine and the strong drink have grown bitter and altogether undrinkable, what will those do who have been accustomed to those drinks? In that time, when flesh-meats have become only disease-breeding and death-dealing, what will those do who are accustomed only to a flesh dietary? In that time when only water will be fit to drink, or can be drunk, and this even only from the hand of God, as to Elijah, what then will those do who simply "must have" tea or coffee? Ah, in that time all these will do exactly as did the "mixed multitude" that left Egypt: they will murmur against God, and also will be cut off

as were they. All those having made no preparation, and having no faith nor heart in any such thing, could not endure the change from the "flesh pots of Egypt" to the bread and water, even though it were fresh from the hand of God. They murmured, and rebelled, and "fell in the wilderness."

And all these things were "written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." And this means really *us* now; for we are in the very presence of the events with which comes the end of the world: and that end so near that we can see straight through to it.

Therefore, of all the things that were ever justified in this world; of all the

77

things that ever in this world had a sound and tangible basis in truest physical and spiritual things; the system that embodies the principles of health, of temperance, of a pure dietary, and of simple and plain living, that is advocated in the MEDICAL MISSIONARY and illustrated in the Battle Creek Sanitarium and affiliated sanitariums the world over, is the one. Of all the things that people can least afford to despise or ignore, this is the one. Instead of its being an invention or a fad of some man, it is God's saving truth, yea, his "saving health," *for this time*.

God has revealed the awful events of the Eastern Question as that world's question culminates in the battle of that great day and of Armageddon. He has revealed the wicked work and worship of the beast and his image and the awful judgments of the plagues that are the consequence. And shall He reveal *no way of escape* from all these terrible things?

He *has revealed* the way of escape: and this is that way. This is the way, and the only way, to be prepared and "counted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man" when he shall appear in His glory in that great day. This is the way, and the only way to that "holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord," and which must be attained by all who shall live to meet Him in that great day.

"Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God."

"God be merciful unto us, and bless us; and cause His face to shine upon us; that Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations."

**September 5, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. The Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns, 10, pp. 83, 84.**

ALONZO T. JONES

A VERY important feature of the Eastern Question at its present and its final stages, is the part played by "the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet."

In Revelations 16:13, 14, two things are shown: -

1. It is "the spirits of devils working miracles" by which the kings of the East and of the earth and the whole world *are gathered to the battle* of that great day and of Armageddon.

2. These spirits of devils "come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet."

It is therefore important to know what are these things - the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet. It is important to know what is their standing in connection with the Eastern Question.

First, what are they? When we shall have learned what these are, it will be easy to see their standing and their connection with the Eastern Question. The dragon, the beast, and the false prophet are first brought to view in Revelations 12 and 13: with the single variation that there "the false prophet" is called the "image to the beast."

In Revelation 12 and 13 there is portrayed the war of Satan against the Church of Christ from the birth of Christ in the world to the end of the world, and the powers by which he makes this war. And these powers are just three - the dragon, the beast, and the image of the beast, or the false prophet. What, then, are these powers? these instrumentalities of Satan in this war against Christ and his Church?

What is the dragon?

At the opening of the twelfth chapter of Revelation there is seen a woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars, who brings "forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron; and her child was caught up unto God, and to His throne." That "man child" is Christ the Lord. Ps. 2:9; Rev. 19:15, 16; Luke 24:50, 51; Mark 16:9; Acts 7:55; Heb. 8:1.

This woman is nothing else than the symbol of the Church of God, in her beauty "fair as the moon," and "clear as the sun." And there stood before the woman a great red dragon "to devour her child as soon as it was born." This dragon, in his own proper person, is declared to be "that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan." But Satan in this world works through instrumentalities. These instrumentalities are men: and chiefly combinations of men in world-powers. What power was it, then, which was Satan's instrumentality in his endeavor to destroy Christ as soon as he was born? - Herod the Great, was the *person* whom he used. But in that connection Herod was much more than merely a person; much more than only himself. He was king of Judea.

And Herod was yet much more than even king of Judea. He was king of Judea, solely as *the official of Rome*. He became king, the king of Judea, solely by the direct action of the Roman imperial power through a vote of the Senate.

Herod was formerly a minor official of Rome, holding the office of tetrarch, when an invasion of Judea by the Parthians caused him to flee to Idumea, the country of his parents. From there he made his way through Egypt and

Alexandria to Rome. Arrived in Rome he went to Mark Antony, who was an acquaintance and friend of both his father and himself, and was just then one of the two men who wielded the whole power of Rome. By this means Herod secured an introduction to the Senate. Both Anthony and Octavius advocated his cause; and the Senate in that very session made him king of Judea, and "made a decree accordingly."

Thus in the kingship of Judea, Herod was only an official of Rome. And he could not have been king for a day in Judea, nor for an hour in Jerusalem, if he had not been supported by the mighty power of Rome. Accordingly Herod in his place of power was nothing else than the representative, the creature, of Rome. Therefore, it was *the Roman power* in the world, that, through Herod, Satan used to destroy Christ as soon as he was born.

However, that attempt failed. Yet Satan never rested until he had, so far as possible, and so far as himself and this world were concerned, destroyed the "man child," the Lord Jesus, - until he had accomplished Christ's crucifixion upon a Roman cross, and had buried him out of the world in a tomb sealed with the Roman seal, and watched by a Roman guard. And it was altogether by the Roman power that he did all this - through Pilate, the Roman governor of Judea. But even in this, Satan failed; because from death and the sealed Roman tomb, the "man child" "was caught up unto God, and to his throne."

Then, still through his world instrumentality, the Roman empire, Satan turned all his endeavors against the woman, which is the Church, and "persecuted the woman which brought forth the man child." Rev. 12:13. This he did while the Roman Empire continued. And during all the time through which that power did continue, it was so completely the instrumentality of Satan, and in its workings was so identified with Satan, who is pre-eminently the Dragon and was so entirely imbued with his spirit, that this power itself is called the dragon. Rev. 12:3, 4.

But Rome itself was not simply Rome; it was more than only a power. Rome was *pagan*. It was as the embodiment of paganism that Rome was used by Satan against Christ and his Church. Paganism was the form taken in the original apostasy from God, in the world. In the days of Christ on earth, and in pagan Rome, paganism had attained its ultimate development and stood fully revealed in just what it was, and what alone it could do for mankind and the world. And in its last analysis the opposition of the Roman power to Christ and his Church was nothing else than the war of the false religion of paganism under Satan, its author and head, against the true religion under Christ, its Author and Head.

And *now* in this time of the rapid shaping of events in the progress of the Eastern Question; in this time of the

entanglement of all the great powers of the world in the Eastern Question; in this time of the re-shaping of the far East to the culmination of the Eastern Question; it is a remarkable and an intensely significant fact that the only remaining distinct and separate paganism in the world is rapidly being shaped into one concentrated and mighty power: and this in the farthest East, and at the very centre of the Eastern Question as it is in the farthest East.

We have seen how that the great powers of Europe, with even the United States, have extended their sway over all the world, so that while they are the kings of the West they are really also the kings of the East and of the earth and the whole world. These are all professedly Christian powers, and many pagan nations are under their sway and are included in their power. But there remains on the earth yet one, and only one, section of the paganism that still stands separate and distinct. This section is composed of China, Korea, and Japan.

It is the truth that the only pagan peoples in the world to-day that are not under the domination of the so-called Christian powers, are these three: China, Korea, and Japan. And it is a striking and significant fact that these three are being rapidly shaped into one centralized power under the masterly molding influence and leadership of Japan. Korea is already Japanese territory. And China is now subject to the tutelage of Japan more than of any, or perhaps all, other.

By her wonderful progress in a single generation, and by her splendid victories over Russia, Japan has gained the recognized ascendancy in the far east, and proposes to keep it. While confessing that China is "the sick man of Asia;" and while welcoming the suggestions of as many physicians as may choose to prescribe for this "sick man" Japan openly announces, and will undoubtedly insist, that she alone shall be the confidential physician and bedside attendant *to administer the medicine*. Under all the circumstances there is no room for doubt that in the re-shaping of the far East, Japan will secure to herself the shaping of China's awakening and progress; and so will bind China to herself in the formation of one of the mightiest of the world-powers, and most vitally connected with the Eastern Question.

And that power will be distinctly pagan. And so the only remaining distinct and separate paganism in the world will be shaped into a mighty concentrated power composing the dragon element of the great three-fold division of the world's political religion designed in the Scripture terms - the dragon, the beast and the false prophet.

Next week our study will be, What is the Beast?

**"Christians Are Glad" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 10 , pp. 85, 86.**

"SERVE the Lord with gladness." Do you do it? If not, why?

Of all the people in the universe, those who are washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God, are the gladdest.

We do not say that they *should be* the gladdest. We say they *are* the gladdest. If you profess to be redeemed by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, and are not one of the gladdest, happiest people in all the world, then it is certain that you have not that which your profession says that you have.

The profession of being a Christian testifies that we are Christians; it testifies that we are in possession of what the Christian faith gives. And by so much as

we lack what that faith implies, by just that much our profession bears false witness against what the Christian faith really is.

Now it is certain that from the beginning to the end of the Bible, the Christian faith gives gladness forever; that even in the midst of sorrow, with which this world is so heavily laden, the Christian faith gives "always rejoicing."

Look at the situation: We were under the curse; laden with iniquity; enslaved to the power of evil, which we hated even while we did it; living in malice and envy; hateful, and hating one another; under bonds to death, and "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord;" and never had any peace. But now, through the grace of the Lord Jesus and the mercy of our God, he "hath redeemed us from the curse;" he has "taken away all iniquity;" he "hath delivered us or from the power of darkness," and given "liberty to the captives;" he has put in our hearts his own love for all people instead of the old malice and envy, hatefulness and hating; he has given us his own of peace, - yea, he has made himself "our peace;" he "hath given us eternal life" in place of death, and a "certain dwelling-place" in his presence, where we "shall see his face," midst "pleasures which are is forevermore" and the blessedness of "eternal glory."

Now any *one* of these things which the Lord has given is sufficient to make glad, and it *does* make glad forever, the soul who really receives it. And how much more is it so when *all* these things are really received! It is literally impossible for any soul really to receive these things that Christ has brought to him, without being literally filled with a gladness which abides, and which will abide forevermore. "The by Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad."

86

Therefore if any one who professes to be a Christian; that is, professes to have received all this which God has given, and which Christ brings, - and yet is not filled with gladness so that he really serves the Lord with gladness, it is perfectly plain that his profession of Christianity is merely a profession, and is not the genuine faith which puts the soul in *possession* of the gifts of God. He still comes short of the glory of God, and bedims to the world the brightness and beauty, the genuine attractiveness, that truly belong to the Christian religion.

Come along, then! Let us believe trod, and "be glad in the Lord," and really serve him "with gladness." No other service than the service of gladness can rightly represent our Lord.

"The righteous shall be glad in the Lord, and shall trust in him ; and all the upright in heart shall glory."

"Be glad in the Lord, and rejoice, ye righteous and shout for joy, all ye that are upright in heart."

"Let all those that seek thee rejoice and be glad in thee: let such as love thy salvation say continually, The Lord be magnified."

"Let the righteous be glad; let them rejoice before God; yea, let them exceedingly rejoice."

"Rejoice in the Lord always; and again I say, Rejoice."

"Rejoice evermore."

"I will be glad in the Lord."

This is Christianity. This is what it is to be a Christian. Come, now, therefore, and let us all be Christians.

**September 12, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. The Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 11 , pp. 91, 92.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen that in Pagan Rome, under the symbol of "the dragon," there was found the ready power that was used by Satan against Christ and his Church while Jesus was upon the earth and after his ascension to heaven.

This power Satan continued to use as long as Pagan Rome continued. But that mighty empire came to an end. That centralized system, that was such a grand instrument in the hands of Satan, was annihilated; and ten new independent and disunited kingdoms stood in its place. In the times of the destruction of the Roman empire and the planting of the new kingdoms in its place there was no power that Satan could use in his war against Christ and his Church. "And he took his stand upon the seashore" (Rev. 13:1, Twentieth Century: and R.V.): waiting for the rise of another centralized system and power with which he might resume his wrathful war.

And he had not long to wait; for presently there was seen "rising out of the sea, a wild Beast with ten horns and seven heads. On its horns were ten royal crowns, and on its heads blasphemous names. The Beast that I saw was a leopard; but its feet were like a bear's, and its mouth like the mouth of a lion. The dragon gave it his power and his throne, and a wide-spread dominion. One of its heads seems to me to have been mortally wounded, but its deadly wound had been healed. The whole earth followed the Beast, wondering; and men worshiped the dragon, because he had given his dominion to the Beast; while, as they worshiped the Beast, they said - 'Who can compare with the Beast? And who can fight with it?' The Beast was given a mouth that spoke proudly and blasphemously, and it was empowered to work its will for forty-two months. It only opened its mouth to blaspheme God, to blaspheme God himself and his tabernacle - that is all who dwell in his tabernacle in heaven." Rev. 13:1-6, Twentieth Century version.

With this new power, Satan immediately renewed his war against the Church of Christ. "But, the woman was given the two wings of a great eagle, so that she might fly to her place in the desert, where she is being tended for one year, and for two years, and for a half a year, in safety from the serpent" "known as the 'devil' and 'Satan.'"

Nevertheless, his war was carried on by means of this new power, for of this new power, "the Beast," it is written, "It has been permitted to fight with Christ's people and to conquer them and it had received power over every tribe, people, language and nation. All who are living on earth shall worship it - all those whose

names have not been written from the foundation of the world in the Lamb's Book of Life, the Lamb that has been killed." Rev. 13:7, 8 Id.

Here, then, is a power that arose after Pagan Rome had perished; a power that dominated the ten kingdoms that had destroyed and taken the place of the Roman empire; a power that had sway over all the nations; a power of so exceptional a character that the world exclaimed "Who is like unto the Beast!" a power whose sway was so complete that all people exclaimed, "Who is able to make war with him!" a power so universally recognized that all the world followed it wondering, as if hypnotized; a power that blasphemed God and his name and his tabernacle and them that dwell in heaven; a power that for twelve hundred and sixty years made war with the saints and prevailed against them; and that power is "the Beast."

What power then is this? What is the beast?

From the specifications given in the Scripture, is it possible for anybody who has read either Scripture or history, to have any difficulty in knowing what it is? There has been just one power in the world that meets the specifications of the Scripture: and that one power meets to the full every single specification. That power is the papacy.

As already shown, paganism was the form of the original apostasy from God, in the time of Augustus and Tiberius Caesar, all the world had been overwhelmed and brought to the brink of ruin, by the darkness and essential wickedness of that apostasy. Then Christ came; and the true religion, fresh and straight from God, was again given to the world. In the horror of great darkness Light sprang up; and the people who sat in darkness saw a great light.

But after this revelation of the mystery of God in the preaching of the gospel had been made known to all the nations for the obedience of faith, there came another apostasy from God. Even while God was revealing to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit the mystery of God that had been hid for ages and generations - even at that same time, the new apostasy was already developing; "the mystery of iniquity" was seen to be already working. And it continued to work and to grow until there stood revealed that "man of sin, the son of perdition who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped: so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

Through the failing days of the Roman empire, this apostasy and mystery of iniquity so steadily grew and worked that even before that empire had perished, the new apostasy was ready and willing to show itself an instrument in the hands of Satan, by seizing and using, as far as possible, even that worldly and pagan imperial organization and power, not only for the destruction of the saints and the truth of God. And when that imperial organization and power had perished and was gone, the new apostasy lost no time in planting itself firmly as a world-power, and in building up itself the most insidious, the most far-reaching, and therefore the most centralized and all-dominating, power that had ever yet been in the world: and so, also the most efficient instrument that had ever yet fallen to the hand of Satan in his war against Christ and his Church.

And that is the beast.

Though the specifications of Scripture are so definite as to make it perfectly plain that nothing else than the papacy is signified by the term and the description of "the Beast" yet it is always well to note the fulfillment of the specifications of the Scripture. This we will here do briefly.

1. That Papal Rome is the true and lineal successor of Pagan Rome, is one of the very fundamental claims of the papacy. Leo the Great was Bishop of Rome A.D. 440 to 461, in the very midst of the time of the ruin of the Roman empire. And in a sermon he as-

92

serted the predestined perpetuity of Rome: who had only obtained her temporal autocracy to prepare the way, and as a guarantee, for her greater spiritual supremacy. St. Peter and St. Paul were the Romulus and Remus of Christian Rome. Pagan Rome had been the head of the heathen world; the empire of her divine religion was to transcend that of her worldly dominion. Her victories had subdued the earth and the sea; but through the peaceful triumph of her faith, she was to rule still more widely than she had by her wars. It is because Rome was the capitol of the world that the chief of the apostles was chosen to be her teacher, in order that from the head of the world the light of truth might be revealed over all the world. - *Sermon LXXXIII; and Milman's Hist. Latin Christianity, Book II, Chap. IV, Par. 2.*

This conception was not only never lost, but it was systematically developed. And in the development of it from *the New Testament*, the authority and *eternity of Rome* was established. Every passage was seized on where submission to the powers that be was enjoined; every instance cited where obedience had actually been rendered to imperial officials: special emphasis being laid on the sanction that Christ himself had given to *Roman dominion* by pacifying the world through Augustus, by being born at the time of the taxing, by paying tribute to Caesar, by saying to Pilate, "Thou couldst have no power at all against me except it were given thee from above." - *Bryce, "Holy Roman Empire," Chap. VII, Par. 17.*

2. The man of sin, the mystery of iniquity. By a council held at Rheims, France, in July, A.D. 991, the following words were declared, adopted, and published: -

"The Council of Nice commands us to hold ecclesiastical assemblies twice a year, without speaking at all of the Pope; and the apostle commands us not to listen to an angel who would wish to oppose the words of Scripture. Let us follow, then, these sacred laws, and ask for nothing from that Rome which is abandoned to every vice, and which God will soon engulf in a sea of sulphur and brimstone. . . . Italy and Germany despise the popes: *the man of sin, the mystery of iniquity.*"

3. Showing himself to be God. Pope Pius IX published a book of his own speeches, in which, in the official and approved edition, it is declared "He is nature that protests; *he is God*, that condemns." - *Page 17.*

4. Blasphemy. June 21, 1894. Leo XIII published a document addressed "To the Princes and Peoples of the Universe," in which he said to them, "It is we who

hold the regency of God on earth." A regency is the office and administration of a regent. A regent "is an administrator of a realm during the minority or incapacity of a king;" "One who rules or reigns, hence one invested with vicarious authority; one who governs a kingdom in the minority, absence, or disability of the sovereign." A regent *of God*, therefore, on earth, or anywhere else, can exist only upon the assumption of the "minority, absence, or disability of God." And plainly such an assumption as that can not possibly be anything short of supremely blasphemous.

5. The Beast. Honorius of Autun, a priest in the twelfth century exclaimed: "Behold these bishops and cardinals of Rome! These worthy ministers who surround the throne of *The Beast!*"

This list of evidences might easily be largely extended, but these are sufficiently plain and definite to make clear what is the Beast.

Our next study will be, What is the False Prophet, or the Image of the Beast.

**September 19, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. The Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 12 , pp. 98, 99.**

ALONZO T. JONES

BY reading and comparing Revelation 16:13, 14; 19:20, and 14:12, it will be readily seen that "the false prophet," and the "image of the beast," are one and the same thing - only under different symbols.

The beast, we have found to be the papacy. An image of the beast can be nothing else than a religious system formed after the likeness of the papacy, espousing the principles of the papacy, and acting like the papacy. And if this thing, while being and doing all this, should at the same time profess to be opposed to the papacy, profess principles directly the antagonism of the papacy, bear the name that is suggestive of repudiation of the papacy, profess to be in fact the way of deliverance from the papacy - if it should openly profess all this, and at the same time be doing more than all other things together to confirm the papacy and to fasten it upon the world, then that thing would certainly very fittingly come under the title of "false prophet."

If this thing should make pretensions and promises, and should set forth, as vital to its existence, principles, by which it attracted the attention of the world and mightily influenced the world, and then in action should falsify every pretension and promise, and should repudiate or violate its own vital principles, that would certainly answer to the description of "false prophet."

We have found that the beast is the papacy. But what is the papacy? The most direct and comprehensive answer to this question is, The papacy is the union of church and state, with the Church supreme - the ecclesiastical superior to the civil power - and using the state and its power for her own purposes and to accomplish her aims in the aggrandizement of herself.

An image of the beast would be a form of religion different from that of the papacy that would insinuate and exalt itself to dominancy over the state: make the ecclesiastical power superior to the civil; and would use the power of the state to further the ends and purposes of the church.

Where, then, are we to look for the coming of this image of the beast, the rise of the false prophet?

Note that the scripture that tells of the rise of this thing, Rev. 14:12, says that it was said "unto them that dwell on the earth that they should *make* an image to the beast." This being so, then this thing could rise, or be made, only in a place where formerly there had been no union of church and state. For where such a thing already existed, it could not be said to them that "they should make" it.

Where, then, is the place where at first there was no union of church and state, and where it has been or is being said to them that they should *make* it? In all the world there is just one place, one state, one nation, where at the beginning there was not only no union of church and state, but also the actual and intentional repudiation of any such thing. That one place, state, and nation, is the United States of America. And in this one place, it has been, and is being, diligently said "unto them that they should *make*" a union of Church and State, in the very likeness of the papacy. And this is being said and urged by professed protestantism - protestantism that in truth is the direct opposite and antagonism of the papacy!

This movement and this *thing* is now most fully manifested, and is best discerned, in the Federation of Churches - of Protestantism - that was effected in New York City in November, 1905. The Conference in which was accomplished that federation, was confessedly Protestant, and was held in the interests of Protestantism. In the letter that was sent to the churches suggesting such a conference there are the following words: -

"In order to secure an effective organization of the various *Protestant* communions of this country for the practical ends indicated, we would suggest that a conference of representatives accredited by the national bodies of said *Protestant* denominations meet in New York City, November, 1905, to form such an organization as may seem proper to them."

And further: -

"Let the church of Christ, in all its varied administrations, so affiliate as to form a bond of union that will enable *Protestantism* to present a solid front to the forces of evil, and in every possible way unite *its* activities for the spiritual conquest of the world, and the final triumph of the kingdom of God."

It was therefore a federation of *Protestantism* and a *Protestant* federation, that was accomplished. And what are the "practical ends" to which this federation was formed? These were indicated more than once by the representative speakers in the conference, but they are more summarily and directly stated in the following words by one of the principal speakers: -

"I trust that one of the practical results of this Conference will be the organization of a force that law-breakers and law-makers will

respect and heed when great questions of morals are involved. . . .  
It is our province in the name of our supreme King, and seeking the good of mankind, to ask rulers to respect the code of our kingdom. Rulers may ignore sects, but they will respect the Church. This Federation will compel an audience, and it will speak with power, if it will put aside its differences and make its agreement its argument."

How this respect of rulers is to be enforced by the Federation is shown in the plan and operation of its practical workings, in that *county* federation of local federations was found to be "essential *in order to bring pressure to bear* upon the *county officials* for the suppression of the evils aimed at" by the churches; that a *state* federation was found to be essential "to bring to bear the pressure of the united influence of the churches of the state;" and national federation was not essential in order to bring pressure to bear upon national officials. And it was declared by the whole conference in its plan of federation that these practical workings of the Federation are to be made applicable "in every relation of human life."

Plainly therefore, this federation of Protestant churches is directly to the intent that it by the ecclesiastical will, through the exertion of "the combined influence" of the churches, shall control the civil power. It was plainly and publicly declared that on a number of public questions that are civil only, as well as

99

on questions that are religious or ecclesiastical only, and on these different classes of questions indiscriminately mixed, "the voice of the churches should be heard," and that the "united and concerted action" of the church "is to lead effectively."

That is what this professedly Protestant federation proposes to do. That is what it has been created to do. And this under the name and profession of Protestantism! But such declarations, such purposes, and such procedure are distinctly the opposite of original and fundamental Protestant principle. In the original charter of Protestantism as such - the Augsburg Confession, Article XXVIII - it is plainly said that -

"The ecclesiastical power bestowes things eternal, and is exercised only by the ministry of the Word, [and] it does not hinder the civil government any more than the art of singing hinders civil government. For the civil administration is occupied about other matters than is the gospel. The magistracy does not defend the *souls*, but the *bodies*, and *bodily things*, against manifest injuries; and *coerces* men by *the sword* and corporal punishments, that it may uphold *civil* justice and peace.

"Wherefore the ecclesiastical and civil power are *not to be confounded*. The ecclesiastical has its own command to preach the gospel and to administer the sacraments. Let it not by force enter into the office of another; let it not transfer worldly kingdoms; let it not abrogate the magistrates' law; let it not hinder judgments touching any civil ordinances or contracts; let it not prescribe laws

to the magistrate touching the form of the state, as Christ says, 'My kingdom is not of this world.' John 18:36. Again, 'Who makes me a judge or a divider over you?' Luke 12:14."

When the professed Protestant churches federate in order to effectually "bring pressure to bear" upon public civil officials for the execution of the will of the combined church, this is nothing else than to "enter by force into the office of another:" and it is not Protestant, but is papal.

When this professed Protestant Federation by the "combined influence" of the churches which it wields, or when any professed Protestant church, transfers the government - whether city, county, state, or national - from one party to another, or from one person to another, it does in principle and in effect "transfer worldly kingdoms:" and in so doing ceases to be Protestant, and is papal.

When this Federation of professed Protestant churches frames bills, presents them to the legislative power, and swings the "combined influence" of the churches in lobbying and "pressure" to cause the will of the church to be enacted into law, it does in principle, in effect, and in fact, "prescribe laws to the magistrate:" and in so doing it is not Protestant, but papal.

All these things this professed Protestant Federation has done, is doing, and avowedly intends to do. But all of it is specifically repudiated by the original Protestantism in the plain words of the original charter of Protestantism as such. All of it therefore is distinctly anti-Protestant, as tested by the very charter of Protestantism itself.

When, therefore, this Federation, organized to do these things, does these distinctly anti-Protestant things, and puts itself thus on papal ground, and still professes to be Protestant, and poses as true Protestantism, it plainly falsifies its name and profession, violates the fundamental principle of Protestantism, and moves and works under a false pretense.

And when this Federation that thus plainly occupies papal ground and does papal things - things which are in express terms repudiated by original Protestantism - and *still professes to be Protestant*; and while occupying distinctly papal ground, professes still to be on Protestant ground; and while doing distinctly papal things, still professes that these are protestant things; it completely falsifies Protestantism. It deceives the people who expect Protestant things from Protestantism, and thus stands plainly as a false prophet.

Yet it is not enough to say that it thus reveals itself as a false prophet. By every consideration in the premises, and by the experiences of its actual workings, it will be found that it will demonstrate itself to the world as distinctly "the false prophet" of Rev. 16:13; 19:20, and 14:12. A careful study of the actual proceedings, the open statements, and the declared purposes of the Federation of Protestant churches, shows that in every feature it is the veriest likeness of the papacy. Facts of future development will demonstrate that it is indeed the living image of the papacy, and is the third element in the great three-fold development and final combination of apostacy designated as the Dragon, the Beast and the False Prophet.

**September 26, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. The Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 13 , pp. 108-110.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen that the Dragon represents paganism, which is the form of religion assumed in the first apostasy from God in the world.

When the evils engendered and fostered by that false religion had brought the world to the brink of ruin, then God sent his Son Jesus into the world; and by him the true religion, direct from God, was again in its purity given to the world.

But again there was apostasy. There was apostasy from this true religion from God revealed in Christ. This second apostasy developed the papacy. And when the papacy had whelmed the world in darkness, and had brought it again to the brink of ruin; then, in the principles and preaching of the Reformation and true Protestantism, God again made manifest his own true and pure religion.

And now there is the apostasy again, from this true religion of the Reformation and Protestantism. And now how shall the true religion be manifested again, except in a protest against this false Protestantism? But when, in the interests of the true religion there must be a protest against professed Protestantism itself, then surely that must be well nigh the limit. There is only one further possible step; that is, that there should arise a movement of protest against this false Protestantism, and then this movement itself espouse false Protestant - that is, papal - principles, and in the interest of the true religion there should have to be a protest against this *professed* protest, against professed Protestantism! That would indeed, be the utmost limit: every application of the divine remedy would be exhausted, and the end would come.

The first great apostasy was from the worship of the one true God, to the worship of many false gods - to mere naturalism in religion: and this is paganism, or "the Dragon."

The second great apostasy was from Christianity to paganism: but *still retaining the name and forms of Christianity*: and this is the papacy, or "the Beast."

The third great apostasy is from Christianity as revived in the principles of the Reformation and Protestantism, to papal principles and practices: but *still retaining the name and forms of Protestantism*: and this is the image of the papacy, or "the False Prophet."

It is of importance to note the specific things in which all three of these apostasies are at one.

First: *The Union of Religion and the State*. The religion of God is ever totally separate from any and all communication with the state. It belongs distinctly and exclusively to another realm than any to which any state can possibly belong. But God was forsaken. The true religion was abandoned; and paganism resulted. And with Nimrod, the founder of the first state, kingdom and empire, in the world,

paganism became essentially identified with the state, and so remained until in that connection it was supplanted by the papacy.

When Christ came and the divine religion was again manifested to the world, it was plainly and specifically separated from any and all connection with the state. But again there was apostasy; and through Federation and the dark intrigue of Constantine and the bishops, this second false religion became essentially identified with the State.

In the principles and preaching of the Reformation and Protestantism, the divine religion was revived and again made known to all the world. In this revival of the true religion, true to its nature it was again plainly and specifically separated from all connection with, or any dependence upon, the State or civil power. But again there has come apostasy; and each particular phase of Protestantism, as it has been developed, has in its turn united with the State and has become a *State* religion instead of remaining the *divine* religion. And not through Federation again, all the remaining phases of professed Protestantism go about to crowd themselves in one body upon the State, to become identical with it and to be the dominating power in it, in the express image of the papacy.

Now it must be borne in mind that the state is essentially of *force*. Whatsoever religion therefore that ever enters into any connection with the State has already in *principle*, and by that connection becomes in *practice*, a religion of *force*.

The two essential elements that enter into the idea of the State are *laws*, and *force*. Any religion therefore, that ever enters into any connection or association with the state, has already become essentially a religion only of laws and force. And just as soon as from any religion there has been lost any shade of entire dependence on divine faith, divine love, and the divine Spirit, that very day that religion becomes only a religion of works, of laws, and of force: and is ready just then to seek connection with the state which is, and by which that religion becomes possessed of, the very crystallization of laws and force.

Dr. Phillip Schaff has remarked that "civil power has proved a Satanic gift to the church." It is a Satanic gift to any religion. Yet it is certain that in this Satanic thing, paganism, papacy,

109

and professed and federated Protestantism are all three absolutely at one.

Another thing in which these three are at one is -

*The Natural Immortality of Man*: or as usually expressed, The Immortality of the Soul. This theory is essentially pagan. It was one of the chief things received and held from paganism in the second great apostasy, that made the papacy. And, through John Calvin more than any other *one*, it has been perpetuated in professed Protestantism.

In this thing there lies couched a world of mischiefs and deceptions. And yet in this thing, paganism, papacy, and professed Protestantism are essentially at one.

Yet another thing in which these three are at one is -

*Divine Honor to the Sun*, instead of to God. This also is essentially pagan. Divine honor to the sun in the place of God has been the bane of all pagan nations in all times. From paganism it was brought over and retained *in several*

*forms* by the apostasy that formed the papacy. But the chief and most lasting distinction that was given to it was in the exaltation of the Sun-Day - "The wild solar holiday of all pagan times" - in the place of the Lord's Day - the Sabbath of the Lord. This too from the papacy is perpetuated by professed Protestantism.

These essentially pagan things were exalted by the papacy as the most vital of Christian things. And to that same effect they are perpetuated by this professed Protestantism that develops the false prophet and the image of the papacy.

Now these three great apostasies, holding in common these vital elements, it will be perfectly logical, and the most natural, thing, that they should form a *three-fold coalition* to the establishment of a *world religion*. Especially can this be expected just now when the ambition for a world-religion seems to permeate the very air. In bringing this about, there will necessarily be some concessions on the part of each; but with the vital points already held in common the necessary accommodations can be worked out as the crises may demand.

And for all this the way is already paved. We have already mentioned the federation of professed Protestantism for the control of legislation and the State in the special interests of Protestantism. But it must not be forgotten that for several years already, there has been formed and in quiet operation a "Federation of Catholic Societies" for the same practical purposes, but in the special interests of Catholicism.

Now, with these two powerful federations, *in the same territory*, working in many points for the same things, actually working together in some things, each often bidding for the favor of the other, but each always intently looking, and steadily working, for its own self-advancement - in view of all this can anybody think for a moment that there will not come actual approaches, accommodations, concessions, and final coalition?

This is *certain* to come, as between the papacy and this professed Protestantism that occupies so largely papal grounds. How stands the case as relates to the remaining distinct and separate paganism, in the Far East under the tutelage and leadership of Japan?

Here also, coalition with the others is fairly in sight. By Japan's wonderful progress of late, and especially by her signal victories in war by land and sea, she has gained such favor in the eyes of the so-called Christian powers that they readily agree that she should be also "Christian."

And Japan thinks just this herself. In the midst of their late war a book was issued in behalf of Japan by a Japanese scholar, and printed in English, presenting Japan's side of the case, and bidding for the favor of the world. And in this book, Chapter V. under the heading of "Japan's Burning Need," this thought is presented as follows: -

"Can Japan fulfil this her heaven-appointed mission, apart from that Christianity which has done so much to make Europe and America what they are? It is impossible to think that there is no need for us Japanese as a people to join the other nations in celebrating with joy the coming and the work of Jesus Christ. Just as Japan has appropriated the material side of western civilization

and grown strong thereby, just so she has need of assimilating the spiritual elements of that civilization to give character to her people. In other words, it is only by becoming Christian that she can fulfil her heaven-appointed mission."

From this the writer proceeds to enlarge upon the following three propositions: -

"1. Japan needs Christianity in order to make a right use of her political and educational institutions."

"2. Japan needs Christianity in order to successful colonization."

And near the close of the Chapter there is the following remarkable observation: -

"Japan has already for the sake of the peace of the Far East formed an alliance with Great Britain; for the promotion of commerce of Manchuria and Korea she has joined hands with America.

"This is surely a wise policy and a great diplomatic success. But to the complete fulfilment of her whole heaven-assigned mission, she must form an alliance with the Kingdom of God and be brought into sympathetic touch with Jesus Christ." - "*The Mission of Japan, and the Russo-Japanese War,*' pages 55-62.

From this it is perfectly plain that Japan's proposed alliance with Christianity and the Kingdom of God, is of a character entirely national and political: exactly as was that which made the papacy, and as is that of federated Protestantism.

A distinct echo of this voice from Japan - even though unintentional - was given in President Roosevelt's letter to the Conference on Federation of Protestantism in New York City last November. That letter runs as follows, italics mine: -

"MY DEAR DR. ROBERTS: - I have your letter of the 7th. Indeed, I remember very well the call of your delegation upon me and our talk upon the proposed meeting of the Inter-church Conference on Federation.

I have the *very highest sympathy with the movement*; for instance, I feel that indirectly in addition to the great good it will do here it is perfectly possible that *the movement* may have a *very considerable effect in the Christianizing of Japan*, which I feel to be *retarded* by the divisions among ourselves and *by the failure to recognize the fact that the Christian Church in Japan* must of course *assume essentially a Japanese national form*.

So you see, I have a very real interest in what you are doing to attend the meeting, as you request, but I regret to say that it is out of the question for me to do so. I am genuinely sorry to have to write you thus. Sincerely yours,  
THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

This letter proposes for Japan exactly the order of "Christianity" to which Japan is aspiring - a national, political "Christianity," after the order of that of the papacy and of federated Protestantism.

And now in the summer of 1906 *Lloyd's Weekly* has published from Japan the following statement, which in its mighty significance is startling - italics mine: -

### "JAPAN SEEKING LIGHT.

"A Parliament of Religions similar to that which met in Chicago during the World's Fair is now in session in Tokio. The Roman Catholic Church and the various Protestant denominations, as well as the Mohammedans, are well represented in this congress. A committee to travel abroad *for the purpose of discovering the true religion,*

110

*the one which should be embraced by the Japanese people,* was appointed by the Mikado of Japan seven years ago. This commission failed to carry out its purpose, but *now the work has been resumed, and European governments have been notified to that effect."*

Japan has begun the search for a new religion; *and she will find it.* And when she shall have found it the vital points of it will be a political mixture of pagan elements adopted from Catholicism and Catholicized Protestantism, further mixed with pagan elements of her own, and all moulded into a new national, State-religion of Japan. She already holds the vital idea of State religion; she already holds in full measure the natural immortality of man; and since the *risen Sun* is already on the flag of Japan, it will be a very easy step from this to the adoption from Catholicism and Catholicized Protestantism, and the "Christian" nations, the Sun-Day as the sign of her new religion.

And then, and thus, there will be presented to the world the curious spectacle of the second great apostasy (that made the papacy) having borrowed from the first great apostasy (paganism), these essentially pagan things; and having christened them, and the Catholicized Protestantism having accepted and perpetuated them; now these two apostasies handing back *as Christian*, to the original apostasy of paganism, these things that originally were, and forever are, essentially pagan!

And when this grand three-fold coalition shall have been accomplished the result will be a truly *world*-religion, in which the papacy will be predominant, and which will be supported by all the great powers of the world. And all the great world-powers involved in this three-fold coalition of religions, will be united in compelling all the people in the world to conform to that world-religion, with the result that "all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

And just now as never before, and with such solemnity and power as never before, there is due to be preached "the everlasting gospel unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. . . Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she

made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. And. . . saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the Beast and his image and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation. . . . Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

**October 3, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. The Greatest Apostasy, The Greatest Deception, and The Greatest Ruin" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 14 , pp. 117, 118.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the developments of the Eastern Question since 1839-40, we have seen the Kings of the West become also the kings of the East and of the earth and the whole world.

In the present conditions of the Eastern Question and the present situation of these world-powers, we see that the world is very near to the time of the ending of the Turkish Empire, and *in that* the "way of the Kings of the East" "prepared" to be gathered to the battle of the great day and of Armageddon.

In the Scripture it is declared that it is "the spirits of devils working miracles" which go forth *from* "the Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet" *to* "the Kings of the Earth and the whole world, *to gather them* to the battle of that great day of God Almighty," and which *do* thus gather them to Armageddon.

We have found the Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet, to be the three great apostasies from God composing paganism, papacy, and false Protestantism; and we have found these three to be just now rapidly advancing to a three-fold coalition into a great world-religion, united with, and supported by, the great powers which are the kings of the East and of the earth and the whole world.

But with this great world-religion it is not enough that it should be only *united* with those powers and supported by them in the things which are to *their* particular interests. This world-religion *must* dominate these powers and *use them* to promote *its* interests first of all and over all. It must not be forgotten that in the three-fold coalition into the great world-religion and papacy will be predominant. And the essential spirit of the papacy is *domination* over all persons and things.

Indeed, the essential spirit of the three is the same; but in the papacy it has found its fullest development. And that spirit is simply and essentially the Satanic spirit. We have read the words of Schaff that "civil power has proved a Satanic gift to the Church." It is only a Satanic gift to any religion; and yet it is the chiefest characteristic of each of the three apostasies, that it has become possessed of the civil power. And in their final form of three-fold coalition into one great world-religion, this characteristic of the Satanic gift will be proportionately developed.

Another thing that makes plain and emphatic this truth as to the Satanic gift in the case of each of the three, is the tracing, as well as the plain statements, of Revelation 12, and 13, concerning the war of Satan against Christ and His Church from the birth of Christ unto the end of the world.

*First:* There was the Dragon standing ready to devour Christ as soon as he should be born. This failed and then the dragon turned his wrath upon the woman - the Church.

*Second:* That power of Pagan Rome passed away, and then arose the Beast: and to the Beast the Dragon gave his power and his seat and his great authority. And in worshipping the Beast "they worshiped the Dragon which gave power unto the Beast."

*Third:* When the Beast went into captivity, there was seen "coming up" the other beast, which causes the making of an Image to the Beast: And though he had "two horns like a lamb" yet it had also to be written of him, "he spake as a dragon."

Thus the spirit and life of the Dragon is perpetuated throughout, and is found in all three separately. And throughout the whole story, that which is preeminently the Dragon is plainly declared to be that old Serpent, which is the Devil and Satan." Rev. 12:9. This certifies to the exact truth of the Satanic character of that "gift" of civil power to the Church, or to any religion. And when it is plainly revealed in the case of each of the three apostasies, separately and in succession, how much more will it be revealed in the *coalition of the three* into *one* great world-religion, possessed of *all the civil power of the world*.

How appropriate to all this stands the Revelation that in the real workings of this coalition it is but the workings of the "spirits of devils!"

Thus the culmination of apostasy, in the coalition of the three great apostasies of the world into one grand combination of apostasy in possession of all world-power, proves to be also the culmination of the development and manifestation of Satanic power in the world and before the universe. For those are the "spirits of devils working miracles," which go forth to the kings of the earth and the whole world to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty, and which do indeed gather them to Armageddon.

118

These miracles are only Satanic miracles, for they are wrought by "the spirits of devils;" and they are wrought only to deceive. He "deceiveth them that dwell on the earth *by means* of those miracles which he had power to do;" and "wrought miracles *with which* to deceive them." Rev. 14:14; 19:20. And in another scripture this whole situation and combination is summed up in the statement that the coming of the Lord Jesus in His glory "is *after the working of Satan* with *all power* and signs and *lying* wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved." 2 Thess. 2:9, 10.

Thus by the Scriptures it is made perfectly plain that the coalition of the three greatest apostasies of the world into the world's one "greatest religion," will prove to be only the world's one greatest apostasy of all, and the world's greatest

possible deception; and only that which will the more hasten the world's certain ruin.

And what can save anybody from this apostasy, from this miracle-working deception, and from this awful ruin? - The same thing that saves from the battle of the great day, and from the worship of the Beast and his Image: namely, a spiritual experience in the Book of Life, and that then manifests unswerving loyalty to God in Christ in the keeping of the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus.

Next week the study will be, The Greatest of All Miracles.

**October 10, 1906**

**"The Eastern Question. The Greatest of All Miracles" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 15 , pp. 122-124.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE final crisis in the Turkish possession of Constantinople is certainly imminent.

After that, there is just one thing remaining in the history of Turkey - the Turkish capital to be established in Jerusalem; and then that power comes to its end because none shall help him.

When that power comes to its end the way of the kings of the East is thereby prepared; and from the Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet, there go out the evil spirits to gather the kings of the earth and the whole world to the battle of that great day and of Armageddon.

This great coalition in a world-Federation that marks supreme and final apostasy and the crowning development of Satanic power, is even now so far under way that it is almost in sight.

By the Scriptures it is true, and it is therefore certain, that by "the spirits of devils working miracles" in the crowning development of Satanic power, the kings of the East and of the earth and of the whole world are to be filled to the breaking point with the spirit of war, and are then to be gathered to the battle of the great day and of Armageddon.

It is worth while to set down here in order the Scriptures that reveal this final and miracle working development of Satanic power. They are the following: -

1. "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and *shall shew* great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. 24:23, 24.

2. "And then if any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ; or, lo, he is there; believe him not; for false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and *shall shew* signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect." Mark 13:21, 22.

3. Referring to the coming of the Lord Jesus, the Word says: "Even him, whose coming is *after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders*, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." 2 Thess. 2:9, 10.

4. "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. . . . And he *doeth great wonders*, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of *those miracles* which *he had power to do* in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live." Rev. 13:11-14.

5. "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the Dragon, and out of the mouth of the Beast, and out of the mouth of the False Prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, *working miracles*, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." Rev. 16:13, 14.

6. "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and He that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. . . . And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. . . . And I saw the Beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against Him that sat on the horse, and against His army. And the Beast was taken, and with him the False Prophet that *wrought miracles* before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the Beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." Rev. 19:11-21.

There is no need ever to enter upon any upon any discussion, or any fine distinction, as to whether anybody but God can really work miracles. Indeed, in the presence of these Scriptures there is no room for any such discussion or distinction. There stand the plain statements that these false Christs and false prophets "*shall show great signs and wonders*;" and so great and so deceitful that if it were possible they would deceive even the very elect. There stand the plain words that Satan will work "*with all power and signs and lying wonders*." There are the words plain and positive that he "*deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by means of those miracles which he had power to do*." "The spirits of devils *working miracles*;" "*wrought miracles . . . by which he deceived them*."

In the presence of these perfectly plain statements of the Word of God there is no room for any question as to whether such miracles will be actually wrought. It is certain that Satanic power and spirits of devils will work miracles to deceive and lead to destruction kings, nations, and peoples at the time of the ending of the Turkish power; and through the grand coalition, in a world-federation, of the three great apostasies.

The two great events - the ending of the Turkish power, and the world-federation of religions - that indicate the time

of this deceitful and destructive working, are both now so near that the loss of Constantinople by the Turkish power is the only great event that stands between *this* time and *that* time. Instead, therefore, of spending any time in vain and fruitless discussion as to whether the miracles will be real or not, it is now high time diligently to consider how we may surely escape the deception and the destruction to which the Satanic miracles only lead.

And this preparation can never possibly be gained by any study or investigation of those deceiving miracles themselves, nor of any theories concerning them. It is only the knowledge of *the truth*, that will ever enable any one to detect error. It is only a knowledge of the *true*, that can expose the false.

And can anybody suppose that while Satan is thus working with all power and signs and lying wonders and all deceivableness of unrighteousness, that God will do nothing? While the spirits of devils shall be working their deceiving and destructive miracles, shall it be supposed that the Spirit of God shall make no manifestation of the true power, and of instruction in the righteousness of God? - No. By every possible consideration the answer is, No. For from long ago it stands written, "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him, and put him to flight." Isa. 59:19.

Therefore, in the time of the greatest manifestation of Satanic power in the multitude of deceiving miracles, there will also be manifested the *mightier power of God* in his own true miraculous working in *righteousness*. Accordingly, in this time there is no room for any question as to whether we shall believe in miracles or not: for everybody in the world will presently believe in miracles. The only question that can possibly remain is, Which miracles shall we believe - the wrong ones, or the right ones? the deceiving and destroying ones, or the faithful and saving ones? the Satanic ones, or the divine ones? For in one or the other all will finally believe.

Another thing that, from these truths is evident: that is, that no miracle is *of itself* any evidence of divinity, of truth, or of righteousness. The only thing of which any miracle is *of itself* evidence, is *power*, - superhuman or supernatural power. The *power* may be benign or baleful, divine or devilish; but of the *character* or *source* of the power, the miracle *of itself* is no evidence; that must be known by some other means, and must be found by some other test. Therefore, the Scripture gives to all this very, and very important, instruction: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world." 1 John 4:1.

But the moment that there is recognized the principle that every miracle must be tested, that moment all miracles are relegated to second place, and truth and righteousness take first place. And this itself is a defense against deceiving miracles.

And that this principle must be recognized is plain from the Scripture just quoted. But that is not the only instruction from God on this point. Read this: "And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath *not* spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the

prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him." Deut. 18:21, 22.

That is plain and easy as to the thing that comes *not* to pass. How then as to the other way? Suppose the thing *does* come to pass, is *that* sufficient ground upon which to accept as true that prophet or dreamer of dreams or miracle worker? - Not at all. Even then, the *tendency*, the *character*, of the sign or wonder that *has come to pass*, must be tested. Read it: "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him, and *keep his commandments*, and *obey his voice*, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him." Deut. 13:1-4.

It is, therefore, evident that any and every miracle, sign, or wonder, wrought by the Spirit of God, is the keeping of the commandments of God. And the Spirit of God does employ many of these, and in a diversity of ways, to affect that good design. Read it: "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." 1 Cor. 12:4-11.

All these, and more, compose the diversities of gifts and operations of the Spirit of God; and all are to the *one great aim* of bringing believers to the keeping of the commandments of God. For it is plainly written that the one supreme object of all the gifts of God, in Christ, by the Holy Spirit, is "the perfecting of the Saints" in the love of God or "charity, which is the bond of perfectness." "And this is the love of God that we keep his commandments." And "In Christ Jesus circumcision is nothing: the want of it is nothing; but to keep God's commands is everything." Eph. 4:11-13; 1 John 5:3; 1 Cor. 7:19. Twentieth Century Version.

And it is further written that when, by means of all this diversity of gifts, operations, and administrations, of the Spirit of God, *that which is perfect has come*, then all these will vanish away; their purpose accomplished, their object obtained. For "charity," the love of God, which is the keeping of the commandments of God in very truth and righteousness - "*never faileth*;" but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. . . . But *when that which is perfect is come*, then that which is in part shall be done away." 1 Cor. 13:8-10.

When it is divinely true that the one supreme object of all these wonderful workings of God himself, is to bring believers to the standard of perfection in the love of God which is the keeping of the Commandments of God, then this makes it certain that even the miracles which the Lord himself works, hold only a secondary place, and never the first place. And whosoever puts even a miracle of God in the first place, and makes *it* the chief point of attention and of interest, misses the whole aim of the miracle, and perverts the purpose of God in it.

The truth and righteousness of God manifested in believers in Jesus, holds rank above even miracles. And the truth and righteousness of God, perfectly manifested in believers in Jesus, in the love of God which is the keeping of the Commandments of God, ranks higher than the mightiest miracle ever wrought even by the power and Spirit of God. For, the mightiest miracle, yes, all the miracles, ever thus wrought were aimed solely to the accomplishment of that one supreme thing.

Therefore, the true keeping of the Commandments of God in the truth and righteousness of God, in this world in human flesh, is the greatest of all mir-

124

acles. And for God to make a man in this world a perfect keeper of his commandments in the truth and righteousness of God, is the greatest miracle that can ever be wrought even by God.

And this greatest of all miracles that even he can work, God proposes and promises *now*, in this very time, to work *in every believer in Jesus*. For in this very time and upon this mighty issue that faces the whole world, He declares of those who refuse to worship the beast and his image, "Here are they which *keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.*" Rev. 14:9-12.

And in this splendid truth there lies the perfect security against any and all manner of deceiving miracles. For whosoever knows that God's transcendent miracle is to make a man a keeper of his commandments, then it is impossible for any other miracle ever to have any weight with him *except only* as it contributes to this one transcendent purpose of all God's gifts, administrations, and operations. And, whosoever knows that *in his own heart and life* there is constantly being wrought by God through his Holy Spirit this greatest of all miracles that even the Lord can work, then never by any possibility can any deceiving and Satanic miracle appeal to him.

And this is the only security against the Satanic miracles, against the miracles of the spirits of devils, that deceive the world into the worship of the beast and his image, and which, from the coalition and federation of the Dragon, the Beast and the False Prophet, gather the kings of the earth and of the whole world to the destruction of the battle of that great day and of Armageddon.

Nor is this thought as to the greatest miracle and its being the sure defense against the supreme manifestation of Satanic power in deception, a new one to Protestant Christians. More than five hundred years ago, by the splendid Protestant Christians of Bohemia, it was clearly seen; and by Brother John Huss was then beautifully expressed, as follows: -

"Anti-christ will have the power of deceiving by wonders. In the last times, miracles are to be retrenched. She [the church of Christ]

is to go about only in the form of a servant; she is to be tried by patience. The lying wonders of the servants of Anti-christ are to serve for the trial of faith. By its own intrinsic power faith shall preserve itself in the elect, *superior to all arts of deception*. Prophecy is wrapt in obscurity; the gift of healing removed; the power of long, protracted fasting diminished; the word of doctrine silent; miracles are withheld. *Not that Divine Providence utterly suspends these things*; but they are not to be seen openly and in great variety, as in earlier times.

"All this, however, is so ordered by a wonderful arrangement of Divine Providence, that God's mercy and justice may be revealed precisely in this way. For while the Church of Christ must, after the withdrawal of her miraculous gifts, appear in greater lowliness, and the righteous, who venerate her on account of the hope of Heavenly good, not on account of visible signs, fail of their reward in this earthly life; there will, on the other hand, be a more speedy manifestation of the temper of the wicked, who, disdaining to follow after the invisible things which the Church promises, cling fast to visible signs.

"This servant of the true Church, in which *the power of the invisible Godlike is all that attracts*, as contrasted with the abundance of lying wonders in the worldly Church of Anti-christ, appearing in glory, serves as the means of separating the elect from the reprobate. The elect must pass through this trial in order to bring out their genuine character; the reprobate must be deceived, according to the just judgment of God. Therefore, in these times, it is rather the servants of Anti-christ, than the servants of Christ, who will make themselves known by wonders.

*"It is a greater miracle to confess the truth and practise righteousness, than to perform marvelous works to the outward senses. The priest or deacon who loves his enemies, despises riches, esteems as nothing the glory of this world, avoids entangling himself in worldly [sic.] business, and patiently endures terrible threatenings, even persecutions, for the Gospel's sake, - such a priest or deacon performs miracles, and has the witness within him that he is a genuine disciple of Christ." - "Ecclesiastical Empire," Chapter XXIII, Par. 119-121.*

O soul, have you given yourself to God, so that by whatever gift, administration, and operation, of his divine power and Spirit, he may accomplish in your heart and life his transcendent purpose of making you a keeper of his commandments?

O soul, is there being wrought constantly in your heart and life by the power and Spirit of God, this greatest of all miracles?

And are you thus perfectly secured against all deception of the Satanic miracles that will engulf the world in destruction?

**October 17, 1906**

**"Religious Federation" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 16 , pp. 131-133.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen that it was by federation that the papacy was made, in all that it has ever been. And of all the evil things that have ever afflicted this world, the Bible presents the papacy as supreme.

And now we see professed Protestantism entering into federation after the same manner, upon the same principles, and to the same purpose, - in short, in the very likeness of the papacy.

These two presently coalescing with the remaining distinct paganism, compose a *world-federation*, and so a *world-religion* to be forced upon all people of the world by all the power of the world.

In view of all this, it becomes of special interest to study this thing of federation for what it is in itself as well as to see how naturally the papacy was developed by it, and how naturally monarch and imperialism in religion must ever be developed by it.

The meaning of "federation" follows: -

"Federation: The act of uniting in a confederacy, by league or alliance."

"Confederacy: A number of States or persons in compact or league with each other, as for mutual aid, protection, or action; a league; a confederation; as the Delian confederacy of Greek States." Illustration: "Even the best of the kings [of

Israel or Judah] trusted more in their armies and confederacies than in the arm of Jehovah."

Synonyms. "League, compact, alliance, combination, coalition, confederation."

"Confederation: The act of confederating: a league, a compact for mutual support; alliance; particularly of princes; unions or States."

Now it is certain that Christ never either established or sanctioned in his

132

Church or in connection with his cause any such thing as a federation or confederacy. Indeed in the plain words of the Scripture, the thing is flatly forbidden. Read it: "The Lord spake thus to me with a strong hand, and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people, saying: Say ye not a confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say a confederacy; neither fear ye their fear nor be afraid."

Instead of any confederacy and confederation being Christian or of Christianity it is plainly forbidden by the Author of Christianity. By a close study of Isaiah, verses 8-18, with Hebrews 2:13, it will be seen that it is directly a prophecy of the times of Immanuel, the times of the Messiah.

Therefore, federation and confederation are not of Christ nor of Christianity. Through federation and confederation, men in the world when Christ came were "enslaved to kings and priests." And "He freed us from the chains of priestcraft, by teaching *the absolute independence of the individual soul on matters religious*; and by promising the Spirit of truth to guide each one into all truth." He came to restore the individual man to himself and to God; and to himself by restoring him to God.

And when Christ went back to heaven, it was with every believer in him bound individually to him as his only head, by his own Holy Spirit; all believers thus forming his Church, which is his own body, of which he himself alone is the head. By the same Spirit all the members of this his body were bound together in one common spiritual brotherhood in "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; all only brethren, and Christ the one only superior and Master.

Wherever there was a company of these, even though it were in a single house or family, there was a church of Christ (Romans 16:3, 4; 1 Cor. 10:19; Col. 4:15); with Christ the head of that church; because the members were members of him, of his body; and members one of another; and he the head of each individual member. 1 Cor. 12:27; Eph. 5:30; Rom. 12:5. Thus Christianity means *individuality*.

Such is the order of things that Christ left on earth when he ascended to heaven. Such is the order of things while yet his apostles remained on earth. But even then the mystery of iniquity was already working to bring men again into the chains of priestcraft. And *through federation* this was done. The story of this is so clearly told in the plain statements of the authentic history of the times, that we need to do no more here than to copy the history just as it stands. It runs as follows: -

"Although all the churches were, in the first age of Christianity, united together in one common bond of faith and love, and were in

every respect ready to promote to the interests and welfare of each other by a reciprocal interchange of good offices; yet with regard to government and internal economy, every individual church considered itself as an independent community, none of them ever looking in these respects beyond the circle of its own members for assistance, or recognizing any sort of external influence or authority.

"Neither in the New Testament, nor in any ancient document whatever, do we find anything recorded, from whence it might be inferred that any of the minor churches were at all dependent on, or looked up for direction to, those of greater magnitude or consequence. On the contrary, several things occurred therein which put it out of all doubt that every one of them enjoyed the same rights, and was considered as being on a footing of the most perfect equality with the rest.

"Indeed it can not, - I will not say be proved, but - even be made to appear probable, from any testimony, divine or human. that in this age it was the practise for several churches to enter into, and maintain among themselves, that sort of association which afterward came to subsist among the churches of almost every province. I allude to their assembling by their bishops, at stated periods, for the purpose of enacting general laws, and determining any questions or controversies that might arise respecting divine matters.

"It was not until the second century that any traces of that sort of association from whence councils took their origin, are to be perceived; when we find them occurring here and there, some of them tolerably clear and distinct, others again but slight and faint; which seems plainly to prove that the practise arose subsequently to the times of the apostles, and that all that is urged concerning the councils of the first century, and the divine authority of councils, is sustained merely by the most uncertain kind of support; namely, the practise and opinion of more recent times.

"It is very common for the assembly of the church of Jerusalem, of which we read in Acts xv., to be termed the *first council*; and if people choose still to persist in giving it this denomination. I shall certainly not trouble myself so far as to fall out with them about it. I would wish them, however, to understand that this is applying the word *council*, in a way altogether inconsistent with its true import. The congregation that is stated to have met on this occasion was nothing more than an assembly of the members of one individual church, consisting of the apostles, the elders, and the people. Now if the term council could properly be applied to such an assembly as this, it would follow as a necessary consequence that more councils were held in the first century than in any subsequent one; whereas even the warmest advocates for their early origin are

ready to admit, that in this age they were not by any means frequent.

"In fact, it was a most common practise in all the churches, at this period, for the members to hold meetings after the manner of that above alluded to as having been convened at Jerusalem, for the purpose of consulting together, and deliberating on matters relating to religion and divine worship; and therefore, if such a meeting is to be termed a council, it may even be said that there were more councils held in the first century than in all the subsequent ones down to our own time put together.

"A council, properly speaking, means an assembly of several associated churches, or a congregation of delegates representing a number of churches so united, in which the common welfare of they whole is made subject-matter of consultation; and such things are resolved on and enacted as may appear to the members constituting such an assembly, or to the major part of them, eligible, and fraught with a promise of conducing to the general good. Now, that such an assembly as this was even once held in the first century, is what I am sure no one, let him take what pains he may, will ever be able to find in the history of that age. As the cause of Christianity, however, advanced, and its concerns became more extensive, so that the churches composing an ecclesiastical province assumed, as it were, the form of a republic made up of various minor districts, it became necessary, in order to preserve tranquility and a mutual good understanding amongst them, that several particulars should be occasionally discussed in a general meeting, composed of legates or deputies from each." - *Mosheim Commentaries.* "Cent. I Sec. XLVIII; and note "Z."

On this matter in the second century the record is as follows: -

"Although, therefore, all the churches had, at the commencement of this century, various laws and institutions in common, which had been received from the apostles themselves, and were particularly careful in maintaining with each other a certain community of tenets, morals and charity; yet each individual church which had a bishop and presbyters of its own, assumed to itself the form and rights of a little distinct republic or commonwealth; and with regard to its internal concerns was wholly regulated by

133

a code of laws, that, if they did not originate with, had, at least, received the sanction of the people constituting such a church.

"During a great part of this century, all the churches continued to be, as at first, *independent* of each other, or were connected by *no consociations or confederations*. Each church was a kind of little state, governed by its own laws, which were enacted, or at least sanctioned, by the people. But by degrees all the Christian

churches within the same province united and formed a sort of larger society, or commonwealth, which, as is *usual with confederated republics*, held its conventions at stated seasons, and in them deliberated for the common advantage of the *whole confederation*. *This custom first arose among the Greeks, with whom such confederation* of several cities, and the consequent conventions of their delegates, *had long been in use*. In process of time, when experience had shown its utility, this practise found its way over all the Christian church.

"In process of time, however, the very great advantages attending on a *federation of this sort*, becoming apparent, other provinces were induced to *follow the example of Greece*, and by degrees *this form of government* became general throughout the whole church so that the Christian community may be said, thenceforward, to have resembled *one large commonwealth made up*, like those of Holland and Switzerland, *of many minor republics*. These conventions or assemblies, in which the delegates from various churches consulted on what was requisite to be done for the common welfare of the whole, were termed *synods* by the Greeks, and by the Latins *councils*. To the laws enacted by the deputies under the powers with which they were invested by their respected churches, the Greeks gave the name of *canons* or general rules, and by this title it also became usual for them to be distinguished he the Latins.

"*The associations*, however, thus introduced amongst the churches, and the councils to which they gave rise, although not unattended with certain benefits and advantages, *were*, nevertheless, *productive of so great an alteration* in the general state of the church, as nearly to effect *the entire subversion of its ancient constitution*.

(Concluded next week.)

**October 24, 1906**

**"Religious Federation (Concluded.)" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns. 17 , pp. 141, 142.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"FOR, in the first place, the primitive rights of the people, in consequence of its new arrangement of things, experienced a considerable diminution inasmuch as, thenceforward, none but affairs are comparatively very trifling consequence were ever made the subject of secular deliberation and adjustment; the councils of the associated churches ascribing to themselves the right of

discussing and regulating everything of . . . ment or importance, as well as of determining all questions to which any sort of weight was attached. Whence arose all sorts of ecclesiastical laws, the one public or general, and thenceforward titled 'canonical,' from the canons; another private or peculiar, consisting mainly of such regulations as each individual church deemed it expedient, after ancient manner, to enact for itself.

"In the next place, the dignity and authority of the bishops were very materially augmented and enlarged. In the infancy, indeed, of councils, the bishops did not scruple to acknowledge that they appeared there merely as the ministers legates of their respective churches, and that they were, in fact, nothing more than representatives acting from instruction; but it was not long before this humble language began by little and little to be exchanged for a loftier tone; and they at length took upon them to assert that they were the legitimate successors of the apostles themselves, and might consequently, of their own proper authority, dictate laws to the Christian flock. To what an extent the inconveniences and evils arising out of these preposterous pretensions reached in after time is too well known to require any particular notice in this place.

"Another effect which these councils had, was to *break in upon* and gradually *destroy that absolute and perfect equality* which had reigned amongst the bishops in primitive times. For as it was necessary that some certain place should be fixed on for the seat of council and that the right of convening the assembling and presiding therein as moderator, as well as of collecting the suffrages and preserving the records of its acts, should be vested in some one or other of its members, it for the most part became customary to give a preference in these respects to the chief city of the province and its bishop, and hence in process of time, sprung up the dignity and authority of 'metropolitans,' a title conferred by way of distinction on the bishops of principal cities. These *associations of churches*, situated *within one and the same province*, soon gave rise to the practise of many different provinces associating together; and hence a still greater disparity, by degrees, introduced itself amongst the bishops.

"In fine, this custom of holding councils becoming at length universally prevalent, the major part of the church assumed the form of a large civil commonwealth, made up of numerous inferior republics; to the preservation of which order of things it being found expedient that a *chief or superintending prelate should be appointed for each of the three grand divisions of the earth*; and that, in addition to this, a *supreme power* should be lodged in the hands of *some one individual bishop*; it was tacitly assented to that a certain degree of ecclesiastical preeminence should be recognized as belonging to the bishops of Antioch, Rome, and

Alexandria, the principal cities in Asia, Europe, and Africa, and that *the bishop of Rome*, the noblest and most opulent city in the world, should, moreover, take the precedence amongst these principal bishops, or, as they were afterward styled, *patriarchs*, and also assume the primacy of the whole Christian Church throughout the world." - *Id. Cent. II., Sec. XXII., XXIII., with Mosheim's "Eccl. Hist." Book I, Cent. II, Part II, Chap. II., Par. 11.*

And of this thing in the third century the record is as follows: -

"It is to be observed, however, that, notwithstanding the primitive and venerable mode of church government, which had been established by the apostles, appeared for the most part still thus firmly to maintain its ground, it was yet in reality on the wane, and gradually giving way, more especially in the larger churches, to a *form that inclined rather to the despotic or monarchial nature*. For as is commonly the case in human affairs, the bishops who presided over congregations of any consequence, being elated by their situation, and not feeling satisfied with the limited degree of power that had been originally committed to their hands, began to arrogate to themselves an extent of authority and importance to which they had not before made pretensions, and artfully encroaching step by step, no less on the rights of the presbyters than on those of the people, they eventually succeeded in altogether dispossessing both of their ancient and undoubted privileges, and placing every thing at their own immediate judgment and disposal.

"Innovations of this kind, however, could not, of course, be attempted without requiring some sort of justification, and we accordingly find, about this time, certain *new maxims and dogmas propounded respecting the right government of the church* and the functions and authority of bishops; the force and validity of which, however, so far from being easily perceptible, should seem to have been but very imperfectly comprehended even by those who may be considered as the first promulgators of them.

"In furtherance of these episcopal encroachments we find Cyprian standing forth a distinguished example to his brethren, being of the episcopal order himself, and, as is too obvious to be deemed, of an ambitious, domineering spirit, he entered the lists as a most strenuous advocate for the dignity and authority of bishops, and in order to prevent any part of what he considered as their just rights, from being at a future time, under any pretense whatever, either wrested from them or even called in question, labored earnestly to establish the whole on all immovable, and eternal basis." - *Mosheim's "Commentaries," Cent. III., Sec. XXIV.*

Cyprian declared that "the church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers." And further, "Whence you ought

to know that the bishop is in the church, and the church is in the bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop, then he is not in the church."

Thus the system of federation and centralization for power that began in the second century and which in the third century had developed an episcopal despotism and monarchy in the church, culminated in the fourth century in the grand world-federation for *power with* and *in the state*, and thus developed the world despotism and world monarchy of the bishopric of Rome - the Papacy. And it cannot be denied that the final development of the actual working Papacy is but the steady, logical growth and development of the very first step away from the individuality, the integrity, and the liberty, of the Christian congregation. And the Papacy was in that first step just as truly, though not in such full and vigorous working, as it was in the later steps in the fourth century and onward.

Note that the history says specifically that this scheme of "federation," "Confederation," etc., had its origin "among the Greeks, with whom such confederations of several cities, and the consequent conventions and their delegates, had long been in use." It was therefore plainly in its very origin the application of the human, the worldly, the heathen, *system of government* to the divine, the heavenly, the Christian, living organization.

The Church which Christ and his apostles left on earth was, and was ever to be, organized from God alone, through Christ the head, with the divine life sent straight down from heaven in the Holy Spirit. Eph. 4:15-16; Col. 2:17-19; 1 Cor. 12:11-13, 25, 26. By the divine life alone, from God alone, through Christ alone, by the Holy Spirit alone, that Church was, and is ever to be organized; and so was, and is ever to be, a living "building," built of living stones, fitly framed together in Christ by the Holy Spirit, and growing "unto an holy temple in the Lord," "for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

1 Peter 2:4, 5; Eph. 2:19-22.

Now to think of applying to this divine, heavenly, Christian, living *church* the form of a human, worldly, heathen *State* or government, was utterly to miss the true idea of the church and its organization. It was at once to put a human figmentary conception in the place of the divine thought. And in its workings it was nothing else than an attempt to repress, to confine, and to stereotype, in a dead, human, and heathen *form of earthly government* the divinely living, growing, and *heavenly church*.

But the heathen idea and conception of things, passed off for the Christian idea and conception, is nothing but the Papacy. The heathen idea and conception of the Church of God, passed off for the Christian idea and conception of that Church, is the very essence of the Papacy. The heathen form of a federated State, passed off as Christian and as the divine order and organization of the *Church* of Christ and of God, is the Papacy full formed. And for professed Protestantism, in spirit and in letter, to reproduce this thing, is to present to the world an *image* of the Papacy full-formed.

And that the Congregationalists, whose very name stands for the independence of the *congregation*, should be found in this church-federation is a sufficient evidence of apostasy. But that the *Baptists*, of all people, the Baptists, who have all these ages stood so nobly for the great truth of the individuality, the

integrity, and the liberty, of the churches and of other people - that the Baptists should be found taking an active and leading part in this Federation of Churches, certainly indicates that the apostasy of the Protestant denominations is about complete.

Federation in religion is only monarchy and imperialism in religion. And that all that the Papacy has ever been should spring from the original church-federation and "confederation," is not at all surprising. Indeed, in view of the facts, it is the only thing that should be expected, or that could logically or intelligently be expected. And that now the living image of the Papacy will spring from church-federation again, is the only thing that should be expected or that can logically or intelligently be expected.

To say, and to point out, that such can be the only outcome of church-federation, confederation, etc., *now*, is not in any sense to be considered extreme, it is in nowise to raise any prejudiced cry, nor yet is it to sound a mere scare-alarm. It is but the application of the calm faculties of sober sense, of intelligent discernment, and of logical deduction, to the unquestionable facts of history and truths of the Scripture; and is but the learning from these facts and truths the most obvious lessons - lessons that are plain everywhere on the very surface of the thing, and which grow only more forcible and more impressive the deeper the study is carried.

The errors *in* church-federation and *of* church-federation are many. They are palpable, they are deceptive, they are destructive. But of all these errors, the fundamental error is church-federation itself.

**October 31, 1906**

**"The Church of Christ" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns18 , pp. 147, 148.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN view of the evils and dangers of Church Federation that have now become all-pervading, and will soon be all [*sic.*] all-prevailing, it becomes important that every Christian, yes, every person, should inquire and study as never before just what is the church of Christ.

And of all the subjects in the Bible that are made plain, this subject of the church of Christ is one. There is no need of any theorizing; there is no room for argument; all that is needed is simply study and acceptance of the plain words of the Bible.

The Greek word that is translated church is *ekklesia*. It signifies the company or assembly of the called-out ones of Christ.

This assembly of called-out ones is the church, and is declared by the Scriptures to be "The body of Christ" in the world, thus: "I, Paul am made a minister; who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for *his body's sake*, which *is the church*."

Col. 1:18, 23, 24. And, God "raised Him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places. . . . and

148

hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to *the church which is his body.*" Eph. 1:22, 23.

"As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ." 1 Cor. 12:12. And "as we have many members in one body, and all members are not the same office; so we, being many, *are one body in Christ*, and every one members one of another." Rom. 12:4, 5. "Now *ye are the body of Christ*, and members in particular." 1 Cor. 12:27. "For we are *members of his body*, of his flesh, and of his bones." Eph. 5:30.

Again, this Church or assembly of Christ's people is said to be God's "house" or "God's building," thus: "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in *the house of God*, which is *the church* of the living God." 1 Tim. 3:14, 15. "Christ [was faithful] as a son over his own house; *whose house are we, if we hold fast* the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." Heb. 3:6. "Ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building." 1 Cor. 3:9. "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house." 1 Peter 2:5.

"Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom *ye also are builded together* for an *habitation of God* through the Spirit." Eph. 2:19-22.

From these Scriptures it is perfectly plain that membership in the church of Christ depends altogether upon our being members of himself; upon our being joined personally to him in the Spirit and by the Spirit.

Since the church is his house, his building, our being members of his church depends altogether upon our being "lively stones" from having come to him the "living stone," and having been made alive by him, in the Spirit and through the Spirit, and thus prepared for a place in that "spiritual house."

Membership in the church of Christ, then, comes not by belonging to something that is called a church in order to belong to Christ. It comes altogether by *belonging to Christ, in order to belong to the church.* And the difference between the two things is just the difference between the mystery of God and the mystery of iniquity.

The mystery of iniquity exalts the form, the name of "the church," and then calls, and sweeps, and forces, all the world into that so-called church. The people are the same as before, though they are designated or denominated differently. They conform to different forms than they did before; but in character, in life, they are the same as though they were not members of the church at all.

But the true church, the church of Christ, is his body in the world; and is therefore himself manifested in the world, in the flesh. In order to belong to this Church is it essential first of all to belong to him. Membership in his Church

depends altogether upon the person's being first of all a member of him. Being in this church and of this church, depends altogether in our being in Him, and of him. When people, having heard his call, come personally to him, and come into the church by coming into him, and are in the church by being in him, that makes a new people. That changes the individual, "into another man." And these people, and *one these*, compose the church of Christ, his called out ones, the assembly of his chosen.

In these times of such wide-spread perversion of the idea of the church, it becomes all important for each one to ask himself, "Am I indeed a member of the church?" Not. "Is my name in the enrollment of some association calling itself a church?" Not to think contentedly that I am a member of the church, simply because I am a member of some association calling itself a church. None of this; but, Am I a member of the church because I am a member of Christ? and because I live and move and have my being in him? Am I a member of the church because my name is in the Book of Life?

Such as these are the only members of the Church of Christ that there are on this earth. And though it should be that circumstances prevent their names being on any book on earth, or themselves from being counted in any collection or association of people on earth; yet when an individual is joined to him and lives in him, that person is a member of the church of Christ though he be the only person on a continent or in the world.

Such is the only true membership of the Church of Christ, and the only way to membership in the Church of Christ. And these compose the Church of Christ wherever they may be found in all the world. And he "knoweth them that are his."

This truth is practically acknowledged by every denomination in the world. For: -

1. There is not a denomination in the world that will say that every single member of that denomination is a Christian.

2. There is not a denomination in the world that does not allow that there are Christians in all the other denominations.

3. In other words, there is not a denomination in the world that will say that the Christians of that denomination are all the Christians that there are in the world.

And when these perfectly plain and true things are acknowledged, then the truth of all that is said in this article is acknowledged. And it is perfectly proper to acknowledge it all, for it is the simple truth of the Scriptures.

**November 7, 1906**

**"The Church of Christ" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns19 , pp. 155, 156.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen by the Scriptures that the church in the world is the body of Christ and the building or house of God; and that Christ's people, his called-out ones, are members of this his body, are "lively stones" in this building, and are members of that "household of God." Of this building Christ is the "foundation," the "chief corner," the life and the light of all the stones that compose the building. 1 Cor. 3:11; Eph. 2:20; 1 Peter 2:3-5.

Of this household Christ is the father and head. Isa. 9:6; Heb. 2:13; 3:6. Of this body Christ is the head; he is likewise the head of each particular member of the body, because of his being the head of the body, Col. 1:18; 1 Cor. 12:27; 11:3.

Of this building, which is the church or the house of God, Christ is the builder; as it is written, "Upon this Rock I will build my Church." Matt. 16:17, 18. It is a "Spiritual house," built by him "for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. 2:22.

Taking the human body as the means of illustration, this body of Christ, which is his church of which his called-out ones are the members, is presented for our thought and comprehension thus: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. . . . Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." 1 Cor. 12:12-27.

Thus Christ's called-out ones are members of him, and compose his body, the church, just as the members of the human body - hands, feet, eyes, etc., - compose the human body. And Christ is the head of his body the church, exactly and as truly as the human head is the head of the human body. And Christ is the head of each particular member of the church which is his body, exactly and as truly as the head of the human body is the head of each particular member of the human body.

The head of the human body is the intelligence, is the will, is the judgment, the decision and the direction, of the whole human body, and of each particular member of the human body. So also is Christ the intelligence, the will, the judgment, the decision, and the direction, of his whole body, and of each particular member of his body, which is the Church.

No member of the human body - no arm, no leg, no hand, no foot, no finger; not even any joint of any finger - can make a single intelligent motion, except as, in that particular motion, it is directed, by and from the head. Just so no member

of Christ's body which is his church, is to perform any action, and can not perform any Christian action, except as in that particular action, he is directed by and from Christ who is his head. Thus is the will of God done in his people on earth, as *that will is* in heaven.

No member of the human body is ever directed or controlled in its action by any other member of the human body. Every member is directed and controlled in its every action by and from the head alone. So also it is in the body of Christ, and among the members of his body, which is his Church.

While in the human body no member directs or controls any other member in what that member shall do, at the same time all other members of the human body respond promptly on the instant, to the slightest intimation from the head that they shall help any member of the body in whatever that member may be directed by the head to do. So also it is in the body of Christ, and among the members of his body which is the church.

Thus there is no schism, no division, and no friction in the human body, nor among the members of the body, because each member is directed and kept in all its ways by and from the head alone. And thus, and thus alone, it is or can ever be that there shall never be schism, or division, or friction in the body of Christ, and among the members of that body, which is the church. Then no member claims, and much less asserts dominion over another's faith, but each and all are helpers of the other's joy; no one seeks to please himself, but only "to please his neighbor for good unto edification" - to his building up. II Cor. 1:24; Rom. 15:1, 2.

From the Scriptures and from the facts of the divine illustration given, it is perfectly plain that as Christ is the builder of the house which is his church, so also he is the organizer of his body, which is the church. Nor are we in this left to this conclusion, evident as it is in its perfect plainness; it is even more plainly stated in the word of Scripture. Read it: -

"But [we] speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

Again: "The Head from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." Col. 2:19; 1 Cor. 3:6.

It is not by might nor by power, it is not by manipulation nor by machinery, it is not by any human contrivance or conception, it is not by any initiative or action of the members that this organization by and from the head is accomplished, but "by my Spirit saith the Lord of hosts." As in the human body it is God who hath by his creative power "set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him," so also in the body of Christ, which is his church, it is God, who by the power of his brooding, organizing Spirit hath set the members every one of them in his body.

"Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets;

and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Eph. 4:8-13.

"Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the *same God which worketh all in all*.

"But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another [divers] kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; but *all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit*, dividing to every man severally as he will.

"For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by *one Spirit* are we all baptized into *one body*, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. 12:4-13.

The Holy Spirit, then, is the only means of the organization and unity of the body of Christ, which is the church. And from Christ, the head, alone, through his Holy Spirit alone it is unified, and organized and led in the work of Christ in the world. It is impossible that it should be otherwise, because: -

*First*, Christ is not only the head of the church, but "he is the head over all things to the church, which is his body." Eph. 1:22. Anything therefore, relating to the church, anything whatever pertaining to the church, which is ever said or done or purposed, of which Christ is not the recognized head, is vanity itself in addition to its being the usurpation of his place and authority, by whomsoever done, said, or purposed.

*Second*, "the church which is his body," is "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Eph. 2:23. Then how could it be possible that any conception of the church, could be correct except only his own divine conception? And how could it be possible for that divine conception to be accomplished by any other than his own divine Spirit?

O, there is due to the individual, to the church and to the world a far deeper and broader view of the church of Christ than is held to-day by even the membership of that church. And that is to say that there is needed to-day by the membership of that church a deeper baptism of the Holy Spirit, and a more earnest seeking for this, than there has ever been in this world since the glorious day of Pentecost.

"Ask and receive." "He that asketh receiveth." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

**November 14, 1906**

**"The Church of Christ" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns20 , pp. 162, 163.**

ALONZO T. JONES

NEAR the close of the preceding article, it was stated in the words of the Scripture that the Church of Christ in truth, is "the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

Upon this it was then inquired, How could it be possible that any conception of the Church or of what pertains to Christ's own divine conception? And how could it be possible for that divine conception to be accomplished by any other than his own divine Spirit?

What mind can comprehend the fulness of Him who filleth all in all? That fulness is infinite. No finite mind can compass it. Only the infinite mind can fathom or compass the infinite. The fulness of Him that that filleth all in all is nothing less than infinite. Therefore nothing less than the infinite mind can comprehend it.

Yet Christ's Church is "the fulness of him that filleth all in all." The idea, the conception of this church is therefore infinite; and only the infinite mind can possibly comprehend that idea, that conception, that "fulness" which Christ's Church is, to organize it and build it up. And this is exactly the thought and the word of Him who is the only Head of the Church of Christ - that it is only "*from the Head,*" through the administration of his own divine and infinite Spirit, that his Church is organized and built up.

It is just as true of the Church of Christ as of any other of the things of God, that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things that God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deeps things of God." The Church of Christ with its infinite blessings, with its infinite blessings, with its infinite privileges and opportunities, with its infinite possibilities, cannot by any means be excluded from the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. And in the very Spirit of things it is forever true that no eye ever saw, no ear ever heard, nor has it ever entered into the heart of man, what God *in the Church of Christ* hath prepared for them that love him. But thank the Lord, it is equally true that God hath revealed to us these glorious things of the Church; hath revealed them to us by his Spirit; because the infinite Spirit fathoms and comprehends clearly all things, yea, the deep, the infinite, things of God.

"The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God." The Church of Christ which is his body, and which is the fulness of him that filleth all in all, is assuredly of the things of God. And this thing, this idea, this thing of the Church of God knoweth no man, but only the Spirit of God.

What an infinite mistake, then, was made, and what an infinite loss was incurred, when, as we have seen, the Greeks took their native, human, and heathen, idea and conception of a perfect earthly, human, and heathen State, a

public, government or confederacy and made *this* to be the idea and conception of the Church of Christ which is in truth nothing less than the fulness of Him who filleth all in all! And how that awful mistake and loss were deepened and enlarged when this false conception of the Greeks was seized upon by Rome

163

and was merged in Roman imperialism and passed off as the "universal Church."

This adoption of the Greek idea and conception of a petty republic or confederacy of this world wholly, and passing it off on themselves and before the world as the church of Christ, was the fundamental error and the transcendent blunder in the great apostasy and the working of the mystery of iniquity that developed "that man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God showing himself that he is God."

For if such a thing as that Greek concept were the Church of Christ, then whatever worldly-minded man, ambitious of power, that could put himself at the head of it and manipulate it according to his ideas and permeate it with his spirit - then that man would be the head - the "visible head" - of the Church of Christ!

But thank the Lord, no such thing as that ever was, nor ever could be, the Church of Christ. Ever and always it was only a human, worldly, and heathen, system of government and confederacy. And whatever man put himself at the head of it and dominated it, was the head of only a human, worldly, heathen, and political system of government and confederacy, exactly as was the head of any other worldly, heathen, and political system.

The Church of Christ is no such thing. It is the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. And Christ himself, in his own person, is alone the head of it. From him, the head, it is permeated with his own divine will. From him, the head, by that same divine Spirit, each member is joined to this body. To each one of these members of him there is given, and each one of these receives, *not* the spirit of *the world* nor of worldly things, "but the Spirit *which is of God*;" and this in order "that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God."

Christ came, *not* to make of *this* world the kingdom of God. Christ came to bring the kingdom of God *to this world*; in order that men might be delivered from this world and from the power of darkness, and be translated into the kingdom of God and his dear Son.

Christ came *not to make* either the things or the ideas of this world the things or ideas of God. He came to bring the things of God and the ideas of God *to this world*; in order that mankind might be called out, delivered, and saved forever, from the erroneous, the dark and debased and debasing things and ideas of *this world*, and be translated "into the marvellous light," the sanctifying truth, and the exalted, exalting and glorifying things and ideas of God.

To accomplish this his own "eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord," God has given without measure his own eternal Spirit to those who will be of his Church, in order that we shall know *not* the things of the world, but only the things of God, the things of the Church of God, the things of the kingdom of God.

Therefore the administration, the operation, and the manifestation of the holy and eternal Spirit of God is the one fundamental and transcendent thing for members of the Church of Christ to know.

The diversities of gifts of the Spirit, the differences of administrations of the Lord, and the diversities of the operations of God who worketh all in all through the one eternal Spirit - *this* is the one only, but glorious, field of study of the members of the Church of Christ. For there is just "one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

The sovereignty of the Holy Spirit in the Church and over the Church; the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit in each member of the Church and over each member of the Church; and, in him and by him and through him, the sovereignty of Christ as head of the Church, as head of each member of the Church, and as head over all things to the Church; - *this*, as the kingdom of God which Christ brought to this world, is the one only realm, dominion, or government, of the Church of Christ and of God, or of any member of that Church.

Long ago God declared of this time - this time of the latter rain - that he would raise up "thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece." And the context plainly shows that it is in the recognizing and receiving of the Holy Spirit *in this very thing of the sovereignty and sole reign of his own Spirit in and over his church*, that he will raise up "the sons of Zion against thy sons, O Greece." Zech. 9:12, 10:3. Thus will he sanctify and cleanse his Church; and thus will he prepare his Church to meet him when he appears in his glory, so that he *can* indeed "present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

And *now is that time*. Now is the time of the receiving of His Spirit in the latter rain. Now is the time to "ask of the Lord rain in the time of the latter rain." Therefore let us *now* recognize the Holy Spirit. Let us ask for the Holy Spirit. Let us receive the Holy Spirit. Let us fully and freely own the sovereignty of his Holy Spirit in and over the Church and over all things to the church. Let us recognize the Church of Christ as indeed his body, and as indeed "the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Let us seek and follow the guidance of this sovereign Spirit *away from* the shallow, petty, and vain things of Greece and Rome, and *into* the deep and exalted and exalting things of God.

"Ask and ye shall receive." "He that asketh receiveth." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

**November 21, 1906**

**"The Church of Christ" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns21 , pp. 172-174.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the order of the Church of Christ the book of Acts occupies the same position as that of the book of Genesis in the order of the earth and the world.

As no science, philosophy, or progress in the things of the earth and the world, can ever be true or safe that leaves out the Creation, the Fall, the Flood and the Peopling of the Earth, of the book of Genesis, so likewise no advancement or order of things in the church can be true or safe that leaves out the sole headship of Christ, and the sovereignty and reign of the Holy Spirit, in the book of Acts.

In his last talk with his disciples before the cross Jesus, after having told them that he was going away, said, "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you."

It is by the Holy Spirit that Christ comes to us and dwells in us. For thus it is written, "The God and Father of our

173

Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory. . . grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might, by his Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." Eph. 3:14-17.

Accordingly, to his disciples he continued, "At that day [the day when the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, should come to them] ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you."

Then the first thing in the book of Acts, on the day and occasion of his ascension, is the statement that he "being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." "Behold I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."

They did as they were commanded, and the second chapter of Acts is the story of Pentecost.

The third and fourth chapters is the healing of the lame man at the Beautiful gate of the temple, Peter's sermon after it, and the arrest of Peter and John by the priests, the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees of the Sanhedrim. The next day Peter and John were brought before the Sanhedrim, the elders, the scribes, the priests, and the high-priest and his relatives.

"Then Peter *filled with the Holy Ghost*," made answer. The Sanhedrim and their company, though compelled by the Spirit to take knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus, yet "straitly threatened them" and "commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus." The brethren being let go went to their own company and all together prayed "and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost."

The fifth chapter is the account of Ananias and Sapphira, in the matter of the sale and gift of their property, in which they agreed together to deceive. And this was "to lie unto the Holy Ghost," and "to tempt the Spirit of the Lord." The consequences were immediate and dreadful. Next the apostles were all arrested by the high-priest and council and put in the common prison. "But the angel of

the Lord by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth and said, Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life."

The sixth and seventh chapters is the choosing of men "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom" to have charge of the finances and daily distributing, and of Stephen, "a man full of faith and the Holy Ghost," speaking before the council with his face shining "as it had been the face of an angel."

The eighth chapter is the preaching of the gospel in Samaria and their receiving the Holy Ghost, "the angel of the Lord" telling Philip to go from Samaria to the road that leads from Jerusalem to Gaza, and as he arrived there a man in a chariot was passing, reading the book of Isaiah at what is the fifty-third chapter, and "the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join yourself to this chariot." Philip did so and preached unto him Jesus; the man believed and was baptized, and went on his way rejoicing; and "the Spirit caught away Philip and he was found at Azotus."

The ninth chapter is the conversion of Saul by the appearing of the Lord Jesus himself, his being "filled with the Holy Ghost;" "the churches walking in the fear of the Lord and the comfort of the Holy Ghost;" and the raising of Dorcas from the dead.

The tenth chapter is an angel of God speaking to Cornelius in a vision and telling him to send men to Joppa for Peter who would come and tell him what he ought to do; of a vision given to Peter to prepare him for the coming of the men; the Spirit telling him that the men had arrived and that he was to go with them; of his going with them and preaching to the house of Cornelius and of the Holy Ghost falling on all them that heard the word.

The eleventh chapter is Peter's rehearsing the preceding experience to those at Jerusalem who were so full of prejudice and bigotry that they could not believe that God could save anybody but themselves. But when Peter had told the blessed story, even they held their peace - at least for a while - and glorified God that he had granted repentance unto the Gentiles. Also the preaching everywhere of those who had been scattered abroad by the persecution that arose about Stephen; the church at Jerusalem sending Barnabas to Antioch to help "for he was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith;" of Barnabas's going to Tarsus to seek Saul; of Saul's coming to Antioch; and of the coming of the prophet Agabus who foretold the coming of a dearth.

The twelfth chapter is Herod's imprisonment of Peter, the church's praying for him, of his being delivered by "the angel of the Lord;" of Herod's being smitten by "the angel of the Lord."

The thirteenth and fourteenth chapters is "the Holy Ghost" saving to the church at Antioch, "separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed;" of Saul "full of the Holy Ghost" rebuking the sorcerer; of the preaching in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia; of preaching to almost the whole city, the next Sabbath; of the Jews' contradicting and blaspheming, and therefore the turning of Paul and Barnabas to the Gentiles; of the disciples "filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost;" of the healing of the impotent man at Lystra; and of their

return to Antioch "whence they had been recommended to the grace of God," and their calling the church together and rehearsing "all that God had done with them."

The fifteenth chapter is the settlement *by the Holy Spirit* of the controversy as to circumcision; and the sending forth of the letter beginning "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and us."

The sixteenth chapter tells that Paul, Silas and Timothy were "forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia;" therefore they assayed to go into Bithynia, "but the Spirit suffered them not;" and they came down to Troas, and there in a vision a man of Macedonia appeared to Paul and said, "Come over into Macedonia and help us;" and "immediately" they endeavored to go, and went.

Persecutions drove them out of Macedonia, and chapter seventeen tells of Paul in Athens, and the eighteenth in Corinth where "the Lord" spake to Paul "in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace, for I have much people in this city."

Chapter nineteen tells that Paul, having coming to Ephesus, found there some disciples and asked them, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" They replied, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Then they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and Paul laid his hands on them and "the Holy Ghost came on them."

In the twentieth chapter, Paul is on the way to Jerusalem and at Miletus called to him the elders of the Church of Ephesus; and in his words to them he said "the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me;" and take heed to "yourselves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers."

In the twenty-first chapter, when Paul came to Tyre, the disciples "said unto Paul *through the Spirit* that he should not go up to Jerusalem;" and when he came to Caesarea, the prophet Agabus took Paul's girdle and bound his own hands and feet, and said, "*Thus saith the Holy Ghost*, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owns this

174

girdle." He went on to Jerusalem, and beginning in the twenty-first chapter and reaching to the end of the book there is one of the most remarkable chains of the direct providence of God that ever occurred in the world. And in chapter twenty-seven "the angel of the Lord" stood by Paul on the ship in the awful storm and assured him of his own safety and also of all the others that were on the ship; and in the twenty-eighth and last chapter of this wonderful book, among the very last words we find Paul saying to the Jews who had come to hear him, "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers," etc.

From only this mere sketch of the book of Acts it is perfectly plain that the one thing that stands out clear and plain and prominent above all other things, throughout the whole book, is that the Holy Spirit was the grand sovereign, reigning, and guiding Personage. And next to that great thing there stands clear, plain, and prominent throughout, the splendid truth that the Christians constantly recognized that sovereignty, reign, and guidance of the Holy Spirit. If they had

not done this, the record could not have been what it is; for then the experience would not have been what it was.

Let Christians again so recognize the sovereignty, the reign, and the guidance, of the Holy Spirit over and in themselves and over all things in and to the church, then again will experience prove what it was at first; for He is the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever. Such only is the Spirit's rightful place with individuals and with the church; and he needs only the recognition of Christians in that place, to prove himself all that he ever was in that place that is supremely His.

**November 28, 1906**

**"The Church of Christ" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns, 22 , pp. 178-180.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE book of Acts is the inspired history of the Church through a period of about thirty-five years. It is therefore the only real and true history of the Church that there is in the world.

We have seen that throughout this history the one transcendent thing is the sovereignty, the reign, and the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the Church of Christ, and in all things pertaining to the Church; and next to this the other great thing, that the sovereignty [*sic.*], the reign, and the guidance of the Holy Spirit was recognized by the Church.

Before Jesus ascended, he commanded his disciples that they should tarry in Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high; and said, "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem and in Judea and Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."

That is to say: He would not have them preach a single sermon, or attempt to witness unto Him, until they had been baptized with the Holy Spirit.

Under the circumstances, this is a remarkable fact. And when the circumstances are considered, the remarkable meaning to His disciples, and His Church, then, and to His disciples and His Church for all time.

First: These men had been with Him constantly for three and a half years. All this time they had studied Him, His work, and His teaching, night and day, in all seasons and in all circumstances. Yet for all this, they were not qualified, and were not allowed, to preach a single sermon or to attempt to witness unto Him, until they had been baptized with the Holy Spirit.

Secondly: These were not self-appointed followers of Jesus; they were called by Him in person. They were not called, even by Him, by a general invitation spoken to a crowd. Nor were they only casually called, merely because he would have some disciples; they were specifically selected.

One day there came a young man to Him saying, "Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest." Yet to hi Jesus did not say, "Come, follow me." Jesus did not make him one of the twelve. But to Matthew sitting at the receipt of custom, not expecting any such thing, he said "Come, follow me." And to Peter and Andrew fishing; and to James and John, with their father mending nets, not expecting any such thing, he said, "Come, follow me."

179

Thus the men who had been with Christ these three and a half years, and who were now to preach the gospel, were all definitely selected by Jesus Himself. These personally selected ones had now been with Him, and had been taught by Him for three and a half years; and yet they were not qualified to preach a single sermon, nor to enter on the work before them, until they had been endued with power from on High by the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

This demonstrates that no natural ability or aptitude, nor the specific and personal call of the Lord, nor three and a half years association and study with Him, not yet all of these together, could qualify them to preach the gospel or to engage in the work of the Lord. All these things were essential; but they were not sufficient; they did not qualify. Though the disciples had all these advantages, and though these were all essential, yet the disciples were not qualified for the work to which they were called till they had been endued with power from on High by the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

We may not know all the reasons for this; but there are at least two reason that are plain: -

One reason is, that in their preaching they must *preach the Word*; and this they could not do without the Holy Spirit; without the Spirit of Him whose the Word is. Without the Spirit they would preach their own thoughts and conclusions, instead of the word of God in truth. All through the gospels it is shown how mistaken were their views of His teaching; and how ready they were always to state their own views and to build on their own suppositions. And whether a man shall preach his own suppositions and his own views, when he is sent to preach *the Word of God*, is a consideration of mighty consequence. But without the Holy Spirit that is just what they would have done.

Another reason is that Christ through the Holy Spirit was to have sole charge, sole authority, and sole guidance, of the Church and of all things to the Church; and if they were not themselves personally and individually possessed of the Holy Spirit, they could not understand His leading nor his work. Without the Holy Spirit themselves, they could not understand His leading nor his work. Without the Holy Spirit themselves, they would be making and pushing *plans of their own*, instead of asking to know, and watching to see, what was His will and His way. Thus they would be working at cross purposes with the Holy Spirit, and then with one another. And whether they should work according to plans and devisings of their own, instead of according to the mind of the Spirit, was a consideration of mighty consequence. Yet without the Holy Spirit themselves, that is just what they would have done.

Therefore, in order that the Lord Jesus should have his own place, as the Head of the Church; in order that the Holy Spirit should have his own place as

sovereign over all things in the Church and to the Church; and in order that there should be the recognition of this and intelligent response to it, by those who were the members of the Church; He would have them all endured with power from on High in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, before they should enter at all upon the work to which He had called them. Only thus could they intelligently move in that work.

At Pentecost, the Holy Spirit openly and fully took the place of sovereignty [*sic.*] that belongs to him as the Head of the Church, and as Head over all things to the Church. Also at Pentecost the disciples were endued with the promised and expected power from on high, they were baptized with the Holy Spirit, and with power they did bear witness to Him, to His resurrection, and to His having shed forth the Holy Spirit.

The sovereignty of the Holy Spirit was recognized when Ananias and Sapphira undertook to play their deception; for Peter did not say to them that they had lied, nor that they had lied to him, but that they had lied *to the Holy Ghost*, and had "agreed together to tempt *the Spirit of God.*" In this it is perfectly plain, that the apostles, the brethren, and the whole Church, considered not themselves, nor any dignity or honor that pertained to them, but only the sovereignty and honor of the Holy Spirit. And in response to this recognition, the Holy Spirit manifested his sovereignty; in such a way too, that even those who were not of the Church were constrained to recognize His sovereignty in the Church; and that it was with the Holy Spirit, and not with men, that they were dealing. For after that, while "believers were the more added unto the Lord," "of the rest [the worldly, the deceivers, and the insincere] durst no man join himself to them."

That was written for our learning. And what we are to learn from it is that the Holy Spirit is sovereign in the Church, that His sovereignty must be recognized and that when His sovereignty is recognized He will respond in such a way that the fact shall be known to all.

After the murder of Stephen by the Sanhedrin and their crowd, there was "great persecution against the Church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles. . . . And they went everywhere preaching the word."

Upon this it should be borne in mind that at this time the Christians in Jerusalem numbered about ten thousand. Also it should be borne in mind that the whole of Palestine was only one hundred and thirty-nine miles from Dan to Beersheba, or from the northern to the southern limit; and from the sea to the Jordan was only twenty miles over the northern or narrowest part, and forty miles over the southern or broadest part - or an average of thirty miles. Thirty by one hundred and thirty-nine miles, is four thousand one hundred and seventy square miles; eight hundred and twenty miles less than the little state of Connecticut [*sic.*], the third smallest in the United States.

Here then were ten thousand preachers "scattered" promiscuously over a territory considerably less in size than the State of Connecticut [*sic.*]. And they "went everywhere preaching the Word." Now no board of bishops, no committee, had sat and planned and deliberated upon the case of each one of these people

and decided just where he must go. It was not by an pre-arrangement that they went. They were "scattered" and the Greek word signifies to be scattered as a man scatters grain when he is sowing.

How in the world then could it be thrown out over such a small field, all of them preaching everywhere they went, yet none of them really trained or experienced preachers - how could this be, without their getting into a general tangle, half a dozen or more of them finding themselves in the same house? - The answer to that question is easy enough in view of the fact of the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit and His guidance in all things of the Church. Each one of these people was baptized, and possessed, and guided, by the Holy Spirit. And it was just as easy for the Holy Spirit to guide ten thousand Spirit-filled preachers in so small a territory as that, as it would be to guide the same number or even a smaller number in the whole breadth of the territory of the whole world.

One of these who were thus scattered abroad and went preaching, was Philip, one of the seven deacons who were chosen, of whom Stephen was also one. Philip went to the city of Samaria and there preached the gospel to them. The people with one accord gave heed to the preaching. When the apostles at Jerusalem heard of this work at Samaria "they sent unto them Peter and John who prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit," and laid their hands on them and they received the Spirit.

While Philip was yet at Samaria the

180

angel of the Lord spake to him, saying, "Arise and go toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem to Gaza." This must have been a distance of nearly sixty miles. Philip went to the place and when he arrived a man was passing in a chariot reading the book of Isaiah. "Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near and join thyself to this chariot." Philip did so; the man invited him into the chariot; from the scripture that the man was reading, Philip preached to Him Jesus, the man believed in Christ, was baptized, and "the Spirit caught away Philip that the eunuch saw him no more and he went on his way rejoicing."

In this brief narrative there are some items that should be noticed. -

1. How did Philip know that it was the angel of the Lord that spoke to him and told him to make this journey? How could he know that it was the angel of the Lord? Shouldn't he have been very suspicious and afraid that he was being deceived by Satan transformed into an angel of light? - No: Philip had received the Spirit of God. He knew the Holy Spirit. And by the Holy Spirit he knew the angel of God, who was the messenger of the Holy Spirit.

2. When Philip had reached the place where the two roads met and the Spirit said to him "Go join thyself to this chariot," how did Philip know that it was the Holy Spirit who said this to him? How did he know that it was not his own mind, or some other spirit, suggesting this to him? How did he know that it was the Spirit who spoke thus to him, and how could he know that that was the thing to do? - The answer to all this is that Philip had received the Holy Spirit, he knew the Holy Spirit. He knew what it is to be led by the Spirit and he knew the way of the Spirit of God.

And this was written for our learning. And the one chief lesson in it, is the simple but very plain truth that the Holy Spirit is true sovereign of the Church and the director of individuals in the work of the Church.

Again, Paul was in Asia Minor and was "forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia." Then "they assayed to go into Bythinia, but the Spirit suffered them not." Then they came down to Troas, the extremity of Asia Minor. There, in a vision in the night, there stood a man of Macedonia saying to him, Come over into Macedonia and help us. From this they assuredly gathered that "the Lord had called" them to preach the gospel there.

In this account it is to be observed that though Paul was an apostle of the Lord, chosen and sent by the Lord in person and in glory, yet Paul was not archbishop, bishop, nor superintendent, of the field, of Asia Minor. Now were the apostles or some other men down at Jerusalem or anywhere else a board or committee in charge of the field of Asia Minor. No. The Holy Spirit alone was Superintendent of the field, not only of Asia Minor, but of Jerusalem, of Macedonia, and of every other place in the world; and also of Paul himself, of all the other apostles, and of every other Christian in the world. And because of this wonderful superintendency and the recognition of it by the church, the gospel of Christ was preached to all the world, as the world then was, in half the lifetime of men who were then living.

And all these things were written for our learning upon whom the ends of the world are come. And if we do not learn what they so plainly teach, then why need they ever to have been written at all?

"Have you received the Holy Ghost, since you believed?" "Ask and ye shall receive," "He that asketh receiveth." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

**"In the Field" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns, 22 , pp. 183, 184.**

HAVING received an invitation from the pastor of the People's Church in Omaha, Nebraska, to preach for a week in his church, I accepted the invitation; and preached there every night from Sunday night, October 21st, to Sunday night the 28th. I never had a heartier Christian welcome anywhere than was given by the pastor and people of this Church. The subjects dwelt upon were: The Eastern Question; National Temperance and Intemperance; World Federation of Religion; The Church of Christ; Miracles, Signs, and Wonders - False and True, and the Greatest of all Miracles; and the Faith of Christ.

These subjects were presented in much the same way as they have been presented in the numbers of the MEDICAL MISSIONARY. The origin, and the meaning of the Eastern Question, and its ending only in the battle of the Great Day. 2. The way of deliverance from the seven last plagues that accompany the culmination of the Eastern Question in the destruction that involves all the nations in the final ruin of the world. 3. World Federation of religion means only world despotism is [*sic.*] religion. 4. The way of deliverance from all this false religion and false worship by being joined only to Christ by the Holy Spirit, in His own true religion and the glorious liberty of the children of God. 5 and 6. The deceptive working of unclean spirits working miracles which go forth to the kings

of the earth and the whole world to gather them together to the battle of the great day; and the way of deliverance from all that deception and destruction, by means of the mighty working of the true Spirit of God in making us true keepers of the Commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

I had arranged for only these six addresses; but when they were finished on Friday night, both the pastor and the people were so interested in the studies that he asked me to stay with them over Sunday and preach both forenoon and evening at the regular service. I did so and preached Sunday forenoon on the Place and Work of the Holy Spirit in the World and in the Church; and Sunday evening I spoke on Creation, or Evolution: Which?

The attendance was good throughout and at the last meeting the house was crowded. With many hearty good wishes, and invitations to return, from pastor and people, I bade them good-bye.

From Omaha, I went to Sioux City, Iowa, and spoke five nights in the Y.M.C.A. Hall. I found that the Omaha pastor had sent ahead of me a generous recommendation to the people there, and on invitation to them to hear the sermons. The attendance was not large, but the preaching was well received. Some interesting experiences were met and souls were enlisted in these and further studies of the truth.

By the kind effort of Brother I. S. Sherwin I preached in the Unitarian Church in Lincoln, Nebraska, from Sunday night, November 4th to Friday night the 9th. Here too the Omaha pastor had generously done all that he could to gain for me a hearing. He had even made the journey from Omaha to Lincoln and spent the day, a day of disagreeable weather, in behalf of the meetings that I would hold.

184

*(Continued from page 183)*

In general thought and otherwise the subjects were the same in all three places. But in Lincoln added interest was given to the subject [*sic.*] of miracles, signs and wonders, by the fact that just then there appeared in the city papers, reports of miraculous gift of tongues to certain ones in some meetings that were being held in that city, and of the consequent excitement. This was only an additional token that the world is now in the time of these very things, and that it is a God-send to know the truth of God for this time that will guide us safely through all to the perfect day.

The first two nights the house was full, and the last night it was crowded. The house is a fine one, and very easy to speak in. Here we had the aid of Mrs. Lilla Gertrude English, soloist, and Miss Mabel Rayner, violinist. The beautiful and impressive music of voice and instrument by these two ladies, was a blessing in itself; but when, throughout the meetings, it was so intelligently blended with the sentiment and spirit of the sermons, it was still more impressive and more of a blessing. And when the last thing the last night, Mrs. English sang with the Spirit and the understanding "A Great Day is Coming," every one could only feel that it is indeed so, and wish to be among the ransomed in that Great Day.

From begging to end it was a pleasant and successful little journey of preaching in the field.  
ALONZO T. JONES.

**December 5, 1906**

**"The Church of Christ: Her Liberty" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns, 23, pp. 186-188.**

ALONZO T. JONES

BY every evidence of the Word of God it is certain that the Holy Spirit was the sole, sovereign, controlling, and guiding authority in the Church of Christ throughout New Testament times.

In the nature of things, therefore, there was liberty in the Church; because "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

Now *liberty* is "the state of being exempt from the domination of others or from restricting circumstances." It is "the power in any rational agent to make his choices and decide his conduct for himself, spontaneously and voluntarily in accordance with reasons and motives."

This was the principle announced by the Lord himself for his Church, while he was yet on earth, in the words, "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." Amongst *brethren* there is no place for domination, nor for distinctions of superiority.

Yet, like all other men, the disciples had it in them to dominate; for throughout the whole story of the disciples in their association with Jesus, they were thinking and discussing among themselves which of them "should be greatest" in the coming kingdom. But He said to them, "the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall *not be so among you*: but whosoever will be great *among you*, let him be your minister, and whosoever shall be chief *among you*, let him be your servant; even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

Such was the principle announced before, for their guidance in their relations one to another and in the Church. And the Holy Spirit was to bring to their remembrance all things that He had said unto them; to guide them into all truth; and to take the things of His and show unto them. Indeed, this principle was remembered and recognized by them, even before the remarkable descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. For in the very first chapter of Acts it is recorded that when the disciples were together to the number of "about one hundred and twenty," the eleven apostles did not in any way take it upon themselves to name or to choose one in the place of Judas. But Peter said to the whole company,

"Men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas which was guide to them that took Jesus. For he was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry. . . . For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein; and his bishopric let another take."

He told them that in compliance with this Scripture, there must be chosen and ordained one who had "compained with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that he was taken up from us."

In response to this "*they*" - the disciples, the one hundred and twenty - "appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And *they* prayed and said, Thou Lord which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place." And "*they*" - the whole company of the disciples, the one hundred and twenty - "gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven apostles."

After Pentecost, when a similar thing was to be done, we find it done in the same way. For "in those days when the number of the disciples was multiplied" to more than *eight thousand*, "there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations." Therefore, the matter had to be considered, and something done to relieve the situation.

Now how was it done? Did the apostles sit as a board of bishops, or as a general committee, and decide the matter? - No. Did they appoint a committee to consider the question and report? - No. What then did they do?

This is what they did: "Then the twelve called *the multitude of the disciples* unto them, and said."

What! Called together thousands of people! eight thousand or more, and these only new disciples, inexperienced in Church work, and inexperienced in parliamentary usage, and in how to conduct themselves in such a large assembly? - Yes, the twelve actually did just that thing; they called the multitude together for the consideration of this matter, and for action upon it. They did not need any experience in parliamentary usage; for it was not a parliament but the Church of Christ that was to assemble. And as for experience in church-work, they were to get it by doing the work under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

But how could the apostles risk the calling together such a great company? - They didn't risk it; simply because there was not risk in it. There is never any risk in trusting the Holy Spirit, nor in recognizing the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit.

But how could they expect to manage such a crowd? - They did not intend any such thing as even to try to "manage" them. They with the whole company were subject, and intended to be subject, to the Holy Spirit.

But was there not danger of disagreement, discord, and confusion, in trying to do business with such a mass of such people? - They did not intend to "do business" with them. They simply intended that the people themselves should

consider their own business, and to their own business themselves, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

But was it not a much wiser way to the twelve to select a few of "the wiser and more substantial ones," the ones of "the best judgment," and lay before them "the plan" devised by the apostles or some one of them, then call together a larger number and have them agree to what had been already decided, and also have them agree to advocate in the general meeting what had been decided first of all by

187

few of "the leaders," and thus prevent confusion and secure unanimity?

*No*, such would *not* have been a wiser way; because the apostles did not have any plans, nor schemes, nor politics, nor superiority of their own, to work upon the Church or the people. There was a matter that pertained to the Church, and *the Church* should consider it. There was something for the Church to do, and the Church should do it; and *the apostles* were *not the Church*. The *membership* of the Church was the Church; and when there was something for *the Church* to do, the Church *in its whole membership* was called together to do it.

Nor was there necessary any scheming, or political working, or wire-pulling to make sure of unity and unanimity in so large a company. This for the simple reason that apostles and people all recognized the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit in and over all things to the Church, and were possessed of the Holy Spirit, and could safely depend upon that Spirit, for both the unity and the unanimity that comes by the leading of the Spirit.

And so "the twelve called *the multitude* unto them and said, It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, *look ye out among you* seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appointed over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the Word.

"And the saying pleased *the whole multitude*: and they" - the whole multitude, the Church - "chose . . . [the seven] whom *they* set before the apostles; and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them."

And that was all written for our learning. And the thing to be learned from it, that which lies on the very face of it, is that the work and business of the Church is to be done by *the Church* - even by "the whole multitude;" and not by a few men who happen to be in the place of leaders, who choose to assume superiority over the Church and presume themselves to be the Church and presume themselves to be the Church. Also that the business of the Church is to be done by an open statement to "the whole multitude," and is to be submitted to the free consideration and actions of "the whole multitude;" and is not to be done through any planning or scheming of a few; nor by any manipulation of a few by fewer, and then the manipulation of *the whole* by *the fewer* through *the few*. In other words, it is to be done in open trust and confidence in the Holy Spirit's sovereignty over the Church, and in His ability to guide the Church.

Note also that the apostles had been attending to the daily distribution and ministration as every one had need. By some oversight, some widows were

neglected. When the attention of the apostles was called to this, they proposed that *the Church* should pass over to others the whole matter of "this business;" for the reason that "it is not reason that we should leave the Word of God and serve tables."

For the apostles to attend to so true a Christian work as the daily distribution to the needs of widows and other disciples, was so much to leave the Word of God, and was so much "business," that it was "not reason" that they should do it.

That, too, was written for our learning. And plainly the thing to be learned by it is that those who are ordained to preach the gospel, should preach the gospel and let business matters alone; yes, to let alone even such "business" as administration to the needs of widows and other disciples; and how much more, other business which in its character cannot in any sense be compared with this!

At Antioch there was a Church. In this Church there were certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Saul, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch. "As they ministered unto the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work where unto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. And they being sent forth of the Holy Ghost, departed." From this record it is evident that the Church of Antioch had the same liberty as had the Church at Jerusalem. And the Church at Antioch had this liberty *from the Lord*, exactly as had the Church at Jerusalem. And the Church at Antioch had this liberty *from the Lord*, exactly as had the Church at Jerusalem. For neither the Church at Jerusalem, nor the apostles at Jerusalem, had anything at all to do with this matter at Antioch.

It is also evident that in the true order, the New Testament order, of the Church of Christ, the individual, local, Church at Antioch had full and complete right under the Holy Spirit to ordain and send forth ministers of the Gospel; yes, to ordain and send forth even the apostles of Christ for the work to which He had already called them.

It was ten years before this that Christ had called Paul and appointed him his work. Yet Christ did not send him forth definitely to that work till he was ordained by the Church. And Christ did not send Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to be ordained by the apostles. He did not send apostles down from Jerusalem to Antioch to ordain them there. He simply directed the Church at Antioch where they were, to ordain them; and that Church alone did it. And these two apostles recognized this Church in their commission and their work; for when they had finished a long and interesting tour they returned to Antioch and "gathered the Church together" and "rehearsed all that God had done with them."

And all this was written for our learning. And if we do not learn what it tells, then of what use is it now, and of what use was it ever?

To Antioch there came men from Judea teaching the Christians that "except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Then the Church at Antioch sent Paul and Barnabas and certain of their number to Jerusalem to the apostles and elders about this question. When they arrived at Jerusalem, they were "received of the Church, and of the apostles and elders."

When the apostles and elders and the whole Church came together to consider the matter there was individual freedom of speech; for the record says plainly that there was "much disputing." And when plainly to all the question had already been settled by the Holy Spirit, "then pleased it the apostles and elders *with the whole Church* to send chosen men of their company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas" with the letter from "the apostles and elders *and brethren*" saying, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," etc.

This tells us again that in the matters of the Church, the order of the Church of Christ is that in the place where the matter is to be considered, "the whole church" considers and acts upon it.

After this Peter came to Antioch, and at first acted according to the conclusion that had been published. But when certain ones came from James at Jerusalem, Peter left the ground of the truth and "dissembled." Upon this, Paul spoke out to him openly before the whole Church: "if thou being a Jew livest after the manner of the Gentiles and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"

This was liberty in more ways than one.

First: It was not denying to Peter, liberty to do as he had chosen to do. But it was rightfully demanding that he should recognize the *same liberty* to the Gentiles. It was granted that he had liberty to live as did the Gentiles, which at first he had done. Paul therefore insisted that the Gentiles had the same liberty to live as Gentiles, and not as did the Jews. And though Peter had abandoned this and had gone back to living only as did the Jews, still Paul insisted that the Gentiles must have the same liberty to live as did the Gentiles, as the Jews had to live as did the Jews.

188

Second: This record reveals the liberty of one Christian under the Spirit of God to speak the truth to another Christian, even publicly, without that other Christian being offended, and turned to enmity or resentment by it. For Peter still considered the one who did it as "our beloved brother Paul."

That, too, was written for our learning.

One time Paul, the apostle of the Lord, wanted very much that Apollos, another disciple, should go with some other brethren from Ephesus to Corinth. But Apollos's "will was not at all" to go at that time. Yet this was not held against him by Paul. Apollos was not held as guilty of high treason, nor of insubordination, nor of willfulness, nor was he suspected of "wanting to run things himself," because he would not go where and when even the apostle of the Lord wanted him to go.

No: the apostle of the Lord recognized that Apollos, as well as himself, was the servant of the Lord, and not the servant of Paul or of any other man. The apostle recognized that Apollos, as well as himself, was subject to the sovereignty and guidance of the Holy Spirit. The apostle of the Lord recognized that Apollos, as well as himself, was led, of the Spirit of God.

Paul was an apostle of the Lord, who more than once had seen the Lord in person, yet he did not presume to exalt his apostleship into an assertion of sovereignty in the place of the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit. No: he held loyally

to the whole fundamental principle of the Church of Christ, that the Holy Spirit is alone sovereign, ruler, and guide of the Church, of each member of the Church, and over all things to the Church. And in that loyalty to the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit, lay the assurance of the perfect liberty of Apollos and of every other Christian.

And this was written for our learning. And that which it teaches needs much to be learned to-day by very many ecclesiastics who are far inferior to any apostle of the Lord. And if Christians do not learn what this record is written to teach, then, either what is the use of its having been written? or else, what is the use of their profession of Christianity?

Yes, *all* these things were written for our learning. Let us learn what they are written to teach - the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit over the Church and over all things to the Church; and, *because of that sovereignty*, the *liberty* of the Church, and of each individual person in the Church.

"Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" "Ask and ye shall receive. . . . He that asketh receiveth." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

**December 12, 1906**

**"The Church of Christ - Her Guidance" *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns, 24 , pp. 196-200.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE Holy Spirit is the guide and the only guide of the Church of Christ, as he is of each individual member of that Church, which is his body.

We have seen that in all the book of Acts, the Holy Spirit is the sovereign guide in all the work of the church. He is likewise the guide of the church into all truth.

Among the thousands of Jews in Jerusalem and Judea that believed, there were some of "the sect of the Pharisees." These thought to hold and confine Christianity within the narrow limits of their own concentric exclusiveness.

The whole nation of the Jews from away back were of this narrow and exclusive spirit; the sect of the Pharisees were only the extremists in it. Thus all Jews were brought up under the influence of this narrow and exclusive spirit, so that this was their natural element.

The disciples of Jesus, being Jews, were of course filled with it. His teaching and his work were intended to deliver them from it; but they were so filled with this thing that it obscured all His teaching, and all His efforts fell almost as upon a leaden shield.

At Pentecost the apostles were enlightened; and their speaking by the Spirit in the tongues of *all the nations* was a wonderful object lesson to them of what was the mind and purpose of the Spirit concerning them and their work. Yet even from all this they were very slow to learn the truth. Then after several years, the Spirit, by an angel to Cornelius, and by a vision and plain words to Peter, showed

to Peter that they were not to recognize any distinctions among men; that the gospel is not exclusive but inclusive, and is for all alike.

Peter accepted the instruction, and when he reached the home of Cornelius, "he said unto them, Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean. Therefore came I unto you without gainsaying, as soon as I was sent for."

"Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing"; more literally, "Ye know how unlawful a thing it is," or "what an unlawful thing it is." But the truth is, and always was, that it was not unlawful in any sense whatever; except by their own selfish traditions, and tradition-made "law." Yet Peter accepted the lesson. He was willing to let traditionalism go, and to receive the instruction of the Spirit: "God hath shown me that I should call no man common or unclean." He therefore preached to them the true, free, open, and inclusive gospel: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."

And the Holy Spirit witnessed to this; for even while he was speaking "the Holy Spirit fell on all them which heard the word, and they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God."

The report reached Judea, "that the Gentiles had also received the Word of God. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of *the circumcision* contended with him saying, Thou wentest unto men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them."

"But Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning and expounded it by order unto them;" and then upon the whole story appealed to them in the words, "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift that he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?"

The "six brethren" who had accompanied Peter from Joppa when, in obedience to the Spirit, he went from there to Cesarea to Cornelius, and who had seen the power of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles there assembled, had accompanied Peter also to Jerusalem and witnessed now to Peter's statement of the case to those who had called him to ac-

198

count. And when upon all this, they had "heard these things, they held their peace and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Acts 10, 11.

Meanwhile, from amongst the Pharisees themselves, there had been converted one of their "most straitest sect" who was now a most active Christian. And in his active Christianity he was a preacher of the gospel *to the Gentiles*. The day that he was converted the Lord said to him, "I have appeared unto thee for this purpose; to make thee a minister and a witness, both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles unto whom now I send thee."

When Saul had been led into Damascus and had waited three days, the Lord said to Ananias of Damascus, "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the Children of Israel."

As we have seen in a former study, it was from Antioch, and with the ordination of the Church of Antioch, that the Holy Spirit sent forth Saul with Barnabas, to the work unto which he had been called. This preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles everywhere by a Christian who had been of the "most straitest sect" of the Pharisees, was a hard blow and a most serious embarrassment to the Pharisaic element among the believers at Jerusalem and at Judea. Therefore, some of these went to Antioch where Paul then was, there, and for all, to put the whole cause of Christianity upon the Pharisaic basis. They "taught the brethren, Except ye be circumcised ye cannot be saved." This to a people who were already saved by the faith of Christ!

Paul and Barnabas, therefore, "had no small dissension and disputation with them." But it all availed nothing, because these who had come from Judea claimed that they, having come straight from Jerusalem, were teaching just what was held and taught by the apostles and elders there. Therefore, the Church at Antioch "determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question."

When they arrived at Jerusalem, "They were received of the Church, and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them." But those who had caused the difficulty, feeling perfectly secure in their position, especially there in Jerusalem and with the apostles and elders, urged anew their contention "that it was needful to circumcise and to command them to keep the law of Moses." Then "the apostles and elders" and "the whole Church" "came together to consider of this matter."

When there had been "much disputing," Peter spoke and cited what God had already done, even "a good while ago," in giving to the Gentiles the gospel and the Holy Spirit. He said, "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they."

When Peter had thus spoken, "all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them."

When Paul and Barnabas had finished speaking, James spoke. He first cited Peter's statement of the fact that God had given to the Gentiles the Gospel; then he showed by the Scriptures of the prophets that the very word and message of God for that time was that "all the Gentiles" should have the gospel as God had already given it to those who had received it; and then said, "Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God; but that we write unto them, etc."

And in order that the church at Antioch might know the truth of the matter, direct from the apostles and elders and the Church at Jerusalem, and might know that the men who had gone down to Antioch at the first had misrepresented them and the truth, "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send *chosen men* of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren: and they wrote letters by them," in which they distinctly repudiated both the men and the words of the men, who, from Judea, had raised this question in Antioch - "after this manner:" -

"The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia: Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment; it seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." Acts 15.

Yet even all this did not end that matter with the "Pharisees which believed." They still persistently pushed their contention; and with such plausibility that they gained the sympathy of James the Lord's brother; and with this leverage caused even Peter to swerve.

The story of it is this: After the meeting at Jerusalem that considered the question; and after the letter and the chosen men were sent out repudiating those Pharisees and their doctrines as "subverting your souls," Peter himself, in one of his journeys, came to Antioch. According to the instruction of the Spirit to himself, and the recognition of this instruction by all in the meeting at Jerusalem on the question, and according to the letter sent to Antioch and other places, Peter made no distinction among men and "did eat with the Gentiles. But while Peter was yet at Antioch "certain came from James;" and these were of that same sort of "Pharisees which believed." These having come "from James" pressed that fact for all that they could make of it. And they were able to make *such* use of it that whereas "before that certain come from James," Peter "did eat with the Gentiles, but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision."

Nor did the evil tide stop with Peter's swerving. "The other Jews likewise dissembled also with him." It is not so remarkable that Peter's swerving should thus influence those "other Jews;" but that the tide should prove so strong that even "Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation," that is remarkable. Barnabas was the first one from Jerusalem to visit Antioch when the first Gentiles there received the gospel. When he came there at the first, and had seen the good work of the grace of God on the Gentiles, he "was glad" and went over to Tarsus "to seek Saul" and found him and "brought him unto Antioch." He had stood with Paul at Antioch for the truth and liberty of the Gospel, against this which was subversive of the gospel, and of souls. He had been through the

meeting at Jerusalem with Paul and the others from Antioch. And now *at Antioch*, of all places in the world, not only Peter, but Barnabas also

199

goes back on this whole experience. And, to a certain extent at least, James is in it; for this crisis was brought about by certain which "came from James."

But thank the Lord there was one man who so well knew both the truth and the liberty of the gospel, that he could not be moved by the swerving of Barnabas, nor by any who come from James, not by the influence of Peter; nor yet by all of this together. Paul spake out openly to Peter before them all, "If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Gal. 2.

This settled the matter so far as the Gentiles were concerned. But still "the Pharisees which believed" insisted that at least *the Jews* who believed must be circumcised and keep the law. And in this they still had with them the influence of James. For when Paul came to Jerusalem, on what, because of this very lingering element of the controversy, proved to be his last visit there, "the brethren received us gladly. And the day following, Paul went in with us *unto James*; and all the elders were present. And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry. And when they had heard it, they glorified the Lord."

Yet they could not be satisfied with that: They must push their old traditional, legalistic, and Pharisaic notion *for the Jews* who believed. Therefore they said unto him: "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law; and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together; for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law. As touching the Gentiles which

200

(Continued on page 200)

(Continued from page 199)

believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing," etc.

Out of deference to James, the Lord's brother, Paul yielded to this persuasion so far as to enter into the temple with these men. But before the time was expired, "the Jews which were of Asia, when they saw him in the temple, stirred up all the people, and laid hands on him, crying out, Men of Israel, help: This is

the man, that teacheth all men every where against the people, and the law, and this place: and further brought Greeks also into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place. . . . And as they went about to kill him, tidings came unto the chief captain of the band, that all Jerusalem was in an uproar: who immediately took soldiers and centurions, and ran down unto them" and took Paul out of their hands. Acts 21.

From that day to the day of his death, except only a short interval, Paul was in the hands of the Gentiles, a prisoner; because he was safer there, and the cause of Christ was safer with him there, than for him to be amongst even his Christian brethren.

Yet in this time that he was a prisoner in the hands of the Gentiles, he bore the message of Christ to nobles, to governors, to kings, and to the emperor himself. The Jews who believed would not receive from him, *by his preaching*, the Gospel in its clear truth and perfect liberty; but in the time of his captivity he *wrote it for the Church*, in the Book of Hebrews, where it lived and instructed and guided the Church into the truth only. James wrote his epistle, and Peter his two epistles, all of which ring true to the truth and liberty of the gospel without a shade of traditionalism, legalism or Pharisaism.

And thus it stands demonstrated that, in spite of perverse notions of selfish and ambitious men, in spite of hereditary and cultivated tendencies, in spite of party and partisan influences, in spite of the mistakes and failures of even leading apostles, the Holy Spirit, the Sovereign and guide of the Church, and of each member of the Church, fulfilled then, and will fulfil forever, the divine word "*He will guide you into all truth.*"

**December 19, 1906**

**"The Church of Christ." *The Medical Missionary* 15, ns, 25 , pp. 202, 203.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the order of the Church of Christ, each separate, local company of believers, is an independent, self-governing church, under Christ in the Holy Spirit.

The believers at Jerusalem composed "the church" at Jerusalem. The believers at Ephesus were the Church at Ephesus. The believers at Cenchrea were "the church which is at Cenchrea;" "the church of the Thessalonians," "the Church of God which is at Corinth," etc. The believers of the house of Aquila and Priscilla were "the church in their house." The believers of the house of Nymphas were "the church which is in his house;" and those of the house of Philemon were "the church in thy house."

The companies of believers of a certain region or country were "the churches" in or of that country or region; as "the churches of Galatia," "the churches of

Asia;" or collectively "the churches of the Gentiles," "the churches of Christ," "the churches of God," etc.

Each church had the care of its own affairs, the sending out of missionaries from its own membership, and the preserving of order and Christian discipline in its own membership; as in the electing of the seven deacons by the church at Jerusalem; the sending out of Paul and Barnabas by the church at Antioch; the dealing with the transgressor at Corinth, and indeed with all who offend. "Go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, *tell it unto the church*, [margin "congregation," R.V.]: but if he neglect to hear *the church*, ["congregation," margin R.V.], let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. . . . Whatsoever ye [the local individual church, or congregation] shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose in earth shall be loosed in heaven."

## CHURCH OFFICERS

In each church there were ordained "elders" - not *an* elder or a bishop, - but always *elders* or bishops; as the "*elders*" at Jerusalem; the "*elders*" in "*every church*;" "*elders* in every city;" to the saints which are at Philippi "with the *bishops* and deacons."

Beyond this order of things, in all the New Testament there is, in truth and righteousness, *absolutely nothing* but the church as the body of Christ, Christ himself in Person as the Head of the Church and of each individual in the church and the Holy Spirit, and the angels of God as the guide: And even in the matters of the angels of God, it must be understood that even they are subject to the guidance of the Holy Spirit (Eze. 1:20); so that in truth beyond the order of things outlined above there is absolutely nothing but the church as the body of Christ, Christ himself as the Head of the church and of each individual in the church, and the Holy Spirit as the guide of the church and of each individual in the church.

In point of organization, beyond the local individual church there is absolutely nothing but the church as Christ's body of which he is the Head.

In point of government, beyond the local individual church there is [sic.] nothing but just Christ alone as the Head of the church and of each individual in the church.

In point of guidance and administration, beyond the local individual church there is nothing but the Holy Spirit to the church and to each individual in the church.

Thus beyond the local individual church as well as in it, the bond of unity of the church of Christ is the Holy Spirit, and her unity is only the unity of the Spirit.

Beyond the individual local church or congregation, there was no federation or formal association of any kind. Of the churches in Judea, there was no federation nor formal association, nor of the churches of Galatia, nor of Asia, nor of any other district, province, section or region to any extent nor in any way

whatever. Beyond the individual local church or congregation there was only the church as the body of Christ and Christ as the Head of the church and of each particular member of the church, and the Holy Spirit as the guide of the church and of each particular member of the church.

And with that simple order of things in the church and among His disciples, the gospel was actually preached to all the then known world, "to every creature which is under heaven," within the lifetime of men who were then already at the fulness of manhood.

But it was not long before there began to appear beyond the local individual church, other things than the church which is His body, Christ as the Head, the Holy Spirit as the Guide.

## DEPARTURES

1. We have seen that in the divine order there were "elders," not an elder, "in every church." These being only brethren under Christ, were all equal. But presently love of pre-eminence, self-exaltation, entered in, as illustrated in the case of Diotrefes - III John 9. 10. John the apostle of the Lord wrote a letter to the church where Diotrefes "who loveth to have the pre-eminence" would not receive the letter, would not receive the brethren who carried the letter, forbade the brethren to receive them, and when some would receive those brethren and the letter he "cast them out of the church" "prating" against John "with malicious words." Such procedure was at one stroke to supplant Christ as the Head of the church, to supplant the Holy Spirit as the Guide of the church, and to supplant the very church itself; and was to put *one man* in the place of Christ, in the place of the Holy Spirit, and in the place of the church itself. It was indeed to make one man to be the whole church and all that pertained to it.

2. The next thing was the formation *beyond the individual local church* an association, consociation or confedera-

203

tion, *by delegates of the churches* in a city or several cities, in a province, or a district. "This custom first arose among the Greeks, with whom such confederations of several cities, and the consequent conventions of their delegates, *had long been in use*. . . . Other provinces were induced to follow the example of Greece, and by degrees *this form of government* became general throughout the whole church. . . . The associations, however, thus introduced amongst the churches, and the councils to which they gave rise, although not unattended with certain benefits, and advantages, were, nevertheless, productive of so *great an alteration* in the general state of the church, as nearly *to effect the entire subversion of its ancient constitution*."

3. This association of *churches* by delegates *in provinces*, was followed naturally enough by another association composed of delegates from *the associations* thus existing in many provinces. This developed *three grand associations* according to the three *grand divisions of the earth* - Asia, Africa, Europe.

## FORMATION OF THE PAPACY

The association of delegates in a *province* developed a *chief* or head of the delegation in that province. The association of provincial *associations* developed a chief of each of the additional grand associations in the three grand divisions of the earth, - Antioch, Alexandria, Rome; "to the preservation of which order of things, it being found expedient that a chief or superintending prelate should be appointed for each of the three grand divisions of the earth; and that, in addition to this, a *supreme power* should be lodged in the hands of some *one individual bishop*; it was tacitly assented to that a certain degree of *ecclesiastical preeminence* should be recognized as belonging to the bishop of Antioch, Rome, and Alexandria, - the principal cities in Asia, Europe and Africa - and that *the bishop of Rome*, the noblest and most opulent city in the world, should, moreover, take *the precedence* amongst these *principal bishops*, or, as they were afterward styled, patriarchs, and also assume the *primacy of the whole Christian Church* throughout the world."

Thus arose and developed the world despotism and the world monarchy of the bishopric of Rome - the papacy. And it cannot be denied that the final development of the actual working papacy is but the steady logical growth and development of the very first step *away from the individuality*, the integrity, and the liberty, of the *local*, individual, Christian *congregation* as it is in the Book of Acts and throughout the New Testament.

And the papacy was in the first step just as truly though not in so full and vigorous workings as it ever has been since. For it put a *man* in the place of *Christ*, it put *machinery* in the place of *the Holy Spirit*, and put an earthly and heathen conception of *human government* in the place of "*the church* which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

### **The Medical Missionary, Vol. 16 (1907)**

**February 20, 1907**

**"A Better World" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 8 , p. 59.**

A. T. JONES

DO you want to get out of this world into a better one?

If you do want this, you can have it; and if you do not want it, you are a very queer sort of person, and we should like to know more of you.

As such a person as that would be so exceptional as fairly to be out of the list, we take it that *you* would like to get out of this world into a better one.

Why do you want to get away from this world?

Is it because you have to labor so hard that you are very weary? Very well, Jesus says, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Is it because your burden is so great that you are wearied in bearing it? Then "cast thy burden upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee."

Is it because your cares are so many and so perplexing? Then cast "all your care upon him; for he careth for you."

Is it because you have so many griefs and so great sorrows? "He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows."

Is it because death reigns, and holds everything under its sway? Ah! but "the sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us *the victory* through our Lord Jesus Christ," - victory over sin, and victory over death *because* of victory over sin. For, "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell [the grave] and of death."

Do you not see, then, that when you are *in Christ*, you are in another world? Christ is the only way out of this world into a better one. If you are Christ's, you are not of the world, because he has chosen you out of the world.

And he is "not far from every one of us." "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock. If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in." And "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." And "ye are complete in him."

Now will you be so inconsistent as to want to get out of this world into a better one, and find the way, and *the only way*, wide open to you, and the not go?

Come along, friend, and let us together be "giving thanks to the Father, . . . who hath *delivered us from the power of darkness*, and hath *translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son*."

### **"Unto Obedience" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 8 , p. 61.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE gift of the Holy Ghost, "the sanctification of the Spirit," is "unto obedience."

It is disobedience to God that has brought all the trouble and woe upon the whole world; so that the children of men are at the same time "the children of disobedience."

But the Lord Jesus gave himself for us, and "suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God," that he might bring us unto the ways of obedience. "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus *unto good works*, which God *hath before ordained* that we should walk in them."

But "obedience is not a mere outward compliance;" it is "the service of love." The obedience is obedience to God. The love, then, from which springs the service, is only the love of God. "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us."

62

"For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments."

Therefore it is written, "Ye have purified [sanctified] your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit." Sanctification is "of the Spirit" only. Sanctification is "through the truth" only. The Spirit is only "the Spirit of truth." The commandments

of God are only "the truth." And true obedience to that truth can be only "through the Spirit."

All trying to keep the commandments, all trying to obey the truth, all trying to do anything, without the Spirit of God, is altogether vain. "God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

"Without me ye can do nothing." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Then, strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, Christ dwelling in the heart and filled with all the fulness of God, you and I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth us.

This is sanctification of the Spirit. This is obedience. And it is sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience.

**March 6, 1907**

**"How Shall We Do God's Will?" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 10 , pp. 77, 78.**

A. T. JONES

WE pray often, some of us every day, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." But how many have ever taken the time to find out just how his will is done in heaven? Yet where can there be any real point in our prayer, "Thy will be done in earth, as *it is* in *heaven*," so long as we do not know how his will is done in heaven?

Such a prayer is certain to be vague and indefinite, a mere generalization, unless we know how his will is done in heaven. But when we do know that, our prayer can be definite, positive, and full of faith, and thus with the sure result that, so far as we are concerned, his will will be done on earth precisely as it is in heaven.

What a wonderful thought that is, - that the will of God will be done in us on earth just as it is done in heaven! Yet it is certainly true, or else that prayer is all in vain, and the giving of it to us by him is but a vain and tantalizing thing.

But the Lord does not present to men vain things. It is intended, and it can be so, that that word shall be accomplished as certainly as it is prayed. Though, again, we say, How can this be unless we know how his will is done in heaven, so that this prayer by us can be definite, positive, and full of faith?

Who are in heaven to do the will of God there? - The angels, to be sure. Then when we know how the will of God is done by them in heaven, and what they do that the will of God *may* be done in them in heaven, we can know how to pray this prayer so that it shall mean to us just what it says, - we shall know just how the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.

What, then, of the angels?

First: In heaven the angels "do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 18:10.

Second: His angels harken to the voice of his word. Ps. 103:20. And they "do his commandments" *through* "harkening unto the voice of his word."

Third: The will of God, *as in his word*, - "as it is in heaven," - is conveyed to the knowledge of the angels by the Spirit of God - "Withersoever the Spirit was to go, they went." Eze. 1:20.

Fourth: When the Spirit of God thus conveys to their knowledge the will of God, *as it is in his word*, to which the angels are "harkening," instantly their spirit responds, and thus his will becomes at once their will, too, - "Withersoever the Spirit was to go, . . . *thither was their spirit to go.*" Verse 20.

Fifth: When, by the instant submission of their spirit to his Spirit, his will has become their will, the thing is done, his word is fulfilled, his will is accomplished, quick as the lightning's flash - "Withersoever the Spirit was to go, they went, thither was their spirit to go." "And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning." Verses 20, 14.

77

That is the way that the will of God is done in heaven. And that is the way that it is *to be* done in the earth. That is what is in the prayer, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." And that is the way that his will *will be* done on earth, in every one who, knowing how his will is done in heaven, puts himself in the same attitude with those in heaven, and makes the prayer in an intelligent faith.

And this attitude of the angels in heaven is precisely the attitude which it is intended that we shall hold on earth. Read, then, of ourselves: -

First: We are always to behold the face of God, "in the face of Jesus Christ." "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the fact of Jesus Christ." "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image." 2 Cor. 4:6; 3:18. "Unto thee lift I up mine eyes, O thou that dwellest in the heavens. Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress; so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God." Ps. 123:1, 2.

Second: We are to hearken to the voice of his word - "Mine ears hast thou opened." Ps. 40:6. "The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back." "He wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned." Isa. 50:5, 4.

Third: The will of God *as in his word*, is to be conveyed to our understanding by the Spirit of God. We are to be ever dependent upon the Spirit of God for this. "Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." 2 Tim. 2:7. "The Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, *he shall teach you all things*, . . . whatsoever I have said unto you." John 14:26. "He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." John 16:13.

Fourth: When the Spirit of God does convey to our understanding the will of God as it is in his word, instantly our spirit is to respond, and yield submission to his Spirit, that his will may be our will. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." "*The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit*, that

we are the children of God." Rom. 8:14, 16. And "the minding of the flesh is death; but the minding of the Spirit is life and peace." Rom. 8:6, margin.

Fifth: When we thus harken to his word, and receive, by his Spirit, the understanding of his will as it is in his word, - "as it is in heaven," - and our spirit responds to his Spirit so that his will becomes our will, *then* the thing is done; his word is fulfilled, his will is accomplished, in us on earth as it is in those in heaven: and it is done just as quickly - "as the appearance of a flash of lightning" - in our innermost, secret life, and shines through all time, openly, before those who are without. . For "my word . . . shall accomplish that which I please." Isa. 55:11. And the word of God always acts *instantaneously* - "He spake, and it was." Ps. 33:9. The leper said, Lord, "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." The Lord replied, "I will; be thou clean. And as soon as he had spoken, *immediately* the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed." Mark 1:40-42.

Do you now see more clearly, do you understand better, *how* the will of God *is* done in heaven, and how it is *to be* done on earth? Can you now pray more intelligently, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven?" And will you now pray directly, positively, and in full faith, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven?"

**March 20, 1907**

**"The Faith of Jesus" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 12 , pp. 89, 90.**

A. T. JONES

JESUS is the Author and he is the Finisher of the faith of all men.

It is through Him only that men have the power, or even the privilege, to believe. For the Scripture says that John came to bear witness of Him as the Light that all men *through Him* might believe;" and that is "by Him" that we "do believe in God." John 1:7; 1 Pet. 1:21.

And yet this faith *in* Jesus, is not the faith of Jesus. "The faith *of* Jesus" is the faith of Jesus himself, the faith which he had and which he exercised in this world in the flesh to show to man and to make sure to man the way of salvation. "The faith of Jesus" is the faith that he had and that he exercised, just as truly as "the faith of our father Abraham" is the faith "which he had" and which he exercised. Rom. 4:12.

This seems to be plain enough on the face of it; yet it is certainly true that Christians almost invariably look upon the phrases "faith in Jesus," and "the faith of Jesus," as signifying only faith in Jesus, and as referring always to the believing of men in Jesus. But the Scriptures make it too plain to be doubted or misunderstood, that the phrases "faith in Jesus" and "the faith of Jesus" refer to things that are entirely separate, - "faith in Jesus" referring to the believing of men in Jesus, as in John 3:16 - "whosoever believeth in Him should not perish" - Eph. 1:15, Col. 1:4; 2:5; Acts 26:18, etc., etc.; and "the faith *of* Jesus" referring to the faith of Jesus himself personally, the faith which he exercised as man in the flesh.

This latter part, the real truth as to "the faith of Jesus," is so important, and is so little apprehended, that we shall quote in full the Scriptures that certainly put it beyond all question.

Gal. 3:22. "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by *faith of Jesus* Christ might be given to them that believe." It is impossible to have the words "faith of Jesus" in that verse to be equivalent to faith *in* Jesus. This is forbidden by the structure of the verse itself. For to make the words "faith of Jesus" mean the same as faith *in* Jesus, would force upon the writer such a meaningless repetition as that "the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that have faith in Jesus Christ." But taken as meaning just what it says, then the verse tells the splendid truth that the promise of God comes to men by the faith of Jesus, and that the promise of God which the faith of Jesus Christ brings to men is given and made sure *to them that believe in Jesus* Christ.

Gal. 2:16. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but by *the faith of Jesus Christ*, even we have believed *in Jesus Christ*, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law." Surely there is here no room for any explication. Both expressions are used in direct connection, and used in a way that makes it impossible that they should be taken as meaning the same thing. And taken for exactly what they say, again there is told the splendid truth that it is "the faith of Jesus" that brings to us and gives to us the justification the righteousness which we receive by believing *in* Jesus.

This is shown in the same way, and just as plainly in Romans 3:21, 22: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested - even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all upon all them that believe" in Jesus Christ. It is the faith of Jesus that has brought to us, that gives to us, and makes sure unto us and upon us, the righteousness of God, which is promised to all who believe *in* him, and which is received by faith *in* him. All this is further witnessed by the statements of Scripture that, "By the righteousness of *one* the *free gift* came upon all men unto justification of life." "By the obedience of *one* shall many be made righteous." "The *gift* by grace which is *by one man*, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."

By the righteousness of Christ we are justified. That righteousness of Christ was wrought, in this world and in human flesh, by the faith of Jesus Christ. By the obedience of Christ we are made righteous. That obedience of Christ, in this world and in human nature, was accomplished by the faith of Jesus. And that which the faith of Jesus has wrought for us in our flesh *which he took*, is received by us in our flesh, which we have, through faith *in* Jesus. Accordingly, "the life which I now live in the flesh, I live *by the faith of* the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me." And this life by the faith of the Son of God, is received by us through faith *in* the Son of God.

90

Eph. 3:12. "In whom [Jesus] we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him." And this boldness and access with confidence which is by the faith of Him, is received by us through faith *in* Jesus.

We see then that "the faith of Jesus" has been brought to the world, and he has made it a free gift to men, the fulfillment of all the promises of God,

righteousness, justification, sanctification, eternal life, and boldness and access with confidence; and that all this that is accomplished for us and is brought to us by "the faith of Jesus" is received by us through "faith *in* Jesus;" that is by simply believing in him.

Yet it must not for a moment be thought that even all this is given to us by the faith of Jesus, *apart from himself*. No: He gives us *himself*, and all this *in himself* and with himself. And he himself is received by us through faith *in* him. But when he gives to us *himself* he gives to us all that is in him and of him. And one of the things that is of him is this very "faith of him." Therefore it is true in this as in all the rest, that by faith *in* him, we actually receive the faith *of* him. And this faith *of* Jesus in us, will accomplish *in us*, in the flesh for him what it accomplished in him in the flesh for us.

And this is the wonderful blessedness that is proclaimed to all men in the words of the Third Angel's Message. "Here are they that keep the Commandments of God and the faith *of* Jesus."

### **"Desire Spiritual Gifts" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 12 , p. 94.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"DESIRE spiritual gifts." Do you? If not, why?

Surely this is as plain an injunction as there is in the Bible. Why, then, should you not obey it?

Perhaps you will say that you have long desired to see spiritual gifts manifested in the church, and have even wondered why they were not.

But that is not what the Scripture says; it does not say, Desire spiritual gifts manifested in the church; but, "Desire spirit gifts;" that is, Desire them manifested *in yourself*.

"Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God." Rom. 14:22. Suppose you should see all the gifts manifested *in the church*, and yet none of them be manifested *in yourself*, what good would that do? You could even see all this, and yet be lost yourself. Do you not know that thousands, yes, *the whole world*, will see all these gifts manifested in the church, and yet it will do them no good?

No; this is an individual matter. True, the gifts are to be manifested in the church; but this can be only by their being manifested in *each individual member* of the church. The gifts are divided "to every man *severally*."

Are you a member of the church? Do you belong to the body of Christ? Do you believe in Jesus? Then you are to desire that the gifts of the Spirit shall be manifested in yourself. If this is not so *with yourself*, you can not be ready *to meet the Lord*.

Yet to "desire spiritual gifts" is only a part of the injunction, - the subordinate part, too. The whole of it is, "*Follow after charity, AND desire spiritual gifts.*"

To desire spiritual gifts is altogether proper. Yet to do this without charity's being held solely in view, would be altogether vain; because though we had all

the gifts, and yet had not charity, it would profit us nothing, and we would be nothing.

Then as the only true way to desire spiritual gifts is to desire them *upon yourself*, and as the only proper connection in which to desire them is to *follow after charity* and desire them, it follows that you must follow after charity *yourself*, and desire spiritual gifts manifested upon yourself in order that you may attain that thing after which you are following.

And the charity after which you are to follow is the bond of perfectness, it is the love of God. And as "this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments," then it is certain that the thing after which you are following.

And the charity after which you are to follow is the bond of perfectness, it is the love of God. And as "this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments," then it is certain that the thing after which we are to follow while we are desiring spiritual gifts, is the keeping of the commandments of God. And the *keeping* of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus is the consummation of the third angel's message.

There can be no true keeping of the commandments of God without charity; there can be no true charity without spiritual gifts; there can be no spiritual gifts without the gift of the Holy Ghost; therefore without the gift of the Holy Ghost, there can be no true giving of the third angel's message.

**March 27, 1907**

**"Christian Loyalty. - I" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 13 , p. 98.**

ALONZO T. JONES

CHRISTIANITY in all that in itself it is, contemplates only a Person. It has its origin only in a Person. It comes to men only from a Person. It is given to men only by a Person. It is sustained and maintained in believers only by a Person.

Christian loyalty, therefore, is and can be only loyalty to that Person. The loyalty of Christians can never be to anybody, and much less to any thing, other than just that one Person. And that Person is God - God, in Christ, through and by the Holy Spirit.

God is a person - a living, intelligent, person: a person who thinks, who loves, who pities, who speaks, who is good, who is true, who is faithful, who enters into covenant with men, and who keeps covenant and mercy with men forever.

And Christ Jesus is a person. In this personal Christ the personal God is manifested to the world and made personally known to believing men. Christ, was a person before he came into the world; yea, he was a person before ever the world was. He was of the person of God before ever the world was; and as of the person of God, he "was the Word," and he spoke the word that made the world and all the worlds. This same Person who was before the world, and who made the world and made man, came into the world and to man. He was a person in the world and with mankind. In this same person he left the world and

ascended to heaven and to the personal God of heaven. In this same Person, and as this same Person glorified, he is at the right hand of the throne of the personal God in Heaven. And in this same Person, and as this same Person glorified, he is soon coming again in all the glory to glorify and take to himself and to the personal God of glory, all who are his by a personal faith upon their own personal choice.

And the Holy Spirit is a person. This great truth is not recognized, indeed it is not believed, by more than a very few even of Christians. For everybody knows that almost invariably, with very, very few exceptions, the Holy Spirit is referred to and spoken of by Christians as "*it*."

But the word "*it*" *never* applies to a person. The word "*it*," in the very genius of our language, refers and applies only to things, never to persons; to things of inanimate substance, as a stone, a horse, a tree; or to things of concept, or experience, as space, height, breadth, peace, joy, grief, an impression, an influence. But the Holy Spirit is none of these: the Holy Spirit is not an influence; nor an impression, nor peace, nor joy, nor any thing. The Holy Spirit *gives* peace, and gives joy, *assuages* in grief, makes an impression, *exerts* an influence; but the Holy Spirit is none of these things, nor any other thing.

No, eternally no! The Holy Spirit is a *Person*, eternally a divine *Person*. And he must be always recognized and spoken of as a Person, or he is not truly recognized or spoken of at all.

See how plain and emphatic the Scriptures set forth this truth that the Holy Spirit is only a Person: and to aid the reader to see this truth, we will print in capital letters *Italic*, the words that designate the Holy Spirit: -

John 14:16, 17: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give, you another comforter that *HE* may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; *WHOM* the world cannot receive because it (the world) seeth *HIM* not, neither knoweth *HIM*; but ye know *HIM*; for *HE* dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

John 14:26: "The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, *WHOM* the Father will send in my name, *HE* shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

John 15:26: "When the Comforter is come, *WHOM* I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which (*WHO*, Revised Version and others) proceedeth from the Father, *HE* shall testify of me."

John 6:7-15: "If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; And when *HE* is come, *HE* will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.) . . . I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now. Howbeit, when *HE*, the Spirit of Truth is come, *HE* will guide you into all truth; for *HE* shall not speak for *HIMSELF*; but whatsoever *HE* shall hear, that shall *HE* speak; and *HE* will shew you things to come. *HE* shall glorify me; for *HE* shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore, said I, that *HE* shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you."

Thus in the short space of a few lines the Lord Jesus speaks *twenty-four* times of the Holy Spirit as a person; and speaks of him in no other term than that which signifies in Greek, literally, "that person there."

Yet this is not peculiar to the New Testament. David said, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and *HIS* word was in my tongue." [sic.] Sam. 23:2.

Note that this latter word introduces another element of personality - "the Spirit of the Lord *spake*." This is also stated of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. Read it: -

"Then the Spirit *said* unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." Acts 8:29.

"The Holy Spirit *said*, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Acts 13:2.

"As the Holy Ghost *saith*." Heb. 3:7.

"Well *spake* the Holy Ghost by Isaiah the prophet." Acts 28:25.

Thus the Scriptures make perfectly plain the truth that the Holy Spirit is, none other than a living, speaking, divine, and eternal person. Exactly as Christ is a person and as God is a person. Indeed Jesus speaks of the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father, just as he speaks of himself as proceeding from the Father.

Of himself Jesus says: "I proceeded forth and came from God." John 8:4 Of the Holy Spirit, Jesus says that he "proceedeth from the Father." John 15:26.

Therefore to be consistent those people who persist in speaking of the Holy Spirit as "it," should also speak of Christ as "it," and of God as "it." But as certainly as any one speaks of God as *HE* and of Christ as *HE*, he must also speak of the Holy Spirit as *HE*.

### **"How to Be Faithful" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 13 , p. 101.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE faithfulness of Christ is the source of all faithfulness in men.

Therefore this is the basis of the divine exhortation to faithfulness: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers, of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; *who was* FAITHFUL to him that appointed him."

"It behooved him *in all things* to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and FAITHFUL high priest in things pertaining to God. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted he is able to succor them that are tempted." "For we have no an high priest which can not be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was *in all points* tempted like as we are, yet without sin."

"Let us *therefore* come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

Do you lack faithfulness? Then consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who was faithful.

Are you weak, so that you think it hard to be faithful? - Then consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who was so weak that he declared, "I can of mine own self do *nothing*," and yet "was faithful to him that appointed him."

Are you compassed with infirmity, so that you are inclined to think it hard to be faithful? Then consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who was also "compassed with infirmity;" who "hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows;" who "himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses," and so was really "touched with the *feelings* of our infirmities," and yet was faithful to him that appointed him.

Are you surrounded with the wicked, and sinners, and despisers of our profession, so that it seems to you difficult to be faithful? Then consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who "endured such contradiction of sinners against himself," and yet was faithful to him that appointed him. Consider him who resisted unto blood, striving against sin, "lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds." Consider him who was faithful, and so be ye faithful.

Let *now*, as of old, the whole multitude seek to touch him, with the touch of faith; for as then "there went virtue out of him, and healed them all," even so it is now.

Knowing your great need of faithfulness, let your faith touch him for the virtue of faithfulness, and you can be faithful to him that has appointed you.

**April 3, 1907**

**"Christian Loyalty. - II" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 14 , p. 106.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the preceding article it was made plain that whether it be to God, to Christ, or to the Holy Spirit, the Christian's relationship is only to a person. Christian loyalty, therefore, can never be of any other character than loyalty to that divine Person.

Among Christians there can never be any such thing as parties or divisions. This is true not only in the nature of the case, but also in the word of Inspiration. In the earliest times of Christianity when such a thing appeared it was so met by the Spirit of Inspiration as to annihilate forever all possibility of it among all who would be Christians indeed.

At Corinth there appeared a tendency to personal preferences, to parties, and partisanship. One said, "I am of Paul;" another, "I am of Apollos;" another, "I of Cephas." But notice how the thing was met: "Was Paul *crucified* for you?" That one all-penetrating question reveals forever the truth that Christian loyalty can never be to any person but the One who was crucified for us. And any person who should ever ask or expect the loyalty of Christians to any person other than the crucified One, would in that very thing show *disloyalty* to Him; would in that very thing, so far as in him lay, destroy all Christian loyalty.

And when this is true concerning all persons, how much more must it be true of *things*.

No Christian can ever be loyal to a "cause," for the sufficient reason that no "cause" was ever crucified for anybody, no "cause" ever created anybody, no

"cause" ever made intercession for anybody "with groanings which can not be uttered."

No Christian can be loyal even to "the church;" and for the same all-sufficient reason that no church was ever crucified for anybody, never created anybody, and never made intercession for anybody "with groanings which can not be uttered."

Yet there has been much made of "loyalty to the Church," and "loyalty to the Cause." Indeed, there has been more than one system that would "compass sea and land to make one proselyte" to a "cause" or to "the church," or to a certain order or system; and in the doing of it violate every principle of loyalty to Christ, to God and to the Holy Spirit.

It is impossible to be otherwise. For, as already shown, loyalty to any person other than God, in Christ, under the Holy Spirit, or to anything, is in itself plain disloyalty to the divine *Person* who was crucified for us, who created us, and who makes intercession for us. And when such is the situation and course in the very beginning that all this is forgotten or ignored, it naturally enough follows that in manifesting loyalty to another person or to some "cause" or order or system, "anything to win," anything that will make the "cause" prevail, can be counted perfectly legitimate.

The Jews, in loyalty to their "cause" and to make their cause to prevail, could blaspheme the Holy Spirit, repudiate God, and crucify the Lord Jesus. From the beginning to the end of the great apostasy, in loyalty to "the Church" those who professed to be the very chief and exemplary Christians could violate every principle of Christianity, could do everything that dishonors Christ, and could persecute to the death those who were Christians indeed. In the Reformation there was renewed in the world loyalty to God, in Christ, through the Holy Spirit - loyalty to the Divine Person. But ere long this was forgotten for only a "cause," and Protestantism, and this even as an "ism," was espoused. Then in loyalty to the "cause," Protestantism, so far as it had opportunity; went over the same ground as Catholicism before it; and each party, each sect in turn, went over the same ground as the one before it - always loyal to some thing, to some "ism" instead of to the divine *Person*. And the whole of history has abundantly shown, as has been well expressed that men "will fight to the death and persecute without pity" in "loyalty" or a "cause," who could not be persuaded to entertain a single serious thought of loyalty to the crucified and, *sanctifying Person*.

On the other hand, through all the period of that dismal history there has been a bright train of blessed individuals who have been loyal, only to the divine Person, loving him, walking with him, living in him. These have been the Christians, and only Christians, always. They have been persecuted, afflicted, tormented, cast out, and this because they would not fight and persecute and sin in behalf of some "cause," or some party, or some "ism;" but to these always loyalty to the divine Person who created us, who was crucified by us, who intercedes for us, and who sanctifies and saves us, was the only true loyalty of any soul.

And such, and such only, is Christian loyalty everywhere and forever.

**April 10, 1907**

**"Consequences of Church Federation" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 15 , pp. 116, 117.**

ALONZO T. JONES

CHURCH Federation is making rapid progress. From the evidences presented in the previous studies of this movement, in these columns, it was made plain that in religious federation there lies one of the world's greatest issues of present and the quickly coming time. It is not the purpose here either to repeat or to review the evidences already presented on this subject. It is important now to study the progress of the movement, and note what must be the direct consequences of its regular and constant workings.

Let us take for illustration the Baptists, who are just now actually involved in the discussion of this question as a practical issue upon which they are called to decide. As is well known, the Baptists have always held firmly the Christian principle of the integrity of the separate, individual, local churches; each individual church standing in its relation to the Lord just as independent of all the others as though there were no others, and it stood alone in the world. This is precisely the New Testament order, and in following it, as well as in baptism itself, the Baptists have ever been and are in the right.

Now the principle of Federation is another principle entirely. It is indeed the opposite principle to that of the New Testament order. To the Baptists, therefore, church federation is strictly revolutionary, and is entirely subversive of the principle and order for which they have ever stood. And yet, there are among the Baptists, leading men who are advocating federation and are arguing that the Baptists should first federate themselves into a centralized organization, and then, as such, become a part of the grand movement for the federation of all the churches into national, international, and world, federation.

This, of course, is causing much discussion amongst them. It is most rife just now among the Baptists ministers of New England, and especially those of Boston and vicinity in their Monday meetings in Tremont Temple. There is opposition to the movement, and how it will be decided remains to be seen. It may be that federation will prevail. And if it does, then what will come to those who opposed it?

First of all, Should those who are opposed to federation fall in with it and favor it, just because the majority favor it and carry it? When they are opposed to it on the original principles of the Baptists, and upon the true Christian principle of church-order, then should they forsake this ground and espouse the opposite, because the majority do so? Everybody who knows what principle is, will instantly say, No. For neither Christian principle nor Christian practise is ever subject to the decisioin of majorities.

Second: Even though these do not adopt federation because the majority do, then should they cease to oppose it? Should they cease to speak against it? In

other words, should they cease to speak and to preach the truth of Christian principle and order, and of Baptists principle and order, because the majority have abandoned it and espoused the opposite? Again everybody who knows what principle is, what truth is, and what Christian freedom is, will instantly say, No.

But only the speaking and the preaching of that truth, will be opposition to federation. For them to continue and to hold and to proclaim the principles that they have always held and proclaimed, this of itself will be nothing else than opposition to federation, because federation is the opposite of those principles just as they are, even without specific reference to federation will of itself undermine federation.

Therefore, for any to preach these principles just as they did before, and as the principles have always been held and preached by Baptists, this will not be pleasing to the federation. And as certainly as it is displeasing to the federation, so certainly will the federation make its displeasure felt, through slights, separation, ostracism, and denunciation. They will be denounced for "causing division," for "opposing the good work and progress of the kingdom of God," which the federation is so devotedly carrying forward, etc., etc.

And this illustration from present experience of the Baptists, is in substance what will be the experience of all the people of all the denominations in the

117

land both in and out of the federation. For it is particularly to be noted that it is not *the people*, but only the *official bodies*, of the denominations that have formed the Federation of the Churches. Yet this officialdom of the denominations will expect that all *the people* of those denominations will promptly sanction and fall in with the federation and all that the federation shall do. But it is very probable that there will be some among those *people* who will dissent wholly from the whole scheme and even the very idea of federation. Also the federation itself may take steps and do things, from which some if not many of the people will decidedly dissent, and against which they will openly protest. But for these to do so will be held by the officialdom of the denominations and the federation, to be disrespect, presumption, treason, rebellion, etc. Then each individual will find himself face to face with the issue. Shall he think and act with the intelligence that God has given him, or shall he cease all that and surrender thought and conscience to an assumptious, hierarchial, officialdom in church and religion?

Such also is in substance what will be the experience of all the people who are not of the denominations that compose the Federation. For the direct aim of the Federation is so to control legislation and the civil power as to make religion a matter of law enforced upon all. And this forces upon every person the personal individual choice and decision as to whether he will be a man and act upon his own free choice before God or whether he will allow himself to be a hypocrite enslaved in thought and conscience to the dictates of a religious despotism.

Thus one direct consequence of federation is that every soul will be caused to make a personal individual choice and decision on religious principle.

**"In the Field" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 15 , p. 118.**

FEBRUARY 22 till March 2 I preached in Rutland, Vt., on the world's greatest issues of the present and future days. We had a good hall in the heart of the city; and while the attendance was not as large as it should have been, it was good, and the interest increased to the end. And when the time comes to go there again, the interest will still be as good, and the attendance will be better. The mighty issues that are fast crowding upon the world are now so plainly to be seen in the current affairs of the world, that people can not fail to see the issues and catch their meaning when attention is called to these things.

From Rutland I went to Northfield, Vt., where I spoke three nights: The first night, on the Eastern Question, in the Methodist Church; the second night, on National Temperance and Intemperance, in the Congregational Church; and the third night, on Christian Health and How to Have It, in the Unitarian Church. This arrangement of the meetings was made by the three ministers of the three churches named so as to give all the best opportunity to attend the meetings. The ministers themselves attended the meetings and were much pleased with the discussion of the subjects. Thus at Northfield, too, there are doors wide open whenever the time comes to go there again.

From Northfield I went to Boston and preached at noon each day, Tuesday to Friday, March 12-15, in the Bromfield St. Methodist Church, on the Eastern Question and Temperance; Wednesday night, in the Bowdoin Square Baptist Tabernacle, on Temperance; and Sunday night, March 17, in the Flint St. M. E. Church, Somerville, on The Place of the Holy Spirit in the World and in the Church. There were other openings in Boston and I arrived there, but circumstances with which I had nothing to do postponed these for at least three weeks. I decided then to spend this time in other places, and to return to Boston, April 19, and preach on Church Federation till the 18th; because *then* that will be an especially live subject in Boston.

These questions are the individual, the local, the state, the national, and the world, issues now and forward, and must be discussed before the people everywhere.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**April 17, 1907**

**"Consequences of Church Federation. II" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 16 , pp. 122, 123.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen that one certain consequence of church federation is and will be slights, ostracism, and discredit, - in a word, *persecution* - against and upon all who choose to dissent from the principles and workings of federation. For it must not be forgotten that a word, or even a sneer or a slight, is by the Scriptures

declared to be persecution: and it is persecution as really as is imprisonment or other physical violence done in Gen. 21:9 it is written that "Sarah saw the son of the Egyptian . . . *mocking*." But in Gal. 4:26 the Spirit of Inspiration, referring to the same incident, says, "He that was born after the flesh *persecuted* him that was born after the Spirit." Ishmael's boyish mockery of Isaac, was persecution. Of itself the boyish mockery was no violence; but it revealed the heart's disposition of the mocker, and showed what he would readily do if circumstances and opportunity were more favorable. And federation beginning with persecution by slights or sneers or words, will easily enough proceed to stronger modes of expressing its disapproval of dissent or in opposition.

Not upon any reasonable basis can this be doubted. For federation is not proposed as a matter of mere social diversion, or ecclesiastical amusement. It is proposed as the practical means of turning the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of God, of saving mankind from itself; and whatever opposes federation or weakens its operation or effectiveness must necessarily be construed as positively inimical to the truest good of mankind, and as treason and rebellion against the kingdom of God. And anything that will effectually quench such supreme evils as these, will in the nature of the case be entirely justifiable and even laudable.

All history witnesses to the correctness of this analysis. Hence the perfect aptness of Bishop Forsler's note of warning to the first essay at national federation of churches, Dec. 1905. "Human nature has not changed."

National federation of Protestantism proposes to expand into international federation of Protestantism, and this into international federation with Catholicism; and this into world-federation of religion including the Christian-dubbed paganism of Japan and China; thus composing one grand world and imperialistic religion.

But what has been the record of world religions?

The first one was paganism established and imperialized by Nimrod. And its procedure was such as to distinguish him forever as the "exceedingly imperious rebel" and "overbearing tyrant in Jehovah's sight."

Again in Egypt paganism arose to a strictly world supremacy, and by oppression and cruelty caused the name of Egypt with its Pharaoh to stand forever as the most expressive symbol of darkness, degradation, and bondage of blind unreasoning, cruelty, despotism, and oppression toward men; and of arrogant insolence and presumptuous defiance toward God.

And even among the people of God paganism succeeded in creeping in and establishing a throne and itself upon it. That woman Jezebel brought into the kingdom of Israel her pagan religion and made it predominant there, supported and made effective by all the machinery and power of the kingdom. The consequence was that the persecution, despotism was so deadly that though there were in all the kingdom yet seven thousand who stood true to God and themselves, they were so scattered that not one of them knew where another was. 1 Kings 19:10, 14, 18.

But it was in Rome another empire that paganism attained its perfect idea in every respect. And the consequence was that it systematically sapped men of

every vestige of individuality and carried them into a boundless sea of ruinous excess of iniquity. And when Christ came with his religion of divine power and virtue to save mankind from the sea of iniquity, and restore to him his native God-given individuality, paganism with all the power of the might Rome crucified him out of the world and unrelentingly persecuted his disciples and even the very name of his religion, for two hundred and fifty years.

Then a new turn was taken, and a new world-religion was established - the papacy. And for more than eleven hundred years it was the same dismal story continued, and deeply intensified in every feature. And again mankind was systematically sapped of every vestige of individuality, and swept into a boundless sea of iniquity.

But in the Reformation God gave again the religion of divine power and virtue of the faith of Christ, to save man from that sea of iniquity and restore them to the native God-given individuality. Yet alas! religious and church professing reformation principles, swing away from those principles to centralized, governmental, and State religion, and continued the same old story of despotism, oppression, and persecution, always to the full extent of the world power obtained. And now all of these go about to form a federation to secure national preference and national power. That accomplished, will then the leopard suddenly change his spots - yes, his whole very nature, and become an innocent veritable lamb? - No. The same old nature will still show itself, and still to the full extent of the worldly power gained.

And when this national and international federation of religion culminates in the world-religion that is proposed, planned, and promised - that world-religion composed only of the elements of these three religions, paganism, papacy, and false protestant, that have made an unbroken record of wickedness, despotism, oppression, and persecution always to the full extent of the world-power obtained - what can then be the only possible consequence? - Nothing less and nothing else than a world despotism, world-oppression, and world-

123

persecution; all individuality again denied and all the world swept into, and finally sunk in, a boundless sea of iniquity.

And again, as always before, there will be those who by virtue of the religion of divine power of God in Christ under the Holy Spirit will not bow the knee, nor kiss the hand, nor in any other way worship according to the doctrines and dictates of that world-religion. As always before, also, these will be few. Also as before, yes, even as in the time of Elijah under that original woman Jezebel, they will be so few and so scattered that one will not know where another is. Yet these as always before standing free in God, in their native God-given individuality and Christian integrity, will "sing for the majesty of the Lord" and will be gathered "one by one" by the glorious Lord when he appears in his glory. Isa. 24:11, 14; 27:12.

Thus individuality, in individual Christian integrity, as the eternal principle in righteousness that it is, is gloriously vindicated and made triumphant by the Lord of Hosts; while federation, confederation, fails and falls in annihilating him by its own impotence, arrogance, presumption, and blasphemy.

"Say ye not, a confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, a confederacy . . . Sanctify the Lord of Hosts *himself* . . . and he shall be for a sanctuary."

**"Let Him Lead" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 17 , p. 126.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"AS many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God;" and "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

To be led of the Spirit and to walk after the Spirit are clearly the same thing. Then it is clear that the Holy Spirit is to show us the way in which we should walk. As it is written, "He will guide you."

"I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee by the way that thou shouldest go." The only object in giving a guide to anybody, the only thing a guide is to do, is to show the right way; and the only thing that anybody can rightly do who has a guide, is to follow him.

It is preposterous to claim to have a guide, and then go our own way. Then the very claim that we have, or that we need, a guide, demands of us that we put ourselves wholly in his charge, that we give ourselves up absolutely to his direction.

"It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." "All we like sheep have gone astray," and do not know the way. The great Shepherd of the sheep has given us a guide to be with us forever. This guide is the Holy Spirit. You and I claim to need this guide. Indeed, we claim to have this guide with us as ours. Now have you put yourself wholly in his charge? Have you given up yourself absolutely to his direction?

"I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go; I will counsel thee with mine eye upon thee. Be ye not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding; whose trappings must be bit and bridle to hold them in."

Do you study, and inquire, and watch, only to know His way?

And when he indicates the way, even only with his eye, do you promptly walk that way? or do you hesitate and parley, and want to know whether there is not another way?

Do you always treat him implicitly as the guide? or do *you* assume the position of guide? Do you try to guide your Guide?

Don't be "as a horse," or "a mule;" be a Christian.

**April 24, 1907**

**"Desire Spiritual Gifts" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 17 , p. 131.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"DESIRE spiritual gifts." Do you? If not, why?

Surely this is as plain an injunction as there is in the Bible. Why, then, should you not obey it?

Perhaps you will say that you have long desired to see spiritual gifts manifested in the church, and have even wondered why they were not.

But that is not what the Scripture says; it does not say, Desire spiritual gifts manifested in the church; but, Desire them manifested *in yourself*.

"Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God." Rom. 14:22. Suppose you should see all the gifts manifested *in the church*, and yet none of them be manifested *in yourself*, what good would that do? You could even see all this, and yet be lost yourself. Do you not know that thousands, yes, *the whole world*, will see all these gifts manifested in the church, and yet it will do them no good?

No; this is an individual matter. True, the gifts are to be manifested in the church; but this can be only by their being manifested in *each individual member* of the church. The gifts are divided "to every man *severally*."

Are you a member of the church? Do you belong to the body of Christ? Do you believe in Jesus? Then you are to desire that the gifts of the Spirit shall be manifested in yourself. If this is not so *with yourself*, you can not be ready *to meet the Lord*.

Yet to "desire spiritual gifts" is only a part of the injunction, - the subordinate part, too. The whole of it is, "*Follow after charity, AND desire spiritual gifts.*"

To desire spiritual gifts is altogether proper. Yet to do this without charity's being held solely in view, would be altogether vain; because though we had all the gifts, and yet had not charity, it

132

would profit us nothing, and we would be nothing.

Then as the only true way to desire spiritual gifts is to desire them *upon yourself*, and as the only proper connection in which to desire them is to *follow after charity* and desire them, it follows that you must follow after charity *yourself*, and desire spiritual gifts manifested upon yourself in order that you may attain that thing after which you are following.

And the charity after which you are to follow is the bond of perfectness, it is the love of God. And as "this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments," then it is certain that the thing after which we are to follow while we are desiring spiritual gifts, is the keeping of the commandments of God. And the *keeping* of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus is the consummation of the third angel's message.

There can be no true keeping of the commandments of God without charity; there can be no true charity without spiritual gifts; there can be no spiritual gifts without the gift of the Holy Ghost; therefore without the gift of the Holy Ghost, there can be no true giving of the third angel's message.

**May 1, 1907**

**"Unto Service" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 18 , p. 139.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE baptism of the Holy Spirit is only unto service.

Anybody who wants the baptism, or the gift, of the Holy Ghost, in order that he may be lifted up in an ecstasy and kept there, swinging, like a canary, in an ecstatic feeling the rest of his days, will never get it.

Yet this is about the idea that thousands of people have of the purpose and the effect of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Therefore their favorite song is, -

"O, could I ever, ever stay  
In such a frame as this,  
I'd sit and sing myself away  
To everlasting bliss!"

Christ never was in such a "frame" as this, thank the Lord; if he had been, we should be eternally lost. But those people *think* that such is exactly the "frame" that becomes heaven. Yet if they would *really think*, they would see in a moment that it is altogether a false conception.

Jesus was in heaven. He was there the possessor, by divine right forevermore, of all the bliss that heaven can possibly know. Yet, knowing and possessing all this, *he* did not sit and sing himself away to everlasting bliss.

No. He left it all behind, and came down to earth, and spent his life here in the service of a poor, ruined people, laden with iniquity, to bring to these the knowledge of God, and all the good which that knowledge brings.

And to him this was bliss. To him this was more than to be in heaven itself. It was not to him *more* nor less than heaven itself; it simply *was* heaven itself; for when he came down to earth, he did not, strictly speaking, leave heaven behind - *he brought it along*, and linked it to earth in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten.

To him this was better than to stay in heaven. He voluntarily chose to do this; therefore he did it because he would rather do it than to stay in heaven.

Thus of his own free choice he came out of heaven to the earth, and stayed here as long as men would let him stay.

As long as he could stay here and work for mankind, he would rather do so than go to heaven.

And this is Christianity.

Unto this glorious mission the Lord Jesus was born of the Holy Ghost, and was baptized and anointed with the Holy Ghost. And this is the purpose of the birth, the baptism, and the anointing of the Holy Spirit, upon every soul who receives him.

"God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who *went about doing good*." "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; *because* he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound."

This is what the baptism of the Holy Ghost was for then; and this is what it is for forever.

What an astonishing conception of Christianity it is, indeed, that he who had received the greatest degree of its spirit should forget everybody but himself; and thinking nothing, caring nothing, for the sin, the distress, and the misery of the multitudes of the lost all around him, should "sit" pampering himself in a hilarious mood, and "sing himself away to everlasting bliss!"

Such is not the Spirit of Christianity. It is simply the spirit of the supremely selfish, shirking, lazy loafer.

No; the spirit of Christianity is the spirit of the Lord Jesus himself, and he who has the greatest degree of it, instead of *sitting* and singing *himself* away to everlasting bliss, *stands up*, in the conscious surety of everlasting bliss, and *works* with all power in heaven and earth, and sings *while he works*, to draw *all others* from the darkness and woe of this world of sin, unto the everlasting bliss of the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

He does not care to go to heaven till his work in the world is done. Give him his choice any day, and he would rather stay in this world, and *work*, than to go to heaven. He knows that in Christ, who is his life, heaven is sure to him. And having found in his blessed Lord, and by his Spirit, the connection between heaven and earth, to him it is heaven to work to get other people into the knowledge and surety of heaven.

O, let us be only such Christians as Christ was in the world! Then we shall be of profit to the world, and the world will know that God sent Jesus into the world.

**May 8, 1907**

**"The Christian Way with the Faulty and the Erring" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 19 , pp. 146, 147.**

A. T. JONES

IN the church which is the body of Christ, "the members have the same care one of another." There is no exclusiveness among them. There is no slighting of one by any of the others. There is no envy or detraction of one that is honored or advanced. If "one member suffer, all the members suffer with it;" if "one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it."

Such only is the spirit that is manifested in the Church of Christ which is his body. And in his church this is the only spirit that is manifested toward the faulty and the erring. It is only according to this spirit that in the Scriptures directions are given for dealing with the faulty and the erring. It is only in this spirit that the Scripture directions can be followed. For the church of Christ is subject to Christ "in everything."

Accordingly it is written, "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual *restore* such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest

thou be also tempted." Gal. 6:1. The only thought or purpose toward the one that is "in a fault," is the thought and purpose of *restoring* him - the bringing

147

of him back and setting him in his true place, and this *by the spiritual*, and in the spirit of meekness and of Christian fellowship "considering *thyself* lest thou also be tempted."

Further, the Scripture directions in this matter contemplate only that the individuals and the church shall go to the utmost limit in the Christian effort to restore the faulty and erring one. And so it is written, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother." The only purpose of going to him and telling him his fault, is to *gain* him, to restore him; and if he hear thee "thou hast *gained* him."

"But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." If he will not hear you, and so you fail to gain him, when you speak to him alone, then try again, with the presence of one or two more that may witness and aid the endeavor to gain him.

And if he neglect to hear them, even then do not cease the endeavor to gain him. "If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church." Then the church in its membership is still to endeavor to gain him from his fault and his error. And it is only when he still refuses to listen to the efforts of the whole church - only then ceases the special, Christian, brotherly effort to gain him and restore him.

"But if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." He has then refused all endeavors individually and collectively of the whole brotherhood of the church proceeding upon the word of God and in the Spirit of Christ, and thus has separated himself from the fellowship of the brotherhood and has put himself decisively on the ground of those outside of the Christian fellowship, and the church, having done all that can be done, now lets him be just as are the others who are outside the Christian fellowship - lets him be as an heathen man and a publican.

And note, the direction is that he is now to be considered only as a heathen and publican, to whom the gospel is ever to be preached for his conversion and salvation, as really as though he had never been of the Christian fellowship at all. The following excellent words, written by another, beautifully cover the whole ground: -

"If he will not hear them, then, and not until then, the matter is to be brought before the whole body of lecturers. Let the members of the church, as representatives of Christ, unite in prayer and loving entreaty that the offender may be restored. The Holy Spirit will speak through his servants, pleading with the wanderer to return to God. Paul, the apostle, speaking by inspiration, says, 'As though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God.' He who rejects this united overture, has broken the tie that binds him to Christ and thus has severed himself from the fellowship of the Church. Henceforth, said Jesus, 'let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.' But he is not to be regarded as cut off from the mercy of God. Let him

not be despised or neglected by his former brethren, but be treated with tenderness and compassion, as one of the last sheep that Christ is still seeking to bring to the fold."

This order of procedure is the only one recognized in the Scriptures in dealing with the faulty and the erring in the church. In the instruction to Timothy it is clearly referred to in the words, "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but *before two or three witnesses.*" And this is so important that it is made the subject of one of the most solemn charges in all the Bible: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality." 1 Tim. 5:19-21.

In the instructions to Titus also this order of procedure is recognized and required, in the words, "A man that is an heretic *after the first and second admonition* reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." Titus 3:10, 11. As already shown, when he has refused to hear the two or three, and then has refused to hear the whole church, when they have done all that they can to gain and restore him, then he has separated *himself*, and is condemned of himself; the church can do no more and "lets him be" in the position and the separation in which, against all the efforts of the church, he has placed himself.

Again this order of procedure is recognized by Paul himself as governing himself. Concerning those who had sinned and had "not repented of the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousness which they have committed," he says, "This is the third time I am coming to you. *In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.*" 2 Cor. 12:21, 13:1.

Such is the order of procedure, and such is the only true order of procedure, and such is the "care" and the manifestation of the loving, honoring, and honorable "care" that the members of the church of Christ have "one of another."

Only when this order of procedure is followed faithfully in the spirit and to the letter - only then is the action of either members or the church ratified in heaven. And since the church, as well as each individual Christian, must be "subject to Christ in everything," any action taken by any individual member, or by the church, other than strictly according to the order thus plainly laid down in the Scriptures, is utterly without the authority or the approval of heaven, and is only arbitrary, human, and anti-Christian.

It may be noticed that in this article nothing has been said about *turning members out of the church*, but only of efforts to *gain*, to *restore*, and to *keep them in*. The *turning of them out*, will be considered next.

**May 15, 1907**

**"Turning People Out of the Church" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 20 ,  
pp. 154, 155.**

ALONZO T. JONES

LAST week, in the study of the Scriptures, we found that in the church of Christ, in dealing with any who are in fault, the only procedure prescribed, is for the gaining and restoring of them and the keeping of them in the church if possible. We found that in the New Testament there is no provision made for turning people out of the church, and that there is no procedure to be undertaken in the spirit or with the design of turning persons out of the church, but only for gaining and restoring them and keeping them in; and that every effort is to be exhausted to accomplish this. And when the one who is in the fault refuses and stands out against all these efforts, then, of his own choice and by his own course, he *is out* of the church. Recall the words in the quotation given: "He who rejects this united overture *has . . . severed himself* from the fellowship of the church;" and also the words of Scripture, "He that is such is subverted and sinneth, being condemned *of himself*."

However, while there is not in the New Testament any provision made for turning people out of church, there is in the New Testament a plain account of the thing. And here it is, "I wrote unto the church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words; and not content therewith, neither does he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would and *casteth them out of the church*." 2 John 9, 10.

This shows that the spirit and working that turns people out of church, is altogether different from that of the New Testament, which exhausts every effort "in the spirit of meekness" to "gain" to

155

"restore," and to keep in the church those who have been "overtaken in a fault."

*First*, it springs from the love of having the preeminence; and by this of itself, and at the one first step, the man who has it puts himself in the place of Christ. For in the church of Christ, and with every Christian, Christ "is the head of the body, the church, . . . that in all things *he* might have the preeminence." In the church of Christ and with all Christians there is no such thing as eminence; even much less is there any such thing as *pre*-eminence; for there, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren," and each one is servant to all. Whosoever therefore would love to have only eminence among Christians, has another spirit than that of Christ; but when anyone loveth to have the *pre*-eminence, that is at once to put himself in the place of Christ himself, and is of the very spirit of anti-Christ. For whenever anyone puts himself in the place of Christ he is certain to act unlike Christ; and that is anti-Christ.

*Second*: The next step was exactly in accord with his putting himself in the place of Christ - he took it upon himself to decide just what the church should receive or not receive. A letter was written "to the church;" but Diotrephes would not allow the church to receive it. This letter was written by John, a chosen apostle of the Lord Jesus; and was written to a church of the Lord Jesus. It was therefore the word of Christ to his own Church. But Diotrephes would not himself receive the letter, and would not let the church receive it; and repudiated even Christ's apostle who wrote the letter, and prated against him with malicious words.

*Third:* He would not even receive the brethren by whom the letter was sent. And when some of the brethren of the church had the mind and heart to receive those brethren, Diotrephes forbade them. And when some of the members of the church disregarded his command, and received those brethren, then he *cast them out of the church.*

Such is the procedure, and that is the only kind of procedure, by which people are turned out of the church. But it is not Christian procedure; it is papal procedure, and that alone. All that the papacy has ever been is revealed in this account of the procedure of Diotrephes - the love of preeminence, in which he put himself in the place of Christ, and opposed and exalted himself above Christ and above his word; usurped the authority over Christ's servants; and assumed, and presumed to exercise, the satanic prerogative of *severing from Christ's body his own members*, and casting them out.

Thus in that procedure by Diotrephes there is in the beginning of that long course of apostasy that made the man of sin, the mystery of iniquity, in all that it had ever been or ever can be. For, all the indications are that this affair of Diotrephes occurred at Ephesus. And to the elders of the church at Ephesus Paul had already said, years before, "Of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them;" "grievous wolves, not sparing the flock." And Ephesus is the name chosen by the Lord Jesus himself as representative of the first of the Seven Churches - that one that had left her first love.

This apostasy exemplified in Diotrephes continued. He was followed by others who loved to have the preeminence, and the number of these multiplied; for such is the spirit of the carnal mind and of the natural heart. These who thus exalted themselves to the preeminence, assumed to themselves *only* the title of *bishop*, while the others in the same office precisely must be designated as only presbyters. And it was only a few years before these self-exalted "bishops" and their supporters actually taught the following blasphemous stuff: -

"It is manifest that we should look upon the bishop, even as we would upon the Lord himself."

"He who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does in reality serve the devil."

A few years more and they had got far enough along to teach the following of the same sort: -

"The church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers."

"Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the church and the church in the bishop, and *if any one is not with the bishop, that he is not in the church.*"

But, as we have seen, in the church where Diotrephes was, there were some Christians who disregarded his preeminence and would not recognize his commands. There were likewise in all the churches true Christians who disregarded the preeminence of these self-exalted bishops, and would not obey their wicked commands, but would honor and obey Christ instead. And, like the Christian in the church where Diotrephes was, these too were "cast out of the

church" and denounced of heresy, apostasy, and of causing diversion. The following is an example of this: -

"Neither have heresies arisen, nor have schisms originated, from *any other source than from this*, that God's priest is not obeyed; nor do they consider that there is one person for the time, priest in the church, and for the time judge in the stead of Christ; whom if, according to divine teaching, the whole fraternity should obey, no one would stir up anything against the college of priests; . . . no one would rend the church by a division of the unity of Christ."

Then just because these were thus denounced and cast out of the church, and were thus counted as outside "the pale of unity," - of the bishops - the churches were warned against them as heretics and not to be listened to. They might be teaching in perfect Christian faithfulness the very truth of Christ, even just as they had taught it before they disobeyed the bishops and were denounced as heretics, yet *that* could not be recognized now; and so it was flatly declared that it mattered not what they might teach, and that no one need even to ask "*what*" any of these might be teaching; so long as he teaches *out of the "pale of unity."*

And this "pale of unity" was nothing else than the arbitrary assumption and presumption of the monarchial and despotic "bishops" who loved to have the preeminence, and would cast out of the church every one who would not recognize and bow to it.

**May 22, 1907**

**"In the Field" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 21 , p. 166.**

AS stated in the previous report, my work in Boston very unexpectedly closed up for the time about two weeks before the time arranged for. Therefore, leaving Boston Monday evening, March 18, I arrived in Newark, N. J., Tuesday, the 19th. This in turn brought me to this place about two weeks earlier than any one expected. But, the announcement was circulated, and the meetings were begun Thursday night, the 21st, and continued every night and Sabbaths and Sundays, including the 31st. The attendance was good, and the interest also. The subjects presented here, were the same in substance as in other places. The Eastern Question showing the nearness of the end of all things and what is the preparation to escape all these things that shall come to pass; Church Federation leading to world federation or religion and world despotism and destruction; and the truth of Christ and of the Church of Christ that saves from that deception and destruction. For these are the great world-issues of the present time; and to know the truth concerning these things and the way of escape, is the great thing that needs to be preached to all people in this time. The experience met in Boston on the question of Church Federation that was being discussed amongst the Baptists only added freshness and point to that phase of the truth that was presented; for this demonstrated that the discussion of church federation was not merely theoretical. but very practical; and was not the pointed out of something

yet to come, but the discussion of a very present and living issue, the very serious meaning of which it was not at all difficult to discern.

From Newark I went to Washington, D. C. and began meetings Wednesday night, April 3, and continued to Sunday night, April 14. The attendance here was larger than at any other place that I had been on this tour. Only once or twice was the attendance less than about three hundred. Here, too, the interest was excellent, prominent educators of the city of Washington being amongst the hearers. One of these, the principal of one of the Manual Training Schools of the city, was present when I spoke on the Eastern Question, and invited me to come and present that question to his school on Wednesday morning, April 10, I went and found there present to hear about four hundred students and teachers with the principal. These were all deeply interested in the subject and expressed with thanks their hearty approval of the presentation of that great question. The interest in the meetings increased from the beginning until the very end; the last night the attendance being more than could get into the house. And the interest was such that I was required to promise that I would visit them again.

Leaving Washington April 16, I went again to Boston, speaking Sunday afternoon, April 21, to a large audience in Berkeley Hall on "Patriotism in the United States." Monday, April 22, I attended the Baptist ministers' meeting in their hall in Tremont Temple, and had the pleasure of listening to the reading of a paper by Prof. Geo. E. Horr, D. D., in opposition to church federation. Then at the noon-hour Tuesday, April 23, and daily throughout the week I discussed in Wesleyan Hall the subject of church federation as to what is proposed therein, and what is in truth therein; and the Christian truth that must be followed by all those who will obey the Word of God and say not "A Confederacy to all them to whom this people shall say A Confederacy," but will "sanctify the Lord of Hosts Himself."

Then incidentally I found that I was not the only one that was just then discussing that great question and presenting the truth of the Lord's Message of deliverance from the evils assured in Church Federation. For, one day, I had the privilege of hearing a man, who was a perfect stranger to me, declare to an assembly of people that this movement for church federation means only the final Babylon of the Book of Revelation and the culmination of anti-christ; and he gave the word "Come out of her, my people." That same day in another hall in Boston a friend of mine heard another preacher, having no connection with the one already mentioned, declare the same thing. Both, these were des out men of God and cited the Book of Revelation as the source of their information on that subject. This is only another token that that movement for church federation is one of the greatest issues now before the world, and that God is finding voices who will proclaim the truth from His Word on that subject.

Sunday, April 28, I again addressed a large assembly in Berkeley Hall on "Church Federation" and what it means to this nation and to the world. There, too, the assembly was so interested that by unanimous rising vote they expressed their appreciation of the truth presented and their invitation that I should come and speak to them again.

I left Boston Sunday night, April 28, and arrived at home in Battle Creek, Tuesday night, April 30; thus closing an absence of ten weeks of blessed opportunities to proclaim the truth for this time to those who had not heard it and ready to take up again the regular work in the Sanitarium to the same purpose as the work done In The Field.  
ALONZO T. JONES.

**May 29, 1907**

**"The Right of Individuality and of Conscience" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 22 , pp. 170, 171.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the preeceding [*sic.*] article we studied the principles and the practice of the Church as illustrated in the Scripture instance of Diotrephes and the historical development of Diotrephes's procedure in the making of the papacy.

There is another phase of that scripture account of Diotrephes that should be noticed. That is, the case as it relates to the membership of the Church, the domination of which was seized by Diotrephes. And that this may be studied to the best advantage, we set down here again the verses of Scripture that tell it: -

"I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church." John 9, 10.

From the plain scripture record it is evident that not all of the members of that Church disregarded the arrogance and commands of Diotrephes. It is evident that some and apparently the majority, did yield to the will of Diotrephes. For if the whole church had disregarded his will and commands, it could not be said that he cast them out of the church; and even if the majority had disregarded him, it could then hardly be said that he "casteth them out of the church" for that would be, in effect, casting out the church itself, and not the casting of certain ones out of the church. Therefore, by the text, it seems that the majority of the church submitted to the arrogance and commands of Diotrephes. Yet it is perfectly plain that there were some who would not submit to this, but did disregard it; and to the extent that they were cast out of the church by him. And they were willing to be cast out of the church by him, rather than to submit to him in the position and authority which he had assumed.

Now it stands on the very face of the whole narrative that Diotrephes was wholly wrong.

1. He loved to "have the preeminence among them;" which, as we have seen, was at once to put himself in the place and position of Christ.

2. He refused to allow the Word of Christ through His apostle to come to the church.

3. He prated against the apostle "with malicious words."
4. He refused to receive Christian brethren.
5. He assumed authority to command Christ's servants and forbid them to receive other Christian brethren.
6. And when some disregarded his assumption, he cast them out of the church.

In every one of these things Diotrephes was wrong; and those who refused to recognize or submit to him in those things, were in the right and did right.

All this is plain. Therefore it is equally plain that those members of the church that submitted to Diotrephes in the course which he took, did wrong and committed themselves to the wrong thing. And in addition to this, by so doing - they put their endorsement upon the course of Diotrephes as the right thing and thus encouraged and supported him in that wrong course.

The issue that was there made by Diotrephes was the straight and plain issue of whether the brethren of the church should be loyal to Christ or loyal to Diotrephes. It was the straight and plain issue that for any member of that Church to be loyal to Christ was to be openly disloyal to Diotrephes; and to be loyal to Diotrephes was to be openly disloyal to Christ. And further the issue was so clear that even to submit to Diotrephes, not out of chosen loyalty, but only from policy, this itself was disloyalty to Christ.

But those who were loyal to Christ were by Diotrephes cast out of the church. Yet since these were loyal to Christ, when they were cast out of the church that was dominated by Diotrephes they were not by any means nor in any sense out of the Church of Christ - they were only out of the Church of Diotrephes. And to be out of that church was a good deal better than to be in it. And those who were out of it were a good deal better off than were those who were in it. Since by Diotrephes's procedure that church could be composed only of those who were submissive to him, for all others must be cast out; and since his whole position and course was anti-christian, then that church was plainly a church of anti-christ instead of a church of Christ, and the only true place for Christians was outside of it. And indeed, Christians could not be in it for he cast them out.

By the fact that some submitted to Diotrephes while others would not, it is perfectly plain that there was division in that church. But who made the division? Beyond question a breach was made in the church. But who was responsible for that breach? Can it be laid to the charge of those who were in the right, who did the right thing, and who were loyal to Christ?

*NO:* the division, the breach, - the whole difficulty from beginning to end - was caused wholly by Diotrephes himself. He had assumed - usurped - position and authority that in no wise belonged to him, but only to Christ. Then in that position he chose to pursue a course that was the opposite of all the whole Spirit, and Word, and way, of Christ. Then when some would not consent nor submit to this, he would not permit any such thing as any right of dissent from his will and dictation; he would not recognize any such thing as the relationship and allegiance of the individual person *to Christ direct*; he would not allow any right of individual conscience and choice; all of which belongs by divine right forever to

every Christian everywhere; yet none of this whatever would Diotrephes allow - he cast them out of the Church.

Diotrephes, therefore, and Diotrephes alone, was wholly responsible for the division and breach that was in that church. He made the division, he made the breach, himself alone.

171

No Christian can ever be rightly charged with any responsibility for any division, or breach, or difficulty of any kind whatever, that arises because of his being a Christian, or because of his acting on Christian principle, or because of his standing loyal to Christ above all.

Ah! and just here there was raised that subtle [*sic.*] and arrogant - that Diotrephesian - question: Who shall decide just when and whether the individual church member is acting really on Christian principle, and is in reality standing loyal to Christ? Might he not mistake just what is Christian principle? and just what is loyalty to Christ? Therefore, should not he allow in favor of Diotrephes, *the official*, the weight of authority, safety, and certainty?

But the official himself is only an individual; and that would be nothing else than one individual; - Diotrephes, deciding for another individual - the private church member. It would also be nothing else than one individual's *consenting* that another individual should decide for him. And *that* would be nothing else than the one individual's surrendering to the other individual, his own individuality, so that that other individual would then be deciding for both *himself* and *the other*. But what guaranty would there be that Diotrephes could decide for himself *and* the other man, any more safely or certainly than the other man could decide for *himself*. Any such guaranty could be only because of his being an *official* and occupying a *position*. The guaranty, then, would attach *not* to the individual - Diotrephes - but to the *office*, to the *position*, to the *chair!* And there you have the whole principle of papal infallibility in an instant.

Again: the official is himself only an individual. And if the individual *church-member* is not capable of deciding for himself, then is not the individual *official* equally incapable of deciding for *himself* - even as an official? If the individual church-member must have the individual official to decide for him, then who shall decide for the individual official? Must there not be some higher and more official official to decide for this one? and so on back - - - how far? Yet somewhere in that course you must come at last to the *farthest one back*: to the highest possible and most official *of all officials*, who decides for *himself and* the other man. But wherever this limit shall be set, and this final official found, when he *is* found, he is found to be nothing else than simply an individual, and an individual *deciding for himself*.

Thus in this Diotrephesian course, there is no escape from finally an *individual* who decides for *himself*. And with this, there is no escape from the danger and possibility of that individual's mistaking just what is Christian principle and exactly what is loyalty to Christ. But that is only where you started. And there stands the original question, How can there be any more safety and certainty in one individual's deciding for *himself and the other man too*, than in the other man's deciding for himself; especially when the *one* has to decide for himself

anyhow? And when you land *at last* where the individual of your own choosing does *decide for himself*, why not accept the truth and principle of the thing, and land there *at first*, and recognize freely before God, and as from God, the divine right of individuality and of conscience everywhere and always?

But it may be asked, Does it not equally involve the claim of infallibility - the infallibility of the private individual, when the private individual claims the right and the capability of deciding for himself in disregard of the will and command of Diotrephes? - Not at all. Because the private individual is not depending upon any figment of office or position, nor is he even depending upon *himself*, to decide it; *but* upon *the Holy Spirit* and the promise of Christ that the Spirit *will guide him* into all truth. And the infallibility is in *the Holy Spirit* where it justly and only belongs.

Still the query may be raised, Might he not mistake even the way of the Spirit? Yes, even that is possible. But still *beyond that* he has ever the sure promise of Christ that the Holy Spirit "*Will guide you into all truth.*" That is to say, the Holy Spirit is able to guide a man even out of his mistakes as to the guidance of the Spirit. And *He will do this* for every one who trusts him; for He is divine, and there alone is infallibility. And the divine Spirit of promise is infinitely more capable of showing to a man his mistake, and of guiding him out of it, than ten thousand Diotrefeses could possibly be.

It comes, then, simply to this, that the Holy Spirit is the sole source of appeal and of judgment among Christians. And whosoever among Christians takes upon him to judge or to decide for another, usurps the place of the Holy Spirit, and asserts for himself the divine prerogative of infallibility.

Therefore, in all matters of difference between individual Christians, even though it be between a "preeminent" official and a private member of the church, there must be recognized the right of individuality and of conscience before God; each and all must, in the fear and honor of God, bow to that right of individuality and conscience; and in brotherly love and mutual forbearance, each commit the other and the whole matter *to the Holy Spirit*, trusting His infallible guidance, judgment, and decision. Thus there will ever be maintained, "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;" for "*He will guide you into all truth.*"

All this will always be perfectly plain and easy to every Christian, to every one who will honor the Holy Spirit in the place that is His in the Church. But to Diotrephes, *never*: Diotrephes must have "the preeminence;" Diotrephes must go beyond his office; Diotrephes must usurp authority; Diotrephes must ascend the throne; Diotrephes must take the seat of judgment and decision; Diotrephes must pronounce the decree; and to all this all must bow or be cast out of the church.

*And there is no middle ground.* Everywhere, always, and with all in the church, it is the Holy Spirit or Diotrephes; in other words, Christianity or the Papacy.

**June 12, 1907**

**"The Baptists and Church Federation" *The Medical Missionary* 16,  
24 , p. 187.**

ALONZO T. JONES

AND this indicates the difference in other points. In the Christian order, Christian work is done by individual Christians; each one of whom is led to the work and fitted for it by the Holy Spirit. In the federation system the work is done by those who are called and sent and managed and controlled by a sheer officialdom, through executive boards, the members of the officialdom connected with "missionary" work solely because they occupy an official position, and they hold official position more because of manipulation of ecclesiastical politics and machinery than from any missionary spirit or zeal.

In the discussion of this Report in the Baptist Ministers' Conference, it was well said that "Not every 'merger' is beneficial to its promoters or its stockholders. The forced organic union of our three societies into one mammoth organization would, in our view, be immediately disastrous. The interests they represent are too vast, too diversified, too complex to allow it."

In this connection also, in the discussion, the question was asked, "How are we going to bring this [already existing missionary] Northern Baptist Convention, unless its members wish to come?" Upon Christian ground and with respect to the individuality and conscience of Christians, that would be a very proper inquiry. But in the presence of "federation" and "confederation" the question is merely academic rather than practical. For as to the point itself the "leadership" of the "strong federation" can very easily make that matter all plain; this leadership can simply issue its commands to the Society that it "come under" the administration of the "strong confederation." And if the Society choose not to do this, then the leadership of the "strong confederation," conscious of its power, can totally ignore the Society and "organize" a new Society adapted to the confederation; and then, by all the power and influence of the "strong confederation" systematically undermine the original society, destroy its credit and its work, and crush it out of all efficiency, if not actually out of existence.

Further, upon the supposition that the society should decide to accept the merger with the "strong confederation," in the discussion it was remarked: "If they vote to take that action, no bare majority vote will be effective - a merger on the basis of a bare majority vote would be a fatal blow to our whole foreign missionary work."

Upon Christian principles such alternative as that might be counted worthy of consideration; but as against the successful administration of a "strong confederation," any such result would be held as of very minor importance. For, with the policy of a "strong confederation" firmly fixed, the success of that policy would take precedence of all other questions or considerations of every kind; and the leadership of that "strong confederation" would push recklessly forward, making it more and more manifest that whosoever would not come under must get out, and that, whether a society or an individual person, whosoever would not

conform to the policy of the administration of the "strong confederation" and thus be recognized as *of the confederation*, would be counted as no longer of the Baptist *denomination* and not entitled even to the name of Baptist.

Of course this procedure would roughly sweep aside considerations of Christian unity; and would supplant it with a machine unity, a confederation unity, a unity of human domination. Also, of course, such procedure would cause division and a breach in the Baptist ranks; because in the nature of the case all who would be Christians in loyalty *to Christ* in his place as head of the church, would refuse to come under such domination.

But, it may be said, such a thing as that would not be Christian. True enough; but it would be "a strong confederation." The wrecking of any efficient missionary society and the ruthless spreading of confusion and suspicion amongst the Baptist churches throughout the world would be a very small matter as compared to the triumph of the "strong confederation." The "wreckage strewn along the way" would be considered by the "leadership" of the "strong confederation" as only the greater evidence of the essential value and efficiency of the "strong confederation." And this is all sufficient to demonstrate just what lies in scripture and on the face of the thing itself, that federation and confederation is simply anti-Christian.

*(To be continued.)*

**June 19, 1907**

**"The Baptists and Church Federation" *The Medical Missionary* 16,  
25 , pp. 195, 196.**

ALONZO T. JONES

*(Concluded).*

AS already indicated this report and movement for federation and confederation is not finding altogether smooth sailing in the meeting of the Baptist ministers of Boston and vicinity. Opposition to it is strong, and it is able. And it is the stronger and the more able, because it is scriptural, and plants itself firmly upon the scripture ground. Illustration of this is found in the words and citations of a paper in opposition to it that was read before the Boston Baptist Ministers' Conference, April 22, 1907, by Prof. George E. Horr, D. D., as follows: -

"Baptists have in general strenuously contended that the single Christian congregation has no earthly ecclesiastical organization above it. They have recognized the right, the privilege, and the duty, of cooperation among these several independent churches. But they have no right, and would regard it as no privilege, to come together, and by their cooperation. Form the Baptist Church of the United States; or the British Baptist Church, in case the independent churches of our views in Great Britain should so combine. Baptists have protested loudly and sternly, and contended

even to the death, against the right of any council or association, meeting in the name of the churches, to lord it over their discipline or doctrine.

"Is there, then, no cooperation possible among them? Much and most effective cooperation, we answer, long as Christ and the Holy Spirit inhabit these several churches, and by such inhabitation give them the necessary unity and mutual love. Without that Spirit they are, and it is safer that they should remain, a rope of sand. But when pervaded by that divine and assimilating love, the sand is molten into a sea of glass. Their cohesion depends upon their piety.

"The perpetual immanence and intercession of the Holy Ghost in the hearts and assemblies of a devout church - this is the breath of our nostrils as to our Spiritual life and well-being, and this is the patent of our indefectibility and invincibility. Soon as the Spirit is grieved and goes forth our polity is such that the process of ecclesiastical disintegration at once commences. When the breath or earthly spirit goes out of a man, his body rots, and the members fall apart. When the fruit becomes decayed, its skin no longer holds the pulp, but it loses shape and solidity and cohesion. So it is with the polity of the New Testament churches. As long as they remain spiritual and prayerful, our churches with Christ in their hearts and Christ in their assemblies, have, on our system, energy, and elasticity, and boundless enterprise, and yet perfect union. But when piety dies, the unity and power disappear, as they ought of right to do; for unity without piety makes the church a curse to the world. Other systems hold the ecclesiastical continuity and organization unbroken, when the Spirit and inward life has vanished. They galvanize the corpse of a Christian church into ghastly and murderous activity, after the breath of the divine life has quitted it. . . .

"Our churches cannot *give* legislative power, because they have it not; and councils or voluntary societies have therefore no right to *take* legislative power as a gift from the churches, even should the churches assume to make such a gift. But forgetting that the legislation of the church was settled and closed centuries since, looking at the democratic side of the church organization in the voluntary character of its membership, and overlooking the regal side of that organization in the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ; then, on this false assumption that the church is, merely and purely, a democracy, building the inference, that, like any other democracy, it should make and mend its own laws; on these false premises building still another false assumption, that the several independent democracies of the various separate churches may come together, by their representatives, and make one conjoint democratic confederacy, which shall legislate for its constituent churches, and yet another false assumption, that the messenger or delegate of the

primitive churches was what we call a representative, sent to similar confederacies - thus, we say, heaping baseless assumptions one on another, good men, loving freedom and Scripture, build up a system which is neither friendly to Scriptural truth nor practical freedom.

"When the system of literal and proper representation was introduced into the early Christian churches, it began with those of Greece, and was a reminiscence of their old republics and Amphictyonic Councils. In the early and middle ages of the Roman pontiffs, these representative bodies, the church synods, favored political liberty, against the despotism of emperors, and against a stern and bloody feudalism. But they, from an early period subverted *religious* liberty, by consolidating ecclesiastical power. A central despotism thus sprung up, before which the haughtiest of earthly monarchs grew pale, in the core of which sate [*sic.*] Antichrist fully formed, and over the throne of whose guilty and impious arrogance the Apocalypse has rolled its heaviest thunders and is pouring out vials of wrath not yet emptied to their last dregs. Representation, in the popular sense, however necessary in the *State* to political liberty, is in the *Christian Church* unwarranted and anti-Christian; because it legislates itself into Christ's seat, and revises his statute-book, and enslaves his freemen."

Therefore "we have no right to admit the dangerous principle of church representation. If representation does not necessarily result in legislation, it slopes toward it as the ways of a ship soon to be launched." . . .

"Now if our churches, in claiming the representative principle, mean what their words mean, and we fear that many from heedlessness do mean just this, they have already passed the Rubicon, and their fancied democracy has taken the first and decisive step in the way to Rome. It wants but time and development and the heart's treachery and Satan's vigilant activity, to bring in all the rest - the crosier, the canon, the

tiara, and the pontiff - infallibility, and despotism and anti-Christ."

"The further you go in this matter, the more thoroughly you will be convinced that the reluctance of Baptists to form 'a representative delegated body' is deep and inveterate. The spirit that found consummate expression in the eloquent report of Dr. William R. Williams in 1848 is alive in the denomination. Thousands of Baptists do not join in the cry 'Make us a king like all the nations.' They believe that even a Saul and a David may be a mistake.

"This conviction strikes deep into the past. It manifests itself unmistakably in our historic confessions. It has been normative in our genius and spirit as Baptists. . . .

"Let me close this address by quoting a sentence from the report of 1848 to which I have referred: -

"The vital missionary agency is happily beyond our control and above our reach. The helm is not given to our weak and mortal hands. The Pilot who points the prow and watches the heavens to guide our missionary way, is older than the stars, and than the keel of the missionary church that He guides; for He is the Ancient of Days, and His goings forth have been from everlasting."

Now who can say, yea, who can have the mind or heart to say, that this opposition of the Baptists to federation and confederation among themselves is not perfectly right and soundly Christian? Yet, whatever any person may or might choose to say or to think of it, it still stands, and will forever stand, as eternally right and perfectly Christian.

But this movement for "federation" and "strong confederation" among the Baptists is only a part of the general, and soon to be universal, movement for national, international, and world federation and "strong confederation." It well illustrates just what church federation and confederation means. Indeed, this is proposed to the Baptists, primarily that, as a *denomination*, they may be fitted to become a part of the great general movement to swing the world into federation and under the "leadership" of "a strong confederation." Therefore, the opposition of Baptists to federation and confederation *among themselves*, is in principle and in substance the sound Christian example of what must be the opposition to federation and confederation everywhere.

It may indeed be all true that, as the first paragraph of the revised report says, the "failure to attain the highest denominational effectiveness" makes manifest the need of something definite "to secure it." But it is eternally certain that no "policy" of any kind whatever, can ever secure it. The only possible means by which at any time any lack of denominational effectiveness among the Baptists, or anywhere else, can ever be remedied is by the *principle* - never "policy" - of seeking most devotedly for the baptism of the Holy Spirit. And now when the "failure to attain the highest denominational effectiveness" is so universal, and there is such a universal attempt to remedy the failure by resort to the definite and pernicious "policy" of federation and "strong confederation," *just now*, as never before, it is imperative that this failure shall be sought to be remedied only by nothing else than a very Pentecostal receiving of the Holy Spirit.

Therefore, just now and henceforth the living issue with every Baptist, and not only every Baptist, but also every Christian, is, whether he will seek the Holy Spirit or federation. And not only with every Christian, but with every *soul*, just now and henceforth the living issue is whether he will receive the Holy Spirit, or the spirit of federation; whether he will recognize the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit, or the sovereignty of a "strong confederation"; whether he will have the liberty of the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit, or the slavery of the domination of the "leadership" of "a strong confederation."

And there is no middle ground. For federation and confederation is sweeping the world like a flood; and it will *force itself upon* the decision of every soul. And now that this enemy is coming in like a flood to carry away the world to

destruction - *just now* the Spirit of the Lord lifts up the standard against him, to lead to eternal salvation every soul who will receive Him and be led by Him.

To receive federation means only man's domination, and this by force. To receive the Holy Spirit means only God's sovereignty, and this by love, and *in* this the *liberty* of love, and the love of *liberty*.

**June 26, 1907**

**"The Catholic Church" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 26 , pp. 204, 205.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

THE word "Catholic" signifies "general, universal;" literally, "according to the whole." In the common or King James version of the Scriptures, the epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude are entitled "The *General* Epistle of James," "The First Epistle *General* of Peter" or of John, "The *General* Epistle of Jude." In some versions these titles read, "The *Catholic* Epistle of James," "The First Epistle *Catholic* of Peter," or of John, "The *Catholic* Epistle of Jude."

In the New Testament and in the divine order of the Christian church, each separate congregation of Christians is designated as a church - the "church at Antioch," "the church which is at Cenchrea," etc.

When these separate congregations are referred to collectively, it is in the terms, "the churches of the Gentiles," "the churches of Galatia," "churches of the saints," "the Spirit saith unto the churches," etc.

When all Christians universally are referred to, it is in the terms "the Church of Christ," "the Church of God," "the Church which is His body," "gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church." This is the Church "*according to the whole*," the "*general, universal*" Church, and therefore the *catholic* Church. This is the true *catholic* Church. It is this catholic Church, this Church "according to the whole," that is referred to in the words of the "Apostles' Creed" - "I believe in the holy catholic Church." Every Christian does believe in this general, this universal, this *catholic*, Church; this Church "according to the whole."

In the earliest times of Christianity, this true meaning of the word "catholic" was everywhere recognized, and the catholic Church was in truth held to be only the whole body of Christians in the world. And this continued so long as all Christians remained only *brethren* and therefore *equal*, and *all one* in Christ Jesus, with Christ himself the only Master and superior. But just as soon as self-exaltation and exclusiveness entered in, all of this beautiful sense and application of the word "catholic" was thrown away. The whole original thought of the word was perverted, and it was made to apply in only a narrow and exclusive sense to a sect or self-exalted division that *called itself* "the Church."

In the churches, there were elders and deacons. These were at first, and in the Christian Church are always, chosen as the *servants* of the churches; not their lords nor their masters. "Those who are regarded as rulers of the heathen, as you know, lord it over them, and their great men are their masters. But among

you it *must not be so*. On the contrary, whoever wishes to become great among you, must be your *servant*, and whoever wishes to take a first place among you must be at *the call of every one*; for even the Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many." Mark 10:42-45; Math. 20:25-27, 20th Century Version.

Only condemnation attaches to any kind of mastership, except only that of Christ. "Be not many masters, knowing that ye shall receive the greater condemnation." Since *many* masters mean only the *greater* condemnation, then any masters at all means only condemnation. Therefore, "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in Heaven. Neither be ye called masters, for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant."

In the Scriptures the terms "elder" and "bishop" invariably designate the same person in the church. The word "elder" signifies primarily an older person; while "bishop" signifies an "overseer," a "lookout." And these are distinctly instructed that, while they are over-seers, they are not to think that they are over-lords or over-rulers. Acts 20:28; 1 Peter 5:1-3, with margin.

Yet, very soon, there were of the elders those of whom Diotrephes is the illustration, who loved to have "the preeminence among them." These asserted a distinction between bishops and elders or presbyters; and claimed for themselves *only*, the title of "*bishop*," as the "*superior*," while the others, as inferior, were entitled only to the designation of presbyter. And the presbyters were, of course, "superior" to the deacons.

The bishops then assumed over the presbyters a superiority and an authority that never belonged to them. The presbyters, in turn, assumed over the deacons superiority and authority that never belonged to them. And all three of these "orders" together - bishops presbyters, and deacons - assumed a superiority and exercised an authority that never belonged to them, over *the people*; and asserted for themselves the distinction of "the clergy," while the general membership of the church were only "the *laity*." As a matter of course for this no justification could be found in the Christian order. Therefore, recourse was had to the Mosaic order. Then these three "orders" of the "clergy" also claimed that they in the Christian Church were the legitimate successors of the high priest, the priests and the Levites of the Levitical law. With this also there was indulged a splendor of dress and function analogous to that of the sanctuary service under Levitical law, while the air of superiority and the exercise of authority that was indulged was always in the spirit of a *Roman magistrate*, instead of that of the Christian *ministry*.

From this point it was an easy step to the arrogance that demanded that "we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord himself;" and that asserted that "the Church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers." And further, "Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the Church and the church in the bishop; and if any one is *not with the bishop*, that he is *not in the church*."

Thus by these bishops and their "clergy" there was built up an hierarchical system which *they* called "the Church." To this thing they confined the term "catholic" and then insisted that *this* was the catholic Church, and denied to all others any right even to the *name* of Christian, and much more of *Catholic* Christians.

Also, as Diotrefes at the first, these *over-lords*, in their overbearing despotism, issued commands and made demands that were not only unchristian, but anti-christian; commands which no Christian could obey, and demands to which no Christian could conform - and remain a Christian. All such disobedience was denounced as heresy and schism, and these Christians were cast out of the church.

However, it is worthy of note that the overlording ones were compelled to acknowledge that those Christians were not cast out because of any disrespect or disobedience *to Christ* or to His word, but only to the usurping and overbearing bishopric. They publicly declared, and it has stood for all time, that "Neither have heresies arisen, nor have schisms originated, *from any other source than this*, that God's priest is *not obeyed*: . . . whom if . . . the *whole* fraternity *should obey* . . . *no one would rend the Church by a division* of the unity of Christ."

The "unity" of this man-made and heathen system called "the church," was thus made to be of more importance

206

than either truth or righteousness, or than even Christian character. No room was now allowed for any question as to *what* any one taught, or what was his Christian character, "so long as he teaches out of the pale of unity." In this way the very truth of Christ was made to be heresy; and the truest Christians were made to be heretics and schismatics in order to maintain a factitious, outward, and enforced "unity."

Then, as they had made the "unity" of this anti-Christian thing to be of more importance than truth or righteousness or Christian character, and when this "unity" had become perfected, it followed naturally enough that truth and righteousness and Christian character should all be made to spring from, and to be the consequence of, this "unity." And so the ultimatum was announced -

(*To be Concluded.*)

**July 3, 1907**

**"The Catholic Church" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 27 , pp. 211, 212.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

(*Concluded*)

AND so the ultimatum was announced -

"It is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church - those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, *together with the succession of the*

*episcopate*, have received the *certain gift of truth* according to the good pleasure of the father." "Since, however, it would be very tedious in such a volume as this to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vain glory, or by blindness, or perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings: (We do this, I say) by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, and universally known church founded and *organized at Rome* by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of *the succession of the bishops*. For it is a matter of *necessity* that *every church* should *agree with this church*, on account of its *preeminent authority*. . . . Since, therefore, we have such proofs, it is *not necessary* to seek the truth among others which it is easy to obtain from the church; since the apostles, like a rich man depositing his money in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously *all things* pertaining to *the truth*, so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For *she* is the *entrance to life*; all others are thieves and robbers."

And since nothing could be recognized or accepted as the truth except as it came from Rome, it next followed that *whatever came from Rome was truth* in itself, and *must be accepted* as the truth without any kind of question. Also no one could be righteous except in the garb of Rome. And whether or not any one's character was Christian was made to depend upon *Rome's* recognition and recommendation.

There was thus built up a narrow, partisan, and exclusive system to which was arrogated the idea and the title of the Church "according to the whole," and therefore, "the catholic Church" and "the body of Christ." Then when, in the progress of this federate and confederate episcopal system, the development had spread over the Roman world and had culminated in one bishop at the great center, as the recognized as well as the asserted head of this body, he naturally enough was head of "the catholic Church," head of the "body of Christ," and therefore "vicar of Christ" or "viceregent of the Son of God," the fountain of faith and of the truth, and therefore infallible.

Thus in the place of the *true* Church "according to the whole," in place of the true Church of Christ which is his body, in place of that divine and spiritual Church which is composed of all true Christians who are known to Christ as his, and which is the fulness of him that filleth all in all, and whose unity is the unity of the Holy Spirit - in the place of this true, and truly holy, catholic Church, there was set up an arrogant, hierarchical and anti-christian *machine*, despotic to all who were in it, and persecuting to all who would not be of it; "organized" and conducted only by men; and refusing the name of Christian to all who were not of the machine. And this counterfeit, this fraud, this narrow sectarian thing, they crowded upon the world, and passed it off as the true catholic Church, the true church "according to the whole."

Then when, at the close of the Diocletian persecution, and under an imperial edict applying to "the whole body of Christians" alike, without distinction, this centralized system would gain possession of all the church property in the Roman empire, the project was made successful by the gaining of *imperial recognition* for this narrow, partisan, and exclusive sect or division, as the catholic church.

As stated, the imperial edict was made in behalf of "the whole body of Christians" alike, without distinction; and the edict directed that the church property that had been confiscated should "be restored to *these same* Christians." But this narrow, partisan, and bogus "catholic Church" launched the claim that all who were out of the pale of *her* "unity" were not Christians, were not entitled to the name of Christian, and therefore could not be beneficiaries under the edict.

When the question came to the emperor - Constantine - for decision, he sustained the contention, and in a new edict declared that "those things belonging to the *catholic church* of the Christians . . . *these* thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to *their* churches . . . since we have previously determined that whatsoever *these same churches* before possessed, shall be restored to their right."

Presently Constantine carried this a step further, in an edict, in these words: "I show such regard for *the holy catholic church* that I wish you, upon the whole, to leave no room for schism or division."

There was one more step to be taken to raise this thing to the pinnacle. This step was taken, also by Constantine, in an edict in which he used the following words: "We have determined that in all the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania, something should be granted to certain ministers of *the legitimate and most holy catholic religion* to defray their expenses. . . . And as I ascertained that some men, who are of no settled mind, wished to divert the people from the *most holy catholic Church* by a certain pernicious adulteration, I wish thee to understand that I have given both to the proconsul Anulinus and to Patricius, vicar-general of the prefects the following injunctions: That, among all the rest, they should *particularly* pay the *necessary attention* to this, nor should by *any means tolerate* that this should be overlooked."

And that, in brief, is the story of how arose "the Catholic Church" of history; that awful thing that has made the blackest record that has ever been made in all the history of this world. And the whole philosophy of that darkest record lies simply in the fact that a human system of government, wholly of the nat-

ural world, was adopted as the order of things for the Church and in the spiritual world. The papacy was not the worst thing in the world because the men who composed it were the worst men in the world; for they were always only the same sort of men as were everywhere in the world. The papacy was always the worst thing in the world only because the same natural men as of the world everywhere, carried their natural dispositions and natural ways, and the ways and things of *this world*, into the realm of the spirit, and would make all these to be the things of the spiritual world.

Every form of government ever of this world tends only to monarchy and despotism, because the dispositions of men who are only of this world are essentially monarchical and despotic. Carrying the dispositions and the things of this world into the spiritual world and making these things to be the things of the spiritual world, does not change these dispositions or these things; it only intensifies the evil effects of the things themselves that are already essentially evil. This is why it is that the papacy, being composed only of human beings like all others of this world, yet proves worse than all other in the world. And every system of church order that partakes in any way of any of these elements will be in the *likeness of the papacy*, just so far as it goes in that direction.

Natural things for the natural world only, and spiritual things only for the spiritual world. This is the law of eternal consistency.

The Christian church is spiritual. It is the body of Christ, and that body is wholly spiritual. The realm of the Christian Church is only that of spirit - the Spirit of God, and the spirit of man. Whosoever is of this Church is so only because of his having been born of the Spirit. The law of this church is only "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" as in the Word of the Lord which is spirit and which is life. The administration of this church is only the administration of the Lord who is Spirit. The kingdom to which alone that Church belongs is only the kingdom of God, and is spiritual. And only those who are spiritual can possibly know this Church which is of *this* kingdom. For "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." And "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Yea, more. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." This alone is the true catholic Church.

Therefore, the true catholic Church is, still, and is forever, just what it was in New Testament times. It is the Christian Church "according to the whole." It is composed of those anywhere and everywhere who belong to Christ in deed and in truth, by personal choice and personal faith; for "in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." It is the "church of the first born which are written in heaven." It is the Church which is His body. It is the Church, every member of which is a member of Christ himself. It is the Church of which Christ alone is the head, the builder, the organizer, and of which his own Spirit is the life and the power, the Sovereign, and the Guide. This alone is the true catholic Church, the true Church "according to the whole."

**July 24, 1907**

**"Authority of the Church?" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 30 , pp. 235, 236.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE great historian of the Reformation, writing of the famous *protest* from which comes the word Protestant - the protest of the Reformers that was made at Spires - says: -

"This protest opposes two abuses of man in matters of faith: the *first* is the intrusion of the civil magistrate; and the *second*, the arbitrary authority of the Church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate; and the authority of the Word of God above the visible Church."

The first abuse in matters of faith, here mentioned - "the intrusion of the civil magistrate" - has been thoroughly discussed through all the subsequent times, so that the principle involved is generally well understood.

But the second abuse here mentioned - "the arbitrary authority of the Church" - has not been nearly so much discussed, is not nearly so well understood, and is far less recognized.

The reason for this difference in the discussion and the understanding of these two abuses is that, whereas all denominations, in turn and together, have always been ready to discuss and oppose the first of these abuses, no *denomination*, as such, has ever been willing to discuss the second abuse; because each denomination in turn, and all together, has always been ready to exercise and enjoy this very abuse. Therefore the discussion of this has always fallen to individual persons, who, in the very doing of it, were distinguished and denounced as "heretics, schismatics," etc., etc. Then when the "heresy" had proved successful and had gained a standing - in short, had developed a denomination - it in turn fell into the same old train, and asserted and exercised arbitrary authority, instead of any longer discussing and disputing it.

It is therefore perfectly proper, and always timely, to discuss this great abuse in matters of faith, - the arbitrary authority of the Church; for no greater nor more lasting abuse has ever been inflicted upon the world.

In order to study this intelligently, let us first understand the terms: -

The word "authority" is defined as "the right to command and to enforce obedience; the right to act by virtue of office, station, or relation."

The word "arbitrary" means "not regulated by fixed rule or law; subject to individual will or judgment; exercised according to one's will or caprice."

The synonyms of the word "arbitrary" are: "Capricious, unlimited, irresponsible, uncontrolled, tyrannical, domineering, imperious, despotic, absolute in power."

246

First as to authority itself: What "authority," what "right to command and enforce obedience," has the Church? Is the series of God's commands left unfinished in his word, and has the Church "authority" to complete it? Is God's revelation as in his Word incomplete, and has the Church "authority" to perfect it? (Rev. 22:18, 19.) In short, Is Christianity a religion of the Word of God, the Bible, only? Or is it a religion of the Bible *and tradition*? Is it of Christ alone or is it of Christ *and the Church*? That is to say, Is it of Christ or is it of the papacy?

All of this is clearly and abundantly answered in the Scriptures. And in the answer the first item is that by the Lord Jesus himself the Church is positively

forbidden any exercise of authority. Here are the words: "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercised dominion over them, and they that are great *exercise authority* upon them. *But it shall not be so among you.*" Matt. 20:25, 26.

Now when "authority" is "the right to command," and when the Church is thus by Christ positively forbidden any exercise of authority, then it stands fixed plainly by the Word of God that the Church is forbidden by Christ all exercise of any right to command or to act by virtue of office, station, or relation.

The reason for this is equally plain: "It shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. 20:26-28.

The Church is not in the world to *rule*, but to *minister*: not to *command* but to *serve*: even as her divine Lord came into the world not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and this to the extent of giving his very life that men might be ransomed from the thralldom of sin.

It is not in the province of the Church to exercise authority "by virtue of any office, station, or relation;" because the office, station and relation of the Church is only that of servant.

It is never in the province of a servant to reign - so long as he is in the place and position of a servant. And the place and position of servant is exactly that of the children of God and disciples of Christ - who compose the Church - so long as they are in this world. Free, and freely chosen, service, loving service, it is true; but none the less it is *service*: "Ye have been called unto liberty, only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh: but by love *serve* one another." "Through love *be servants* one to another." R.V. Gal. 5:13.

It is not only utterly incongruous therefore, but actually mischievous, for a servant to assume to rule, to command, - to exercise authority. For of the "three things" on account of which "the earth is disquieted," and of the "*four which it can not bear*," the very *first* is "a servant when he reigneth." (Proverbs 30:21, 22). And hasn't the history of the Church from Diotrephes to this day, demonstrated this divine truth in most wearisome detail? For in all the history of the world what has more disquieted the earth, and what has been harder for it to bear, than the reign of the church, wherever and just to the extent that her reign has been asserted?

Again, under the Word of God, there is no "fixed rule or law" for the exercise of authority either in or by the Church, nor is there any room for her to act by virtue of office, station, or relation, because in the Church of Christ *all are equal*; there are no masters, nor is there place for any. "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. . . . Neither be ye called Masters; for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." (Matt. 23:8-12). Therefore, "who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth." Rom. 14:4.

In the presence and under the Word of Christ, the one Commander, what authority has one Christian to command, or to legislate for, another? Absolutely none whatever. And when no one Christian has any authority whatever to command, or to legislate, for another, then what possible authority can any *number* of these have to command or legislate for another?

Of Christ it is written, "Behold I have given Him for a witness to the people, a Leader and Commander to the people." (Isa. 55:4). Christ is "the Head of the Church, which is his body." In *the head*, not in the the [sic.] body, is the place of intelligence, judgment, and will. It is in *the Head*, not in the body, which is the Church, where is the seat of authority, and it is the Head, not the body, who issues commands in the things of religion.

Again, Christ is "the mighty God," the supreme king and the sole sovereign, in and to the Church, and in and over "all things to the Church." On the other hand "the Church *is subject* unto Christ . . . in all things." (Eph. 5:24). The Church, then, is subject, not *sovereign*. It is hers to *obey*, not to *command*: to obey *Christ*, not to command *men*.

By the plain word of Christ, then, as well as by the situation and relation of the Church itself, the Church is specifically forbidden to exercise authority, - forbidden to exercise any right to command. It therefore follows that any exercise of dominion, or of authority, by the Church, upon or over anybody, is in itself "*arbitrary* authority." For, as we have seen, "arbitrary" is "not regulated by fixed rule or law; subject to individual will or judgment." And when there is not only neither fixed rule nor law regulating the exercise of authority by the Church, but there is the positive prohibition of it, then any exercise of authority by the church is absolutely without any fixed rule or law from the Lord, and therefore can be only the assertion of authority by the will or caprice or at the instance of some individual or collection of individuals, and so is arbitrary only.

**July 31, 1907**

**"Authority of the Church" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 31 , pp. 243, 244.**

ALONZO T. JONES

LAST week we discussed the question of authority *of* the church.

While there is no such thing as any authority *of* any church, there is authority *in* the Church *of Christ*. This authority is in Christ's Church because he, by his divine Spirit, is in his Church. The authority *in* the Church, therefore, is the authority of the living God, in the living Christ, by the living Spirit, through the living Word of Truth.

"All authority is given unto Me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations. . . . And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "In Whom ye also are builded together for an habitation *of God* through *the Spirit*." Thus, and thus only, is there any authority even *in* the Church. And

this authority *in* the Church, never, in any way, becomes the authority *of* the Church; but is always the authority solely of Him who is the Head and Life of the Church, who dwells in the Church by His divine Spirit, and to whom alone is given all authority in heaven and earth. It is He alone who exercises this authority that is given to Him alone and that is His own. See Acts 3:12, 13; 4:10; 5:3-6; 9-11; 13:2-4; 16:6-10.

Therefore, in the Church, position, office, or place, never gives any authority. The Lord Jesus, the Creator of the worlds, the Author of life, and the Fountain of revelation, when he came to this world came only to his own; yet he had no position, office, nor place. He was held aloof, ostracized, denounced, and cast out by those who did hold *all* the positions, offices, and places, in the Church of his time. The Pharisees, the priests, the scribes, the lawyers, the hypocrites, had position, office, and place. They were all ambitious for the highest place. They held position and office, and could lord it over Him, and summon Him, and demand of Him, and sit in judgment on Him. All this they could do because of position and office in the Church; but where was their *authority* to do any of it? - Simply nowhere at all. It was all only arrogance, usurpation, and arbitrariness.

Therefore Jesus told the people, "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do" - because, as they sat in Moses' seat they read to the people the word of God which Moses had written. That was the word of God

244

and by whomsoever it might be spoken or read it was authoritative and to be obeyed. But "do not ye after their works; for they say and do not." With Moses in the seat there was authority from the seat; because God was with Moses, and God's Spirit was in him. But with a Pharisee or a scribe of that time in Moses' seat, there was no authority from the seat nor otherwise except only in the Word which the man might read to the people, and which, because of his hypocrisy and selfish ambition, was altogether apart from him.

But as to Jesus, who had no position, office, nor place, they all "wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth." And why? - Ah: "He taught them as one having authority, and *not* as the *scribes*." All that the scribes could speak was borrowed, and everybody could know that it was borrowed; it was empty and alone so far as concerned any connection of their lives or spirits with it. But when Jesus spoke even the same words that the scribes and Pharisees had spoken, everybody knew that what he said was not borrowed, but was of his very soul; was not empty, but was very substance; they knew that that word lived in him, that his spirit and the Spirit of the Word were one, and that he himself was the veritable expression of the word which he spake. When the word of the Scriptures was read or spoken by him, there was in it a weight and meaning that caused it to fall impressively upon the ears and hearts of all who heard.

Thus though Jesus had neither position, nor office, nor any place, he had *authority*; and the people recognized it. And the scribes, the Pharisees, the priests, and the lawyers, who had position, office, and place, also recognized it, and grew so jealous of him that they could not endure him any longer lest they

*lose their place*; "all the world is gone after him," we must get rid of him to save our place. "If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation."

But where lay Jesus' authority, when he had no position, nor office, nor any place? - It lay just where true authority always lies - *in the truth* which he preached *from* God, and the sincerity had purity of mind and heart with which he received and preached that truth.

All true and right authority of any man in the Church comes to him only in the truth of God which he receives. If it were possible to find a man in this world who had as much of the truth of God as had Christ, in him we should find one who had all power in Heaven and earth, because of his having all the truth in Heaven and earth. The measure of truth that a man has is the only measure of true authority that he has, wherever he may be. And if he be in the highest place of responsibility in any church in the world, if he has no truth, he has no authority.

Therefore Jesus said, "The princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great *exercise authority* upon them. But *it shall not be so among you.*" God has never given to any man in his Church authority to exercise authority. That is the difference between the princes of this world and the princes of God; for Christians are princes of God. God calls and sends his princes to be apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, elders, deacons, etc. He clothes them with authority in giving to them his own truth and his own call and commission to speak it, and his own personal presence to speak it, and his own personal presence by his own Spirit. He sends them to *speak* with all the authority of the conviction of the divine truth, of the heavenly commission, and of his personal presence. (Acts 18:9, 10; 2 Tim. 4:1, 2). But the "exercise" of authority rests wholly with him whose alone the authority is, and who is ever with the one whom he sends. John 8:29; 20:21, 22; 3:24. The princes of this world in places of authority, but without true authority, exercise authority. The princes of God having true authority never exercise authority. That belongs - and the princes of God are ever happy to leave it just where it belongs - to Him to whom it is given, and whose only it is.

Again let it be said that position, office, or place never gives authority. Authority that a man already has from God will qualify him for the place of position to which God calls him. And if he has not that authority

**August 7, 1907**

**"That Meeting in Acts 15" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 32 , pp. 251, 252.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

OF all the Scriptures that have been misused to bolster up what has already been done *without* Scripture, this in Acts 15 relating to the meeting held at Jerusalem must be the one that has been so misused the most.

Those denominations who hold general councils - as the Catholic churches - make that meeting to be "the first general council." Those who hold general assemblies - as the Presbyterians - make the meeting to be "the first general assembly." Those who hold general conferences - as the Methodists and others - make it to be "the first general conference." And by this sleight all these denominations make that meeting to sanction their general "councils," "assemblies," "conferences," etc., and all that they do therein.

It is time that this scripture was studied to know what is in it. What, then, are the simple facts as they stand in the plain statements of the Scriptures?

1. Certain men came down to Antioch from Judea, and taught the Christians at Antioch, "Except ye be circumcised, ye can not be saved." V. 7.

2. "Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them." V. 2.

3. The brethren at Antioch "determined that Paul and Barnabas and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem about this question." V. 2.

4. "Paul and Barnabas" and certain other of them "of the church at Antioch," were all who went "to Jerusalem about the question." V. 2.

5. These "passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles; and they caused great joy unto all the brethren" in those parts; but *no one went with them* from the churches in Phoenicia or Samaria. V. 3.

6. When they arrived at Jerusalem, "They were received of *the church and* of the apostles and elders." V. 4.

7. To "the church and the apostles and elders," at that meeting on their arrival, Paul and Barnabas "declared all that God had done with them." V. 4.

8. Here also "there arose up certain . . . saying that it was needful to circumcise the Christians from among the Gentiles. V. 5.

9. Then "the apostles and elders *with the whole church*" "came together to consider of this matter." Vs. 6, 22.

10. In this second meeting there was first, "much disputing." Then Peter spoke. Vs. 7-11.

11. Next, "all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." V. 12.

12. At last spoke James. Vs. 13-21.

13. "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, *with the whole church*, to *send chosen men* of their own company *to Antioch* with Paul and Barnabas." V. 22.

14. "And they wrote letters by them after this manner: The apostles and elders *and brethren* send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia." V. 23.

By the simple facts of the plain words of the record there appears the sober truth that -

(a) The only thing in any possible way that was in any sense general about either of the meetings in Acts 15, is that it was a general meeting of the *church at Jerusalem*; and nobody else present except "Paul and Barnabas and certain other" from Antioch.

(b) There were two of those meetings.

The *first* one, when those from Antioch on their arrival were "received of the church and of the apostles and elders, and they [from Antioch] declared all things that God had done with them." V. 4.

The *second* one, afterward when "the apostles and elders with the whole church" came together to consider the matter that had brought these from Antioch, and that had been urged anew at the first meeting. Vs. 6, 22, 23.

(c) The two meetings were composed alike: -

The *first* meeting was composed of "*the apostles and elders with the whole church*," and those from Antioch. Vs. 6, 22, 23-25.

(d) Neither of these meetings was any more of a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference, than the other. The only difference in the meetings is in the fact that more persons spoke in the second meeting than in the first.

(e) In the character of the two meetings, and in the persons who were present, neither meeting was any more of a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference, than the other.

(f) And since both meetings were composed only of the church and the apostles and elders *at Jerusalem*, with "Paul and Barnabas and certain other" *from Antioch* - if that must count for a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference, then it is certain that *any* meeting of the whole membership of any local church or congregation, with possibly a half dozen brethren present from another local church or congregation, to consider a particular matter, is equally a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference.

But no such thing as that is ever contemplated in the conception of those who make the record in Acts 15 to be the precedent and sanction for general councils, general assemblies, or general conferences. What these mean by it is, that it was a council, or an assembly, or a conference, of persons from *many churches* met as delegates or "representatives" of those churches; and so, by such representatives of churches, a general council, or general assembly, or general conference, of the Christian cause as a whole.

But by the simple facts of the plain record in Acts 15, it is certain that neither of the two meetings there mentioned was in any sense any such thing as that. And this is confirmed by other facts of the Scripture record:

I. Attention has already been called to the fact that though the brethren from Antioch passed through Phoenicia and Samaria on their way to Jerusalem, and "caused great joy unto all the brethren" in those regions, - where there were churches - yet no *persons*, much less any delegates or representatives of the churches there, went with those brethren to Jerusalem.

.II. Much more: In addition to the churches in Phoenicia and Samaria, there were at that time churches in An-

252

tioch in Pisidia, and "all that region;" at Iconium, Lystra and Derbe and other places in Lycaonia; and at Perga and other places in Pamphylia. (Acts 13.) Yet no person, much less any delegate or "representative" of any church or "field," from any of those churches or places was present at either of the meetings at Jerusalem mentioned in Acts 15.

By the Scripture record, therefore, it is certain that neither of the meetings at Jerusalem, mentioned in Acts 15, was a meeting of "representatives" or even of persons, of the churches, regions, or fields of the Christian cause in general at that time. Neither of these meetings, therefore, was in any sense a meeting of delegates or representatives, as in the conception of those who make it a general council, or general assembly, or a general conference. It is therefore certain that there is not in Acts 15 nor anywhere else in the Scriptures any record of, nor was there ever held in apostolic or New Testament times, any such thing as it meant in the term, "general council," "general assembly," or "general conference."

Yet further: The Scripture record makes perfectly plain just why those meetings occurred at Jerusalem, and why it was only the apostles and elders and the church *at Jerusalem*, with the brethren *from Antioch*, that composed the meeting.

1. Those who started the disturbance at Antioch had come to Antioch "from Judea," and evidently from the church at Jerusalem itself. For, in the letter sent out from this meeting by "the apostles and elders and brethren," those others are referred to as "certain which went out *from us*."

2. These having gone out from the church at Jerusalem, sought to ring in the apostles and elders, if not the whole of *that church*, as responsible for the doctrine that they were urging.

3. They even claimed that the apostles and elders and brethren at Jerusalem had sent them with "commandment" to teach that Christians must be circumcised in order to be saved. For -

(a) At the conclusion of the discussion in the meeting "it pleased the apostles and elders with the whole church, to send *chosen men of their own company* to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas," to repudiate those who had raised the issue there, and to assure the brethren at Antioch that those who had troubled them with words had *no commandment* from either apostles or elders or the church at Jerusalem to teach any such thing, and that, instead of those having taught truth, they were really subverting souls.

(b) In addition to their sending these chosen men of their own company to tell this by word of mouth at Antioch, "the apostles and elders and brethren" at Jerusalem wrote and sent a letter, to the same purpose, declaring that "certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment," and "it seemed good unto us . . . to send chosen men unto you . . . who shall also tell you the same things by mouth."

The plain and easy truth of the whole matter, then, is that -

.I. Those who went first to Antioch and raised there this issue of a false gospel, were from the church at Jerusalem.

.II. When Paul and Barnabas withstood the with the true gospel, and they could not maintain their ground by any merit of their teaching, they fell back upon their being from the church at Jerusalem and sought to carry their point by "authority," through the claim not only that what they were teaching was what the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem taught, but that these had sent them to teach that thing.

.III. This at once threw back the whole question to the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem, and made the main question to be, *not* - Is what these men are teaching, true? *but, Is it true* that the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem are teaching thus? and did they send out these men to teach it?

.IV. These questions necessarily could be answered only by the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem.

.V. Therefore, the only thing to be done at this point by the brethren at Antioch was, just what they did, to decide "that Paul and Barnabas and certain other of them should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question."

.VI. And when they had done so, and the apostles and elders of the whole church at Jerusalem had considered the whole matter, they unanimously repudiated those men and their teaching as having come in any way from them, and did *now send* chosen men of their own company to Antioch to tell there that those men and their teaching were repudiated, and to tell what the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem really did teach; and also sent a letter telling the same thing that the chosen men were to tell by word of mouth.

By those who had first gone to Antioch the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem had been misrepresented, had been put in a false position, and had not only been falsely pledged but had been falsely pledged to a false doctrine. The journey of the brethren from Antioch to Jerusalem was to inquire for the truth in the matter; and the two meetings of the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem with the brethren from Antioch were held to consider the matter and to make known from the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem *themselves* the plain truth of the matter in which they had thus become involved.

It is true that the issue involved was the very foundation of the gospel; but this in no wise affects the fact that neither of the meetings held as the consequence of the issue, or in considering the question, was in any sense a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference; but that both of the meetings were meetings only of the church and apostles and elders at Jerusalem, with the few brethren from Antioch.

Another thing, and a thing that should make the meeting of most suspicious "authority" as a "general council," or a "general assembly," or a "general conference," even to those who hold such thing, is the fact that what it did was not held as authoritative by the two leading men in the meeting - Peter and James - "all the elders," and at least a very large number of the church at Jerusalem. For afterward both Peter and James with many others abandoned the ground taken in the meeting, and went over to the ground of those who had first advocated the circumcision of Christians. And so strong was the tide that even Barnabas was carried away with it. Gal. 2:11-16; Acts 21:18-25.

Nevertheless, Christ, who is the Head of the Church and of all Christians, by the sovereignty and guidance of his own Holy Spirit, kept his church in the straight path of "the truth of the gospel," and even led back into that straight path those mistaken brethren. And so will he do forever - whensoever he is allowed to have his place as Head of the Church, and his Spirit his place as the Guide of his Church and of all the membership of the Church.

**August 14, 1907**

**"The 'Why' of the Religious Phase of the Sanitarium" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 33 , pp. 259-261.**

I HAVE been asked by patients in the Sanitarium to speak upon "the Religious Side of the Sanitarium and Its Work," and to tell the "why" of it. While we have no disposition to push this matter offensively or obtrusively upon the attention of anybody, we are always happy to tell it all to any who want to know it.

The original and fundamental "why" of this is because of the Bible's being the Word of God to us. The Sanitarium was founded by Christian men for Christian purposes, and the Bible as the Word of God is the basis of all that is Christian.

The Bible comes to us as the Word of God. And it will prove itself to be the Word of God to every one who will receive it as the Word of God.

As certainly as it is the Word of God, it is final in all matters of which it speaks. For when *God* has spoken, there can not possibly be anything beyond. As certainly, therefore, as we profess to receive the Bible as the Word of God, it must be to us the final information and authority in all that it says. If it is not allowed to be in all things final to us, when it is not the Word of God to us, whatever we may profess.

When God has spoken, and I have His word, what room can there possibly be for opinions or views of my own, that shall be different from just what that word says. No man needs a revelation from God, in order to think his own thoughts. Therefore, when the Word of God comes to us, our own opinions must be laid entirely aside. When the thoughts of God are expressed, our own thoughts must be abandoned, if we would learn from Him. "Be still, and know that I am God." "Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts. . . . For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the Heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." We are not to come to the Word of God, to think our *own thoughts*; but to *get the thoughts of God* with which to think.

However, it is asked, How shall we know that the Bible is really the Word of God so that we can confidently accept it as the Word of God? Many say, prove to me that the Bible is the Word of God, and I will accept it.

**THE BIBLE ITS OWN PROOF**

Very good. There is abundance of proof. Yet, bear in mind that the proof is the Word itself, and can not possibly be anywhere else. If I make to you a statement, and you require proof of it, I must present something in which you can have more confidence than in my own statement, I must cite authority that is higher authority than my own word. So, to ask proof *outside of that Word itself* that the Bible is the Word of God, is to call for authority that is superior to the authority of God.

But in the nature of things there can not be any authority higher than that of God; nor can there be any more authoritative statement than that of the plain Word of God. Therefore, it is impossible that there could be cited a statement of greater weight, or worthy of more confidence than the Word of God. As certainly as it is the Word of God, it is ultimate. And it is the essential character-

260

istic of only ultimate truth, that the proof is in itself.

But it is said, There are other books that profess to be the Word of God. Yes, that is true. And this test will successfully apply to every one of them. Does it prove itself? And the certain test that of all the books that profess to be the Word of God, the Bible is the only one that can prove itself to be in truth the Word of God, lies in this truth: The man who has the most of the religion of the Bible is the most peaceable and harmless, while of the religions of all other books, those who have the most are the most dangerous.

The Bible, then, is the Word of God to the Sanitarium management. The aim of the Bible is holiness. And *health* and *holiness* are *inseparable*. Let me make this plain by the Word of the Bible. "Ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty. Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, *perfecting holiness* in the fear of God."

That tells us that both physical and spiritual purity are essential to holiness. But this truth of health and holiness being inseparable stands plain in our own native language. The word "health" is an abstract noun from "whole," not from "heal." The real meaning of the word "whole" is "hale, sound, entire, complete." The original sense of the word "whole" is "hale," which signifies, "in sound health." This is illustrated in the words of Scripture, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick."

## HEALTH FIRST

It is a most remarkable fact that the first "statute and ordinance," the very first set instruction, that God gave to His people after His mighty deliverance of them from Egypt, was instruction in the way of perfect health, and the revelation of Himself as "the Lord that healeth thee." I read it: "There he made for them a statute and an ordinance, and there he proved them, and said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the Lord that healeth thee." Ex. 15:25, 26.

I am glad to be able also to make plain the valuable truth that this relationship between sin and disease, and health and holiness, is recognized beyond the walls of this Sanitarium and even outside of the Sanitarium system as such. In

many places and by many hearts this splendid truth is recognized and loved. It has been most excellently expressed by a physician who is editor of one of the leading medical journals in the United States. I will read it to you in his own words: -

"The relationship of sin and disease has been recognized by all great philosophic minds. . . . It is an old trick of the mind to rid one's self of difficulties and responsibilities by denying the existence of facts. He *who silences his conscience by denying sin, only adds another sin to his individual burden, and another sinner to the burden of the world.*

"Let us therefore assume as beyond discussion that atheism is unscientific, and that God lives, and that sin *is opposing and not furthering His biologic work in the world.* . . .

"*God is a true physician, working for final normality.* He may cauterize in order to cure, and prefer amputation rather than necrosis. His patient is the entire future body and soul of humanity, not the individual members now and here existing. The wise ones of the world, the philosophers and the prophets, the leaders of men to better living, have been those who saw the far and subtle lines and laws of causation running back from disease and untimely death to *the sources of ignorance (which is also sin), of selfishness, and of wrong-doing.* This is the text of all preaching and prophecy, the burthen of all tragedy, the plot of all literature. *And it is the heart of medicine!* . . . As physicians we must work to cure and prevent disease. If, as we have seen, disease is always more or less dependent upon sin, we must in a scientific prophylaxis try to stop the sin that partly or entirely generates or allows the disease. . . .

"Science, it is plain, has outrun morality; we know how to lengthen the average human life by many years, with a proportionate reduction of all the suffering and expense, but we are powerless to do it, because, *simply of sin.* There is no doubt that sin alone prevents a reduction of the death-rate and sickness by one-half, and a lengthening of life to 50 or 60 years. *And we have nearly or quite reached the limit so far as the art of therapeutics is concerned.* We can never cure a much greater proportion of the sick until we have *better bodies and souls in the patients.* The great progress of the future in medicine will be prevention. . .

"There is no prevention of disease without stifling the cause of disease. *Wherever sin exists, its works itself out finally in sickness and death.* The man who says his sole duty is to cure disease, not to both about sin or society, is a bad physician and a poor citizen. In a hundred ways he can influence his neighbors and his nation, to lessen disease and death, besides by what the text-books calls therapeutics. *The best therapeutics is to render therapeutics unnecessary.*"

This idea of the forgiveness of sins as an element in the true treatment of disease does not in any sense sanction the quackery of the so-called faith-cures. Undeniably, faith is in it; because forgiveness of sins is received and known only by means of faith. But it is the "faith which works;" not an airy, figmentary "faith" that prays and "believes" and then lies down or sits around *and does nothing*. It is the faith which upon the Word of God and the love of God teaches the forgiveness of sins and then works most vigorously to reduce fever, to eliminate poisons, and diligently to search for the physical causes of the sickness, in order that these causes shall with the sins be forever abandoned, and the true way of true health, which is inseparable from holiness, be faithfully followed in the future.

Upon this principle the philosophy of the forgiveness of sins is studied in order to know how, as a matter of practical knowledge, the forgiveness of sins enters as an element into practical medical science. And in this direction there is not far to go to find at least one important truth as to how this is. Here it is: "*Peace, peace* to him that is far off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord; and *I will heal him*. But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." Isa. 19:21.

## SIN AND DISEASE

The peace of God which comes to man in the forgiveness of sins and the restoration of the soul to righteousness is a distinct element in recovery from sickness and is a right way to health. And there is not an intelligent physician in the world, even though he be an avowed atheist who will not say that a disturbed mind, a troubled heart, a perplexed life, is a positive hindrance to whatever may be done to bring a person back from sickness to health; while, on the other hand, peace of mind and quietness and rest of heart are a positive aid. And that sound medical principle, which every physician recognizes, is declared in the Bible as a medical principle; and is given by the Lord directly as a medical prescription to the wick: "*Peace, peace . . . saith the Lord; and I will heal him.*"

And yet this is but an instance in illustration of the essential virtue and power of the word of God to heal. It is written: "He sent His word, and healed them." (Ps. 107:20). And of the medicinal virtue of His word as such, it is written: "My son, attend to My words, incline thine ear unto My sayings. Let

261

them not depart from thine eyes; keep them in the midst of thine heart. For they are life unto those that find them, and *health* [margin, Heb. "medicine" to all their flesh." It is the flesh that disease takes hold of. But the words of God received into the heart, and treasured in the life, and allowed to be indeed the spring of the life - that is "health to all the flesh." It is the Divine Physician's own prescription for health, and the Divine virtue is in it for all who will take the "medicine" thus prescribed. The prescription is repeated in Ex. 15:26, and in Deut. 7:12-15.

And yet all this is but a part of the expression of the Lord's supreme wish with respect to the health of mankind. For he says, "I wish *above all things* that thou mayest prosper and be in health." (3 John 2). Indeed, He puts His wish for the

prosperity of the *health* of man exactly on an equality with His wish for the prosperity of the *soul* of man. "I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth." And this is but the repetition of the mighty truth already touched upon, that, as the opposite of sin and disease being inseparable, *health and holiness are inseparable*.

Thus emphasized in the Bible and its philosophy throughout, and rooted and imbedded in the very language in which we speak, is the truth as a medical principle that health and holiness are inseparably combined. Therefore, in every Christian these must also be inseparably combined; else how can we be truly and intelligently Christian? And of all things these two - health and holiness - must be inseparably combined in the physician; and only less so in the preacher. The preacher who separates them, fails to preach the principles of true holiness; and the physician who separates them, fails to practise the principles of true health. And what God has so inseparably joined together, how can any person do well in putting asunder?

This is sufficient to show that health and holiness are absolutely inseparable. The aim of the Bible is holiness. Holiness and health, as it is written, "I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth."

The Sanitarium adopts that much for all people, and undertakes as far as it can do, so to see it fulfilled in things spiritual and physical. As the gospel contemplates the complete restoration of the lost in soul and body, it becomes the duty of every gospel agency to work for the entire man.

And this is the "why" and "wherefore" of the religious phase of the Sanitarium as relates specifically to health.

**August 21, 1907**

**"The 'Why' of the Religious Phase of the Sanitarium. - II" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 34 , pp. 166, 167.**

ALONZO. T. JONES

THERE is another item of the religious phase of the Sanitarium, the "why" of which was especially asked for. That is, Life only in Christ. This also is simply because of the Bible. And it stands at the very threshold of the Bible. When God made man He said to him, "Of the trees of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." The man did eat of that forbidden tree. Why then did he not die that day? - Simply because Christ gave himself, and stepped in between, and took upon him the death that was descending upon man; and gave to man opportunity to lay hold upon the eternal life, that Christ extended in place of the eternal death that was falling. And there Christ gave to man the life which is "even a vapor that appeareth for a *little time* and then vanisheth away," that the man might have opportunity to choose and lay

hold upon life that is *substance* and *eternal*. Therefore Christ said, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." And in the way in which men use the life that is "a vapor," they show just what use they would make of life that is substance and eternal. And thus they decide for themselves as to whether they can be entrusted with that life that is substance and more abundant, and that measures with the life of God. For "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much. . . . And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?"

Thus by the Bible, after the man had eaten of the forbidden tree he would never have had a chance even to breath a second time, except for the gift of Christ. And when man owes to the gift of Christ, the very breath by which he lives only this temporal life, how could it be possible that he could have *eternal* life *without* Christ? To think that he can, is only to argue that he has life of himself, that he is self-existent and independent of God; and therefore equal with God. But that will never do. Any life at all for man is solely because of the gift of Christ; and how much more is it so as to eternal life?

Another item as to the "why" and "wherefore" of the religious phase of the Sanitarium is, The observance of the Sabbath. The inquiry is not as to the observance of a day, for that is expected of all; but, Why do we observe a day different from the one recognized by the great mass of the people - the seventh day? This, too, is simply because we would have the Bible to be to us the Word of God. For the Word of God says as plainly as words can say, that "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." And this is the truth of the word of God not only in the general sense of the Bible as the word of God, in the specific sense of the Word spoken by Himself personally at Sinai with a voice that shook the earth. Nearly everywhere among Christians there is found on the walls of the churches, copies of the Ten Commandments. And the fourth of these says plainly to all, "The seventh day is the work which God has created and made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made."

The Seventh day is the Sabbath, *not* because it is the seventh day, but *because God made it the Sabbath*. He could have made another day the Sabbath, if he had chosen to do so. But he did choose the seventh day and made it the Sabbath. And since this is his will and his word, surely this must stand if he shall be God, and his word the word of God, to us. That may not be the day that we would have made the Sabbath. But we did not have the making of it. It is God who made the choice of the seventh day, and who made it the Sabbath. And he did this for us; for "the Sabbath was made for man."

This whole matter of our observance of the Sabbath in the Sanitarium is simply because that to us the Bible is the Word of God. Therefore, the seventh day, chosen by the Lord and made the Sabbath, and declared in his word to be the Sabbath, is the Sabbath of the Lord in the religious phase of the Sanitarium. True we could refuse to recognize or observe this Sabbath of the Lord. But that would be disobedience; that would be saying, I do not want God's will or his way of His Word. But if we should *put another day in the place* of the one chosen of

God, and should observe this other day instead of the one which he has made and designated, that would be *more* than disobedience; that would be to put ourselves above him. For it would be only to say that he was not sufficiently wise to make the right choice or to do the right thing, while we are sufficient in all this to make exactly the right choice and to do precisely the right thing. And this would be nothing else than to require that God and his word should give way to us and our will; that his should cease and ours prevail. Yet even if we were to do that, and succeed in persuading many, and even all, others to do it, it never could be right nor could it prevail, for God will ever be God and his word stands forever.

I stated that God could have made another day the Sabbath if he had wished to have it so. For, surely, when creation was accomplished only by his speaking the word he could have created the worlds in less than six days if he had chosen to do so. He could have created all in five days and rested the sixth, and blessed and hallowed and sanctified the sixth day; then the sixth day would have been the Sabbath, as the seventh day now is. Or he *could* have created all in four days, and rested the fifth, and made it the Sabbath; or in three days and made the fourth, or in two days and made the third, or in one day, and made the second day the Sabbath. But he could not have created all things in one day, and then made that first day the Sabbath. For Sabbath means rest, and Sabbath-day, rest day. And the day he worked, could not be also the day he rested. The day in which he created all, would necessarily be the first day; and it being impossible for that to be the rest day too, it would, therefore, manifestly be impossible for even the Lord to make the first day the Sabbath. Yet that is the very day that has been set up as a Sabbath *by somebody*, in the *place of the day chosen and made the Sabbath, by the Lord*. I remarked, a while ago, that for us to refuse to observe the Sabbath that God has made would be disobedience; but for us to observe another day instead of the one appointed by Him, would be to put ourselves above him in wisdom and righteousness. And just this thing has been done. And whoever it was that accomplished this thing certainly went the whole length; for in fixing on the first day of the week to be the Sabbath, they went beyond even what God could do; and thus put themselves above God, not only as to wisdom and righteousness, but as to power; and thus would show themselves in all things independent of God, and above him.

But that will never do. God is still God. His will and work stand forever supreme. And in recognition of this, we yield to him in wisdom, in righteousness, and in power, accepting the Sabbath which he has made, and enjoying the rest, the blessing, the holiness, and the sanctification, of it. For just this is the purpose of the Sabbath of the Lord as it is written, "Hallow my Sabbaths and they shall be a sign between me

267

and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Is it not a good thing for a person to know, really to *know* that the Lord is his God? Yet this is precisely the purpose of the Sabbath. The Sabbath of the Lord, therefore, is a blessed means of God's revealing himself to the knowledge of men.

The Sabbath is given, that by hallowing it we may know that the Lord is our God. God is known only through Christ. Therefore, the Sabbath is divinely

established means by which men may know God as he is revealed in Jesus Christ. And by observing this Sabbath of the Lord, in spirit and in truth, men ever grow in the knowledge of God. And this even to eternity, for when the new heavens and the new earth shall be brought in, then "from one Sabbath to another shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. 66:23.

**September 11, 1907**

**"The Everlasting Covenant Is not 'Obey and Live'" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 37 , pp. 294, 295.**

BY ALONZO. T. JONES

IN a recent publication it is said, "We have found the condition of the covenant between God and his creatures to be, "Obey and Live," and, "The compact, or covenant, under which Adam began his existence was that God promised life only on condition of Adam's obedience."

Now as a matter of fact, is it true that Adam began his existence under an agreement between him and God? The only possible way in which it could be true that Adam "began his existence" under an agreement of any kind whatever, would have to be that he entered into that agreement before he existed. For if his existence began before the agreement was made, then it is plain that he did not begin his existence under that agreement. And if it be true that Adam began his existence under that agreement, then it is equally plain that the agreement existed before he did, and the only way that the agreement between him and God could exist before he existed, would, in the nature of things, have to be that he entered into that agreement before he existed.

Note also that according to this statement this agreement was that "God promise life *only* on condition of Adam's obedience." As certainly then as life was promised him only on a condition, so certainly he did not already have life; and not having life, he agreed to obey in order that he might have it; as it was "only" on that "condition" that he could have life. This statement would demonstrate that Adam entered into this agreement before he had life; that is, before he existed; and did really "begin his existence" under that compact. Does anybody need to be told that such a thing as that is, in every conceivable sense, an absolute impossibility?

Since Adam and every other intelligence must necessarily be alive before they could possibly enter into any compact, it follows in the nature of things that each one began his existence with

295

life, and not with any such thing as an agreement to do something in order to get life or to have it. Therefore, the simple and plain fact, and the plain Scripture truth, is that Adam and angels began their existence with life; and that this life was, by the gift of the grace of God, in creating them living souls; and was not, in

any sense, under, nor was it by virtue of, any compact or bargain or condition or anything of the kind.

According to the statement noted above, God promised to give to them life provided that they would obey; and on their part they promised to obey so that they could have the life, and had to do it before they could have the life. Then when they did do it and so got the life, how was it in fact and in truth that they got the life? There is only one possible answer, and that answer is perfectly clear - it is that they got life by their own works.

When God promised life only on condition of obedience, then it is positive and plain that their hope of life rested only on their obedience. And since God's part could not come in till their part was fulfilled, since God's promise could not come in till their promise was made good in obedience, it follows that their hope of obedience rested only on the virtue of their own promise to obey. And thus God's everlasting covenant is made to rest on the promise of creatures.

In perfect consistency with this is the suggestion often met with of God's eternal or everlasting covenant being "broken," and "renewed," "broken" and "renewed." But if the covenant were God's indeed and rested on God's promise only, then it never was broken and never could be broken. For God neither will nor can break his own promise; and no creature can break God's promise. And hence it never could require renewing. An everlasting covenant would be unbreakable.

Righteousness and life truly go together. But if Adam and all men and angels could have life only by their own works, in fulfillment of their own promise to obey, it is plain that they got righteousness by their own works in fulfillment of their own promise, and so this righteousness was absolutely and exclusively their own righteousness. It was absolutely righteousness by works and not by faith; it was exclusively *their own* righteousness, by *their own works*, upon their own promise and not in any sense the righteousness *of God*, which is by faith.

Since God's covenant is identical with his law of Ten Commandments, this theory suggests that God's law must be renewed when it is broken! Why should not the real gospel thought be recognized that it is the *sinner*, and not the law, that needs to be renewed? that it is the *person who fails*, and not the cove-

*Continued on page 296*

*Continued from page 295*

nant that *cannot possibly fail*, that needs to be renewed.

Such conception presents to us God as one who did not have enough confidence in his own goodness or the merit of his own truth or the worth of his own grace, to lead him to trust *to this* to *win* their free confidence and loving obedience; but, to secure it, he must put them under bonds of a legal system of bargain and "compact," of "condition" and proviso!

But that is not God at all. That is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The very inherent name of the true God is "The Lord, the Lord God; merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth,

keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." And he has enough confidence in his own mercy and grace, and long suffering and goodness and truth and forgiveness, to depend upon this alone to secure eternally the spontaneous free-flowing, grateful service of his created intelligences. And this was settled for all eternity before ever there was settled for all eternity before ever there was a creature or any creation at all.

Intelligence is essential to virtue. Freedom of choice is essential to intelligence, and freedom of choice is essential to virtue. God made angels and men intelligent. He made them to be moral. He therefore made them free to choose; and he eternally respects that freedom of choice. He made all intelligences free to choose him. This perfect freedom of choice to glorify him, carries in itself the freedom of choice not to do so. But for any intelligence to choose not to glorify God is sin. Therefore, in the nature of things, freedom of choice involves the possibility of sin.

**September 18, 1907**

**"The Everlasting Covenant Is not 'Obey and Live'" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 38 , p. 302.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

*(Continued)*

THEN as God created angels and men free to choose, and thus free to choose to sin, did he not, therefore, have to provide against this possible choice before they were created? Did he not have to provide for the possibility of sin, before ever a single creature was created? - Most assuredly; *and he did so*. And this provision which he then made is an essential part of that eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, and which is revealed in the preaching of the everlasting gospel.

Let us go back to when there was no created thing; back to the eternal counsels of the Godhead. The existence of God is not a self-satisfied existence. His love is not self-love. His joy is not fulfilled in wrapping himself within himself and sitting solitary and self-centered. His love is satisfied only in flowing out to those who will receive it and enjoy it to the full. His joy is fulfilled only in carrying to an infinite universe full of blessed intelligences the very fulness of eternal joy.

Standing then in thought with him before there was a single intelligent creature created, he desires that the universe shall be full of intelligences enjoying his love to the full. In order to do this, they must be free to choose him and to choose to serve him. But in their freedom to choose to serve him lies also the freedom to choose no to serve him or themselves, life or not life. For to choose not him is to choose not life, and to choose not life is to choose death.

But this involves the possibility of the entrance of sin, the possibility that some will choose not to serve him, that some will choose the way of sin. Shall he then refuse to create, because if he does it must be with the possibility that sin may

enter, which is the very opposite of his very nature? - This would be but eternally to remain self-centered and solitary. More than this, such a shrinking would in itself be but to cease to be God. For what would be the worth of a God who cannot do what he desires? Who cannot fulfill his own will?

So, then, since he is God he is Creator and he will create realms of intelligences. But, lo! He is to create them free to choose, and therefore with the possibility of their choosing not his way, and therefore with the possibility of their sinning. Shall he then seek to guard against the entrance of sin, by putting them all under bonds to keep the peace? under bonds of a bargain and "compact," upon "condition" and proviso, that they will obey, that they will keep his law, that they will not sin? and this all in order that they may secure life from him? No, eternally, no! Such a thing as that would be the surest possibly guaranty of the entrance of sin. And even until sin might enter, the service would be only the service of legality, their obedience only their own, upon their own promise, and their righteousness only of themselves and of the law. That, therefore, is eternally *not* the way of God.

No; thank the Lord, such as that is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He made all intelligences free to choose, and to *think as they choose*; and therefore free to sin if they choose. And at the same time, in his infinite love and eternal righteousness, he purposed to give *himself a sacrifice to redeem all* who should sin; and give them even *a second freedom* to choose him or themselves, to choose life or death. And those who the second time and against all this would choose not him who is their life, - let them have what they have chosen, which could be only death. And those who would choose life, - the universe full of them, - let them enjoy to the full that which they have chosen - even eternal life, the fulness of perfect love, and the dear delights of unalloyed virtue and joy forevermore.

This is God, the living God, the God of love, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is fully able to do whatsoever he will, and yet leave all his creatures free. This is he who from the days of eternity "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." And this is "the mystery of his will. . . . which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things *in Christ*, both which are *in heaven*, and which are *on earth*; even in him," and that "God may be all" in each one and "in all." This is "the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord"; and of which the gospel in this world is only the revelation. Eph. 3:8-11; 1 Peter 1:22.

And this is simply why is it that whosoever, - cherub, angel, or man, - hardens himself against all this infinity of the goodness, mercy, and grace of God, in confirming to the limit his choice *not* to have *Him*, thereby makes of himself only a very devil.

(To be Continued)

**September 25, 1907**

**"The Everlasting Covenant Is not 'Obey and Live'" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 39 , pp. 309, 310.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES  
(Continued)

AGAIN I ask, What were the angels and what was Adam when they began their existence? Intellectually, morally, and spiritually were they mere bodies of pulp? people that could receive impressions and take shape only by pressure from without?

What saith the Scriptures? Adam was created in the image of God. Gen. 1:26, 27. He was clothed and crowned with glory and honor. Ps. 8:5; Heb. 2:7. In the very first hours of his existence he stood in a mind of such compass, of such penetrative power, of such flexibility, and yet of such precision, that he could read instantly each created thing, and run in succession through the whole realm of beast and fowl and at sight catch the secret of the very nature of each, and express the thought of God as therein manifested. In heart and mind, in thought and will, he was so at one with God in the Spirit of God that every faculty was but the faculty of the divine mind; and all this upon his own free choice. Gen. 2:18-20. And even he was ye "lower than the angels." Heb. 2:7.

Surely such splendid intelligences as those were not held up by God for a bargain, for a "compact," for a promise, upon condition and proviso that they would obey so that they could have life, and that "God promised them life only on condition of obedience!"

No, eternally, no! They already *had* life *from the Author of life*. They dwelt joyously in the very presence of Him who of himself was their life, and with whom is the Fountain of life. Deut. 30:20; Ps. 36:9. They beheld the face of Him who is also the Fountain of light, and in whose light they saw light. And as they with open face thus beheld his glory they were changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord. Matt. 18:20; 2 Cor. 3:18. Their life was from him; and since "righteousness and life go together," their righteousness was from him. They lived, *from* him and *by* him and *in* him and *with* him; and they *were righteous, from* him, and *by* him, and *in* him. Thus their righteousness was the righteousness *of God*, and not of *themselves*; not their own righteousness which was of the law, but the *righteousness of God* which *is* by faith.

They knew no such things as "obey and live." No; they *lived*. And they knew *one to live from* God and *in* God. They lived from him who was *their life*. They lived by him and in him and with him who is the Fountain of life. And in the *very living* thus, obedience was manifested in the very manifestation of the life and righteousness of God in them. It was not an obedience of outward compliance, nor of legalistic form. It was an obedience of the inspiration of the life and love of God; an obedience freely and unconsciously flowing from within because of the possession of the *life* and *love* and righteousness of *God* in the fulness of the possession of the holy Spirit of God.

I am not in any way either saying or intimating that Adam and the angels did not keep the law of God before they sinned. What I *am* saying is that not one of them ever did it in order to be righteous, nor in order to get life, nor to have life; not one of them ever *promised* to obey or keep the law in order that he

310

might have righteousness, nor in order that he might have life for any other purpose, nor for any reason whatever; God never held them up on a bargain or agreement or any "condition" requiring of them a *promise* of *obedience* before they *could have* life.

The universe of God is not a universe of bondage, but of perfect freedom. It is not a universe of the works of the law, but of grace through faith by the promise of God *alone* and altogether and forever.

But why was the covenant at Sinai a covenant of bondage? Didn't they promise to obey and keep his law, - the Ten Commandments? - Certainly.

And is not obedience to God in the keeping of his law a good thing? - Unquestionably.

Then wasn't it a good thing that they promised? - Most assuredly.

Then what was the difficulty? Where was the fault? - The difficulty was not in the thing that they promised to do, but in their *promise to do that thing*. The covenant from Sinai is declared by the Scriptures to have been faulty; that it was faulty in the promises, and that the fault was found "*with them*." Heb. 8:7, 8. Yet all that they did was to promise that they would obey the voice of God and keep the Ten Commandments. Therefore by the plain word of the Scriptures it was a fault for the people at Sinai to promise to obey God's voice and keep his law *in order to have* God be their God, and they to be his people. And this simply for the reason that *they could not do it*. It was, therefore, a fault for them to enter into a compact of "obey and live."

It will doubtless be said, "Of course, this was true of *them* because they were sinners; but it could not be true of angels and of Adam at the beginning of their existence and before they were sinners."

I say deliberately that it is a fault for any person in the universe, either angel or man, at the beginning of his existence or at any other time, to promise to obey the law of God in order that he may have life or righteousness, or for any other purpose or for any reason whatever. It is a fault for either angels or men ever to enter into any compact of "obey and live," or to offer to God obedience as the satisfaction of a "condition" upon which "only" they can secure the promise of life. And this for the reason that under such "compact" and upon such "condition" their obedience and therefore *their righteousness* would be only of themselves and of the law. And self-righteousness is no more true righteousness, and no more acceptable to God in a heavenly angel than it is in an earthly Pharisee.

Why, the Lord Jesus himself, the Creator and Lord of all, the glory of God and the Light of the universe, when he came down to this world and took "the form of a servant," could not manifest *his own* righteousness, righteousness of *himself*; but must "empty himself" and must "do nothing" of *himself*; and this in order that the righteousness *of God* might appear - the righteousness of God *by faith*. Phil. 2:5-7; John 5:30; 12:49; 14:10. And when the Lord of glory "in the form of a

servant" could not do this, then no angel (all of whom in fact are but servants, Rev. 19:10; 22:9) could, or can, ever do it. And when the Lord of glory himself could not do it in "the form of a servant" on earth, no angel could ever do it in heaven.

What then? - Just this: The Lord of glory emptying *himself*, and doing nothing of *himself*, in order that *not* even *his* own righteousness should appear, but only the righteousness of God, - as the mighty and glorious "Leader" that he is, he has, *in this, revealed the way, has set the pace*, and has lifted the true standard, to *all the universe*, of the only way, to the only righteousness that can ever be acceptable to God - the righteousness of God alone; the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ.

For when in truth did God give Christ, and give himself in him? When, in truth, did Christ offer himself? When did he "empty himself"? The answer is, "Before the foundation of the world? (1 Pet. 1:20); before there was any creature, yea, even before there was any creation. Creation itself rests upon the grace of God who *denies* himself, who *gives* himself, who *empties* himself, who *gives* himself, who *empties* himself, for the life, the joy, and the good of his creatures. And the divine thing of emptying himself, that God might appear all in all, this divine thing that was done *in truth* before there was any creation, and that was done *in very fact* on the cross of Calvary - *this* divine thing it is, that is the only way of righteousness anywhere in the wide universe, or in eternity.

Righteousness, whether to men, to angels, to bright seraphim, or to exalted cherubim, comes not by obedience of their own. It comes *only* from the grace of God through the faith of Jesus Christ; *never* their own righteousness which is of the law, *but* always only "that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."

And in this word "faith" I mean not a mere theoretical notion, but "faith" in its only true meaning of the *will submitted* to him, the *heart yielded* to him, and the *affections fixed* upon him. This only is faith; and this itself by the grace and gift of God. And this faith, of the will submitted to God through Christ, of the heart yielded to God in Christ, and the affections fixed upon God by Christ - this is the faith of angels as truly as of men. And by this faith and in this faith of the Lord Jesus, all the glad array of holy angels, bright seraphim, and beatified cherubim, as well as men, empty themselves of all thought of self, of all thought of any righteousness of self or of law, and receive the righteousness *of God*, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, through his boundless grace.

And "obey?" - Of course they obey. But the obedience is not an outward compliance, or of law; but the inward, free-flowing service of love, which is the only true obedience in heaven or earth. And in this obedience, of course, they *live*; for it is the very expression of the life and righteousness of God which is in them by the faith of Jesus Christ through the grace of God.

**October 9, 1907**

**"Prophets and Prophesying in the New Testament" *The Medical  
Missionary* 16, 41 , pp. 323-325.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

PROPHETS and prophesying belong in the New Testament Church.

The prophet Joel foretold it, and Pentecost introduced it in the Christian Church. For of Pentecost Peter said: "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy." Acts 2:16-18.

324

And of the gifts of the Holy Spirit in the Church, it is written: "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Eph. 4:11, 12. "For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; . . . to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; . . . And God hath set some in the church, first apostles secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, etc." 1 Cor. 12:8-11, 28. And, "Despise not prophesying." 1 Thess. 5:20. Of these gifts, the gift of prophesying is chiefly to be desired. And so it is written: "Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy. . . . I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the church may receive edifying." "He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the church." 1 Cor. 14:1, 4, 5.

All may prophesy. For it is written: "I would that ye *all* spake with tongues; but rather that ye prophesied." "If *all* prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all: and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth. . . . For *ye may all prophesy* one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." 1 Cor. 14:5, 24, 25, 31.

The inspired definition of prophesying is given. Thus: "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort." 1 Cor. 14:3. Note, however, that this is not a mere casual speaking in social meeting, nor is it even the preaching of a sermon. Prophesying is a gift of the Spirit; therefore it is the speaking to men "unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort," by the gift, the power, the inspiration, of the Holy Spirit. This speaking by the gift and inspiration of the Spirit, could also be manifested in the foretelling of events as we shall see. Such is the truth and the definition, by the Scriptures, as to prophesying, in the New Testament and in the New Testament Church.

The first definite mention of prophets in the New Testament Church, that is after Pentecost, is in Acts 11:27, 28: "In these days came prophets from

Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world; which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cesar."

The next is in Acts 13:1: "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul."

The next is in Acts 15:32. Judas and Silas were the "chosen men" selected by "the apostles and elders with the whole church" at Jerusalem to carry to Antioch the letter that was sent from them to Antioch. When the letter had been read to the brethren at Antioch, "they rejoiced for the consolation. And Judas and Silas, benign [*sic.*] prophets themselves, exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them."

The next is in Acts 21:4, where, though neither the word prophet nor prophesying is used, it is plainly a manifestation of the gift of prophecy. Paul and his company came to Tyre; "and finding disciples, we tarried there seven days; who said to Paul *through the Spirit* that he should not go up to Jerusalem." Paul, however, continued his journey toward Jerusalem.

The next is in Acts 21:9-11. When Paul and his company came to Cesarea, to the house of Philip the evangelist, it is written: "The same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy. And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judea a certain prophet, named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said: Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles." And this came to pass as we read in the same chapter, verse 27, and onward in the following chapters.

Those are all the instances that are recorded in which the gift of prophecy was actually manifested among the disciples in the New Testament Church, excepting, of course, in the writings of the apostles in their epistles and in the book of Revelation, and when baptized with the Holy Ghost as in Acts 19:6. This is not in any sense to imply that these are by any means all the instances of the manifestation of the gift; it is only to state the fact that those instances are all that are recorded.

These, however, were written for our learning. What, then, is given in these things for us to learn?

*First*, as already given, the definition of "prophesying," in the plain words of Scripture: "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort." *That*, being the definition and instruction of the Spirit of inspiration himself, can never be denied, nor qualified, nor modified.

*Second*: That the gift to prophesy is chiefly to be desired, and that all may have this gift: "Desire spiritual gifts; but rather that ye may prophesy. . . . For ye may all prophesy." And "If all prophesy, he that cometh in will report that God is in you of a truth."

*Third*: That this speaking by the gift and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, "unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort" may also be manifested in the

foretelling of events, as the Spirit may will and by whom he may choose. For in the instances recorded, *both* these phases of the manifestation of the gift are clearly indicated.

In Agabus the gift was clearly manifested in the foretelling of events.

Also in the disciples at Tyre, the gift partook of this characteristic; for, though the record does not say that they told Paul what would befall him at Jerusalem, as did Agabus, they did tell him "*through the Spirit* that he *should not* go up to Jerusalem." Thus, though it was not a revelation of *just what* would come, it was a revelation that there was *something to be avoided*, though just *what* it was might not be specified.

The other instances are evidently manifestations of the gift "unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort." For though Philip had four daughters "which did prophesy," and though Paul and his company were at Philip's house "many days" where these daughters were, yet none of them said anything to Paul about the danger before him, or what would be done with him at Jerusalem. Nothing of this was told till "there came down from Judea a certain prophet named Agabus." But "when he was come," then the thing was foretold.

Likewise in the cases of Judas and Silas it is evidently this manifestation of the gift "unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort," and not in the foretelling of events. For it is plainly stated that when they delivered the letter at Antioch, "they *exhorted* the brethren with many words, and *confirmed* them."

In addition to this indication we have the fact that Silas accompanied Paul in his preaching through Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece even to Corinth, through many remarkable vicissitudes and notable crisis, yet in all the story there is not even a hint that in a single instance there was manifested by Silas the gift of prophecy in foretelling any event. Yet Silas was a prophet.

There is not only no hint that he did foretell, or foreknow, but there are plain indications that he did not do so. For Silas was with Paul in Asia Minor where, forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia and the Spirit suffered them not to go into Bithynia, they came down to Troas and did not know what next to do. Yet they were

325

not told by Silas the prophet what next they should do, but "*a vision appeared to Paul* in the night" in which there stood a man of Macedonia saying, "Come over and help us. And after he had seen the vision, we endeavored to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us to spread the gospel unto them." Acts 16:6-10.

Again: Silas was with Paul at Corinth. Yet though he was a prophet, it was not by him that the Lord told Paul to stay in Corinth. But "then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city." Acts 18:5, 9, 10.

Now if Silas had the gift of prophecy, in the sense of foreknowing and foretelling, then when he was the personal and chosen traveling companion and fellow worker of Paul, why should it not have been known and told by him what they should do when they came to Troas, and that Paul should stay in Corinth,

instead of these things having to be made known to Paul by the Lord himself in visions in the night.

These facts certainly indicate that Judas and Silas and Philip's daughters were prophets in the sense of speaking "unto men edification, and exhortation, and comfort," and not in the sense of foreknowing and foretelling events; while Agabus and the disciples at Tyre had the gift in the sense of foreknowing and foretelling.

*Fourth:* There is another item that is plainly for our consideration and learning. Judas and Silas were prophets. We first meet them as "chief men among the brethren at Jerusalem" in the meeting that discussed the question of circumcision about which Paul and Barnabas came up from Antioch to Jerusalem. They were "chosen" by the "apostles and elders with the whole church" in that meeting to go to Antioch and tell "by mouth" as also to carry the letter in which was *written* the message sent by that assembly to the brethren at Antioch.

At that time two meetings were held in Jerusalem by the church and the apostles and elders, with the brethren from Antioch. At both these meetings the question was discussed, and at the second meeting there was "much disputing." And these two men who were prophets were there, and were "chief men among the brethren." And yet the question at issue, the question that had caused "no small dissension and disputation" at Antioch, and over which there was "much disputing" in the meeting at Jerusalem, - *this question* was not settled in that meeting by those prophets nor by anything that they said or did. They are not even mentioned in any connection with the question or with the meeting, till the matter is all settled and the word is to be sent to Antioch. And even then they are not mentioned as prophets till they have come to Antioch, where, as "being prophets themselves" they "exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them."

Again: After those meetings in Jerusalem, at which that question was settled, Peter and "certain who came from James," at Antioch, strongly believed the same old issue and showed that with them it was not yet settled. And "there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets." Yet neither then did any prophet deliver any revelation to decide the matter or to settle the question. No; Paul withstood Peter to the face and spoke openly before them all "the truth of the gospel"; and the Holy Spirit himself settled the question.

*Fifth:* There is yet another thing in the record that is for our consideration and learning. The disciples at Tyre "said to Paul *through the Spirit*, that he *should not go up to Jerusalem*." But Paul went on the way to Jerusalem. As he was on the way he came to the house of Philip at Cesarea, where the prophet Agabus met him and told him how the Jews at Jerusalem would bind him and deliver him to the Gentiles.

From these revelations of the Spirit, those who were of Paul's company, as well as the brethren at Cesarea, understood that it was the mind of the Spirit that Paul should not go to Jerusalem. They therefore all "besought him not to go up to Jerusalem," yet he would not listen to this, but exclaimed, "What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to

die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done." Acts 21:4, 10-14.

It is not for any man to say whether Paul did right or did wrong, in that matter. With any question of the right or wrong of it we can have nothing at all to do. But the *record* and the *facts* are for our learning. Therefore -

.(a) It is plain and certain that the disciples at Tyre did say to Paul, and did say it "*through the Spirit*, that he *should not go* up to Jerusalem."

.(b) It is plain and certain that the prophet Agabus did say to him, "Thus saith *the Holy Ghost*, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle."

.(c) It is plain and certain that all who were with him understood that it was the mind and counsel of the Holy Spirit that he should not go to Jerusalem, and therefore they besought him not to go.

.(d) It is plain and certain that he would not be thus persuaded, and did go straight on to Jerusalem.

.(e) And it is equally plain and certain that after all this neither the Christians nor the prophets separated from Paul, nor ostracised him, nor denounced him, nor whispered against him, as one who "didn't believe the testimonies," or as one who disregarded the counsel of the Lord," now anything of the kind. No. They simply said, "The will of the Lord be done," and left it there, with Paul and the Lord. Nor yet did the Lord separate from him, nor denounce him, nor require his children to separate from him. Neither did the Holy Spirit turn against him and discredit him among his brethren and try to break him down and destroy his life's work.

No, no, no. But when he would not be persuaded, but would go up to Jerusalem, the brethren went with him, and the Holy Spirit and the Lord went with him. And when all came upon him, against which the brethren had tried their best to persuade him, still, at least, *some* of the brethren, and the Holy Spirit, and the Lord Jesus, and the Heavenly Father, remained with him, and comforted him, and strengthened him and preserved him and delivered him.

It is true that afterward, whether for this cause or some other equally groundless, all those that were in Asia turned away from him. And at nearly the very last, at one time, no man stood with him, but all men forsook him. But they had far better all have stood with him through all to the very end; for the Lord stood with him and strengthened him, and delivered him from every evil work, and preserved him unto his Heavenly kingdom. 2 Tim. 1:15; 4:16-18.

Thus in the New Testament Church the gift of prophecy was and is to be manifested both in "men's speaking unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort," and in men's foreknowing and foretelling. In the first phase, it is chiefly to be desired by all believers, and all may have the gift and all may prophesy. In the second phase, not all could be prophets, but only such as God should choose and set in the church. 1 Cor. 12:28, 29, 17, 18.

**October 30, 1907**

**"In the Field" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 44 , pp. 350, 352.**

LEAVING Battle Creek, August 17, the time till the 26th was spent by special invitation in attendance at the Convocation of Ministers and Assembly of the

352

General Conference of the Seventh-day Baptists, at Niles and Alfred, New York. A hearty Christian welcome was accorded by ministers and people, in all their meetings and exercises; and the ten days were most enjoyably spent among those splendid Christian people; to all but about a half dozen of whom I was at first and by sight a total stranger, but by none of whom either at first or afterward was I in any wise treated as any other than a Christian brother.

After the Conference adjourned, on the night of the 26th, I remained at Alfred over Sabbath, the 31st, the guest of Pastor and Mrs. L. C. Randolph, of the Alfred Church, preaching Thursday night the 29th and Sabbath, the 31st. Alfred is a beautiful place, and a town of excellent people; and my stay there was a real pleasure from beginning to end.

Leaving Alfred the night after Sabbath, August 31, I went to Washington, D. C., where I spent two weeks in a tent-meeting with Brother Sheafe. Throughout the two weeks of meetings the attendance was good and the interest excellent; and both interest and attendance increased continually. The attendance was a thousand or more on Sunday nights, and from two hundred to three hundred on other nights. The meetings were to continue two weeks after I left there; so the results of the work during the tent season could not be reported. But it is certain that Brother Sheafe and his people have everything to encourage them in the work of the gospel message.

From Washington I went to Newark, N. J., where for two weeks I helped Brother Franke in his tent-meeting, in that city. This happened to be just in the time of the equinoctial storms so that the attendance was not as large as otherwise it would well have been. Yet even under the disadvantages of the stormy time the attendance was well worth while and the interest was good.

From Newark I went to New Haven, Conn., Westerly and Providence, R. I., visiting friends of the truth, and preaching in Providence Sabbath and Sunday four times, October 5 and 6. From Providence I went, by invitation, to West Newton, Mass., where I preached in a Baptist Church twice on Sunday, October 12, and on Wednesday night, October 16; and held Bible studies in a private house on other nights, October 9-15.

Sabbath, October 19, I preached at 11:00 A. M. in the Seventh-day Baptist church at Westerly, R. I., to the regular congregation of which Rev. W. L. Burdick is pastor, and at 3:00 P. M. in a hall in the same town to another assembly.

Sunday night, October 20, I preached in a public hall in Irvington, N. J.

In all these places the one general theme of the preaching was the deep and far-reaching meaning of current events, national and international, and the only preparation that can enable any to meet these things in the truest way for the best good of themselves or mankind in general for their best good, whether for this world or the world to come: Righteousness, and temperance in view of the judgment to come; individuality - each one to know God himself for himself,

through personal faith in Jesus Christ, and led by the Spirit of God - as against the universal spirit of combine that characterizes the business, industrial, and religious world of today, by which all are brought under the domination of man, with the crushing out of all individuality, and the enforced worship according to the dictates of the creeds and councils of a religion utterly false. Thousands of people are asking themselves the meaning and tendency of all these things; and they are glad to have the answer from the Scriptures of truth, clear and plain. This is a wonderful time, and there are more wonderful things to tell concerning the time and the events of the time.

**November 20, 1907**

**"Religious Liberty" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 47 , pp. 369-371.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

GOD created man free. When man by sin was separated and lost from that freedom, Christ came to restore him fully to it. The way of God and of Christ, therefore, is the way of liberty. And the work of God through Christ with mankind in the whole history of the world has been to make plain this way and to give to man the absolute assurance of this "soul liberty" which is the only true liberty.

"Liberty" is "freedom from the domination of others or from restricting circumstances." In the nature of things there is no rightful room for the domination of others in the life and affairs of the soul of the individual person. This is peculiarly and supremely the realm of God alone, who created man in his own image and for his own glory; and who created each person individually and personally responsible and answerable to him alone.

Yet man, sinful and unruly man, has never been willing to allow God to have his place in and with the soul of the individual man; but has always been ambitious and ready to claim that place for himself, and by every means and contrivance possible to make this claim effective. History itself, as it relates to general principles and not to details, is hardly anything else than a succession of attempts upon the grandest possible scale to make successful this arrogant claim of sinful and unruly man in the place of God to dominate the souls of men. And no grander demonstration that there is a divinity striving hard to shape the destiny of mankind could ever be asked or given than from the day of Cain until now is given in the perpetual heroic assertion and maintenance of this perfect liberty of the individual soul by the individual person against the subtlest

370

pretensions and mightiest combinations of force and power that this world could possibly contrive. From Nimrod to Nebuchadnezzar and from Nebuchadnezzar until now the course and energy of empire have been bent and exerted to this one thing. And through all that time such splendid individuals as Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Daniel and his three brethren, Paul, Wyckliff, Huss, Miltitz, Matthias, Conrad, Jerome, Luther, Roger Williams, and multitudes unnamed, and

over all Christ Jesus, by divine faith have sublimely stood *alone with God*, absolutely alone so far as man is concerned, for the individuality, and in that the liberty, of the soul of man; and for the sovereignty of God alone in and over the realm of the soul.

In the Scriptures there are given distinctly and clearly five specific lessons on this subject of religious liberty - the liberty of the individual soul against the domination of man and combinations of men in the powers of the world. Each of these lessons deals with the subject upon a distinct and specific principle. And the five lessons, taken together, cover completely the whole ground upon every principle.

We now purpose to take up for special study these five lessons separately and in succession as given in the Scriptures. The contest for religious liberty is not yet finished. Religious liberty complete is not yet recognized, even in principle, and much less in practise, even by the mass of Christians, as it is made perfectly plain in the Scriptures.

Come, then, let us study and let us have, and let us study that we may have, religious liberty complete, in principle and in experience, as it is in the Scriptures of truth.

The Empire of Babylon embraced the civilized world, as the world then was. Nebuchadnezzar was monarch and absolute ruler of the empire. "Thou, O King, art a King of Kings; for the God of Heaven hath given thee a kingdom, and power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the haven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all." Dan. 2:37, 38.

In his own providential purpose God had made all nations subject to the sway of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon. Jer. 27:1-13. In the form and system of government of Babylon the authority of the king was absolute. His word was the law. In this absolutism of sovereignty king Nebuchadnezzar assumed that he was sovereign of the souls as well as the bodies, of the religious life as well as the devil conduct, of those who were subject to his power. And since he was ruler of the nations he would be ruler in the religion, and of the religion, of the nations.

Accordingly he made a great image, all of gold, about ninety feet tall and nine feet broad, and "set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon." Then he summoned from the provinces all the officials of the empire to the dedication and the worship of the great golden image. All the officials came, and were assembled and stood before the image.

"Then an herald cried aloud, To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up; and whoso falleth not down and worshippeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace." And as the instruments of music sounded forth the grand signal for the worship "all the people, the nations, and the languages, fell down and worshipped the golden image." Dan. 3:4-6.

But in the assembly there were three young Hebrews who had been carried captive from Jerusalem to Babylon, but who had been appointed by the king,

officials "over the affairs of the province of Babylon." These neither bowed nor worshipped, not otherwise paid any particular attention to the proceedings.

This was noticed, and excited accusation before the king. "There are certain Jews whom thou hast set over the affairs of the province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego; these men, O king, have not regarded thee: they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." Verse 12.

Then the king "in his rage and fury" commanded that the three young men should be brought before him. This was done. The king himself now spoke to them personally and direct: "Is it of purpose, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, do not ye serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up?" The king himself then repeated the command that at the sound of the instruments of all kinds of music they fall down and worship, and if not, they were to be cast "the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace."

But the young men quietly answered: "O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." Verses 14-18.

The issue was now clearly drawn. The sovereign of the world's power had personally issued his command direct to the three individuals; and from them he had received answer as direct, that they would not conform. This was conduct, and these were words, such as the king in his absolutism of power had never met before. There was therefore a personal as well as an official resentment aroused in him; and he was so "full of fury" that "the form of his visage was changed against" the young men, and he commanded that the furnace should be heated seven times hotter than usual, and that "the most mighty men in his army" should bind the young men and cast them into the midst of the roaring furnace.

It was done. And the three men, "in their coats, and their hosen, and their hats, and their other garments" fell down bound "into the midst of the burning fiery furnace." But just then the king was more astonished than ever in his life before. He was fairly petrified - "astonied" - and "rose up in haste" and to his counselors cried out, "Did not we cast *three men bound* into the midst of the fire?"

They assured him that this was true. But he exclaimed, "Lo, I see *four* men, *loose*, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God."

Then the king went near to the mouth of the furnace and called to the men by name and said, "Ye servants of the most high God, come forth and come hither." And they "came forth of the midst of the fire." And the princes, governors, and captains, and the king's counselors, being gathered together, *saw these men* upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed upon them.

"Then Nebuchadnezzar spoke, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and *have changed the king's word*, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, except their own God."

Here, then, is the situation: The Lord had brought all nations in subjection to the king of Babylon. By messages of his own prophet he had commanded his people, the Jews, and these three young men among them to "serve the king of Babylon." Yet these three had explicitly refused to serve the king of Babylon in this thing which he had personally and directly commanded them; and in this refusal the Lord himself had most signally stood by them and delivered them.

Therefore it would be impossible more plainly to show that the Lord, in commanding the people to be subject to the king of Babylon and to serve him, had never either commanded or intended that they should be subject to him or serve him *in the realm of religion*.

By this unmistakable approval of the course of the three men, and this signal deliverance of them, the Lord made perfectly plain to the king that his command in this matter was wrong; that

371

he had demanded a service that he had no right to require; that in making him king of the nations the Lord had not made him king in *the religion* of the people; that in bringing him to be head of all the nations, peoples, and languages, God had not given him to be head of the religion of even a solitary individual; that while the Lord had brought all nations and peoples under the king's yoke as to their political and bodily service, this same Lord had unmistakably shown to the king that he had given no power nor jurisdiction in any way whatever in their soul's service; that while in all things between nation and nation, and between man and man, all peoples, nations, and languages had been given to him to serve him, and had made him ruler over them all; yet in the things between each man and God the king could have nothing whatever to do; and that in the presence of the rights of the individual person, in conscience and in worship "the king's word" *must change*, the king's decree is naught; that in this the king even of the world is only nobody, for here only God is sovereign and all in all.

And for the instruction of all kings and all people, forever, all this was done that day, and it was written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come.

**December 4, 1907**

**"Religious Liberty - II. As Related to the Supremacy of the Law" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 49 , pp. 385, 386.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

THE world power and empire of Babylon passed away forever; and another took its place - the power and empire of Medo-Persia. Here was another principle of government, and here there is given to the world another lesson in religious liberty.

In the Medo-Persian empire the principle of government was different from that of Babylon.

Babylon, as we have seen, was not only an absolute monarchy, but an autocracy - a one-man government, a one-man absolutism. The word of the kings was the law, and the law was changeable as the will and word of the king might change. The king was the source of the law; his word was the law for all others, but as for himself there was no restriction of law.

The Medo-Persian government was an absolute monarchy also. There, also, the word of the king was the law, but with this all-important difference from Babylon, that when once the word of the king had gone forth as the law, that law could not be changed nor reversed even by the king himself. The king himself was bound, even against himself, by his own word or decree that had once become the law. The government of Medo-Persia, therefore, was a government *of law*; its principle was the supremacy of THE LAW.

At the head of the administration of the affairs of this empire there were three presidents, of whom Daniel was first. Because of Daniel's knowledge, integrity, ability, and general worth in the administration the king had it in mind "to set him over the whole realm." This, becoming known, excited the jealousy of the other two presidents and of the princes; and they conspired to break him down.

They sought, first, "to find occasion against Daniel" concerning his conduct of the affairs of the empire. But after long and diligent search, and the closest possible scrutiny, they were obliged to cease their endeavor and confess that "they could find none occasion nor fault;" because "he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him."

"Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God." But they could not find any occasion against him concerning even the law of his God, until they themselves had first created a situation that would render inevitable the desired occasion.

Their long and exacting endeavor to *find* come [*sic.*] occasion or fault against him in the affairs of the empire, had convinced them of his absolute devotion in loyalty to God. Through their investigation they knew by experience that he could not by any means be caused to swerve a hair's-breadth from the straight line of absolute devotion to God. But this was wholly an individual matter, in which there was no interference with any man in any way whatever. And in in [*sic.*] his conduct in relation to others and to the State, their own consciously prejudiced investigation had demonstrated that it was actually beneficial.

Thus there being no possible ground upon which they could find occasion against him even concerning the law of his God, as circumstances [*sic.*] and conditions were; and they, therefore, being put to the necessity of actually creating such ground Daniel's unswerving devotion to God became the way over which they would proceed. They therefore concocted a scheme into which they drew all the officials of the empire, and went to the king and said: - "Oh [*sic.*] king, live forever. All the presidents of the kingdom, the governors, and the princes, the counsellors, and the captains, have consulted together to establish a royal statute, and to make a firm decree, that whosoever shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of thee, O king, he shall be cast into the den of lions. Now, O king, establish the decree, and sign the writing, that it be not

changed, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not." Dan. 6:6-8.

The king allowed himself to be caught by this very flattering proposal of so large a number of the highest officials of the empire; and he signed the decree. Daniel knew that the decree had been framed, and that the writing had been signed by the king. He knew that such was now the law of the empire - a law that could neither be changed nor altered. Nevertheless he went to his house, and as his regular times of prayer recurred, three times a day, he "prayed and gave thanks before God, as he did aforetime." And his windows happening to be open, the imperial law had not enough place in his mind or weight upon his attention to induce him to take the precaution even to close the windows.

The plotters expecting nothing but just this on the part of Daniel, "assembled and found Daniel praying and making supplication before his God." Then at sight of this open disregard of the imperial law, they hastened to the king and very deferentially inquired. "Hast thou not signed a decree," etc? The king answered. "The thing is true, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not." Then the plotters reported, "that Daniel which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed, but make thhis [*sic.*] petition three times a day."

"Then the king, when he had heard these words, was sore displeased *with himself*," because he had allowed himself to be so flattered as to be caught in such a trap as that. "And he set his heart on Daniel to deliver him." But the plotters

386

were ready with their plea of the supremacy and integrity of "the law"; and to urge arguments that it was "not a question of religion, but of the law;" that to countenance disregard and violation of "the law" was simply to undermine all the government and make an open bid for a reign of anarchy, and for the very dissolution of society itself; that they were exceedingly sorry that such an excellent man as Daniel should be thus involved, yet to allow such open disregard of "the law" by one of such high standing and reputation would be only all the worse, because this very fact of the high standing and wide reputation of the one who so openly disregarded "the law" would be only the more encouragement to all people to do the same, etc., etc.

Yet the king "labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him." But through all that time and at every turn, the king was met by the plotters with the plea, "The law; the law." "Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, that no decree nor statute which the king establisheth may be changed." The supremacy of the law bound the king himself; there was no escape; and, though with greatest reluctance, "the king commanded and they brought Daniel, and cast him into the den of lions."

The king passed the night in fasting and in sleeplessness. But very early in the morning he hurried to the den of lions and "cried with a lamentable voice unto Daniel . . . O Daniel servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually, able to deliver thee from the lions?"

Daniel answered, "O king, live forever. My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as *before Him*, innocency was found in me; and also *before thee*, O king, have I done no hurt." And therein the demonstration is made in perfection forever that the person who disregards any law that touches service to God *is innocent before God*, and also does "no hurt" to the king, nor to the state, nor the society, nor to any principle of law or government.

All of which in divine truth demonstrates again that no earthly government can ever have the right or jurisdiction in matters of *religion*; that is, in "the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it." And in *this* case there is the additional demonstration that no government can ever of right incorporate *in the law* provisions touching *religion*, and then plead the supremacy and integrity of "the law;" that "it is not primarily a question of *religion* but only of *the law*;" that "we are not asking for religious observance, we ask only *respect for law*." In the case of Daniel and the "supremacy of the law of the Medes and the Persians," the divine answer to all such pleas is that, nothing pertaining to religion can ever of right have any place in the law.

The right of perfect individuality in religion is a divine, and therefore an absolutely inalienable, right. And to make religious observations or prohibitions a matter of the law, does not affect the free exercise of this divine right. The fulness of the right, and the perfect liberty of its exercise, abides ever the same, even though religion be made a matter, and a part of the law. And when religion or religious observance or prohibition is fixed in the law, even though the law be as supreme and inflexible as that of the Medes and Persians, the divine right and perfect liberty of individuality in religion then extends *to the law that incorporates the religion*, and such law is simply no law. The subterfuge of enforcing religious observances or prohibitions under cover of "the supremacy and integrity of the law," instead of taking away or in any way limiting the divine right and perfect liberty of individuality in religion, simply reacts to the extent of actually sweeping away all ground of claim for "the supremacy and integrity of the law" - in actually nullifying the specific law in the case.

The civil law is rightly supreme in the realm of things civil, but in the realm of things religious it simply has no place at all.

In the presence of the divine right of individuality in religion as relates to autocratic government, illustrated in King Nebuchadnezzar, *the King's word must change*.

In the presence of the divine right of individuality in religion as relates to the supremacy and inflexibility of the law, illustrated in the government of the Medes and Persians, any law that touches or contemplates religion is simply no law at all.

The realm of religion is the realm of God. In that realm - God alone is Sovereign, and his will is the only law. And in that realm the individual stands alone with God, and responsible to him alone.

**December 11, 1907**

**"Religious Liberty - III. As Related to the Supremacy of the Law" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 50 , pp. 397-399.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

BY most remarkable facts and unquestionable experiences, in the case of King Nebuchadnezzar and the three Hebrew young men, there was made plain for ever the divine truth and principle that with the religion of the people no monarch can of right have anything to do; that in the presence of the right of individuality in religion, the king's word must change.

By corresponding facts and experiences in the case of the Medo-Persian govern-

398

ment against Daniel there was made plain forever the divine will and truth and principle that with the religion of the people no law, nor any government by means of law, can of right have anything to do - that in the presence of the free exercise of individuality in religion, any law teaching religion is nothing; and every individual in absolutely ignoring and disregarding such law is "innocent" before God, and also does "no hurt" to government, to law, or to society.

These two examples and the principles which they illustrate cover every phase of earthly government as such, and so make plain the great and vital truth that religion, with its rites, institutions, and observances, is totally excluded, and is to be totally exempt, from the cognizance of earthly government of whatever phase or form; that religion, with all that is incident to it, pertains to the individual lone in his personal relations to God.

But there is another means by which man has sought to dominate man in the realm of religion, that is by means of *the Church through the State*.

People called out from the world and separated from the world unto God, are his church in the world. When God had called his people out of Egypt they were first "the church in the wilderness" and afterward in the land of Canaan they were the church there.

Through their stiffness of neck, hardness of heart, and blindness of mind, they sadly missed God's great purpose for them as his church. Yet in his goodness and mercy God suffered their manners in the "wilderness," and in the land from age to age. Thus through many vicissitudes that people and continued as the church till the time when Christ the Lord came to dwell on the earth; and through all that time this church was heir to most glorious promises of a widespread kingdom and dominion.

At the time when Christ came to the earth as man, the dominion and power of Rome held the people of that church in stern and cruel temporal subjection, and they longed for the promised Deliverer to appear. This Deliverer had been abundantly promised, and at last he came. But the high ones of the church had allowed their worldly ambition to hide their eyes from the spirituality of the kingdom and dominion that had been promised; and they looked for, and had taught the people to expect, a political and temporal deliverer who should strike

off the yoke of Rome, break her power, and exalt the church of the chosen people to a position of power and dominion over the nations, corresponding to that which for so long had been held by the nations over them.

When Jesus first appeared in his public ministry, these high ones of the church went with the crowds that flocked to hear him, listened with interest, and hoped that he would fulfil their expectations. But when they saw the interest and enthusiasm of the multitude reached the point where "they would come and take him by force to make him a king"; and when they saw that Jesus, instead of accepting the honor or encouraging the project, "withdrew himself from them"; in this they also saw that all their ambitious hopes of deliverance from the dominion of Rome, and of exaltation over the nations were utterly vain so far as Jesus was concerned.

But by this time the influence of Jesus with the people had become so widespread and so strong that the church-leaders saw that their rapidly vanishing; instead of seeing fulfilled or sanctioned their ambitions, plans, and hopes for worldly power and dominion, they saw with dismay that what power and influence they did have with the people was most certainly undermined. And this by a man risen from the greatest obscurity, who came from a town of the meanest reputation, and who was at most only a private member of the church. Something must be done, and that very soon, to preserve their own place and dignity. It was manifestly too late to think of commanding him not to preach or teach; by this time they knew full well that not only he but the multitudes [*sic.*] themselves would pay no attention to any such prohibition. But there was a way out - a means by which to maintain their place and dignity, and to assert their power over him and the people. In their opinion of themselves and their position, it was a very easy thing to make their place and dignity identical not only with the position but with the very existence of the church and even the nation itself. Accordingly they concluded, "If we let him thus alone all men will believe on him and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation." And "from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death."

But subject as they were to the Roman authority, it was not lawful for them to put any man to death. Therefore, to effect their purpose they must get control of the governmental or civic authority. It mattered not that this authority was Roman; and it mattered not that this Roman authority they hated above all other earthly things, and could not by any possibility willingly recognize; all this must be forgotten in the presence of the awful alternative of seeing vanish their place and dignity and power in the church.

In the church the Pharisees and the Herodians stood at opposite poles. The Herodians were so called because they were the party and partisans of Herod. They were the apologists for Herod in his position of king of Judea. But as Herod was king only by the direct appointment of Rome, and was seated and maintained as king by the power of Rome, for any one to be a partisan and an apologist of Herod was to be even more a partisan and an apologist of Rome.

The Pharisees were the exclusively righteous ones of the church. They were the extreme church party. As such they were the conservators of the purity of the church, the representatives of the truest loyalty to God and the ancient dignity of

the chosen people. As such they were the extreme and most uncompromising dissidents from Rome, and from all that was of Rome or that was in any way connected with Rome.

But the Pharisees, as the exclusively righteous ones and the chiefest in dignity, were the most fixedly set against Christ, and took the lead in the counsels and plans to destroy him. And to accomplish their purpose to put him to death, they must have the co-operation of the secular power, which was Roman only. Therefore to accomplish their purpose against Jesus, they would glaze their hatred for Rome, and would use for their purpose against Jesus that very power of Rome of which they were by profession the extreme disputers and opposers.

The means by which at one stride they would both cross this gulf to Rome and make sure of the secular power, was to join issues with the Herodians. The Herodians, as being only less opposed to Jesus than were the Pharisees, were ready for the alliance. By this alliance the political party would be at one with the Pharisees, and the political influence and power of that party would be at the command of the church lovers. This would make sure to them the use of the soldiery, which they must have if they would be really secure in their open movements against Jesus.

The alliance was entered into, and the conspiracy was formed: "And the Pharisees went forth and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, *how they might destroy him.*" Mark 3:6. "Then went the Pharisees and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians," "spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that *so they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor.*" Matt. 22:15, 16; Luke 20:20. And that governor was Pilate *the Roman.*

And when finally the time came, at that awful midnight hour when Judas, "having received" a band of men and a captain and officers, "with swords," came upon him in Gethsemane, it was "the band and the captain, and the officers," who, at the direction of "the

399

chief priests and Pharisees," took him and bound him.

And having so taken him they led him to Annas first. Annas sent him to Caiaphas, and Caiaphas sent him to Pilate the governor, the Roman. Pilate sent him to Herod, who "with his men of war" set him at naught and mocked him and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe and sent him again to Pilate, "And when Pilate would have let him go, they rung their final political note and plea of *loyalty to Cesar and Rome*, even above the loyalty of Pilate and the Roman himself, "If thou let this man go thou art not Cesar's friend. Whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cesar."

Pilate made his last appeal, "Shall I crucify your king?" only to be answered with the words expressive of their final abandonment of God and their completest unity with Rome, "We have no king but Caesar. Crucify him. Crucify him. And they were instant with loud voices. And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed."

Thus the mightiest crime and the loudest crying sin in all the history of the universe was committed, and was made possible as it was committed, only by the union of church and State - only by the church in control of the civil power, using to make effective her wicked will and purpose.

And that awful fact alone is all-sufficient to blast with perpetual and infinite condemnation and to consign to eternal infamy all such connection anywhere forever. And with such a record in the very first instance of the thing, it is not at all strange that this same thing of union of church and state - the church in control of the secular power - should have proved and must ever prove, the chiefest curse to men and nations wherever found in all after times.

So true it is, and so completely demonstrated, that "secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the church."

**December 25, 1907**

**"Religious Liberty - IV. As Related to the Church Itself" *The Medical Missionary* 16, 52 , pp. 413, 414.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen that no monarchical government has any right to enforce or require any religious observance; and that when any such power does so, the right of individuality in religion is supreme, and the monarch's word must change.

We have found also that no government in which the law is supreme has any right to put into the law of the realm any statute, decree, or provision touching religion; and that when such a thing is done, the right of individuality in religion remains supreme, and innocency before God, and perfect harmlessness before the government, the law, and society is found in him who disregards such law.

We have found that the church has no right to control the civil power for the execution of her will of the furtherance of her aims; and that when she does so a connection of crowning iniquity is formed, only a Satanic gift is in the possession of such church, and the right of individuality in religion is still supreme and to be freely exercised.

There is yet another combination by means of which domination of man in religion has been sought; this is *the church itself*, within itself - the church as relates to the membership of the church. And upon this, whether in principle, or in facts of remarkable experience, the Scripture is no less explicit than in any other of the examples given on this subject.

It has been already related how that Israel when delivered from Egypt was first "the church in the wilderness" and afterward in the land of Canaan; and that this same Israel in the days of Christ on earth, though in spirit and substance far short of God's ideal for them, yet in fact was still the church in direct descent.

The official organization of this church was also still in fact the same in direct descent. The priesthood - the chief priests, and the high priest - in order and in succession, were the direct continuance in succession of the order established

by the Lord through Moses in the wilderness; and was just as truly the church in descent from the church in the wilderness.

And the apostle of the Lord and the original disciples of Jesus were all, without exception, members of that church. They took part equally with others in the services and worship of that church. They went to the temple and into the temple with all the others to worship at the regular hours, and they taught in the temple (Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:12); and the people were. . . the approval of. . . upon them all.

But those apostles and. . . learned something and knew. . . truth that the high ones of the church did not know and would not recognize. Therefore they preached Jesus and the resurrection, and salvation through Him, and that there is no other way - that very Jesus of whom the official order and organization of the church had "now been the betrayers and murderers." Therefore this official order and organization of the church assumed the office and prerogative of deciding that those private church-members should neither preach nor teach this truth that they knew to be the truth.

Accordingly the priests and the temple authorities arrested Peter and John and put them in prison; when they had gone up to the temple at the hour of prayer, and the lame man had been healed through faith in the name of Jesus, and Peter had preached to the assembled wondering people. Then the next morning all the official order and organization of the church - the rulers, the seventy elders, the scribes, the priests, and the highpriest - gathered together and had Peter and John brought and set in the midst, and demanded of them what authority they had to be preaching: "By what power, and by what name, have you done this?"

Then Peter "filled with the Holy Ghost" made answer. The whole assembly "marveled" at the boldness of these two only common and illiterate members of the church in the presence of that official and august body, "and they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus." Peter and John were remanded outside the council, while the council "conferred among themselves."

In their conference they decided, "Let us straitly threaten them that they speak henceforth to no man in this name." Then they called in again Peter and John "and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus." But Peter and John answered immediately, "Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard." In that answer so promptly given, it seemed to that assembly that these mere common men and private and illiterate members of the church, would actually convey the impression that it was possible for such as they to be taught of God, and to know from God things that this whole assembly of the highest officials and most learned ones of the church did not know; and they would pay no attention whatever to the command of

414

. . . would go right ahead. . . that the council might. . . Plainly enough such a . . . could mean only every one for himself, an individual independence that would overthrow all order and authority.

Such an answer as that from such persons as those, to such an official and dignified body as this; such an answer from mere common persons to this august assembly, from mere private members of the church to the regular assemblage of that which for ages had been the highest official and divinely appointed order in the organization of the church; could not be considered by those officials as anything less than arrant presumption, and the destruction of all order and organization in the church.

However, the council let them go, with further charge under heavy threat that they should so teach no more.

Peter and John being let go went to the company of the other disciples and "reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them." And all the others, instead of being in the least awed or more afraid by it, not only decidedly approved what Peter and John had done, but were so glad of it that "with one accord" they thanked and praised God, asked Him to "behold the threatenings of the church officials and grant to *all* of the disciples boldness that they may speak thy word." And God witnessed to their Christian steadfastness, "and the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and *they spake the word of God with boldness.*" "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of man and women."

This open disobedience to the "authority" of the church, this bold "disregard for established order and organization? could not be allowed to go on. Therefore *all* the apostles were next arrested and imprisoned; for "then the highpriest rose up, and all they that were with him, and were filled with indignation, and laid hands on the apostles and put them in the common prison."

But lo! "*the angel of the Lord* by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth and said, Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life. And when they heard that, they entered into the temple early in the morning and taught."

That same morning the highpriest and they that were with him "called the council together, and *all the senate of the children of Israel*, and sent to the prison" to have the apostles brought before them to answer for all this "insubordination," "apostasy" and "opposition to the organized work" of the church. The messengers returned and reported that they found the prison securely closed and the keepers on guard, but there were no prisoners. But while those of the council were wondering what this could mean, there came one saying that the men were "standing in the temple and teaching the people."

Officers were sent who arrested them all anew and brought them before the council. The highpriest demanded of them, "Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine."

The apostles answered as before: "We ought to obey God rather than man. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel with forgiveness of sins. And we are witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey Him."

At this bold persistence in the forbidden course the council "took counsel to slay them." From actually murdering the apostles the council was dissuaded by Gamaliel. Nevertheless, the council called in the apostles again, and "had them flogged" and then again "commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go."

The apostles departed from the presence of the council. But instead of being either awed or subdued by the council or by what it had done, they were all only glad again to be counted worthy to suffer stripes and whatever other disgrace from the official organization of the church for teaching what they saw and knew to be the truth. And notwithstanding that it was "all the senate of the children of Israel," that is, all those who composed the official organization of the church, that had so treated them and had repeatedly commanded them not to preach at all nor teach the things which they were both preaching and teaching, "never for a single day, either in the temple or in the private houses, did they discontinue teaching or telling the good news of Jesus the Christ."

*(To be Continued.)*

## **The Medical Missionary, Vol. 17 (1908)**

**January 8, 1908**

**"Religious Liberty - IV. As Related to the Church Itself. (*Continued.*)"**  
***The Medical Missionary 17, 2 , pp. 39-42.***

BY ALONZO T. JONES

*(Continued.)*

THUS by plain facts of remarkable experiences under God it is demonstrated that above all officialdom of priesthood, council and senate of any church, the right of individuality in religion, in faith, and in teaching stands supreme. By, this unquestionable Scripture account, it is demonstrated that no church assembly or council or senate has any authority or any right to command or call in question any man of even the church's own membership concerning what he shall teach or preach. <sup>21</sup>

By the inspired record in this case, it is demonstrated that -

40

1. Just as certainly as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar and the three Hebrews it is divinely shown that no monarch can ever of right command anything pertaining to religion;

2. Just as certainly as in the case of *the law* and government of Media and Persia, it is divinely shown that no government can ever of right make any law touching religion; Just as certainly as in the case of the church of Israel against Christ it is divinely shown that no church officialdom can ever of right use the civil power to make effective her will or to further her aims;

3. Just so certainly in this case of the church of Israel against the apostles and disciples of the Lord, it is also divinely shown that no church, no council, senate or other collection or association of officials or others, can ever of right command any member even of her own communion in anything pertaining to what he shall believe or not believe, or what he shall teach or not teach.

The four cases presented in the Scriptures are perfectly parallel: in every case the power that attempted domination in religion was directly opposed and exposed by the God of Heaven, and was thus divinely shown to be absolutely in the wrong; and in each case the right of individuality in religion was divinely demonstrated to be eternally right.

In each of the four cases a distinct principle is involved and illustrated: in the fourth no whit less than in each of the preceding three. As certainly as Nebuchadnezzar was wrong in commanding worship; as certainly as the law of Media and Persia was wrong in prohibiting worship; as certainly as the church of Israel was wrong in using the civil power to execute her will against the Lord Jesus; so certainly that same church was wrong in prohibiting any member of the church from teaching or preaching the truth which he knew from the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of God.

And as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar the principle is that no monarch may ever of right do as that monarch did; as in the case of the law of the Medes and Persians the principle is that no law may ever of right be similar to that law; as in the case of the church organization using the civil power against Christ, the principle is that no church and no church order or organization or officialdom may ever of right use the civil power in any way whatever; just so in the case of the church of Israel against the apostles, the principle is that no church, and no church order, or organization or officialdom may ever of right do in any way similar to what in its officialdom that church did.

No, Gamaliel's counsel to that church-senate that day was right then and is right forever; and it is divine instruction to every church assembly, council, and senate, forever: "Let them alone." If the preaching or the work be only of man or of human origin it will come to naught of itself. And if it be of God you cannot overthrow it whatever you do: and in that case, in whatever you do to overthrow it you will be found to be only fighting against God. This thing is in the realm of God. It is subject to his jurisdiction alone. Leave it there, and trust him and serve him for yourselves; and let others alone to do the same themselves.

This is also plain enough in the plain truth itself. For, the Holy Spirit is given to each individual to guide him "into all truth." The truth of God is infinite and eternal. Therefore it will always be true that there is still an infinity and eternity of truth into which the Christian is to be guided. In the nature of things it is impossible for any other than the infinite and eternal Spirit to guide any one into or in the truth of God. Therefore every soul must be infinitely and eternally free to be guided by the infinite and eternal Spirit into this infinity and eternity of truth.

To say anything else than this is only to limit the truth of God, and limit the mind's advancement in the knowledge of truth and of God, and is to put an effectual estoppel upon all possibility of progress. Imagine the condition of

mankind and the world today, if the principle espoused by that church of Israel had been recognized and her com-

41

mands obeyed by the apostles and disciples of the Lord! But the crowning iniquity of saying anything else than this, is that it recognizes, sanctions, and establishes a mere human tribunal in the place of the eternal Spirit, and clothes a clique of sinful men with the prerogative of that infinite and eternal Spirit, as the guide into and in all truth.

Yet as plain as all this is in the simple manifestness of the truth of it, it is deplorably true that from the close of the apostolic period unto this hour, there has not been, and there is not now, a single church "organization" or denomination in the world that has not espoused the identical principle, taken the same position, and done the like thing, as did that Jewish church in the case of the apostles. And today there is not a denomination in the world, even to the very latest one that has risen, in which there is in any way recognized the right and the freedom of each individual member of the denomination to be led of the Spirit of God into truth and to the teaching and preaching of truth that the denominational officialdom does not know or chooses not to countenance. And when any member is so led and does teach and preach the truth that he knows by the Spirit and Word of God, immediately the denominational officialdom is awake, and its machinery in motion, and in the very spirit, and in the very way, of the officialdom and machinery of the Jewish church, he is forbidden to teach or preach any more in that name. And if, as did the apostles, he disregards such action and command, and ceases not to teach and to preach Jesus in the truth and the way that he knows, then he, as were the apostles, is persecuted and driven out.

And this is precisely and alone the cause of there being more than three hundred and sixty-five or more denominations in the world.

But is there never to be any end to this wicked thing? Will the time ever come, or must it never come, when there will be among Christians the recognition of the fundamental Christian principle of the right of individuality and liberty in faith and in guidance into divine truth? Will the time ever come, or must it never come, when there will be a company of Christians in the world who will recognize that the Holy Spirit is the Guide into all truth, that will recognize the right and the liberty of that Spirit to guide, that will recognize the right and the liberty of each Christian to be guided into all truth by that Spirit of truth, and that will± recognize the liberty of each Christian to hold, to teach and to preach any and all truth into which by the Spirit of truth he may be guided?

Isn't it time that such a thing should be? Isn't it time that the Christian principle should be recognized, that such a condition should prevail among Christians? Even the world has learned the principle that the monarch and the autocrat must recognize the full and perfect right of individuality and liberty in religion. Even the *world* has learned that *the law* must recognize the full and perfect right of individuality and liberty in religion. Even the world has learned that the church must not control the civil power to cause her will to prevail, but must recognize the full and perfect right in the field of persuasion, and therefore must recognize

the free and perfect right of individuality and liberty. And now must it be that the Church herself will *never* learn that she must recognize the free and perfect right of individuality and liberty in faith, in the Spirit, and in the truth? Isn't it high time that the Christian church was learning to recognize in its perfect genuineness the fundamental principle of her own origin and very existence? And if it must be so that no denomination will ever learn or recognize this fundamental principle of her own origin and existence, then is it not doubly high time that *individual Christians* shall everywhere recognize and practise constantly this fundamental principle of *their* own origin and existence as Christians, as well as the fundamental principle of the origin and existence of the Christian church?

And so it shall, be and will be. The God of individuality and of liberty will not allow that the divine principle and right of individuality and liberty in faith and in truth which He has wrought so

42

wonderfully and so constantly through all these ages to make plain and to maintain, shall be forever beaten back and pressed down, unrecognized and misrepresented by the Christian church and by Christian people. No; this splendid truth, this truth is the fundamental and the crowning truth in and to the very existence of the Christian church and of Christianity itself - this divine truth will yet win and hold forever its own divine place before the world *and in the church*: for those who espouse this divine and fundamental truth of the Christian religion and church, will themselves be now and forever, as in the beginning they were, the true Christian church in the world, and will compose that "glorious Church" which Christ, who gave himself for the Church, will "sanctify and cleanse with the washing of water by the word." in order that at his glorious appearing "He might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but holy and without blemish."

For upon this whole story of the church of Israel against the apostles, there stands out with transcendent meaning a truth that is worthy of the most solemn consideration by every Christian: this truth is, -

That which until that time had been the true church, called and preserved by the Lord, then and there ceased to be the true church at all; and that which this church despised, and forbade, and persecuted, and cast out, *became itself the true church*.

And so it is forever.

**January 22, 1908**

**"Pastor A. T. Jones in the West" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 4 , pp. 76, 77.**

ALONZO T. JONES is engaged in preaching the gospel in the West at present, where he has now been for the past five weeks. From a recent letter we copy the following concerning his work: -

"December 1-10 I preached every night and on Sundays in the "People's Church" in Omaha, on "The Spirit of

the Times and the Spirit for the Times, "The Church of Christ," and Christian Health and how to have it." The interest was excellent, and the truth was gladly received - the health principles no less than the others. Some dropped their tea and coffee drinking immediately and have not touched any since, and meat is meeting the same fate; and they propose to eat only that which is good, and glorify God in their bodies as well as in their spirits. Wednesday night, December 11, I preach in the M. C. Church at Auburn, Nebraska. Friday night to Tuesday night, December 13-17, I preached each night on Sunday in "Full Gospel" Hall, Sioux City, Ia. This hall being devoted to the promulgation of the full gospel, gave a good opportunity to present the full gospel indeed - the gospel for the whole man, body, soul and spirit. And though this was a fuller gospel than some of them had thought of, yet they accepted it gladly and propose to enjoy it for what it is.

From Sioux City I returned to Omaha, and spent the time of the holidays here, preaching in "The People's Church," in the First M. E. Church, South Omaha, and in Trinity M. E. Church, Omaha. In every place both ministers and people were glad and thankful for the truths preached; and heartily expressed themselves so.

I now to on further West to cheer and bless other people with the good word and message of the Lord.

**January 29, 1908**

**"Religious Liberty - V. As Between Individuals" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 5 , pp. 85-88.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

FROM the Scriptures, it is plain that the divine right of individuality in religion stands supreme in the presence of autocratic monarchy; in the presence of

86

any decree, statute, or law, of any government; in the presence of the church in control of the civil power; and in the presence of the church itself, even within the membership of the church.

There is just one other possible relationship - that of the individual to the individual. But when it is plain and positive by the word of God that no autocracy, no government of law, no church in control of civil power, and no church within the circle of its own membership, has any authority, jurisdiction, or right, in matters religious in the presence of the supreme and absolute right of the individual, then it is certain that no *individual* can ever have any authority, jurisdiction, or right over another individual in things religious.

Though this is plain in itself it is well to study at least some of the Scriptures on this, as well as on each of the other phases of this subject.

Faith is the gift of God, and to the individual. Jesus Christ is both the Author and the Finisher of faith. This being so, it lies in the nature of things that never by

any possibility in righteousness can anybody but Christ have any authority, jurisdiction, or right, respecting the exercise of faith which is the vital element of religion. Christ being both the Author and the Finisher of faith, to him alone belongs the sole sovereignty [*sic.*] and jurisdiction in all things relating to faith and to the exercise of faith, which is religion.

Accordingly the Scriptures say, "Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself before God." Rom. 14:22. Faith being the gift of God, and Christ being the Author and the Finisher of it, it is impossible for any one to owe to any but God in Christ any responsibility in matters of faith or the exercise thereof, which is religion. And this is the ground and surety of complete individuality in religion.

Therefore, the word of God stands written to individual believers forever, "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations"; not to judge his doubtful thoughts; not for decisions or doubts; not to "judge him"; not to "despise him"; "for God *hath received him.*" Rom. 14:1-3.

Please let there be noted forever, and forever regarded, that the reason, divinely given, as to why no Christian can ever "dispute" or "decide", or "judge," or "despise" another, is that "God hath received him."

"God hath received him" therefore, "receive ye" him.

"God hath received him" *upon his faith*, therefore, "receive ye" him "*upon his faith.*"

Even though he be "weak in the faith," "God hath received him"; therefore, even though he be still "weak in the faith," "receive ye him."

Even though he be "weak in the faith," it is "*the faith*" in which he is weak. And in that faith and by that faith he is saved. That faith is the gift of God, given to save the soul; and whosoever is in that faith, even though he be weak, has the salvation of God which is by faith. Of that faith, Jesus Christ is the Author and the Finisher; and whosoever is in that faith has Christ working in him to finish the blessed work of that faith unto the salvation of the soul. That faith, the individual is to hold unto God the giver of it, and in Christ, the Author and Finisher of it. The faith being the gift of God through Christ, he who has it, has it only unto God in Christ and in that faith his responsibility is solely to God in Christ.

Therefore, "him that is weak in the faith receive YE, . . . for God hath received HIM." God being the giver of "the faith" through Christ, the Author and Finisher of faith, the responsibility of every one "in the faith" is to God in Christ; therefore, "him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations, not for decisions of doubts," not to "despise him, not to judge him"; for, since "God hath received him" "in the faith and since "in the faith" he is responsible to God only. "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?" Verse 4. This is impossible in righteousness even though he be a man's servant, how much more, when he is God's servant, received and accepted of God "in the faith?"

Who, then, art thou that judgest God's servant, received of him "in the faith?" "To his own Master he stand-

eth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand." And when "God hath received" "in the faith" one whom you and I will not receive in the

faith, then, where shall we appear? The question is not then between us and him, but between God and us. Our difference is then with God, and we have entered into judgment with God. But when we enter into judgment with God over his having received "in the faith," one whom we will not receive "in the faith," then it is certain that we cannot stand in that judgment; because we ourselves are not "in the faith."

And when God will hold up, and will make to stand "in the faith," him whom you and I will not receive, whom you and I will not hold up nor try to make to stand, then that one is altogether safe with God "in the faith." And even though he be "*weak* in the faith," yet God is able to hold him up and to make him stand, and "he shall be holden up" and made to stand by God who has received him "in the faith" of which God is the giver, and Christ the Author and Finisher. And as for you and me, in all this matter, "let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

Another item that demonstrates the perfect individuality of man in things religious, follows immediately the words already quoted, thus: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Verse 5.

This Scripture does not say that all days *are* alike; but only that some "esteemeth every day alike." The Scriptures are perfectly plain upon the truth that all days are *not* alike: that there is a day that God has made peculiarly his own, and for man's eternal good has set it apart from all other days. That day is "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

Yet though this is true by the word of God, as to the observance or non-observance of that day the word of the Lord explicitly declares, "Let every man be fully persuaded *in his own mind*." And in this declaration he has again confirmed the perfect supremacy and absolute right of individuality in religion.

And, by the way, this item touches a matter that is everywhere rife today: the matter of the compulsory observance of a sabbath or day of rest. But in all things pertaining to the observance or regarding of a day, the word of God to all people is, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." "He that regardeth the day regardeth it unto the Lord: and he that regardeth not the day to the Lord, he doth not regard it." Verse 6.

Any day regarded or observed *not to the Lord* is not truly regarded or observed at all, for then there is nothing in it truly to regard. It is God who has selected, distinguished, and set apart, the day. The observance of the day pertains, therefore, to God; and lies only between God and the individual in faith and conscience. Therefore any observance of a sabbath or rest day enforced by law, by statute, by police, by court, by prosecution, or by persecution, is, in the first instance, a direct invasion of the province of God and of the realm of faith and conscience in the individual; and in the second instance is not even the observance of the day, and never can be, because it is not of persuasion in the mind.

God has appointed his own chosen and sanctified day to be observed; that is true. He calls upon all people to observe it, that is true. But in the observance or regarding of this day, the word of God thus explicitly declares that it is wholly an

individual matter: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." And when any man is *not* fully persuaded in his own mind, and therefore does not observe the day to the Lord, his responsibility for this is to God alone, and not to any man, nor to any set of men, nor to any law, or government, or power, on earth.

Following this item there is made an appeal in behalf of the recognition of perfect individuality in religion - this in view of the awful fact of the judgment of Christ and of God. This appeal runs thus: "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every

88

tongue shall confess to God." Verses 10, 11.

Every one of us must stand before the judgment seat of Christ and of God, there to be each judged by *him*. How then can it be possible ever in righteousness, that one of us can be called to be judged by another, or by any or all others, in the things of religion? that is, in the things in which we are to answer at the judgment seat of Christ.

No, no. "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." And, "He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge. There is else Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: who are thou that judgest another?" James 4:11.

Thus, that there is to be a judgment seat of Christ and of God where all must appear, each to answer for "the deeds done in the body" - this is one of the mightiest guaranties of perfect individuality in religion, and one of the strongest possible pleas for the recognition of it by every soul always.

Finally, the whole thought and truth of perfect individuality in religion is splendidly summed up, and powerfully emphasized as well as clearly expressed, in the inspired conclusion, -

"So then every one of us shall give account of HIMSELF to GOD." Verse 12.

**February 12, 1908**

**"Religious Liberty - VI. God and Cesar" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 7 ,  
pp. 130-134.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

IN the case of the church of Israel against the members of that church, who chose to believe in Christ and to

131

teach the truth concerning Him, the principle is made perfectly plain that no church has any authority, jurisdiction, or right, in, over, or concerning, the faith or the teaching, of any individual member of that very church itself. Acts 4 and 5; 2 Cor. 1:24.

There is another remarkable scripture that not only illustrates this total absence of authority, jurisdiction, or right, of any church; but also, makes plain some additional principles of the great truth of religious liberty.

This notable scripture is the one that contains the words of Jesus when the spying Pharisees and Herodians came to him with their crafty question, "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cesar or not?" With the tribute money in His hand, Jesus said: "Whose is this image and superscription? they said unto Him, Cesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render, therefore, unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

Here are revealed two persons - God and Cesar: two powers - the religious and the civil: two authorities - the divine and the human: two jurisdictions - the heavenly and the earthly: and only two, to whom, by the divine instruction, is anything due or to be rendered by men.

There is a jurisdiction and an authority, a power and a right, that belong to God. There is also, a jurisdiction and an authority, a power and a right, that belong to Cesar.

And these are totally distinct realms. There is that which is Cesar's; this is to be rendered to Cesar, not to God. There is that which is God's; and this is to be rendered to God, not to Cesar. It is to be rendered to God alone and direct. It is not to be rendered to Cesar, nor to God by Cesar.

Originally there was, and ultimately there will be, only one realm, only one jurisdiction, only one authority, only one power, only one right - that, of God alone. 1 Cor. 15: 24-28.

If sin had never entered there would never have been any other realm, nor any other jurisdiction, authority, power, or right, than that of God alone. And even when sin had entered, if the Gospel had been received by each and every individual ever coming into the world, then there would never have been any realm or jurisdiction, authority, power, or right, other than that of God alone. Eph. 1:7-10; 1 Cor. 1:20-23.

But not all will receive the Gospel; and so not all will recognize the sovereignty, the jurisdiction, the authority, the power, and the right of God. Not recognizing God's kingdom, will, purpose, and power, which is moral and spiritual, and which makes moral and spiritual all who do recognize it, these then, being sinful, fail to be even civil. Therefore there must be in the world a jurisdiction and a power that will cause those to be civil who will not be moral. And this is the State, the civil power, Cesar; and this its reason of existence.

In the nature of things there are only the two realms and the two jurisdictions: the moral and the civil, the spiritual and the physical, the eternal and the temporal; the one of God, the other of Cesar. There are these two realms and jurisdictions, and NO MORE. And there simply cannot of right *be* any more. One of these is God's realm and jurisdiction. The other is Cesar's.

And since by the divine word these are the *two*, and these two are the only two that there can possibly be, then it follows absolutely and exclusively that to the church there is in either kingdom nor dominion, realm nor jurisdiction, nor *is there any place for any*.

It is therefore perfectly plain that without assumption and usurpation no church can ever have any kingdom or dominion, any realm or jurisdiction. The church is not Cesar's; and without assumption and usurpation it is impossible for the church to exercise any of the jurisdiction of Cesar. The realm and jurisdiction of Cesar - the State, the civil power - is wholly of this world. The church with all that is of it is "not of this world." It is therefore impossible for the church without assumption and usurpation ever to occupy the realm of Cesar, or to exercise any jurisdiction in the things of Cesar, which things are wholly of this world.

This being so of the church as relates to Cesar, how much more is it true of

132

the church as relates *to God!* The church is not Cesar and cannot be Cesar. Much more the church is not God and cannot be God. And has not Inspiration set forth in such unsparing terms as "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," "the mystery of iniquity," "sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." THAT CHURCH that has thought to be the kingdom and hold the dominion, to occupy the realm and exercise the jurisdiction, *of God*. Is anything other than that needed to make perfectly plain the truth that for any church to assume that to her it belongs to be the kingdom and hold the dominion, to occupy the realm and exercise the jurisdiction, *of God*, is the very ultimate of arrogance, assumption, and usurpation.

But, it is asked, is not the church the kingdom of God? - Yes, it is - *provided* that by the term "the church" is meant only the divine conception of the church as expressed in the divine word - "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." When only that is meant in the use of the words "the church," then it is indeed the kingdom of God. But when by the "church" is meant some human conception, some religious sect or denomination, some earthly "organization," then it is not true of any church ever in this world that it is the kingdom of God.

But suppose that such a thing as that were really the church, and therefore the kingdom of God; even so, it would still be true that in order for such to be indeed the kingdom of God, it could be so only by God's being king there. And where God is king, he is king and Lord of all in all. God is never, and can never be, king in a divided kingdom. He never does, and never can, share His dominion with another. Will anyone claim or imply that there can in truth and in fact be a kingdom of God without God's being in truth and in fact king there; and king in all that is there? No, God must be king there or else it is not in truth the kingdom of God. He must be king and Lord of all and in all that is there, or else it is not in truth and in fact the kingdom of God. The realm must be occupied by Him, the jurisdiction must be exercised by Him, the principles must be His, the government must be of Him, the image and superscription must be His, and all this exclusively, or else it is not in truth and in fact the kingdom of God.

The soul and spirit of man, as man is in the world, as the world is, is in *intent* and *by right* the kingdom of God. And so to wicked and unbelieving Pharisees, Jesus said, "the kingdom of God is within you." But in lost mankind that kingdom is usurped and that realm is occupied by another. The usurper is on the throne, exercising jurisdiction that enslaves, debases, and destroys. Thus, while in intent and by right the kingdom is God's, yet in truth and in fact it is not God's but

another's. Yet let the lost and enslaved soul only welcome God into that alienated realm to occupy His own place on that usurped throne, and to exercise true jurisdiction there. THEN will that soul and spirit and life, in truth and in fact, as well as in intent and of right, be the kingdom of God. And even then it is the kingdom of God in truth only as God is king in all and over all to that soul. And so it is with the church.

The Church OF GOD is indeed the kingdom of God: it is "the fulness of him that filleth all in all;" it is composed only of those who are His. And He is king and sole ruler in this His kingdom. The jurisdiction in this realm is His alone; the principles of the government, and the authority and the power of the government, are His alone. And every citizen of the kingdom owes allegiance to Him alone; and this direct, in Christ, by the Holy Spirit. Every inhabitant of that realm is subject to His jurisdiction alone; and this direct, in Christ, by the Holy Spirit. Every member of this church, which is His kingdom, is inspired and actuated by the principles which are His alone and from Him alone; and is governed by the authority and power of Him alone; and this all direct is from Him, through Christ, by the Holy Spirit. Thus all who are of the Church of God in truth, which is the kingdom of God, render to God all that is of the heart, of the soul, of the mind, and of the strength. These also render *to Cesar*

133

the things that are Cesar's - tribute, custom, honor, in his place. Rom. 13:5-7.

Thus again it is perfectly plain and certain that neither between God and Cesar, not yet along with them, is there any *third* person, party, power, realm, or jurisdiction, to whom any man is to render anything. There is no command nor obligation from God to render anything to any kingdom or dominion, to any power or jurisdiction, but that of God and that of Cesar, - *these two only*. There is no image and superscription of *the church*, neither is there place for any.

And this is only to say that without God, and without God in His place as all in all, any church is simply nothing. And when such church attempts to be something, she is only worse than nothing. And in either case nobody; can ever owe anything to any such church.

On the other hand, when the church is truly with God; and when He is truly to her in all; she is truly of the kingdom of God. And yet even then, the kingdom, the dominion, the realm, the jurisdiction, the authority, and the power, are all *God's* NOT HERS; so that all that is owed or rendered is to *God*, *not* to the church. Thus it is strictly and literally true that never in any case is anything owed or to be rendered by anybody to the church, as such.

And thus again it is emphasized that there are just two persons, two realms, two jurisdictions, two authorities, two powers, to whom anybody can really owe or render anything - God and Cesar; these two and no more, and no other.

This requires, therefore, that the church to be true to her calling and her place in the world, shall be so absolutely devoted to God, so completely swallowed up and lost in God, that only God shall be known or manifested, wherever and in whatsoever she is or is to do.

In the very spirit of Christianity this is certainly true. For this is exactly the calling and attitude of individual Christians in the world - to be so absolutely

devoted to God, so completely swallowed up and lost in Him, that only God shall he seen in all that they are: "God manifest in the flesh." And the church is composed only of individual Christians. Also the church is "the body of Christ;" and Christ is God manifest, to the complete emptying, yea, the very annihilation, of *self*. And this is the mystery of God.

And just here is where the church, both before Christ and after Christ, missed her calling, and her place: she aspired to be something *herself*. It was not enough for her that God should be all in all. It was not enough for her that the kingdom and the dominion, the realm and the jurisdiction, the authority and the power, the word and the faith, should all be God's and only God's. She aspired to kingdom herself; to realm and jurisdiction of her own; to authority that she could assert; to power that she could wield; to a word that she could speak; and to a "faith" that she could dictate.

To satisfy this ambition and to make tangible this aspiration, she rejected God and assumed and usurped the kingdom and the dominion, the realm and the jurisdiction, the authority and the power, that belonged to both God and Cesar. And so being herself neither rod nor Cesar, but only a self-constituted and self-exalted interloper, her blundering confusion of things only multiplied iniquity and deepened the curse upon the world.

And such precisely is the charge that God lays against her in each age and in both testaments. The glory and the beauty, the honor and the dignity, the authority and the power, the sweet influence and divine attractiveness, that all were hers and that were grandly becoming to her, because of *His dwelling with her and being in her* - these all she arrogated TO HERSELF and assumed to be OF HERSELF. Read Eze. 16:11-19; Rom. 1:7-9, 2 Thess. 2:2-3; Rev. 17:1-6.

When God gave to her the true and divine *faith* that could be "spoken of throughout the whole world," upon this she assumed that HER faith was to be the faith of the whole world, and so took it upon *herself* to assign and to dictate "the faith" for the whole world, and to main-

139

tain that "the faith" which she dictated was the true and divine.

When God gave to her his *word* in such perfect purity to speak that when she should speak it would be even as the voice of God, upon this she exalted herself to the claim that HER voice was the voice of God, and that the word which she chose to speak was the word of God *because she* spoke it.

When God gave to her such perfection of truth that her very speaking of that truth was to speak with all authority, upon this she assumed for herself that SHE had authority to speak; and therefore that when she should speak, all must obey because it was she who spoke.

When God bestowed upon her such measure of his power that even the devils were subject to that power and must obey God, upon this she assumed that to HER belonged the power; and even the power to compel all men and nations in all the world to be subject to her and to obey her.

Thus in all things she actually thought it a thing to be grasped and held fast, "a usurpation to be meditated, to be equal with God." But the time has come when every person and everything that would be the church or of the church,

must never more think it a thing to be seized upon, a usurpation to be meditated, to be equal with God; but to think only of how the church shall empty herself, and make herself of no reputation, and take upon herself the form of a servant, and humble herself, and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; and all this in order that GOD may be made manifest in His own person and Spirit in her; and through her to the world.

The time has come when no church should any more call men to herself but to *Christ only*. The time has come when the church herself must be most of all interested in making it manifest that there is no third kingdom, realm, jurisdiction, or power; but only the two - God and Cesar; and when she must ever urge upon all people the divine instruction, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

The time has fully come when the church in all things must let only the mind be in her that "was also in Christ Jesus," that will *not* think it "a thing to be grasped, to be equal with God;" but that will completely empty *herself* in order that *God* may be revealed; the living and true God, and He all in all.

**February 19, 1908**

**"Religious Liberty - VII. (Conclusion)" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 8 ,  
pp. 146-150.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

WE have now traced in the Word of God the principle of the divine right of individuality in religion, as that principle is applied and illustrated as relates to autocracy, to government of the supremacy and inflexibility of law, to the union of Church and State, to the church itself; and to individuals.

Please let no one think that all this is only a series of studies in ancient history, nor yet that it is a study of principles and Scriptures only as such; though on either ground the study would be amply justified. However, it is nothing of the kind. It is a study of principles which in one phase or another are fully, as alive and active today as ever. And the day is yet to be, and that not far distant, when the whole series of illustrations covered in these studies will again be all alive and active, and all at once, as truly and to the like purpose as each was in its place and day.

The day is coming, and it is not far distant, when autocracies, governments of the supremacy and the inflexibility of the law, unions of church and State, and churches as such, will all be standing unitedly, and bent as from one mind, to compel submission and uniformity in religion; and to crush out every suggestion of individuality in religion and every kind of right of it.

It is particularly in view of what is soon to come that these studies have been published. All these things writ-ten in the Scriptures were set down there by the Spirit of inspiration, not only for the instruction of people always, but, particularly "for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come." The mightiest

contest, and this upon the grandest scale, between the forces of evil and the reign of righteousness that this world's experience shall ever know, is yet to be. This mightiest conflict is to be in the time when the ends of the world are come. That time is even now at hand. For this reason these lessons from the inspired record are all-important just now.

In view of the mighty pressure from

148

all these sources and by all these forces, that is soon to be put on every individual, it is of the greatest importance that each individual shall know for himself, and know by the surest possible evidence - to know by very certitude itself - just what is his place, his responsibility, and his right, individually, in the presence of principalities and powers, and before God and with God.

While in these studies of the Scriptures we have discussed each case from the point of view that these powers have no right to assert or exercise any authority or jurisdiction in religion, but that the right of individuality in religion is supreme in the presence of all, the other side is equally true and no less important, even if it be not even more important - that it is incumbent on the individual never to allow any other than God to assert authority or jurisdiction in religion without being openly challenged and absolutely ignored: that in true allegiance to God and perfect loyalty to the right, the divine right of individuality, in religion, shall be maintained. This every individual owes absolutely to God, to the right, and to himself in God and for the right. This principle each individual must maintain or else prove disloyal to God, to himself as a man before God, and to consent that the wrong shall prevail instead of the right; in other words, to consent that the wrong shall be the right.

It is true, as the inspired record shows, that autocracy, as illustrated in King Nebuchadnezzar; that government of the supremacy of law, as illustrated in the Medo-Persian power; that the union of church and State, as illustrated in the Jewish church and the Roman power against Christ; that the church as such, as illustrated in the church of Israel against the disciples of Christ; has no right to assert authority or jurisdiction in religion. It is equally, and even more emphatically, true, that, to be at all loyal to God and the right, or true to themselves and to their fellow men, the three Hebrew young men, the man Daniel, the Lord Jesus, and the apostles of the Lord, must absolutely disregard every such assertion. In each case God's dominion was usurped. In each case the right was being completely thrown over, and the wrong established in its place. In such a case and at such a time could any who knew God or cared for the right, sit still and do nothing? Is allegiance to God, nothing? Is loyalty to the right, never to be known? Shall the wrong be recognized as having only the right to prevail? Shall man never be true - neither true to God nor to the right, neither true to himself nor to his fellowmen.

It is true that Nebuchadnezzar was entirely out of his place and did wholly wrong when he attempted to exercise authority in religion; and the story is written to show to all people forever that every autocracy is just as much out of place, and just as far wrong, when it presumes to assert authority in religion. At the same time it is true, and equally important to remember, that the three Hebrew

individuals openly and uncompromisingly disregarded that autocratic assertion of authority in religion. And the story is written to teach that all other individuals forever must do as did those three individuals, if these, too will be true to God, to the right, to themselves, and to their kind.

It is true that, notwithstanding its principles of supremacy and inflexibility of the law, the Medo-Persian government did wrong when it by its law entered the field of religion; and the story is written to show to all governments and people forever that every government is equally wrong in entering by law the field of religion. It is equally true, and equally important to remember, that the individual, - Daniel, - did absolutely and uncompromisingly disregard that law, and that the story is written to teach all individuals forever that in all like circumstances they must do as did that individual, if they will honor God and the right and be true to themselves and to their fellowmen.

It is true that the Church of Israel did an enormously wicked thing when she allied herself with the civil power in order to make her will effective; and the story of it is written to show to all the world forever that every church commits the like enormity whenever, under any pretext whatever, she seeks

149

to control the civil power to make her will effective. It is equally true, and equally important to recognize and remember, that the One lone individual who was the object of this wicked alliance of the church and State, would die under it recognize it in the slightest degree. And this is all written, that every other individual to the world's end shall be ready under like circumstances to do as did the Lord Jesus, in order to be true to God, true to the truth, true to himself, and true to the human race.

It is true that the church of Israel went out of the right way, and did entirely wrong, when she assumed the authority to decide what the members of that church should or should not believe and teach; and the story of it is written to make plain to all churches and people forever, that every church is just as far from the right way, and equally wrong, when she assumes any authority to decide what any member of the church shall or shall not believe and teach. It is equally true, and just as important to remember, that the individual church members there openly and uncompromisingly refused to recognize any such authority to any extent or in any degree whatever. And this is written to teach to all church-members forever that they must individually do the like, if they will be true to God, true to Christ, true to the right, true to themselves, and true to mankind.

The three Hebrew young men did right when they refused to recognize any right of autocracy in religion. Daniel did right when he refused to recognize any right of civil government of law in religion. The Lord Jesus did right when he refused to recognize any right of the church through the civil power to make effective her will. The apostles and disciples of the Lord Jesus did right when they refused to recognize any right of the church to decide or to dictate what they should or should not believe and teach. In each of these cases God openly and in mighty miraculous power made perfectly plain to all that these individuals were right. By this it is openly demonstrated not only that they were right, but that they

were *divinely* right. And in each case the story has been written out that all powers and people forever may know that sure course is divinely right. And whosoever will stand with God as did each of these in his place, can know it.

It is these individuals and such like these, who, in their day and from age to age, have kept alive in the world the honor of God, who have kept alive the right in the world, who have kept alive integrity and true manliness in mankind, yea, it is just these and such as the blessed *individuals* who have kept the world itself alive.

It is not autocracies, nor governments of law, nor yet is it even churches as such, that have maintained the honor of God, that have held true to the right, and that have preserved the integrity of man. For all history with one voice testifies that all these have done all that they could to undermine and break down the integrity of man, to obliterate the right, and to shut out God from his own place in men and in the world.

No, it is not these, but the blessed INDIVIDUAL with God and in God; it is those who have known and maintained the divine right of individuality in religion, it is the Daniels, the Christ, the Paul, the Wyckliffes, the Luthers, who have have [*sic.*] stood alone in the world and in the church, and against both the church and the world - it is THESE, who have maintained the honor of God, who have kept alive the knowledge of God, of the right and of the true, and so have kept alive the world.

And now, and for the time to come - when there is being pushed forward among the churches and urged upon the world, denominational, national, international, and world FEDERATION in religion and of religion; when all this is aimed expressly to the one end of asserting by autocracies, by governmental law, by churches allied with and in control of civil power, by churches of themselves; when all these shall work at once and together to the assertion and exercise of absolute authority in religion - in view of all this, just now, as

150

never before, it is essential to know, to proclaim, and to maintain, -

The Divine Right of Individuality in Religion, and Religious Liberty Complete.

**March 11, 1908**

**"Through the Bible" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 11 , p. 212.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE one thing most needed is the study of the Bible.

The study of a verse here and there in the Bible, is not the study of the Bible.

The study of subjects in the Bible, even though there be many subjects and much study of them, is not the study of the Bible.

A person may be able to quote many texts of Scripture on many subjects in the Bible, and yet be sadly lacking in real knowledge of the Bible.

Verses here and there, even many of them together, - this is not the Bible. Subjects, even many of them, traced by the concordance from beginning to end of the Bible - this is not the Bible.

The Bible was not written in subjects nor verses, but in thoughts - the thoughts of God.

The Bible is the Word of God, and words express thoughts. The Bible, therefore, as the word of God, is the expression of the thought of God. There are thoughts of God expressed in single words. There are thoughts expressed in single verses. There are thoughts expressed only in whole chapters. There are thoughts expressed only in whole books. And there are thoughts expressed only in the whole Bible together. And true Bible study is to find, to receive and to dwell upon thoughts of God expressed in single verses, expressed in several verses, expressed only in whole chapters, expressed only in whole books, and expressed only in the whole Bible together.

Therefore, we are not saying that there should never be any study of single verses, nor of passages, nor of subjects, in the Bible. We are only saying that even when verses and passages and subjects in the Bible have been studied, the Bible has not yet been studied. It takes all that is in the Bible to be really the Bible. And plainly a person has not thoroughly studied the Bible till he has studied everything that is in the Bible - everything that goes to make up the Bible. And in order to study everything in the Bible, it is plain that it is necessary to go through the Bible, and through the Bible, and through the Bible - always be going through the Bible, until you know the Bible.

The Bible is composed of the story of -

The creation:

The fall:

The flood, in its cause and effects:

The re-peopling of the earth, and the confusion of tongues:

The patriarchal times:

The life of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph:

The oppression and exodus of Israel:

The conquest and inhabiting of the land of Canaan:

The dwelling of the people in the land:

The Kingdom of Israel:

The division of the Kingdom:

The Kingdom of Israel - the ten tribes - until their destruction, the Kingdom of Judah - until their captivity:

The captivity:

The return from the captivity, and the re-establishment of the people and worship of God in the land:

The prophetic sketch of the course of empire to the end:

The coming of the Messiah, and his rejection:

The re-building and organization of the church of God:

The prophetic sketch of the course of the church to the end and to her glorious triumph in eternal glory.

Please study this list until you know it and you will know what is in the Bible. And then you will be prepared to begin the study of the Bible.

**March 18, 1908**

**"The Secret Life Is the Key" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 12 , p. 220.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"WHEN thou prayest, enter into the closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret, and the Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly."

Note, this does not say that He will reward you in *secret*. No, he *sees* you in secret, he *hears* you in secret; but he *rewards* you, he *answers* you, *openly*.

In this, then, He teaches you and in that we are to care for *the secret* life and He will care for *the open life*. And as certainly as we are watchful upon our secret life, and keep it straight for *God*, so certainly He will be watchful upon our open life, and will keep straight *with men*.

Yet man's ways is the reverse of this, he is inclined to be ever watching his *open* life, trying to correct a wrong impression here, to straighten a crooked influence there; all the while neglecting the secret life, of which these outward things are but the reflection.

Can a crooked stick cast a straight shadow? - No more can a life that is crooked in secret be straight openly. When a crooked stick has cast its crooked shadow, is it the sensible thing to go to tinkering the shadow to make it straight? - No; correct *the stick*; make *it* straight; then there will be no difficulty with *the shadow*; all who see it will see that it is straight. No more is it sensible to be tinkering your outward life to have it straight; straightening the secret life, and God has certified that your open life shall be straight.

Therefore, put your time and attention upon your secret life; keep your time and attention there; spend much time with Him who seeth in secret; and he will put his time and attention upon your open life. He will keep his time and attention there, and will spend much time with you openly, and before those who see only openly. Thus he will see to it that your open life tells only of the good, the pure, and the true - that it tells only of God.

**March 25, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - II" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 13 , p. 244.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN order to study the Bible for what the Bible is, and for what it tells, it is veil to know what portions of the Bible are occupied with each great thought.

Creation, the first two chapters.

The Fall, the third chapter.

The Flood, the fourth to the ninth chapters inclusive.

The Repeopling of the earth, and the origin of the many languages, the tenth chapter, and first nine verses of chapter eleven.

The Patriarchal times, chapter eleven, verses 10 to 32; and the book of Job.

With the exception of a small portion to the generations of Ishmael and of Esau, all the rest of Genesis is occupied with the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph; Abraham, 12:1 to 25:10; Isaac, 25:19 to 28:5; Jacob, 28:10 to 35:29; Joseph, 37:1 to 50:26.

The Oppression and Exodus of Israel occupies the four books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.

The Conquest of the land and the settling of the tribes in it occupies the book of Joshua.

The Dwelling of the People in the land occupies the books of Judges, Ruth, I Samuel 1 to 7 inclusive.

The story of the Kingdom occupies from I. Samuel 8:1 to the end of II. Samuel; the first eleven chapters of I. Kings; and the first nine chapters of II. Chronicles.

The story of the Divided Kingdom occupies all of I. Kings after the eleventh chapter; all of II. Chronicles after the ninth chapter; and the books of Joel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Zephaniah, and Habakkuk.

The story of the Captivity occupies Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel.

The story of the Returning from Captivity, and re-establishment in the kind occupies Ezra, Haggai, Zechariah, Esther, and Nehemiah.

The succession of Empires from the time of Daniel to the end of the world, is given in the Book of Daniel.

The Coming of the Messiah and his rejection, occupies the four Gospels.

The Rebuilding and Organizing of the church of God, occupies the book of Acts, and the Epistles.

And the Course of the Church to the end, and to her glorious triumph in eternal glory, is prophetically sketched in the book of Revelation.

Please study this outline, verifying it by the Scriptures, and you will know more about what is in the Bible; and will be better prepared to begin the study of *the Bible*.

**"How Shall We?" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 13 , p. 244.**

A. T. J.

HOW shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?

How shall we? Can you tell?

Can a man live in what he dies of? When any person dies of any disease, can he live any longer in it? No; that is why he died - he could not live any longer in it.

Having died of that disease, and were he even brought back from the dead into that very disease, could he live any longer in it? No; he would certainly and

immediately die again. A person simply cannot live any longer in the thing of which he has died. This is perfectly plain to everybody.

Have you died to sin? Have you grown so sick of sin that you died of it? Have you grown so sick of it that you could live no longer in it, and so died to it?

If you have, do not be afraid; you cannot live any longer therein. Were you even taken back from that death, and put once more in the presence of sin, you would certainly and immediately die again. You could not live any longer in it when you were there before; and because you could not live any longer in it, you died; and if you were brought back to it again, you could not live any longer in it any more than you did before.

Remember, this is being sick unto death, of sin; not sick of a few, or even many, particular sins, while at the same time you choose others, because they are pleasing to you, and become fat and flourishing on them. In this way you can live in sin forever, and then die in it, and then die the second death for it.

No; it is not sins, so that we can die to one and live to another, that are contemplated in the Scripture; it is sin, - sin in the essence, - so that when you die to it, it is a death indeed to sin in every phase and of every sort. Then, being thus dead to sin, you simply cannot live any longer therein. The very presence of the thing, the very suggestion of it, is death to you.

And being thus dead to sin, the Lord intends that we shall not live any longer in it. And intending that we shall not live any longer therein, he intends that we shall live ever longer without sinning.

There is power in Jesus Christ to keep the believer from sinning. There is virtue in the grace of God to hold back the believer in Jesus from serving the sinful propensities and passions that dwell in the human flesh. Praise his holy name forever and ever.

"Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

Are you dead to sin: Then how shall you live any longer therein?

"Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid."

Then as we are not to continue in sin, in order that grace may abound, shall we continue in sin at all?

Surely if there could be any possible excuse for continuing in sin, it would be that grace should abound.

But that is God-forbidden; it is impossible to have even any such excuse as that for continuing in sin.

Consequently the gist of this question is, "Shall we continue in sin?" Shall we continue in sin at all? Is there any possible ground for it? And the answer is forever, "God forbid."

Then when God has forbidden it, why do it? He has made abundant provision for us not to do it; then why do it? Why should not this provision be employed, so that we shall not continue in sin?

**April 8, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - III" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 15 , p. 290.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth, and man upon the earth to inhabit it forever. (Isa. 45:18; Ps. 115:16.) God's works were there for man to enjoy, and God's rest for him to enter into and there abide forever more. Gen. 2:3; Mark 2:27; Heb. 4:3-5.

But the man forsook his glorious privileges and fell from his high estate. Yet the Lord gave himself to redeem man from his sin and loss. And even from this gift of redemption there was such a departure and such a fall that the flood was the only remedy.

291

In Noah and his family God again started mankind and the world in the right path; and with those who knew his way. And again, when man had multiplied upon the earth, there was a forsaking of the way of the Lord for the ways of sin; and a forsaking of him as true God and only king for idols as gods and man as king in the place of God.

Nimrod, the exceedingly impious rebel, "and overbearing tyrant in Jehovah's sight," was the first to establish this idolatrous, rebellious, tyrannical, monarchical, and imperial order of things.

Nimrod "began to be a mighty one in the earth." He was the first mighty one; the first to assert monarchical and imperial power; the first to assert human authority *by force*, compelling all to recognize his dominion and his authority; - hunting, pursuing, and persecuting all who desired still to worship God and have him as their king. Gen. 10:8-12.

However, Nimrod's assertion of dominion and authority was totally different in *principle* as well as in operation from the dominion of God. The sovereignty of God is primarily over *persons*; over the minds, the hearts, the souls, of people, in a loving fellowship and joyous liberty that sanctifies, enlightens, and ennobles. Nimrod's asserted sovereignty was primarily over *territory*; and secondarily over men, and as the consequence of their happening to be in the territory. For men as men he cared nothing at all. *Territory*, dominion, and authority over territory, lordship, ownership, and monopoly of territory, - this was primarily the direction taken by Nimrod's monarchical and imperialistic ambition; and it followed as a necessary consequence that the people who happened to be within the territorial bounds of his ambition must acknowledge him as only lord and only king, and must pay tribute and all obedience and allegiance to him.

Therefore, "with the setting up of Nimrod's kingdom, the entire ancient world entered a new historical phase. His reign introduced to the world a new system of relations between the governor and the governed. The authority of former rulers had rested upon the feeling of kindred, and the ascendancy of the chief was an image of parental control. Nimrod on the contrary, was a sovereign of *territory*, and of men just so far as they were its inhabitants, and irrespective of personal ties. Hitherto there had been tribes - enlarged families - society; now there was a

nation, a political community - the State. The political and social history of the world henceforth are distinct, if not divergent."

Nimrod extended his empire, established his dominion, and enforced his will and authority over all the Mesopotamian plain, from Erech to Nineveh. But that empire failed, fell, and became nothing. Yet others followed readily the way of Nimrod in the Mesopotamian plain. The first, was that of Chaldea, after which Elam by Chedorlaomer arose to power and spread her empire not only over all the Mesopotamian plain from Ur to Nineveh, but also over all the country westward to the mountains of Lebanon and the River Jordan.

This empire King Chedorlaomer held for twelve years. But the thirteenth year there was revolt in the West; and "the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer and the kings that were with him" to put down the rebellion. They came as far as to Sodom and Gomorrah, and defeated the four kings of the plain of the Jordan. But on their return to the East laden with the spoil, and with Lot as prisoner, Abram followed and effected a night surprise and an overwhelming defeat; and the empire of Chedorlaomer was at an end. Gen. 14.

Next arose Egypt to world-power, and by invasion and slaughter extended her empire over all people and countries from Ethiopia to Asia Minor and to Elam. This extensive empire was maintained about three hundred years, when it, too, was broken to pieces.

292

Next arose the power of Assyria, and by repeated invasion and merciless slaughter she spread her empire over all countries from Elam and Asia Minor to Ethiopia. For four hundred years Assyria held imperial and terrorizing sway, when her empire and her very existence as a power were annihilated. Isa. 10:5, 13, 14; the book of Nahum; and Zeph. 2:13-15.

Then came Babylon; "the hammer of the whole earth," smiting the nations "in wrath with a stroke." This continued for eighty years, when in the wild orgy of reckless intemperance and irreligion of Belshazzar's feast the power of Babylon sank forever. Jer. 50:23; Isa. 14:4-6; and Dan. 5.

Next came upon the stage of the world the power of Media over Persia. Two hundred years Persia held sway, the latter half of which time murderous men and violent, intriguing women strove for the mastery in a system of almost the very desperation of wickedness. Dan. 5:31; Dan. 11:12; 10:20.

Next, following the marvelous example of Alexander, the rapid energy of the Greeks filled the stage of empire for a hundred and fifty years, till again "the transgressions were come to the full," when this power and empire also sank forever. Dan. 8:21-23; 9:10; 11:16.

Then came a new order of things in the way of empire - government of the people, a republic. A people had risen who had repudiated kings and kingships, and all that pertained to them; asserting that men were capable of governing themselves, and needed no such ex-pensive luxury as kings to be over them, to exact of them tribute, and to oppress and abuse them. This was Rome. Thus arose a world-power and empire, "different from all that were before it," and "diverse from all kingdoms." While this was true as to principle and form, in character and in practice it proved to be the same old imperial despotism and

tyranny, only intensified. This empire continued for five hundred years, when it, too, filled the measure of iniquity, and fell in annihilating ruin. Dan. 11:14, margin; 7:7, 19, 23; Rev. 8:6-12.

Empire was gone, government of the people - republic - was gone, and ten kingdoms occupied the stage. (Dan. 7:7, 24.) But again the story of imperial ambition was repeated through a long succession of thirteen hundred years, when again there came a new order of things. Again there arose a people who repudiated kings and kingship and all that pertained to them, asserting that men are capable of governing themselves, and need no such expensive luxury as kings to be over them, etc., etc. Again from this new order of things there arose a world-power expanding into empire as before, following the same course as the others, and finally to come to the same end as all the others, and with all the others of its time and its day. Rev. 13:11-17; 16:13-16; 19-19, 20; Dan. 2:34, 35, 44, 45.

Please follow carefully this study through the Bible, verifying it by the Scriptures, and you will be better prepared to study *the Bible*.

**April 15, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - IV" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 16 , pp. 310-312.**

ALONZO T. JONES

GOD made the world to be man's dwelling-place *with God*. Gen. 1:28-28; Mal. 2:15.

But the man forsook God, lost his dominion, and lost his dwelling-place with God. Heb. 2:7, 8; Gen. 3:1-6, 24.

Yet God came to man in his lost condition, *to dwell with him* in the darkness, to lead them in the light and back to dwell with God in the light of God, and in the world of the light of God forevermore. Gen. 3:8-15; Isa. 9:2; Isa. 60:1, 2; Micah 4:8; Rev. 21:1-4.

Yet there were those who would not allow God to dwell with them, to lead them into the light; but against all that even he could do, went further into the darkness, and would not have the light: Cain and his descendants, as in Gen. 4:5-24.

Nevertheless, there were those who welcomed God to dwell with them, in order that they might walk with him. These gladly called upon the name of the Lord, and even called themselves by the name of the Lord. These were the children of God, the people of the Lord: Seth and his descendants, as in Gen. 4:26, with margin, to 5:32.

Through ten generations these were true to God, and held their own and the way of right and truth against the growing tide of evil from the children of the darkness. And then, ah saddest to tell, the children of the light forsook the way of the light; those who knew the way of right and truth went in the way of falsity and

wrong; "the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and took them wives of all which they chose." Gen. 6:1, 2.

The consequence was that with this mighty encouragement in the wrong, the children of darkness swung away into overwhelming wickedness with no thought of any restraint. Then the wickedness speedily grew so all-prevailing that "every imagination of the thoughts of the heart, the very spring of every purpose and desire, was only evil continually." The whole world became so corrupt and filled with violence that nothing short of the mighty waters of the Flood could stop it. And the Flood did stop it. But it should not be forgotten that it was *not* of itself the wickedness of the ones who were only wicked, but it was apostasy of those who knew God and the right that brought the Flood.

The Flood cleansed the earth of the wickedness and violence that had cursed it to its ruin; and again mankind and the world were started with those who were willing to have God dwell with them to lead them in the way of light.

311

But again there were those who loved darkness rather than light, and practiced the deeds of evil. Strife and violence grew until *force* became the only prevalent authority; and this *itself* developed the mighty imperial power of Nimrod.

However, the particular evil of Nimrod's imperialism lay not so much in its civic or political aspect as in its *religious* bearing. This was the country of Chaldea, the extreme southern portion of the Mesopotamian plain from a little below Erech to the very waters of the sea that is now the Persian Gulf. But it was not long after Nimrod had passed from the world before Chaldea herself followed his example, and in the same spirit. Ur was the capital of Chaldea, and the King of Ur and Chaldea, brought under the power all of the country of the two rivers to the borders of Assyria. Uruldt was this King of Ur who established the empire of Chaldea, and was succeeded in it by his son Ilgi.

And it was just in this time of the imperial sway of Ur and Chaldea that Abram and his relatives went forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan. When all the power of imperial combination was used to compel all to worship idols and the sun and the moon and the constellations; when the worship of the true God was then forbidden, and his worshipers were persecuted, God separated his own true worshipers from it all. He called out Abram from Ur of the Chaldees, and removed him, far from the seat and the bounds of empire, into the land of Canaan, where there was no such thing, but where all was open and free. Gen. 11:13; 12:1; Acts 7:2-4.

Thus and then God began to take one of the Gentiles, to call out from the heathen, a people for his name. He would make Abram to be father of a multitude, numberless as the stars, who would be of faith. Thus God began to build his church, his selected assembly or called-out ones. And he began it by calling them out and away, by separating them, utterly, from all that was, or was of, any state or empire; and joining them to himself as their only Lord and king. These, through the experiences of Egypt and the wilderness, He brought into the land of Canaan, a congregation of the Lord, his church, all of faith; a people who knew the mighty works of the Lord, and whom he called to enter into his rest. Acts 7:38; Joshua 3:11-17; 6:2-20; Heb. 3:16-19.

But lo! even with these called-out ones, these especially his own, there was a forsaking of God for idols, and in forsaking of him as only king and Lord, for a man in the place of God as king and Lord - "like all the nations."

And when they had thus rejected God and had chosen a king and kingdom of this world "like all nations," even this kingdom God would make a type of the wisdom and righteousness and peace and plenty and joy of his own true kingdom. And again the people were shown the mighty work and ways of God, and were called to enter into his rest. 1 Chron. 29:23; 2 Chron. 9; 1 Kings 4:20-34; Heb. 4:47.

But even from this there was a falling away - a forsaking of God for idols, and of his way for the ways of the kingdoms of the world. (1 Kings 11.) This evil way was continued and persisted in to the destruction of the kingdom and to the destruction or captivity of the people.

Through the experiences of the captivity, God brought into the land again a people who knew his way. But again there was a falling away. God's way was forsaken for the ways of the kingdoms of this world; again "like all the nations," only worse. Yet after all this, even after these, God called and be-

312

sought that they would let him come to them and dwell with them. In his own son he came to them to redeem them to himself. And even in this way they rejected him, and threw themselves over bodily to the kingdom and king of this world, vehemently exclaiming, "We have no king but Caesar!"

Again God began to build his church, and to visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name. Matt. 16:18; Acts 15:13-17.

But again there came a falling away, a forsaking of the way of God for the ways of the world; a rejection of God as only king and Lord for a man in the place of God; and worse than all the nations. Rev. 2:7; Acts 2.1:17, 29, 30; 2 Thess. 2:3, 4, 7; 3 John 9 :lo.

And still the same old question abides as fresh and urgent as ever, Will those know the Lord, even the Lord's own people - will these, after so long a time, allow the Lord to be their king - king and Lord indeed, and they his people and of his kingdom in very truth? Thank the Lord! there is yet to be a people of God, and the time is just now, - a people who will have God their true and only king according to his own mind and wish as purposed through all the ages. For it stands written with a mighty oath that in *these our days* the mystery of God, which is God manifest in the flesh, should be finished: and it will be finished to the true glory of God. Rev. 10:5-7; Eph. 5:25-27.

**April 22, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - V" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 17 , pp. 223-225.**

ALONZO T. JONES

GOD is Creator. Whatever he accomplishes is by creation. The Bible, the Word of God, presents no other thought than that all the works of God are of creation only.

See: "In the beginning God created." He "created the heaven and the earth." Gen. 11.

"These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were *created*." Gen. 2:4.

"By Him were all things *created* that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were *created* by him and for him." Col. 1:16.

"Ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God *created* man upon the earth." Deut. 4:52.

"*Create* in me a clean heart, O God." Is. 57:10.

"I *create* the fruit of the lips." Isa. 57:19.

"The people that shall be created shall praise the Lord." Ps. 102:18.

326

"They are *created now*, and not iron the beginning." Isa 48:7.

"We are his workmanship, *created* in Christ Jesus unto good works." Eph. 2:10.

"Put on the new man, which after God is *created* in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. 4:24.

"Remember now thy *Creator*." Eccl. 12:1.

"Behold I *create* new heavens and a new earth. . . . Be ye glad and rejoice forever in that which I *create*; for behold I *create* Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy." Isa. 65:17, 18.

There are many, many more such scriptures, but these are sufficient to make plain the truth that in all things God is Creator, and that whatsoever he does, is by *creation*.

Now it is the essential characteristic of *creation* that it is done immediately, that it is done suddenly, at the moment, upon the speaking of the creative word.

"By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth; . . . for *he spoke* and *it was*." Ps. 33:6, 9.

"And God said, Let there be light: and there *was light*."

"And God said, Let there be a firmament, . . . and *it was so*."

"And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and *it was so*."

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, and herb yielding seed, and fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and *it was so*." Gen. 1:3, 6, 9, 11.

"I have declared the former things from the beginning; and they went forth out of my mouth, and I showed them; I *did them suddenly*, and they came to pass." Isa. 48:3.

"They are created *now*, and not froth the beginning." Isa. 48:7.

It must ever be borne in mind that it was by the Lord Jesus that God created, and ever creates all things (Eph. 3:9); and that it was the Lord Jesus who spoke the creative word.

This "same Lord Jesus came to the earth in the form and flesh of man, and still spoke here the word of God, the creative word. And in every instance, as soon as the word was spoken, the thing was done.

The centurion whose servant was sick of the palsy, said to Jesus, "Speak the *word only*, and my servant shall be healed." Jesus spoke the word, "and his servant was healed in the self-same hour." Matt. 8: 8, 13.

When the nobleman came to Cana, asking that Jesus would come down and heal his son who was sick at Capernaum, Jesus said, "Go thy way, thy son liveth." And "at the same hour . . . the fever left him." John 4:46-53.

When the leper called to Jesus, "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," Jesus answered, "I will, be thou clean. And *as soon as he had spoken, immediately* the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed." Mark 1:40-42.

Lazarus was dead four days, and was in the tomb, but when Jesus spoke the word, he came forth immediately.

These scriptures make plain the certain truth of the whole Bible that when a thing is *created*, when the creative word is spoken, it is done "immediately," "suddenly," "*now*." And it is certain that the whole Bible, from beginning to end, deals primarily and pre-eminently with the Creator and creation only.

And this truth that the, word and work of creation is ever accomplished "immediately," "suddenly," and "now," - this sweeps utterly away forever all possibility of there being any truth in the theory of evolution; that is, the theory that it is only through a long, long succession of ages that the things that are came to be. It confirms by the best possible evidence, the Word of God, the perfect truth of the statement of one of the three original and always leading modern evolutionists that "evolution is antagonistic to creation."

That is the truth, and so perfectly the truth that it is simply impossible to hold both at once. Yet there are those who try to hold both under a theory of so-called theistic evolution. But "theistic evolution" is a contradiction in terms. "Theistic" is from *theos*, which means "God." "Theistic evolution," then, is

327

"God evolution" or evolution with God. But God is *Creator*. And creation is "immediate," "sudden," and "now;" while evolution is only long drawn out through untold ages. So, to dub evolution "theistic" does not, and can not, save it from what its modern originators declared it to be, "antagonistic to creation."

That is the plain truth as to the principle and the fact of creation. And the plain record of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis confirms and emphasizes that truth. There were six days of the creation, and nine successive creative steps from "the beginning" to the finishing of the creative purpose.

The first was the creation of the heaven and the earth; and the earth was without *form* and *void*, and, darkness was upon the face of the deep, while the Spirit of God brooded upon the face of the waters.

The second was the creation of the light.

The third was the creation of the firmament or atmosphere.

The fourth was the creation of the dry land.

The fifth was the creation of all vegetation.

The sixth was the creation of the lights in the heavens.

The seventh was the creation of the creatures of the sea and of the air.

The eighth was the creation of the beasts and other moving things upon the earth.

The ninth was the creation of man.

Note that in these nine successive steps to the completion of the one creative purpose, each one of the nine was a distinct creation itself. Each time there was spoken the creative word, as distinctly as if it were the only one. And all possibility, of evolution anywhere in the course is excluded, not only by the creative word, but also by the very order of the successive steps.

The first was a condition of darkness and water. The second was light. But light is not an evolution from either darkness or water.

The third is the firmament or atmospheric heaven. But atmosphere is not an evolution from light. The fourth is the dry land. But dry land is not an evolution from atmosphere.

The fifth is the whole vegetable kingdom. And while it might be possible to present a plausible argument in favor of vegetation being an evolution from the dry land, it, would be only plausible, for the plain word is against it.

But whatever plausible plea might be made in behalf of vegetation being an evolution from dry land, it is certain that all possibility of any such plea is excluded in connection with the sixth step in the succession; for that is the "lights in the firmament of heaven," and it is absolutely certain that the lights and stars of heaven were never as evolution from vegetation on the earth.

Likewise the seventh, which is the fishes of the waters and the fowl of the air, could never by any possibility be an evolution from the sixth, which is the lights and stars of heaven.

The eighth is the beasts and other creatures that move upon the ground, which are not by any possible means an evolution from those creatures that move in the water and in the air.

And the ninth is man, "the thinker," mind, "in the image of God;" and he is not an evolution from beasts nor from creeping things.

Thus evolution is not only "antagonistic to creation," it is likewise antagonistic in every way to the plain word and structure of the first chapter of Genesis. And however confidently people may hold the theory of evolution as true, it is certain that it can not be held at the same time either with the idea of creation, or with the plain reading and structure of the first chapter of Genesis.

No; the whole thought of the Word of God is creation, not evolution. The plain word, the whole structure, and the all-pervading idea of the first chapter of Genesis is creation, not evolution.

**April 29, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - VI. Creation" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 18 , pp. 339, 340.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"IN the beginning." The Bible is the only book in the world that gives any plain, direct, tangible statement of any real beginning. The Bible does this, and does it in a way that, in the very wording of it, conveys the conviction that the writer is sure of his ground and *knows* what he is telling.

The Bible writer not only knows that there was a definite and tangible beginning, but knows the true Source of that beginning. "In the beginning, *God*." The beginning had its origin in God. God is the source of the beginning. And this in one word, and a single thought, gives a sure and perfectly satisfactory resting-place for the mind in its inquiries after the origin of things. "In the beginning, *God*." God when he is found, is the all-satisfying answer to every inquiry.

This splendid fact that the origin of things, that the beginning of the beginning is in God, is well worth thinking of in our own affairs. Is the beginning of each one of our daily tasks found in God? Each purpose of life, each business calculation, each journey, each aim, each ambition, let there be said of it, "In the beginning, *God*." Of such day itself, as at waking the day begins, let it be said, "In the beginning, *God*." This will be found to give a sure and perfectly satisfactory resting-place for the mind, the soul, the spirit, and all the life; for there from this beginning as from that other and original one, God will be found to be the mighty worker unto a finished creation to his own glory and the eternal salvation of the soul.

For "in the beginning, *God created*." The first of all that God is to any person, or to anything, is Creator. And whoever will have the beginning of everything in his life to be from God will find his life and affairs to be the creation of God. He will know God as Creator indeed.

"In the beginning God created heaven

240

and earth." And he did it by Christ Jesus the Lord. For, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." (John 1:1, 2.) "God created all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. 1:9.

But the creation in the beginning is not all that there is of creation. Christianity is creation; for, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17); and "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus." Thus creation and Christianity are identical. The Creator is the Redeemer; redemption is only creation over again of man and the world when both had been undone by sin. Eph. 7:10: Rev. 21:5, 6.

In the beginning creation was accomplished only by the Creator's speaking the word. For, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. For he spake and it was." (Ps. 33: 6, 9.) And in Christianity, the new creation is accomplished in the same way. For, "Of his own will begot he us with the word of truth." And, we are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. . . . And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:23-25.

This is the characteristic of the creative word, that the word which is spoken, itself produces that which the word speaks; the word of the Creator is self-fulfilling. In the beginning when the word was spoken, "Let there be light," "there was light." And in Christianity when the word is spoken, and by the same One, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," "I will, be thou clean," it is equally so.

To expect the word of the Creator itself to do what that very word speaks, and to depend upon that word itself to do it, - this is faith. For when the centurion came to Jesus, saying, "Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented," and Jesus answered, "I will come and heal him," the centurion replied, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." And upon this Jesus said, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." (Matt. 8: 6-10.) And Jesus spoke "the word only," and "the servant was healed in the self-same hour."

And thus it is that "through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11:3.

When a person recognizes and receives the word of the Creator, and receives it "not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God," and expects that word only to accomplish what the word speaks, and depends upon the word only to do it, this is faith. Then upon that faith, that word, self-fulfilling, effectually works in him that so believes, and the thing is done, according to the will of God.

And whosoever thus understands the power and working of the creative word in his own experience, thus also understands that the worlds were framed by the word of God, He understands the truth and the fact of creation in the beginning. Thus Christian experience is inseparable from creation, and the understanding of creation - even the creation in the beginning - is inseparable from Christian experience. And so true it is that creation and Christianity are identical.

**May 13, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - VII. Creation or Evolution: Which?" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 20 , pp. 388-390.**

A. T. JONES

BY the Scriptures we have found that God is *Creator*; that all his works are accomplished by *creation*; and that creation is "immediate," "sudden," "now." And we have found that *Christianity* is *creation*; that Christian experience is an experience of creation.

Yet in spite of the fact that the Word of God says explicitly and only that the world with all that is of it was created, and that this creation was accomplished by six separate and distinct creative words, in six days; and in spite of the fact that one of the three chief originators of modern evolution says plainly that "evolution is antagonistic to creation," there are many professed believers of the Bible and

professed Christians who hold that the world and all that is of it came by evolution; that is, by an almost interminably long and slow-moving series of ages.

Now, why is this? - It is simply because these persons have not *faith*. For it is written, "Through *faith* we *understand* that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which

389

do appear." (Heb. 11:3.) Creation - the fact of creation - is *understood* by *faith*. Then when any one does not understand it, but instead adopts that which is "antagonistic to creation," it is certain that such a person has not faith. And since faith cometh by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17), by which alone creation is accomplished, then when any one does not understand creation, but accepts instead that which is "antagonistic to creation," it is plain that this is simply because he does not accept the word of God *as the word of God*, but looks upon it only as the word of men having in it no more power to create than has the word of man. And looking upon the word of God only as the word of men, having in it no possibility of creation, then in the very nature of the case all that can remain is that he accept the notion that all things could have come only of themselves, and of course only through an interminably long succession of ages, and thus only by evolution.

Therefore this whole matter as between evolution and creation turns upon the one single question, Is the word of God really the word *of God*?

Is then the word of God really the word of God, or is it only as the word of men? And this question simply means, Is God really God, or is he no more than a man would be in his place; so that his word means no more than a man's word would mean spoken on the same subject?

That the word of God is really the word *of God*, can be known by every soul. And this can be known simply by faith; that is, simply by accepting it as the word of God, expecting that word itself to do what the word says. (Matt. 8:8, 10.) And so it is written, "For this cause thank God without ceasing, because that ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it *not as* the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God, which *effectually worketh* also in you that believe." 1 Thess. 2:13.

When the word of God is received as the word of God that it is, and not as the word of men; that is, when it is received by faith, then it is found to be the word of God that it is in truth. And when it is found to be the word of God in truth, it is found and known to be the *creative* word that it is in truth, accomplishing itself the thing which the word says. And so, again, it is written: "As the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven and watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; *so shall my word be* that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but *it shall accomplish that which I please*, and *it shall prosper* in the thing whereto I sent it." Isa. 55:9-11.

It is not *we* who accomplish what the word of God says; but "*it shall accomplish*" *in us* what the word says. And thus "it is *God* that worketh in you that which is well pleasing in his sight." Therefore "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly." Thus Christianity is creation.

And this is just what ever professed Christian needs to learn; that Christianity is creation, not evolution; that Christian experience at the beginning and always is by creation, not by evolution; that it is "immediate," "sudden," "now," and not a long, tedious struggle, and even then still unaccomplished.

Every soul who has had the glorious experience of the divine forgiveness and conversion, knows full well that it was accomplished immediately, suddenly, "now." And *that* is creation; for we are his workmanship *created* in Christ Jesus; and the clean heart is the result of creation - "Create in me a clean heart, O God." And this beginning of Christian experience, being, as every one knows, immediate, sudden, "now," is evidence enough that Christian experience at *every stage* is accomplished in the same way - by creation. Is it not even so written that "now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation?" That is simply the assurance to every soul of the divine - the Christian - experience of the creative word and power that accomplishes things "now."

390

For it must not be forgotten that though from the beginning to the finishing of the creation of the world there were six days and six successive stages, yet *each of these* was a *distinct creation* by the word of God *spoken specifically to the accomplishment of that particular stage* toward the completed creation. At each stage, God "said" the creative word, "and it was so."

And that is written to make plain to all the people forever that, since Christian experience is by creation equally with the formation of the world, and equally by the same person speaking the word, however many steps or stages there may be from the beginning to the finishing in perfection of Christian experience, yet each successive step or stage in that experience is a *distinct creation* by the word of God, *spoken by the Holy Spirit* to the mind and heart and spirit of the believer specifically to the accomplishment of *that* particular stage.

Therefore, the life of *faith*, which is life by creation and not by evolution, is to read the word of God constantly, receiving it as the word of God in truth, expecting *it* to accomplish the thing that it says. And when by the light of the word and the Spirit there is seen any lack in the life, find the word of God that speaks the thing that will supply the need, then thank God in the Spirit for that word, accept it in the Spirit as the word of God to you, expect *it* to accomplish that which it says, depend upon the word itself to accomplish this in supply of your need *creatively*, that is "immediately," "suddenly," "now," and in the Spirit of God and in the faith of the word of God thank God that "it is so;" that the thing is done, and that the victory is yours. And thus "this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith;" faith in God through Christ by the Spirit *as creator*; faith in his word as the *creative* word; faith in his doing things by his word *creatively*, which is "immediately," "suddenly," "now."

Now, dear soul, are you a creationist, or are you an evolutionist? And if you see that you have been an evolutionist, will you not drop it "immediately," "suddenly," just "now" by faith in the Creator and the creative word, and henceforth be a true creationist only.

**May 20, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - VIII" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 21 , pp. 413, 414.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE second chapter of Genesis, no less than the first, is the story of creation. The second chapter gives facts and particulars that the first chapter does not give; so that the study of both chapters is essential in order to know the story of creation.

Note the fourth verse: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord made the earth and the heavens, and every plant of the field *before it was in the earth*, and every herb of the field *before it grew*." This refers directly to Gen. 1:11, that tells of the creation of vegetation: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so."

It is plain upon the face of the statement that the first vegetation, *did not grow*, but was created full-formed. For herb "yielding seed" is nothing less than full-standing, ripe, seed-bearing herbage. Fruit tree "yielding fruit" is nothing less than a tree standing complete, with the fruit upon it. And fruit "whose seed is *in itself*" is only fruit that is ripe with the seed there. And all this makes perfectly plain the truth of the statement in Gen. 2:4, that the first vegetation did not grow, but was made "before it grew;" that is, that it was created.

Again Gen. 1:27 tells that God created man, male and female, on the sixth day. Gen. 2:7, 18-22 tells *how* the man, male and female, was made: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And the Lord God said: 'It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.'"

Please note that the Lord does not say a "helpmeet." There is no such thing as a "helpmeet." Rightly there is not even any such word as "helpmeet." No, the word and thought of the Lord is, "I will make him an help" that is meet, *fit*, for him; that is adapted to him; that is the mate of him; a companion for him.

The man was alone. It was not good for him that he should be alone. But the man did not yet realize that he was alone. Therefore in order that the man might know how completely he was alone, the Lord brought "every beast of the field and every fowl of the air" unto Adam to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name of it, . . . but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him."

As each creature after its kind passed before Adam, and by the light and wisdom of the Spirit of God he read the inmost nature of each, he saw that of

every kind there was a pair, male and female, that each was adapted to the other, that each was meet, fit, for the

414

other and the complement of the other, that they were perfectly mated; and that of every kind there were these perfect mates.

And when all creatures of earth had thus passed before him, each kind in mates perfectly meet, fitted and adapted each to the other, lo! he saw that there was nowhere one that was a mate for him; nowhere one that was adapted to him; nowhere one that was a meet, that was a companion for him; nowhere one that was congenial to him. Then the man knew that he was alone, and that of all the creatures in the world he was the only one that was alone. This then caused him to know that he was alone indeed; and to know for himself that it was "not good for him to be alone."

Then the Lord made the woman "and brought her unto the man;" and instantly the man knew that he was no longer alone; that he now had his mate, one meet for him, one adapted to him; and in rapture he exclaimed, "This is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man."

And this teaches always that if the man will allow the Lord to bring to him the woman who is his mate, meet for him, and adapted to him, there will be always that true unity and its attending happiness in marriage that belongs there, and that the Lord intends shall always be found there. But instead of this, it is far more often that both the man and the woman, moved only by the fancy of a day, plunge into a relationship that is for life, and presently find that instead of the joyous blessedness that makes a lifetime all too short, they have put themselves into a galling bondage that makes each day only all too long. And then anything, anything, for relief, and at last divorce for release.

No, no, none of that; but sober thoughtfulness in the blessed sanctions that God has provided, and noble respect for the divine relationship of which God is the author. Then will there ever be found in that relationship only, the dear delights and sacred joys with which God has filled it. "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." Here is another piece of instruction that was written for always: that a man shall leave his father and his mother and shall stand full and free with and for his wife. When a man takes a wife, he is to take her to himself, not to his parents; he is to take her to himself and to their homes, not into somebody's else home - not even into the home of his own father and mother. No: "a man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife."

For love of him she has willingly and without question left her own home: and all else. To her now life and all that is of it is utterly new and strange - except only her husband. In everything of life she must now deal with new environments, and find new adaptations; and he must do all to make all this easiest and most pleasant. He must not think of having her pass through this in places and surroundings that are not her own, or where there shall be any but her and her husband.

See how carefully the Lord instructed his people of old on this. Every newly married man was forbidden to go out with the armies, and was not to be charged with any public business, nor with any business that might take him from home, for a whole year. And this in order that he might be "free at home" to "cheer up his wife."

Read it, for it is as good to-day as ever: "When a man has taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be c with any business, but a shall at home one year, and shall cheer up his wife which he hath taken." Deut. 24; 5.

O, if the Bible were really learned and followed, how far, far different even this world would be? Even as the days of heaven on earth. Deut. 11:21.

**May 27, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - X. Creation Finished, and God's Rest" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 22 , pp. 425-427.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE creation of man, male and female, was the crowning, as well as the finishing, work of the whole creation. There they stood, the perfect holy pair reflecting the image and glory of God.

Think of the wonderful mind and faculty of the man who by a look could read the essential nature of each creature and of the whole creation, and could speak the word that expresses the thought of that essential nature and characteristic. This word which the man spoke, defining each, was but the reflection of the word of God which had produced each. This tells that the man was so at one with God in spirit and will and mind that at sight he could read correctly the thought of God in creation, and could exactly express that thought in the word of God. It shows that the mind and faculty and spirit of the man were truly but the reflection of the divine mind and Spirit.

"And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." To man was given dominion over every creature of earth. But dominion over man himself belongs only to God.

"And God said, Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of the earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat." There is the original and divinely prescribed dietary for man. Was it a proper dietary for him? Was it adapted to him? Did the Creator know what was the right thing, the best thing, for the food of the man whom he had created?

And this was the man in his original and best estate, in his divinely appointed and sinless estate. Whatever changes may have since come in man's estate that has brought changes in the dietary, is it not evident that such change in this dietary must necessarily be solely

because of the change in the man's estate? But has any change that has come in man's original and divinely appointed estate ever been for man's improvement? - Most assuredly not. Then has any change from man's original and divinely appointed dietary ever been for man's improvement? Equally assuredly not.

Is it the divine will or purpose that man should remain, or that any man should be satisfied to remain, in any condition that has come by change from the man's original and divinely appointed estate? Plainly not. Then is it the divine will or purpose that any man who seeks restoration to man's original and divinely appointed estate should choose to retain or can it be for any such man's good to retain the changed dietary that has come only as a consequence of the change from man's original and divinely appointed estate. Equally plainly not.

Plainly enough, then, it is only those who are satisfied with the change from man's original and divinely appointed estate, and would have this changed condition to be the eternal one - it is only these who can consistently plead for the permanency of the changed dietary that has come only as a consequence of the change from man's original and divinely appointed estate.

"And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day. Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made: and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made."

He rested, not because of weariness, but for the purpose of holiness: not for recuperation of wasted energy, but for spiritual refreshing, delight, and triumph in the finished creation. "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary." (Isa. 40:28.) "God is Spirit." Therefore the only rest possible to him is spiritual rest - "that supreme repose which only the Spirit can know."

"Just as, in the solemn pauses between the creative days, He pronounced his creatures good, so did he rejoice over the finishing of his work, resting in the perfect satisfaction of an accomplished plan; not to restore his wasted energy, as man rests, but to signify that in the coming of man the creative idea has found its consummation and crown. Such is the rest possible to a purely spiritual nature, - the rest of a completed work."

And this rest of God was for man - for the eternal blessing, benefit, and instruction of man. (Mark 2:27.). Of this truth the ninety-second psalm is the expression. It is "a psalm or song for the Sabbath day," and it says, "Thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work: I will triumph in the works of thy hands. O Lord, how great are thy works, and thy thoughts are very deep." This is the reflection, in man's experience, of the very thought expressed in the statement that at the finishing of "all his work" God "rested and was refreshed."

"Suppose the question to be asked, How can we know that any precept is moral in its meaning and authority, and not simply a positive and arbitrary command? . . . No more perfect vindication of

the moral character of a law can be given than to show that it is a rule of the divine conduct, that it has been imposed upon his own activity by that infinite Will which is the supreme authority both in the physical and moral government of the universe.

"That law to which the Creator submits his own being, must be of absolute binding force up every creature made in his image. Such is the law the Sabbath. God rested the seventh day, and by so doing has given to the law of the Sabbath the highest and strongest sanction possible even to Deity. In no conceivable way could the Almighty so perfectly and with such unchangeable authority declare, not simply his will in a positive institution, but the essentially moral character of the precept, as by revealing his own self-subjection

427

to the rule which he imposes on his creatures.

"Its obligation is addressed, not to man's physical nature alone, but to man as a spiritual being made in the image of God. It is laid not only on his bodily powers and natural understanding, but upon his moral reason as right, and upon his conscience as duty. It is therefore bounded by no limits of time, place, or circumstance, but is of universal and perpetual authority."

"And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." His resting on the seventh day was for man; his blessing the seventh day was for man; his sanctifying the seventh day, was for man; yea, his very creation of the world was for man, for "He created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited." (Isa. 45:18.) And thus "for man" the seventh day was made the rest day. As it was made, and in all that was done to make it, the rest day, it was and is "for man."

And it is wholly spiritual; for God is only Spirit. It is the day of God's rest, and of God's blessing, unto holiness and sanctification. In that day man is not to seek his own rest, which is only physical, but God's rest, which is spiritual. In that day man is not to seek his own self-pleasing, which is only temporal blessing; but God's blessing, which is spiritual. And this spiritual rest, and this spiritual blessing, from God, are to be sought and found the seventh day for the cultivation of the soul in holiness unto sanctification.

This is not to say that physical rest and blessing can not be, or are not to be, found at all on the seventh day, but only that these are not to be sought. The spiritual only is to be sought. And when the spiritual is found, then in and through that the physical is found in a far better and truer way than can ever possibly be by seeking the physical itself. And thus at the very threshold of the world and of man's existence God would teach forever to all the grand and all-important lesson that man's truest existence is found only in the spiritual; that man's highest good and truest enjoyment of the physical and temporal things that are both rightly and necessarily his, are found only through the spiritual.

And this transcendent truth is no more plainly taught in Matt. 6:33 - "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be

added unto you" - than it is in Gen. 2:2, 3, in God's resting and blessing the seventh day "for man" unto man's promotion in holiness and sanctification of heart and life unto God.

**June 10, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - VIII. God's Purpose in His Rest Day" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 24 , pp. 469-472.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"AND He rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

And this was all for man. He created the world for man. He rested the seventh day for man. He blessed and hallowed and sanctified the seventh day, as the rest day, the holy day, the Sabbath of the Lord, *for man*.

What, then, was his purpose in all this for man? Here is the answer: "Hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that *ye may know* that I am *the Lord your God*." Eze. 20:12.

There is therefore, that about the Sabbath by which he who hallows it may know not only that the Lord is God, but that the Lord is his God. To know God is to know not only that he is, but also what he is; for his name is not simply "I AM," but "I AM THAT I AM," - I am what I am, I am that which I am.

Therefore, as the Sabbath is a sign which God has set, by which those who hallow it may know that he is the Lord their God, it follows with perfect certainty that *there is in the Sabbath* that by which those who hallow it may find the knowledge of God. There is in it that by which he who hallows it may know what God is so the person, the Sabbath is a means of the revelation of God.

This is yet more fully seen in the truth that "no man knoweth . . . the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." (Matt. 11:27.) What God is, is revealed only through Christ, and can be known only in Christ. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." Christ is therefore and forever "God with us." 2 Cor. 5:19; Matt. 1:23.

As the Sabbath is God's sign by which men may know that he is the Lord, and as he is known only as he is revealed in Christ, it is the very certainty of truth that the Sabbath is God's sign by which those who hallow it may know God as he is revealed in Jesus Christ, - the sign by which men may know what God is to the believer in Jesus. And this itself "is life eternal." John 17:3.

Again: the Sabbath is God's sign by which those who hallow it may know that the Lord sanctifies them. (Eze. 20:12.) But no man can be sanctified except by faith that is in Jesus Christ. (Acts 20:18.) Therefore, as the Sabbath is the Lord's sign that he sanctifies men, and as men can be sanctified only by faith in Jesus, it is the plain truth that the Sabbath is God's sign by which men may know the sanctifying power and purity of God, through faith in Jesus Christ.

This is why it is that only the believer can enter into God's rest in the Sabbath, as it is written, "We which have believed do enter into rest." And this is why it was that Israel, who did not believe, could not enter into God's rest; as it is written, "So I swear in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest." But "to whom swear He that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief." Thus faith in Jesus Christ is and always was the object of the Sabbath; and the whole life of Sabbath-keeping.

470

The Sabbath, then, being the sign of what God in Christ is to the believer, it follows that there must be found in the Sabbath that which is also found in Christ. In other words, the Sabbath being the sign by which men may know that God is the Lord, and God being known only in Jesus Christ, it follows that in the Sabbath there is the very reflection of what God is in Christ to the believer: otherwise it could not be such a sign.

Let us, therefore, look at the Sabbath as God made it; and at what the Lord did in the making of it; by which it became the Sabbath of the Lord. First, He created all things; then he ceased from his works and rested the seventh day; he then blessed the seventh day, and made it holy, and sanctified it. The Sabbath, therefore; is -

1. The reminder of God as Creator: it is the reminder of his creative power manifested; for it is a sign between him and his people forever, *because* that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." Ex. 31:17.

2. In the Sabbath is God's *rest*; "for He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. And in this place again [he spake of the seventh day on *this wise*], They shall not enter into my rest." Heb. 4:4, 5.

3. In the Sabbath is God's *blessing*; for he "blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. 2:3.

4. In the Sabbath is God's *holiness*; for "he hallowed [made holy] the Sabbath day." But it is only the presence of God which makes anything holy. When Moses, attracted by the curious sight of the bush burning with fire yet not consumed, turned aside and approached to behold, "God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I: And he said, Draw not nigh hither; put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." (Ex 3:4, 5.) That place was made holy ground solely by if the presence of "Him who dwelt in the bush." Again, when Joshua, near Jericho, beheld "a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand," and Joshua asked him, "Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?" he said, "Nay; but as Captain of the host of the Lord am I now come.... And the Captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy." (Joshua 5:13-15.) That which made holy the place whereon Joshua stood, was the presence of the "Captain of the Lord's host," who was there. And as it is the presence of the Lord which makes

holy, that which made holy the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord, was the presence of him who rested the seventh day from all his works.

5. The Sabbath has in it God's sanctification; because he not only blessed the seventh day; but sanctified it, set it apart unto the holy use and service of the Lord, - that his presence Might dwell therein. For it is not merely the transient presence, but the abiding presence, the special dwelling of God in a place, which sanctifies: for it is written: "Israel shall be sanctified by my glory for "I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God." Ex. 29:43 (margin), 45.

Thus connected with the Sabbath there is the creative power of God the rest of God; the blessing of God; the presence of God which makes holy, and the continuing dwelling presence of God which sanctifies.

And all this is precisely, and in order, what is found *in Christ* by the believer in Jesus; for -

1. First of all, the believer finds in Jesus the creative Power of God Manifested in making him a new creature; for, "We are his workmanship *created in Christ Jesus* unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2:10.

2. The believer finds in Jesus, God's rest; for, having found in Christ creative power to make him new, he ceases from his own works, as God from his, and enters into God's rest in Christ. (Heb. 4:10.) Therefore it is written:

471

"Come unto me, all ye that *labor* and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me: for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find *rest* unto *your souls*." Matt. 11:29.

3. The believer finds in Christ, God's *blessing*; for "God, having raised up his on Jesus, sent him to *bless* you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." (Acts 3:26.) And "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . *hath blessed* us with all spiritual *blessings* in heavenly things in Christ.

4. The believer finds in Christ, *the presence of God* to make him *holy*; for it is written: "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you. . . At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. . . . If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him." (John 14:18-23.) And "God would make known ["to his saints"] what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is *Christ* in you, the hope of glory." Col. 1:27.

5. The believer finds in Christ, God's *abiding, dwelling presence* to sanctify him; for it is written: "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make *our abode with him*" (John 14:23); and, "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God *dwelleth* in him, and he in God" (1 John 4:15); "For ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." 2 Cor. 6:16.

Thus it is plainly seen that in the Sabbath is the very reflection of all that the believer finds in Jesus; and thus it is that the Sabbath is a sign to every one who hallows it, by which he knows that the Lord, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, is his God. And as no one can know God except as he is revealed in Jesus

Christ; and as the Sabbath has connected with it the suggestion, the reflection, of all that the believer finds in Jesus; it is plainly God's sign, by which he who hallows it may find the knowledge of God as he is revealed in Christ.

In all this it must be borne in mind that it was in Christ and by him that God created all things; for, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made than was made." (John 1:1-3.) "By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones; or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him." Col. 1:16.

Thus it was Christ who created all things; it was Christ who rested on the seventh day from all his work; it was Christ who blessed the seventh day because that in it he had rested; it was Christ whose presence made the day holy; and it is the continuing, dwelling presence of Christ which sanctified, and sanctifies, the seventh day. It was Christ himself; therefore, who connected with the Sabbath of the seventh day that which is the reflection of himself, that which is the expression of what he is to the believer in him, so that whosoever would hallow the Sabbath might know that the Lord, who is known only in Christ, is his God.

God's rest is in the seventh day; and God's rest is in Christ. It is impossible for God's rest to be in antagonistic places; for as with God "there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning," God's rest is the same wherever it may be. Therefore, God's rest being ever the same, God's rest in the seventh day, and God's rest in Christ, is precisely the same rest. And this being impossible to be in antagonism, is in perfect unity, and therefore demonstrates that the Sabbath is found in truth only in Christ and Christ is found in his fulness only in the Sabbath.

A beautiful lesson that shows Christ in the Sabbath and the Sabbath in Christ, is found in the ancient sanctuary. There was the table of showbread, upon which were placed, at the beginning of every Sabbath, twelve fresh-baked cakes. Those cakes remained there until the beginning of the next

472

Sabbath, when they were replaced by the fresh bread. Thus at the beginning of every Sabbath the bread was renewed.

The term "showbread" is literally "bread of the presence;" and signifies Christ the "true bread which came down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." This bread of the presence therefore signified the presence of Christ with the whole people - the twelve tribes - of Israel. The bread's being always there, signified the presence of Christ always with his people. But this bread of the presence was always there only by being renewed, and it was renewed every Sabbath. And thus God would teach the people then, and now, and forevermore, that his presence in Christ is renewed to the believer every Sabbath. When the Sabbath is past, however, his presence still abides through all the days of the week until the next Sabbath, when it is renewed; and thus is fulfilled the scripture. "My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest." Ex. 33:14.

Thus the true believer in Jesus, the true observer of the true Sabbath, is ever growing in the knowledge of God as he is revealed in Christ; and thus the

Sabbath is a sign by which he knows that the Lord is his God, and that by his abiding presence he sanctifies him.

It is so also with the *blessing* of God in the Sabbath. When on the sixth day God made man. "God blessed them." (Gen. 1:28.) Then came the seventh day, in which God rested, and "God blessed the *seventh day*." (Gen. 2:3.) Thus both the man and the seventh day were blessed. The man was blessed before the day was blessed. Then when that *blessed* man came to that *blessed* day, he found *additional blessing*; and each succeeding Sabbath he found yet additional blessing. And had he remained faithful, it would ever have been the blessed man coming each Sabbath to the blessed day; and so he would ever have grown in the knowledge of God. *And so it is to-day, and will be eternally* with every soul whom God has blessed in turning him away from his iniquities, and who hallows God's blessed Sabbath day; every time this *blessed* man comes to that *blessed* day, he receives additional blessing, and so is ever growing in the knowledge of God. Isa. 66:22, 23.

And thus, whether before man sinned, or since he sinned, the Sabbath has ever been, and is still, and will ever be, God's sign, by which he who hallows it may *know* that the Lord, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is his God; and may know what God is, as He is revealed in Jesus Christ, whether in creation or in redemption.

And what shall we more say? The Sabbath, truly understood, means all of Christ; and Christ, truly understood, means all of the Sabbath. And neither can be truly understood without the other. The Sabbath is God's sign and Christ is God's sign. Christ is God's sign spoken against, and the Sabbath is God's sign spoken against; and all, "that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed." (Luke 2:34, 35.) Yet ever He is indeed "the glorious Lord" (Isa. 33:21); and ever "his rest." his Sabbath, is indeed "glorious." Isa. 11:10.

"Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. . . . For we which have believed do enter into rest." "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." "The *seventh day* is the *Sabbath of the LORD THY GOD*."

**June 17, 1908**

**"Through the Bible - IX. The Fall - I" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 24 ,  
pp. 494, 495.**

ALONZO T. JONES

GOD created man upright; in mind and spirit reflecting the image and glory of God. "I have created" him "for my glory." Isa. 43:7.

God created the man to stand and to abide with him eternally. Yet whether he would thus stand and abide, must he at the choice of the man himself. He was created free - to make his choice and decide his conduct for himself,

spontaneously and voluntarily, in accordance with reasons or motives. He was created to stand - though free to fall, if he should so choose.

Accordingly, "the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. . . . And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

"With *the mind* I myself serve the law of God." The man was created to glorify God; that is, to receive of God and make it manifest. It was with *the mind* that the man was to receive the knowledge of God. God gave to the man his *word* and word is the expression of thought. Man receiving through the Spirit the word of God, the word containing the thought of God, which was the expression of the mind of God, the man would thus by the Spirit be constant partaker of the mind of God; would ever be at one with God; would ever be at one with God, and ever growing in the knowledge of God.

There came to the man another word: The serpent "said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" "Yea?" Is it so? Hath God said? The question is one suggesting doubt and distrust; and is expressed literally only by that sneering grunt that is familiar to all, but which can not be indicated in any form of actual word.

"The woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

Here was another word, expressing another thought, the product of another mind. The two ways were now before her; the two words, the two thoughts, the two *minds*. The power of choice is fully and freely hers; which way now will she use that power? Will she choose the word, the thought, the *mind* of God, or that of Satan? She knew the word of God; would she faithfully hold and trust that word, just as the word stood as the word of God? or would she allow herself to be drawn away from that word to an "interpretation" and a "meaning" suggested by a mind that was foreign to that word?

For note: Though Satan did antagonize the word of God with his "ye shall not surely die," yet he did not say flatly that it was a lie, and not to be followed at all. He concealed his antagonism under the suggestion that she did not have the correct idea of the word, that she had not caught the true meaning; and that what he was telling her was the true meaning and interpretation, as even God himself knew - "for God doth know" that in the day ye eat thereof, instead of dying, as you suppose that the word means, ye shall be like God, knowing good and evil. And *He knows* that what I am telling you is the true meaning and interpretation of the word that you have cited.

Here, then, is the first comment and the first commentator on the word of

God; the first to suggest that the word of God does not mean what it says, and to offer to show the true meaning and interpretation by presenting something different from what the word says. There is the first, but unfortunately not by many means the last, of these.

But to it all forever the answer is, No, no, no. God is perfectly able to say exactly what he means; and is sufficiently intelligent to select the words by which he means exactly what he says. There is never any need, nor is there any room, for anybody to tell what the word of God *means*; for it means just what it say.

Accordingly it is written, "Consider what I say, and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." (2 Tim. 2:7.) Understanding of the word of God is *the gift of God* to the believer who reads that word. It comes from God direct to the believer, and not through comments and "meanings" and "interpretations" given through wild conjecture of men.

And it is by the Holy Spirit that God give this understanding of his word to the one who will consider what he says. And so it is written, "The Comforter which is the Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John 14:26.

Please note that even when the divine Spirit gives understanding of the divine word, even *He* does not do this by attempting to tell what the Lord *means*, but only by bringing to the mind "whatsoever I have *said*." Even the Holy Spirit, in teaching, and giving understanding in, the divine word sticks to what the word says. And only this, and such as this, is true teaching of that word forever. Let every one who stands as a teacher of the word of God, spend any length of time, and any degree of effort, that may ever be needed, to enable the people to see and consider what the good Word of God says; but never a moment in any attempt or suggestion to show what it means.

Just here is where lay Eve's salvation or her loss. If she had said to Satan this day: "Whether the word that I have cited may *mean* what you suggest, I know not, nor do I care to inquire. I know what the word says, and I shall take it for just what it says; and there I stand and will stand. I will not eat of the fruit of that tree, because the word says that I shall not." If Eve had done just that simple thing, everybody knows that she would not have sinned. Yea, not only she *would* not have sinned, but so long as she should continue to do this simple thing, she *could* not have sinned.

And that simple thing is as true to-day and forever to every person now in the world as it was and as it would have proved itself to be that day to Eve. And in that simple thing lies the power of the divine word to keep the soul from sinning. That divine word thus simply held by Eve would forever have kept her from sin. That divine word thus simply held kept the Lord Jesus in human flesh from sinning. As it is written, "Concerning the works of men, by the word of thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer." (Ps. 17:4.) And that divine word thus simply held will keep every other one from sinning, just as it did Him, as it is written, "Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against Thee." Ps. 119:11.

And to all people forever there stand written the all-gracious words: "I fear lest by any means as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so *your* minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." 2 Cor. 11:3.

"Consider what I *say* and *the Lord give thee* understanding." "The Comforter which is the Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatever *I have said* unto you."

**June 24, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. - II. The Fall" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 25 , pp. 499-501.**

ALONZO T. JONES

GOD had given to man His word. That word was the expression of His thought. That thought was of His mind. Man receiving that word as the word of God in truth, would thereby receive the thought of God, and would thus be partaker of the mind of God.

In the garden there came to man another word, - the opposite of the word of God. This word likewise was the expression of thought, and the thought, the product of mind. To, receive this word was likewise to receive the thought expressed in the word; and to receive that thought was to be partaker of that mind.

This letter word was the opposite; of the word of God, the thought, the opposite of the thought of God, this mind the opposite of, the mind of God. To accept this word, instead of the word of God was evidently to accept another mind than the mind of God. And in the garden this latter word was received in place of the word of God. And the fact, that another mind had then been received; was immediately manifest; for "the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise."

The tree was not good for food; for in the garden apart from this tree and freely accessible to man grew "every *tree* that was ... good for food."

The tree was not pleasant to the eyes; for in the garden, *apart from this tree* and freely accessible to man, "made the Lord God to grow every *tree* that was pleasant to the sight."

The tree was not "a tree to be desired to make one wise," this is demonstrated every minute from then till now.

But the woman "*saw*" that the tree was good for food and pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise. She "*saw*" that the tree was what it was not. In other words, she saw what was not so. Yet she saw it; and to her it was real. Indeed, to her that was the only thing then that was real.

Now the only way in which anybody can see what is not so the only way in which anybody can see as real what is not real at all - is by a hypnotic spell. One who is hypnotized sees only what is not so; to him that is real. Indeed, that is all

that is real; and it is all that he sees. And that is just how Eve saw that the tree was good for food and pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, when in truth it was nothing of the kind. It was by suggestion - the suggestion of the ma-

500

lign and deceiving mind. And thus that which was true and real just as it stood, by suggestion became to her nothing; and what was not in any sense true or real, by suggestion became the only thing that was either true or real. It was a reversal of her own nature, wrought by her receiving the foreign mind, the mind that is the opposite of that of God.

Thus seeing the false and unreal to be the only true and real, "she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." However, "Adam was not deceived." (1 Tim. 2:14.) Seeing that Eve "was in the transgression," he by his own choice went with her. But the result was the same; the foreign and deceiving mind was received, and it now reigned. The glory departed. And whereas, before, they had reflected the image and glory of God, they now to their own shame reflected only the image and shame of the deceiver.

And the results immediately appeared; when they heard the voice of the Lord, they were afraid. This was a new experience. They had heard the voice of the Lord before this, and were not at all afraid, but rather rejoiced. And the fear was altogether on their own part. Always, God is the one of whom no one can ever rightly be afraid. And even now on God's part they had no cause at all to be afraid. He had not come for revenge nor for punishment. Even though they had sinned, He had not come to condemn or to destroy, but only to save.

Yet they were afraid and hid themselves; and really thought that they could hide themselves from God. This itself betrays an utterly false mind. And the being afraid of themselves, and the consequence of the sin. Here, then, is revealed the origin, the genesis, of the fear that is afraid. Sin is the cause, and the only cause of fear. Remove sin and there is no fear. And so it is written, "Perfect love casteth out fear." When the sin is removed and the love of God is implanted by the power and Spirit of God, all fear is gone. The converted and cleansed soul is not afraid of anybody or anything. And if any one is afraid of anything, it is because not all sin is gone: trust is not full. And above all he is not afraid of God. Instead of being afraid of God, he only loves and trusts Him absolutely - with perfect abandon. So certainly is it true that "Perfect love," the Love of God imported by the Holy Spirit, "casteth out fear."

But they were afraid, as the consequence of their sin. And when asked in his hiding, "Where art thou?" Adam replied, "I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself." The Lord pierced this shield through and through with the simple question, "Who told thee that thou wast naked?" They had been naked before, they had been naked all the time, and "were not ashamed." It was not their nakedness, but their sin: that caused them to be both ashamed and afraid.

Therefore the Lord proceeded, "Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?" Here was a straight question. And he had eaten of the tree. Did he, then, answer, "Yes, Lord, I have, and am

exceedingly sorry?" Not at all. He gave a reply that involved in blame everybody but himself: "The woman, whom thou goriest to be with me she gave me of the free, and I did eat." . . . The Lord had not asked him what other people had done: He had asked him whether he had eaten of the forbidden tree. And though he had done it, all that he could answer was to tell what others, and even the Lord himself, had done; thus insinuating that whatever blame was in the case should be traced who gave the woman to him.

"And the Lord said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done?" Did the woman now say, "O, I have disobeyed thy word. It is true, I have eaten of the forbidden tree. O, I am so sorry?" No, Like the man, she tells him what some one else did. "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."

Now, why didn't they answer straight to a straight question? Well, reader, did you never find yourself doing just as they did? When you had done a

501

thing that was wrong, and you knew it, and you were asked a straight question as to whether you had done it, did you never find yourself dodging and bringing in everybody else before yourself to bear the blame? Everybody knows that this trait is found in everybody in the world; and that to do so is as natural as it is to breathe. It is seen in the child as truly as in the grown person. And each one knows that it is the first impulse in such circumstance. And that transaction with Satan in the garden is the genesis of it. And this is how it is that the disposition has come to every one in the world and is found natural and spontaneous in every one.

That is how it came; but still the question remains, Why is it? Why didn't Adam and Eve answer straight instead of crooked? The answer is, They couldn't. They were under the spell of another, and so were not themselves. They had received the word, and the thought and the mind of Satan; that mind that "is enmity against God, is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be;" that mind in which self is supreme, and which will involve in wrong everybody in the universe, including even God, to protect self. That mind was now in possession of Adam and Eve. They were enslaved by it, and to him whose that mind is. And at that moment it was no more possible for Adam or Eve to answer straight a question involving himself or herself in wrong - at that moment it was no more possible for Adam or Eve to confess wrong - than for Satan himself to do it. They were completely possessed and enslaved by the mind of Satan. In mind and thought they and he were completely at one. Man was completely fallen.

**July 8, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. The Redemption. - I" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 27 , pp. 547, 548.**

ALONZO T. JONES

MAN had fallen. He was a captive and enslaved in mind and body to Satan. Between man and his new and cruel master there was complete harmony. Satan's mind was man's mind and will.

But thank the Lord, the merciful and true God, mankind was not left in this enslavement. For immediately from His gracious lips there passed to Satan the ominous sentence, and to all mankind the blest assurance, that this alliance of enslavement was forever broken up. "And the Lord God said unto the serpent. . . . I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

By the infinite power of that divine word enmity was then planted between mankind and Satan; and from that moment to this, there has been no unity of mind or of soul between mankind and Satan, and no unity between even any individual and Satan except upon the continuous, persistent, and determined choice of the individual himself. The enmity between mankind and Satan that by the divine word was there and then implanted was fixed and perpetual from God; and it never can be affected nor modified by anything that Satan can do, but only by the personal choice of the individual himself.

The working of this divinely implanted enmity is fully described in the following inspired passage: "That which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it [the law] is good." "Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me [that is, in my flesh,] dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Rom. 7:15-24.

The warfare there described between the good and the evil, is in every soul that ever came into the world. Every soul *knows* better than he *does*. He knows the good and "would do it." And though he hates the evil, he *hates* the evil that he does; and many times even fairly hates himself for doing the evil that he hates. Each person knows in himself the experience of knowing better than he *does*; and the experience of resolving and promising himself to do better; and the experience of trying to do better, and failing; and the experience of "turning over new leaves," and the new leaves soon blurred as the former ones; and in and through it all only the wearisome and discouraging experience of the treadmill or the quicksands.

Every soul knows that the law of God is good that says that what he is doing should not be done. He gladly consents in his mind that the law of God is good. He willingly "wills" that this good should be done, and even "wills" that he will do that good. But "how to perform," that is the problem. For in his members, in his flesh, he finds another law, the law of sin, warring

against the law of his mind, the law of God, and in the warfare he finds this "other law" gaining the victory and bringing him into captivity to the law of sin in his members. And this is always so, this experience is so constant, so utterly unrelieved, that itself forces the cry, "O wretched man that I am ! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" A body of death because it is only a body of sin.

This is the warfare that is the consequence of the enmity that by the divine word was that day in the garden implanted between mankind and Satan. But it is not a warfare in which the victory is always on the wrong side. It is a warfare in which the victory need not ever be on the wrong side. The warfare was started by the gracious Lord, expressed in order that every soul should be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the blameless children of God! Expressly in order that each soul should have only victory all the time; expressly in order that victory should always be only on the right side, and on the side of right.

The only reason why in this divinely implanted warfare victory ever is on the wrong side; the only reason why the warfare ever turns against the soul, is that the soul himself seeks to gain the victory by his own battling and his own struggling. The victory in this warfare can never be gained in this way; the disadvantages are too many, the opposing forces are too many and too powerful. The lost, captured, and imprisoned soul is too weak to so fight the battle as to gain the victory and deliverance alone.

And it was never the intention that the victory and deliverance should be gained in that way. Note again the situation when the enmity was implanted, of which the warfare is the consequence. Adam and Eve were already lost, captured, and enslaved to the enemy. Their minds were only the reflection of his mind. And that being the condition, how could it be possible for them, of themselves, to carry to victory a warfare against their captor, even when the enmity had been implanted? On the very face of affairs, such a thing was plainly impossible.

What, then, alone could mean the implanting of the enmity and its consequent warfare! Just this! In Adam and Eve in transgression mankind was then in unity with Satan, and with the evil. There was no enmity between them. God breaks up that unity and friendship by creating and implanting in mankind enmity against Satan and the evil; implanting enmity against the very evil in which they were, and which was in them, and of which they were a part. This planting in them enmity against the evil, was in itself to give to them the knowledge of the good. And in planting fixed hatred of the evil, there was given a longing for the good.

But, and please note it particularly, this good was not in them. And the longing for the good could not possibly be satisfied from themselves. The good was not in themselves, and they were not to look there for it. The good was only in God, who in His goodness had planted in them who were now bad the enmity against the bad, that gate to them the knowledge of the good. And the longing for the good could be satisfied *only from Him* who in His divine goodness had planted hatred of the evil in them who were already in the evil.

The planting of the enmity, therefore, plainly did not make mankind good. It gave them the knowledge of the good and a longing for the good. And it broke up the absolutism of the captivity and mastery of Satan, again setting free the will and the power of choice, so that mankind were again possessed of individuality to be exercised in choosing and willing which mind they would have and who should be their master.

And as the good, the knowledge of which, and the desire for which, was thus given, was not in themselves, but in Him who in His goodness created in mankind the enmity against Satan and the hatred of the evil, it is plain that the planting this enmity against Satan and the hatred of evil was the opening of the door, and the showing of the way of salvation to lost mankind. And this door and this way of salvation thus opened and shown to lost man-

549

kind, was in itself only the gift of Jesus Christ the Lord "the Door," and "the Way," "Desire of all nations;" "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

And thus to every soul exclaiming in his defeat, "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from this body of death?" from the moment of the planting of that enmity against Satan unto this moment and forever the blessed answer is, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord" there is in Him complete deliverance from defeat, from captivity, and from all loss, unto triumphant victory, unto glorious liberty, and unto eternal possession of "all things."

In the planting of enmity against Satan that day, there was the gift of Christ, "the true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world" "on his coming into the world." And in this gift of Christ there was a restoring of the true mind to lost mankind, and of freedom to choose this mind instead of the false and deceiving mind of Satan. And from that moment until now and forever, the divine call to every soul has been "Change you mind;" that is, "Repent." Repent your mind from the false to the true; from the mind that "is enmity against God and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," to the mind that is in Christ, and that is itself the very keeping of the Law of God because it is made manifest by the Holy Spirit.

"The Son of God is come and hath given us a mind." "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." "We have the mind of Christ." And "with the mind, I myself serve the Law of God."

This is the redemption that was given to lost man the very day that he sinned and was lost. And it is the redemption to lost mankind forever. It is a free gift of divine grace, ever to be had in all its fulness only for the taking.

**July 15, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. The Redemption. - II" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 28 , pp. 499-501.**

ALONZO T. JONES

TO the man, and of the consequences of eating of the forbidden tree, God had said, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

The man did eat of the forbidden tree. Why then did he not die *that day*? - The answer is: Because Christ that very moment gave himself to die, that the man might escape the death that he had incurred and that was that moment falling; because Christ took upon him the death that was falling, and held forth to the man the free gift of life, instead of the death that was his due.

As soon as the man had sinned, the death was swiftly descending, and would have stricken him. But more swift than the swiftly descending death, was the loving Christ, the Author of life, to throw himself between, to take upon himself and so receive in himself all the death that was falling. Except for this blessed and swift redemption in

569

the gift of Christ, the man would never have breathed after he had sinned.

Accordingly it is written: "I am come that they might have *life*; and that they might have it more *abundantly*." Except for his "coming" the man would never have had life after he sinned. But the moment he had sinned and so needed life, that moment he, the blest Lifegiver, "came" that the man "might have life." And so he "is our life." "He is thy life."

And this "life more abundantly" that he came that mankind might have, is eternal life. For, it is life in place of the death that was falling. If that death that was then falling had smitten the man, it is plain that it would have been only eternal death. Therefore, the life which Jesus came that the man might have, in place of the death that was falling, is plainly eternal life.

Yet this eternal life was not, and could not be, bestowed upon man and put within him as his very own, arbitrarily and without man's will or choice; for man was then a sinner. And to bestow upon him and put within him eternal life whether or not he should will or choose, would have been only to eternalize sin and the sinner. Therefore, this eternal life, the "life more abundantly," was then in Christ given as a free gift to man to be accepted or rejected at the free choice of the man himself, in the freedom of will and choice that in the gift of Christ and the consequent planting of enmity between mankind and Satan had been given.

This, then, required that the man should have a life that would give to him a breathing-space in which he might exercise his freedom and power of choice, as to whether or not he would accept the eternal life so freely given. It required that there should be bestowed a temporal life, in which man would have opportunity, at his own free choice, to "lay hold on eternal life." And so it is written: "What is your life? It is even a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away."

Note that the Word does not say that your life is even as a vapor. No; but that "it is, even a vapor." And it vanisheth away." Then that statement of Inspiration what words could possibly more strongly show the temporary, fleeting, intangible, and unsubstantial nature of "the life that now is," vitally spoken of as the natural life.

Yet even this unsubstantial, intangible, fleeting life, this life that "is even a vapor that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away," is altogether the

gift of Christ in the gift of himself, that swift moment when he interposed himself and intercepted the swift, descending eternal death. And this is how it is that in, every sense of the word it is altogether true that, "I am come that they might have life; and that they might have it more abundantly." it was only by his "coming," there and then, that they could ever have had life at all, after they had sinned. But he "came" that they might have life more abundantly, even eternal life. And that they might have this more abundant life, of their own free choice, and because they prized it. He came that also they might have life at all, life in its simplest terms, life that "is even, a vapor, that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away;" in order that in the breathing-space of this life that is even a vapor that could "lay hold on eternal life"; that in the breathing-space of the life which is "even a vapor" and appearing "for a little time," they might lay hold on the life that is divine substance and abiding eternally. Thus it is, and so true it is, that in the fullest meaning of the words, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

Therefore, and thus, it is the truth of God that every breath that has ever been taken by any soul on earth since the moment that Adam sinned, has been solely because of the gracious gift of Christ in that swift moment. And every breath that any soul breathes in the world to-day and ever, whether he, be wicked or righteous, natural or spiritual, he owes to, and receives from, the Lord Jesus in the gracious gift of himself that swift moment when he "came that they might have life," Mid this in order "that they might have it more abundantly."

And the way in which each soul uses the life that "is even a vapor" that is a "little time" vanishes away, this makes manifest to the universe just the use that he would make of the life that is divine substance and eternal, if he had it. And just here as upon no other point in human experience is worked out the principle: "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shalt give you that which is your own!"

He who, having from Christ the gift of life that is a vapor and for a little time, in order that he may have the infinite opportunity of having hold on eternal life, yet who spends this gracious gift and its grand opportunity, in dishonor to God and disregard of man, thereby demonstrating that this is just what he would do with eternal life, each thus counts himself utterly unworthy of everlasting life.

On the other hand, he who in gratitude to the Giver, and in appreciation of the gift of the life that is "even a vapor" and "for a little time," uses to the glory of God and the blessing of men, even this life that is so unsubstantial and fleeting, thereby demonstrates what he would do with life that is divine substance and eternal; and so demonstrates before God and the universe that he can be absolutely trusted with life that measures to eternity.

And note the question: "If ye have not been faithful in that which in another man's, who shall give you that which is your own!" This life that is "a vapor" and for "a little time" is *not our own*. It comes to us without any choice or will of our own. It stays with us also without any choice or will of our own, except by act of sheer violence we destroy ourselves. And when this time comes for it to "vanish away," it then goes without any will or choice of our own; and we can not retain it

whatever we do. So completely is it so that this life that is "a vapor" is not our own.

In Christ, however, the life that is substance and eternal, is our own. Christ gave himself for all. He came to all, that all might have this life more abundantly, this eternal life. By very right of his coming and his gracious gift, this eternal life belongs to every soul. But how can any one be entrusted with this which to Christ is his own, so long as he refuses to recognize at all the Author of life, and while the life that is not his at all he uses for every other purpose than the one single purpose for which it was loaned.

The life that is even a vapor, the life that is not our own, was lent to us in order that in the "little time" of it we might lay hold on eternal life and make our calling and election sure. And when in the use or misuse of this life that is "a vapor" and "for a little time and that is not at all our own, each soul has proved himself, then cometh the end, the resurrection, and the Judgment, when all, small and great, and each one just as he, himself, has decided that he shall be, shall stand before God and before the judgment seat of Christ, to receive according as he hath chosen and done.

Then, those who have "counted themselves unworthy of everlasting life" receive just what they have persistently and confirmedly chosen - everlasting death. He who at the first interposed himself and intercepted the everlasting death that was then descending, will now no longer stand between; they have persistently and confirmedly executed him. And he having been finally shut out from between, he no longer holds upon himself the death that at the first was due and falling, and now upon all who have persistently and confirmedly chosen only this, it falls and in all its awfulness of death eternal. And all who have chosen him in whom in the life, and the life that is in him - *these* go away into and in the blessings, the peace, the joy, and the glory of life eternal.

And so this life that is but "a vapor" ending in this death that is but a sleep, is the breathing-space and the probation that is lent to mankind that they may freely and confirmedly make their choice of the life that is eternal, or of the death that is eternal.

For, when the life that "is even a vapor" and "for a little time" comes

570

to mankind solely by means of Christ's giving himself that day for mankind, and even then is not our own, how could it possibly be that the life that is divine substance and eternal could come to any soul except also solely by the gift of Christ?

"See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; . . . therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live; that thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him; for He is thy life, and the length of thy days."

**July 22, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. The Redemption. - III" *The Medical Missionary* 17,  
29 , pp. 581-583.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"AND the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken."

"The man is become as one of us." Satan had said to the woman, "In the day ye eat thereof. . . . ye shall be as God." (R.V.) And in a way, that is in Satan's way, this had come true. For, as the direct consequence of his having now the mind of Satan, the mind that "is enmity against God," the mind of self-exaltation, *in his own estimation* the man has ever considered himself of God, in the place of God, and above God.

This is the natural and spontaneous disposition of the mind that man received from Satan that day, the mind that "is enmity against God." And everywhere, throughout all history, wherever the man has shown himself forth just as he is in this natural mind, he has invariably set himself up as God in the place of God, and even "above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself off for God."

And in view of this native trait of man in possession of the carnal mind; God appeals to him, in these gracious words "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee; but to do justly, and to love mercy, and *to humble thyself to it walk with God*" (Micah 6:8, margin.) The man is so exalted, so above God, that in order to "walk with" God he must be content to *humble himself* to the lower plane.

Accordingly, the divine exhortation to man from that day, to this is, "Let this mind be you that was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God; thought it not robbery [a thing to be seized upon and held fast as a robber, his prey] to be equal with God, but emptied himself took upon him the *form* of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion *as a man, he humbled himself*, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross."

"To know good and evil." For any creature to know good and evil, is in fact and in practice to know only evil; for whatever he may know, it is certain that he does only evil. Good and evil in the same place at the same time, good and evil mixed, is only evil, just as food and poison in the same place at the same time, food and poison mixed, is only poison. Therefore no creature is ever to seek to know good and evil, but only good; for to know good and evil, is surely to *do* only evil in spite of all the good that he may know, and against all his desire to do the good. Read again Romans 7:14-24.

No, no. "Refuse the evil, choose the good." Seek only the good. Know only the good. "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that *good* and acceptable and perfect will of God." The good is of God only. To seek only the good is to seek only God. To know only the good is to

know only God. (Matt. 19:17.) "The fruit of the Spirit is. . . goodness." "Ask and ye shall receive. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

"Lest he put forth his hand and take

582

also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever, the Lord God sent him out of the garden. This sending the man from the garden, and from the tree of life, was the only way of deliverance of the man from sin and death. He was now in sin and was a sinner. To eat of the tree of life and so live forever, would have been to eternalize sin and sinners. Therefore the Lord drove out the man, separating him from the tree of life, "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Heb. 2:14, 15.

"The Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, *to till the ground.*" Before the Lord sent the man forth "to till the ground," he had said to him, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; . . . in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." And this is an element in the deliverance of man from sin, an element in the work of redemption.

Even before sin had ever entered the world, when the man was first created and put in the garden, it was with the purpose that he should work. For it is observed that before the man was created, "there was not a man to till the ground." And when he had been created, the Lord "put him in the garden of Eden *to dress it and to keep it.*" (Gen. 2:5, 15.) Thus industrial occupation was essential to the welfare of man in his very creation, and in paradise, when he was in that blissful state which he was to enjoy forevermore.

And when this was essential to man's welfare when he was in righteousness, perfection, and paradise, how much more is it essential when he has fallen into an and imperfection! Therefore in this latter state, since work is the more needed for his welfare, for his sake the ground is caused to require more labor in the dressing and the keeping of it, that it shall supply to man the heeded sustenance.

It is therefore an utter mistake to think that manual labor is in any sense a curse, or that it is any part of the curse. Yet it can not be denied that multitudes of people do think that such labor is akin to a curse, if not the very original curse itself. Indeed, even many Christians so misread the word of God as to make it appear that the requirement that man shall eat bread by the sweat of his face, is a material part of the curse.

It is not so. The word of the Lord to man is, "Cursed is *the ground for thy sake*; . . . in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." When a thing is done for *my sake*, this is evidence of special thought, care, and consideration for me, and of good will to me. The ground was thus cursed for man's *sake*. Then that curse upon the *ground* for the man's sake, was *to the man* not a curse, but a blessing. And such is the kind, benign, and wise provision for mankind, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread."

And let there ever be kept in mind the thought that there is in all this a moral *element*. While the man was sinless, there was in the earth no untoward elements; and his occupation was only in the perfect abundance of all that was good in the earth, "to dress it and to keep it." But after the man had fallen into sin,

and when God would save him from the increase of work is supplied, and "for his sake." And though it is now actual *labor*, and this to the extent of "the sweat of his face," - not the sweat of his "brow," but the sweat of his *face*, - yet it is all "for his sake."

And all this reveals the mighty truth that work, manual labor, industrial occupation, holds an important place as an element in the recovery of man from the inroad of sin, and in the development of the morals of Christian; character. And this is fully confirmed by the life of the Saviour on earth as "the Way" of salvation and redemption of man. For, counting from the time that he was twelve years old in the flesh, to the time of his baptism, when he entered specifically upon his teaching and ministry, he spent nearly six times as much of his life on earth the daily occupation of manual labor as he spent in the direct work of his public ministry.

Now it can never be said that the Lord of heaven and earth as man learned the carpenter's trade and spent eighteen years at it, with the purpose of having

583

a safeguard, if possible he might need it, "some time" as a means of "making a living." No! The Lord Jesus on earth was the moral Man, the Pattern of what every man must be to be a perfect man; that is, to be a Christian. He was just as much the Saviour of the world when he was sawing boards and making benches and tables as he was when he was preaching the Sermon on the Mount. This fact in the life of the Lord, therefore, demonstrates that in manual labor, honest work at honest occupation, there is that which, *as a moral element*, is valuable to man for *itself alone*; and as a factor in the solution of the mighty problem of the redemption of man.

**August 12, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. Gen. 4:1. What Was Cain's Fault?" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 32 , pp. 644-646.**

ALONZO T. JONES

CAIN and Abel each brought an offering unto the Lord.

And each brought his offering from the field of his industry.

Cain was a "tiller of the ground," and "brought of the fruit of the ground, an offering unto the Lord."

Abel was "a keeper of sheep," and he "brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof."

"And the Lord had respect unto Abel and his offering, but unto Cain and his offering He had not respect."

Each brought an offering, each worshiped. Each brought an offering "unto the Lord;" each recognized *the Lord*, and offered to him worship. And each brought from the field of his own industry the offering that was the token of his worship. What was the fault? Wherein did it lie? We can find it.

Note that when Cain saw that he and his offering were not respected nor accepted, he was disappointed - "his countenance fell;" and he was offended - "he was very wroth." This shows that he really expected that his offering and his worship would be accepted; and that in it all he really meant to be worshipful.

And the Lord recognized Cain's meaning to be worshipful, gave him credit for it, and taught him why his worship was not true nor acceptable.

"And the Lord said unto Cain, why art thou wrath? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door."

"If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?" Abel was accepted, and Cain knew it. Abel, therefore, had done well. If, therefore, Cain would do as Abel had done, he, too, would be accepted. But Cain had brought an offering *unto the Lord*; and Abel had brought an offering. Abel was accepted, while Cain was not, in his offering. And since each had brought his offering *unto the Lord*, and Abel was accepted while Cain was not, because Abel had "done well," while Cain had not, in this the Lord told Cain plainly enough, that he had not brought the *right kind* offering; and that his having respected and accepted Abel was not because of any preference for Abel over Cain *as a person*, but solely because of what his *offering meant* over Cain's offering.

"And if thou doest not well, *sin lieth at the door*." Cain had not done well in the *kind of offering* which he had brought; for if he had "done well" in this, as had Abel, then he would have been respected and accepted as fully and as truly as was Abel. And the reason why Cain had not done well in the kind of offering that he brought, the Lord made unmistakably plain to him in the words - "sin lieth at the door." That is to say that Cain's offering recognized no sin. But *the offering* was only the *token* of the spirit and worship of *the man*, and the man's view of his relationship to the Lord in worship. Therefore since Cain's offering recognized no sin, this thing showed that Cain himself recognized *no sin in himself*. And in the gracious words, "sin lieth at the door," the Lord in merciful kindness revealed to Cain his whole fault and the whole secret of it.

Cain recognized no sin in himself, and yet he wanted to be recognized as a respected and an accepted worshiper of the Lord. And when the Lord revealed to him that there was sin there, when the Lord told him that sin lay at the door, and that *this* was why himself and his offering were not respected nor accepted, even then he would not recognize that there was sin in himself. Yet there *was* sin there. And since he would not recognize it of himself, nor by his own conscience, nor yet by the open revelation of God, he thus shut himself up where the sin that was there would so manifest itself that even he would

645

have to recognize it as the sin that it really was.

And, indeed, the sin that he refused to recognize was already manifesting itself. For no sooner did he see that his offering was not accepted as was Abel's, then "his countenance fell," and he was "very wroth," and he instantly grew jealous of Abel, and evilly surmised that Abel was exalting himself to the place and privileges of the first-born. And even in this the Lord showed him that he was wrong; telling him that if he did well excellency of the first-born would still surely

be his, that Abel would be subject to his, and that the rightful dominion would be his. Verse 7, margin.

Yet none of this merciful persuasion could avail. Cain still refused to recognize sin, still in sin nursed his sinful wrath, and his jealousy and evil-surmising of Abel. And his sinful and groundless conjecture presently became so altogether real to him that he supposed that the only way in which he could preserve to himself the position and excellency of the first-born was to make sure of it by putting Abel entirely out of the way. "And it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him."

"And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel, thy brother? And he said, I know not: Am I my brother's keeper? And he said, What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground. And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand. When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth: And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear. *Mine iniquity is greater than that it may be forgiven.*" Verse 13, margin.

And so at last, and through this awful experience, Cain did recognize that he was a sinner; yes, even that his iniquity was very great. But this is only what he might to have recognized at the first. He was no more a sinner at the last than at the first, except only the fact of the sin having actually worked itself out. But when the sin had actually worked itself out is it did, it was only the working out of what was already here at the first. It was only working out of what was there before he ever brought his offering.

And if at that tune Cain had recognized the truth that he was a sinner and had brought an offering that signified the confession of it, and his faith in God's gift of salvation from it; or if he had recognized this even after God had revealed it to him in the word, "sin lieth at the door," and had *then* brought an offering that signified his confession of it, and his fault in God's gift of salvation from it; he would have been saved from it, and kept from it; and it never would have appeared in his life. *because* he would have been saved from it, and kept from it, and the righteousness of God through faith would have appeared instead of the sin.

This was Abel's case exactly. Abel was a sinner as truly as was Cain. But Abel recognized this truth, acknowledged that he was a sinner, and brought an offering that signified the confession that he was a sinner, and that signified his faith in God's gift of salvation from sin and from sinning. Abel brought an offering, the firstling of his flock, - a lamb. By this he expressed his faith that God had already given the Firstling of his flock, the Lamb of God, as an offering for the sins of men. Abel slew the lamb, and offered its body and blood, a sacrifice, a whole burnt offering, unto God. And this he did as the expression of his faith that God had already given the Firstling of his flock, the Lamb of God, to be slain in the offering of his body and blood, a sacrifice, a whole offering unto God for the sins of men. In this faith Abel was accepted of God, and his sin was all forgiven. By this faith he was saved from sin, was kept from sinning, and received the righteousness of God to be manifested in his life instead of the sin that was

there. And thus "by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous."

646

Cain could have done the same as did Abel; and God would have testified of *his* gifts and would have given to him, also, the "witness that he was righteous." And so could, and so can, every other person in the world. And all that Cain needed to do was simply to recognize that he was a sinner, and to bring an offering that signified the confession of the sin and faith in the gift of God for his salvation from sin and from sinning. And that is all that any one ever needs to do, even now. God's Gift has been made. The Lamb of God has been slain. "It pleased the Lord to bruise Him; *He* hath put him to grief;" and O "when thou shalt make *His* soul an offering for sin. He shall see of his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand." Isa. 53:10.

But Cain would not do it. And there have been multitudes of others who would not do it. And still there are multitudes who will not do it. And ever the story is the same - "sin lieth at the door," and the sin that they refuse to recognize and acknowledge in themselves works itself out in the life, multiplying the curse upon themselves and the world.

There are many people, even Christians, who wonder why it is that in the prayer that Jesus taught his disciples to pray, there is the petition constantly for the forgiveness of sins, when it is taught, and provided and expected, that His disciples shall not sin at all. This petition is in that prayer for this very purpose that we shall not sin, and as the sure defense against our sinning. Sin is in us. Our human nature is a sinful nature - a nature full of sin. Yet though this be ever true, as surely as we recognize, and acknowledge, and confess it, and offer the Offering that is ever acceptable to God, so surely the sin is forgiven and we are made "partakers of the *divine* nature;" and the sin of our human nature is not manifested, but the righteousness of the divine nature is made manifest instead.

And this is the wonderful lesson that is given to the world in the story of Cain and Abel in Genesis 4. And thus at the very threshold of the sinful world there was made plain by the gracious Lord the way of salvation from sin and from sinning.

**August 19, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. Gen. 4:11. The Unrepentant Cain" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 33 , pp. 644-646.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WHEN the sin which Cain refused to recognize had worked itself out so that even *he* must recognize it as the terrible thing that it was from the beginning, then not only he, but all others recognized it as the great sin that it was.

Therefore, Cain not only recognized that "mine iniquity is greater than that it may be forgiven," but also that "I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass that *every one that findeth me shall slay me.*"

But in all this Cain had mistaken the Lord, as in all the other he had mistaken himself. There is with the Lord forgiveness of iniquity, and transgression, and sin. The Lord had given the Firstling of his flock, the Lamb of God, a satisfaction and propitiation for the sin of the world and for the sins of men. There was for Cain forgiveness full and free at the first, when he refused to recognize that there was in him any sin at all. there was for him forgiveness just as full and free after he had manifested his refusal to recognize that there was in him any sin at all, and when the Lord had in mercy revealed to him that "sin lieth at the door." In the Lord's sight the sin was no greater when it had worked itself out than when it lay at the door; no greater when it had made the spring and accomplished its awful stroke than when it lay at the door crouching ready to spring to its awful stroke. There was with the Lord *then* forgiveness full and free, and there was with him now forgiveness just as full and just as free; for he changeth not.

Therefore Cain's iniquity was not greater than that it might be forgiven; in reality no more so now than at the first. And this the Lord now makes manifest to him in such a marvelous manifestation of mercy that even not only Cain, but also all others could know it. To Cain's complaint he Lord answered: "Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him seven-fold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, *lest any finding him should slay.*"

And what a token of the blind perversity of the natural mind is given in the fact that in this marvelous extension of mercy to Cain there is seen by thousands even of professed Christians only an advertisement and condemnation of Cain and his guilt, and all emblazoned before the universe! These refer to "the mark of Cain" as if it were distinguishing blood-red mark of his guilt and condemnation branded upon him by God to enlist all men also in the condemnation; and according to this blind and perverse nation; they promptly enlist in the hue and cry of the condemnation of Cain and other sinners, and condemn themselves in their condemnation of him and others. In this blind perversity they overlook the divine and glorious truth that with God there is forgiveness, not condemnation, of sinners; that God gave not his son to condemn the world nor any man, but that the world and all men through him might be saved. John 3:17.

657

Cain was guilty, that is true, and by his transgression and his guilt he was condemned accordingly; this he showed by his fearful complaint. But God did not add to the condemnation; added condemnation never helps anybody. No; the merciful God extended forgiveness; and merciful consideration so that the guilty one might be encouraged to believe in and receive the merciful forgiveness.

And the "mark" which "the Lord set" upon Cain was the full assurance to him and to all men that there *was* extended to him this merciful consideration and probation; for the word distinctly says that the Lord set this "mark upon Cain, *lest any finding him should slay him.*" It was thus the divine surety that no one should slay him. It was therefore a divine pledge of the divine protection; and in this it was the full assurance of the extension of merciful forgiveness, and of merciful

consideration and probation in order that he might avail himself of the forgiveness and salvation of the Lord "in full assurance of faith."

And thus was the gospel in its blessed fulness preached to all the world in the case and for the salvation of the first open sinner in the world after The Fall.

And, sad to say, as for any faith and salvation of Cain, it was all in vain. Still through it all Cain remained unrepentant. Instead of allowing this marvelous mercy and goodness of God to lead him to repentance, he made it rather the sanction of his continuance in hardness of heart and transgression.

This is not only declared by Inspiration in the words of Jude 4:11 [*sic.*], but it shows itself in the life of Lamech the fifth in descent from Cain. "Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, I have slain a man, for wounding me, and a young man for hurting me. If Cain shall be avenged seven-fold, truly Lamech seventy and seven-fold." (Gen. 4:23, 24.) His argument is: Cain slew an innocent man, one who had done him no hurt at all; and any slaying him would be avenged seven-fold. But this man wounded me, this man hurt me. If, then, Cain was protected and avenged seven-fold, who slew an innocent man, a man who had done him no hurt, truly I shall be protected and avenged seventy and seven-fold, when the man whom I slew had wounded me, and had hurt me.

Thus God's great mercy to the sinner was used only for the sanction of the sin; "turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the Lord God, and our Lord, Jesus Christ. And *this* was only going "in the of Cain" - still unrepentant and hardened.

In the life of Lamech, the fifth from Cain, there appears another strain of evil - "Lamech took unto himself *two wives*." Polygamy was thus begun.

And thus, and so soon in unrepentant Cain and his family there was developed and confirmed the two crowning evils of the world; polygamy, that would annihilate the family and society, and would turn mankind into only a herd; and murder, that would annihilate mankind and the race itself.

Is it any wonder that in five more generations of such as these, the earth became so filled with violence and licentiousness that only the waters of the Deluge could effectually cleanse it, and that thus these two crowning evils did come within "eight souls" of annihilating mankind and the race?

**August 26, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. What Caused the Flood?" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 34 , pp. 675-677.**

ALONZO T. JONES

AFTER the murder of Abel, another son was born, whom Eve named Seth. "For God," said she, "hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew."

"And to Seth, to him also, there was born a son; and he called his name Enos." Seth was indeed "instead of Abel;" for he, as had been Abel, was a

worshiper of the Lord in truth. And Seth's son Enos was also one who walked in the Lord's way. And the influence of these two was so remarkable for good that it is written, "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." Gen. 4:26.

Another translation is that "then began men to proclaim the name of the Lord." Both thoughts are correct, for when men called upon the name of the Lord, they did it in a way to let it be known by others; to persuade them also to call upon the name of the Lord. And the results of this gospel preaching were then such as always - men were born again, and so became sons of God.

And the distinction was so clear between those who worshiped the Lord and those who did not that these were called "by the name of the Lord" (Gen. 4:26, margin) and so were called "the sons of God," the people of the Lord, etc., as distinguished from those who were only the children of men and of natural birth.

Through nine generations this genuine gospel work prevailed; and in such sincerity and power that by it one man was brought to such height of divine living that he never died, but actually passed alive from this world into the world of eternity. "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him."

But gradually the people of God forgot their high calling, loosed down their integrity and stepped down from the high estate of the sons of God and mingled themselves with the seed of men in the ways of the flesh. "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they

676

were fair; and they took themselves wives of all which they chose." Gen. 6:2.

Note that it was not that they took themselves wives of only such as they chose, as if each one had taken him a wife from the daughters of men. "They took themselves wives of all which they chose;" they entered upon the polygamous practice of the sons of Cain. If they had maintained their integrity, then the sons of God taking from the daughters of men, bringing in from the descendants of Cain, each of them only a wife, would have been bad enough. For, such numbers of unconverted women, caring nothing for the way of God, and knowing only the wild ways of the descendants of Cain, could have had no other effect than to wipe out the clear distinction between the children of God and the children of this world.

That, we say, would have been bad enough if only that had been done. But that is not what was done. It was not that the sons of God brought the daughters of men across the line and over into the field of the children of God; it was the far worse thing of the sons of God crossing the line and going over into the field of the daughters of men, the field of the descendants of Cain, and adopting their polygamous practices. And the effect of *this* was as a mighty tide to sweep the world into the very depths. So long as the sons of God kept themselves on their own side of the line of the gospel distinction, their life of the righteousness of faith was through conscience and the presence of the Spirit a restraint upon the evil tendencies of the descendants of Cain. But when they abandoned their own native ground of the sons of God, and went over to that of the descendants of Cain, this was only to encourage the descendants of Cain by putting the fullest seal of approval upon their evil courses. It was to say that the Gospel distinction

that had been made was a mistake from the beginning, and that the descendants of Cain had been right all the time.

Of course the only effect of this was to encourage a perfect abandon to every kind of excess without restraint. And so in the tenth generation from Adam, and only the third from Enoch, the wickedness of man had become so great in the earth that "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." The spring of every thought, the spontaneous impulse of every purpose, the deepest depth of every desire, was only evil continually; and all of this continually manifesting itself in excessive and unrestrained eating and giving in marriage, till "the earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence; ... for all flesh had corrupted His way upon the earth."

But lo! there was one man in the world who in the midst of it all and in spite of it all stood true to God and thus true to the right. "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God." Literally, "Noah *set himself* to walk with God." And when Noah set himself to walk with God, God responded with the assurance, and was certified, that "Noah *walked* with God."

But how could Noah do this! How could he be "a just man" and "perfect in his generation," and "walk with God," when all the world beside, and all round him everywhere, was so entirely and continually evil. He could do this just as truly with the world all this way as with all the other way; for it was all outside of him. And it is never what is outside us, but what is *inside* of us, that decides our cause and makes the way of right easy or otherwise to us. Noah was son of God by birth. He had made God his portion. God was his king, ruling in him and reigning over him. This is Noah's fixed choice; and whatever others might choose, made no difference to him, and could not affect his course. And so "Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generation's; and Noah walked with God."

"And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall also the coming of the Son of be."

In the days, and at the time of the coming of the Son of man the earth will be corrupt, and filled with violence, as in the days of Noah. Also, thank the Lord, there will be those who in the midst of it all and in spite of it all will

677

be just men and perfect in their generation, and will walk with God.

And in that day Noah's righteous example and instruction carried with him his whole family. In the presence of universal polygamy it held his three sons true to the way of the true sons of God in the marriage bond as established by the Lord, when all the *professed* sons of God had gone in the way of the children of men in taking to themselves "wives of all which they chose." And this shows what could have been done, if all the professed sons of God had been true sons of God as was Noah - each a just man and perfect in his generation and walking with God.

And this in turn tells that it was not so much the wickedness of the confessedly wicked, as it was the sheer formalism and denial of the power of godliness - *of the general looseness* - of the professedly righteous that brought the Flood.

In this also, also it was in the days of Noah, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. As it is written, "In the last days perilous times shall come. For

men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; *having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.*"

Yet let it never be forgotten that still, "as it was in the days of Noah, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be;" "and Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God."

**"The Northwestern Sanitarium" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 34 , pp. 684, 685.**

THE Northwestern Sanitarium is at Port Townsend, Wash. Port Townsend is on the western shore of Puget Sound, at the point where that shore of the Sound turns to the westward along the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the Ocean.

The Sanitarium is a well-built four-story structure of two hundred finished rooms, one hundred and twenty-five of which are nicely furnished and invitingly fitted up singly and *en suite* for the use of guests and patients.

The institution is conducted by Dr. and Dirs. W. R. Simmons as an agency in the blessing of mankind through the knowledge and application of the principles of physiological therapeutics. Good success is attending them, and has been from the day that they opened it. Not only is the building well fitted up for the work to which it is devoted, but it is ideally located for a sanitarium. Let us take a look out and around and see what lies open to the view.

Suppose yourself to be sitting on the front porch, or in one of the front rooms of the second story, as I am while writing this. Immediately in front of you, to the east, lies a beautiful lawn extending about five hundred feet to the water of the harbor. This harbor is three miles wide and seven miles long, and stand as one of the best anchorage harbors in the world. Even as I write these lines there are lying at anchor on the water so close as to seem almost in speaking distance, fifteen great oceans-going sailships. Beyond these in plain view can be seen

685

sound and ocean steamers passing in or out to or from Seattle and other ports of Puget Sound. To your left about a half a mile away lies the town of Port Townsend, a place of about five thousand inhabitants.

Beyond the harbor are a number of evergreen wooded, islands, and beyond these is the mainland, which stretches away in the distance, to the Cascade range of mountains, where in plain view there stand like mighty sentinels many lofty snow-clad peaks.

Leaving this view point, and going to the west or to the south side of the building, the beautiful evergreen wooded hills are seen stretching away to the westward to the Olympic range of mountains, with its peaks standing up so many, so sharp, and so well-aligned that it looks like a great crosscut saw lying teeth upward. Directly to the southward lie thickly the islands of the Sound, and the hills of the mainland, clad everywhere in their beautiful evergreen, and Mt. Ranier in the distance furnishes the finishing of the picture.

To the northward lies the town of Port Townsend, more islands of the Sound, and the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

These beautiful views are had as one sits on the front porch, or in the front rooms above, or by walking to the ends of the building. But when you ascend the stairs to the top of the building, you see it all at once in one grand and glorious panorama of lofty peaks, snowy mountains, hilly mainland, wooded islands, nestling town, floating shipping, and silvery waters; and *any* of it an inspiration and an enjoyment that of itself is an inducement to health.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**September 9, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. The Rainbow and Its Meaning - I" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 36 , pp. 727-729.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"AND God spake unto Noah, saying, Go forth of the ark, thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and thy sons' wives with thee. . . . And Noah went forth, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him; every beast, every creeping thing, and ever fowl, and whatsoever creepeth upon the earth, after their kinds, went forth out of the ark."

"And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him saying, And behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you; and with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth. And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth. And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations; I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud; and I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. And the bow shall be seen in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth."

"And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth." Gen. 9:8-17.

The rainbow is the natural consequence of the sun's shining through water. How, then, is it a token that there shall never be a flood to destroy the earth? Easily and naturally enough; for, whenever a rainbow is seen anywhere on earth, that is certain witness that the sun is shining somewhere on earth. And when the sun is shining anywhere on earth, that is certain evidence that the rain is not falling everywhere on earth, so certainly there is no danger of there being a flood to cover the world as there was before. And as certainly as the cloud with its rain

does not cover all the earth at once, so certainly the sun is shining somewhere on the earth, and so certainly there will be a rainbow, and in it the faithfulness of God's pledge that there shall no more be a flood to destroy the earth.

And this of itself tells the deep truth that at the time of the Flood the cloud and the rain did certainly compass and cover the whole earth; and this so thick, so dense, and so dark that for the whole forty days and forty nights no rays of the sun shone through. For as certainly as the sun had shone through, there would have been a rainbow. And this in turn and of itself certifies to the certainty of the fact of the universality of the Flood.

So the rainbow is not the token that there shall be no more an outpour of

728

water that will drown the earth, but it is also the token of the certainty that in the time of Noah there was such a universal cloud and outpour that for forty days and forty nights there was no shining of the sun anywhere on earth; and that so at that time there was a Flood that destroyed the earth.

Further, the fact of the rainbow since the flood, when the rainbow is only the natural consequence of the sun's shining through rain, is very certainly that before the flood there was never any rain.

How, then, was the earth watered when there was no rain? That was easy enough, too, in the fact that before the flood the earth was *watered* instead of *drained* by the rivers.

Let us go back to Genesis 2 and see how plainly this is told: "A river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted and became into four heads. The name of the first is Pison.... And the name of the second river is Gihon. . . . And the name of the third river is Hiddekel.... And the fourth river is Euphrates."

First, there was *one* river; and this one river "went out of Eden to water the garden."

Next, "from thence" - from watering the garden - this *one* river was "parted and became into four *heads*," and each "head" was a "river," so that these four "heads" were four "rivers."

Each of the four head-rivers watered the part of the earth to which it flowed, just as the one river watered the garden before it was parted into the "four heads." And just as the one river was "parted and became into four heads," so each of these four head-rivers as it flowed was parted and became into other streams, as creeks, rivulets, and rills. And thus the whole earth was *watered*. And from this watered earth "there went up a mist from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground" (Gen. 2:6); because there was always the abundant flow of water everywhere to supply the moisture that arose by evaporation and was condensed and fell as dew watering "the whole face of the ground." Thus there was never any rain, and so there was never any rainbow.

It will be seen at a glance that the water-system of the world now, is the reverse of what it was in the beginning and before the flood. *Then* the head-rivers, the rivers, the creeks, the rivulets, and the rills, always flowing full, watered the earth. *Now* the rills, the rivulets, the creeks, the rivers, and the great rivers *drain* the earth. And except for the grand system by which precipitation -

rain and snow - is supplied, there would not be any streams, and the whole earth would be only a parched waste.

But while "all the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again." (Eccl. 1:7.) The place whence the rivers come, is the snows of the mountains and the rains of the valleys. And these snows and rains are poured down from the vapors which "He causeth to ascend from the ends of the earth," when He "calleth for the waters of the sea and poureth them out upon the face of the earth." Jer. 10:13; Amos 5:8.

And as He poureth out the waters on the earth in rain, wherever it may be, and the sun shining, there is the blessed rainbow, the token of his divine faithfulness in keeping the earth alive by his gracious rain, and also the token of his divine faithfulness to the promise that the earth shall no more be destroyed by the waters of a flood.

And whether or not any human eye, or eye of any kind, is there to see the bow, that blessed bow is there all the same, and is the token of His everlasting faithfulness in his everlasting covenant.

And though no earthly eye of any kind ever see the bow, there is always the bow, and ever the same. And though all earthly eyes utterly disregard the bow and all its blessed meaning, yet there is One who always sees it, and never forgets nor disregards any of the fulness of its divine meaning; for there it stands written, "I do set, *MY bow* in the cloud. . . and *I will look upon it, that I may remember* the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth," and "between Me and the earth."

And though man "believe not, yet He abideth faithful." O, the faithfulness of the faithful God! Ever "the same, yesterday, and to-day, and forever."

**September 16, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. The Rainbow and Its Meaning - II" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 37 , pp. 745-747.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE rainbow is the "token" of God's everlasting covenant that there shall be no more a flood to destroy the earth. The rainbow is also the token of God's everlasting covenant in Christ - the New Covenant. Mal. 4:2; Isa. 44:22; 45: 8; Eze. 1:28; Rev. 4:3.

Since the rainbow that is the token of God's everlasting covenant concerning the Flood, is also the token of his everlasting covenant concerning our sins, then his everlasting covenant concerning the flood is a fair illustration of his everlasting covenant concerning our sins.

Any one who will read God's everlasting covenant concerning the Flood, in Genesis 9:8-17, can readily see that it consists of *God's promise* only and alone. And it is made with Noah and all his descendants, and with all living things on the

earth, and with the earth itself, without any kind of promise on their part or any room for any. And the rainbow is the token of it.

And since the same rainbow is also the token of His everlasting covenant concerning our sins, this tells that *this* everlasting covenant also consists of *God's promises* only and alone without any kind of promise on our part or any room for any. And this can readily be seen by any one who will read Hebrews 8:10-12 or Jeremiah 31:33, 34. And all who accept this everlasting covenant just as it is and for just what it is - God's promises wholly and alone, - thus become "the children of promise," - children of the promise of God, and, so, true children of God. Gal. 4:28; Rom. 9:8; Gen. 17:19.

Yet as plain as all this is everywhere in the Scriptures, it is not naturally in man readily to accept it nor even to see it as it is. And because of this there is always much confusion of view and discussion on the subject of the covenants; and this not only among professed Christians, but even among leading teachers of the Bible.

An excellent and very pertinent illustration of this confusion of view on the subject of the covenants and especially on God's everlasting covenant, is given in a discussion of the subject that was issued not long ago by a leading Bible teacher of one of the denominations. In his discussion of the subject he solemnly wrote out and set down to stand permanently as the truth of God's everlasting covenant, and to be defended "against all who may take issue" the following definition: -

"A covenant consists of at least three parts, *First*, something set forth or enjoined by a first party, which is to be performed by a second party, or something which the second party is to refrain from performing. *Second*, The promise of the second party to comply with the requirements set forth. *Third*, the consideration or result promised by the first party."

From this gentleman's whole discussion of the subject it is evident that what he thus wrote is the only idea of a covenant that he entertains, and that such is God's everlasting covenant of salvation. In truth that definition and description fits only the covenant *at Sinai*, which, instead of being in any way an *everlasting* covenant, did not last and could not last half as long as it took to make it, yet it is plainly meant by him that such as he has defined is the only covenant that there can be, because in another place he says flatly that "on the side of God," the covenant at Sinai and God's everlasting covenant "are identical." But the truth of the Bible is that not one of God's everlasting covenants is in any sense any such thing as that definition describes.

Let us test this by the Scriptures of truth. Let us set side by side (p. 746) that statement and definition of a covenant, and the words of this one of God's everlasting covenants in Gen. 9:8-17.

*There* is God's everlasting covenant between him and Noah and Noah's sons and all their descendants, and every living creature of fowl and cattle, and every beast of the earth; and between Him and the earth itself.

Now where in that word of God, in that everlasting covenant of God, can anybody find anything "that is to be performed by a second party" - by Noah or any other man, by any creature or fowl

746

### **GOD'S EVERLASTING COVENANT**

"And God spake unto Noah and to his sons with him, saying and behold, *I establish my covenant* with you, and with your seed after you; and with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth, and I will establish *my covenant* with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth.

"And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for *perpetual generations*; I do set *my bow* in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud; and I will remember *my covenant*, which is *between me and you and every living creature of all flesh*; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember *the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature* - of all flesh that is upon the earth.

"And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant, which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth."

### **A MAN'S DEFINITION**

"A covenant consists of at least three parts: *First*, Something set forth or enjoined by a first party, which is to be performed by a second party, or something which the second party is to refrain from performing. *Second*, The promise of the second party to comply with the requirements set forth. *Third*, The consideration or result promised by the first party."

or cattle beast or by the earth? Where in that covenant can anything be found of any "promise of the second party to comply with the requirements set forth?" Where is any promise of Noah or any or any promise of creature, of cattle, or beast, or any promise of the earth itself, "to comply with the requirements set forth?"

Not only where in all that word of the covenant God can be found anything "which is to be performed by a second party;" but where is there any possible *room* for anything of the kind? In that word God has entered into an everlasting covenant with every human being, with every creature that moves on the earth or in the air, and with the very earth itself, that there shall never "any more be a flood to destroy the earth." What can any man, or creature, or the earth itself, possibly do in the matter? Or what can any of these even promise to do in the matter? - Simply and absolutely nothing at all.

But that is God's everlasting *covenant* with us all, and with the earth. It consists only, exactly and absolutely of *God's* promise. There is absolutely no promise, no agreement, of any kind whatever on the part of anybody else than God; and absolutely no place for any such thing. All that is possible for any man to do in the matter is to go on glad and rejoicing in the perfect security of that promise of God that there shall never be any destruction of the earth by a flood. And the rainbow is the token, by its glorious beauty, to fill with the good cheer of God's promise in this everlasting covenant the heart and life of every one who ever sees "the bow."

And we must not forget that "the bow" - God's bow (Gen. 9:13) that is the token of *this* everlasting covenant, is likewise the token of *that other* everlasting covenant; God's everlasting covenant in Christ. And just as this everlasting covenant in Gen. 9, of which "the bow" is the token, absolutely excludes everybody's promise or performance but God's alone; this certifies to the eternal truth that likewise that other everlasting covenant, - God's everlasting covenant of life and righteousness, of salvation and peace, in Christ - absolutely excludes everybody's promise or performance but God's alone.

Let us set down here (p. 747) this everlasting covenant, the New Covenant; and side by side with it let us set that definition of "a covenant;" and see how they correspond in this case.

Surely any one can see that this everlasting covenant is in perfect parallel, and is in character identical, with the everlasting covenant of Gen. 9, 8-17. And not in any possible way can that definition have a shadow of a place in the presence of either of them. This one equally with the other absolutely excludes all possibility of either promise or performance by "a second party."

**September 23, 1908**

**"Through the Bible. The Flood - I" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 38 , pp. 757, 758.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen how wickedness and violence increased in the earth till the whole race was so absorbed in it that "every imagination of the thoughts of the heart was only evil continually," and "the earth was filled with violence through them."

When conditions had reached the point where the spring of every thought the very fountain of every desire, an the spontaneous impulse of every purpose, was only evil continually; when both the source and the consequence of every thought was evil and nothing but evil continually with no variation; and when they simply *would not* hear any call to anything better; then in the very nature of things, in the righteousness and mercy of God, the only thing to be done was to put an effectual estoppel to their opportunity to do evil. And in the conditions

which they had created, this could be done in no other way than by putting a stop to the very existence of those who created the awful conditions.

And it was only mercy on the part of God to do this. For, when absolutely all the use that they would make of existence was to heap up towering iniquity and violence, then all the consequence of their existence was to heap up only misery for themselves. Every soul must answer in the judgment for everything that he has done here, and must meet there and bear the consequence of what he has done here. While there is any hope at all that a man may turn from his evil way, while there is any hope at all that anything good shall be found, the long-suffering of the Lord can endure the perversity of the natural heart, waiting for the man to come to himself, and the soul to awake to righteousness, the sins be blotted out forever and the soul be saved in everlasting righteousness. And thus "the long-suffering of the Lord is salvation." But when existence has been competed at its very source; when the fountain both in its spring and in its utmost flow, is only evil and unto evil continually; and when every call of God is repelled with scoffing and bitter-

158

ness, then continued existence means only the heaping up of distress and misery for the soul in the great day of account.

But the mighty and eternal God has no pleasure in the distress and misery of feeble and finite man. He wants man to turn and escape forever from all distress and misery and from all that could ever cause any such thing. When men will not do this, but will only confirm themselves irredeemably in the way of distress and misery; then the ever merciful God in mercy stops their heaping up distress and misery for themselves by stopping their existence.

And this is the story and the philosophy of the all-sweeping calamity that befell in the Flood, Sodom and Gomorrah, Adma and Zeboim; the inhabitants of Canaan, Pompeii and Herculanaeum; the fall of Babylon and of Rome, - and every other such; and the fall of the world again at the last. Read Gen. 18:32; 2 Pet. 2:5-8; Gen. 15:16; Lev. 18:24, 25; Dan. 5:1-5; 8:23; 2 Tim. 3:1-5; Luke 17:26-30. And it is all ever the story of the mercy of God to irredeemably wicked man.

And so the Flood came. No mind can imagine the awful portent and terror of that upheaval and downpour when "the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened;" and when the blackness and darkness and tempest reigned so ruinously for forty days and forty nights.

Note the gradations: -

1. "And the waters increased and *bore up the ark*, and it was lift up above the earth." Gen. 7:17.

2. "And the waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth; and *the ark went* upon the face of the waters." V. 18.

3. And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and *all the high hills*, that were under the whole heaven, *were covered*." V. 19.

4. "Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail and the *mountains were covered*." V. 20.

"And all flesh that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man; all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died.

"And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark.

"And the waters prevailed upon the earth an hundred and fifty days.

"And God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle that was with him in the ark: and God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters asswaged; the fountains also of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was restrained; and the waters returned from off the earth continually: and after the end of the hundred and fifty days the waters were abated.

"And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat.

"And the waters decreased continually until the tenth month; in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen.

"And it came to pass in the six hundredth and first year, in the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were dried up from off the earth; and Noah removed the covering of the ark, and looked, and, behold, the face of the ground was dry.

"And in the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, was the earth dried." Gen. 7:21; 8:14.

## **September 30, 1908**

**"Two Sons" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 39 , pp. 769-771.**

ALONZO T. JONES

ABRAHAM had two sons.

One was born of the bondwoman; the other, of the freewoman.

One son, therefore, was a bond son; the other was a free son.

One was born by their own invention; the other was born by the promise of God.

One was born of the flesh; the other was born of the Spirit.

The son who was born of the bond-woman, by their own invention, and of the flesh, was a "wild man." Hebrew, literally, "a wild-ass man." Revised Version; "He shall be as a wild-ass among men." His hand was against every man, and every man's hand was against him.

The son who was born of the free-woman, by promise, and of the Spirit,

was meek and lamblike. His hand was against nobody; and when any person's hand was inclined to be against him, that person soon "saw certainly that God was with" him, and "departed from him in peace." Gen. 26:12-31.

"Which things are an allegory;" for God has two sons. "For these [women and their sons] are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children." The other is from mount Calvary, and answereth to "Jerusalem which is above" and "free, which is the mother of us all." Gal. 4:24-26.

Now in teaching redemption to the people in old time, the Lord said, "All the first born of man among thy children shalt thou redeem," and of "every firstling that cometh of a beast which thou hast; the males shall be the Lord's;" *except* the firstling of *an ass*.

The firstling of an ass had to be *redeemed*; and it had to be redeemed *with a lamb*: "Every firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb." And any firstling of an ass that was not so redeemed, its neck was to be broken: "If you wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck." Ex. 13:12, 13.

These things were shadows of realities. What are the realities? - *One* we can find, anyhow, if not all.

The scripture says that the son of Abraham by Hagar was "born of the flesh," and that he was "a old-ass man."

The scripture likewise says that Hagar and her son represented the covenant from Sinai and the children of that covenant.

This says, then, that those who were or are of the covenant at Sinai were and are born after the flesh, and are "wild-ass men." And as the firstlings of the ass must be "redeemed with *a lamb*," this says that every soul who ever was or is of the covenant at Sinai, every one who is born of the flesh must be redeemed with *the Lamb of God*, or his neck will be broken.

"For this cause he [Christ] is the mediator of the *new* testament [covenant], that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgression that were *under the first* testament [covenant], they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." (Heb. 9:15.) This is to say also to every soul of those who are the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, that they must be redeemed with a lamb, - the Lamb of God, - they shall perish; for it is not possible for the blood of bulls or goats or lambs to take away sin.

Yet more than this, it is likewise to say to all who are born only of the flesh, who are therefore "wild-ass" men, who are of the "carnal mind," which "is enmity against God," and which "is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," - it is likewise to say to all these that they must be redeemed with a lamb, - the Lamb of God, - or their necks will be broken, and they will be destroyed by their own sins.

And to all who are of the covenant from Calvary, who are born of the free-woman, of the promise of God, and of the Spirit of God, who are the seed of Abraham according to the promise, - these, too, shall be redeemed, to these redemption is certain; for the Spirit itself, of which we are born, is "the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise

of his glory." (Eph. 1:14.) And the redemption of the purchased possession includes the redemption of our bodies, who "have the first-fruits of the Spirit." Rom. 8:11, 23.

How is it with, you? Are you born of the flesh only? or are you born of the Spirit? Are you in the condition where you are in danger of having your neck broken because you have not been redeemed with the Lamb, born of the Spirit, and by that Spirit sealed until the redemption of the purchased possession?

"Now we brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." "For if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, ad heirs according to the promise," - born of the Spirit of God, children of the free, sealed unto the day of redemption. Bless the Lord!

771

And gladness is sown for you in the promise of your own sure and eternally undisturbed inheritance and home in this glorious land where "the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly and rejoice even with joy and singing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. . . . And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with sons and everlasting joy upon their hears; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." "Be ye glad and rejoice forever in that which I create; for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy."

Will you not, just now and always, receive into good ground these seeds of gladness? Will you not cultivate them carefully, that they may grow exceedingly, that you may, just now and always and forevermore, reap abundantly the blessed cup of gladness from these many seeds of gladness which the Lord has sown all around you, and *before* you throughout eternity?

Who, then, will not "serve the Lord with gladness," and "come before his presence with singing?"

"I will be glad in the Lord." Amen. And let all the people say Amen.

**"What Is the Pay?" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 39 , p. 782.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"WHAT shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits toward me?"

You know that the Lord has bestowed upon you benefits of all sorts, and in countless number. "They can not be reckoned up in order." "If I would declare and speak of them, they are more than can be numbered."

Now the question is, "What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits toward me?" How shall I pay him for what he has bestowed? And the answer is, "I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord."

That is to say that what you are to render to the Lord for all the benefits which he has given you, is *to take more benefits*.

Yea, more than this; what you are to render to the Lord for all the benefits which he *has* given, is to take the greatest of all the benefits which he can possibly give.

If you have all these benefits except this greatest one, then all he asks of you to pay for all these is that you take this greatest of all.

And if you have, all of them, even to the *greatest*, then all he asks of you to pay for all these is that you take yet more of the greatest of all, - that you drink yet deeper of the cup of salvation, and call yet more upon the name of the Lord.

That is the Lord's system of receiving pay for what he bestows.

Now read Acts 17:24, 25; Luke 6:32-38 and Acts 20:34, 35.

**October 21, 1908**

**"It Is Easy" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 42 , p. 835.**

ALONZO T. JONES

SAYS Jesus: "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." And that is the living, present truth. It is, day and night, everlastingly true that his yoke is easy, and his burden is light. Do you say, as some have said, "I have not found it so"? If so, then the difficulty in your case is that you have not his yoke nor his burden on you.

This is as certain as that two and two make four. Look at it: there stands the word of Christ, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Will you say that he lied in saying this? - No, no, certainly not. He told the truth.

Very good, then; he told the truth when he said, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." And you say that is the truth. Then if you have not found his yoke easy and his burden light, is it not certain that you have not found them at all? If to you his yoke is *not* easy, and his burden is *not* light, then is it not perfectly plain that you haven't his yoke on at all?

There is no dodging this. You can not go along uneasy and galling under the yoke that you are wearing, and bowed down under the burden that you are bearing, and call that the yoke and burden of Christ; for that is not true of his yoke nor of his burden. He says "*My yoke is easy, and my burden if light.*"

Then, dear soul, take *His yoke* and *his burden*. Give to *him* yours.

"Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; . . . and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

It is true, bless the Lord!

**"Only with Him" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 42 , p. 844.**

ALONZO T. JONES

JESUS says, "Without me ye can do nothing." But he is gone away; he is not here as he was when he said this. That is all right, however; for it was expedient for us that he should thus go away.

Nevertheless he says: "Be not ye troubled; I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you."

We are not left comfortless, because he comes to us by the Comforter. And "the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost," shall "abide with you forever."

The Holy Spirit brings the presence of Christ to the believer, to abide with him forever. "Strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts, . . . that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God."

The Holy Spirit comes to abide with us forever. The Holy Spirit brings the presence of Christ to abide with us forever. Therefore says Jesus, "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee."

Jesus said, "Without me ye can do nothing." It is the Holy Spirit *only* that brings Christ to us. Therefore it is as plain as A B C, and as true as the word of God, that *without the Holy Spirit we can do nothing*.

Professing religion, joining the church, "working in the cause," are all "*nothing*" without the gift, the baptism, the abiding forever, of the Holy Spirit. "Ask, and it shall be given you." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

**November 18, 1908**

**"Free from the Service of Sin" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 46 , pp. 915, 916.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"KNOWING this, that our old than is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we *should not serve sin*."

Plainly, therefore, the Lord intends that we shall not serve sin, and, accordingly, has made provision that this intention shall be fulfilled.

"The body of sin" must be "destroyed," in order that henceforth we shall "not serve sin." If the body of sin is not destroyed, if sin is not taken up by the root, we shall certainly still serve sin, whatever our profession or desire.

Indeed, if I desire not to serve sin, if I desire to live without sinning, and yet do not desire it enough to have the body of sin destroyed, to have sin completely uprooted, whatever the cost, or however painful the process, then my desire is not sincere, and can not possibly be realized. I am simply tickling my fancy with a mirage.

No; the body of sin must be *destroyed*, - nothing short of destruction will do, - in order that we shall not serve sin. See; too, what "destroy" means: "To pull down; to build; demolish; to overthrow; lay waste; ruin; make desolate; to kill; slay; extirpate; to bring to naught; put an end to; annihilate; obliterate entirely; cause to cease, or cease to be."

The Lord has made full provision for this destruction of the body of sin; it must be accomplished by crucifixion. "Our old man is *crucified*," "that the body of sin might be *destroyed*, that henceforth we should *not serve sin*." That is the straight, sure course to freedom from the service of sin.

But thank the Lord, we do not have to go this way alone. "Our old man is crucified *with him*." He was made "in the likeness of sinful flesh" *for us*. He was "in *all things* made like unto his brethren." He "was *in all points* tempted like as we are." "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." And he was crucified. He was crucified for us. He was crucified as us. He was "the last Adam." He was humanity. And in him the old Adam - the old, sinful humanity - was crucified. And "our old man is crucified with him," in order "that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

Are you indeed crucified with him? Have you given up yourself to crucifixion, do you give yourself up to destruction, that you may be delivered from the service of sin? Is your desire to be freed from sinning so sincere that you freely give yourself up to crucifixion, - that you abandon yourself to destruction? If it is, then you can easily know the triumph that there is in knowing that the body of sin is destroyed, and that henceforth you shall not serve sin.

Why is this verse of Scripture written, if it is not intended that you shall not serve sin? And when it is written to show you this the Lord's intention, then of what good is that to you, what good can it ever be to you, if that intention is not fulfilled in you, and you are not kept from the service of sin?

**November 25, 1908**

**"Sin Shall Not Have Dominion" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 47 , p. 930, 931.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"SIN shall not have dominion over you."

That is the faithful word of God, and it is the eternal truth.

What is that promise worth to you? Is it worth its face value to you? or are you obliged to discount it?

If sin does have dominion over you, then of what benefit is that word to you? And if that word is of no benefit to you, then, so far as you are concerned, why should it be in the Bible?

And if sin does have dominion over you, then of what use is any part of the Bible, what use is the Bible itself, to you? In reality, what is salvation itself, what is Christ, to you, so long as sin has dominion over you?

No, no! salvation is *deliverance* from the dominion of sin.

Christ *breaks* the cruel power of sin, and sets the prisoner *free*.

Christ, and in Christ, is the fulfillment of that glorious promise, "Sin shall not have dominion over you."

And that promise is worth its full face value, every hour of the day, to every believer in Jesus.

Sin shall not have dominion over you, because you "are not under the law, but under grace."

Grace is able to deliver you from the dominion of sin, both because it is stronger than sin, and because there is much more of it than there is of sin.

Grace is of God; sin is of the devil. Grace is therefore as much stronger

931

than sin as God is stronger than the devil.

Grace being of God, and sin being of the devil, there is as much more of grace than there is of sin as there is more of God than of the devil and all his works.

Therefore "where sin abounded; grace did *much more* abound."

Grace much more abounds in order that "as sin *hath reigned*," "*even so* might grace *reign*."

"Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." But let grace reign.

If sin has the dominion, change sovereigns and realms this instant. Give grace the dominion. *Then* "sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace."

God does not want sin to have dominion over you. He wants grace to have the dominion. Will you let him have what he wants, to-day - even while it is called *to-day*!

**December 2, 1908**

**"The Root and the Fruit" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 47 , p. 940.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"THE fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance."

In order that there may be *fruit*, there must be *root*. It is impossible to have fruit without first having root.

In order, therefore, to have the fruit of the Holy Spirit to appear in the life, the Holy Spirit himself must be the root of the life. In order that the fruit of the Spirit may appear in the tree, the Holy Spirit himself must be the life of the tree.

It is impossible to have genuine love, or joy, or peace, or long-suffering, or gentleness, or goodness, or faith, or meekness, or temperance to appear in the life, without having the Holy Spirit to be the root, the spring, of the life - yea, even the very life itself.

It is not genuine love that loves only them that love you, but that which loves all, even enemies. It is not genuine goodness that does good only to them that do good to you, but that which does good to all, even the unthankful and the evil. Luke 6:32-35.

Genuine love, or joy, or peace, or long-suffering, or gentleness, or goodness, or faith, or meekness, or temperance, comes not from ourselves, it comes not from this world; it comes only from God, it is the fruit only of the Spirit of God.

**December 9, 1908**

**"Are You Dead?" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 49 , p. 986.**

ALONZO T. JONES

"HE that is dead is freed from sin."

Are you freed from sin? If not, do you not see exactly where the difficulty lies?

There stands the truth of God, that "he that is dead is freed from sin." Then if you are not freed from sin, the only cause of it is that *you are not dead*.

Jesus says, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it dies, it bringeth forth much fruit."

Again he says, "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit."

Again he says, "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit."

As the Father is glorified in your bearing much fruit, and as it is only "if it die," that it "bringeth forth much fruit," it certainly follows that herein is the Father glorified, that ye die.

Are you dead? Are you freed from sin? Will you glorify the Lord by bearing much fruit? Will you die?

"Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone."

Do you want forever to abide alone? "Without Me ye can do nothing."

Without Him you can do nothing; without Him you abide alone; "except it . . . die, it abideth *alone*;" except you die, you can do nothing.

But, bless the Lord, "if it *die*, it bringeth forth *much fruit*."

In being dead, then, there is freedom from sin; there is abiding with the Lord; there is the bearing of much fruit to the glory of God; and the end, *eternal life*.

In not being dead, there is bondage to sin; there is abiding alone; and the end, *eternal death*.

Thus he that will save his life shall lose it; but he that will lose his life for Christ's sake shall keep it unto life eternal.

Will you lose your life and save it? or will you save your life and lose it?

"It is appointed unto men once to die." And in the gospel, God has fixed it so that every man can die that "once," so as to live forevermore.

Except it die, it abideth alone; but when we choose to die that we may bring forth much fruit, he does not leave us alone, nor ask us to die alone. He only asks us to die *with him*. Bless his name!

Then "if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." He does not live in sin. And being with him, we shall not live in sin.

Are you freed from sin? Are you dead? Are you dead with Christ, so that you live with Christ?

**"Be of Good Cheer" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 49 , pp. 987, 988.**

ALONZO T. JONES

HAVE you ever thought carefully of what is involved in that statement concerning Jesus, that "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all"?

"Iniquity" is inequality, or crookedness; and means "all departure from the rectitude of God and of the law of God." It is a word covering the same ground as the word "sin."

Iniquity, or sin, is accompanied with guilt. According to the measure of the consciousness of sin, is the measure of the sense of guilt; and according to the degree of the sense of guilt, is the sense of condemnation.

To separate the sin from all sense of guilt and of condemnation, would be only to destroy all real sense of sin; and so would nullify it as a matter of consciousness or intelligent thought.

Therefore, when it is said of Jesus that "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," it says that all the consciousness of all the sins, and all the guilt and condemnation that attaches to the consciousness of all the sins, "of us all," - *all this* was "laid upon him."

Think of the sense of guilt and condemnation that rests upon yourself, in

988

the consciousness of the sins which have been most vividly brought home to your soul. Then think that His consciousness of sin was as much clearer and more intense than yours, as his mind and life were purer and more spiritual than are yours; and that according to the degree of the consciousness of sin is the sense of guilt and condemnation; then you will begin to get some idea of what was done when the Lord laid upon him all the iniquities, not of yourself only, but all the iniquities of *us all*.

Then think of Him, laden with his intensity of the consciousness of all the sins of all men; and, in that, laden also with the burden of all the guilt and condemnation that inevitably goes with the consciousness of sin; and you can begin to form some conception of the fearful disadvantage under which He went the way before us.

All this sin with all its attendant guilt and condemnation, was *imputed* to him, - was made his own as if he had actually committed it all, and was rightfully feeling the guilt and the condemnation of it all.

Thus He was made "*to be sin* for us;" thus was he made "*in all things*" "like unto his brethren;" and thus was he stricken with the curse which must rightfully blast sin, and also the one upon whom sin is found.

Thus, laden actually with the sins of the world, He, in the weakness of human flesh, passed over the ground where Adam failed. His trial was as much greater than was that of Adam as was the extent to which the race had degenerated from the condition of Adam when he was tried. And his trial was as much greater than that which we could be called to bear, as the sins of all are more than the sins of one, and as his consciousness of the nature of sin was broader and more intense than ours is, or could be.

And yet, under this enormous disadvantage, *He in this world and in the weakness of human flesh, was faithful to God*, and overcame the world.

With what encouragement, then, comes to *us* the exhortation: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; *who was faithful* to him that appointed him"! And with what inspiration comes to *us* His triumphant word, "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world"!

**December 30, 1908**

**"Why the Price?" *The Medical Missionary* 17, 52 , p. 1029.**

ALONZO T. JONES

GOD paid a mighty price for sinners. He paid the greatest price that could possibly be paid even by him.

"He gave his only begotten Son;" and "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

Now why did he pay that awful price?

Was it because man, of himself, was worth the price? or was it because that which man had lost was worth the price?

It was not because man, in himself, was worth it; for "they are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one."

It could be, then, only because what man had lost was of much inestimable value that it was worth all it cost to restore it to him.

Men are apt either to think that because they are worth nothing in themselves, the Lord could not have given so much for them, or else to think that in themselves they are worth all that the Lord paid for them, and therefore they are sufficient of themselves, without God. And Satan does not care which of these views is adopted, as either is effective for his purpose; that is, that they shall not accept the Price.

But while it is true that men, in themselves, are not worth the price that God paid for them, that which man had lost is worth, *to men*, all that it cost; and God is so abundantly good, so perfectly generous, that he gave all that it is worth, which is the greatest possible price, in order to make it forever sure to men who, of themselves, are worth nothing.

Therefore for men to accept the Price in all its fulness, that they may enjoy, in all its fulness, all that the Price has brought to them, is to do the greatest honor to God, - and the greatest honor to themselves by doing the greatest honor to God.

"For the love of God is broader  
Than the measure of man's mind,  
And the heart of the Eternal  
Is most wonderfully kind!"

## The Medical Missionary, Vol. 18 (1909)

January 13, 1909

"Church Federation" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 2 , pp. 36-39.

ALONZO T. JONES

[It should not be expected that we should give here any account of the origin and growth, so far, of the Federation of Churches. All this, both in the history and in the principles of it, has been fully set forth in these columns in the past three years; and has been reprinted in book form. All that can be done now is to follow the thing in its further development, as in the late council manifested. All who have not read the accounts up to the present time can do so by obtaining the two pamphlets - "The World's Greatest Issues," twen-

37

ty-five cents; and "The Christian Church and Church Federation," thirty-five cents. Probably a good many have "The World's Greatest Issues," but we know that not so many have "The Christian Church and Church Federation," though the latter is, if anything, more than the former essential to a fair understanding of church federation and its far-reaching meaning. Both of these pamphlets can be had by addressing, with the price, THE MEDICAL MISSIONARY, Battle Creek, Mich.]

THE first meeting of the "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America" was held in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., Dec. 2 to 8, inclusive.

Three years ago there was held in New York City a conference on federation. That conference proposed to the churches a form of federation. This was approved, the federation was a fact, and this council in Philadelphia was the first meeting of the officially formed and officially named and called "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America."

In the opening speech by the president of the Council, he said that this Council was "a federation of denominations. Federation itself is no new idea; but *denominational* federation is new. This Council stands officially for thirty-two denominations, with a membership of eighteen millions, and representing a population of fifty millions, a majority of the inhabitants of the United States.

"It is American, and has rightly a relation to the questions of temperance, marriage and divorce, Sabbath desecration - to *all* the great questions that demand the united efforts of the churches. It has also relation to the world at large; for the attitude of our nation is largely Christian toward other nations, and the essential spirit of our nation is that of the Lord Jesus.

"It is Protestant; but whereas the Protestant Reformation emphasized the right of private judgment and developed in a notable manner individuality, thoughtful persons are now realizing the need of combination, and the interests of the individual no

longer blind the minds of believers to the need of mutuality in service."

There were about four hundred delegates from the thirty-two churches of the Federation. The Methodist Episcopal had fifty delegates; the Methodist Church South had thirty-four; the Baptist Federation of the North had thirty-two; Presbyterian Church had thirty-one; the Disciples, thirty; the Congregationalists, twenty-one; and so on down to the Primitive Methodists, who had but two.

Three years ago, when this Federation was formed, the Baptist churches were not a federation, of themselves. Since that time, however, the Baptist Churches have formed a federation of themselves. There was opposition to it, and the opposition was Scriptural and Christian. Nevertheless, federation was practically accomplished at the annual assembly in Washington City, 1907, and was perfected at the annual convention in Oklahoma City, 1908; and became a part of this National Federation by the appointment of the thirty-two delegates before mentioned.

Business sessions were held forenoon and afternoon each day except Sunday; and mass-meetings in two or three places every night and Sunday afternoon - except Saturday night.

The time of the Council in the business sessions was occupied with the hearing and discussion of the reports of large committees that had been appointed apparently at the Conference in 1905, and that had made up their reports before this Council had assembled.

These reports and the discussions showed plainly that this Federal Council of Churches, in the name of heaven assumes jurisdiction of everything on earth - local, national, and international; civil and religious alike. For with equal confidence they dealt with "International" and "Interdenominational" relations; with affairs of the State; as well as of the Church. And this universal jurisdiction has been assumed with the direct purpose of its being held, exerted, and enlarged. In their own words: "A body of men that represents to any extent a constituency that includes a church membership of over seventeen millions and a family and individual constituency of more than half the population of this nation of

38

eighty millions, can not but receive world-wide recognition from those who thoughtfully watch the trend of national and international affairs."

Sunday afternoon there was held at Lyric Theater a mass-meeting professedly in the interest of workingmen; but in fact it was in the interest of trades union workingmen. And everything about it, except one speech, showed plainly that on the part of the Church Federation the meeting was chiefly for the purpose of their feeding taffy to the trades unions. The chairman of the meeting was a vice-president of the Federation of Labor and a Roman Catholic; while the meeting itself was gotten up altogether by the Federation of Churches, a federation of Protestants only, and which would not by any means admit Catholics to its membership. This Catholic chairman of the mass-meeting of the

Federal Council of Protestants, on behalf of the Federation of Labor congratulated the Federation of Churches on "the strong and open stand that it had taken in behalf of labor. We would almost concede that the Church Federation resolution emanated from a trades union."

Of course, the chairman and everybody else there knew full well that by his reference to "labor" *he* meant only *union* labor as the object of that action of the Church Federation. And the Federation Council had only the day before taken such action, in the words. "To those who by organized effort are seeking . . . to uphold the dignity of labor, this Council sends the greeting of human brotherhood and the pledge of sympathy and of help in a cause which belongs to all who follow Christ." *This*, while in the same report declaring that "the churches must stand for the right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance; a right ever to be wisely and strongly safeguarded against encroachments of every kind" - a declaration in the presence of which trades-unionism can not stand for a moment.

Nevertheless, both parties rode the two horses going in opposite directions, and the Catholic vice-president of the Federation of Labor introduced the Protestant president of the Federation of Protestant Churches. Then, the Protestant president of the Federation of Protestant Churches, a bishop, said: -

"This Federation represents a membership of seventeen millions and a population of more than fifty million. If Christ had not been here, there would have been no federations. The badge of this Federation bears the hand of a laboring man - the hand of Christ. I would not be here if Christ were not a workingman. I would not respect him if he were not a workingman. Christ is the model workingman. He has a claim on the workingman, as no other religion has. Laboring men rarely use the name of Christ profanely."

Then the Catholic chairman of the meeting said: -

"In our great struggles, in our great strikes, we have felt that the church was indifferent. The great majority of members of trades unions are church members. When a man joins a union and goes on a strike, it does not mean that he is not a Christian. We all worship the same God. And now since the church has declared herself, it devolves on us to do our best to keep the respect of the church."

But what the bishop said is worth a little notice for its own sake alone. Take his expression. "I would not be here if Christ were not a workingman. I would not respect him if he were not a workingman." Just look at that, will you? Think on it a little. Jesus Christ, being the Lord of glory and the Creator of heaven and earth, it would seem that he should be respected by every person in the universe, wherever and in whatever form or condition he might choose to come. But lo, here is one who makes it the sole condition of his having *his* respect that he "come as a workingman!" The Lord of glory and Creator of all things condescends to come to the world of sinful men for the purpose of delivering sinful men from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. In view of this it would seem that any sinful man would be only glad to

welcome him and do him grateful reverence and everlasting homage, in whatever form or estate he might choose to come. But no! here is one

39

who flatly declares that if Christ the Creator and Redeemer had not come as "a workingman" *he* would not even respect him. This gives just ground for query as to what the bishop considers the real relative attitude and position of *himself* and the Creator. How much more of a step would he have to take in that same direction before he would be ready to proclaim that unless the Creator and Lord of all conform strictly to *his* notion in *all* points he "would not respect him"?

Also about how much larger mass-meeting of trades unions would be needed to draw from him the declaration that if Christ were not a trades-unionist *he* would not be at such a meeting, and "would not respect him"? Indeed, this is implied in what he did say; for he said, "If Christ had not been here, there would have been no federations." And what are trades-unions but trades-federations? And what is trades-unionism but trades federationism, equally with *church* federationism?

But so far is it from being true that if Christ had not been here there would have been no federations, that exactly the opposite is true. Christ is "the word made flesh." And that word said to him with a strong emphasis that he "should not walk in the way of this people," saying to him "Say ye not 'A confederacy' to all them be whom this people shall Say 'A confederacy.'" Isa. 8:11, 12. So of Christ's coming being the ground or cause of federations, the *truth* is so completely the opposite that where Christ is recognized and received or even *respected*, there can not be any such thing as federation or confederation of any kind or to any degree, whether federations of labor, or federations of churches, or what not.

The chairman next introduced the Rev. Mr. Stelzle, who before he became a minister was a machinist. He made "the one speech" before referred to as the exception. It was a straightforward, open, fair, and honest, Christian speech to union men on the principles of the gospel of *salvation*; of the change of heart as the true spring and guide of life, citing with telling effect the philosophy of Josh Billings, that "before you could have an honest horse-race, you must have an honest human race"; and closing with a most powerfully spiritual appeal to them that they "Give Jesus a square deal." It was the best address that I ever heard given to union men. And the contrast - in the speech itself, in its effect, and in every respect - between this speech and the adulation of the bishop was so marked that it seems the bishop must surely have seen it and been fairly ashamed of his toadyism, if not of himself also.

And this contrast is only a phase, and illustrative, of a wide and mighty contrast that was manifest throughout the whole course of the session of the Federation Council - a contrast that conveys a world of meaning, and is in itself the touchstone of the whole scheme of Federation.

But this part of the story will have to be told next week.

**January 20, 1909**

**"Long Beach Sanitarium" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 3 , p. 45.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE readers of the MEDICAL MISSIONARY will, we are sure, be glad to know that our old friend and former associate in the Battle Creek Sanitarium - Dr. Winegar-Simpson - is now established in a fine sanitarium of their own at Long Beach, California. The building was originally erected as a hospital, so that with but small expense it could be made into the fine and well-equipped sanitarium that it now is, containing beautiful parlors and offices, wide halls, handy treatment rooms, and fifty nicely furnished rooms for patients.

Being in that beautiful place of perpetual summer, in the presence of flowers and palm trees always, with a grand, wide-sweeping view of the ocean, and only a short distance from the beach, it is certainly an ideal place for invalids at any time; but more especially in winter. And we do not know where those who must leave the wild and severe winters of the North or East could find benefit more surely or more pleasantly than at this beautiful sanitarium by the summer sea - summer sea *in winter*. In the midst of the snow and storms of the Eastern or Northern winter, it may be difficult to realize that this is true as to this "sanitarium by the summer sea *in winter*." But it is true. I have been there, and I know. Only lately I had the pleasure of visiting the Long Beach Sanitarium, and renewing acquaintance with Brother and Sister Simpson and their good family of nurses and helpers.

Long Beach is about twenty miles from Los Angeles. The journey is pleasantly made in about forty-five minutes over a finely equipped double-track electric road; and the cars stop within little more than a block of the Sanitarium.

The place was secured and opened by the present management last summer. Their work has been a success from the beginning; and I am sure that all the readers of the MEDICAL MISSIONARY will heartily join in wishing that only success and blessing shall attend them always and forever. ALONZO T. JONES.

**"Church Federation - II. Federation 'Unity' Is Not Christian Unity" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 3 , p. 45.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the Federal Council of the Churches, there were plainly apparent throughout two distinct phases and fields of endeavor; we might fairly say two distinct worlds.

On the one side, - and this the primary, - there was the hard, cold, governmental, legislative, legal, formal, assuming and dominating, spirit and machinery of Federation and Confederation of *men* and of the ways of *men*. But when this was all laid aside and forgotten, as several times it was, and they were met only as Christians, to speak of the work and power of the common Gospel

and the common faith to reach and save and lift up mankind and bless the world, then there was seen the warm, comforting, and helpful Christian spirit of the Gospel.

And between these two the contrast was so clear and so great that it seemed each time that those who composed the Council could not fail to see it; and, in this, to see that "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" is so far beyond and above the governmental, legal, formal, merely human and machine, "unity" of Federation and Confederation that there is left neither place for it nor need of it.

And this true unity - "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" - is easier found than is the other, even by those who are seeking the other. All that is required is that they all look only to Christ as the one grand Center of all, drink into his one Spirit, and *freely forget everything else*. Then they would all *be* one immediately and by that alone. And this, entirely without any, and without any need of any, mere human contrivance and governmental machinery of the false and fleeting "unity" of Federation and Confederation.

This truth is strikingly illustrated in this Federation itself. For instance, in this Council there were seven kinds of Methodists and five kinds of Presbyterians. Since, then, the Methodists have already built seven machines, and the Presbyterians have built five machines, solely to accentuate their differences and the absence of unity, is it now probable that the building of this extra and larger machine by *all* of them together, will be the means of uniting those seven kinds of Methodists and those five kinds of Presbyterians any more than they were united before?

In this Federation there are thirty-two separate denominations. Those, then, who compose this Federation have already built thirty-two machines solely to accentuate their differences and their total lack of unity. Is it, therefore, in any wise likely that, in the building of this extra machine by all of them together, they will be any more united in spirit or in any real Christian unity than they were before they built this "new" machine?

In a word, is Christian unity the fruit of human machinery? even though the machine that is to effect this unity be a thirty-third one built by the very ones who have already built thirty-two in emphasis of their decided lack of unity? and all of the thirty-two still held, and to be held, intact in the presence of the thirty-third one? No. No. No; that is not and never can be in any sense the way to Christian unity. The only unity that can ever by any possibility be thus attained is a mere political, governmental, formal, outward, human and worldly unity; and thus a unity never for piety, for only for power.

Christian unity, the only true unity that can ever be, is *toto cúle* different from that; and as far higher as heaven is higher than the earth, and as the divine Spirit is higher than human machinery.

Christian unity is unity not *from* the divine Spirit, nor thus *by* the divine Spirit; but is "the unity of the Spirit"

*Himself*. Christian unity is not a unity derived *by* people *from* the divine Spirit, nor primarily *caused* among people *by* the divine Spirit. It *is* "the unity of the divine

Spirit Himself; it is known only *in* the Spirit; and is *obtained* by believers in the receiving, and being possessed of, the Holy Spirit Himself.

Christian unity is far more than union among Christians. It is far more than even the union of *all* Christians. Christian unity is nothing less, and nothing else, than the *divine unity itself*, possessing Christians. As excellency expressed in this Council itself by the most evangelical speaker in any or all of the evangelical speeches made in the Council, Christian unity "is not a unity of brotherhood" even; it is far more than that; for Jesus prayed "that they all may be one" - *not* as James and John are or may be one - *not* as Andrew and Peter are or may be one, BUT - "*as thou Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they may be one IN US.*" "*That they may be one, even as WE are one.*" "*I in them, and thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in One.*"

Christian unity then is nothing less and nothing else than the divine unity itself, *as that unity is in the very Godhead*. The unity of the Godhead is the unity of Spirit *in* the Spirit; for the Godhead is only Spirit. And all who "have been made to drink into this one Spirit," of the "one Lord," through the "one faith" of the one Christ, and of the "one God and Father of all," and are possessed of this "one Spirit," and "live" and "walk" "in the Spirit," - all these are one in Him and with Him in the very "unity of the Spirit," which is the divine unity itself.

This is further shown in the words of the Scripture defining Christian Fellowship: "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. . . . This the is the message which we have heard of him and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness we lie and do not the truth; but if we walk in the Light *as he is in the light we have fellowship one with another.*" 1 John 1:3-7.

By this Scripture it is plain that Christian fellowship is not primarily fellowship with *one another*; but fellowship *with the Father and with the Son*; and *then* fellowship with one another as *the consequence* of this fellowship with the Father and the Son. It is only when Christians "walk in the light *as He is in the light*," that "we have fellowship one with another." That Light is God. Walking in the Light is walking in God. Thus we have fellowship *with him*; and having fellowship *with him* we *have it with one another*. And this Life and Light is "declared," so that, having the Life and walking in the Light, we may have fellowship *with him*; and *this* in order that we may have fellowship *with those* whose "fellowship is," truly and primarily, "with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ."

That and that alone is Christian unity. And all so-called unity of federation, confederation, organization, and association, accomplished even by Christians, is of only human contrivance, is only a hollow shame, is a sheer counterfeit, and never Christian unity at all.

All who are of this unity *are* one. They are one already by the very virtue of the divine unity itself; and they need no federations, confederations, organizations nor associations in order that they *may be* one. They are all one already; and all such contrivances as these are only the open confession that they have not the real unity *of* the Spirit and *in* the Spirit - the divine unity; and

they must go about to supply the lack by construing a mere human, political and worldly "unity."

All who are of this true, this divine, unity *are* one. They do not have to feel around to see whether it is so. It *is* so already, and they know it; they know it by the Spirit of Him in whom alone the unity is found. And among all these "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye *are* all *one* in Christ Jesus"; "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ *is* all, and *in* all;" and

56

"the one God the Father of all is over and through all and in you all;" with "the Son also himself subject" unto God even the Father, "that *God* may be *all* in *all*." 1 Cor. 15:28.

That is Christian unity and nothing else is. And *this* is only the revelation of "the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in One all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are in earth; even *in him*." Eph. 1:9, 10.

The "unity" which the Federal Council of Churches has in mind and aims at - Federation Unity - is of infinitely too low an order, and when attained is utterly of the wrong kind. And yet it must in truth be said that this "unity" is only of the same old order and kind as that of all the denominations. It is precisely the order and kind of "unity" that characterizes denominationalism of every sort everywhere. Indeed, this great Federation of the denominations, with its utterly inadequate and mistaken views of Christian unity, is only the logical culmination of essential denominationalism, with *its* inadequate and mistaken views as to what Christian unity really is. This whole scheme of the Federation of Churches to accomplish federation unity is only the same, and the reproduction and perpetuation of the same, old papal notion and papal kind of "unity." And all that can ever come of it is the living likeness of that same old thing over again.

But thank the Lord, the Spirit of the Lord lifts up a standard against it wherever found; whether in a single denomination, or in the great federation of many denominations in the likeness of the papacy, or in the papacy itself. The time has come when Christian unity as it is in truth - "the unity of the Spirit" - will be known and manifested. For now is the time when "the mystery of God should be finished" (Rev. 10:7; and this mystery is "*God* manifest" in the flesh, "Christ in you the hope of glory," through the divine Spirit; and thus the divine Spirit making manifest the *divine* unity in Christians and so manifesting true Christian unity. And the only culmination of this true Christian unity is that "glorious Church" which the divine Lord will "present to Himself" without "spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but holy and without blemish" at his "glorious appearing." Eph. 5:27.

**January 27, 1909**

**"Church Federation - III. Its Meaning, to All Churches and Religious People [sic.]" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 4 , pp. 70-72.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the first article on this subject the statement was made that the Federal Council of the Churches, "in the name of heaven assumes jurisdiction of everything on earth." By the records of the council this is so plainly and abundantly manifest, and it means so much to everybody on earth, that it is important to present the evidence: First, as relates to the church; and secondly, as relates to the State.

It must constantly be kept in mind that the thought and scheme of the Federation itself, though entitled "the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America," is not by any means to be confined to America; but is intended to become International Federation and World Federation.

In the report of the committee on Foreign Missions, in this Council it was said that "closer interdenominational affiliation and co-operation . . . has gone further in foreign countries than it has at home, and that the movement is increasing with commendable rapidity." And this council recommended "that these practical and effective efforts at, co-operation abroad have the hearty and even enthusiastic support of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." And this same report mentioned as "the special merit of this new union" or Federation in foreign lands "that it plans to absorb gradually all the outward activities of the missions and make them its own." This shows at once that there is to be a centralization of all, in the Federation council, wherever and at whatever stage it may be developed. And as developed in America, what this means in America and everywhere else is to be seen for exactly what it is and as it is.

In the report of the committee on State Federation, the Federation centralized body is said to be "the Senate of the Federated Churches of the Commonwealth;" and that as such "its office is to collect and make available -

"(1) A list of all pastors in the state, and possibly church-clerks and laymen of prominence, in every local community.

"(2) A list of all churches in each city or township, with location by ward or village, membership, and income. . . .

"(3) A compilation of statistics, civil and religious, State and local, as the basis for the study of the task and degree of success of the churches in reaching the entire population.

"(4) A file of letters, reports, and documents, giving further information about localities and local churches, especially their experiments in co-operation: including "annual reports of all denominational bodies; the histories and anniversaries of local churches, and newspaper clippings of any permanent importance.

"(5) Diagrams, charts and maps; to present the common tasks of the churches to the eye. . .

"(6) A list of all interdenominational organizations for religions education or evangelism, philanthropy or reform, with information as to their organization, income and work.

"To learn all the facts and to ally all the factors, is the only method of usefulness for a Federation!"

And so it was declared by the council that "not only in our cities but in smaller towns and rural communities the time has come when the churches of every community should join their forces in Federated effort."

71

And now to what *purpose* is all this knowledge and effort and assumed jurisdiction? It is for the purpose of dividing up and apportioning all of the territory - "each square mile," yes, "each foot" - of the United States, among the denominations; each section to be controlled exclusively by a certain denomination, or denominations, or the Federation. For it is plainly said:

"No community, in which any denomination has any legitimate claim, should be entered by any other denomination through its official agencies without conference with the denomination or denominations having said claims."

And -

"In case one denomination begins gospel work in a destitute community, it should be left to develop that work without other denominational interference."

And "a complete list of all churches in a State" is to be made "to discover every case of overlapping" in the occupancy of territory. And where disputes arise between denominations as to rights of occupancy, all these "cases of friction between denominations or churches of different denominations" are to be referred to the Federation for "formal arbitration"; as it is the purpose and promise of the Federation to "provide arbitrators, where this is required and requested, whose decision shall have only the authority of its own obvious wisdom and the Christian public sentiment back of it."

Nor is this jurisdiction to be confined to the denominations that form the Federation itself, and that have invited it by becoming a part of the Federation. The jurisdiction is first *territorial*, and then is a jurisdiction of *all in the territory* just *because* they are in the territory. Therefore, whether a denomination be of the Federation or not, it is to be under the jurisdiction of the Federation; because it is in the territory the jurisdiction of which has been assumed by the Federation. Of course this is religious imperialism flat and open, as plain as ever was in the world.

Nor yet does this Federation-jurisdiction stop with including all the denominations. It stops nothing short of including everything religious that shall be found in the territory. In many country districts there are union congregations, and undenominational assemblies, several of which together employ for themselves a pastor. All of these are likewise to be included and dominated, for the plain word is -

"There are also many scattered undenominational or union churches. . . . Ascertaining the existence of these by its knowledge of every community, the State Federation. . . can bring them into

touch with each other and with the Federated churches of the State."

But it is just to escape the domination of centralized denominational federation, that in any cases these undenominational or union churches have been formed. But while they have thus and so far escaped the denominational federation, they are not now to be allowed to escape the same thing from interdenominational Federation; and this in such all-inclusive form that they simply can not escape it.

Having, then, monopolized the territory and all of the religious activities in the territory, and having duly apportioned the territory among the agencies which the Federation recognizes and commends, *then* if there should be a denomination, or any congregation, sufficiently Christian to repudiate Federation and all that there is of it, in any and every form, that denomination or congregation will immediately become "a speckled bird." It will be an "anarchistic element," and "injurious to the interests and progress of the kingdom of God."

And if there be a minister of the gospel, called and commissioned and sent by the Lord with his message to the people, for the time, but who is not of any denomination, and who will not be of the Federation; - the territory being all apportioned or exclusively held, by the Federation - such minister of the gospel, with his message from heaven, will be absolutely excluded; against him every place will be closed. And if in loyalty to Christ and under the weight of the mighty importance of the truth and message that he has from God, such message that he has from God, such messenger shall go and preach his message anyhow, then the Federation-management will warn all the churches against him, will direct them all to close the doors against him, and he will be religiously

72

outlawed. And if any of the churches disregard the interdict, and will hear him, then *they* will be attainted and their "insubordination" will be dealt with accordingly by the Federation "authorities"; because that preacher of the gospel is "opposed to Federation" and such example followed "would destroy all Federation." The Federation, then, assumes jurisdiction of all *territory* and of all the denominations and churches and religious activities *in* the territory. And this jurisdiction is so complete, so absolute, and so natural to her, that without any sign of any sense of incongruity it readily includes even the Lord himself. For when in the Council a speech was made in protest against it, asserting that the Federation stands professedly "on the principle of the Protestant reformation - the right of private judgment"; and that therefore "native Christians in all countries have the right to organize as they please and to do as they please," - this was met with the palliative that "if they see fit under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to organize without any denominational name or connection, they may know by this action of the Council that they have the authority of the council for so doing."

It would seem that when any person had been guided by the Holy Spirit to do a thing, that of itself should be considered all sufficient authority for the doing of it. And it would seem that in the presence of the authority of the Holy Spirit the Federated Council of Churches would say to herself and to all, "Hands off. That is of God, and is enough." But lo! instead of this the Federated Council of

Churches must needs take "action" indicating that when the Holy Spirit has guided people in the doing of a thing, then "by this action of the Council" those people may know that they have the "authority" of the Council to do what the Holy Spirit has already guided them in the doing of! And that *this* was allowed to pass in the Council without any question and without any apparent sense of its incongruity, shows that it seems to *them* proper enough to be taken for granted.

(Concluded next week.)

**February 3, 1909**

**"Church Federation - III. (Concluded)" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 5 , pp. 83-85.**

ALONZO T. JONES

AND in the report on Local Organization, one of the "certain committees that should be created in every local Federation" and that are "needed in every community," is a committee of -

"Investigation - to look into the merits of proposed interdenominational enterprises or such organizations as ask for the support of the churches of the community, for the purpose of either approving or disapprove."

Thus under cover of the purring profession of "protecting the churches from appeals from aid which tend to benevolence from the regular and recognized channels," the Federation at one mighty stride plants herself bodily and in full panoply in the jurisdiction of the whole realm of all bodies, denominational and undenominational and of the channels of the benevolence of them all.

It assumes jurisdiction of all the undenominational bodies by assuming to "endorse" and "commend" them, or assuming to refuse to endorse or commend any; and by calling upon all who want "financial assistance from the churches" to file with the executive committee of the Federation an "annual statement" of their business and how it is done.

And suppose that upon fundamental Christian principle, and by plain human right, these organizations or any of them, should mildly and in a perfectly Christian way tell the Federation Council that she has no kind of authority nor any shadow of right to assume any such office or jurisdiction in their affairs nor in their business; and that such assumption is only presumption, officiousness and meddling. Then the Federation could, and undoubtedly would, direct the local Federation to make that "needed" "investigation," and the general Federation make its disapproval manifest by "public sentiment" created by the Federation and passed on to all the Churches of the Federation. And the churches of the Federation, in "loyalty to the Federation," must expect to accept this pub-

lic sentiment," and in accordance therewith exclude that Christian agency which is just as worthy as any, and as worthy as it ever was; but must now be held as

utterly unworthy, just because the centralized Federation has put upon it her stamp of disapproval. The churches themselves may have no disagreement with the Christian agency in question, and no disapproval of its work but they must be "loyal to Federation," and so must yield to the "public sentiment" manufactured and dealt out by the centralized Federation.

And the dictum of the centralized Federation will be expected to be thus accepted by the churches of the Federation, and to control them. For have not the churches entered into this Federation! Have not the churches set up this centralized hierarchy! And is not this centralized Federation office most disinterestedly "protecting the churches," and most benevolently keeping "the stream of their benevolence" in "the regular and recognized channels"?

And suppose that some of the churches, or some individuals of the churches, choose to think for themselves; and they see that the work that has been now "disapproved" by the Federation, is a perfectly Christian work, and entirely worthy of their benevolence; and they therefore choose to disregard the Federation dictum and the "regular and recognized channels," and give their sympathy and their money to this "disapproved" enterprise direct! Then, those churches and individuals will be held as "disloyal," as "opposed to Federation," as "setting an example that will destroy all organization, and therefore such "disloyalty" must be stopped, those churches or individuals must be "disciplined." And if the churches or individuals will not accept the Federation discipline and come under the universal Federation assumption and domination, then they fall under the ban of the Federation, and must be cut off and east out from the Federation system, so as to make sure that the blessed benefits of Federation with all its assumption and domination, shall be preserved.

But any individuals separately and alone, or any individuals composing a church, have full and perfect right; they have divine right, to give their money to whomsoever they choose, and to bestow their benevolence wherever they please, according as *they themselves* shall think that their money will be expended most to the promotion of the gospel. And this without any reference whatever to any "regular and recognized," or any other kind, of fixed and specific "channels" of any denomination or any local or state or national Federation.

It is the individual who makes the money. It is the individual who saves the money. And it is the individual who must give the money. And the individual has just as much right to give the money, without any denominational or Federation interference or assumption or domination, as he has either to make the money or to save, it, without any of this.

So far, the individual is left free to make the money and to save it, without denominational or Federation interference - assumption and domination. But having made it and saved it without this he is not allowed to give at without this. When it comes to his giving it, then ecclesiasticism assumes control; denominationalism assigns "regular and recognized channels" through which alone he can give his money; and Federationism backs up the other two in firmly fastening and making perpetual this ecclesiastical and denominational assumption, which is only usurpation of the control of the individual as to his giving.

This assumption is that the money that the individual has saved and has in "his possession, is subject to control, to levy, and to appropriation by the church combine. The denominational combine fixes "the regular and recognized channels" through which his money, by the centralized levy and appropriation, must go; and the federation combine decides that only those whom the Federation endorses" and "commends" to the denominations can have any of this money; and these can have it only through "the regular and recognized channels." Thus individuality in giving is annihilated, in-

85

dividual benevolence is swept away, and the individual himself is eliminated from Christian giving, by this assumption - this usurpation - of Federation.

We have seen the Federation assumes control of all - "each foot" - of territory. We have seen that Federation assumes control of all religious work that shall be done in the territory. And we have seen that Federation assumes control as to just who may, and who shall not, have access to "the stream of benevolence" that shall flow only through fixed and "regular channels."

It is evidence, therefore, that Federation means nothing else than a universal and all-absorbent religious trust, a close and exclusive monopoly of all that pertains to religion; and consequently the pronounced disapproval and exclusion by the Federation voice, and the oppression and persecution by the Federation "public sentiment" of all who will not come under the Federation domination; this "public sentiment," however, being not public sentiment at all in any true sense, but only a federation formed and federation-foisted "public sentiment" the more effectually to accomplish the Federation purpose of domination.

In the conference on Federation in New York City, November, 1905, Bishop Fowler spoke the warning that "If this Federation should grow into a centralized power under which the denominations lose their distinctive identity and native perfect freedom, then we shall see here despotism, cruelty and persecution by Protestantism. Human nature has not changed. It was a sorry day for the world when there was but one human brain in the world, and that brain in the chair of St. Peter's."

By purring pretensions of "protection," and sly degrees of encroachment, that process has begun. And all who will look will see it grow in the very likeness of that thing which made "the sorry day" that Bishop Fowler cited.

All of this is enough, and is bad enough, to be a warning. Yet there is far more and it is far worse. But *that* phase of Federation must be deferred till next week.

**February 17, 1909**

**"Church Federation - IV. Its Meaning to the State and to All the People" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 7 , pp. 131-133.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen that the "Federal Council of Churches" assumes jurisdiction and domination of all the territory of all the nation, and of all things and all people *religious* in that territory.

It is equally true that she assumes jurisdiction and domination of all of the people in all things moral, and in many, if not all, things *civil* in that same territory. This is as plain in her own officially published words as is the other.

That her assumed jurisdiction and domination is universal and all-embracing - State and civil, as well as church and religious; people who are not religious as well as those who are - is made certain in the following statements in the report of the committee on State and Local Federations:

1. "The time has come when the churches may and must know every individual in the entire community as accurately as they now know their own membership."

2. One of the "certain committees that should be created in every local Federation" is one on -

"Civic Righteousness or Civic Affairs - to keep in touch with all the moral issues of the community."

3. "A large part of the task of the state federation is to organize the churches in every minor political division, *i.e.*, city or township. By political divisions, rather than villages for several reasons:

"(1) "Only by covering every political division, can we be sure that the whole State is covered.

"(2) To ascertain the task before the local churches and their efficiency in meeting it, religious and civil statistics must be compared; and the latter are for political divisions."

4. And why shall the whole State be covered by the church-combine in "political divisions," "civil statistics," etc.? - Answer:

"The enforcement and improvement of law often becomes the imperative duty of Local or State Federations, especially in regard to Sunday-rest, liquor-selling, sexual immorality and child labor."

And -

"Civic action on the part of the churches, *i. e.*, in law-enforcement must proceed on lines of township, etc."

5. How widely extended is this to be? - Answer:

"The churches have as great an opportunity as ever to-day, if they will combine to meet the real needs of each community, from building roads and organizing industry, like John Frederick Oberlin, to swinging the thought of a whole great metropolis to religious things by concerted evangelism; . . . and make possible what we have never had before, a systematic campaign to Christianize every phase of the life of the entire commonwealth."

6. And does she really mean to make all this effectual? - Answer:

"It thus becomes possible, *as in two States already*, to announce the watch-word: 'Some church responsible for each square mile!' Responsible, *i. e.*, to know and seek in some way every individual therein, mutually reporting preferences to sister

churches. The area of each 'responsibility district,' of course, varies from one city block to a whole town of forty square miles."

"The Federation . . . should emphasize the importance of the 'responsibility districts' which it establishes. When these cover the State, and the churches so appreciate their opportunity and responsibility, that each church will know the position of every voter on moral issues and tirelessly work to place every one upon the right side, moral reforms will come swiftly and permanently."

"Knowledge of men alone gives power over men."

"The keynote is responsibility! Dynamite is in that word! Its significance

132

once realized, it will revolutionize the relation of the churches to the community and to each other."

"The State Federation, like a general, taking in the whole field, can suggest what is needed at each point."

"There has already been worked out a practical program of activities as definite and comprehensive as has ever been proposed for any religious or civic campaign. We have planned the work; let us work the plan."

Now note in that plan which is to be "worked" just what is embraced in the jurisdiction find included in the activity of the church-combine.

1. All of the territory.
2. All of the people - "every voter" and "every individual in the entire community."
3. All of these voters and individuals to be known "as accurately" as is the very church-membership itself; and every voter to be "tirelessly" worked for the "right side."
4. Law-enactment.
5. Law-improvement.
6. Law-enforcement.
7. "All the moral issues of the community."
8. "All "the real needs of each community, from building roads to evangelizing the metropolis."
9. "Every phase of the life of the entire Commonwealth."
10. "Power over men."

Now when the church-combine so fully occupies everything in all of that list, then where will there be left any room for the State! Where, in fact, will be the State! - The State as a body distinct from the church will be gone. As a distinct system of law and government the State will have been utterly supplanted, and its machinery will exist only as the tool of the church to accomplish by force her arbitrary will and to make effective her despotic decrees.

Let us look over that list again and see what it really means.

The universal monopoly of territory. This is sheer imperialism: as verily as was that of Nimrod at the first. Religious or ecclesiastical imperialism is strictly Nimrodie and Babylonish, as truly as is civic imperialism, and is the worst

possible kind of imperialism. And it would seem that this had been sufficiently illustrated in the papacy to be a warning to all people for all time.

The truth is that no church can ever rightly have anything to do with *territory*, nor with territorial bounds, nor with territorial jurisdiction. The church has to do only with *souls*. And no church can ever have any *jurisdiction* of souls, any more than of territory. The church is never sovereign nor lord of anything or anybody; but is only the servant of everybody.

Likewise the church can never of right have anything to do with *law*; neither law-enactment, nor law-improvement, nor yet with law-enforcement, in any way nor to any extent whatever, whether Divine law or human law; but only with the gospel; and in that, only with *preaching* the gospel, never with enforcing it.

Likewise no church can ever of right have to do with building streets or sidewalks or roads or bridges or towns. No minister of the gospel was ever commissioned by Christ to plan or superintend the building of streets, or sidewalks, or roads or bridges, or towns; nor to mold and swing votes in the electing of town or city governments; but only to preach the gospel. Think of Paul planning and superintending the building of roads, bridges, and towns; and manipulating town-elections!

No minister of the gospel was ever commissioned to turn any state or nation of this world into a "kingdom of God"; but only to preach the gospel of the kingdom of God, and so to have men delivered from the darkness and the bondage of sin of this world, and translated into the light and glorious liberty of the kingdom of God as that kingdom is in the realm of God. The kingdom of God "is not of this world."

And when the whole Federation church-combine; as in her own list thus indicated, in order to acquire and exercise "power over men," shall be actively engaged over every foot of the territory of the United States, inquiring into the standing of every individual to know how he stands on all moral issues, to know how he will vote on all questions

133

of this assumed ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to pry into every phase of life of the entire commonwealth, then what can that be but simply a federated system of universal, inexcusable, and pernicious meddling, that will differ from the very Inquisition itself only in degree, and not in spirit nor in kind. The centralized head of this Federation can then say of this nation as did Boniface VIII of the King of France, "I know all the secrets of his kingdom."

Indeed, there never was a closer likeness to the papacy than is this thing in every feature. The program here defined in their own words, and the plan which is to be "worked" so universally and so intricately, is, in spirit, in purpose, and in every detail, identically that of the Church Federation of the fourth century in the Roman empire. This can be illustrated by the citation of only a single paragraph from the history of that original scheme of Church Federation and imperialism:

"Religion asserts its authority, and endeavors to extend its influence over the whole sphere of moral action, which is, in fact, over the whole of human life, its habits, manners, conduct. Christianity, as the most profound moral religion, exacted the most

complete and universal obedience; and, as the acknowledged teachers and guardians of Christianity, *the clergy continued to draw within their sphere every part of human life* in which man is actuated by moral or religious motives. The moral authority, therefore, of the religion, and consequently of the clergy, might appear legitimately to extend *over every transaction of life*, from the legislation of the sovereign, which ought, in a Christian king, to be guided by Christian motive, to the domestic duties of the peasant, which ought to be fulfilled on the principle of Christian love."

That passage was written by Dean Milman nearly seventy years ago with reference solely to that church-combine and its clergy of the fourth century, in its assumption, encroachment, usurpation, and domination. It is as closely descriptive of this present church-combine and its clergy, as if it had been written only y to-day and with reference solely to this movement in our time.

In one second article of this series it was remarked that the "unity" sought in this Federation is a "unity not for piety, but for power." In these two articles - III and IV - it is abundantly shown by their own words, that this is altogether true. Therefore, in view of the vast field that is to be so completely occupied, and that is to be so intricately and "tirelessly worked, by this Federation of "Protestants," what an awful meaning lies wrapped up in it in the presence of the mighty truth that "Unity without piety makes the church a curse to the world."

That system in the fourth century in its "unity without piety" made the papacy, and *in that* the greatest curse that ever befell the world. And now here comes this church-federation and ecclesiastical imperialism of professed Protestantism in the very likeness of that which made the papacy. And when this scheme shall have been only developed and systematically worked as planned and already begun, then what can these two things together do for the world but absolutely to sink it?

**February 24, 1909**

**"Church Federation - V" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 8 , pp. 147, 148.**

IN the bad ambition to control by hard and fast monopoly all things of heaven and earth, it is but natural to this Church Federation that it should assume for the church the sole authority and jurisdiction of the two institutions that God in Eden gave to all the race alike - marriage and the Sabbath; the one covering the relation of human beings to one another, the other the relation of man to God.

Marriage was instituted by the Creator in Eden between the one original pair of human beings. From that, notwithstanding all the sin and wanderings of mankind, this blessed gift has remained with every nation, people, tongue, and tribe.

But the Church of Rome first, and now this vast Federation of professed Protestantism following her, would make marriage solely a church-affair; so much so that it must be even "a sacrament" of the church. In this Federation Council the report of the Committee on "Family Life" which was adopted as the voice of

the thirty or more Protestant churches, claims it as "in the fullest sense a sacrament."

Now in truth the sacraments of the church - baptism and the Lord's Supper - belong only to those who believe in Jesus, to those who are of the church, and can rightly be partaken of only by those who are believers in Jesus, and who are thus of the church. But marriage belongs to all of the race alike, and not only to those who are of the church. Any man and woman of the veriest heathen tribe on earth who enter into the marriage relation according to the marriage rites of that tribe are as truly married as are any pair who enter into that relation through all the vain pomp and display and ceremony of "the church."

Marriage, belonging to all of the race alike, and not to the church only, is properly in the jurisdiction of the state. The church-combine, in insisting that marriage belongs only to her as "a sacrament," usurps the jurisdiction of the state to control it, and the prerogative of the state to regulate it. Also insisting that marriage belongs only to the church as "a sacrament" of which none but those that belong to the church have a right to partake, the church requires that the state also have a right to partake, the church requires that the state also shall be of the church; and so forces a union of church and state in such a manner as that there is no longer the state as such in any distinct law of system and government, but the church is everything.

This is precisely the course that on this subject was pursued by the Church of Rome in the making of the Papacy. And the history records that "The first aggression . . . which the church made on the state, was assuming the cognizance over all questions and causes relating to marriage." And now, this same course is entered upon by this new church-combine in the likeness of the papacy. In the report of this Federation Council it is declared that "The function of the church is threefold: To bear public witness to the fact of the marriage; to pronounce the blessing of God on the pair who have of their own accord entered upon the holy estate of matrimony instituted by God himself; and ever after to guard the sanctity of the marriage bond so long as they both shall live."

This is following in the very steps of Rome. The truth is that neither of the first two of these things is in any sense

148

the function of the church, and the third, not in the sense here intended. Any two persons who are married according to the laws of the state are just as truly kind of witness of the church to the fact, as with it. And any two persons who enter into the marriage relation according to the law of the state can have the blessing of God upon their union just as truly and just as much without any pronouncing of that blessing upon them by the church, as with the church's pronouncing it ten thousand times. The blessing of the marriage relation is in that relation itself, and doesn't come from the church at all. God's blessing is in the marriage relation. He put that blessing there when he established the marriage relation; and the blessing of God is there for every pair who ever enter into the relationship. And all that those who are married need to do to have that blessing is to recognize God in their blessed relationship, and so enjoy the blessing that is there for them. And this recognition of God and his gracious blessing in the marriage relation, by

those who are married, is infinitely more of a guard to the sanctity of the marriage bond than any guardianship of the church has ever proved to be, or ever can prove to be.

For, in truth and in fact, has the church ever in this way bettered things in respect of the marriage relation and abuses of it? The certain and sober answer must be, Never. Instead, she has always made things worse. When she absolutely owned the Roman state, and had it fully "Christian" according to her own order, divorces were so plenteous that sober history declares that "Men changed their wives as quickly as their clothes, and marriage chambers were set up as easily as booths in a market."

Of course the church officials then complained, as these now complain, of "the divorce evil." But the evil went straight along unchecked, simply because that then as now, it was the church-members equally with others who indulged the propensity to divorce.

And when the Roman State had perished under the very hand of the church, and she was left alone to run things as the church solely, and she then prohibited the marriage of the clergy, and prohibited divorce to all who were married, did even this *regime* better things as to the abuse of the marriage relation? - Not at all; it only made things worse; for it simply fixed hard and fast a system in which all who were married could do everything but be divorced; and the clergy could do everything but be married. And the resulting conditions are sufficiently indicated in the two awful but notorious facts: (1) that the very palaces of the popes were practically brothels, and (2) that syphilis [*sic.*] became epidemic in Europe.

And it all sprang and will ever spring from the fact that the church forgets her mission in the world, neglects the work that is hers to do, and attempts what can never be hers to do. She neglects the heavenly and blessed work of purifying the fountains of the inner life of the individual soul through the presence and power of God; and then by edict, proclamation, prohibition, law and force - by all outward pressure - seeks to curb the inevitable outward flow from the inherent inward corrupt condition. Instead of, by the presence and power and purity of God in the inmost soul, saving *people* from *sin*, she attempts by all means of outward pressure and force, to save "the stae" from vice and crime. She abandons the *individual* and seeks to save "society" and the mass.

This is illustrated by a fact stated in the council in the discussion of this subject - a fact stated as a thing to be commended and imitated - that a certain bishop had made it an established rule never to visit divorced people who are married. What then is that bishop in the church for? Yea, what is he in the world for? Is he here thus to condemn and persecute sinners, instead of to save sinners? Christ came not to condemn, but to save, sinners. And all whom he sends are sent to do the same.

People who have been divorced and have married again, are not criminals to be punished; but sinners to be saved. Indeed, they are not criminals at all; for by due and regular process of law they have been divorced. They are not subject to punishment for crime. And when

this proposed model bishop so deals with them, he transcends both the jurisdiction and the power of the state. And when he so deals with them he transcends any commission from God; for "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved," and "that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

All such people need to be saved from the sinfulness that has led them into the sins that caused the divorce, instead of being punished by professed preachers of the gospel of salvation from sin, only because they are sinners of such sort of sins as please not the preachers.

No, no, no; instead of the ministry and the church attempting or hoping to run everything in society, the state, and the world, let them all with an utter abandon throw themselves upon God in an absolute devotion to him in the way of his Spirit and Word, to save individuals from sin and purify them unto the good works which God has before ordained for us all to walk in.

Thus saving and purifying *at the fountain*, both the family and the home, the ministry and the church will easily do infinitely more for society, the state and the world, than they can ever possibly do through utmost difficulty in the way which they propose.

**March 3, 1909**

**"Church Federation - V. The Federation and the Sabbath" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 9 , pp. 167-170.**

ALONZO T. JONES

IN respect of the Sabbath, the other blessed institution from Eden, the Federation of Churches goes astray equally as in respect to marriage. The Federation claims that Sunday is the Sabbath; and then upon this claims that Sunday as the Sabbath or rest day is a church-affair, which indeed is true as regards Sunday, and then the Federation wants to compel all who are not of the church to observe this day which is of the church. But if it be of the church, none but those who are of the church have any right to observe it, or could observe it even were they to try.

Yet here the church not only perverts God's order, but reverses her own order as regards marriage. Marriage, as we have seen, being properly within the jurisdiction of the State, the church in claiming it forces herself over into the realm and jurisdiction of the State. With respect to the Sabbath or a day of rest, which never in any sense can be within the purview of the State, but pertains only *to God*, the church, *in claiming it as hers*, drags the State over into her realm to do by force of the State the office of the church in securing the observance of the church's day.

But since the Sabbath, or a day of rest, as it is in truth, pertains solely to God and the individual, and belongs neither to the church nor to the State, the church in seeking to drag the State over into her place, seeks in reality to put both

herself and the State in the place and jurisdiction of God. The Sabbath is "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." It is the Lord's day; not the church's day, nor the State's day. "The Sabbath was made for man;" not for the church, nor for the State. Its observance is by the individual, and unto God alone; not unto the church nor unto the State.

The Sabbath and its observance lies wholly between the individual and God. Its observance is wholly by the individual unto God, and this through persuasion in the mind of the individual. And so it is written: "One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded *in his own mind*. He that regardeth the day regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Rom. 14:5, 6.

This scripture does not say that all days *are* alike; it only says that "one man" or "another, *esteemeth* every day alike"; and when he does this the matter is wholly between him and God, and he is responsible only to God for *not* esteeming one day above another as the Lord has ordained. All days are not alike. God has selected, and has reserved to Himself, and has distinguished, and set apart, this day, from all other days, as His own, and to be devoted to Him. This day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. It is the Lord's day. This day is the seventh, as designated in the Fourth Commandments, and in the Scriptures throughout.

The observance of this day is wholly unto the Lord. Whosoever will regard the day regards it unto the Lord, or else there is no regard in it. The regard of the day pertains neither to the church nor to the State, but to the Lord only; and this by the individual, "one man," and by this one man's being "fully persuaded in his own mind" - not by force of statute, or police, or court, or prosecution of the State; not by decree, or

168

canon, or creed, or resolution, or persecution, *of the church*; but only by *persuasion in his own mind*.

And the only office of the church in relation to the observance of a day is just what her office is with reference to everything else, just what her office is in the world; that is, to "persuade men"; to persuade men to be reconciled to God; to persuade men to believe in Christ and thus to know God; to persuade men to worship God; to persuade men to esteem the day which God has established and ordained; to persuade men to regard this day unto the Lord and to worship Him on that day according as He has ordained. And whosoever can not, and will not, be thus "persuaded in his own mind," then his responsibility is solely to God, and not to the church nor to the State in any way or upon any ground or plea whatsoever.

Such is the Scripture ground and truth and teaching, as respects the observance of a day. But such is not the ground nor the teaching of the Federation of Churches as regards Sunday observance. Such is not the ground or the teaching of any single church composing the Federation as regards Sunday observance. From the beginning of the great apostasy immediately following the days of the apostles, when and by which Sunday was substituted for the Sabbath, the professed church has claimed governmental authority and

has required that men shall render to her under force of her authority, that which is to be, and which can be, rendered only to God by persuasion and conviction from God in the mind of the individual.

In other words the church in all this time and by his procedure has put herself in the place of God, and by force of compact, creed, canon, and persecution, has required that men shall render to her what is due to *God alone* personally and direct from the individual in faith and conscience. And when the authority and force which thus she could muster proved insufficient, then she would seize upon the power and force of the State to make her will effective. And this Federation of Churches now, in this matter of the observance of a day, as in other things, is following strictly in, the steps of the original great apostasy.

In the report on "Sunday Observance" that was made and adopted in the Council, the Federation of Churches recognized in principle that the observance of a day is due to the Lord. For it said "we are first to remember that the proper observance of the Lord's day is an obligation we owe to the Lord." And yet instead of leaving people to observe the day to *the Lord*, this same Council advocates force and legislation by the State to compel people to observe the day to *the State*; or the rather thus to compel people *by the State* to observe the day unto *the church*, according to the will and direction of the church which she will have to dominate in and through the State. And thus after the example of the original great apostasy this Federation of Churches as the one united church, with herself in the seat of sovereignty, puts both the State and herself in the place of God to the people.

And to put herself in the place of God seems so natural to the Federation that, as indicated in the first article of this series, she seems totally oblivious of all thought of incongruity in it. For in the report on "Sunday Observance" the Federation sets forth this supremely arrogant statement:

"We have no objection to reading the commandment:  
"Remember that you keep holy one day in seven. Consecrate this day unto the Lord as the Lord's. Let it be unlike other days. Sanctify it."

The Federation has "no objection to reading" the Fourth Commandment like that! Well, suppose that the Federation does "have no objection" to this; is that final? Does that settle the question for all time, and for all people, and in places in heaven and earth? Upon what ground can this Federation assume that because she has "no objection" to the reading of the Fourth Commandment in this astonishing way, it must necessarily follow that the Author of the Commandment, the Creator of heaven and earth, could have no objection to it? Upon what ground indeed, other than the over topping assumption that to this Federation there belongs authority to revise,

170

to change, to set aside, the commandment and law of God; *as she* wills; and that because *she* has no objection to this, the Author of the Commandment, and the Fountain of law, can likewise and of necessity have no objection!

But this is all a grievous mistake; yes, an egregious, blundering, and sinful assumption. The Lord himself, the Author of this Commandment, and the

Fountain of law, in His word has given *His* estimate of the church-combine which first assumed the prerogative and the authority to change His law, and thus to exalt herself above Him. And in this estimate He has used such expressions as "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," "the mystery of iniquity," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God"; speaking "great words against the most high," and "wearing out the saints of the most high, and thinking to change times and the law" of the most high. 2 Thess. 2:3, 4; Dan. 7:25, R. V.

That is the estimate which God has put forever upon the church-combine that first assumed to deal so arrogantly with this same Commandment of His law. And upon what ground can it be supposed that He has changed His mind, or will change His estimate, relative to this new church-combine which has assumed precisely the same prerogative and authority in relation precisely to the same point of His holy law?

Therefore, while this Federation may indeed "have no objection" to reading in this utterly false way that Commandment of the Law of God, yet it must ever be true that all those who will recognize *God* as God; and will respect Him in His place as God and his law as the law of God - that all these will most decidedly object to this Federation reading of the Commandment of God, or any other reading of it, that differs "one jot or one tittle" from the reading of that law precisely as worded by the voice of the Lord from heaven and twice written with his own blazing finger on tables of stone.

In addition to all this, error and blundering assumption of that statement of the Federated Council of Churches, it is worth noting that it is not true even as a statement the Federation. The Federation has officially said, "We have no objection to the reading of the Commandment: 'Remember that you keep holy me day in the seven.'" But that statement is not true. The Federation does decidedly object, and in the proceedings of this council itself, it is demonstrated that she does decidedly object, to any such reading of that Commandment with reference to any other "one-seventh of our time," or "one day in seven" than that particular "one-seventh of our time" or "one day in seven" that is marked by the specific limitations of Sunday.

This is demonstrated in the official proceedings of the late council itself. For when the report of which that statement is a part was under discussion, the following resolution was offered by a member of that council:

"It is not our intention that anything shall be done to interfere with the convictions of those brethren represented with us in this council who conscientiously observe the seventh instead of the first day of the week as a day for rest and worship."

That resolution was offered by a member of the council who does not observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. As shown on its face, it was presented in behalf of those who do observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. And note the restriction: it relates only to "those brethren represented with us in this council, who conscientiously observe the seventh" day. In this the resolution pertains

specifically to the Seventh-day Baptists. For the Seventh-day Baptist church is the only church in the Federation whose members observe the seventh day.

Instantly upon the presentation of the resolution there was manifested the most energetic protest and the most decided opposition, and from the most members, that was manifested on any or all of the questions or propositions that arose in the council from beginning to end. One exclaimed, "I trust that the resolution as proposed be not accepted." Another, emphatically, "I hope that this resolution will be voted down." Others,

170

"It will not pass." The gentleman who had offered the resolution got the floor and said:

"I hope that this resolution as presented *will* pass. Let us remember that the brethren of the Seventh-day Baptist denomination are members of this council as are any other body. If we are going to observe brotherhood and Christian love, we are not going to clash because of the religious and conscientious conviction of brethren associated with us in this Council of Churches. These brethren (I do not myself sympathize with them in their belief) but I do respect their convictions. I do respect them for the fact that they are willing to sacrifice. I respect them for their willingness to stand firm and true to what they believe. While I fully sympathize with the spirit of the resolution already submitted (by the council), it does seem to me that we ought never in this council of churches to adopt such statement as shall even *seem* to conflict, without due explanation; and I fully believe that our brethren are equally united in this.

"This Federation of Churches shall be more and more acknowledged through-out the churches, and it is absolutely necessary that we be thoroughly fair with one another, that we be thoroughly brotherly with each other in all our relations.

"I believe that God looks smilingly upon this desire to be absolutely fair and just and brotherly to all represented in this Federation of Churches. I earnestly hope that this resolution will pass."

In addition to this, one of the regular Seventh-day Baptist delegates in the council expressed their evangelical faith, and their unity of purpose with the purpose of the council, and pleaded that there might be a practical manifestation of that "religious liberty" which had been proclaimed from the platform of the council. But pleas for the adoption of the resolution, pleas for fair and just and brotherly dealing, pleas for the practical recognition of the "religious liberty" that had been proclaimed, were all of no avail. The resolution disavowing "intention" to "interfere with the convictions of those . . . who conscientiously observe the seventh instead of the first day of the week as a day for rest and worship," was overwhelmingly rejected with loud and vigorous "No-o-o-o!!"

By the decided action and the official record of the Federated Council of Churches, therefore, it is made perfectly plain and emphatic that the Council's

statement that they "have no objection" to their own proposed reading of the Commandment, "that you keep holy *one day in seven*" is not true, - except as that "one day in seven" is and shall be Sunday. It is thus demonstrated that the Federated Council of Churches will not allow anybody but themselves to read the Commandment the way that they have said; and that they themselves will read it that way only with reference strictly and specifically to Sunday.

And by the whole record as made by the council itself, it is demonstrated that the Federal Council of Churches not only assumes place and prerogative and authority to revise and to change the law of the Most High, according to her own perverse will, but that she also denies the propriety and the right of any to observe that law as the Most High himself has spoken and written and commanded it. And than in this, how *could* she more fully show her spirit of independence of God?

**March 10, 1909**

**"Church Federation - VII. The Federation and Sunday Legislation" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 10 , pp. 181-187.**

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen how that the Federal Council of Churches has committed herself to the observance of Sunday, and to the exclusion of the observance of the Seventh-day, as the meaning of the Fourth Commandment.

The Council also committed herself specifically to "legislation" in behalf of Sunday observance. By resolution the Council declared -

"That all encroachments upon the claims and sanctities of the Lord's Day should be *stoutly resisted* through the press, the Lord's Day associations and abloom, *and by such legislation as may be secured* to protect and preserve this bulwark of our American christianity."

In this connection, therefore, it will be strictly pertinent to present a speech on the Sunday legislation that was before the late Congress, which legislation, as in the particular bill that was passed by the Senate and that was before the House for passage, had the approval of the Church Federation. This speech was made before the House Committee, District of Columbia, on February 15, 1909, and was stenographically reported.

That the said legislation failed to pass the House and thus to become a law of the United States, does not in any wise lessen the pertinency or the importance of what was presented in this speech. For the Church Federation is still here and is determined upon Sunday legislation. And though that legislation failed to be made effective by the Congress which expired March 4, 1909, it is just as certain that the like legislation will be revived in the next Congress, as that

Congress shall meet in regular session the first Monday of December, 1909. The speech follows:

Mr. K. C. RUSSELL: We next call upon A. T. Jones, of Michigan, who represents himself, and speaks on the point of individuality.

### **Remarks of A. T. Jones**

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee: I speak not only in behalf of myself, but of a vast multitude of other people in the United States, who claim the right as individuals to be religious or not upon their own personal and individual choice, without belonging to any religious combination, without being legislated into it by Congress, and without being members of any religious society as this bill proposes that they shall be. We hold this as both a divine and a constitutional right; the right of individuality in religion, and as relates to religion and religious rites or observances.

First, I shall present the facts that demonstrate - I mean demonstrate, not simply to prove, but demonstrate - because all the history, all the literature and all the evidence, on the subject is on that one side of the question - that Sunday legislation is religious legislation and nothing else, and never can be anything else, whatsoever other plea may be made in behalf of it.

About three minutes of a sketch will give you the history of the whole subject from the beginning until now.

The first Sunday legislation was in 314, by Constantine, at the demand of the church-combine, exactly as is this now; and the object of it, in the words of those who caused it and obtained it, is given by the church historian of the time in these words:

"Constantine enjoined the observance of the day termed the Lord's day and commanded that no judicial or other business should be transacted on those days, but that *God should be served with prayers and supplications.*"

That fixes it, that the object of the first Sunday legislation over in the world was religious, and religious solely:

The next step was in 321, and the object of that, as the former, was religious solely. Eusebius, the eulogist of Constantine, who helped to put through the legislation, defines it thus:

"He [Constantine] commanded that one day should be regarded as a special occasion for religious worship."

Also he says:

"Who else has commanded the nations inhabiting the continents and islands of this mighty globe to assemble weekly on the Lord's day and to observe it as a festival, not indeed for the pampering of the body [nothing physical about it, nothing civil about it], NOT for the pampering of the *body*, but for the comfort and invigoration of *the soul* by instruction in divine truth."

That fixes that second step in Sunday legislation as religious exclusively.

Constantine himself gives us the meaning, and what his intent was, in the legislation when he established it, in the fact that he wrote a prayer and had it to be recited every Sunday by the troops of the empire paraded for the purpose. That prayer, which was repeated in concert at a given signal, runs thus:

"We acknowledge Thee the only God; we own Thee as our King and implore Thy succor: By Thy favor have we gotten the victory; through Thee are we mightier than our enemies. We render thanks for Thy past benefits and trust Thee for future blessings. Together we pray to Thee and beseech Thee long to preserve to us, safe and triumphant, our Emperor Constantine and his pious sons."

And when he and his "pious sons" had obtained all the power of the whole empire, then these same ecclesiastics proclaimed that the kingdom of God come, and that "the saints of the Most High" had taken the kingdom.

The third step was when Theodosius enacted a law, by which the scope of the legislation was made universal, and "civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden." And the penalty shows the thought of the legislation; for "whoever transgressed was to be; considered in fact, as guilty of *sacrilege*." *Sacrilege* is religious offense only and not in any sense a civil offense.

That system of legislates including

183

this very Sunday legislation covered all the Middle Ages, and down to the time of the Reformation. Sunday legislation thus came, into England legislation only. And there it has never been claimed as anything else than religious. In Blackstone it is clearly recognized as religious; and as an essential of the church-and-State system of England. When England was separated from the Roman system by Henry the Eighth, the Roman Sunday legislation continued unchanged as the Sunday legislation of the English system which was only the Romish system continued with the only change that the King took the place of the Pope. Then, England's laws and government were extended to this continent in the Colonies here. And thus England's Sunday laws were the original Sunday law of the Colonies here. Thus the Sunday legislation of England extended to the Colonies, was the Sunday legislation of the Roman system, retained by England in its full original, religious character.

The Colonies greatly added to the original Sunday laws extended from England. And nobody will say that the Sunday legislation of the Colonies was anything else than absolutely and exclusively religious. Then the Colonies, all in a day, became so many States. And without any change whatever the Sunday laws of the suddenly become States, and were as exclusively religious laws as *State* laws, as, the day before, they were religious laws of the Colonies. And thus the Sunday legislation of the original twelve of the thirteen States - for Rhode Island did not have any - was the exclusively religious legislation of the Colonies, which was the exclusively religious Sunday legislation of England, which was the exclusively religious Sunday legislation of Rome, descended without any break whatever in any way.

Now all the Sunday legislation of the other States since the original thirteen has been copied from that exclusively religious Sunday legislation of the original

twelve, which was wholly that of the Colonies, which was that of England, which was that of Rome. And from the first of it in Rome to the last of it in the latest States, that same original religious character abides in it.

All this demonstrates that Sunday legislation, from the beginning until now, is essentially and only religious. And whatever other reason may be read into it, or whatever other plea may be attached to it, this does not, and never can, take away from it that essentially religious character. Therefore any Sunday legislation by Congress, no matter for what reason pleaded, is unconstitutional by reason of the essentially religious character that attaches to it, and that can never be separated from it.

This Sunday legislation which we are discussing to-day is the same thing, revamped, and brought to the national government for adoption as national law; because the church-combine, now, and, as ever, since the days of Constantine, can not be at rest unless they can compel everybody to be religious as the church dictates. And this is now brought to the national government to have the national government give this added sanction to all the Sunday legislation of all the States.

The fact has been noted in one of the speeches already made that the preamble to the Constitution says that one of the objects of the establishment of the National Constitution is to "insure domestic tranquillity." But, gentleman, as surely as this legislation shall pass, there will be everything else than domestic tranquillity; not only in the District of Columbia, but all over this broad land.

Only a few weeks ago I finished a journey of ten thousand miles between the two oceans, speaking on this subject, and discussing these questions; and all over the land I found that the church-combine is waiting for this legislation, that when the nation shall thus put its endorsement upon Sunday legislation, then the Church Federation, the "Lord's Day Alliance" and all the other religious combines will take that endorsement and make the thing sweeping and oppressive all over this land, by the rigid enforcement of the Sunday laws that they already have in all the States, and intensify them all the more.

And to show you what the disposition is of at least some of those who are en-

184

gaged in this, I will cite an instance. An ecclesiastic in the city of Denver, in one of their conventions, mentioned it as one of the great reasons why Sunday is not now satisfactorily observed in the States, that the national government by its influence, through having no Sunday legislation, is against it. But if the national government can be brought to Sunday legislation, and so to put its endorsement upon it, then we can make effective the Sunday laws in the States. And he went on to say that the Sunday never would be observed fully and strictly enough, until the penalties for Sunday work should be increased to "fines of fifteen hundred to two thousand dollars *and* imprisonment for a year and a half to two years," upon everybody who does any work on Sunday. That is what this bill means.

This bill itself shows that it is religious; and here I come to the particular point upon which I wish to dwell in my remarks, and that is the right of the individual. The bill itself shows that it is religious legislation, in that it requires specifically that all who would observe any other day than Sunday must be "members of a

*religious* society" that observes such day. The gentlemen of this committee need not to be told that the legislative power can not do indirectly what it is forbidden to do directly. It is safe to say that the most ultra of these ecclesiastics who want this legislation would say that the Congress would have no right to enact a law positively and directly requiring any person to be a member of a religious society. Can any member of this committee think for a moment that Congress could enact a law, reading: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That all persons who would observe another day than, Sunday must and shall be 'members of a religions society'?" Surely the most ultra of the ecclesiastics who demand this legislation would say that such a law would be clearly forbidden under the Constitution. Yet this bill does require, indirectly, exactly that thing that you have no possible right to do directly. For it does say specifically:

"Provided, That persons who are members of a religious society who observe as a Sabbath any other day in the week than Sunday, shall not be liable to the penalties prescribed in this act if they observe as a Sabbath one day in each seven, as herein provided."

Has Congress ever a right to say that anybody shall be "a member of a religions society" by direct legislation, - Certainly not. Therefore this is bill requires that the Congress shall do indirectly what it can not possibly do directly under the Constitution, and consequently it is just as completely forbidden.

Again: This requires that whoever will observe any other day than the Sunday shall belong to "a religious *society*." What, then, will be a religious *society* within the meaning of the law? - The courts will have to decide, the State will have to say, I, as an observer of another day, must be a "member of a religious *society*" that is approved by the State, in order to be free from the observance of Sunday, which I do not observe, and will not observe.

But by the Constitution of the United States, and by the divine religion, which is Christianity, every individual has a divine right, and also the constitutional right, to be religions without belonging to any combination or society in any way whatever. He can be religions by belonging to God who has created him, and to Jesus Christ who has redeemed, and by being a member of "the church of the firstborn which are written in heaven;" and he can be all this simply as an individual before God, without any reference to any society or denomination, or other religious combine of any kind whatever, anywhere on earth.

This bill, then, plainly requires of all people that they must either observe Sunday or else be "members of a religious society" which the State approves, that observes another day. This legislation, therefore, leaves no place whatever for the individual relation to God, or, for the individual choice of service to God, as to the observance of a day. Under this bill all the religion that any one is allowed to have as to the observance of a day must be derived from the sanction and the authority of the *State*. But who-

soever get his religion from the sanction of the State does not have any religion that is worth having. All true religion comes from God alone, and directly, by

divine grace, through the faith of Christ, to the individual upon his own personal choice and lies solely between the individual and God.

This is the vital principle of Christianity. And it is the principle of the Constitution of the United States. And to put beyond all question the fact that it is the vital principle of the National Constitution, I present the words of Bancroft, the historian of the Constitution. In his remarks upon the Constitution as made, he says:

"The Constitution establishes nothing that interferes with individuality. . . . It leaves the individual alongside of the individual."

This bill sweeps away individuality. No man can be religious except as *the State* provides, and he must be religious on Sunday or else belong to a religious *society* of which *the State* approves, that observes another day than Sunday.

Again I quote from Bancroft:

"The rule of individuality was extended as never before [by the Constitution of the United States]. Religion was become avowedly the attribute of man and not of a corporation."

This bill makes religion the attribute of a corporation, and of a corporation only. By this bill a man must either observe Sunday as dictated by the State, from the church; or else by edict of the State he must be a "member of a religious society." And thus this bill makes religion avowedly the attribute of a corporation, - either the State, a *civil* corporation; or the church, a *religious* corporation. And therefore it does absolutely sweep away this right recognized and guarded by the Constitution, the right of individuality in religion as being avowedly the attribute of man, the individual, and not of a corporation.

To what source is traced this American constitutional right of individuality in religion? - Bancroft still:

"No one thought of vindicating liberty of religion for the conscience of the individual till a voice in Judea. . . . commanded to render 'unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.'"

Therefore -

"Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new Nation [this blessed American Nation] dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained of God in Judea."

This right of individuality in religion is traced, then, directly to the Author of Christianity. This bill, then, in sweeping away individuality in religion, is clearly both unconstitutional and anti-Christian.

Then to crown it all, Mr. Bancroft remarks upon the "perfect individuality extending to religion" under the Constitution of the United States.

This legislation, then, seeks to drag the power of the State, not over into the realm of the church, but into the realm of *God*, and causes the State to take the place of God to the people in religion.

But the Scripture tells us that: "One man esteemeth one day above another; another man esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." That does not say that every day *is* alike; but it does recognize the

right of one man to esteem all days alike so far as concerns either the State or the church, or anybody else than God.

As to the observance of a day, "every man" - the individual - is to be "persuaded in his own mind." And that persuasion - mark it - into be IN HIS OWN MIND, - not by Congress, nor by courts, nor police, nor prosecution, nor persecution; but solely by persuasion in his own mind. And that establishes the scriptural, the divine foundation of individuality in the observance of a day. It tells to everybody in the world that the observance of a day lies between the individual and God. And when even the church puts itself in between the individual and God, the church is out of her place; much more does the State get out of her place when she steps in between the individual and God, and endeavors to tell him that he shall observe a day, and how he shall observe it.

186

The observance of a day lies between the individual and God alone.

For the Scripture contains: "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord, he doth not regard it." It is God who has selected, distinguished, and set apart, the day that is to be observed as a rest day. The observance of the day pertains therefore to God, and lies only between God and the individual in faith and conscience. Therefore any observance of the Sabbath or of a rest day enforced by law, by statute, by police, by court, by prosecution, or by persecution, is, in the first instance, a direct invasion of the province of God and of the realm of faith and conscience in the individual; and in the second instance, is not even the observance of the day, and never can be, because it is not of persuasion in the mind. And when any man is not fully persuaded in his own mind, and therefore does not observe the day to the Lord, his responsibility for this is to God alone, and not to any man, nor to any set of men, nor to any law, or government, or power on earth.

Gentlemen of the Committee, the conclusion of the whole matter, the sum of all that can be said, is that this legislation would doubly revolutionize this whole Nation. First, in that, being essentially religious, it commits the Nation to the old order of things: the governmental domination of religion and in religion. Secondly, in that all right of individuality in religion, it sweeps away absolutely and forevermore. And in this double revolutionizing of things here, it is doubly unconstitutional and doubly anti-Christian.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there some one here who desires to be heard in behalf of the Jewish people? I understood there was some one.

There being no response, Mr. A. T. Jones requested the privilege of speaking.

A. T. JONES: The gentleman [Mr. Jackson] made a challenge for anybody to present a federal decision against Sunday legislation. That challenge is easily and safely made. There is no federal *decision*, simply because there has never been any federal law on the subject. Without any *federal law* upon which an issue could be made, it is impossible to have a *federal decision*.

Therefore, his whole argument, all that he has presented here from the Supreme Court of the United States, is utterly irrelevant in this case; because that which he cited pertains solely to *State cases* and to issues of law in *the States*. It is true that the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly

recognised the Sunday laws of *the States* as being properly within the police powers of the States. But, I repeat, the Supreme Court of the United States has never touched this question as a national or federal question, for the simple reason that there has never yet been any national or federal law on the subject. And it is only fair to state that the logic of the decisions of the Supreme Court on this *question in the States* would confine it within the police power of the States, and would exclude it from federal cognizance.

Therefore, I repeat, the gentleman's whole argument as based on decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, is wholly irrelevant here.

Yet let this law which we are to-day discussing, be enacted, and then, having a statute enacted by federal authority, there will follow a federal decision. But there being, so far, no federal law, and therefore no federal decision, in lieu of that, here is a legal authority that should be satisfactory to the legal profession. It is Cooley's "Constitutional Limitations, Chap. 13, par. 1-9:

"The legislators have not been left at liberty to effect a union of Church and State, or to establish, preferences by law in favor of any religious persuasion or mode of worship. There is not complete religious liberty where any one sect is favored by the State and given advantage by law over other sects.

"Whatever establishes a distinction against one class or sect to the extent to which the distinction operates unfavorably, a persecution; and if based on religious grounds, a religious persecution. The extent of the discrimination

187

is not material to the principle; it is enough that it creates an inequality of right or privilege."

And all of that is just what this bill and what it does.

M. E. HILTON JACKSON: The gentleman who replied concerning the federal decision did not seem to understand the matter properly. The Constitution of the United States provides, among other things, that no law shall be passed respecting the establishment of religion or the free exercise thereof. Now, if the State passes such a law, it is as much a violation of the Constitution of the United States as though the nation passed such a law, and it is possible for every one of these State laws to come under the review of the Supreme Court of the United States, as did the Minnesota law; and as far as any State law is concerned, under the principle laid down in regard to the Constitution of the United States, it becomes a federal question; and as a federal question it may be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States. It was upon that principle that the Minnesota law was reviewed, and it was speaking to that principle that Mr. Justice Fuller declared that such law had been declared by innumerable decisions of the courts to be constitutional.

A T. JONES: Mr. Chairman: It is plain that it is not I who do "not understand the matter properly." The first amendment of the Constitution is a prohibition upon *Congress only*, and *not upon any State*. So far as the first amendment' goes, any State may establish any religion; and may forbid any other than this established religion; and may punish or persecute to the death all who refuse to conform to that State-established religion. Every State in the Union, exempt Rhode Island, at the time of the establishment of the National Constitution, had an established

religion; and as a matter of fact, the first amendment to the Constitution forbidding Congress to make any law respecting - not "*the*" but "*an* establishment of religion," was for the purpose of preventing Congress from interfering with these already State-established religions.

Therefore, for the information of the gentleman, I repeat that the clause to which he referred, and misquoted, is the first amendment to the Constitution, is a prohibition upon *Congress alone*, and *not upon any State*.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now have to close the hearing.

**March 24, 1909**

**"Church Federation - VIII. In International Affairs" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 12 , pp. 228, 229.**

ALONZO T. JONES

FROM the beginning it has been one of the avowed purposes of the Federation of Churches to become international. And its international standing and purpose is intended to be only the extension internationally of all that it is in its purposes local, State, and National. And this we have seen is nothing less than an imperialistic monopoly of all things ecclesiastical, civil and moral.

In the late council there was a report on "International Relations." Yet this report was not on the international relations of the Federation; it was on the international relations of the nations themselves. And that this report on the international relations of the nations of the world, should be made to this Federal Council of churches, by a committee of the Federal Council of Churches; and that this report should discuss and advise upon the international relations of the nations of *the world*, for the consideration and action of the Federal Council of *Churches*, plainly shows that the Federal Council of *Churches* has assumed jurisdiction of the international relations of the nations of *the world*, just as, and with the same assurance, that she has assumed jurisdiction of all religious work, and of all the territory, and of all the people in the territory, and of all things civil, and in all things moral, in the United States.

While this report of the committee and the action of the council plainly shows that the council assume jurisdiction of the international affairs of the nations of the world, the report itself and the action of the council dealt particularly with the subject of *war*, and how to cause war to cease and assure to the nations and the world the reign of peace.

And not surprisingly, but curiously enough; the report and the council soberly proposed to stop war by establishing a, "substitute for war." They said: "If nations are to abolish war, then some substitute for war must be found by which States can settle those international differences which can not be adjusted through the channels of diplomacy."

It never seemed to occur to a single individual in the council that there was anything ridiculous or absurd about the idea or the proposition to abolish war by

a "substitute for war"; "that while a substitute for war would remove actual war one degree, it would not in any degree remove the *spirit* of war; and therefore would remove actual war that one degree *only for a time*, when the same old abiding spirit of war would sweep away the substitute and all kindred contrivances, and plunge into actual war more deeply and more desperately than as if no substitute had ever been, indulged.

And what is this "substitute for war" through which the churches would have the nations to "abolish war"? Here it is, and the one only: "There is but one substitute for war, and that is the doctrine of arbitration."

But it being perfectly plain both on principle and from experience that true arbitration - voluntary and friendly arbitration - could never prove a substitute for war, simply because there could be no certainty that the nations would voluntarily enter it, the Federation Council put its unqualified endorsement on what it called "*obligatory* arbitration."

But "obligatory arbitration" is arbitration only by force and compulsion. And force and compulsion "is itself only the spirit and essence of war. For to "oblige" in this sense, is "to bind, constrain, or compel, by any physical, moral, or legal force or influence." It is especially appropriate that this warlike "substitute for war" should have been "originally proposed by Russia." Undoubtedly Russia is the one grand model of all the nations, to originate that "one substitute for war."

And yet the Federated Council of Churches unanimously fell in with that self-contradictory and deceptive thing, and adopted a resolution that "It declares its conviction that war is evil and that Christian nations should determine by obligatory arbitration the international differences which can not be settled by diplomacy."

It is hardly more than to be expected that any view that could soberly pronounce any of the nations "Christian"

229

could just as readily approve Russia's originally proposed "obligatory arbitration" as the "one substitute for war." The two conceptions are perfectly fitting to each other, and to the whole conception and scheme of Church Federation.

All this was by way of the Federation's expressing its disapproval of war. And it very well reveals just the measure of the influence of the Church Federation to stop war. That is, just none at all in any true or Christian sense. It is all only outward and substitutionary, and this wholly by worldly means and human and political contrivance; never inward and absolute, through the entire change of heart and mind and spirit of individual persons by the gospel and Spirit of God.

If the *people* of the nations, or if even only the *men in power* in the nations, were Christians indeed there could not be any war; for no Christians will ever engage in war. But the truth is that the people, and the men in power, of the nations, call themselves Christians and are recognized by the churches as Christians, when they are nothing of the kind in truth. These so-called "Christian nations" and people, not being Christians, and being as full of the same old spirit of war as any other heathen, will inevitably go to war. Then the churches who recognize them as "Christian Nations," and vast numbers of them being members of these churches, the churches federated and confederated, find

themselves under the necessity of doing something to keep these their own church-members from engaging in war, and must needs adopt Russia's "original proposition" of warlike "substitute for war."

And thus again we are brought face to face with the fact that this grand centralisation of church influence and endeavor is but following in the same course, and even in the very steps, of that former one, of the fourth century and onward, that first produced "Christian Nations" and so assiduously cultivated them that Europe was filled with "Christian Nations" that were so perpetually at war that the church must needs come in amongst them with her obligatory "truce of God," which, by the way, answers very well to this now Russia-proposed and Church-Federation-promoted, "obligatory arbitration."

But none of it was ever of any avail to stop or abolish war. When the papacy was at the height of her power and had everything in her own hand, Europe was so filled with wars and anarchy by the quarrels of the popes, that the heads of the Nations were compelled to revolt and force the calling of the Council of Constance expressly to "reform the church in its head and members" and so save themselves and Europe from the supreme curse of the church-combine.

And the character of those "Christian Nations" is sufficiently indicated by the fact that in a war brought on by themselves in their own open violation of a solemn treaty, under the leadership of the papacy, the Sultan of the Turks rode out between the two armies arrayed for battle, read aloud the violated treaty, then fastened it on the head of a lance and appealed to the "insulted Jesus"; "Oh, Thou insulted Jesu! avenge the wrong done under thy good name, and show thy power upon thy perjured people." And he did it splendidly.

It is altogether likely that through this "obligatory arbitration" or some other such "substitute for war" this Church-Federation scheme of to-day will succeed in getting; the so-called Christian Nations of to-day into such an attitude of seeming to "learn war no more" that the churches can proclaim a universal peace. And then the abiding and native spirit of war will suddenly break forth in a universal war engulfing the world in sudden and mighty destruction.

There is no such thing as Christian Nations. There is no such thing as a substitute for war.

There are individual Christians, and that is all. And in these individual Christians there is annihilated all spirit of war, and in its place there reigns the spirit of Christ which is only the spirit of "peace on earth good will to men."

**March 31, 1909**

**"Church Federation - IX. Federation and the Kingdom of God" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 13 , pp. 249-251.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE Church Federation claims to be the kingdom of God. Over and over this is stated, and throughout the proceedings it appears. The grand object of

national, international, and world Federation is not only to make of each nation a kingdom of God, but to make of the whole world the kingdom of God.

The Federation therefore emphatically and continuously disavows any purpose of wishing or even of allowing the State to establish the church or the Federation. Instead of that, the Federation declares that the church through the Federation is to establish the State. And this church-established State is to be the kingdom of God.

And all of this is over again exactly the conception and the philosophy of the ambitious design of the church-combine of the fourth century in establishing the Roman State and so bringing in "the kingdom of God." But instead of its being the kingdom of God in truth, it was always only a kingdom of men, and what is far worse than even that - a kingdom of *men in the place of God*.

Kingdoms of men as they relate to men and the affairs of men in this world - these have a proper place in the world. They are essential for the keeping of order among the violent, and insuring safety to those who are civil and peaceable. This is "Cesar" and his place, and is recognized by the Lord as being entitled to "honor," "custom" "tribute," in his place. "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's."

But for any such thing as a kingdom of *men in the place of God* there is no rightful place anywhere. This is the very sum and summit of all that is contrary to God. Instead of the Lord's ever recognizing this as having any rightful place, or ever telling anybody to render anything whatever to this conception of working of things, He declares it to be "apostasy," "the man of sin," "the mystery of iniquity," "the son of perdition," "the beast," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God showing himself that *he* is God." And the Lord declares that all who accept, or give honor to any such thing are worshipers of the beast instead of worshipers of God.

Of course there is no call for this Federation to erect itself into a kingdom of men relating only to the affairs and relations of men with men. This is understood by all. There is no pretense or profession other than that the Federation organization, administration, government, is to deal primarily with men and affairs and nations as relates to God. It thus distinctly and specifically proposes to stand as a kingdom or government of God to men in the place of God.

And yet it is preeminently and in all respects a kingdom or government of men only. And its whole order and organization is modeled wholly upon the order and government of men. In it men meet together as the delegates or representatives of other men, or organizations of men. These men then appoint committees of men; form a "constitution and by-laws"; by resolution, discussion, votes, and other forms of legislation, enact other laws; and by manipulation, engineering, wire-pulling, nominating, voting, and electing, manifest the will and the ways - the politics - of men precisely as is done by men in other assemblies of men only. And if the will of God, the law of God, or God, finds any place or recognition at all in the proceedings, it is so altogether in such a subordinate way as to show only so much the more the will of men and the laws of men - *the kingdom of men* - in the place of God.

The plan and order of government of the Federation is professedly patterned after that of the United States. In the Council this was several times mentioned. But like some other things said by the

250

Council, it is not true. In this the Federation is flattering itself with a sheer fallacy and is making an utterly false show. For the sake of the case as it is and as it is to be, this should be made plain.

1. The Federal Government of the United States was originated and accomplished not by the Congress of the United States, nor by the legislatures of the States, but by *the people* the United States.

With the originating or the making of the Federal Government of the churches of the United States, the people of the churches have never had a thing to do. It was the official bodies of the denominations, and these not being instructed by *the people* to do so, who sent delegates to the Conference on Federation in New York City, Nov. 15-21, 1905. When this conference had decided on Federation and had adopted a constitution, what the conference had done was ratified by these same official bodies, and not by *the people* nor by any reference to the people. When this had been done, these, the delegates to the Federal Council in Philadelphia, December 2-9, 1908, were appointed by the *official bodies* of the denominations, without any choice of *the people*, or any reference to *the people*, of the denominations.

Thus instead of the Federal Government of *the churches* being a government of the people of the churches, as the Federal Government of the United States is a government of the people of the United States, it is a government of a hierarchy only, and is hierarchical wholly. And instead of its being patterned after the Federal government of the United States, it is totally unlike, and is another thing altogether.

2. The Federal government of the United States is composed of legislative, executive, and judicial coequal departments, in which the law is supreme.

The government of the Federal council of churches is legislative; executive, and judicial, all in one, in which only the will of the assembled council or its executive committee is supreme.

.3. In the Federal government of the United States the constitution as the supreme law, was framed, not by Congress, nor by the State legislatures, but by a convention of commissioners chosen and sent by the people. When the constitution had been framed by these commissioners of the people, it was then ratified, not by Congress, nor by the State legislatures, but by conventions of men chosen and instructed by the people. Thus the constitution of the United States was, and ever is, the expected will of the people as the supreme law binding and guiding the legislative, executive, and judicial agencies of the government; and these are all subject to *the people*, and are to be called subject to the people, and are to be called to account and corrected by the people, if they disregard the will of the people, as expressed in the supreme law, the written will of the people.

In the government of the Federal Council of Churches, neither the people nor any agencies of the people ever had anything to do with the constitution; their

condition constitution was framed by themselves, to be a "check" upon themselves, and to protect themselves from themselves. And in order that it shall be absolutely subject to themselves, they make ample provision for amendment of it *by themselves* whenever they choose.

And such a centralized, hierarchical, wilful thing as that they will pretend is patterned after the Federal government of the United States that is a government of law, of the people, by the people, and for the people! It is but a figment of hierarchical imagination, and in truth is not patterned after anything in the world - outside of the papal system.

But far worse than this, they think of such a thing as that as the kingdom of God!! It is not even a sensible kingdom of men. But as a kingdom, a government, a rule, of *men in the place of God*, it is very fitting. Under cover of a "constitution" it enables the to assert their own will to the utmost limit, and if anybody calls in question their self-assertion, to throw upon him the odium of "disregard of authority," "opposed to organization," "disrespect for the kingdom of God," "rebellion," "anarchy."

It would seem that if they had any kind of fair idea or just conception of the kingdom of God as the kingdom of

251

*God*, and not of men in the place of God, they ought to be able to think that *God* is King, Sovereign, and Governor, and *is government and laws*, would be all-sufficient in His kingdom, without any of the puny and puerile "laws," or senseless "constitutions," or hierarchical wilful "governments" of *men*; passed off as those of God.

However, when such a system as that is built up and demand is made that it shall be accepted by all the people as the kingdom of God, it certainly is high time that upon the part of all the people there should be a prayerful and devout study of the kingdom of God in truth, as it is revealed in his Word.

Next week we will study the kingdom of God as it is as the kingdom *of God*.

**April 14, 1909**

**"The Kingdom of God" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 15 , pp. 290-292.**

ALONZO T. JONES

THE kingdom of God is that realm and dominion, that place and order of authority and government, in which God is king.

Where God is king the rule, the authority, the power, the law - the whole order of things - is his alone; else it is not the kingdom of God in truth. In the kingdom of God, God is king of all and in all that is there. Where God is king there is no room for any other authority or law or order of things. He is not king in a divided kingdom; no one can serve two masters. In this it is always God manifest in Christ by the Holy Spirit - the Godhead - that is meant.

In the second chapter of Daniel, where in the kingdoms of this world men are seen occupying their little place, playing their little part, and passing away, it is declared that when the kingdom of God shall come all these kingdoms shall be broken to pieces together and become as the chaff of the summer threshing-floor, and the wind carries them away and "no place" is found for them. This makes it plain that where the kingdom of God is there is "no place" for any other.

Again it is written, "Then cometh the end, when he (Christ) shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power." This makes it perfectly plain that where the kingdom of God is, and in the presence of the King, all other rule, all other authority and all other power is "put down." And this is so completely true that the Scripture continues to the effect that when all things shall thus be subdued unto Christ, and all other rule, and all other authority, and all other power, shall have been "put down," "then shall the Son also himself be subject" to the Father, "that God may be all in all."

It is therefore perfectly plain and certain that the kingdom of God and of Christ is indeed "not of this world," and is not like any kingdom or anything that is of this world or in this world. And in this mighty contrast between the kingdom of God, and all kingdoms and things that are of this world or in this world - it is *there* where lies its chiefest benefit and highest blessing.

In the kingdoms, and unto the limitations of the kings, of this world it is impossible for the king to be personally and all the time with each person in his kingdom everywhere and all at once. With the kind of men that the kings in this world have mostly been, this is a blessed good thing for the people. But even if all kings of this world were invariably only good and kind and merciful and wise and humble and companionable, and so would gladly be with each person everywhere and all the time, still it would be impossible because of the essential limitations in his being but a man like other men, and so confined to just one place at a time.

But God, the one time King, is nothing like that. He is infinite in all relations and in all ways. "Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord." He can be, and he is, with each one personally throughout the whole infinity of his universe, and is personally with each individual everywhere, and with all at once, all the time. "I am with you always." "I will hold thy hand"; "I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness"; "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee"; "whither shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend into heaven thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me, even the night shall be light ahead me. The darkness and the light are both alike to thee."

And he is with each one personally everywhere and always, to teach him and to lead him in the way of the kingdom, and to show him the truth and the principles of the kingdom, so that he can be a true and faithful citizen of the kingdom. "I am the Lord thy God that teacheth thee to profit, that leadeth thee in the way that thou shouldest go."

"Thou shalt hear a voice behind thee

saying, This is the way, walk ye in it."

And since he is with each one personally to teach and to guide each one personally in the way that he should go, he does not need in his kingdom a lot of satraps or petty sub-rulers, as in kingdoms of this world. And what does any citizen of the Kingdom need of any sub-ruler between him and the King when he has with him all the time the very King himself? "The Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee. . . . and thou shalt be turned into another man. And let it be, when these signs are come unto thee, that thou do as occasion serve thee; for God is with thee." "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." "And they shall be all taught of God." "The anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie."

Again the kingdom of God is unlike the kingdoms of the world, in that in it there is never any ambition for power, nor strife for place, nor exercise nor assertion of authority, nor exaltation of one over another. "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all." He the true and rightful King, is sole Sovereign, Lord, Ruler, Leader and Commander, in, over, and with, each one and all in the kingdom. And He being first King of Righteousness and after that King of Peace, the Kingdom is ever and always, and in and with all, only "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

In the Kingdom of God, on the part of the Governor the principle of the government is, Government with the consent of the governed. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." "Choose life that ye may live. . . He is thy life." "Whosoever will, let him come." "Behold I stand at the door and knock, if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in." Among all the infinite numbers in the kingdom there will never be one there other than with his own consent. When all shall be finished pertaining to the kingdom, and "every creature that is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them" shall be heard saying, "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever," among them all there can not be found one intelligence who is there without his own consent, in the exercise of his own free choice of the faith of Christ the rightful king.

In the Kingdom of God, as pertains to the governed the principle of the government is, self-government. For when God governs each one only upon his own individual choice and consent, and when each one does thus choose to govern himself by God and in God, this is in the strictest sense self-government. And thus each one governing himself, there is no place for any governing or control of one by another. And so again all that is of the Kingdom and in the Kingdom is only "righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

The Kingdom of God is a kingdom of Spirit and in the Spirit God is King, and "God is Spirit." And "the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God."

God is King over all, and with all, and in all, and he is "the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." Such is the Kingdom of God on the part of the King who is Spirit.

And "the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance (self-control)" - the love of God which is the keeping of the commandments of God, the joy of the Lord which is your strength, the peace of God that passeth all understanding, the longsuffering of the Lord that is salvation, the gentleness of God that makes great, the goodness of God, the faith of Jesus, the meekness of Christ, the self-control by which a man rules his own spirit and is greater than he that taketh a city. Such is the

292

kingdom of God on the part of the citizens of the kingdom of the Spirit.

Therefore, the kingdom of God being all of the Spirit and in the Spirit, and man being of the flesh and in the flesh, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God," but "now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God."

For though it be forever true that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for those who love him," in his kingdom now and evermore, yet it is also true that "God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit." And "ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit: if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you."

"Ask, and ye shall receive." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

**April 21, 1909**

**"The Kingdom of God - II. 'The Kingdom of God Is within You'" *The Medical Missionary* 18, 16 , pp. 308, 309.**

ALONZO T. JONES

MAN was created for the glory of God. God was to be manifest in him. He was to reflect the image and glory of God. God's will was to be done in him as that will is in Him whose the will is. God was to dwell in him, and his whole life and character was to be that of God manifest in the flesh.

Thus in the heart and life of man, God was to be enthroned. All of the rule, all of the authority, all of the power, was to be his through the Spirit, at the ever-responsive will and spirit and the free choice of the man. This was, and was ever to be, the kingdom of God in the man.

But this realm and dominion was surrendered by man to another, and the throne in this kingdom was usurped by another - the wicked one. The rule, the authority, and the power became that of the usurper. The character manifested became that of the wicked one. The law of the kingdom became the law of sin, instead of being the original law of the kingdom - the law of God; the law of sin

and death prevailed, instead of the law of the Spirit of life and righteousness. The kingdom, instead of being the true one of light and liberty, of righteousness and peace and joy, became a kingdom of darkness and bondage, of sin and war and discontent.

In this kingdom there is perpetual war. For no sooner was the kingdom surrendered to the enemy, and the usurper had taken the throne, than the word of God was spoken: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed." This divinely implanted enmity against the evil one, and against his wicked rule, awakens the soul to the consciousness of the evil that reigns in the kingdom of the soul, and to a hatred of the evil and a longing for the reign of the good. This there springs up a war for freedom from the bondage, a struggle for deliverance

309

from the captivity, of this strange and foreign kingdom and dominion.

But it is a war of constant defeat; and so of greater bondage and deeper captivity, of the longing, struggling soul. "For the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin that is in my members."

Thus in the kingdom there is always war, and always defeat; never peace, because there is never victory. Deliverance can never come that way. In that kingdom man is subject to a power that is mightier than he. The man can not break off the power, and the usurper will not yield his rule; he will "not let his prisoners loose homewards."

But O! Soul, be of good cheer. There is deliverance. "The Lord hath laid help upon one that is mighty." Invite in they rightful King: Him "whose right it is" to reign. Welcome Him to His own rightful place in His own native kingdom. Give Him his own place upon His own throne, in His own Kingdom within you. He is asking, knocking, waiting and longing, to come in." Let Him in. "Behold I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in."

Then with the rightful King enthroned, all power is His. "He breaks the cruel power of sin; He sets the prisoner free." He delivers the captive, He "puts down all rule and all authority and power" - all the rule of dark passion, all the authority of evil habit, all this power of sin and of the evil one. All things are put under His feet. He is first King of Righteousness, and after that King of Peace. He reigns in righteousness only. "And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever."

Thus the soul being "delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of his dear Son," the kingdom of God *as the kingdom of God indeed*, with the divine and rightful King enthroned, is "within you." Thus the war of defeat and captivity is over and the good fight of faith proceeds. Peace reigns forever, because the king of righteousness and peace reigns forever; and "he is our peace." In Him there is victory forever. And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even your faith - the faith of Jesus.

This is the kingdom of God with you in truth; the King himself in the kingly place on his throne in his own native kingdom; the law of the kingdom, the holy character of the living king himself: "the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." And as this holy law of the King is made manifest in the kingdom through the eternal Spirit of the eternal King whose the kingdom is; for "the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance."

This is the kingdom of God "come within, and this is the will of God "done" in this his kingdom "on earth as it is in heaven."

This is the kingdom of God indeed "within you," in which, by the reign of Christ, all other rule, all other authority, and all other power, is "put down" and the kingdom is delivered up to God even the Father. and "God is all it all."

And every soul in whom the kingdom of God is thus established can with glad heart and voice join the heavenly chorus "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which are and wast and art to come, because thou hast taken unto thee thy great power and hast reigned."

<sup>1</sup> Synopsis of Bible studies at the Sanitarium, by Elder Alonzo T. Jones.

<sup>2</sup> As relates to *conduct* in matters of 'trespass' or 'fault' of any member, divine instruction and direction are given to the church precisely how to proceed: and this word is to be faithfully followed in letter and in spirit and in the spirit of meekness to 'gain' and to 'restore' such an one, never to judge, to condemn, or to cast off; but as relates to *faith* the church has no divine instruction and therefore no right of procedure - 'not for that we would have dominion over your faith; 'Hast thou faith? have it to thyself, before God;' 'Looking unto *Jesus* the *Author and Finisher of Faith.*'"