

*INTEGRITY is published each month and seeks to encourage all believers in Christ to strive to be one, to be pure, and to be honest and sincere in word and in deed, among themselves and toward all men.*

## Integrity

8494 Bush Hill Court  
Grand Blanc, Michigan 48439

Nonprofit Organization  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Flint, Michigan 48501  
Permit No. 239

---

### THANKSGIVING AND FORGIVING (continued from page 82)

from readers who say they cannot afford to contribute financially to *Integrity* but would like to express their thanks for receiving it. In such cases, thanks, "the exchequer of the poor," is enough. But we would do wrong if we failed to pass this thanksgiving on to other readers who have contributed far beyond the reasonable price of their own subscription and who may not be aware of how God is using them to bless others.

It is also true that our writers, who labor much harder than nonwriters generally realize, have little way of knowing the extent of their helpfulness. Those of us who profit from their burdens could do a lot of good by simply saying so.

We who have the ultimate responsibil-

ity for the production of *Integrity* are keenly aware of our debt, not only to the vital financial contributors, or to the writers without whom there would be no need for money, but also to the countless people who encourage us and pray for us. To—and for—you all we give thanks.

And finally, since you know God's grace, we will venture to ask for your forgiveness—for failing to keep up with our correspondence, for proofreading lapses which damaged literary reputations, for clerical errors, for mistakes in editorial judgment, for critical comments which did not sufficiently reflect our goodwill, and for overlooking hard labors contributed toward our common goal. Please be merciful!

December 1978

# Integrity

---

### Editorial: Thanksgiving and Forgiving

#### Is the Concept of "Restoration" Valid for Today's Bible College?

*C. Barry Willbanks*

#### Instauratio Magna

*W. Carl Ketcherside*

#### Of Dogs and Sheep

*Elton D. Higgs*

#### How the Bible Says

*F.L. Lemley*

DECEMBER, 1978  
Vol. 10, No. 6

Editor-in-Chief  
Hoy Ledbetter

Editorial Board  
David F. Graf  
Joseph F. Jones  
Dean A. Thoroman

Contributing Editors  
S. Scott Bartchy  
Bill Bowen  
Dan G. Danner  
Don Finto  
Don Haymes  
Maurice Haynes  
Elton D. Higgs  
W. Carl Ketcherside  
Norman L. Parks  
Jim Reynolds  
J. Harold Thomas

Subscriptions  
are by written request.  
There is no subscription  
charge (we depend on  
contributions from  
readers and God's  
grace). However,  
contributions are  
necessary for our  
survival. Since we  
are approved by IRS,  
they are deductible.  
Important: Readers  
who fail to notify us  
of address changes  
will be dropped from  
our mailing list.

Available back issues  
can be obtained from  
Amos Ponder,  
1269 Pickwick Place,  
Flint, MI 48507.

Manuscripts  
written exclusively  
for INTEGRITY  
are welcomed.

Mailing Address  
8494 Bush Hill Court  
Grand Blanc, MI 48439

### THANKSGIVING AND FORGIVING

Two of my favorite people in the New Testament are Priscilla (I prefer that form of her name; we gave it to one of our children) and Aquila. They were also highly regarded by Paul, "to whom," said he, "not only I but also all the churches of the Gentiles give thanks." They must have made quite an impact, not only on Paul and Apollos who owed them so much, but on the whole early Christian world.

Sharp students will know that the foregoing reference (Rom. 16:4) is the only one in the entire New Testament wherein the word "to give thanks" (*eucharistein*) is used of giving thanks to men; elsewhere it is reserved for thankfulness toward God. Nevertheless, the need to give thanks to people as well as to God is apparent throughout the Bible.

But our ability to express our gratitude to each other will depend upon our capacity to forgive each other. We may safely assume that even Priscilla and Aquila, despite their virtues, were not totally faultless. While we may be sure that there was in them much more to praise than to pardon, still our attitudinal reference point is not how Paul felt about his fellow workers, but how Christ feels about all sinners. When we see others through the eyes of the Lord, we can easily (though not cheaply) forgive those irritating (and seemingly ubiquitous) brethren who can even make a compliment sound like an insult.

There is a suggestive verbal connection between the Greek words *charis* (grace), *eucharistein* (to give thanks), and *charizesthai* (to forgive). This may be illustrated by the English words *giving*, *thanksgiving*, and *forgiving*. But in the Bible the connection is more than verbal: we both give thanks and forgive in acknowledgment of God's generous gift to us.

As the Bible clearly indicates, Christians, who carry on the work of the incarnation, are vehicles of God's grace. Each of us is unique in the way he enriches others, but God uses us all, and sometimes in ways we are not aware of. With surprising frequency we receive notes

(continued on back cover)

## Is the Concept of "Restoration" Valid for Today's Bible College?

C. BARRY WILLBANKS

*EDITOR'S NOTE: This article is a very unusual presentation made early this year to the board of directors of a college. Since it does not necessarily reflect the viewpoint of the other members of the board, the name of the college has been left out. We are leaving it to our usually astute readers to make their own critical analysis of the article, but it is no reflection on its merits to say that the fact it is done at all makes it of more than casual interest.*

The title of this paper implies a possibility which may seem ludicrous to you. Such is the power of culture. Its norms seem inviolable. Some may actually be; but, if they are, serious men will demand confirmation. Honest men will admit contrary evidence. Before attempting to

make a case for the unworkableness of the concept of "restoration" for today's Bible college, let me affirm what must not be forgotten, if fairness is to be afforded to me personally.

I confess my unqualified conviction that Jesus is Lord. I gladly acknowledge that the scriptures alone provide the normative basis for our practice of this faith.

The ultimate question to which this paper is addressed is, "Does our restoration heritage permit us to exist as a school for the whole Church while maintaining our exegetical convictions, or do we exist intentionally and essentially only for our churches?" To offer an answer, let me ask several focusing questions.

### 1. WHAT IS THE MEANING OF "RESTORATION" IN OUR HERITAGE?

**A. Dual motif.** From the earliest days, there were two aims of the 19th century reformation: (i) the unity of the Church,<sup>1</sup> and (ii) the "restoration" of the "ancient order." There was at once a disgust

with sectarian systems and a yearning for fellowship among all believers using the Bible alone. Yet as a growing emphasis one aim became the ground for the other; the unity was seen as possible only

1. At the beginning the zeal for unity was unsectarian. The ground for it was not doctrinal. For Dr. Abner Jones, a New England pioneer, it was "true piety alone." For Barton Stone, the Kentucky pioneer, it was the Bible alone "without note or comment." For Campbell it was consent to the truth that Jesus is the Christ (later amplified with the requirement of immersion). When Stone wrote the "Last Will

and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery" in 1804, he said, "We will that this body die . . . and sink into union with the Body of Christ at large; for there is but one Body, and one Spirit . . ." In the address which followed he said, "We heartily unite with our Christian brethren of every name . . . which we hope will terminate in the universal spread of the gospel and the unity of the church."

by means of "restoration." It had not always been clear or necessary that such a subordination was required.<sup>2</sup>

The definition of "restoration" was a return to the doctrines, ordinances and fruits of the earliest normative stage of the church as uniformly taught in the scriptures.

**B. Confusion of the plea.** The causes for the confusion are easy to discern. Let me list some.

(i) Scapegoating the creeds. The variant creeds, it seemed, created divisions. Therefore, only by speaking as the Bible speaks could unity be achieved. Or so it was thought (thought in two ways, viz., that we could speak only as the Bible speaks and that if so done unity would inevitably result). But by this formulation unity would have to await agreed conclusions about what the Bible says regarding certain essentials. This whole process put "restoration" at the service of "unity," thus destroying the creative and mutually supportive tension between them.

(ii) Double definition. Alexander Campbell had two definitions of faith. In speaking for unity, "faith" meant confession of the fact of Jesus' messiahship. In speaking of "restoration," "faith" meant an acceptance of the divine testimony in

its full meaning and as regards all subjects which it presents to view. Unfortunately, since "restoration" was the means to unity, this double definition meant that agreement had to be achieved first on the larger definition of "faith" before the smaller definition could be celebrated across party lines in any meaningful way.

(iii) Sacralized selfishness. Psychologically, for the sin-warped human nature, it is easier to focus on and proclaim the meaning of a text with a view to having others agree (and thus unite) than it is to focus on and proclaim unity with a view to having each learn from the other (progressive "restoration"). Thus, the creative tension of the two aims was relaxed so that the full potential of neither could be reached.

(iv) Results. The movement divided between those who have opted for unity (sometimes at the expense of any continued interest in New Testament norms) and those who opted for "restoration" with only lip-service to practical unity. A humble process was replaced with proud but competitive achievements.

**C. Strict constructionists.** By turning the scriptures into a political document, some believers have become strict constructionists, like constitutional lawyers. The positive goals are turned into hostile weapons. The "come with us" attitude is replaced by a "come to us" mentality. This is done by rational maneuvers which use scripture mixed with inference, assumption, ignorance, and meanness of spirit to segregate and protect believer from believer. Here is an example of how this works:

The New Testament gives us a picture of the church. . . . That is, the term "ecclesia" referred to something definite in the New Testament day. Its meaning was established. . . . Something else is not the church (H.W. Ford, *A History of the Restoration Plea*, Okla. City: Semco Color Press, 1952, p. 197).

This unchallengeable statement merely says that a word has one meaning. Granted. Yet words are used connotatively as well as denotatively. The term "ecclesia" refers to *someones*, not merely *something*. To presume that any group fully embodies all the denotative characteristics of the word "church" only sets them up for pride and exclusiveness.

People should never be replaced by brittle rationalized definitions. In scripture, people with warts and all are, as the church, called to become all they are meant to be. To use the ultimate "to be" to cancel all the faith and effort in "becoming" is senseless rationalism which ignores the spirit of scripture.

Another hermeneutically fragile example of the strict constructionist's manner of thinking is his assumption that the scriptural conditions upon which the promise of forgiveness may be claimed are also conditions without which grace cannot be granted by God or man.

It is a big jump, however, from the understandable responsibility to preach and practice the sacramental acts as we understand them, to excluding from our fellowship (although we in our congregations inconsistently give them communion as an act of fellowship yet deny them any privileges in the legal matter of voting; thereby, a state-required by-law for membership overrides a spiritual principle of love and fellowship) those who are unconvinced about either the strict constructionist process or its conclusions.

The parables of the vineyard (Mt. 20), the field with tares and wheat (Mt. 13) and the fishnet (Mt. 13) should caution us against doing the winnowing which belongs to God alone. The plain truth is: there is no scripture by which we may exclude the pious unimmersed (as a case in point), since the command to be immersed was issued to those making a conversion rather than to those holding a "mistaken" practice of the act of expressing conversion to Christ. Surely the conversion to

Christ should be acknowledged before (both temporally and in terms of value) the means by which it is expressed.

The hermeneutical law of opposition requires us not to apply any promise negatively (e.g., the unimmersed cannot be forgiven) unless that is clearly and necessarily the contrast before the author's mind. For example, if I say, "Come on in and I'll give you a coke," that does not require that I deny someone a coke if he does not or cannot come in. The attitude of the speaker may very well make a strict constructionist's interpretation hostile to the speaker as well as the listener/reader.

**D. The formulas have failed.** The double plea has failed. The separate pleas have failed.

(i) The plea for unity. "In essentials unity; in non-essentials liberty; in both charity." That was an early way of pronouncing the plea for unity. It has been a historical failure. By essentials Alexander Campbell meant "things necessary to be believed or done to receive salvation." Concretely, the "things" were belief in one fact (Jesus is the Messiah) and submission to one act (immersion). On this basis he could accept a universalist and a unitarian as a brother (while disagreeing with the ideas of each). He would not take communion with the Baptist or pedo-baptist, however. This kind of legalism remains a blot on our spirit. When the expression of faith is reduced to a single act, the whole of many believers' lives is cancelled as nothing. This is a curious stance when even the most legalistic mind agrees that without faith the act of even immersion is nothing. How is it, then, that faith without the act is also nothing? (Nothing plus nothing is nothing!)

(ii) The plea for restoration. The plea sought to replace creeds with the Bible alone. This plea, as a means to the other (unity), was psychologically a hoax. It aimed at replacing creeds by a creed (the Bible understood as we understand

it). What is a creed but a statement of what someone believes the Bible says? Thus, by aiming at unity *via* the Bible properly understood, the reformers simply amplified the potential for division, since the Bible is bigger and expands the volume of considerations to be at variance over. Is it not clear that the Bible is no more a guarantee of unity than creeds?

If there is any validity to the plea for restoration, it is as an attitude open to wholesome relationships with all believers and to change of interpretation while we share in learning together with others. As

## 2. IS THE CONCEPT OF RESTORATION, AS HISTORICALLY DEFINED, A NEW TESTAMENT ONE?

The answer is no. The evidence and supportive argument require more space, but at least you know where the following paragraphs will be aimed.

**A. New Testament word study.** We have made a lot of to-do about speaking as the Bible speaks. Perhaps we should start with our pet words.

(i) Restoration (*apokatastasis*), meaning a setting in order again, is used in Acts 3:21 of the work of God to be achieved throughout the Christian era and completed only at the return of Christ (*achri* in 3:21 is a characteristic Lukan word expressing duration of time). The restoration, then, is God's and has been continuing since at least the days of John the Baptist. Therefore, it is not our idea or achievement. Since it is what the prophets spoke of, it cannot refer to specific ordinances and institutional forms which did not yet exist. You cannot preach restoration of things which do not yet exist! Therefore, the restored reality cannot have anything to do with the primary emphasis of what we labor at as "restoration." John the Baptist came to restore relationships to their uncorrupted nature before the fall. He came to turn hearts to hearts. He came to make people, by the Spirit of

soon as the plea becomes a set of conclusions to which others must convert, it is destructive of the very purpose for which it is urged. How can the whole body be edified by its diverse members if they are segregated by some principle smaller than faith in Jesus Christ?

It appears, then, that the plea for unity and the plea for restoration have failed in their intentions. Why? Because some degree of intellectual consensus about scripture's essentials was urged as the foundation of unity and restoration rather than as their capstone.

God, once again a blessing to each other.

(ii) Restore (*katartizō*), meaning to mend or return (a thing) to its proper relationship or condition, is used in Galatians 6:1 metaphorically. The believer overtaken in a sin is to be "restored" as a dislocated member of the body. The tense of the verb shows it is a process necessitating patient perseverance. Again the meaning focuses on a loving relationship, not on forms of expressing faith.

(iii) Restore (*apokathistēmi*), a verbal form of (i), refers to the ministry of John the Baptist. He came to restore all things (Mt. 17:11) but was not warmly received because that meant a change of mind (repentance). Surely his restoring was again relational rather than formal. (See Mal. 4:6; Mk. 1:4.) Jesus is promised the same reception given to John, because he came for the same purpose, as well as the power to effect restoration (Mt. 17:11).

(iv) It appears that the biblical terms refer to a process of purifying our relationships with God and people. This is the work of God which climaxes only in the *Eschaton* when Christ returns to glorify us. The vision of the first believers was to the future and its completed perfection of each believer, rather than to the past as an unvarying model of all times.

This envisioned perfection or maturity (*teleiōtēta* in Heb. 6:1) was to be measured by nothing less than full maturity (*teleion* in Eph. 4:13) of Christ himself. Notice that Christ, rather than the scriptures, is the canon of restoration.

With this biblical theology in view, it is clear that the perfection is God's once-and-for-all eschatological gift which we are in the process of now receiving by the mutual ministry of persons whose spiritual gifts help "perfect" us (see Eph. 4:7-13).

One of the errors of first-century Gnostics was in proclaiming that this eschatological reality was a historical possession. They said the resurrection was already past (1 Cor. 15:12; 2 Tim. 2:18). Do we not commit the same mistake by saying the restoration is achieved while withholding ourselves from brotherly relationships with other believers? Biblically, the resurrection and the restoration have their perfection in the future.

Restoration and perfection, both biblical terms, are two ways of pointing to the one state of being which existed once before the Fall and will exist again in Christ in the End. The only restoration, renewal or perfection spoken of in the New Testament refer to the solidarity of the people in their likeness to God (see Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10).

This New Testament theology makes it a poor stewardship of words to think of "restoration" as a call to any time, condition, or pattern of relationships which is not like that before the fall or after the final resurrection. Certainly any observation of people will verify historically and concretely that restoration in its biblical definition is a not-yet reality.

**B. Inferences for judgments.** The usage of the phrase "restoration of the ancient order," meaning apostolic practices, requires us not only to depart from sound New Testament theology, but it forces us to use hermeneutical inferences to make negative judgments on others for whom Christ died. Since the New Testament

was not written to our denominational situation (don't brush this fact aside as irrelevant), it is not clear that our inferences and deductions (usually made by winking at the law of opposition) have any authority at all over persons who are the servants of Another.

(i) There is no clear example in the New Testament of a disfellowshipping occurring on the basis of a doctrinal difference. No clear case can be cited of an exclusion from communion due to even a clear doctrinal misunderstanding. Examples do exist where persons were censured and disciplined for withdrawing from others (Gal. 2; Rom. 16). The fundamental problem is relational, not doctrinal.

There are episodes of a believer being instructed more perfectly in the matter of baptism (Acts 18), but no inference is given that, had he been unconvinced at the time, he would have been stripped of his spiritual privileges.

(ii) The example of a Christian believer instructing a disciple of John the Baptist is of another kind. This was clearly a call for a change of ultimate allegiance (see Acts 19).

**C. The nature of the scriptures.** While believers are encouraged to remember and obey the words of Jesus (Acts 20:35) and the apostles (1 Cor. 7:25; 2 Cor. 10:8), it is form-critically<sup>3</sup> clear that the words and deeds of Jesus were not always preserved unaltered. They were shaped and

3. Let me try to explain form criticism and redaction criticism by way of an illustration. A mountain stream bed is covered with rocks. The larger ones are in the center where the rush is greatest. Other rocks feathering out to sand are at the outer sides. The rocks are tumbled smooth by the years of movement in and by the water. So also the memories of Jesus.

For years these memories were passed along orally in bits and pieces by teachers and preachers and eyewitnesses. Now if the process of oral transmission, which continued for several decades before written compositions were made, could be compared to the flowing stream and the several memories of Jesus—the individual

applied to the situation at hand. All that was intended was to be true to the spirit of Jesus. Again *Christ is the canon* to which the scriptures alone can bear witness. Our need is to try to live by the spirit of Jesus as it is reflected in the memories of apostles which they shaped to their own needs.

**D. The nature of the apostolic church.** He who says Bible says church. The Bible came to us as the selected productions of the church. Yet in reading the church's own works we find no overbearing uniformity in its normative practices. The assumption of uniformity in the church's normative practices is not supported by the work of any scholar of Christian origins known to me. (See sample: *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, James D.G. Dunn, London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1977.) This diversity of doctrinal expression and congregational polity, etc., shows that the thrust of the efforts of the early church was to preserve the memory of Jesus in a way that permitted a living faith in every new situation, rather than simply to preserve unaltered the raw data

sayings and stories—to the tumbling rocks in the stream, we can perhaps understand the process of shaping and sorting that occurred.

Some memories would be lost, like the sand cast aside by the rushing waters. One of the gospels confesses that many things Jesus did were not written (Jn. 20:31); they were forgotten from the tradition. Those that were preserved were kept to serve the interest of faith as applied to some particular situation which motivated the composition.

Not only were some memories lost, but the ones transmitted were shaped and smoothed to perform particular functions—evangelism, defense against Jewish competitors, instruction of new converts, worship, etc. These shaped pieces of the tradition were collected for specific new situations. The way they were collected (best seen by the obvious editorial remarks especially between the recognizable pieces of the tradition) is called redaction. Redaction criticism, then, seeks to find the purpose of the author, while form criticism seeks to discover the older purpose of the pieces of tradition which had already been shaped to be useful for the church.

of his life or a set of unalterable historical norms with saving significance.

**E. The nature of the sacraments.** While we have no justification for deliberately changing the sacraments, our main intention should be to preserve their intention and to recognize that intention in the lives of all believers. Clearly the fundamental purpose of baptism and communion as well as the Lord's Day was to witness to and preserve faith in Jesus Christ as the crucified and risen Lord who forgives and saves. By overshadowing this intention with an emphasis on the alleged absolute forms, these symbols of our unity in Christ have been transformed into instruments of our attitudinal division. Refusal has replaced reconciliation.

This is achieved in part by ignoring again the law of opposition. Let me give an example. Paul's celebration of our "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one hope . . ." was not offered intentionally as a means of excluding believers who had an imperfect understanding or practice of their faith. For us to use them in that way is unlike the spirit of God. God excludes when faith is unbelief, when the Spirit is blasphemed, and when Christ is crucified afresh. Those errors are surely of a different class than holding to Christian practices which only imperfectly signify our faith (objectively) yet express our subjective confidence authentically.

**F. Conclusion.** Because the historical definition and practice of restoration are uncanonical in the highest sense, they must be judged as graceless perversions. No wonder they have failed. No wonder we convince ourselves to act otherwise in practical matters in spite of our hostile theology.

In our churches we enroll people to attend the seminars of Gothard and Schaeffer. We sing from "their" hymnals, subscribe to "their" periodicals, study from "their" textbooks, support "their" Bible societies, and send our students to "their" seminaries. As a college we even join and

submit to the standards of "their" accrediting associations. We somehow recognize

everything about "them" except the faith which makes them our brothers.

### 3. WHAT IS OUR PRESENT CALLING?

Clearly our heritage with noble intentions has been bogged down in unbiblical definitions of its ultimate purpose and in sectarian attitudes. Our college has made its sectarian character known too by its credal Articles of Incorporation and "denominational" Board of Directors. New directions are needed. I propose the following:

**A. Abandon our unbiblical, unproductive platform.** The intentions of the restoration fathers were honest and honorable. The application to which they put them, however, was steadily more-and-more geared towards sectarianism. The results have been consistent with the application.

**B. Deliberately acknowledge a wider fellowship.** We should not shut ourselves off from the contributions we can receive from and give to others who revere Christ as Lord. In a community of diverse churches we can be a unifying element.

**C. Broaden our staff's affiliations.** This should not be done willy-nilly but consistent with standards of competence in the needed fields of instruction and service. Those chosen should also be demonstrably unsectarian in their interpretations and undenominational in attitude. I would be glad, as an expedient matter, to select only those who practice immersion for instruction in the New Testament, but I would not be agreeable to automatically excluding any believer because of his affiliation and/or experiential expression of the faith. Charismatics, for example, need not be seen as unworthy if they are unsectarian.

Good education requires exposure to various points of view. Good Christian education should not limit itself to part of the brotherhood but seek to guarantee a broad fellowship of believers whose faith and love are real. Otherwise we may

only communicate well our ideas while failing at the greater gift of exhibiting a full-orbed spirit. Rationalism can eat up grace. Ideas can eliminate persons. Dreadful!

I agree with a once expressed attitude of Alexander Campbell. He said that he could not say that all the unimmersed are pagans, since it was a simple mistake rather than a voluntary renunciation of the institution. If they have erred, he said, "I may err more in judging and treating them as pagans." Indeed they may have the praise of God by submitting their spirits as they have.

**D. Remember the Biblical concept of restoration.** It is not achievement. It is not formal. It is not backward in its vision. It is a gift of God. It is relational. It looks to the future for its perfected state. Any other view, like cheap grace, offers little to admire and less to hope for.

**E. A modest proposal.** That we might minister intentionally to the larger Church without losing ourselves, I suggest the following:

(i) Modify our by-laws to choose all administrators and faculty and board members according to (a) a nonsectarian understanding of the value of the Christian churches as we know them, (b) faith in Jesus as Savior and Lord, (c) confidence in the scripture to give normative guidance in the understanding and practice of this faith, and (d) commitment to the creative and transdenominational tension between the goals of unity of believers and biblical restoration of our likeness to God in all our relationships.

(ii) Recruit as widely as we can to make opportunities for ourselves by this wider stance.

**F. Consequences.** Even the most evolutionary transition in this direction would bring some misunderstanding and rejection.

tion. The school should not forever be stifled by those congregations and board members with the narrowest concept of fellowship. If congregations or board members or staff cannot in good conscience agree with a more inclusive attitude/association (provided a majority of the board can in good conscience), then their resignations can be accepted with regret.

We must not be indifferent to the denominations as are some evangelicals. We must not merge with them as some liberals. We must not exclude them as some fundamentalists. But we must love and share with them as transdenominationalists with a zeal for speaking as the Bible speaks (as God gives us ears to hear it) and for hearing the Bible speak (as God gives others mouths to proclaim it).

Without this association we are doomed to wear the reputation of misapplying biblical principles and teaching baptismal regeneration. This is how we are seen. Surely history shows no instance of a reformation being effected in a group from which the reformers have withdrawn themselves.

## FINAL REMARKS

Clearly we are not unified now in

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

*How do we regard diversity in doctrinal approaches to fellowship? That is, what is essential? How do we determine what is/is not essential?*

For us to believe we can decide essentials puts us in the driver's seat. Cushioning that presumptiveness by claiming we merely speak where the Bible speaks cannot be heard any way but arrogantly. Let us recognize all who, by their own claim, recognize Jesus as Lord. From among these, let's choose some who can offer competent biblical, historical or practical instruction with a transdenominational attitude. What is essential to me is that I

many ways. Our eschatological theories; our assumptions about women-in-the-church; our understandings of polity, election, and the Holy Spirit; our conceptions about the literalness of biblical language; our counsel regarding divorce, abortion, pacifism, tongues; and many other differences abound. Some are Calvinists. Others are Arminians. Some do not know the difference or care. So why must we segregate ourselves from the whole Christian world by self-deceptively assuming we are the "New Testament Church" and that our baptism is the *sine qua non* of true Christian faith. Consistency, like sinlessness, is a goal to be pursued, not a standard to be imposed. He who would so impose would thereby himself depose.

There will always be a tension between serving Christ and serving a particular group of his followers. The tension is between theological ideals and political realities. Our political radars begin to blip impending dangers when we venture out too far with high-minded theological principles. Our theological radars begin to blip when we narrow our attentions to ourselves. I would rather live with less theological blipping in me, and if need be, more political blipping. The balance has been too far the other way. □

not ignore anyone who claims to love and trust Jesus, regardless of how inconsistent or screwy his exegetical ideas may be. What is important, if not essential, is that I demonstrate the virtue of unity by seeking to learn from others in an actual working fellowship.

*How do we determine the degree of adherence to what we personally understand to be sound doctrine that we will require of others?*

As far as a staff position at our school, I would suggest the following: (i) a commitment to Jesus as Lord; (ii) a commitment to teach and practice the normative

principles of scripture as he/she understands them and in a transdenominational manner; (iii) be willing to learn from others as well as teach others in a fellowship of Christian scholars.

*How does diversity affect the life of a church and how does it affect the life of the churches in a given area or of an entire religious group?*

A very perceptive question. The political radar blips when the theological ideals are too radically practiced. The answer, however, lies in whether the churches value (or can be taught to value) actual demonstrated unity with diversity. Some would so value it. Some wouldn't. There are plenty of solid examples both ways. Plenty of churches support Biola, Westmont, Wheaton, Moody, John Brown, Fuller, etc. And each denomination has its own schools. Having attended some of the inclusive ones, I know the latitude included Calvinists, Arminians, and various denominations with diverse practices of baptism/communion. To those with some openness, a more inclusive position could be communicated in two ways: *theologically* (we really do stand for unity of believers committed to scripture, without uniformity of interpretation) and *practically* (we really do want the best education for our students, and the best requires diversity and open loving relationships).

*Do the churches of the restoration heritage hold biblical and/or historical distinctives that must be preserved through the educational processes of our school?*

Yes. Students need competent *representation* of our heritage. This preservation (via representation) need not imply a monopolistic or isolationist arrangement. I would prefer a mingling of ideals held by representatives of several heritages where each can model before the others (as well as students and churches) his individual strength.

*Is our school preparing a leadership ministry for the whole church or only for those congregations of the restoration heritage?*

Both. Neither as effectively as possible. A large minority of students come from denominations other than our own. They profit (as we would all agree!) from their

association with us. They and we could profit even more by having a more wholesome concept of Christianity actually modeled on campus by a united faculty of diverse affiliations. After all, *that* is the real church.

*Should our school be avowedly interdenominational (as Biola or Moody) or remain within the restraints of biblical interpretation and cultural traditions of "our people"?*

The school should be avowedly *Christian*. To be that means to recognize those who confess Jesus as Lord. One does not need to be against our people/traditions to be for other people. Why choose from an either/or set of options? Its philosophy should be transdenominational, although due to the frailty of man, its staff would be "interdenominational" as far as their Sunday attendance is concerned.

*Should the faculty of our school reflect a more diverse evangelical religious experience and training through the employment of qualified professors from churches outside the restoration heritage?*

Other things being equal, yes. In some areas especially would this be true. In general our schools and churches have not produced strong Old Testament scholars, Christian educators, practical ministry specialists, and apologists. Naturally we do better at New Testament and restoration history. So, if competence and a transdenominational attitude were better exhibited in someone from outside our circles than from someone from within, I would not hesitate to choose the outsider (if so crude a term can be permitted for a brother).

*Should our school actively recruit students from churches and congregations beyond the restoration heritage to diversify and enlarge the student body, or should we concentrate our recruiting efforts on those of the Christian Church and Churches of Christ?*

Philosophically, I would say diversity. Practically, we have very few contacts for admission into other churches, camps, etc. Recruitment in other groups won't be fully possible until we are willing to accept others to our staff, board, etc. □

## Instauratio Magna

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

Saint Louis, Missouri

Among a number of large books I have recently read was a biography of Sir Francis Bacon. I had long been intrigued by this philosopher who occupied such a prominent place in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, James I and Charles I. Never one to dream little dreams, he was the author, among other works, of *Novum Organum*, of which King James said, "It is like the peace of God, which passes all human understanding." It was the second book in a never-completed greater thesis which Bacon called *Instauratio Magna*, a review and encyclopedia of all knowledge.

Instauration is from a word meaning to renew. It means "restoration after decay or lapse." *Instauratio Magna* means great renewal or restoration. *Novum Organum* helped imbue science with a spirit of unbiased and accurate observation. Bacon maintained that all prejudices and preconceived attitudes must be abandoned. He designated these as "idols" because their maintenance came between the minds of men and their attainment of truth. There were "idols of the tribe," which were the common property of the race due to common methods of thought; there were "idols of the cave," representing the peculiar possession of the individual. There were "idols of the market place," which arose from too great a trust in or dependence upon language. There were "idols of the theater," representing tradition.

I am one of the minor heirs of a magnificent attempt to introduce an *Instauratio Magna*, a great renewal or restoration after centuries of lapse, into a fragmented and ripped-off religious world. It never

became as great as it should have, or could have, because it lost its way. By the third generation it was accumulating prejudices and preconceptions. These became idols which took the mind off God and centered on leaders and their ideas. It was born in the Second Great Awakening, but forgot its purpose and began to worship itself.

Although there is a great deal of disagreement, I see definite signs that the western world is moving toward a Third Great Awakening. It will spill over into the Orient this time. Russia will be affected. China will have to reckon with it. The one great thing which deters it now is the division among the believers. The world will not be won to believe in Jesus until those who believe in Jesus are one. So said our King and so I believe.

This is the time when believers in His Lordship should be waging peace as others wage war. It must not be a Baptist thrust, or a Church of Christ thrust, or an Assembly of God thrust. All such attempts would be sectarian. They would be dedicated to bringing men to us instead of to Jesus. We must really begin to believe that one can be a Christian and a Christian only. Not a Baptist Christian. Not a Church of Christ Christian. Not a Christian Church Christian. If we can get the sectarian lead out of our shoes we can be ready to march for conquest of the world.

The world is crying for renewal. Renewal can only come by recovery of that which has become lost, distorted or obscured. Renewal through recovery of the apostolic proclamation, purpose and pow-

er. This is the kind of thing which will earn the approval of every disciple of Jesus, regardless of the sect in which he has been reared. This does not mean the formation of another sect containing the pure. It means purging every sect by the Word until it is no longer a sect. The party spirit can be eliminated just as any other sin can be washed away in the blood of the Son of God.

It is obvious that we should begin with ourselves. We must cast our exclusiveness, our "better-than-thou" attitudes, our prejudices and preconceptions to the moles and bats. We must start to lift up holy hands without wrath and doubting and not offer Pharisaical prayers of self-adulation and congratulation. We can be the nucleus for an *Instauratio Magna*, a great new movement of renewal. □

### OF DOGS AND SHEEP

(Matt. 15:21-28)

"Dog" could not deter me,  
For I knew I was not a sheep.  
But this Shepherd of another flock  
Could not bestow such richness  
On His own, without surplus  
That they could not consume.  
Surely there was room  
For David's Son to care  
For a child not David's heir.  
And who, in need of His touch,  
Would stand on pride?  
I begged not children's bread,  
But only as much of the crumbs  
As would make my daughter whole.  
Even the leavings of the feast He spread  
Were more than I could demand.

And yet I have heard  
That the bread itself by some is spurned.  
Dogs may be turned into sheep  
By the touch of His hand;  
Demons will have no haven  
In Canaanite land,  
For needy dogs will come  
To take from faithless sheep  
Both bread and crumbs.

—Elton D. Higgs

## How the Bible Says

F.L. LEMLEY

Bonne Terre, Missouri

The Restoration Movement produced the idea that the Bible teaches in three ways: by plain statement or command, by approved example, and by necessary inference. This no one denies, for it is true; but we get things twisted at times. To apply this truth in such a way as to make it say, "The Bible *enjoins* in three ways: by a plain statement or command, by approved example, or by necessary inference," is false through and through.

In the first place, not all plain statements are imperatives. No example in and of itself constitutes a mandate, and no necessary inference is from God, but is human through and through. There is a vast difference between learning and in binding the thing learned upon the whole brotherhood as a condition of salvation.

We learn about Paul's missionary journeys by reading the plain facts set forth in his report, but to make such journeys a condition of salvation for all Christians would be a bit absurd. Examples may serve to illuminate a command, as in Acts 8:38-39, but standing alone, examples are powerless. Many of them only reflect the convenient expedient available to the people of the time, as, for example, meeting in the upper room in Acts 20. What one may call a "necessary inference" may not appear necessary to his brother at all. We have no essential doctrine that depends upon inference alone or upon example standing alone. For essentials there is always some form of an imperative, as, for example, when Paul said to the jailor, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved . . ." (Acts 16:31). Not all plain commands are imperatives.

A command plus an approved example does not always constitute a mandate. For example, Jesus sent his disciples, say-

ing, "Go teach all nations . . ." (Mt. 28:18-20). In Luke 4, Acts 2, and numerous other places, we find Jesus and the disciples teaching by addressing all present in one undivided assembly. Does this constitute a mandate on how the teaching is to be done? Several good and sincere brethren think so, but the correct answer is *No!* Let us not exceed the bounds of hermeneutical integrity by attributing to the Bible an authority that is actually our own. □

### SAINT LOUIS FORUM

The annual Saint Louis Forum, which seeks to bring together for discussion, representatives of all segments of the restoration movement, will be held at Saint Louis Christian College, 1360 Grandview Drive, Florissant, Missouri 63033, December 28, 29. The opening session will begin at 2:00 p.m. on December 28, and will be followed by another session that night, and three sessions on December 29.

Questions for discussion are: What is woman's role in the home and the church according to the scriptures? On what grounds should believers who come to us from denominational groups be rebaptized? What do the scriptures require of congregations faced with racial and ethnic differences? Is our modern affluent lifestyle compatible with the Christian faith? Two speakers will address each of these questions for forty minutes each and will then submit to questions from the audience for forty minutes. There will be a session in which any person present may speak briefly on the topic, "What is unity in Christ and how may it be obtained?"

Housing may be secured in motels in the vicinity of the school. For further information write Charles Boatman at the school address or call him at 314/741-9898. You are invited to attend and have your confidence in brotherhood and fellowship restored. —WCK

## LETTERS

### A Reply to Bess Stinson

I am persuaded that if Bess B. Stinson better understood the nature of the judicial process and the history of constitutional law, she would still be solidly behind the ERA. Her letter in the September issue reveals a crucial misunderstanding of the "equal protection" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

What she apparently does not realize is that the Supreme Court has never extended this clause to cover the broad category of sex, nor is it likely to do so in the foreseeable future. Hence the urgent need for the ratification of the ERA. Contrary to her assumption, protection against discrimination because of sex is not in the Constitution.

It is true that Congress has extended some protection to women against discrimination in employment and wages through the commerce clause and its spending power. However, this protection does not extend to women outside interstate commerce or where federal dollars are not involved. Moreover, these are just laws which can be repealed or inadequately enforced. Tens of millions of women have no protection whatever against discrimination because of their sex. What is crucially important is a blanket guarantee of protection to all women.

Ms. Stinson finds the "equal protection" clause the basis for banning state prayers in the public schools, "abortion on demand," and "innumerable others." This is hysterical nonsense. The banning of state-written prayers from the schools rests on the First Amendment bar against establishment of religion by the state. Its decisions on abortion do not rest on the equal protection clause. This clause was adopted in 1868. It was never successfully invoked until 1954 in the *Brown* case, and it has been used almost entirely to protect the civil liberties of the blacks, for whom it was put into the Constitution in the first place. What she laments—23 "equal protection" cases on the 1977 Supreme Court docket—civil libertarians applaud. Cases should continue to be there un-

til the last vestige of discrimination because of race is eliminated.

Ms. Stinson proposes that instead of adopting the ERA, each state should enact a special law barring each particular form of discrimination. Multiply this by fifty states and count the endless kinds of discrimination that have been invented and will be invented, and one would have a nightmare of voluminous legislation beyond the capacity of mortal man to grasp. It would be necessary for the states to act since there are vast areas of life beyond the reach of Congress. Add to this the necessity for the courts to interpret each law and we add to the volume and the confusion.

It would be a very foolish Congress to attempt to name all of our "rights" and put them into the Constitution. Old rights may fade away, such as freedom from the quartering of troops in one's home. New rights are discovered as society changes and needs change. Each generation revalues its rights and counts its freedoms. Sometimes it may be necessary to list a crucial one in the Constitution, such as the right to vote. Others we find it best to leave in the body of Constitutional Law. But when any society fails to protect its rights and abandons the judicial process to assert them, it is moving toward slavery. I think the ERA, if ratified, will spawn a spate of cases. It should. And as to Ms. Stinson's fear of not having final definitions of the words in the ERA, we should rejoice in the fact that great words escape obsolescence by interpretation, so that our Constitution grows and changes to meet society's needs. Else it would have to be replaced every decade with a new one. If Ms. Stinson thinks that the ERA wording is "vague," just what would she do with such great words as "faith," "grace," and "worship" in the Bible?

NORMAN L. PARKS  
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

### What Happens in Baptism

Concerning the recent articles on baptism in *Integrity* I would like to express these thoughts: Those who believe and are baptized will be saved because that is what baptism is for, the remission of sins. The believer is baptized into Christ's death even though he may not know that is what happened when he was baptized into Christ Jesus.

DOUGLAS SMITH  
Pampa, Texas