

The Remnant

*“Even so then at this
present time also there
is a remnant according to
the election of grace.”
Romans 11.5*

November-December, 2008

Volume 22, No. 6

PREMILLENNIALISM AND OUR PRINCIPLES PART 8

Principle 12: The principles outlined in the Black Rock Address of 1832

*For who hath despised the day of small things?—
Zechariah 4.10.*

The text of the **Black Rock Address** is given in the book, “Feast of Fat Things,” which is advertised on page 19 of this issue. As this public address and the historical remarks accompanying it constitutes over thirty pages of that volume, it would be impractical to reproduce it in its entirety here, nor is it necessary to do so. Our purpose at this time is not to expound the address itself so much as it is to touch briefly on the principles contained therein and to demonstrate that there is nothing in it that contradicts premillennial principles, nor is there anything in premillennialism that would contradict any of the principles of the Black Rock Address.

WHO, WHEN, HOW, AND WHERE? The Address itself was drafted by a select, appointed committee of Old School or Particular Baptists on September 28, 1832. It was delivered the next day before the representatives of Particular Baptist churches assembled at the Black Rock meeting house in Baltimore, Maryland. Hence we have the name, “The Black Rock Address.”

WHY? For several centuries, Arminianism had been making inroads into the Baptist churches. These Arminian Baptists, who advocated new inventions of men, including theological colleges and seminaries to

train their pastors, preachers, evangelists, and missionaries, eventually became known as “the New School” or “New School Baptists.” Those holding to the historic Baptist principles of sovereign grace became known as “anti-means Baptists,” “anti-missionary Baptists,” “Particular Baptists,” “Primitive Baptists,” “Old School Baptists,” or “Old Baptists,” declaring they were only of the “old school of Christ.” On the opening page of the Address it is stated:

“In reference to the epithet “Old School,” which we have used as a discriminating term, we beg leave to say that we were led to adopt it from its having been applied to us by others; and that in our use of it we have reference to the school of Christ, in distinction from all other schools which have sprung up since the apostles’ days.”

No other “school,” college, or seminary was or is necessary for the children of God, whom the Holy Spirit regenerates and teaches exactly what He would have them know.

There was probably no one incident that triggered a break between the Old School and New School Baptists. In point of fact, over a long period of time, the New School churches and ministers had departed in both doctrine and practice from the doctrine and practice of the Baptists of earlier centuries. The general thrust of all the New School innovations, and indeed all inventions of men added to the pure gospel and religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, is to dethrone God, to deny His power in the affairs of His own

The Remnant

published
6 times annually
by

Saints Rest Primitive Baptist Church
of Dallas, Texas

The Remnant Publications

In the interest of

The Old Order of Baptists

Elder C. C. Morris
Editor and Publisher
P O Box 1004
Hawkins, Texas 75765
Phone 1-903-769-4822

The Remnant is sent free of any obligation
to all interested persons.

Address all correspondence to:

THE REMNANT PUBLICATIONS

P O BOX 1004

HAWKINS, TX 75765-1004

Phone 1-903-769-4822

E-mail: ccmorris@Cox-internet.com
or ccmorris@the-remnant.com

Web sites: www.the-remnant.com
and www.primitive-baptist.com

EDITORIAL POLICY

All material submitted for publication in *The Remnant* becomes the property of *The Remnant Publications* and will not be returned unless its return is requested and the material is accompanied by an appropriately addressed envelope with sufficient postage.

The Editor reserves the right to reject any material received and to edit any article prior to its being published. Other than minor changes in spelling, punctuation, and grammar, no changes are made without the original author's full consent. Our intent is to express the author's doctrinal beliefs and sentiments as clearly as possible, and in harmony with our understanding of the **Principles** on page 20. Articles by writers other than the Editor do not necessarily reflect the Editor's viewpoint in every detail. The Editor's views are his alone and do not necessarily express the views of any other writer published in *The Remnant*, or any other individual, group, or organization.

The Remnant in its entirety is protected by all applicable copyright laws. Authors retain all rights to their articles. By submitting their articles to us, writers grant First North American Serial Rights to *The Remnant*. Permission to reproduce or distribute any article, whether by photocopying, electronic media, or in any other way, should be sought from its author.

Contents

Premillennialism and our Principles, Part 8: The Black Rock Address	1
Books, Tapes, Notices.....	18-19

(Continued from page 1)

creation, and to exalt and glorify the works and power of men. Christ said, "Without me ye can do nothing (John 15.5)." He meant that literally, and the Particular, Old School Baptists take it literally. But the New School Missionary Baptists reverse it and teach, "Without man, God and His Christ can do nothing." Eventually the differences grew to the breaking point, which came in 1832. "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" (Amos 3.3) No, they cannot.

A Primitive Baptist Elder was once asked, "What is the difference between Primitive Baptists and Missionary Baptists?" He replied, "**The Missionary Baptists have an independent people and a dependent God. The Primitive Baptists have an independent God and a dependent people.**" That fairly well says it all.

In 1832, our spiritual forebears separated themselves from the growing Arminian movement in the Baptist ranks.

New School Doctrine and Practice

Doctrinally, the New School had modified, soft-pedaled, or completely left off the historic doctrines of Total Depravity, Unconditional election, Limited Atonement, and Irresistible grace. For some reason none of them have ever been able to explain, they retained the doctrine of the Preservation of the saints, which is often informally called "once saved, always saved." The following is a necessarily brief summary of some of the doctrinal errors the New School was teaching in their churches in the 1800s:

(1) They were teaching a modified partial depravity which says men are able to obey or disobey God's commands or to believe in Christ Jesus or not believe

in Him, whichever they might choose, “of their own free will”;

(2) They were teaching that election was not of God’s grace, but it is based upon God’s foreknowing whether or not a person would “accept Christ,” and God’s election was merely His choosing those men whom He foresaw would choose Him. They taught God’s grace is offered to all mankind, yet it is not “forced” upon anyone, and salvation by grace can be successfully and finally resisted by the sinner;

(3) They taught the atonement was not limited to the elect, but God *intended* it for the entire Adamic race; and its application hinged not upon the will of God but upon the will of each individual sinner;

(4) They taught (a) “gospel regeneration,” i.e., that preaching and hearing the preaching is necessary to get people born again, and (b) anyone could be saved if, hearing the preached word, they would believe and repent. Consequently, there is no room in the Missionary system for the biblical teaching of a class of reprobates predestinated to be destroyed.

(5) They taught that God’s grace was not irresistible, but that it could be successfully resisted by the sinner, and that the sinner could perish in his sins in spite of everything God can do;

(How, in the face of that, can they teach “the Preservation of the saints” as they do? How can they say that a man can resist or accept God’s grace of his own free will; say man can do whatever he wants, whether or not God wants him to, and *refuse to do* anything God wants him to do unless he wants to do it; and say a man can come to Christ of his own free will, but **then**, how can they say that once a person has come to Christ, he can *not leave* Christ of his own free will? Would they please tell us, when does such a person *lose* his so-called “free will”? Of necessity, if a person truly has a “free will,” he should be able to leave God as easily as he can come to God. John Wesley, Alexander Campbell, yea, Jacobus Arminius himself—they were all more consistent than a free-will Missionary Baptist. But I digress.)

There are many other doctrinal departures from the faith by the New School advocates in the latter part of the 1700s and the early 1800s, but this is not meant to be an exhaustive inventory of Missionary Baptist doctrinal errors. For now we move on to consider some of their major *practical* errors; that is, their errors in *practice*:

Having overtly rejected the biblical principles of our Sovereign God in favor of the works of man, the Arminian Baptists became bold in introducing new ideas, means, and measures designed to woo the *natural* man and his *carnal* mind to accept *spiritual* things, even though “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned (1 Corinthians 2.14).” Using human logic, reasoning, and every psychological trick they could, they added new and auxiliary programs to what they saw as a church weakened and failing because (a) it was steeped in too much “Calvinistic” preaching on the Sovereignty of God and (b) not enough was being preached about the responsibilities and duties of man. Some of the “improvements” they added to the church, and which are directly condemned in the Black Rock Address, were:

(1) **Tract Societies**, to publish leaflets and hand-outs to get the gospel “where it would never otherwise go.” Their reasoning was that a grizzled old sinner or an African Hottentot may not go to church or read a Bible, but he might read a small slip of paper, be captured by its wit and wisdom, and thus be led to be reconciled to God;

(2) **Sunday Schools**, designed to capture children for Christ while they are yet of tender age and more easily swayed in the direction of righteousness;

(3) **Bible Societies**, which the unwary Christian may think is something noble, in that it will get the Scriptures into the hands of millions who would otherwise never see a Bible. Such will nevertheless unite the church with the world, the flesh, and the devil in an effort to further the cause of God and truth in a joint business venture;

(4) **Missions and Missionary Societies**, as auxiliaries to aid the church in carrying the gospel beyond where the local church could otherwise go, in and of itself. These societies were designed first to assist, then to supplant, the work of the Holy Spirit in calling, qualifying, and sending forth His ministers according to His sovereign will. Compare the new Missionary approach with the biblical method:

“Now there were in **the church that was at Antioch [not in the approved “Missionary Society”]** **certain** [not uncertain; they are named] prophets and teachers; as Barnabas,

and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they [**the church at Antioch, and not the Missionary Society**] ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost [**not the Missionary Society**] said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I [**not the Missionary Society**] have called them. And when they [**the church at Antioch, and not the Missionary Society**] had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they [**the church at Antioch, and not the Missionary Society**] sent them away (Acts 13.1-3).” [Bracketed insertions are mine—CCM]

(5) **Colleges and Theological Schools** were designed to train men who would otherwise be “perceived” as being “unlearned and ignorant men (Acts 4.13),” in the fine points of expository homiletics, of exegesis, and of the critical exposition of metaphysical discourses and well-polished philosophical dissertations, sermons, sermonettes, and twenty-minute talks. Tent-makers, fishermen, or anyone clad in camel-skins and who eats locusts and wild honey need not apply.

(6) **Protracted Meetings**, more popularly known nowadays as “revivals.” These extended meetings or revivals were originally designed to stir up and awaken lethargic church members. This quickly degenerated into pressuring “unsaved” friends, neighbors, and relatives to “get saved” either (a) by scare tactics and scare sermons (“If you don’t get saved now, you may die and go to a devil’s burning hell tonight!”) or (b) by emotionalism (“Think of your dear old mama up in heaven...”), or (c) by some other cheap psychological trick.

One of the biggest complaints of radio and TV Arminian preachers and pastors against their own churches and church members is that their people will not behave as they should. They do not attend their churches’ scheduled meetings. They are uninterested in “visitation” programs, “prayer meetings,” tithing, or bringing new visitors to church, and so on.

Their problem is that they bring “goats” by the droves into the church and convince them they are now “sheep.” The Missionary pastors are then puzzled and confused when the goats do not come up to expectations of how sheep should behave. The poor goat-

herding pastors are more confused than their goats, and conclude the goat-herd is in dire need of a revival. More than one earnest Primitive Baptist, trying to be helpful, has asked about these so-called “revival meetings,” *How can you RE-vive something that has never been vived in the first place?*

Whatever these meetings are supposed to accomplish, and however they are supposed to do it, these meetings were and are designed to bypass and replace true Holy Spirit conviction and His effectual calling of His people, to ignore the doctrine of Christ’s calling His elect, and to bring into God’s kingdom “multitudes who would otherwise never be there.”

There were other innovations introduced by the missionary-minded that are not directly addressed in the Black Rock Address, such as the introduction of organs and other musical instruments into the worship services. In his book “Fifty Years Among the Baptists,” the Missionary Baptist historian David Benedict wrote:

Staunch old Baptists in former times would as soon have tolerated the Pope of Rome in their pulpits as an organ in their galleries, and yet the instrument has gradually found its way among them and their successors in church management.... (Page 206, David Benedict, “Fifty Years Among the Baptists”)

Benedict says *this* after he admits that **the first organ in a Baptist church, in the USA** and possibly anywhere else in the world, may have been under his watch:

“...the first one [organ] ever employed by the [Baptist] denomination in this country, and probably in any other, might have been seen standing in the singing gallery of the old Baptist meeting house in Pawtucket, about forty years ago, where I then officiated as pastor....”

(Benedict uses the term “old Baptist” quite loosely here. He is not referring to the Old School Primitive Baptists; he merely means old, established Baptist churches in general.)

Benedict, who lived and labored before, during, and after the split between the Old School “Primitive” Baptists and New School Missionary Baptists (his

“fifty years” cover about 1800 to 1850), went with the Missionary faction. Yet, as a faithful historian, he documented many other changes introduced by the Arminians into the Baptist ranks. In so doing, he often unwittingly vindicated the Old School Baptists as having stayed with the Baptists’ ancient doctrine and practice. In so doing he condemned his own people, the Missionaries. He documents many points of doctrine and practice in favor of the Old School and against the New School that a less honest man would have changed, glossed over, or left out of his history. For comparison see Frank S. Mead’s “The Baptists,” published by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tennessee (1954; originally published by the Bobbs-Merrill Company in 1934). In his little book, Mr. Mead never mentioned the Black Rock Address or the reason for it. Everything he says, including his misrepresentations and omissions, is told in a way favorable only to the Southern Baptist Convention.

Discussing all the changes introduced into the Baptist ranks in the nineteenth century and before is well beyond the scope of this article. What we have in the Black Rock Address is first, a documenting of errors that were increasingly brought into the Baptist churches in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and second, a declaration against those errors in the form of a firm resolve of the Black Rock participants to remain with the old paths. Third, wherever possible, the Address gives the ancient and scriptural view of the Baptists from apostolic times to the time then present, showing that the Old School or Primitive Baptists were continuing to “earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints (Jude 3).” The brethren meeting at Black Rock not only presented the negative side of these issues, but they also presented the positive biblical teachings. Where they objected to the man-made, worldly missionary societies, they also presented the scriptural views and examples of the proper (that is to say, *scriptural*) method of spreading of the gospel. Where they objected to a salaried ministry, they presented the scriptural teachings of the support of the ministry, and so on.

The Black Rock Address, then, was essentially a resolution of non-fellowship or a declaration of non-affiliation by the Old School Baptists, who continued holding to the historic principles of sovereign grace Baptists. It dissolved all ties between them and the

Arminians among them who would eventually become known as the Missionary Baptists.

For its size and content, The Black Rock Address is indeed an amazing document. Everyone who has an interest in Baptist history, doctrine, and practice should have a copy of it.

II.

The Pitts Resolution Compared To The Black Rock Address

Before looking at how the premillennial view of prophecy and the Black Rock Address relate to each other, we might briefly look at The Pitts Resolution, a document originating among the Conditionalist “Primitive” Baptists in the year 2000.

In recent years, many of the Conditionalist elders and members had become alarmed at the increasing introduction of worldly means and measures into their own ranks. **For a century the Conditionalists had ignored their own free-will Arminianism, and, being ignorant of history, they have found it necessary to repeat it.**

The areas of concern the Pitts Resolution itemizes include “*Sunday Schools and Organized Bible Study Classes, Youth Camps, Missionary Programs, Theological Seminaries (Preacher’s Schools), Dedication of Infants, Salaried Ministry, Tithing, Teaching that the Great Commission was given to the church, rather than to the Apostles, Accepting and Retaining Unqualified Members, Misdirected Ministerial Authority, Ordaining Novices, and Failure to Recognize Church Authority.*” The Pitts Resolution was adopted on or about January 29, 2000, endorsed by thirty-one elders among them at that time, and later by fourteen additional elders, making a total of forty-five. The movement has probably gained additional support since the Resolution was signed. The number of their churches actually represented was not disclosed in the copy of the document I read.

The authors of the Pitts Resolution have in a great measure paralleled the Black Rock Address, to which the Resolution refers four times (once to the meeting at Black Rock Church and three times to the Address itself). The parallel is there, because the Conditionalists have among them those who are all too willing to take upon themselves the means and methods of the world in order to build up their churches in *quantity*, seeing *quality* has fled from them. The signers of the

Pitts Resolution have evidently separated themselves from those adopting the new means and measures condemned in this document.

It is of far more than passing interest to me that the Pitts Resolution mentions “forty years or more”:

For forty years or more, we have sat complacent, and passively listened to our ministry criticize and chip away at some of our long-standing church practices. While they criticized the existing church practices, they were maneuvering themselves into a position of lordship rather than servants; thus, usurping authority over the church. Both the church and ministry are responsible for the development of this situation; i.e., the lackadaisical attitude of the majority of the church membership coupled with a misdirected zeal of some of our ministry.” (Pitts Resolution, Item X, Misdirected Ministerial Authority. Emphasis in the first line supplied—CCM)

The above statement is of interest to me because forty years before the 2000 Pitts Resolution was 1960, the year I was first brought (I trust it was by the God of all grace) from the Conditionalist ranks to the Absolute Predestinarian Old School Baptists. At that time I was intimately acquainted with both the Fundamentalist Missionary Baptists, among whom I had been born and raised, and the Conditionalists, as I had left the Missionaries for what I mistakenly thought was genuine Primitive Baptist baptism on November 9, 1958.

Only later, after I had united with the Conditionalists, did I find out that there was a major difference between the “Conditionalists,” with whom I had unwittingly united, and the “Absoluters,” whom I had been seeking and had wrongly assumed I had found. By the end of one year among the Conditionalists, they had proved beyond any doubt that they were far more rottenly contaminated with Arminian free-will doctrine than the Missionaries from whom I had so recently been delivered.

That was almost fifty years ago. Since then, there has been a steady deterioration of the Missionaries, the Conditionalists, and everyone else, including the Absoluters, for these years. **There is in all religion no less than in all politics a decidedly leftward drift.**

It was true of Old Testament Israel, and it is true of the New Testament church, which ends with the Laodicean period of Revelation 3.14-22. Nor am I quite alone making observations like this. “It is of the LORD'S mercies that we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not (Lamentations 3.22).” “For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed (Malachi 3.6).” Elder Loyd Wall often used to say, “If it wasn't for the grace and mercy of God, we would have destroyed ourselves as a people long ago.” We need protection from ourselves, which can only come from our God.

Here is what I mean. “Forty years ago,” now closer to fifty years ago, in 1960, the deacons and elders of our churches and associations aggressively and jealously guarded the gospel and doctrine of Christ and the practice of His church as strongly as so many armed guards around the camp. They *knew* doctrine and order, and the church was governed accordingly. Nowadays, such elders and deacons are few and far between. There are entire associations that have only one or two people among them who know order, and there are seemingly few among the younger generation who care about learning about doctrine, discipline, and order. Many brethren now tolerate almost anything that is said from the stand or done in conference, almost without question. Most of our associations throughout the southern USA are mere shadows of what they used to be; in 1960 any one of their churches was bigger in number than their entire association is now.

If anyone knows of any Absolute Predestinarian Primitive Baptist associations or churches that are growing in number *and thriving spiritually*, with “elders that rule well...” and “who labour in the word and doctrine (1 Timothy 5.17),” I would gladly welcome and print the good news. The comments we hear at home and abroad generally express the understanding that, as a people, we no longer see a spiritual concern about these things.

Most of our churches have a rule somewhere in their rules of decorum to the effect that, if a male member misses three consecutive conferences, a committee of inquiry is to be sent to see him; and if his explanation for his non-attendance is unsatisfactory, he is to be excluded. Does this still happen?

The leftward (“liberalizing”) trend did not start a mere fifty years ago. Its roots are in (1) Satan's “Yea, hath God said...,” (2) his lie, “Ye shall not surely die,”

and (3) his empty promise, "...your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The liberalization of religion was put into practice by the fall of Adam, first manifested in his fig-leaf finery and was first organized into religions by Cain and the rebels of Babylon. Liberalizing of church doctrine and practice was integrated into the early church by the Gnostics and the Alexandrian School in Egypt and continues unabated today in all forms of free-will will-worship and variant "interpretations" of Scripture. It roots and grows well whenever and wherever spiritual slothfulness has supplanted a God-given, reverential familiarity with what God hath said in His Scriptures.

"The activities engaged in by the attendees makes the referenced meeting equivalent to a preachers' school (school of theology). We know that true Old School Primitive Baptists declared against Theological Schools over a hundred and sixty years ago. Our brethren from that era (1832) said it better than we can. Therefore, we quote from the Black Rock Address: "As to theological schools, we shall at present content ourselves with saying that they are a reflection upon the faithfulness of the Holy Ghost, who is engaged according to the promise of the great Head of the church to lead the disciples into all truth. See John 16:13. Also, that in every age, from the school of Alexandria down to this day, they have been a real pest to the church of Christ. Of this we could produce abundant proof, did the limits of our address admit their insertion." (Excerpt from **The Black Rock Address** as quoted in **The Pitts Resolution**)

The School of Alexandria, Egypt

The above mention of "the school of Alexandria" refers to that ancient center of secular and religious learning in Alexandria, Egypt, which was the originating fountainhead of "spiritualizing" (falsely so called! There is nothing "spiritual" about perverting the plain meaning of a text by saying it means something it does not, and by denying the truth of what it means) and allegorizing of the sacred Scriptures in the church. This became the doorway into the church of Jesus Christ for **Pelagianism, humanism, denial**

of the supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures as the word of God, Amillennialism, preterism, Arminianism, Arianism (the forerunner of modern **Unitarianism**, which denies the deity of both our Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, denying that the Son of God is God, equally with His Father; and denying the Holy Spirit is God equally one with the Father and the Son, saying the Holy Spirit is only a "godly influence," etc.); and a host of other "isms" to enter. Clement of Alexandria, and his underling student Origen, brought in their own mixture of Greek and Roman philosophy blended with the abominable **Gnosticism**, with an allegorical interpretation of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament. The allegorizing spiritualizers were the "intellectual elite" snobs of their day who sneered at a literal understanding of the Scriptures. And, as the natural mind loves to think of itself as more intelligent than others, thinking more highly of itself than it ought to think, this spiritual and mental disease was quick to spread in the paganized church of Constantine and his successors in Rome. It became "cool" to make up "spiritual interpretations." It was the thing to do.

The old way of simply believing the Bible means what it says and says what it means was considered simple-minded. Puffed-up priests perpetuated the Mars Hill practice: "For all the Athenians and strangers which were there **spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing** (Acts 17:21)."

The organization called the Roman Catholic church became the self-appointed doorkeeper that welcomed and ushered all of these new attitudes, new beliefs, and new doctrines into the official "church."

When the reformers such as Martin Luther, John Calvin, the king of England, and others came out of Rome, they established new "denominations" (Lutherans, Presbyterians, the Church of England, etc.), but in so doing, they brought much of the Roman baggage with them, including the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures embedded in the amillennial position.

Neither Postmillennialism, Amillennialism, nor Preterism offends anyone except a brokenhearted sinner who wants desperately to know what the Bible says and means. These allegorical systems do not offend the Pope; he is the guardian of such systems of interpretation. These systems do not offend sleazy

politicians, corrupt judges, criminals wearing police badges, money-grubbing lawyers, or a reprobate ministry. Amillennialism and Postmillennialism do not offend prostitutes, adulterers and adulteresses, child molesters, gamblers, or dope-peddlers. The most corrupt and wicked men in the world, if they go to church (and many of them do), will hear an amillennial or postmillennial message, smile, shake the hand of their modernist “minister,” and say “Good sermon!” The gospel preached with the power of the Holy Spirit offends the sensibilities of a cultured natural mind that is accustomed to think more highly of itself than it ought to think (see Romans 12.3). With a misdirected text and a syrupy “message,” however, “**then is the offence of the cross ceased** (Galatians 5.11).”

When the Baptists (who for most of the previous 1500 years had to hide in caves and forests to escape martyrdom) sought respectability and acceptance in mainstream English society, they adopted a composite of the confessions of faith of the Church of England (The Thirty-nine Articles of 1563), the Presbyterians (the Westminster Confession of Faith of 1646), and the Congregationalists (the Savoy Declaration of 1658). In so doing, they had an acceptably orthodox confession of faith in their London Confession of 1689. By so doing they said to the worldly churches, “We are acceptable, so accept us. We are practically just like you, except for our views on the ordinances and a few other things.” In this manner, the Baptists became more generally accepted in the years that followed. **In so doing, they also went along with Rome’s amillennialism.**

Am I against the London Confession, then? No, not at all. It is the statement of faith of my own home church. In the main, it is an excellent document, although it is not inspired in the sense the Bible is. Its framers said that such confessions were to be used as guidelines in our study of the Scriptures and not fetters to bind their adherents.

There’s more to these things than what is presented here, of course, but that is, essentially, a necessarily brief overview of what happened in the late 1600s, as pertaining to the Baptists’ accepting a blend of recognized confessions in exchange for the privilege of living in town instead of living in caves. And along with this tradeout, they also (wittingly or unwittingly) traded the first century premillennial prophetic view

for Rome’s and Protestantism’s amillennial, allegorical, figurative interpretation of much of the Bible.

The earlier view (that they were going through **the great tribulation**, immediately before the return of Christ to this earth) was little valued from that point on. They were no longer going through the persecutions they had earlier understood to be **the great tribulation**, so they correspondingly lost interest in the return of Christ *as* their **blessed hope**: “Looking for **that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ** (Titus 2.13)” held no real appeal or practical application any longer. Now they could join (wittingly or unwittingly) with Rome and the Protestants to make “spiritual applications” (like saying *the church is the kingdom of heaven on earth, Israel is the church*, or whenever you see a *woman* in the Bible, she is a “*type*” of the *church*) to their hearts’ content, and they wouldn’t offend anyone, and for the most part no one would bother them.

Nowadays, around four centuries later, we are at the point where, thanks to the Alexandrian school and Rome’s sponsorship of it, just about anyone can ignore the plain teaching of the Bible, say that almost any Scripture verse or passage, or person or object mentioned in the Bible, is a type, figure, picture, or shadow of just about anything he wants to say it is, and he may do so with little fear of being challenged.

Meanwhile, the Conditionalists who are the most concerned about their brethren who have run eagerly into the Missionary practices (“Sunday Schools, youth camps, Missionary Programs, Theological Seminaries, the Dedication of Infants, Salaried Ministry, Tithing,” etc.) **do not have a clue** that

(1) **practice follows doctrine and is founded in it** (2 Timothy 3.16f). This is true whether it is sound doctrine or unsound doctrine; and, in particular, we cite this fact as it applies to the Conditionalist churches;

(2) **the Arminian doctrine and practice pervading Conditionalist churches is a direct result of the free-will conditional doctrine they have been preaching ever more increasingly since they openly began introducing it into the Primitive Baptist ranks about the time of the War Between the States.**

For all practical purposes, the Conditionalists should have gone out in 1832 with the Missionaries and the Campbellites (who, by the way, also left the Old Baptists in 1832); but as is always the case, Satan

is a great counterfeiter. He *would be like* Most High God (Isaiah 14.12-14). Therefore, since God has apostles and ministers, Satan also must have his false apostles and false ministers. "...such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works (2 Corinthians 11.13ff)." That being the case, there must also be tares among the wheat, false "children of God" among God's elect, as Christ said. We should not be surprised, then, to find "a **mixed multitude**" of Egyptians left Egypt with the Israelites (Exodus 12.37-38), and it was "**the mixed multitude** that was among them [who] fell a lusting (Numbers 11.4)."

In Nehemiah's day, a thousand years later, God's people were still plagued with a mixed multitude. "Now it came to pass, when they [Israel] had heard the law, that they separated from Israel **all the mixed multitude** (Nehemiah 13.3)."

In Ezra's day, when the Jews laid the foundation to rebuild the temple, which was in ruins because of Nebuchadnezzar's destruction, the younger people, who did not know of the glory of the original temple, sang and shouted for joy (see Ezra 3.10-11). "But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice...(verse 12)." That is, the old-timers who had seen the first temple in all its glory wept, because they knew "the glory has departed," and this new temple would never attain to the original glory. In like manner, there are a few old-timers left among us who, knowing what the Lord has given the Old Baptists is sufficient unto our day, yet remembering the former glory, when their meeting houses were full and Christ was preached in power to brethren who hungered to hear it, they weep.

God's people are a separate people, and they were and are instructed to maintain themselves as such, from the time Abraham gave Lot the pick of the land of Canaan, the promised land, and told him, "Is not the whole land before thee? **separate** thyself, I pray thee, from me (Genesis 13.9)." But there are always the "hangers on," who want to "eat their own bread, and wear their own apparel," while saying, "Only **let us**

be called by thy name, to take away our reproach (Isaiah 4.1)."

It was so when "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch (Acts 11.26)." The name "Christians," or "Christ ones," was originally a joke. It was a term of ridicule, insult, and mockery. The disciples of that day, however, embraced and owned the term as their own, to the extent that Peter said, "Yet if any man suffer as a **Christian**, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf," and king Herod Agrippa II "said unto Paul, 'Almost thou persuadest me to be a **Christian**.'" Nowadays, almost everyone in our country seems to want to be called a "Christian" and thinks he or she is one.

It was so in a lot of other cases; we mention only the term **Baptist**, which the Missionaries insist is their own, and the Conditionalists, who for some strange reason want to be included among the **Primitive Baptists**. Both Conditionalists and Missionaries want to wear their own apparel and eat their own bread, but they want to be called *Baptist* or *Primitive* to take away their reproach of being the innovators who have left the old order of Baptists in both doctrine and practice. In each case the ones who have left the old order try to pass themselves off as being both orthodox and historically the first. History, however, and the writings produced by the writers on both sides of any controversy in any age, prove exactly who is the original side and who are the interlopers; history and the Scriptures prove who is vindicated and who are proved to be the impersonators and frauds. For now, we will leave it at that.

III.

The Black Rock Address and Premillennialism

It is obvious to anyone who reads the Address that there is no reference to prophecy in it, and therefore there is no direct statement, pro or con, about the various views of prophecy.

This may be readily attributed to the fact that prophecy was not a particular issue in the 1800s. The issue of the day was maintaining the distinction between two groups of baptizers: one group who maintained the historic New Testament principles of faith, order, and practice, and the other group who introduced new doctrines and practices. It seems that in every age one doctrine or another has come under attack by its enemies. Or to put it the other way, every

doctrine has come under attack in one age or another. The issue of the nineteenth century was this: God's original method of evangelizing His people *versus* the Arminian missions system and all the baggage Andrew Fuller, Adoniram Judson, Luther Rice, and William Carey brought in with it. The Black Rock Address was a specific remedy to the situation of the day, not a treatise on prophecy.

In 1832, the brethren had no particular reason to address doctrinal subjects as, for example, the deity of Christ, law and grace, angels, election, predestination, the fall of man, *or prophecy*. All these other aforementioned doctrinal subjects (and many others) had been addressed in earlier times and ages. Prophecies concerning the second coming of Christ had been addressed in the first and second centuries AD, during the primitive persecutions. After the time of Constantine the Great, prophecy was no longer a serious issue in the mainstream, Politically Correct ("Catholic") church. From apostolic times, the church had been premillennial until the school of Alexandria made popular the *allegorical* method of Bible *interpretation*.

Perhaps the error that "*Premillennialism is a New School doctrine introduced by Arminianism*" should be addressed under this heading. Some who are almost entirely ignorant of the history of prophetic views seem to think that **Premillennialism** (the doctrine of Christ's second coming to assume the throne of David, from whence He will literally and personally rule the entire earth for one thousand years) is something concocted by the Arminians, the same as Sunday Schools, missionary societies, and the like. A Premillennial understanding of prophecy is not even remotely in the same category.

Our point in this entire extended series has been to demonstrate there is nothing in the premillennial understanding of prophecy that contradicts the principles of sovereign grace. Rather, the kingdom of our Lord will be the penultimate revelation of His sovereign power and rights as the Creator of this universe. Only the judgment at the great white throne will vindicate His sovereign prerogative more.

There is nothing in the doctrine of Christ's literal reign as King of kings and Lord of lords that faintly resembles Arminian free-will doctrines, any more than Philippians 2.9-11 is an Arminian free-will text, for Premillennialism and this text are, in effect, one

and the same. This text says, "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that **at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth**; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." "*Just when and how will the knees of everyone and everything in [on] earth be brought to bow, etc.?*" A few moments of meditation on that question, blessed by the enlightenment that can only come from the Holy Spirit of God, will convince the unprejudiced mind that not even the great white throne judgment will fully answer that question. It will come to pass only when our Lord returns to rule rightfully over His own creation, not only as the suffering **Lamb** of God (which He came as at His first coming), but as the **Lion** of the tribe of Judah (which He will come as at His second coming).

The fact that Jehovah's Witnesses, Seventh Day Adventists, the Missionaries, the Charismatics, and other Arminians have perverted the doctrine of His second coming and earthly reign of a thousand years in no way detracts from *the truth* of His millennial kingdom, any more than the Arminians' proclaiming a universal atonement or their teaching that "God loves everybody" would or could nullify the truths of the Father's sovereign election and the Son's effectual atonement's being limited to only God's elect.

On the positive side, the **premillennial** second advent of our Lord is strictly in 100% harmony with free and sovereign grace. "The Jews," or national Israel, will be regenerated as a nation, exactly as the church elect are regenerated now: by the sovereign, irresistible, direct operation of the Holy Spirit, without the "assistance" of any human means or instrumentality. This, we now point out, is also in distinct contrast to the **postmillennial** view:

IV.

Postmillennialism Examined

The postmillennialists' doctrine is, essentially, the world is getting better and better; the church is making great strides in "taking the world for God." When we get the world converted, they say, we will usher in an era of universal peace, love, brotherhood and harmony, where all the world's population will be loving brethren for a thousand year utopia ("the millennium"), after which Christ will return to the

wonderful society men will have created by their human efforts. Christ's return supposedly "after" the manmade millennium is where the term "POSTmillennialism" originates. Such is the doctrine of the postmillennialists: The world is getting better and better through mankind's efforts of evangelizing the world.

In sharp contradistinction to the postmillennial view of prophecy, the premillennial view agrees with Paul when he said, simply, "But evil men and seducers shall wax **worse and worse**, deceiving, and being deceived (2 Timothy 3.13)." It will get so bad that it will finally go into a one-world super-government headed by Satan's man, referred to in Scripture as "that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God (2 Thessalonians 2.3f)." This man will for a time have such power that it will be "given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Revelation 13.7f)."

To this Christ appends His words, "If any man have an ear, let him hear (verse 9)." If any man does not hear, it is because God has not given him an ear to hear, for "The hearing ear, and the seeing eye, the LORD hath made even both of them (Proverbs 20.12)." "...the LORD said unto him, Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh the dumb, or deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? have not I the LORD?" (Exodus 4.11).

Comparing these two views (Premillennial and Postmillennial), we may ask some simple questions: **How do things appear to you? Is the world indeed getting better and better, or worse and worse?**

A. Is the field of *politics* better or worse in the USA than when our founding fathers gave us a Republic? Much more on this, a bit later.

B. Is *religion* itself, in the broadest sense, as to purity of doctrine and practice, any better generally than it was a hundred or a thousand years ago, or is it worse? Are they growing deeper in spiritual knowledge, understanding, humility, and the gifts and graces of God's Holy Spirit, or are they generally

growing ever more shallow and superficial? Are the churches' elders, preachers, pastors, deacons, and members deeper in the Scriptures than they were a few hundred years ago, or are they less so? Are the saints searching the Scriptures daily, whether these things are so (Acts 17.11), more or less than their parents and grandparents did? Are the local churches of Jesus Christ growing in numbers, or are they shrinking?

Here I am not at all referring to "adding to the number of God's elect" or any such nonsense, or to trying to make the church attendance grow in numbers-for-numbers'-sake. We know that "He maketh it not to grow" (2 Samuel 23.5). I am referring to the relentless descent of the church from the Philadelphian peak period of Revelation 3.7-13 to the Laodicean apostasy of Revelation 3.14-22. This IS part of God's predestinated path and therefore a necessary step in the general degeneration of a world gone mad. It will not be reversed, changed, or improved. We are headed directly into "great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be (Matthew 24.21)."

Objection: *We have always had tribulation in the world and always will. "In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world (John 16.33)."*

Reply: True enough, but that does not address **the** specific "great tribulation" of Matthew 24.21, Revelation 2.22, and Revelation 7.14. In the last verse, the original text has the definite article "the" (Greek, *tes*) twice: *tes thlipsis tes megales*, "**THE tribulation, THE great.**" There is a vast difference between sickness, suffering, and general tribulation we go through in this life, and **THE tribulation, THE Great**, "...which shall come upon **all the world**, to try **them that dwell upon the earth** (Revelation 3.10)." The phrase, "**them that dwell [or dwelt] on the earth**" means more than those of us who live here. It implies those who are *settled down, as if permanently*, and who love life here. They love the world's system as it is. They, **the earth-dwellers** (literally), are the objects of "the Great Tribulation," not God's children, who will be preserved through it. As God sent the plagues of Exodus 7-12 upon Egypt, but Israel was protected and preserved through them, so God's elect will be preserved through the plagues of Revelation chapters 6-19 that will kill half the world's population, literally, before they are over.

The further **religion and politics** both move to the left, the closer they will continue to get to each other, until “**Church and State**” will finally merge into the one world government of the man of sin. This man, whom Christ the Lord will destroy with the brightness of His coming, will have the **religious** power (2 Thessalonians 2.3-10) to demand universal worship as God, and the **political** and **economic** power (Revelation 13) to enforce his demands.

C. Is *society* getting better or worse? Is there less gambling, drunkenness, idolatry, lust, fornication, adultery, drug and dope peddling and use, or is there more? Are there fewer murders, robberies, burglaries, rapes, homosexuals, and abortions, or are there more? Is society mourning its own sad decline, or do men revel in their newfound freedoms to sin?

D. Is the *economy* better or worse than it used to be? Think back. Can you buy *more*, or *less* for a penny or a dollar than you could when you were a child? Was trading the Gold Standard for “Federal Reserve notes” a good thing or a bad thing to do? Is there really any such thing as “truth in lending,” as long as there are “variable rate mortgages” and “balloon notes”? Is “affordable housing” really available—and affordable, especially for the “haves” whose taxes pay for this program so a socialistic government can give free housing to the “have nots”?

Is individual and corporate greed decreasing or increasing? To help reduce an intolerable national debt, are localities such as yours and mine willing to give up our own “pork-barrel” industries? We want our peers in neighboring states to do so.

Are the nations of the earth preparing to *beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks, so that nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more*, (Isaiah 2.4), or are they **preparing war, waking up the mighty men, and letting all the men of war draw near, beating our plowshares into swords, and our pruninghooks into spears** (Joel 3.9f) because it is “good for the economy”?

Do we rejoice to send our young men across the world to die in economic battles because getting the boys out of the work force “lowers the unemployment rate”? (This was blabbed by A Man Who Said Too Much And Spilled The Beans, some government economist. It was unintentionally reported to the public during our “conflict” in Viet Nam.)

E. Speaking of “wars”: Has the “*war on drugs*” been won or lost? If it has been won, who won it?

If “we” *won* it, then *why* are two dedicated Texas Border Patrol Agents (Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean) even now, as prisoners of war, languishing in prison for shooting an *alleged* drug smuggler (Osvaldo Aldrete Davila) who was *allegedly* bringing drugs in from Mexico, and who was *allegedly* armed and *allegedly* drawing down on them? Why were these loyal Border Guards prosecuted by the Department of Justice for, among other things, “violating the civil rights” of Davila, while Davila himself was granted immunity instead of being prosecuted?

F. How about the old “*war on poverty*”—has it been won or lost? Our readers might be interested to know that the government of the United States of America is now officially committed to **eliminating poverty**, not only in the United States, but also **in the entire western hemisphere**. “We” are also committed to eliminating poverty, not only in the entire western hemisphere, but **in the entire world**. You need not take my word for it:

(1) Get a copy of Senate Bill 571, introduced in the Senate of the United States, almost six years ago, on March 6, 2003. It is entitled, “**Bill to Establish Millennium Challenge Account and the Millennium Challenge Corporation.**” Its short title is the “**Millennium Challenge Act of 2003.**” Is it not interesting that the Senate has used the word “**Millennium**” here? The bill’s avowed *Statement of Policy* says:

“It is the policy of the United States to reduce global poverty through increased economic growth by supporting a **new compact** for global development in which **increased support is provided by developed countries** to those **developing countries** that are ruling justly, fostering economic freedom, and investing in their citizens.” [bold emphasis supplied—Ed.]

To that end, Senate bill 571 calls for **1.3 billion dollars** for fiscal year 2004, “and such sums as may be necessary for subsequent fiscal years.”

You notice “we” are now supporting “a new compact.” *Goodbye, Mayflower Compact.*

But you need not have me go on; you may get a copy of S. 571 and read it all for yourself.

(2) While you are at it, get a copy of Senate Bill 2120, introduced in the Senate of the United States, less than six months ago (as of this writing) on July 15, 2008. Its short title is, the “**Social Investment and Economic Development for the Americas Act of 2007.**” In it you will find (Section 3), it is really an “**Amendment to Foreign Assistance Act of 1961,**” and “**Amendment to the Inter-American Development Bank Act.**”

It is also authorizing (Section 6) “**Payment of arrears owed by United States to the Multilateral Investment Fund**” the sum of **51 million dollars.** Did you know “we” are behind in those payments?

Once you have your copy of S. 2120, you may examine in Section 3 the “**Amendment to Foreign Assistance Act of 1961,**” and find that it is amended to contribute to its fund a total of **one billion, two hundred and fifty million dollars** with the stipulated amounts for each fiscal year **beginning in 2008** (fifty million dollars), with annual payments increasing each fiscal year by an additional twenty-five million dollars, until it reaches one-hundred and fifty million dollars in the (fiscal) year 2012, with that amount (\$150,000,000) to be paid each successive fiscal year **through the year 2017. This will total \$1.3 billion dollars, if** the US economy is still alive and functioning in A.D. 2017.

The purpose of these payments is stated as, “Use of Funds- *The Fund shall be used to provide assistance to reduce poverty, expand the size of the middle class, and foster increased economic opportunity in the countries of the Western Hemisphere....*” (bold emphasis and italics supplied—CCM)

But don’t take my word for it; you can get a copy of this bill and read the details for yourself.

(3) While you are getting things, go to the official United States Government-sponsored web site at

http://www.spp.gov/2005_launch.asp, and get a copy of the documents there and on the linked sites to see the rosy future planned for us, if we live.

(4) While you are getting official government documents, get whatever you can on the Organization of American States (OAS) to see what has replaced the United States of America while she either slept or watched “I Love Lucy” reruns or “Sex in the City.”

Point of Order!

If anyone thinks my pointing out these things is a “political statement” or that I have some “political

agenda” to further, I will say as plainly as is possible, **you simply do not understand the situation, and you do not know what is going on.** I have utterly no interest in the politics of this world other than how they are predestinated to directly relate to the welfare of God’s people, including how and when they are martyred. I do not care whether your candidate wins or loses. I have no candidate of my own and no dog in that fight. I do not answer survey questions on the phone, the computer, or in person. I am neither a Democrat, Republican, Socialist, Fascist, extremist, pacifist, Plutocrat, politician, pundit, Aristocrat, Communist, anarchist, reformer, extremist, fanatic, spammer, or one who goes about perpetually moaning, “Oh, dear! **Our only hope** is to get *good old so-and-so* elected!” I am no petition-signer or one who calls or writes his Representative or Senators about “important issues.” I do not pray for the Lord to turn this nation around, because He will not. **The times of the Gentiles** are well-nigh over, and this is a Gentile or *heathen* nation on a one-way trip. The winners of any elections have already been preselected and predestinated by my God and pre-approved by the devil. Whoever gets into any political office (as the old hymn says about death and hell) can do no more than what my Father pleases.

No. **Our only hope**, whether anyone sees it or not, or understands it or not, or whether or not they even care, our **only hope** is the return of our “**Lord Jesus Christ, which is our hope** (1 Timothy 1.1).”

Paul told Titus that our “only hope” is “**that blessed hope**, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ (Titus 2.13).” That hope is one thing, not two: The “blessed hope” IS the glorious appearing of Jesus Christ, who IS both the Great God and our Saviour.

G. Do you find the amazing *communications* systems that God has given us, including radio, television, and the internet, are being used for the honor and glory of our God and of His Christ, or are they being used more for the glory of the god of this world? Which way goes the trend? Is there more “truth in broadcasting,” or less? Do you find you can believe news anchor-persons about national or international affairs? Have they kept you informed about any of the things mentioned in this article? Are they fair, unbiased, and impartial, or are they biased and corrupt in what they foist off upon a largely gentle and

unsuspecting public? Are the media persons and pundits trustworthy men and women of honor and character, or have they sold their souls and public personas to the god of Mammon? Are they informing the masses so that people can make intelligent decisions, or are they leading the people like sheep to the slaughter? They do anything and everything to make anything an issue that will keep the public occupied, so people do not know what is happening to this country. Stem cell research, abortion, sex education in schools, bird flu, the weather—it matters not what the issue is, as long as it keeps citizens unaware of the bipartisan hijacking of the USA into the one-world globalization movement.

Have the national news media told you the reason why the USA is *not about* to secure its southern (or northern) border(s) is because **on March 23, 2005**, the President of the USA met in Waco, Texas, with the President of Mexico (Vincente Fox), and the Prime Minister of Canada (Paul Martin), and they three entered (and this without the benefit of *your* knowledge or consent) into yet another of untold dozens of behind-your-back agreements, this one known as **the Security and Prosperity Partnership?**

Because of this agreement, there really are no more “illegal aliens.” *De facto* Borders between Canada, Mexico, and the USA no longer exist. It would be as foolish to build a fence along the Red River to keep Oklahomans out of Texas or a fence along the Mississippi River to keep citizens of Illinois out of Missouri as it would be to build a fence along the southern border of the USA to keep Mexicans out. Every one of us are now citizens of the Western Hemisphere, and ALL are citizens of the world. Period. Get used to it, or prepare to meet thy God.

Have the news anchors and pundits explained to you what **the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPPNA)** is, and what it has done to you, and (if the Lord gives us time enough) to your children, and your grandchildren? If not, why not? That would be *real* news.

Has any major news network told you that **Senators John McCain (R-Arizona) and Kay Bailey Hutchinson (R-Texas)** co-sponsored a bill (Senate Bill 532, “**The Colonias Gateway Initiative Act**”) they introduced into the US Senate on March 5, 2003? This bill pledged a \$6.25 million grant “to benefit

fifteen *colonias* in Laredo and Webb County Texas.” Do you know what a *colonia* is (or is your Spanish a little rusty)? That’s Spanish for a *colony*. What they are calling “colonies” are awful shanty-towns that straddle the unpoliced border between the USA and Mexico. There, those we *used to call* “illegal aliens” can come from further south (or from Red China, or from Iran or other terrorist countries, or from anywhere else) and cross unmolested into the USA. The problem is, most or all of these colonies are shambles with little or no running water, electricity, gas or schools, no paved roads or sewage systems. The object of **Senator McCain’s and Senator Hutchinson’s bill** is to remedy all that for the poor colony occupants—with **\$6,250,000** of the US taxpayers’ money.

Are you getting the picture as to why a “border fence” is not about to be built?

How can Representatives or Senators be both for and against something at the same time? They cannot. “*Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be. Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter? Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh* (James 3.10ff).” Senator **McCain** is as deceitful as Senator **Obama**, who is probably the most deceitful man on earth at this time.

One other point on this: We are told that S.532 is dead, thank the Lord. BUT, on May 24, 2007, Rep. Henry Cuellar (D-TX) introduced a very similar bill into the House of Representatives (H.R. 2499) entitled “**SBDC Colonias outreach Act of 2007.**” It asks for **\$7,000,000 for each fiscal year of 2008 through 2010.** Its status: On the day it was introduced, it was referred to the **House Committee on Small Business**, where it is for now. Remember: The enemy never gives up.

Don’t take my word for it. You can get information like this directly from the US government web sites at <http://thomas.loc.gov/> and <http://www.spp.gov/links.asp> or at privately managed web sites such as <http://www.govtrack.us>.

All of this is moving toward one end: a one world government in which everyone in the world will be responsible to **one man**. “The man of sin” will then have such power, for a time, that he can “cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed (Revelation 13.15).”

Objection: Someone will say, “*The ‘beast’ in Revelation 13 refers to the pope.*”

Reply: (1) The pope could not begin to destroy the USA as efficiently and completely as her elected and appointed representatives and officials are doing.

(2) No doubt the pope of Rome would love to rule the world, and he might have a major part in the fulfillment of some of these prophecies, but the pope cannot hold a candle to **the man of sin** as described in the Scriptures. Although popes down through the dark ages have had the power of death over many countries, NEVER has it yet been that all the world, except for God’s elect, has worshiped him, and he has never had the worldwide power of life and death over all who did not worship him. Never has he had the power spelled out in Revelation 13.16f: “And he causeth **all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond**, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: And that **no man** might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.” Billions of people can as yet buy and sell without worshiping the pope or his religious system. There always have been those who were outside of his control. If this text refers to the pope, it will have to be something that is yet future and on a far greater scale, and far worse than anything any pope of the dark ages and the inquisitions was able to enforce.

Revelation 13 predicts a worldwide control over **all humanity**. This has not happened yet, but it will.

As the Pitts Resolution puts it, “**For forty years or more**, we have sat complacent.” Forty years ago, 1960, is a start, but it does not go back far enough. Try going back to the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia a hundred years ago. (Even that is still not far enough.) As a nation we have been complacent while the **postmillennial** religion and social-liberal politics have lulled us into a rosy sense of prosperous security and secure prosperity with their “The world is getting better and better until Man will usher in God’s heavenly kingdom on earth” dogma, while **amilennialism** has spiritualized away hundreds of prophecies pertaining to the days in which we live and the years on the horizon immediately before us.

National Borders and God’s Retribution

Do you want to know what happened to our national borders, and **why**? By international laws and

treaties, our elected leaders of both parties have cooperated in removing our national borders without our knowing it. That, I happen to believe, is by God’s direct **retribution**. He has done so because **as a nation** we have refused to stand with Israel and help her secure her God-given borders against the aliens who eat, sleep, and live for the destruction of that nation. Remember: **Israel’s enemies are the enemies of the USA, and, as a nation, we have coddled our common enemies to our own shame and national detriment.**

“*For, behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for My people and for My heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted My land* (Joel 3.1f).” Let us examine this text:

“*In those days and in that time*”—in *what* days, and in *what* time? The days and time when “I,” **God**, will bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem.... To “bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem” is an idiom that actually always refers to God’s bringing His people (Israel, Judah, Jerusalem, etc.) **back** from captivity. In other words, like right *now*, since 1948.

What is the problem? It is that for nearly two thousand years **the nations** have scattered Israel—national “Abraham-Isaac-Jacob-**Israel**”—among themselves (the same **nations**; read the text for what God says), as God says, above; now, after 1900 years of exile, when the Lord has finally brought them back into their God-given homeland **as He has always said He would**, the nations, including our own, have bartered away Israel’s temporal security for the hopes of gaining so many more barrels of crude oil from the sworn enemies of Israel and of our own nation. The nations, including our own, have further taken it upon themselves to “**partition**,” **part**, or **divide** the promised land of Israel between Israel and the avowed enemies of God, His chosen nation Israel and the USA.

You will note that Jehovah calls the land “**MY** land”; “*they have...parted My land.*” It is God’s land, by creation; not England’s, the USA’s, the Arabs’, the United Nations’, or anyone else’s land, other than **GOD’s** land and those to whom He gave its title by Warranty Deed. Not another man or nation has ever had a square inch of real estate so given to them by God.

It is God's land, and Israel's land, because He gave it to her irrevocably. **"Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?"** (Matthew 20.15)"

The Apple of God's Eye

Because the USA has been party to the partitioning of Israel, the rubbing out of Israel's borders, the destruction of Jewish settlements, our nation's support of terrorists' occupation of Israeli land, it is my considered opinion, as one man who is yet entitled to an opinion (and for the time being I am still entitled to freely express it), that it is **exactly for such wicked chicanery as this that our own national borders and sovereignty have been removed.** "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man [or a nation] soweth, that shall he also reap (Galatians 6.7)." The Lord puts up with a lot of wickedness in a nation before He destroys it, and never lose sight of this fact: He does so to fulfill His predestinated purpose ("The Lord shall laugh at him: for He seeth that his day is coming.—Psalm 37.13"); but one thing He will not long tolerate is when someone pokes his dirty fingernail in His eye, and that is exactly the picture God Himself has used: "For the LORD'S portion is His people; **Jacob** is the lot of his inheritance. He [the LORD] found him [Jacob] in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness; He [the LORD] led him [Jacob] about, He [the LORD] instructed him [Jacob], He [the LORD] kept him [Jacob] **as the apple of His [the LORD's] eye** (Deuteronomy 32.9f)." *"Ho, ho, come forth, and flee from the land of the north, saith the LORD: for I have spread you abroad as the four winds of the heaven, saith the LORD. Deliver thyself, O Zion, that dwellest with the daughter of Babylon. For thus saith the LORD of hosts; After the glory hath He sent me unto the nations which spoiled you: for he that toucheth you [Zion] toucheth the apple of His eye (Zechariah 2.6ff)."*

That "Ho, ho," is not a jovial laugh. It is an attention-grabber: **WHOA! HO! Wait a minute! STOP!** God has scattered Israel into "the land of the north" and "spread her abroad as the four winds of heaven." Now, He that scattered Israel will also gather her. Then, after that, payback time is coming to the nations of this world.

*

"My kingdom is not of this world."

— **John 18.36**

One more thing. Some men act as if they believe this one text is the final answer to premillennialism. They suppose that all they need to say is, "*Christ said, 'My kingdom is not of this world,'*" and a thousand Bible texts will disappear, as if by magic, into thin air. What does the text say, though, and what does it mean? They say it means, "God is through with this old world." "Christ will never put His foot on this old earth again." "His kingdom is spiritual only, not literal."

As if men, and *religious* men at that, can keep God out of His own creation! Why would worshipers of God and of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ *want* to keep Him from ruling over His enemies and theirs? Could it simply be "the tradition of the elders"?

The spiritualizers in effect say, "We will not have this man to rule over us—at least not literally. Spiritually is okay." Behold, how patiently our God waits for men to approve and set the time, place, and manner of His kingdom!

Anyway. If "*My kingdom is not of this world*" means what they say it does, then **what would a "spiritual kingdom" be doing in this world now, as they say it is?** Such would be both unthinkable and unexplainable.

The statement "not *of* this world" is expressing the genitive case, speaking of the kingdom's *source or origin*, from whence it comes or came. All He was saying is, His kingdom did not *originate* in or *come out of* "the this-world." It is not like earthly kingdoms that start among men. *This* kingdom originated in heaven and comes from there (hence, "the kingdom of heaven"), and God originated it (hence, "the kingdom of God"). It originates from and comes down from heaven, from God's throne. The kingdom of God on earth, like "*Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.*" Do not think for a second that God in Christ will never take visible, physical control of His natural creation for every eye to see. He will. He controls it now providentially, but not everyone can see and understand that fact. At Christ's return they all will see it. Everyone.

What if we don't believe it?

That is not a problem. "If we believe not, yet He abideth faithful: He cannot deny Himself (2 Timothy 2.13)." **"For what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar;** as it is written, That Thou mightest be justified in Thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged (Romans 3.3f)."

Summary

Some may still think I have written these things because I have a political agenda to sell. **I do not.** I have not advocated that you should vote for or against anyone or anything, or even that you should or should not vote. None of this is an issue.

My point is twofold: (1) Nothing in the Black Rock Address contradicts Premillennialism or vice versa, because prophecy is not addressed in it, and Premillennialism goes hand in glove with God's sovereign purpose. National Israel will be regenerated, converted, and saved exactly as any individual is: without man's help or interference, but by God's direct intervention and His sovereign power, without the Missionary's innovations of gospel regeneration, tract and bible societies, Sunday Schools, revivals, or other works of man enumerated in the Black Rock Address. It will be all of grace, not of works. When it comes to speaking about national Israel, Amillennialism always reverts back to a works doctrine. Lord willing, I will explain that later. I am now out of space and time.

(2) We live in perilous times, as never before. It will only get worse, leading up to a one-world government under the Beast. Martyrdom is certain for many, and it has already begun in some countries. Even here and now, freedom of speech is being shut down by Politically Correct "thought police."

The Lord Jesus Christ said, *"For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch.*

"Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning: Lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch (Mark 13.34-37)."

—C C Morris

FREE SERMON TAPES ARE AVAILABLE AGAIN

Dr. Tom Jackson has made the sermon tapes of Elder James F. Poole available again, still at no charge to those who are interested. He may be reached by mail at

**Dr. Thomas W. Jackson
15 Greenbriar Lane
Rome, GA 30161**

or by e-mail at DOCJackson@aol.com.

Even though many of us still use the cassettes, stores are discontinuing them in favor of CDs. Many stores have about quit selling blank tapes. Dr. Jackson uses 90-minute audio tapes. **If you have recordable 90-minute cassette tapes you no longer need, please consider sending them to Dr. Jackson at the above address.**

NOTE: Elder Stanley Phillips has informed us that he has no books for sale at this time.

BOOK: "PAGAN FESTIVALS OF CHRISTMAS AND EASTER"

The book, "Pagan Festivals of Christmas and Easter," by Shaun Willcock, is available. This is a much-appreciated book among *The Remnant's* readers since we first advertised it a few years ago. Now, this concise, 64-page booklet is available once more. Copies may be ordered directly from *The Remnant* at

**The Remnant Publications
P. O. Box 1004
Hawkins, TX 75765-1004**

Single copies are **\$7.00 postpaid**. Texas residents please add 6.75% sales tax (48¢) for each copy ordered.

ADDRESS CHANGE?

If your address has changed and you wish to continue receiving *The Remnant*, please notify us as soon as possible. The U.S. Postal Service will not forward our magazine. If you do not furnish us with your new address, including the Zip +4 designation, your *Remnant* will be returned to us, and your name will probably be dropped from our mailing list.

Whether or not your address changes, if you no longer wish to receive *The Remnant*, please let us know, and we will remove your name from our mailing list. We appreciate your consideration.

POSTAL PRICE INCREASES ARE COMING IN JANUARY, 2009

We have put off any price increases for the books we sell about for about as long as possible. We regret to announce that, beginning with the January-February issue of 2009, the following changes will go into effect, for the reasons given below:

1. There will be a charge for packaging materials and postage added to the prices of all books. There have been several postage rate hikes in recent years, but we have been blessed thus far to absorb those costs. We can no longer do this. Our Post Office has informed us that the U.S. Postal Service will be increasing postal rates again in the spring of 2009, and they will probably be increasing the postage rates every year after that, at least for a while. Accordingly, we may need to increase our proposed shipping and handling surcharges again in the not too distant future.

2. The book, "**Pagan Festivals of Christmas and Easter**," by Shaun Willcock, will be \$10.00 each, postpaid (\$7.00 plus \$3.00 for shipping and handling). The reason for this increase is because we buy this book for resale, and its cost to us has increased. The padded envelopes in which we send books cost over \$1.00 each, and it now costs us around \$3.00 each to mail most, if not all, of our books, especially the hardbacks.

3. For the present time, the cost of the book "**Absolute Predestination**," by Jerome Zanchius,

will remain at \$6.00, but beginning in January, 2009, there will be an additional \$3.00 charge for packaging materials and postage. This will make the price of this book \$9.00, including postage and packing expenses.

4. The prices for **Feast of Fat Things, A Second Feast**, and all books by Elders Beebe, Trott, Bartley, and Durand will remain the same as they have been, but **there will be a \$3.00 charge added to each book for packaging materials and postage.**

5. The above shipping costs apply only to books being mailed to locations in the United States of America. **Costs for mailing or shipping to other countries have increased even more than domestic costs. EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY (we cannot postpone this until 2009!), the rate to send books to any country other than the USA will be an additional \$10.00 per book, no exceptions.**

Even this rather drastic-sounding increase will not cover our expenses in all cases.

6. State sales taxes still apply only in Texas.

The Remnant does not "make any money" on the books we sell or on the shipping and handling expenses. No one is reimbursed for secondary costs for gasoline or other expenses. Any income from book sales and donations over the actual costs of the books, and the packaging and postage is applied directly to the printing and mailing of this magazine, *The Remnant*, for which we do not charge a subscription price. If it were not for the generosity of the brethren who, in God's kind providence are inclined to send additional contributions with their orders, and also the many brethren and sisters who send us their unsolicited donations, we would have had to raise the shipping prices long before now.

With the exception of the "Absolute Predestination book," all books on page 19 are still at the price for which they were originally sold, and, Lord willing, they will remain at those prices until they are sold out.

Except as otherwise stipulated above, **to avoid the increased postage and handling costs, any book order must be postmarked before midnight, December 31, 2008.** Thank you for your understanding.

OUR BOOKS: LAST TIME AT THESE PRICES!

Beginning with the next issue of *The Remnant* (January-February, 2009), our book prices will increase as explained on page 18.

EDITORIALS OF ELDER GILBERT BEEBE

These books contain the editorial writings of Elder Beebe from 1832 until his death in 1881. He was a firm Absolute Predestinarian and disciplinarian. He is widely considered to have no equal among the Old School or Primitive Baptist writers. The books are hard-cover bound in F grade library buckram cloth.

Volume 1—768 pages

Volume 2—768 pages

Volume 3—480 pages

Volume 4—512 pages

Volume 5—480 pages

Volume 6—480 pages

Volume 7—528 pages

\$20.00 each, postage paid.

*

FEAST OF FAT THINGS

New and enlarged edition. Includes the Black Rock Address. 116 pages, paper cover. \$7.00 each, postage paid.

*

THE SELECT WORKS OF ELDER SAMUEL TROTT

Hard-cover bound in F grade library buckram cloth. 488 pages. \$20.00 each, postage paid.

*

THE CHRIST-MAN IN TYPE

By Elder David Bartley. The best book in circulation on the types. Covers Adam, Melchisedec, Isaac, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Aaron, Jonah, Boaz, David. 182 pages, paper cover. \$8.00 each, postage paid.

THE TRIAL OF JOB

By Elder Silas Durand. Hard-cover bound in F grade library buckram cloth. 248 pages. \$14.00 each, postage paid.

A SECOND FEAST

“The doctrine of the Old Order of Baptists”

Chapter titles and their authors:

“The Sovereignty of God,” Elder Gilbert Beebe

“Election,” Elder F. A. Chick

“The Will of Man,” Elder H. M. Curry

“Repentance,” Elder J. F. Johnson

“Baptism,” Elder Gilbert Beebe

“The Gospel,” Elder Silas Durand

“The New Birth,” Elder H. M. Curry

“Good Works,” Elder David Bartley

“Romans 8.28,” Elder J. F. Johnson

“The Church,” Elder H. M. Curry

“Absolute Predestination,” Elder Gilbert Beebe

“Resurrection of the Dead,” Elder Silas Durand

“The Judgment,” Elder Gilbert Beebe

148 pages, Hard-cover, bound in F grade library Buckram. \$12.00 each, postage paid.

*

All books are postage paid at these prices until further notice. Make all checks or money orders payable to *The Remnant Publications* or simply to *The Remnant*, and send them to the address below. We are sorry, but telephone orders and credit card orders cannot be accepted. Texas residents must add 6.75% State sales tax.

ABSOLUTE PREDESTINATION

by Jerome Zanchius

This is *the* classic work on the doctrine of predestination. Written over 400 years ago, it was translated into English by Augustus M. Toplady. There has never been a serious attempt to refute this book, mainly because it cannot be refuted! Paper cover, 128 pages. **\$6.00 each, postage paid.**

Send all orders to:

The Remnant Publications

P. O. Box 1004

Hawkins, TX 75765-1004

Phone 903-769-4822

Texas residents *only* add 6.75% sales tax on all books.

Saints Rest Primitive Baptist Church
 THE REMNANT PUBLICATIONS
 P. O. BOX 1004
 HAWKINS, TX 75765-1004

BOUND PRINTED MATTER

NONPROFIT ORG.
 U. S. POSTAGE PAID
 PRE-SORTED
 STANDARD MAIL
 PERMIT NO. 39
 HAWKINS, TX 75765

CHANGE SERVICE REQUESTED

A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES:

The following is an outline of principles the readers of *The Remnant* may expect to see maintained in this publication. Under no circumstances do the publishers or writers for *The Remnant* seek to delineate herein a standard of doctrine or views to be imposed upon the readers. Rather, we set these principles before the readers that they may know what general principles guide our efforts. All attempts at declaring articles of faith will be marred by prejudices and frailty, and ours are by no means any exception.

We believe these principles are, in the main, harmonious with the articles of faith published by predestinarian associations and churches of the old order of Baptists known as Primitive, Particular, or Old School Baptists the world over.

1—The eternal existence, sovereignty, immutability, omnipotence, and perfections of Jehovah God; He has revealed Himself as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and these sacred Three are One; Jesus Christ was and is God manifest in the flesh, and in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily;

2—The Old and New Testaments in their original languages are the verbally inspired word of God, and they are the complete and only valid guide of faith and practice; the King James Version is the preferred English translation;

3—The will of the eternal God is the first cause of all causes;

4—The absolute predestination of all things;

5—The eternal personal election of the redeemed in Christ, before the world began, and their eternal, vital union with Him; their number is fixed, certain, and sure, and can neither be increased nor diminished; their fall in

their federal head Adam into spiritual death, total depravity, and just condemnation; their utter inability to recover themselves from this fallen state;

6—The blood atonement and redemption by Jesus Christ are for the elect only, and are both efficacious and effectual in accomplishing the will and purpose of God to reconcile His people unto Himself;

7—The sovereign, irresistible, effectual work of the Holy Spirit in quickening the elect of God; the new birth is by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit without the use of any means;

8—The final preservation, perseverance, and eternal happiness of all the sons of God, by grace alone;

9—No works are good works other than those which God Himself has so designated; none of the works called good are left up to men to perform or not, at the creature's discretion; nor do the works of the creature, either before or after regeneration, result in merit accruing to his account in God's sight;

10—The peaceable fruits of righteousness are the certain result of God's working in His people both to will and to do of His good pleasure, and His people will be found walking in paths of righteousness for His name's sake;

11—The separation of church and state;

12—The principles outlined in the Black Rock Address of 1832;

13—The bodily resurrection, first of Christ, and also that of all the dead;

14—The final and eternal judgment; and,

15—The bliss of the redeemed and the torment of the wicked are both eternal and everlasting.