

Chapter 1 : Exposition of the Doctrines of Grace

The South Carolina Exposition and Protest, also known as Calhoun's Exposition, was written in December by John C. Calhoun, then Vice President of the United States under John Quincy Adams and later under Andrew Jackson.

In the early s, some discussion arose among Church members about the roles of God the Father and Jesus Christ. The First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles issued the following in to clarify the meaning of certain scriptures where Jesus Christ, or Jehovah, is designated as the Father. It is thought that a printing of this statement will be helpful to members as they study the Old Testament this year. The scriptures plainly and repeatedly affirm that God is the Creator of the earth and the heavens and all things that in them are. In the sense so expressed, the Creator is an Organizer. So also life is eternal, and not created; but life, or the vital force, may be infused into organized matter, though the details of the process have not been revealed unto man. For illustrative instances see Gen. Each of these scriptures states that God breathed into the body of man the breath of life. See further Moses 3: Each of the four significations specified in the following treatment should be carefully segregated. Elohim is the Father in every sense in which Jesus Christ is so designated, and distinctively He is the Father of spirits. Thus we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews: In view of this fact we are taught by Jesus Christ to pray: Jesus Christ is the Son of Elohim both as spiritual and bodily offspring; that is to say, Elohim is literally the Father of the spirit of Jesus Christ and also the body in which Jesus Christ performed His mission in the flesh, and which body died on the cross and was afterward taken up by the process of resurrection , and is now the immortalized tabernacle of the eternal spirit of our Lord and Savior. God is not the Father of the earth as one of the worlds in space, nor of the heavenly bodies in whole or in part, not of the inanimate objects and the plants and the animals upon the earth, in the literal sense in which He is the Father of the spirits of mankind. Therefore, scriptures that refer to God in any way as the Father of the heavens and the earth are to be understood as signifying that God is the Maker, the Organizer, the Creator of the heavens and the earth. That Jesus Christ, whom we also know as Jehovah, was the executive of the Father, Elohim, in the work of creation is set forth in the book Jesus the Christ, chapter 4 [by James E. Jesus Christ, being the Creator, is consistently called the Father of heaven and earth in the sense explained above; and since His creations are of eternal quality He is very properly called the Eternal Father of heaven and earth. Following are a few of the scriptures illustrating this meaning. In fervent prayer offered just prior to His entrance into Gethsemane, Jesus Christ supplicated His Father in behalf of those whom the Father had given unto Him, specifically the Apostles, and, more generally, all who would accept and abide in the gospel through the ministry of the Apostles. I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. Salvation is attainable only through compliance with the laws and ordinances of the gospel; and all who are thus saved become sons and daughters unto God in a distinctive sense. In many instances the Lord had addressed men as His sons e. That by obedience to the gospel men may become sons of God, both as sons of Jesus Christ, and, through Him, as sons of His Father, is set forth in many revelations given in the current dispensation. I am the life and the light of the world. To Orson Pratt the Lord spoke through Joseph the seer, in Consider also the following given in In a revelation given through Joseph Smith in March we read: Behold, I say unto you, that when his soul has been made an offering for sin he shall see his seed. And now what say ye? And who shall be his seed? And now, are they not his seed? In tragic contrast with the blessed state of those who become children of God through obedience to the gospel of Jesus Christ is that of the unregenerate, who are specifically called the children of the devil. Note the words of Christ, while in the flesh, to certain wicked Jews who boasted of their Abrahamic lineage: Thus Satan is designated as the father of the wicked, though we cannot assume any personal relationship of parent and children as existing between him and them. A combined illustration showing that the righteous are the children of God and the wicked the children of the devil appears in the parable of the tares: Men may become children of Jesus Christ by being born anew—born of God, as the inspired word states: For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Those who have been born unto God through obedience to the gospel

may by valiant devotion to righteousness obtain exaltation and even reach the status of godhood. Of such we read: Yet though they be gods, they are still subject to Jesus Christ as their Father in this exalted relationship; and so we read in the paragraph following the above quotation: This solemn truth is further emphasized in the words of the Lord Jesus Christ given through Joseph Smith in An analogous instance of sonship attained by righteous service is found in the revelation relating to the order and functions of priesthood, given in This is true of Christ in His preexistent, antemortal, or unembodied state, in the which He was known as Jehovah; also during His embodiment in the flesh; and during His labors as a disembodied spirit in the realm of the dead; and since that period in His resurrected state. The same truth was declared by Christ Himself to the Nephites see 3 Ne. We read, by way of analogy, that God placed His name upon or in the angel who was assigned to special ministry unto the people of Israel during the exodus. The ancient Apostle John was visited by an angel who ministered and spoke in the name of Jesus Christ. John was about to worship the angelic being who spoke in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, but was forbidden: And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. And then the angel continued to speak as though he were the Lord Himself: None of these considerations, however, can change in the least degree the solemn fact of the literal relationship of Father and Son between Elohim and Jesus Christ. Among the spirit children of Elohim the firstborn was and is Jehovah or Jesus Christ to whom all others are juniors. Following are affirmative scriptures bearing upon this great truth. Paul, writing to the Colossians, says of Jesus Christ: The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews affirms the status of Jesus Christ as the firstborn of the spirit children of His Father and extols the preeminence of the Christ when tabernacled in flesh: That the spirits who were juniors to Christ were predestined to be born in the image of their Elder Brother is thus attested by Paul: John the Revelator was commanded to write to the head of the Laodicean church, as the words of the Lord Jesus Christ: A later verse makes plain the fact that human beings generally were similarly existent in spirit state prior to their embodiment in the flesh: There is no impropriety, therefore, in speaking of Jesus Christ as the Elder Brother of the rest of humankind. That He is by spiritual birth Brother to the rest of us is indicated in Hebrews: Let it not be forgotten, however, that He is essentially greater than any or all others, by reason 1 of His seniority as the oldest or firstborn; 2 of His unique status in the flesh as the offspring of a mortal mother and of an immortal, or resurrected and glorified, Father; 3 of His selection and foreordination as the one and only Redeemer and Savior of the race; and 4 of His transcendent sinlessness. Jesus Christ is not the Father of the spirits who have taken or yet shall take bodies upon this earth, for He is one of them. He is The Son, as they are sons or daughters of Elohim. So far as the stages of eternal progression and attainment have been made known through divine revelation, we are to understand that only resurrected and glorified beings can become parents of spirit offspring. Only such exalted souls have reached maturity in the appointed course of eternal life; and the spirits born to them in the eternal worlds will pass in due sequence through the several stages or estates by which the glorified parents have attained exaltation.

Chapter 2 : South Carolina Exposition and Protest - Wikipedia

New Testament Affirmations: Romans, Philippians, Titus, Hebrews & Peter The epistle to the Hebrews opens with one of the most remarkable descriptions of who Jesus is and then asks a series of questions: Hebrews (CSB) Long ago God spoke to the fathers by the prophets at different times and in different ways. 2 In .

Monroe Doctrine In the early s, the United States deemed two matters untoward interference by European powers in its zone of influence. The United States considered this area to be part of the Oregon Country and hoped to eventually gain control of it. The second was possible European threats against the Latin American nations, newly independent from Spain. In , he proposed to the American minister to Great Britain , Richard Rush , that their two nations issue a joint statement against the retaking of the former Spanish colonies by force. Rush asked for instructions from President James Monroe. The President consulted with his predecessors, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison , who favored the joint statement, as an alliance with Britain would protect the United States. Accordingly, Rush was instructed to decline the opportunity to enter into a joint statement, although he was to inform the British that the two nations agreed on most issues. It warned European nations against new colonial ventures in the Americas, and against interference with Western Hemisphere governments. The doctrine had little practical effect at the time, as the United States lacked the ability to enforce it militarily and most European powers ignored it, considering it beneath their dignity even to respond. When Britain and other powers seized additional land in the Guianas in the s, the United States did not issue a formal protest. The Mexican-American War of increased Latin American suspicions over the doctrine, as many south of the border felt that the American purpose in warning European powers to keep out was to reserve the land for itself. By , the Hollywood film industry was in serious trouble. Established in the Los Angeles area during the s after moving from such eastern venues as Fort Lee, New Jersey , the industry had been rocked by a number of scandals. These included the mysterious shooting death of film director William Desmond Taylor , and the subsequent evasive testimony concerning it by actress Mabel Normand , which helped destroy her career. Another notorious scandal of the early s was the death of actress Virginia Rappe following an orgy at a San Francisco hotel. Actor Roscoe "Fatty" Arbuckle was, after three trials, acquitted of manslaughter, but the negative publicity ended his career as well. These scandals, together with the death of romantic lead Wallace Reid from a drug overdose and a number of instances of onscreen sexual explicitness, led to nationwide calls for a boycott of Hollywood films. They hired former Postmaster General Will H. Hays as censor to the industry; the Hays Code would govern how explicit a motion picture could be for decades to come. Another idea was an exposition and film festival to give good publicity to the industry, with the profits to be used for the making of educational films. The question is whether the United States government is going to go on from year to year submitting its coinage to this well-harlotry. Davison came up with the concept for the designs. They are going to have a cent piece and have decided that on the obverse shall be the heads of President Monroe and John Quincy Adams It strikes me that the designs having been settled upon, the [plaster] models could be worked out quite readily and that a pretty swell thing could be made. Map of North and South America. North America is in the form of a draped figure, with the laurel of Peace [an olive branch], reaching to South America, also a draped figure carrying a Horn of Plenty. Their hands to touch at the Panama Canal. The West Indies are indicated. The current of the oceans are lightly shown. Between the dates are a scroll and a quill pen, symbolizing the "Treaty". I do not know of a memorial [commemorative] coin which for sheer beauty equals this Pike, in his article in The Numismatist about the coin, deems the design "uninspired" and complains that the low relief of the coin leaves it without sufficient detail. David Bowers states that because of the shallow relief, "newly minted coins had an insipid appearance. Few if any observers called them attractive. Its designer, Raphael Beck , considered Beach to have plagiarized his work. The faint lines in the field around the continents represent various ocean currents, with the Gulf Stream to the upper right of the reverse. Swiatek and Breen speculate that the reason ocean currents were shown was to symbolize the trade routes between the continents. They also consider the design to have an Art Deco look, though noting that the lettering has more of an older, Art Nouveau

appearance. The letter was forwarded to the Commission of Fine Arts for comment. In October, Fraser wrote to Beck, stating that he had suggested to Beach that he use figures to represent the continents instead of maps, and that he had never seen the Pan-American seal until Scobey forwarded the letter. The fair was located off of Figueroa Street in Exposition Park , just to the east of the brand-new Los Angeles Coliseum , where every evening a complimentary show for exposition visitors, "Montezuma and the Fall of the Aztecs", was given. Admission to the fair was fifty cents, though fairgoers could purchase a coin for a dollar at the box office and enter without further charge. After the first week, organizers realized the public was not interested in the historical theme, but was there to see favorite movie stars. Exhibitors accordingly greatly expanded the space devoted to movie attractions, but the exposition was a financial failure. Those in charge of the fair had hoped to attract a million visitors; the actual attendance was about ,, many of whom were teenagers given complimentary admission in the final two weeks of the fair. However, if Hollywood owes its current status in any way to the event, then it was quite a success indeed. Sales continued after it closed, but by October , they had dropped off to almost nothing, and the banks holding them released the remaining nine-tenths of the mintage into circulation, which accounts for the wear on most surviving specimens.

Chapter 3 : Gospel Classics: - ensign

Exposition on the Doctrine of Evolutionism. July 28, 1881, by James Bishop in Articles, Articles, Atheism, Science. Evolutionism is a philosophical doctrine atheistic in nature.

This congress was sponsored by the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy. Geisler, John Gerstner, Carl F. Sproul, and John Wenham. The ICBI disbanded in after producing three major statements: *Henry in God, Revelation And Authority*, vol. Word Books, , on pp. Geisler and William E. An official commentary on these articles was written by R. Sproul in *Explaining Inerrancy: A Commentary* Oakland, Calif.: Clarification of some of the language used in this Statement may be found in the Chicago Statement on Biblical Hermeneutics The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy Preface The authority of Scripture is a key issue for the Christian church in this and every age. To stray from Scripture in faith or conduct is disloyalty to our Master. Recognition of the total truth and trustworthiness of Holy Scripture is essential to a full grasp and adequate confession of its authority. The following Statement affirms this inerrancy of Scripture afresh, making clear our understanding of it and warning against its denial. We see it as our timely duty to make this affirmation in the face of current lapses from the truth of inerrancy among our fellow Christians and misunderstandings of this doctrine in the world at large. This Statement consists of three parts: It has been prepared in the course of a three-day consultation in Chicago. Those who have signed the Summary Statement and the Articles wish to affirm their own conviction as to the inerrancy of Scripture and to encourage and challenge one another and all Christians to growing appreciation and understanding of this doctrine. We acknowledge the limitations of a document prepared in a brief, intensive conference and do not propose that this Statement be given creedal weight. Yet we rejoice in the deepening of our own convictions through our discussions together, and we pray that the Statement we have signed may be used to the glory of our God toward a new reformation of the Church in its faith, life, and mission. We gladly acknowledge that many who deny the inerrancy of Scripture do not display the consequences of this denial in the rest of their belief and behavior, and we are conscious that we who confess this doctrine often deny it in life by failing to bring our thoughts and deeds, our traditions and habits, into true subjection to the divine Word. We invite response to this statement from any who see reason to amend its affirmations about Scripture by the light of Scripture itself, under whose infallible authority we stand as we speak. Articles of Affirmation and Denial Article I. WE DENY that the Bible is merely a witness to revelation, or only becomes revelation in encounter, or depends on the responses of men for its validity. WE DENY that human language is so limited by our creatureliness that it is rendered inadequate as a vehicle for divine revelation. WE DENY that later revelation, which may fulfill earlier revelation, ever corrects or contradicts it. We further deny that any normative revelation has been given since the completion of the New Testament writings. WE DENY that the inspiration of Scripture can rightly be affirmed of the whole without the parts, or of some parts but not the whole. The origin of Scripture is divine. The mode of divine inspiration remains largely a mystery to us. WE DENY that inspiration can be reduced to human insight, or to heightened states of consciousness of any kind. WE AFFIRM that inspiration, though not conferring omniscience, guaranteed true and trustworthy utterance on all matters of which the Biblical authors were moved to speak and write. WE AFFIRM that inspiration, strictly speaking, applies only to the autographic text of Scripture, which in the providence of God can be ascertained from available manuscripts with great accuracy. We further affirm that copies and translations of Scripture are the Word of God to the extent that they faithfully represent the original. We further deny that this absence renders the assertion of Biblical inerrancy invalid or irrelevant. WE AFFIRM that Scripture, having been given by divine inspiration, is infallible, so that, far from misleading us, it is true and reliable in all the matters it addresses. Infallibility and inerrancy may be distinguished, but not separated. WE DENY that Biblical infallibility and inerrancy are limited to spiritual, religious, or redemptive themes, exclusive of assertions in the fields of history and science. We further deny that scientific hypotheses about earth history may properly be used to overturn the teaching of Scripture on creation and the flood. WE DENY that it is proper to evaluate Scripture according to standards of truth and error that are alien to its usage or purpose. We further deny that inerrancy is negated by Biblical

phenomena such as a lack of modern technical precision, irregularities of grammar or spelling, observational descriptions of nature, the reporting of falsehoods, the use of hyperbole and round numbers, the topical arrangement of material, variant selections of material in parallel accounts, or the use of free citations. WE DENY that inerrancy is a doctrine invented by scholastic Protestantism, or is a reactionary position postulated in response to negative higher criticism. WE AFFIRM that the text of Scripture is to be interpreted by grammatico-historical exegesis, taking account of its literary forms and devices, and that Scripture is to interpret Scripture. WE DENY the legitimacy of any treatment of the text or quest for sources lying behind it that leads to relativizing, dehistoricizing, or discounting its teaching, or rejecting its claims to authorship. We further affirm that such confession should lead to increasing conformity to the image of Christ. However, we further deny that inerrancy can be rejected without grave consequences, both to the individual and to the Church.

Exposition Our understanding of the doctrine of inerrancy must be set in the context of the broader teachings of the Scripture concerning itself. This exposition gives an account of the outline of doctrine from which our summary statement and articles are drawn.

Creation, Revelation and Inspiration The Triune God, who formed all things by his creative utterances and governs all things by His Word of decree, made mankind in His own image for a life of communion with Himself, on the model of the eternal fellowship of loving communication within the Godhead. Within this frame God has from time to time spoken specific words of judgment and mercy, promise and command, to sinful human beings so drawing them into a covenant relation of mutual commitment between Him and them in which He blesses them with gifts of grace and they bless Him in responsive adoration. Moses, whom God used as mediator to carry His words to His people at the time of the Exodus, stands at the head of a long line of prophets in whose mouths and writings God put His words for delivery to Israel. Henceforth the Church was to live and know God by what He had already said, and said for all time. At Sinai God wrote the terms of His covenant on tables of stone, as His enduring witness and for lasting accessibility, and throughout the period of prophetic and apostolic revelation He prompted men to write the messages given to and through them, along with celebratory records of His dealings with His people, plus moral reflections on covenant life and forms of praise and prayer for covenant mercy. The theological reality of inspiration in the producing of Biblical documents corresponds to that of spoken prophecies: Thus, what Scripture says, God says; its authority is His authority, for He is its ultimate Author, having given it through the minds and words of chosen and prepared men who in freedom and faithfulness "spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit" 2 Pet. Holy Scripture must be acknowledged as the Word of God by virtue of its divine origin. The revelation He gave was more than verbal; He revealed the Father by His presence and His deeds as well. Yet His words were crucially important; for He was God, He spoke from the Father, and His words will judge all men at the last day. As the prophesied Messiah, Jesus Christ is the central theme of Scripture. Canonical Scripture is the divinely inspired and therefore normative witness to Christ. No hermeneutic, therefore, of which the historical Christ is not the focal point is acceptable. Holy Scripture must be treated as what it essentially is—the witness of the Father to the Incarnate Son. It appears that the Old Testament canon had been fixed by the time of Jesus. The New Testament canon is likewise now closed inasmuch as no new apostolic witness to the historical Christ can now be borne. No new revelation as distinct from Spirit-given understanding of existing revelation will be given until Christ comes again. The canon was created in principle by divine inspiration. The word canon, signifying a rule or standard, is a pointer to authority, which means the right to rule and control. Authority in Christianity belongs to God in His revelation, which means, on the one hand, Jesus Christ, the living Word, and, on the other hand, Holy Scripture, the written Word. But the authority of Christ and that of Scripture are one. As our Prophet, Christ testified that Scripture cannot be broken. As our Priest and King, He devoted His earthly life to fulfilling the law and the prophets, even dying in obedience to the words of Messianic prophecy. So Christians show themselves faithful servants of their Lord by bowing to the divine instruction given in the prophetic and apostolic writings which together make up our Bible. The Biblically-interpreted Christ and the Christ-centered, Christ-proclaiming Bible are from this standpoint one. As from the fact of inspiration we infer that what Scripture says, God says, so from the revealed relation between Jesus Christ and Scripture we may equally declare that what Scripture says, Christ says. Infallibility, Inerrancy, Interpretation Holy Scripture, as

the inspired Word of God witnessing authoritatively to Jesus Christ, may properly be called infallible and inerrant. These negative terms have a special value, for they explicitly safeguard crucial positive truths. Similarly, inerrant signifies the quality of being free from all falsehood or mistake and so safeguards the truth that Holy Scripture is entirely true and trustworthy in all its assertions. We affirm that canonical Scripture should always be interpreted on the basis that it is infallible and inerrant. However, in determining what the God-taught writer is asserting in each passage, we must pay the most careful attention to its claims and character as a human production. So history must be treated as history, poetry as poetry, hyperbole and metaphor as hyperbole and metaphor, generalization and approximation as what they are, and so forth. Differences between literary conventions in Bible times and in ours must also be observed: When total precision of a particular kind was not expected nor aimed at, it is no error not to have achieved it. Scripture is inerrant, not in the sense of being absolutely precise by modern standards, but in the sense of making good its claims and achieving that measure of focused truth at which its authors aimed. The truthfulness of Scripture is not negated by the appearance in it of irregularities of grammar or spelling, phenomenal descriptions of nature, reports of false statements e. It is not right to set the so-called "phenomena" of Scripture against the teaching of Scripture about itself. Apparent inconsistencies should not be ignored. Solution of them, where this can be convincingly achieved, will encourage our faith, and where for the present no convincing solution is at hand we shall significantly honor God by trusting His assurance that His Word is true, despite these appearances, and by maintaining our confidence that one day they will be seen to have been illusions. Although Holy Scripture is nowhere culture-bound in the sense that its teaching lacks universal validity, it is sometimes culturally conditioned by the customs and conventional views of a particular period, so that the application of its principles today calls for a different sort of action. Skepticism and Criticism Since the Renaissance, and more particularly since the Enlightenment, world-views have been developed which involve skepticism about basic Christian tenets. Such are the agnosticism which denies that God is knowable, the rationalism which denies that He is incomprehensible, the idealism which denies that He is transcendent, and the existentialism which denies rationality in His relationships with us. Transmission and Translation Since God has nowhere promised an inerrant transmission of Scripture, it is necessary to affirm that only the autographic text of the original documents was inspired and to maintain the need of textual criticism as a means of detecting any slips that may have crept into the text in the course of its transmission. The verdict of this science, however, is that the Hebrew and Greek text appear to be amazingly well preserved, so that we are amply justified in affirming, with the Westminster Confession, a singular providence of God in this matter and in declaring that the authority of Scripture is in no way jeopardized by the fact that the copies we possess are not entirely error-free. Similarly, no translation is or can be perfect, and all translations are an additional step away from the autographa. Yet the verdict of linguistic science is that English-speaking Christians, at least, are exceedingly well served in these days with a host of excellent translations and have no cause for hesitating to conclude that the true Word of God is within their reach. Inerrancy and Authority In our affirmation of the authority of Scripture as involving its total truth, we are consciously standing with Christ and His apostles, indeed with the whole Bible and with the main stream of Church history from the first days until very recently. We are concerned at the casual, inadvertent, and seemingly thoughtless way in which a belief of such far-reaching importance has been given up by so many in our day. We are conscious too that great and grave confusion results from ceasing to maintain the total truth of the Bible whose authority one professes to acknowledge. This means that at bottom independent reason now has authority, as opposed to Scriptural teaching. If this is not seen and if for the time being basic evangelical doctrines are still held, persons denying the full truth of Scripture may claim an evangelical identity while methodologically they have moved away from the evangelical principle of knowledge to an unstable subjectivism, and will find it hard not to move further.

Chapter 4 : Doctrine of the Trinity – Bible Exposition

A brief catechetical exposition of Christian doctrine. Divided into four catechisms, comprising the doctrine of the 1. Two sacraments. 2. Lords prayer.

Thursday, April 11th, These messages are part of the inaugural ceremonies held at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, London, when it first opened. Spurgeon had already preached the first sermons there, beginning March 25, while the building was not yet quite finished. This, however, was the official opening ceremony, and Spurgeon presided, choosing several fellow pastors to expound the doctrines of Calvinism. George Wyard, of Deptford, offered prayer. Spurgeon in opening the proceedings said, we have met together beneath this roof already to set forth most of those truths in which consists the peculiarity of this Church. Last evening we endeavoured to show to the world, that we heartily recognised the essential union of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. My only business upon this occasion is to introduce the brethren who shall address you, and I shall do so as briefly as possible, making what I shall say a preface to their remarks. The controversy which has been carried on between the Calvinist and the Arminian is exceedingly important, but it does not so involve the vital point of personal godliness as to make eternal life depend upon our holding either system of theology. Between the Protestant and the Papist there is a controversy of such a character, that he who is saved on the one side by faith in Jesus, dare not allow that his opponent on the opposite side can be saved while depending on his own works. There the controversy is for life or death, because it hinges mainly upon the doctrine of justification by faith, which Luther so properly called the test doctrine, by which a Church either stands or falls. The controversy again between the believer in Christ and the Socinian, is one which affects a vital point. If the Socinian be right, we are most frightfully in error; we are, in fact, idolaters, and how dwelleth eternal life in us? There are other controversies which thus cut at the very core, and touch the very essence of the whole subject. But, I think we are free to admit, that while John Wesley, for instance, in modern times zealously defended Arminianism, and on the other hand, George Whitfield with equal fervour fought for Calvinism, we should not be prepared either of us, on either side of the question, to deny the vital godliness of either the one or the other. We cannot shut our eyes to what we believe to be the gross mistakes of our opponents, and should think ourselves unworthy of the name of honest men, if we could admit that they are right in all things and ourselves right too. An honest man has an intellect which does not permit him to believe that "yes" and "no" can both subsist at the same hour and both be true. I cannot say, "It is," and my brother point blank say, "It is not," and yet both of us be right on that point. It may not be misunderstood, we only use the term for shortness. That doctrine which is called "Calvinism" did not spring from Calvin; we believe that it sprang from the great founder of all truth. Perhaps Calvin himself derived it mainly from the writings of Augustine. Augustine obtained his views, without doubt, through the Spirit of God, from the diligent study of the writings of Paul, and Paul received them of the Holy Ghost, from Jesus Christ the great founder of the Christian dispensation. We would be just as willing to call them by any other name, if we could find one which would be better understood, and which on the whole would be as consistent with fact. And then again, this afternoon, we shall have very likely to speak of Arminians, and by that, we would not for a moment insinuate that all who are in membership with the Arminian body, hold those particular views. There are Calvinists in connection with Calvinistic Churches, who are not Calvinistic, bearing the name but discarding the system. There are, on the other hand, not a few in the Methodist Churches, who, in most points perfectly agree with us, and I believe that if the matter came to be thoroughly sifted, it would be found that we are more agreed in our private opinions than in our public confessions, and our devotional religion is more uniform than our theology. I have been exceedingly struck with the very forcible expressions there used, some of which I might have hesitated to employ myself. I shall ask your attention while I quote verses from the hymns of Mr. Wesley, which we can all endorse as fully and plainly in harmony with the doctrines of grace, far more so than the preaching of some modern Calvinists. I do this because our low-doctrine Baptists and Morisonians ought to be aware of the vast difference between themselves and the Evangelical Arminians. HYMN , verses 1, 2, 3. I see my sin, but cannot feel; I cannot, till thy Spirit blow, And bid the obedient waters flow. I wait the moving

of the pool; I wait the word that speaks me whole. HYMN , verses 8, 9, But thou, through whom I come to God, Canst to the utmost save. From sin, the guilt, the power, the pain, Thou wilt redeem my soul: Lord, I believe, and not in vain; My faith shall make me whole. I too, with thee, shall walk in white; With all thy saints shall prove, What is the length, and breadth, and height, And depth of perfect love. HYMN , verses 6, 7. Ungrasp the hold of thy right hand, Or pluck the sinner thence? Sworn to destroy, let earth assail; Nearer to save thou art: Stronger than all the powers of hell, And greater than my heart. Thou alone the way canst show; Thou canst save me in this hour; I have neither will nor power: God, if over all thou art, Greater than my sinful heart, All thy power on me be shown, Take away the heart of stone. Take away my darling sin, Make me willing to be clean; Make me willing to receive All thy goodness waits to give. Force me, Lord, with all to part; Tear these idols from my heart; Now thy love almighty show, Make even me a creature new. Conquer thy worst foe in me, Get thyself the victory; Save the vilest of the race; Force me to be saved by grace. I take the blessing from above, And wonder at the boundless love. And now, having made these remarks upon terms used, we must observe that there is nothing upon which men need to be more instructed than upon the question of what Calvinism really is. The most infamous allegations have been brought against us, and sometime, I must fear, by men who knew them to be utterly untrue; and, to this day, there are many of our opponents, who, when they run short of matter, invent and make for themselves a man of straw, call that John Calvin, and then shoot all their arrows at it. We come here to state what our views really are, and we trust that any who do not agree with us will do us the justice of not misrepresenting us. If they can disprove our doctrines, let them state them fairly and then overthrow them, but why should they first caricature our opinions and then afterwards attempt to put them down? Among the gross falsehoods which have been uttered against the Calvinists proper, is the wicked calumny that we hold the damnation of little infants. A baser lie was never uttered. There may have existed somewhere, in some corner of the earth, a miscreant who would dare to say that there were infants in hell, but I have never met with him, nor have I met with a man who ever saw such a person. We say, with regard to infants, Scripture saith but little, and, therefore, where Scripture is confessedly scant, it is for no man to determine dogmatically. But I think I speak for the entire body, or certainly with exceedingly few exceptions, and those unknown to me, when I say, we hold that all infants are elect of God and are therefore saved, and we look to this as being the means by which Christ shall see of the travail of his soul to a great degree, and we do sometimes hope that thus the multitude of the saved shall be made to exceed the multitude of the lost. Whatever views our friends may hold upon the point, they are not necessarily connected with Calvinistic doctrine. I believe that the Lord Jesus, who said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," doth daily and constantly receive into his loving arms those tender ones who are only shown, and then snatched away to heaven. Our hymns are no ill witness to our faith on this point, and one of them runs thus: Nowell, I testified my firm belief that the souls of all departed infants are with God in glory; that in the decree of predestination to life, God hath included all whom he decreed to take away in infancy, and that the decree of reprobation hath nothing to do with them. It is plain that Arminians and Pelagians must introduce a new principle of election; and in so far as the salvation of infants is concerned, become Calvinists. Is it not an argument in behalf of Calvinism, that its principle is uniform throughout, and that no change is needed on the ground on which man is saved, whether young or old? John Newton, of London, the friend of Cowper, noted for his Calvinism, holds that the children in heaven exceed its adult inhabitants in all their multitudinous array. Gill, a very champion of Calvinism, held the doctrine, that all dying in infancy are saved. An intelligent modern writer, Dr. Russell, of Dundee, also a Calvinist, maintains the same views; and when it is considered that nearly one-half of the human race die in early years, it is easy to see what a vast accession must be daily and hourly making to the blessed population of heaven. Now, there may be Calvinists who are fatalists, but Calvinism and fatalism are two distinct things. Do not most Christians hold the doctrine of the providence of God? Do not all Christians, do not all believers in a God hold the doctrine of his foreknowledge? All the difficulties which are laid against the doctrine of predestination might, with equal force, be laid against that of Divine foreknowledge. We believe that God hath predestinated all things from the beginning, but there is a difference between the predestination of an intelligent, all-wise, all-bounteous God, and that blind fatalism which simple says, "It is because it is to be. We do not deny that the thing is so ordained that it must be, but why is it to be,

but that the Father, God, whose name is love, ordained it; not because of any necessity in circumstances that such and such a thing should take place. Though the wheels of providence revolve with rigid exactness, yet not without purpose and wisdom. The wheels are full of eyes, and everything ordained is so ordained that it shall conduce to the grandest of all ends, the glory of God, and the next to that the good of his creatures. But we are next met by some who tell us that we preach the wicked and horrible doctrine of sovereign and unmerited reprobation. Election does not involve reprobation. There may be some who hold unconditional reprobation. If any of you have ever uttered that libel against us, do it not again, for we are as guiltless of that as you are yourselves. If he be lost, damnation is all of man; but, if he be saved, still salvation is all of God. To state this important point yet more clearly and explicitly, I shall quote at large from an able Presbyterian divine: He is taught that Calvinists hold that men are lost, not because they sin, but because they are nonelected. Believing this to be a true statement, it is not wonderful that the Methodist stops short, and declares himself, if not an Arminian, at least an AntiPredestinarian. But no statement can be more scandalously untrue. It is the uniform doctrine of Calvinism, that God creates all for his own glory; that he is infinitely righteous and benignant, and that where men perish it is only for their sins. In speaking of suffering, whether in this world or in the world to come; whether it respects angels or men, the Westminster standards which may be considered as the most authoritative modern statement of the system invariably connect the punishment with previous sin, and sin only. If it be asked, why sin which destroys, is permitted to enter the world, that is a question which bears not only on the Calvinist, but equally on all other parties. They are as much concerned and bound to answer it as he; nay, the question is not confined to Christians. What is the declaration of Calvin? Against nothing have they more stoutly protested than the thought that the infinitely holy, and righteous, and amiable Jehovah is the author of sin; and yet how often do the supporters of rival systems charge them with this as an article of faith? A yet further charge against us is, that we dare not preach the gospel to the unregenerate, that, in fact, our theology is so narrow and cramped that we cannot preach to sinners. Gentlemen, if you dare to say this, I would take you to any library in the world where the old Puritan fathers are stored up, and I would let you take down any one volume and tell me if you ever read more telling exhortations and addresses to sinners in any of your own books. Did not Bunyan plead with sinners, and whoever classed him with any but the Calvinist? Did not Charnock, Goodwin, and Howe agonise for souls, and what were they but Calvinist? Did not Jonathan Edwards preach to sinners, and who more clear and explicit on these doctrinal matters. The works of our innumerable divines teem with passionate appeals to the unconverted. Oh, sirs, if I should begin the list, time should fail me. It is an indisputable fact that we have laboured more than they all for the winning of souls. Was George Whitfield any the less seraphic?

Chapter 5 : Exposition on the Doctrine of Evolutionism. | James Bishop's Theological Rationalism

A Brief Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church Which Is Meant by "The New Jerusalem" in the Book of Revelation I, John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down.

Print Print What is Army Doctrine? The first step in learning doctrine should be understanding what it is. The manual that replaced it includes only two paragraphs on the role of doctrine and the remainder of the material was moved to a new 64 page Doctrine Primer ADP that greatly expands the topic. The remainder of this article relies heavily on the short but detailed definition of the role and components of doctrine in the FM As a military term, Army doctrine is defined as the fundamental principles by which the military forces or elements thereof guide their actions in support of national objectives. But doctrine is more than just principles. It is a body of thought on how Army forces intend to operate as part of a joint force and a statement of how the Army intends to fight. It establishes a common frame of reference including intellectual tools that Army leaders use to solve military problems. It is supposed to focus on how to thinkâ€”not what to think. A great deal of knowledge, study, and meditation is necessary to conduct it well. A quote attributed to Marine General Jim Mattis is illustrative of this view: This again is a misunderstanding of what doctrine actually consist of. According to the old FM , doctrine consists of a fundamental principles, b tactics, techniques, and procedures, and c terms and symbols. First and foremost, doctrine provides fundamental principles. They are principles that have been learned through battles and wars that have been successful under many conditions such as the principles of fire and maneuver or the principles of joint operations. Importantly, doctrine is not always prescriptive, but it is authoritative and a starting point in addressing new problems. Principles are not supposed to be checklists or constraining sets of rules. They are meant to foster the initiative needed for soldiers to be adaptive, creative problem solvers. They provide a basis for incorporating new ideas, technologies, and organizational designs. Secondly, doctrine consists of tactics, techniques, and procedures TTPs. They support and implement fundamental principles, linking them with associated applications. Tactics are the employment and ordered arrangement of forces in relation to each other. Techniques are non-prescriptive ways or methods used to perform missions, functions, or tasks. They are the primary means of conveying the lessons learned that units gain in operations. Procedures are standard, detailed steps that prescribe how to perform specific tasks. They normally consist of a series of steps in a set order. Procedures are prescriptive; regardless of circumstances, they are executed in the same manner. They are often based on equipment and are specific to particular types of units. Finally, doctrine provides a common language for military professionals to communicate with one another. This is particularly important under fire when information must be quickly and accurately transferredâ€”and universally understood. When a mission is given to destroy, clear, or secure an objective there will should be shared understanding by all on the task to be completed. And yes, doctrine includes our love of acronyms so that we can transfer a lot of information quickly. Military symbols are our way of providing common graphical understanding of a myriad of information and provide another way to quickly transfer information. Establishing and using words and symbols with common military meanings enhances communication. It makes a common understanding of doctrine possible. Doctrine provides the ability to take a sketch like the figure below to transfer a massive amount of information. It enables soldiers to quickly identify the units involved, the main effort, all the missions, the exact tasks to be completed and much more. Sample course of action sketch, FM The importance of this common language cannot be overstated. It allows people from completely different backgrounds social, regional, commissioning sources, etc. It enables the Army to communicate quickly even when there is a language barrier such as military international, multinational, non-government partnerships. It provides the lessons from generations of soldiers learned during hard fought battles, campaigns, and wars. Challenge the naysayers who might think they are smart enough to win the next war on the basis of their experience alone. Encourage all to take advantage of the tools doctrine provides our force. An infantryman for the past 23 years, he has held the ranks of private to sergeant first class, and lieutenant to major while serving in ranger, airborne, light, and mechanized infantry units. The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the

Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.

Chapter 6 : An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, with Respect to Controvert | eBay

Details about An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, with Respect to Controvert Be the first to write a review. An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, with Respect to Controvert.

They were rebuffed in their efforts to coordinate a united Southern response and focused on how their state, by itself, would react. While many agreed with George McDuffie that tariff policy could lead to secession at some future date, they all agreed that as much as possible the issue should be kept out of the upcoming presidential election. Calhoun, while not at this meeting, served as a moderating influence. He did not feel that the first step in reducing the tariff was to defeat Adams and his supporters in the upcoming election. Preston, on behalf of the South Carolina General Assembly asked Calhoun to prepare a report on the tariff situation. Calhoun readily accepted this challenge and in a few weeks time had a 35, word draft of what would become his "Exposition and Protest". All through that hot and humid summer, emotions among the vociferous planter population had been worked up to a near-frenzy of excitement. The whole tenor of the argument built up in the "Exposition" was aimed to present the case in a cool, considered manner that would dampen any drastic moves yet would set in motion the machinery for repeal of the tariff act. It would also warn other sections of the Union against any future legislation that an increasingly self-conscious South might consider punitive, especially on the subject of slavery. In it, Calhoun argued that the tariff of was unconstitutional because it favored manufacturing over commerce and agriculture. The tariff power, he felt, could only be used to generate revenue, not to provide protection from foreign competition for American industries. He believed that the people of a state or several states, acting in a democratically elected convention, had the retained power to veto any act of the federal government which violated the Constitution. This veto, the core of the doctrine of nullification, was explained by Calhoun in the Exposition: If it be conceded, as it must be by every one who is the least conversant with our institutions, that the sovereign powers delegated are divided between the General and State Governments, and that the latter hold their portion by the same tenure as the former, it would seem impossible to deny to the States the right of deciding on the infractions of their powers, and the proper remedy to be applied for their correction. The right of judging, in such cases, is an essential attribute of sovereignty, of which the States cannot be divested without losing their sovereignty itself, and being reduced to a subordinate corporate condition. In fact, to divide power, and to give to one of the parties the exclusive right of judging of the portion allotted to each, is, in reality, not to divide it at all; and to reserve such exclusive right to the General Government it matters not by what department to be exercised, is to convert it, in fact, into a great consolidated government, with unlimited powers, and to divest the States, in reality, of all their rights, it is impossible to understand the force of terms, and to deny so plain a conclusion. Calhoun, who still had designs on succeeding Jackson as president, was not identified as the author but word on this soon leaked out. The legislature took no action on the report at that time. This, plus the political fallout from the Petticoat affair ended friendly relations between Calhoun and Jackson. Calhoun resigned the vice presidency in December to take a seat in the U. Senate, where he continued to speak in opposition to the tariff.

Chapter 7 : Monroe Doctrine Centennial half dollar - Wikipedia

*A Concise Exposition Of The Doctrine Of Association [Albert Brisbane] on blog.quintoapp.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. This is a reproduction of a book published before*

Chapter 8 : Exposition of Christian Doctrine | work by Spangenberg | blog.quintoapp.com

The history of creation: or the development of the Earth and its inhabitants by the action of natural causes: a popular exposition of the doctrine of evolution in general, and that of Darwin, Goethe, and Lamarck in particular.

Chapter 9 : Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy

The root meaning of the word Karma is Action, and as every action contains inherently its coming effect, we thus get at its second meaning, and it is in this sense that the word is most frequently used, and so we frame a general working Definition of Karma, viz.: It is the Law of Cause and Effect.