

Correspondence

**From : Mr. H.C. Mullin
Hamiltonhill, Glasgow.**

Ron Hanko's searching unveiling of "**The Forgotten Pink**" looks likely to stir up some kind of response. Frankly, I am quite troubled to learn that the Banner of Truth excised about half of Pink's "Sovereignty" from their revised edition first published in the early 1960's. The whole affair reminds me of George Orwell's novel "1984" where Winston Smith—an employee of the Ministry of Truth, has the job of censoring newspapers by cutting extracts from them, if they are deemed to have political views inconsistent with those of "Big Brother". The extracts are then dropped into the "memory hole" to be burnt up with a hot flame. The (altered) newspaper is then re-printed, to be stored in the archives for historical research.

Orwell, incidentally, made his criticisms to be applied to the Soviet Union during the Stalin Era, when such things actually happened.. We would expect such things from atheistic Communists, but the Banner of Truth is a Christian publishing organisation, isn't it?

Interestingly and significantly, D.C. Steele and C.C. Thomas made a reference to Pink's Book in their fine study, "The Five Points of Calvinism". I thought you might like to read what they said, and so quote for your edification from the 1963 Reformed and Presbyterian Publications edition of their book page 68 : **Pink Arthur W. The Sovereignty of God**, London, the Banner Of Truth Trust-1961, 160 pages Paperback.

"This book deals with the Sovereignty of God...We have listed the revised British edition, rather than the American edition, for the following two reasons: first, its cost is considerably less since it is in paperback (in the same year Steele and Thomas's book was published, 1963, Pink's book cost half a crown, or twelve and a half pence, the writer knows this for a fact, since I bought 100 copies to distribute) and second, in our opin-

ion, the deletions made in this revision have improved the work."

I esteem the writings of Steele and Thomas and have read both their work on "Romans" and "The Five Points". Whilst I don't accept every single thing they have written, I found their works very edifying indeed. I would NEVER suggest that their works should be subjected to "deletions" to make them better, nor that they should be revised by anyone except themselves. What an insult that would be to those two fine brethren. It would be to cast obloquy on their researches. I am certain that neither author would appreciate it if their works were censored like Pink's work. They would be most unhappy if any publisher were to demand that they eradicate from their pages doctrines they held sincerely. I mean, is not such conduct a sort of reverse plagiarism, that awful sin of academia?

Yet is this not in essence what both Steele and Thomas were recommending for Pink's work? Let us cut out from his writings those parts we don't accept, lest he offend other confessing Christians who subscribe to a sort of Arminianism. Pink won't mind. He is dead now, and can hardly raise any voice in protest about it, can he? However, Arthur Pink, though being dead, yet speaketh in his uncensored works, which are a rebuke to those brethren who want to cut his writings asunder, and all to promote some theological line held by his censors. That is Big-Brother conduct, in my view. I close by asking this very cogent question; how many more of Pink's books, published by the Banner of Truth Trust, have been subjected to this process of "revising"? I have a number of their editions of Pink's works. Are they reliable, or have they been doctored to conform with the theological line embraced by the Banner people? I would dearly like to know. Pink is one of my favourite commentators.

Letters Contin. bottom page 47.

The Bible is God's self-revelation to His elect. Therein Christ speaks to His bride. So Scripture must axiomatically track along the laws of language and logic that the Almighty Himself designed and put into language in the first place, must it not? Otherwise, Scripture, is no Revelation at all, Christ's bride will be bamboozled by it. Revelation would then still be "a mystery", as **Barthian modernism** teaches.

We believe Scripture is wholly true, and wholly consistent internally, which it has to be in order to be wholly true. Inconsistency, failure to maintain "the law of the excluded middle", would involve Scripture in lies. Inconsistencies, contradictions, are not paradoxes, they are lies. (Paradoxes arise from misunderstanding of phenomena, not the phenomena themselves). And thus it is we can trust God, that really in the very depths of His unfathomable Being, He is the same as He is in Jesus Christ, revealed to us, the "express image of His person". And thus we repose our total trust in Him.

Is the "Call of the Gospel" a contradiction of Limited Atonement just as much as is "the well-meant offer"? No. The "well-meant offer" theology includes a declaration to the reprobate that God wants to save them. "Gospel Call" theology is distinguished in that it carries no such declaration. "Well-meant offer" theology is in contradiction to the whole phalanx of Scripture, and its proponents justify it on the basis of paradox. But a manifest contradiction is no paradox. It is a lie. The "Gospel Call" theology in contrast lays down God's preceptive will, what sinners ought to do, not what He has predestined them to do. In like manner God commanded Pharaoh to release His people, but had already predestined Pharaoh to ruin, because: **Rom. 9:17** *For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.* Hence God's over-arching purpose was that Pharaoh should disobey His command, and thereby merit a public demonstration of Divine Justice.

Ability cannot, in the sinner's case before God, be the measure of his responsibility, as by his wilful sin in Adam he voluntarily and knowingly took inability on board. Thus if a man borrows a million from the Bank, then "blows" it, he is still liable to repay it with interest, even though now **totally incapable** of so doing. To abrogate such a principle is to excuse, and even endorse, sinning to the ultimate extreme. Thus under the Adamic covenant, every sinner retains **total** liability, alongside **total** inability. A dreadful state!

Correspondence..... Contin. from Page 48.

From: Dr. Stephen Westcott
Reformation Christian Ministries
Bristol.

Dear editor and friends,

Michael Dove in Bournemouth raises the question (in British Reformed Journal Issue No. 17, Jan-March 1997 page 48) of J.I. Packer's 'recommendation' printed with John Owen's **Biblical Theology**, and he is right to do so.

I presume that Soli Deo Gloria (the pub-

lishers) obtained this because J. Packer is thought of as an Owen 'expert', but certainly this translator/editor was not consulted about this in any way in advance, nor was his agreement sought.

If I recollect my comment at the time, it was that as Mr. Packer seems willing to add similar prefaces to books from all over the theological spectrum, I personally regarded that coin as being very much a devalued one indeed! I trust that the book is its *own recommendation*.