



# The King's Highway

An Advocate of Scriptural Holiness

Mrs. Thomas Morgan, Feb. 17

“And an highway shall be there and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness.”

VOL. XXXVIII.

MONCTON, N. B., JANUARY 15TH, 1947

169

## THE REAL CHRIST, ACCORDING TO ST. PAUL

W. Edmund Smith

It is interesting to study the different moods of St. Paul. Like Jesus he revealed his inner feelings and attitudes towards those he addressed in what he said, and wrote. In the first chapter of Philippians, often called his love letter to that church, Paul shows a wonderful magnanimity when discoursing on those who preached a Christ of mere goodwill or of contention supposing to add affliction to his bonds, while others preached a Christ of love, knowing that Paul was set for the defence of the gospel. Paul said what then! Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence or truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea and will rejoice.”

He as much as says: I cannot afford to let my peace of mind be disturbed by trying to straighten out false teachers. I have come to the place that after having given line upon line, and precept upon precept in regard to the person and work of Christ in redemption, I can leave the issue with Him who is more concerned about the truth than I can be.” And besides, the Philippians were so loving, so united in their faith in which they were rooted and grounded, he did not have to give them a strong exhortation on orthodoxy.

But to the church at Galatia! Here was a body of believers torn by dissensions caused by Judeizers who had come in to preach a mongrel gospel. Their teaching threatened to destroy the church. This aroused the apostle and brought from him his strongest denunciation of wrong teaching. Hear what he says: “Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. He as much as says: ‘If I after long absence from you, come back and say to you that I have reconsidered the doctrines I have been preaching and have received new light; I have met the philosophers of Athens and the great teachers of other religions, I have been too radical. I have wanted all the road for my Christ, and in relation to him have been preaching very narrow doctrines. Oh yes! I still believe in Christ and preach Him. But I had crude ideas about the blood that are offensive to the minds of culture. I have even said that there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. I come to you now, oh Galatians, with a broader view. I renounce the narrow dogmas I have been preaching. I would advise you to hold onto Christ as a wonderful teacher, and divine, but only above us all who are divine and the sons of God.’”

Now Paul says if I come back talking this way whittling the gospel down, taking off its

rough edges so obnoxious to the carnal mind, let me be damned with all other compromisers and false teachers.

Yes, this is the same Paul who wrote so tenderly and magnanimously to the Philipians. Can it be the same man? We ask was it the same man who spake so tenderly the words: “Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest,” but who on another occasion broke forth with the fiercest denunciations of the most religious sect of his day, the proud Pharisees! Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites, how shall ye escape the damnation of hell!”

I have been reading a book recently by a great man who has written many books on Christ. He has a holiness background, having been graduated from a holiness college in its embryonic days. His name has become a household word. He is almost apothosized by even the Liberals. In his latest book he is out to seek the unification of all churches, in America at least. Dogma, and that means narrow doctrines, with him are taboo. He wants Christ and his spirit to abound. He has great hope in the young people of the high schools, and colleges. He says he finds them longing for reality and so ready to respond to a same teaching of Christ. I venture to give verbatim his approach to the modern student.

Perhaps it is not amiss to say that I have personally tried the following approach in putting the religious message into public schools. I announce some subject such as ‘What a MODERN person believes,’ and then at the close say something like the following: What do we do about it? WELL, if you are a member of the Jewish faith, I would suggest that you go home and talk to your rabbi and say to him, ‘I’m committed and see what I must do. I am going to give myself to God and the Temple.’ If you have a Roman Catholic heritage, go home and say to your priest: ‘I’m committed. I’m going to give myself to God and to the Church.’ And if you have an evangelical heritage or Protestant heritage, go home and say to your pastor, ‘I’m committed; I’m going to give myself to God and to the church: And then I tell them what they may write in the flyleaf of their Bible as their decision. I have done that in scores of high schools and colleges across the country and never once have I had an unfavorable reaction. The public teacher could teach the Christian faith with its Jewish heritage and background and, then go on and say: “I have taught you these basic ideas and principles, now go home and if you are disposed, identify yourself with the church of your choice — Jewish, Catholic or Evangelical.”

I wonder how such teaching would have struck Paul. How do those so-called Funda-

mentalists feel about it, especially those who believe in the power of the blood to cleanse from the inbeing sin!

What is the weakness of this brother's theology? He preaches Christ, and says let us begin with Christ, but he ignores Christ's background as declared in the Old Testament. He demands a Christ-like God, and says all the severity of the Old Testament is a travesty of the real God, who is a God of love revealed in Christ. It is evident this brother does not believe in the story of Genesis and the Fall of man. He says nothing about the origin of sin or its absolute cure.

This brother could sit down with the proud Brahmins and tell them of what Christ means to him and they tell him the blessedness of their religion, and feel themselves on an equality with him. He got a great hearing of course; he was so broad and patronizing. In a great Methodist conference, a real holiness bishop who had long been in India was speaking. Questions were asked. “Is not S. J. doing a wonderful work in India getting the Brahmins converted by the wholesale?” The Bishop replied kindly but positively: “I’m sure he is getting a great hearing; the Brahmins like to talk on religion, but I have not heard of anyone being really converted.” I heard this myself.

Repudiate doctrines and specific teaching if you will, but it is the gospel of Christ according to the doctrines of Paul that brings real salvation. If some of those who said they “were committed”—Jewish, Catholic or even evangelical—get really and truly converted it would disrupt the whole beautiful wholesale plan to capture the schools and colleges. This is a beautiful sentimentalism, pleasing and acceptable to Unitarians as to all modernists, but it never can bring about a genuine revival. Those students so committed must be the same worldly, godless crowd they were before—dancing, card playing, theatre going, rollicking, cigarette smoking, with no idea of separation from the world or victory over sin. It is awful how men of great gifts fall for popular endorsement and thus escape the shame and reproach of the Cross. This brother can write beautiful devotional literature, helpful and often stimulating. He could go to a holiness camp meeting, but I have not heard of his having become intimately associated with the holiness movement, and give a holiness sermon. But in that paragraph that I have quoted verbatim, we can see his philosophy and method in revival work. It robs the Christian faith of its real dynamic and makes Christ but little better than Gandhi whom so many adore.