

WESLEYAN HERITAGE Library

Holiness Writers

ERADICATION

By

Stephen Solomon White

*“Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without
which no man shall see the Lord” Heb 12:14*

Spreading Scriptural Holiness to the World

Wesleyan Heritage Publications

© 1998

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By

Stephen Solomon White

Beacon Hill Press
Kansas City, Missouri

First Printing, 1954

Printed in the United States of America

[NO COPYRIGHT]

Digital Edition 10/10/97
By Holiness Data Ministry

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated
By
Stephen Solomon White

CONTENTS

1	The Chief Objection to the Term Eradication
2	Other Objections to the Term Eradication
3	Wesley and Eradication
4	Eradication Versus Suppression
5	Eradication Versus Suppression (Continued)
6	Eradication Versus Integration
7	What Is Eradicated by Entire Sanctification?

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

FOREWORD

Significant additions to literature on the subject of scriptural holiness, or entire sanctification, have not been numerous in recent years. Thus, the appearance of this book, providing subject matter of such fundamental value, and presented by an unusually competent author, is a source of blessing and satisfaction to all who love this vital truth and who enjoy this blessed experience.

As to subject matter, it is a clear, discriminating, scriptural presentation of the meaning of eradication as applied to spiritual experience. The use of this term by the proponents of entire sanctification as a second definite work of divine grace is adequately defined and fully justified. At the same time, the false, illogical, and unscriptural criticism of the opponents of this experience, particularly as directed against the term eradication, is also met with effectiveness.

With respect to competent authorship, the record of Dr. Stephen S. White speaks for itself. A graduate of Peniel College, Texas (now Bethany-Peniel College, Oklahoma), he received the Bachelor of Divinity degree from Drew Theological Seminary, the Master of Arts degree from Brown University, and the University of Chicago conferred on him the degree, Doctor of Philosophy. The honorary degree, Doctor of Divinity, was conferred on him by Olivet Nazarene College, Illinois. Ordained in 1914, Dr. White has served as pastor, educator, and Christian journalist in the Church of the Nazarene for more than thirty-five years. In 1945 he was elected professor of theology at Nazarene Theological Seminary, and in 1948 he became editor of the Herald of Holiness, official publication of the Church of the Nazarene.

Characteristically, Dr. White, in this book, has moved from the narrow confines of defense of a term out into the broad field of aggressive propagation of the great truth of heart holiness as attainable "in this present world." In the midst of subtle temptations to evade some of the more strenuous terms associated with the preaching of scriptural holiness, and attempts to find a more palatable phraseology for this doctrine and experience, it is refreshing and heartening to read this straightforward declaration of the right and responsibility of those who adhere to the Wesleyan interpretation of this truth to use, without apology, this strong, applicable, appropriate, scriptural word — eradication.

May this book serve not only to clarify the immediate issue but, as well, to strengthen the moral and spiritual backbone of the holiness ministry.

Hugh C. Benner,
General Superintendent,
Church of the Nazarene
February 9, 1954

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated
By
Stephen Solomon White

Chapter 1
THE CHIEF OBJECTION TO THE TERM ERADICATION

OUTLINE

Introduction

The chief objection to the term eradication is that it has a materialistic meaning from the standpoint of its etymology, or origin. Because of this objection, a very careful study of the connotation of the word will be made, both from the standpoint of its dictionary definitions and from its present-day usage.

I. The Dictionary Meanings

In dealing with the word eradicate Webster's New International Dictionary illustrates its meaning by referring to the destruction of a disease, which is surely not something that has roots in the literal sense. Then it mentions abolish, destroy, and annihilate as synonyms of eradicate; and not one of these signifies a thing which is plucked up by the roots. Finally, after comparing it with two other synonyms — exterminate and extirpate — it informs us that eradicate is now commonly figurative; and the example given is the eradication of a fault, which is neither a thing nor an outgrowth of or development from a root.

Funk and Wagnalls' New Standard Dictionary starts out in its first definition by declaring that to eradicate is "to pull out by the roots or root out." That this is the etymological meaning of the term eradicate, no one denies; but that this word has largely moved away from this significance is evidenced even in this first definition, when the dictionary continues thus: "hence to destroy thoroughly, extirpate; as to eradicate error." But since error is psychical and not materialistic, it could not have roots. This means that eradicate is used figuratively, and not literally. Then this dictionary's discussion of the term concludes thus: "We speak of eradicating a disease, of extirpating a cancer, or exterminating wild beasts or hostile tribes; we seek to eradicate or extirpate all vices and evils." Vices and evils do not have roots, and they are not physical things or psychical entities — they are psychical qualities, conditions, or states.

Crabb's English Synonyms, although written many years ago, has this to say about eradicate and extirpate: "These words are seldomer used in the physical than in the moral sense; where the former is applied to such objects as are conceived to be plucked up by the roots, as habits, vices, abuses, evils . . ." In those early days, they were evidently talking about the eradication of psychical traits, which were, of course, rootless in character.

The earliest use of the term eradicate, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, was figurative, and not in accord with the literal or etymological meaning of the term. This was in 1436 and even before the word was spelled as it is today. It refers to the absence or destruction of the peace of Christ in this world; and peace is psychical, and not physical. The remainder of the extended study of the development of the word as given by this authority substantiates this use of it.

Again, the New Winston Dictionary says: "Eradicate, though still applied literally to plants in numbers, is now commonly employed in the figurative sense; we eradicate evils, faults, or offensive mannerisms."

Thus, all of the authorities which we have consulted point to but one conclusion, and that is that eradication has two fundamental meanings — the literal, or etymological, and the figurative. Further, almost from the first, the primary connotation of the term has been figurative; and what change has taken place has been in this direction. All of this indicates that when one speaks of the eradication of anything he simply means that it is completely destroyed, and that this term is now generally used in this sense.

II. Present-day Usage

More important than dictionary definitions is the way a word is actually being used; for dictionaries are built on usage, and not usage on dictionaries. The evidence here is certainly very striking. It indicates that while we may be inclined to give up the term eradicate in our theology because we are afraid of its materialistic implications, leaders in other walks of life are not at all troubled about this. Illustrations are given of its use in the following fields: mechanics, health and medicine, politics and sociology, education and psychology, and religion in general. Many of these examples are taken from the statements of learned men in various walks of life; and they should certainly know the true meaning of words. Someone may ask what eradicate signifies as it is used in these different fields, and the answer is, to destroy completely.

Conclusion

We conclude this outline with a quotation from Davidson's Old Testament Theology, one of the most famous books ever written in its field. Here are the significant words: "Etymology is rarely a safe guide to the real meaning of words. Language, as we have it in any literature, has already drifted away from the primary sense of its words. Usage is the only safe guide. When usage is ascertained, then we may inquire into derivation and radical signification. Hence the concordance is a safer companion than the lexicon."

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

MAIN BODY TEXT
Chapter 1
THE CHIEF OBJECTION TO THE TERM ERADICATION

In any discussion of "eradication," the first point at issue is the meaning of the term. All who discuss this subject seem to be very much aware of its etymological or literal connotation. Especially is this the case with those who are not sure as to the wisdom of employing it in connection with the doctrine of entire sanctification. In fact, many of those who deal with eradication from the standpoint of holiness fail to mention any other meaning. In view of this situation we shall seek to discover what the dictionaries and usage indicate as to the import of this word.

Webster's New International Dictionary (the latest unabridged edition) defines "eradicate" thus: "To pluck up by the roots; to root up or out; hence, to extirpate; as to eradicate disease." Here we have disease eradicated; and certainly a disease does not have roots. This dictionary goes on to give three synonyms: abolish, destroy, and annihilate. Please note that not one of these synonyms signifies plucking up by the roots. The dictionary also tells the investigator to see "exterminate."

When we turn to "exterminate" we find some interesting information. The first definition which is given for exterminate is "to drive out or away, to expel." This is obsolete. The second meaning for exterminate is "to destroy utterly, to cut off, to extirpate; to annihilate; to root out; as to exterminate vermin." Then we are informed that exterminate, extirpate, and eradicate are synonyms which are to be differentiated as follows: "To exterminate (originally to banish) is, in modern usage, to destroy utterly or bring in any way to extinction; to extirpate implies a violent and intentional rooting out, whether literal or figurative; eradicate (now commonly figurative) implies a less violent rooting up than extirpate; as, to exterminate (or extirpate) a species (of birds, animals, etc.); to exterminate (or extirpate) a heresy, a vice; to eradicate a fault." In this connection, as you see, we are informed that eradicate is now commonly figurative; and the example given is the eradication of a fault, which is neither a thing nor an outgrowth of or development from a root.

Funk and Wagnalls' New Standard Dictionary agrees with Webster essentially. It first defines eradicate according to its etymology as follows: "To pull up by the roots or root out." That this is the literal meaning of the word no one who is informed can question. However, that it is not now the primary purport of the term will be implied again and again as we proceed with this discussion. In fact, we shall discover that the figurative meaning, completely or utterly destroy, is with but few exceptions the only connotation today. Even in giving this first definition of pulling out by the roots or rooting out, Funk and Wagnalls continues thus: "hence to destroy thoroughly, extirpate; as, to eradicate error." In so many words, it is informing us that the true significance of eradicate is now figurative and not literal. Error is psychological and does not have roots. Thus it is not a material thing. Neither is it a psychological entity. (We use entity here in the sense of real being. This is the first definition which is ascribed to it in Runes' Dictionary of Philosophy. Thus, when we state that error

is psychical and yet not a psychical entity, we mean that it is only a psychical quality, state, condition, or principle.)

But let us go on and give the whole picture from Funk and Wagnalls. Under "exterminate" it tells us that "eradicate is always applied to numbers and groups of plants which it is desired to remove effectually from the soil; a single tree may be uprooted, but it is not said to be eradicated; we labor to eradicate or root out noxious weeds." (Thus the only leftover from the literal content of the word eradicate is its reference to a group of things — trees or plants — which have roots; but in this case, even, the emphasis is upon removing rather than uprooting the things. Further, in actual usage we shall find it difficult to secure examples which illustrate this implication.) "To extirpate is not only to destroy the individuals of any race of plants or animals, but the very stock, so that the race can never be restored." (Thus, from the literal standpoint extirpate is a more radical term than eradicate and is also more involved in materialism. Nevertheless, there are those who freely use extirpate while at the same time rejecting eradication on the basis of its materialism.)

Next Funk and Wagnalls gives a final comparison of these three words from the standpoint of their usage. This is as follows: "We speak of eradicating a disease, of extirpating a cancer, of exterminating wild beasts or hostile tribes; we seek to eradicate or extirpate all vices and evils." Vices and evils do not have roots and they are not things or entities. Still, they are eradicated.

Crabb's English Synonyms starts out by giving the literal significance of eradicate and extirpate. Then it proceeds with the following explanation: "These words are seldomer used in the physical than in the moral sense; where the former is applied to such objects as are conceived to be plucked up by the roots, as habits, vices, abuses, evils; and the latter to whatever is united or supposed to be united into a race or family, and is destroyed root and branch. Youth is the season when vicious habits may be thoroughly eradicated; by the universal deluge the whole human family was extirpated, with the exception of Noah and his family." Then Crabb gives the following quotation from Blair to illustrate the use of eradicate: "It must be every man's care to begin by eradicating those corruptions which, at different times, have tempted him to violate conscience." Thus we perceive that eradicate was largely figurative in meaning when Crabb's Synonyms was published, and that was some years ago.

Murray's (now the Oxford) English dictionary traces the word eradicate and its kindred forms from the time of their entrance into the English language. Let us notice what it has to say. First, we shall consider some irregular forms of this term which are also among the earliest. Irradicable is one of these and was once used as an equivalent of ineradicable. At another time irradicate was employed as a synonym of eradicate. Murray gives a quotation from a poem in which irradicate stands for eradicate. It reads as follows: "*He [Christ] . . . mote gefe us pease so well irradicate here in this worlde, that after all this feste we mowe have pease in the londe of Bhyeste.*" The date of this poem was 1436. This is the earliest appearance of any form of the word to which Murray calls our attention. He gives us another example of this use of irradicate which is dated 1656. Here are the words of it: "*to irradicate all vertue from out of his subjects souls.*" There is no reference in either of these quotations to the etymological or physical meaning of eradicate. Peace and virtue are psychical in character but are not psychical entities.

The next instance which we shall cite from Murray is one of the earliest and is also irregular. Its date is 1533 and it is a quotation from Henry VIII. It is the term eradicate but it is used for eradicated. This meaning is easily evident when one reads the sentence which is as follows: "*Heresie, shulde . . . utterly be abhorred, detested, and eradicate* [eradicated]." Heresy is not a physical thing either with or without roots. As a nonorthodox belief it is psychical, but it is not a psychical entity. Another illustration of the use of eradicate as eradicated is found in the following quotation, which Murray dates as 1556: "*And zour succession they shall be eradicate* [eradicated] *from zour ryngs* [reigns, or kingdoms]." There is no reference in this case to that which has roots or is an entity, either physical or psychical.

Thus far in our consideration of Murray's discussion we have dealt with irradiate as eradicate, and eradicate as eradicated; now we shall have to do with eradivative with its somewhat limited significance. It is defined by Murray as "tending or having the power to root out or expel (disease, etc.). Eradivative cure: originally the 'curative treatment of disease as opposed to palliative.'" The following example, which is dated as 1543, is given: "*We wyll speake of his cure as well eradivative as palliature*." This reading is rather unusual for us, but it connects one form of our term with disease, which is physical but does not have roots and is not an entity. The same may be said as to the three other uses of the term eradivative which Murray gives us. They sound more familiar and are more in line with present-day usage. These and their dates are as follows: 1684 — "*eradivative of the whole disease*," 1691 — "*eradivative of morbific matter*," and "*eradivative cure of this distemper*."

The writer is inclined to think that one of the important factors which prompted the choice of the term eradication by the holiness movement was this relation which it had to disease through the word eradivative. The sin nature has perhaps been more often described as a moral and spiritual disease than in any other way. This being the case it was easy to seize on the term eradication to indicate the cure or destruction of this disease, since it had already, in one of its forms, often been used to signify the cure or destruction of various physical ills.

After dealing with these earlier and somewhat irregular forms, let us take up eradication as Murray sets it before us. He explains two general connotations of the word. One is the etymological — "To pull or tear up by the roots; to root out (a tree, plant, or anything that is spoken of as having roots)." Several illustrations are presented in this connection, with the date of each as follows: 1564 — "*eradicate roots of carbuncle*," 1635 — "*Okes [oaks] eradicated by a prodigious whirlwind*," 1725 — "*eradicate weeds*," 1860 — "*eradicating trees*," 1871 (from Darwin's *Descent of Man*) "*the Indians of Paraguay eradicate their eyebrows and eyelashes*." The second and final general meaning of eradicate is stated thus: "to remove entirely, extirpate, get rid of."

This, of course, is the figurative signification of the term. Most of the examples which appear above in connection with the irregular and earlier forms of the word are of this type. However, Murray calls our attention to several other examples which are in this class (we shall give them in chronological order): 1628 — "*eradicating reformation*," 1647 — "*seeds of discord eradicated*," 1658 — "*blood eradicated from body*," 1659 — "*Sihon is eradicator, that evil spirit that endeavors to root up all of the plants of righteousness*," 1660 — "*eradicating other enemies of God*," 1667 — "*eradicating judgments*," 1748 — "*that man should eradicate his fellowman*," 1751 — "*the*

eradication of envy from the human heart," 1788 — "desires and fears eradicated," 1801 — "unfeelingly eradicator of the domestic charities," 1825 — (Thomas Jefferson's autobiography) "this stopped the increase of the evil by importation, leaving to future efforts its final eradication," 1857 — "eradicating the incorrigible," 1865 — "even rage and hate . . . are eradicable, as most systems of ethics have assumed," and 1869 — "eradicating mendicancy."

We have completed a study of three dictionaries and one book of synonyms. These are all recognized authorities and they have a standing which is unquestionable. The result of this investigation leads to but one conclusion, and that is that eradication has two fundamental meanings, the literal or etymological and the figurative. This has been true of the term since it first entered the English language back in the first half of the fifteenth century. Further, the figurative meaning, which is nothing more nor less than to completely destroy, has been the primary connotation of the word practically from the first. And what change there has been across the years has been so definitely in the direction of the figurative meaning that we can state the situation as it is today in the words of the New Winston Dictionary: "Eradicate, though still applied literally to plants in numbers, is now commonly employed in the figurative sense; we eradicate evils, faults, or offensive mannerisms."

But somebody may tell us that dictionaries only report usage and sometimes they do not do this accurately, that is, they may fail at times to keep up with usage. This is very true; and, therefore, our next task will be to make a study of present-day usage.

Young men in the Nazarene Theological Seminary gathered many quotations where the word eradication or eradicate is used. Some of the exponents of holiness may be afraid to use this term in connection with entire sanctification, but there are plenty of people in other walks of life who do not hesitate to employ it in its figurative sense. They do not seem to worry about being thought of as speaking crudely or materialistically. These quotations range all of the way from things without any semblance of roots to the highest concepts of religion. Let us now present some of them. An advertisement in a small-town paper offers expert body and fender repair with the assurance that all dents will be completely eradicated. "The Douglas Company urged all users of the 4-engined planes to ground them until the causes of recent fires aboard 'have been established and eradicated.'"

Next we move into the field of health and medicine. A pamphlet from the United States Public Health Service referred to certain diseases "which may be controlled and eventually eradicated by general measures undertaken by the community in which the individual citizen is seldom called upon to take a part." The former editor of the Christian Advocate, Roy L. Smith, headed one of his editorials thus: "In My Opinion Alcoholism Can Be Eradicated." A Farmer's Bulletin from the United States Department of Agriculture states its subject in the following words: "The Sheep Tick and Its Eradication by Dipping." The W.C.T.U., in its National Convention, adopted as its aim the eradication of the self-inflicted disease of drunkenness. The United States Department of Agriculture, in a broadcast, discussed the hoof-and-mouth disease eradication program. An article appeared in the January 20, 1948, Kansas City Star which emphasized the fact that at least some cancers can be eradicated. The Methodist church puts out a tract on drink which tells us that "the American people have gladly given multiplied millions of dollars for the eradication of this disease which preys upon our children."

The fields of politics and sociology provide us with illustrations of the use of this term. We begin with a news-heading which declares that the Taft-Hartley Labor Law does not eradicate the closed shop. Another newspaper informs us of the fact that the eradication of the Taft-Hartley Act supporters in Congress is the goal of the AFL. Bishop Oxnam asserts that to defeat Russia in a war would not eradicate her philosophy of materialism, solve her economic problems, nor end her atheism. Juan Peron, of Argentina, offers this suggestion: "The work to be carried out . . . must consist in the eradication of capitalistic and totalitarian extremism." Professor Sorokin, the famous sociologist of Harvard University, in *The Crisis of Our Age*, writes in more than one place of the eradication of social evils such as poverty, war, tyranny, and exploitation, and also of social diseases.

Next, we turn to the field of education and psychology. One writer, speaking of the self-centeredness of some children, gives us these words: "This is seen even in infants and seems not to be eradicated in all adults." Goddard, in his book on *Juvenile Delinquency*, entitles one chapter thus: "The Eradication of Delinquency." In *Christian Religious Education*, by De Blois and Gorham, we are told that certain powerful tendencies toward evil in the work of the Church should be eradicated. Five quotations from Stolz's *Pastoral Psychology* employ the term eradicate as follows: Certain social urges should express themselves in a readiness to submerge or eradicate the self for the welfare of the group, and in participation in the activities of the group." Speaking of certain fundamental human functions and drives, Stolz says that they "should be neither suppressed nor eradicated but disciplined and directed in accordance with the precepts of Christianity." In regard to mental hygiene he asserts that it "strives to correct or eradicate pernicious habits or attitudes in their early stages and before they have done irreparable harm." In another section of his book he declares that sex difficulties are so complex that "rare insights, patience, and skill are the preconditions of their relief or eradication." And in the last quotation from him we are given to understand that some evils perish with confession while "others require prayer for their complete eradication or for their transmutation into activities of higher ethical value."

When we come to what may loosely be called religion, we find that the word eradicate is used in many ways. We read about man's ineradicable sense of right and wrong. We are exhorted as preachers "to eradicate and eschew all meaningless mannerisms," and are told that one of the aims of Jeremiah's prophecy was to eradicate certain prevalent misconceptions. We read that the Protestant world has inherited a prejudice against the Middle Ages which historians have found it difficult to eradicate; that Kant posited a radical evil (not original sin) which cannot be eradicated; and that Augustine affirmed that after the fall the will, although helplessly bound, was not eradicated. A Jewish leader has paraphrased Ezek. 36:26 as follows: "And God said 'In this world because the evil impulse exists in you ye have sinned against me; but in the world to come I will eradicate it with you.'" We are told that "America can never seek the re-establishment of Christianity as it was in the Reformation because she can never eradicate the marks left upon her by the Great Revival of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries," and that the Communists believe that, "after the complete eradication of the exploitation of capitalism, there will be no more frustration and hence there will be no more need of religion." We learn further that "the preacher shortage in the Upper Midwest of the United States is now being eased, and may soon be eradicated."

These quotations could be multiplied almost without limit. Also, please bear in mind the fact that not one of these references is connected with a material thing which has roots. Every one of them,

without exception, nothing more nor less than complete or thorough destruction of that to which it refers, whether it be a physical thing, a psychical attitude or trait, or a spiritual condition. Regardless of what we are talking about, we have the right to use some form of the word eradicate if we wish to assert its complete destruction. This holds good for physical things, for that which is in the realm of health and medicine, sociology and politics, education and psychology, philosophy, religion, or any other field of human study or existence.

Thus, usage points even more definitely to the figurative meaning of this term eradicate than did the definitions in the dictionaries — and, in the last analysis, usage is the final criterion. In line with this, and as a fitting close to the discussion, permit us to quote a few lines from Davidson's Old Testament Theology. They are as follows: "Etymology is rarely a safe guide to the real meaning of words. Language, as we have it in any literature, has already drifted away far from the primary sense of its words. Usage is the only safe guide. When usage is ascertained, then we may inquire into derivation and radical signification. Hence the concordance is always a safer companion than the lexicon."

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

Chapter 2
OTHER OBJECTIONS TO THE TERM ERADICATION

OUTLINE

Introduction

In the first chapter the chief objection to the use of the term eradication was dealt with. It had to do with the etymological, or physical, connotation of the word — the fact that from the standpoint of its origin it refers to that which is rooted out. A further statement along this line will be made before we take up the other objections to the use of the term eradication. It must be remembered that practically all of our psychical and ethical terms have had a physical derivation. Here are a few illustrations of this fact: We lay hold of, grasp, or embrace a belief or an idea. We speak of the spirit, and yet spirit literally means wind — something materialistic. Both purge and cleanse originally had to do with physical processes, and yet we talk about being purged, or cleansed, from sin.

I. Four Objections to the Term Eradication

1. Eradication is a nonscriptural term. In the first place, there are some who on fairly good grounds refuse to admit that eradication is a nonscriptural term. But let us pass this point by, since some would deny it, and think of eradication as a word which does not appear in the Bible. In answer to this argument, one can easily point to many of our important theological terms which are not scriptural. We would not get very far in building a theology if we were limited to only Biblical words. Besides, since theological terms are interpretive, it is often better to have words which are non-Biblical. In that way we can more definitely state our position. The word trinity is not a scriptural term, and yet it states the traditional interpretation of the Christian Church as to certain important passages in the Bible.

2. One man who uses the term eradication thinks that he has found a better and more up-to-date way of stating our position in connection with the term instinct. He fails to realize that the word instinct is no longer used in connection with human psychology. Thus he tries to substitute an out-of-date psychological term for what he thinks is a somewhat inadequate theological term. We cannot see the gain in such a procedure.

3. Again, it has been objected that eradicate is an excellent theological term, but is an inadequate experiential and practical word. It is difficult to see how such a distinction can be logically made without involving the maker in a worse dilemma than he was in before.

4. Another writer objects that the word eradication is too radical term — is radical a term — it shocks people. Thus it arouses unnecessary antagonism. But the same might be said as to

regeneration or any other definite Christian term in this day and age when all kinds of non-Christian theories are confronting the world. Repentance is radical to a proud and selfish people. Further, there is no way to camouflage people into the consecration and self-denial which Christ demands.

II. Four More Objections to the Term Eradication

1. We are also told that we should not use the term because it overstates what is really done in entire sanctification. This could not be if we really believe in the destruction of the old man, or the carnal mind, when one is sanctified.

2. Some object to eradication, as well as to much of the terminology which is used by the holiness movement, because, as they say, our terminology does not fairly represent our position. These people even go so far as to assert that those on the outside of the holiness movement make this complaint against our terminology. All that we can say in this connection is that, after many years in the holiness movement and plenty of contacts with people in other religious bodies, we have never once heard this criticism. They may not agree with our position, but they do not say that our terminology fails to describe our position.

3. Some urge us to throw out eradication because those of us who profess entire sanctification do not live up to what it signifies. This is surely a poor argument, for many outsiders say the same as to those who profess to be regenerated.

4. There are those who suggest that the use of the term eradicate be given up because, by so doing, the holiness people could work harmoniously with certain religious groups. No doubt this would be the case; but can we afford to pay such a price, or surrender our clear-cut position, in order to win the co-operation of those who are definitely opposed to it? This question is answered in the negative. Such a procedure would be as dangerous as it would be to exchange another phase of our teaching for that of eternal security. In fact, it would be only a subtle way of persuading the holiness people to surrender the central truth in their teaching.

Conclusion

Eradication is a clear-cut and forceful word, and no other term has yet been found which can improve upon it. Not one of the objections urged against it is logically valid.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

MAIN BODY TEXT

Chapter 2

OTHER OBJECTIONS TO THE TERM ERADICATION

In the first chapter of this book, the criticism which is most often brought against the term eradication was discussed. It dealt with the etymological or physical connotation of the word — the fact that it refers to that which is rooted out. But from the standpoint of the dictionary and usage it was proved that the word is almost always used figuratively and not literally. Especially is this true today. The evidence for this was overwhelming.

In this chapter, some other objections to the use of the term eradication will be considered. However before proceeding to this particular discussion, there is another point which we shall mention that might have been dealt with in the first chapter. This is the fact that many of the terms which are used to express psychical activities have a physical derivation, but they have come to have a figurative meaning. For instance, we lay hold of, grasp, or embrace a theological position, belief, or truth; we reach a point in our thinking; we waver in our belief, or cast aside the idea which has been uppermost in our minds. In fact, it is difficult to find any term which is used today in connection with the study of the mind or spirit which has not arisen from a physical background.

Any study of philology, or the development of language, clearly proves this. Take the word spirit for instance. In all of its forms — Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English — it literally means breath or wind. Nevertheless, it has moved so far away from its etymological meaning that no one ever thinks of holy wind or breath when we speak of the Holy Spirit. So far removed are we from any such thought that it is almost sacrilegious to mention such a possibility. Some of the terms other than eradication which are used to describe the work of entire sanctification have a definite physical significance. Purge literally means to wash or clean, and yet a disposition is not washed or cleaned. The same may be said as to cleanse, which has to do with the elimination of dirt or stain.

The way is cleared now for the consideration of the other arguments against the word eradication. Some would refuse to use the word because it is not scriptural. This is not a new way of attacking a theological term. Back in the fourth century, after the Nicene Council, the word *usia* was objected to, and one of the grounds of this objection was that it was un-Biblical.

Fisher's History of Christian Doctrine has this to say about it: "The bishops at the Court were eager to stave off an open rupture in the Eusebian ranks. Their prescription was to abjure the use of the un-Biblical word *usia*, the center of the contention. In the second Sirmian creed (357), the members of which were Western bishops, it was declared that no more mention should be made of either 'Homooousion' or 'Homoeousion.'" This contention was of no avail then and has been ignored throughout the history of the Christian Church. The fact that a term is not scriptural has never been considered a sufficient reason for its rejection. Systematic theology is full of words and phrases

which are not to be found in the Bible. Here are just a few of them — trinity, incarnation, depravity, entire sanctification, trichotomy, dichotomy; creationism, traducianism, kenosis, sublapsarianism, supralapsarianism, infralapsarianism, consubstantiation, transubstantiation, omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, and immutability. If anyone doubts this fact, let him turn to the third volume of Wiley's Christian Theology and look through the index.

Systematic theology rests on two forms of revelation: natural revelation, which comes through nature, history, and man; and special revelation, which is brought to us through the Bible. Here are two types of facts, and in order to properly account for them they must be interpreted. Thus their meaning is brought into sharp focus by words which are not in themselves scriptural, and the total teaching on any revealed subject is set forth in a clear-cut or unmistakable manner. On the other hand, a Bible term might be used by two different schools of thought. In that case, each would have its own interpretation, and there would be much confusion.

One helpful writer in the field of holiness suggests an interesting plan for eliminating the use of the term eradication. He believes that it is more harmonious with the thought forms of our day and, therefore, more up-to-date and appealing. His plan or scheme is as follows: The moral image of God in man is an instinct for holy living with man and with God. When man fell this instinct was lost. This instinct which was lost in the fall governs and co-ordinates all of man's otherwise independent impulses. Total depravity is the loss of this balancing, controlling instinct of holiness.

In the first place, this is too negative a description of the situation. But, forgetting this fact, let us investigate this matter of instincts.

The author of this plan thinks that it is up-to-date, while the fact in the case is that it is not. I have before me now a text in general psychology. It is by Munn, and was copyrighted in 1946. I happen to know that it is the text which is being used in the University of Chicago and in the University of Kansas City. It has the sanction of the best universities and stands at the top in scholarship. After informing us on page 211 that the word instinct was used with so many different meanings in the somewhat recent past that "widespread controversy developed, and hundreds of articles were written on one aspect or another of the 'instinct doctrine,'" it continues as follows: "Several psychologists even claimed that there are no instincts; that all complex behavior is learned.

"However, when a differentiation between inborn drives, reflexes, and instincts was finally made, the viewpoint represented by this chapter, namely, that while instincts clearly exist in animals, they are obscured or perhaps absent in man, became widespread. Even McDougall, perhaps the strongest proponent of instinct, eventually came around to the view that instincts are peculiar to lower animals. He said, 'I recognize that, in the fullest and most universally accepted sense of the word, instinctive action is peculiar to the lower animals, and the extension of the term to the behavior of higher animals and of man has led to unfortunate confusion and controversy which have obscured, rather than elucidated, the true relations between lower and higher forms of action.'"

In this statement Munn has given a fair appraisal of the position of instinct in the psychological world today. This being the case, it is certainly not up-to-date to use instinct, which is now a term employed only in animal psychology, as descriptive of the image of God in man. I can conceive of

the use of hardly any term in connection with entire sanctification which would be more confusing to present-day high school and college students. Now please do not misunderstand me. I differ at many points with the modern psychologist. Nevertheless, I surely would not use a psychological term entirely out of harmony with its present-day usage while attempting to be up-to-date. This same criticism holds for E. Stanley Jones and his use in a somewhat different way of instinct in his explanation of entire sanctification. I am compelled to say this about Jones and those who go along with him at this point, even though he and his books have been a very great blessing to me. He is undoubtedly one of the greatest men living and has made a very unusual contribution to the cause of Christ.

Some tell us that the term eradication is acceptable as a designation of a theological school of thought, but is inadequate when used in connection with the experience and practice of entire sanctification. But the fact about this objection is that eradication is an experiential term — it is a doctrine which refers to experience. Any attempt to make such a distinction between theology and experience and practice really declares that eradication is all right from the standpoint of theory but is misleading when it refers to experience and practice. Such a separation between theology and experience cannot be logically made, because eradication is a theory or theology of experience and practice.

There are those who object to the use of the term eradication on the ground that it is too radical. They tell us that it shocks people and, therefore, arouses unnecessary antagonism and controversy.

But the same argument has been brought against many words which are in use in Christian theology. Especially is this true with reference to the theology of holiness. On this ground, entire sanctification, Christian perfection, perfect love, and holiness would be ruled out. In fact, regeneration, justification, adoption, the eternal Son of God, the only uncreated Son of God, and scores of other definite theological words or phrases which fundamentalistic and conservative theologians use today arouse and disturb many people. Any definite Christian term shocks and creates antagonism in the average man today. Further, strange as it may seem, there are those who hold that eradication is too radical and yet they employ terms in this connection which etymologically are just as radical or more so. Again, they do not hesitate to talk about the ineradicable nature of human infirmities while they refuse to refer to the eradicable character of the carnal mind.

Another objection to the use of the term eradication is that it overstates what is really done in entire sanctification. No one can make this claim who believes in the destruction of the carnal mind or inbred sin. It is either destroyed or else it is not. If it is destroyed, the use of eradication in connection with what takes place when one is entirely sanctified is not an overstatement.

Of course there may be those who define the carnal mind in such a way as to include more than it does. In this case, the thing to do is not to reject the use of the term eradication but rather to more exactly define what is eradicated — that is, the carnal mind or inbred sin. We shall give ourselves to this task in the last chapter in this series, which will deal with the subject, "What Is Eradicated by Entire Sanctification?"

Someone has said that the usual criticism of the Wesleyan movement and the position of the Church of the Nazarene is that our terminology does not fairly represent our position. This may be the case, but I have never discovered it; and I have had numerous contacts with those who are outside of our ranks. I have heard many criticisms of our view, but not once have I heard any of them claim that our terminology is misleading. The only persons whom I have heard object to our terminology — eradication or any other term — have been those who are in the ranks of the holiness movement. Outsiders may say that they do not believe in or accept what our terms connote or indicate, but they do not assert that they misrepresent our doctrine.

The claim that eradication implies eternal security or the impossibility of backsliding is based on the notion that eradication refers to the rooting out of a material thing. That eradication does not signify any such thing has already been proved by the first chapter in this book. The connotation of eradication in this connection is figurative and points only to the complete destruction of whatever is referred to. In this case, it is a moral state or condition — and moral states or conditions can disappear and return just as truly as mental states or conditions can. A habit may be completely broken or destroyed and then later be built up again.

It is very interesting to note that some argue that we should refuse to use the term eradication because Wesley did not use it, while others take just the opposite position. The latter say that we should break away from Wesley and his out-of-date terminology. "Wesley and Eradication" will be the subject of the next chapter in this book, and this matter will be discussed fully there. However, it may be said here that Wesley never used the term eradication, but he often employed words in this connection that were not Biblical — and some of them were just as definite and radical as the term eradication.

Some would reject the term eradication because they cannot harmonize the experience which it describes with the lives of many of those who profess it.

In the first place, it may be said that such a claim may be made as to any level of Christian experience. There are people who profess to be regenerated who do not manifest it by their lives. Further, there is a very real sense in which the experience of regeneration demands as high a standard of life outwardly as the experience of entire sanctification does — that is, freedom from conscious or deliberate sin. Therefore, whatever rules out entire sanctification or the eradication of sin on this basis would likewise rule out regeneration. Also, if this claim were true, we would not have the right to lower God's standard in order to make room for man's shortcomings. And finally, it must be insisted that there are those who profess that the old man of sin within has been eradicated and prove the fact by the lives which they live. It is asserted that we cannot harmonize our teachings with those who disagree with us — especially the Calvinists — if we continue to use the term eradication. The writer agrees with this contention and adds that he does not believe that agreement can ever come with those who are diametrically opposed to our position, except by surrendering our essential doctrines. This is too big a price to pay. There are many good people, among the Calvinists and others, who do not see entire sanctification as we do; but we cannot afford to give up the doctrine that has made the holiness movement, just to win their favor. Eradication — complete deliverance from inbred sin — is our fundamental position, and we cannot let down at this point and keep the favor and blessing of God.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that eradication is a forceful and highly descriptive word. It expresses in a clear-cut and definite way the thoroughness of the moral cleansing which is wrought in the heart of the Christian by entire sanctification. Again, it has been historically associated with our interpretation of the Bible teaching as to entire sanctification, and we can see no good reason for discarding it.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated
By
Stephen Solomon White

Chapter 3
WESLEY AND ERADICATION

OUTLINE

Introduction

Wesley believed in two types of sin — sin as an act, and sin as an inbeing, or nature. When man fell he both sinned and became sinful in nature. When a sinner is converted, he is freed from the guilt of his acts of sin and from the power of indwelling sin. At that time, however, he is not cleansed from the presence of indwelling sin.

I. The Reach of Indwelling Sin

Wesley described the sinful condition of man in no uncertain terms. He believed in total depravity. Nevertheless, this depravity was total only in the sense that it affected every part of man, and not in that every part of man was completely bad. Man was in a helpless but not a hopeless condition. He still had the image of God in a certain sense, and thus could be appealed to by God. He could not save himself, but he could still be saved by God if he would co-operate.

II. The Essence of This Sinful Nature

Wesley used many figures of speech to describe this indwelling, or inbred, sin. Because of this, some have accused him of being very materialistic in his conception of the carnal mind — thinking of it as a physical thing. Such was not the case. In the last analysis, Wesley thought of this sinful nature as something psychical and ethical — as atheism and idolatry, pride, unbelief, self-will, and love of the world. The soul, and not the body, was the seat of sin for Wesley.

III. The Sinful Nature Destroyed in Entire Sanctification

Wesley was constantly using terms and phrases which implied that the sinful nature is destroyed when the Christian is sanctified wholly. Here are some descriptions of what takes place when one obtains the second blessing: purification from sin, present deliverance from sin, perfect deliverance from sin, deliverance from evil thoughts and evil tempers. He also speaks of this sinful nature as being destroyed, extirpated, subsisting no more, or cleansed away when we are sanctified. Likewise, he spoke of this second crisis as the renewal of our souls after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness, Christian perfection, full salvation, entire renewal of the spirit, having the mind of Christ, and loving God with all of our heart and our neighbors as ourselves. Therefore, it is no surprise that one writer declares that, according to Wesley's teaching, the self-will which the believer has but is not governed by is utterly annihilated by entire sanctification.

IV. Wesley Belonged to the "Extinction School"

Wesley did not use the term eradicate, but he certainly implied all that it means by the words which he did employ. He used the term extirpate; and it is more comprehensive in its destructive significance than eradicate. Still, there is even more direct evidence in this connection than anything which has yet been given. One writer has correctly said recently that Wesley belonged to the "extinction school." In one letter Wesley declared that he would not dispute as to whether sin is suspended or extinguished, but in another and later letter he did that very thing. There he said: "I use the word 'destroyed' because St. Paul does: 'suspend' I cannot find in the Bible."

Conclusion

Soon after Wesley's time, the term eradication came into use and became a key word in the American holiness movement. Pope, the theologian of the Wesleyan movement, uses the term at least once in his three-volume work on theology. It appears several times in Steele's writings, and then in most of the writings of the leaders of the holiness movement in America.

Discussing how this term eradication came to be used in this religious sense, we suggested in an earlier chapter that it might have been because of its connection with disease. It was early used to indicate that a physical disease had been destroyed, and then it was taken over into the moral and spiritual realm and employed to describe the complete destruction of the sin nature, a moral and spiritual disease. Another theory as to how it came to be used to set forth the complete destruction of the carnal mind is that it was employed when some began to drop the words entire and wholly as used with sanctification to indicate the thoroughness of the destruction of the old man which had been suggested by these words.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated
By
Stephen Solomon White

MAIN BODY TEXT
Chapter 3
WESLEY AND ERADICATION

Wesley believed in two types of sin: sin as an act, and sin as a nature. He looked upon sin as an act as largely springing from sin as a nature. Sin as an act and sin as a nature were both acquired. Man was created perfect, free from sins without and within. In Adam the human race fell. From then on, all men have been born in sin. Wesley believed in this doctrine of original sin so strongly that he declared it to be the essential difference between Christianity and heathenism.

Wesley defined an act of sin as a willful transgression of a known law of God. Any other act which might deviate from the perfect law of God was a mistake and not a sin. Of course, both sins and mistakes could be divided into inner and outer, or negative and positive types. When one is converted, he is forgiven for his acts of sin. He is also freed from the power of inbred or original sin, but not cleansed of its presence. This results in an intense inner struggle between the spirit of Christ, which comes in when one is born again, and the carnal mind or evil nature which remains.

Wesley described, in many and varied ways, the extent of this evil condition which is still in man after he is saved. Here are some of his statements: Man is all sin, he is merely a lump of ungodliness, he is prone to evil and averse from all that is good. As a result of this sinful state, confusion and ignorance and error reign over our understanding; unreasonable, earthly, sensual, devilish passions usurp authority over our will; in a word, there is no whole part in our soul, all of the foundations of our nature are out of course. Original sin is a condition in which all of the faculties of man, understanding and will, and affections, have been perverted. It is a total corruption of the whole human nature. These statements prove that Wesley believed in total depravity. However, out of fairness to him, we must say that this total depravity was chiefly thought of as something which made man helpless, morally and spiritually, but not hopeless. Man still had the image of God in certain senses. However, he could not come to God without divine help.

More important for us than the reach of this sinful nature is its essential character. Just how did Wesley think of the condition of man? He described it in many ways. It was an evil nature, a force inherent in man, an innate corruption of the innermost nature of man, an evil root, an inclination to evil, a natural propensity to sin, a leprosy or illness. But this was not all. He called original sin an evil root from which spring both inward and outward sins; a sour yeast which permeates the whole soul; that carnal mind which is enmity against God — pride of heart, self-will, and love of the world; a leaven which leavens the whole mass; roots of bitterness which infect our words and taint our actions; a corruption chiefly manifested in atheism and idolatry — pride, and self-will, and love of the world. Thus Wesley uses many figures of speech in setting forth the essence of original sin. In the light of this fact, how can anyone hold that he thought of original sin as a thing because he sometimes likened it to a root? The Bible is guilty of the use of such figures with reference to both

regeneration and entire sanctification. The minister who preaches about either of these today does the same.

Like Jesus, he talks about the living water, the new birth, the old man of sin, the dirt of sin which needs to be cleansed away, the disease of sin which needs to be cured, etc., etc., ad nauseam. Further, Wesley, time and time again, tells us what he really means by the figures of speech or the manner in which this original sin manifests itself. The chief expressions of this root or disease or leaven are atheism and idolatry, pride, unbelief, self-will, and love of the world. These manifestations of original sin are psychical in character; and material roots do not produce psychical effects or branches — if I may be permitted to use a figure of speech without being misunderstood. Besides, we ought to remember that Wesley, when he uses these figures of speech, is always talking about a certain type of sin; and sin is psychical and not physical. Of course, Wesley did not live in our day and have the opportunity of being taught modern psychology. But he did live after Plato and Descartes and many other thinkers who had differentiated clearly and fully between the material and the immaterial or spiritual. He was not as dumb in this realm as some have tried to make us believe. Lindstrom, in speaking of Wesley's view of justification as over against his doctrine of sanctification, says rightly that the latter makes justification judicial and objective, and sanctification subjective and psychological.

He also declares that, according to Wesley, Christian perfection is an inherent ethical change. As a conclusion to this part of our discussion, let me give a significant quotation from Wesley: "But surely we cannot be saved from sin while we dwell in a sinful body. A sinful body, I pray observe how deeply ambiguous, how equivocal, this expression is! But there is no authority for it in Scripture. The word sinful body is never found there, and as it is totally unscriptural, so it is palpably absurd. For no body, or no matter of any kind can be sinful; spirits alone are capable of sin. Pray, in what part of the body should sin lodge? It cannot lodge in the skin, the muscles, the nerves, the veins, or the arteries; it cannot be in the bones any more than in the hair or nails. Only the soul can be the seat of sin." How could a man who gave us these words think of original sin as a material thing? And I am convinced, also, that we have plenty of reason for believing that for Wesley, original sin was a psychical-ethical condition or state, and not an entity of any type.

Did Wesley believe in the eradication or complete destruction of this psychical-ethical condition or state of sin in which man is born? We believe that the evidence compels one to answer this in the affirmative. Here are a number of phrases which he used in stating what is done when a person is sanctified wholly: purification from sin, present deliverance from sin, perfect deliverance from sin, a heart that is purified from all sin, deliverance from inward as well as outward sin, deliverance from evil thoughts and evil tempers, the circumcision of the heart from all filthiness — all inward as well as outward pollution, salvation from all sin, inbred sin or the total corruption of man's nature taken away, the heart purified or cleansed from all unrighteousness, liberation from sin, a love which is incompatible with sin, a love unmixed with sin — a pure love, a condition in the heart where there is no mixture of contrary affections, full deliverance from sin, freedom from evil thoughts and evil tempers, a total death to sin, delivered from the root of sin — the source of inward and outward sins, delivered from original sin, and freed from all sin. Notice how many times the term all appears in these statements. In fact, all of them imply universal affirmative propositions, from the standpoint of logic, and could not, therefore, fit into any other interpretation than that of eradication.

Keeping to the negative idea of what is destroyed when a Christian is entirely sanctified, let us present a somewhat longer quotation from Wesley. From the sermon on "The Repentance of Believers," we have these words: "Indeed this is so evident a truth, that well-nigh all the children of God, scattered abroad, however they differ on other points, yet generally agree in this: that although we may, by the Spirit, mortify the deeds of the body, resist and conquer both outward and inward sin; although we may weaken our enemies day by day; yet we cannot drive them out. By all the grace which is given at justification we cannot extirpate them. Though we watch and pray ever so much, we cannot wholly cleanse either our hearts or hands. Most sure we cannot, till it shall please our Lord to speak to our hearts again, to speak the second time, 'Be clean'; and then the leprosy is cleansed. Then only, the evil root, the carnal mind, is destroyed; and inbred sin subsists no more." Here we have at least five very definite and all-inclusive phrases which refer to the elimination of sin. It is destroyed, subsists no more, or the leprosy is cleansed. Further, it is implied that while we cannot drive out or extirpate the inner enemy before entire sanctification, this is exactly what is done when we are wholly sanctified. Etymologically, extirpate is one of the strongest terms ever used in connection with the sin nature. It means "not only to destroy the individuals of any race of plants or animals, but the very stock, so that the race can never be restored."

One writer rightly asserts that, according to Wesley's teaching, the self-will which the believer has but is not governed by is utterly annihilated by entire sanctification. Such a statement is certainly in harmony with eradication. Another quotation which has in it both the negative and positive aspects involved in entire sanctification is now given. It reads as follows: "By salvation I mean, not barely, according to the vulgar notion, deliverance from hell, or going to heaven; but a present deliverance from sin, a restoration of the soul to its primitive health, its original purity; a recovery of the divine nature; the renewal of our souls after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness, in justice, mercy, and truth. This implies all holy and heavenly tempers, and, by consequence, all holiness of conversation."

Since we have given positive, as well as negative, elements in this quotation, permit us to offer some other names and declarations from Wesley which indicate what is done positively when a person is sanctified. They are as follows: Christian perfection, full salvation, entire sanctification, wholly sanctified, perfect love, pure love, entire renewal of the spirit, purity of intention, dedicating all of the life to God, giving God all our heart, one desire and design ruling all our tempers, devoting all our soul, body, and substance to God, having the mind of Christ and walking as He walked, and loving God with all our heart and our neighbor as ourselves. These positive results of entire sanctification bar the possibility of sin remaining in the heart, in any form, after one has received this experience.

Nowhere do we find Wesley using the word eradication, although, as we have shown, he used many statements which mean the same as to destroy completely. We could stop here and be perfectly satisfied that he was an eradicationist, but we have still more definite proof of this fact. One recent writer has correctly said that Wesley belonged to the "extinction school." In one letter he declared that he would not dispute as to whether sin is suspended or extinguished; and yet in another letter he did dispute, and came out for the latter truth. In writing to John Benson he said: "Are not the love of God and our neighbor good tempers? And, so far as these reign in the soul, are not the opposite

tempers, worldly-mindedness, malice, cruelty, revengefulness, destroyed? . . . I use the word 'destroyed' because St. Paul does: 'suspended' I cannot find in the Bible."

After Wesley, the term eradication soon came into use and was appropriated by the leaders of the holiness movement in America. Of course, it is fair to say that it has never been extensively used. We find it at least once in Pope's discussion of entire sanctification in his second volume. It appears in Steele's writings and occasionally in most of the books written by the early leaders of the holiness movement. Some of these men seem to prefer the word extirpate, which, as we have already shown, is a stronger and more definite term than eradicate. However, eradicate has been the word which holiness preachers and theologians have generally employed when they have wanted to state our position in a clear and unmistakable manner.

In an earlier chapter we have made the suggestion that eradicate likely came into use because it had already been employed with reference to physical disease, and now could well signify the destruction of the moral and spiritual disease of inbred sin. (Wesley, as we have seen, often likened it to an illness.) Allow me now to offer another explanation for the fact that it came into use. Some of the staunch believers in the truth of entire sanctification began to leave off the entire and the wholly — which Wesley so often used with sanctification to indicate its completeness or thoroughness — because of certain misunderstandings which might have arisen. In order to offset this, they then adopted the use of eradication, which so strikingly indicates the thoroughness or completeness of the destruction of sin in the second blessing.

ERADICATION

Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

Chapter 4

ERADICATION VERSUS SUPPRESSION

OUTLINE

Introduction

In this chapter we discuss the most important phase of the whole question of eradication — its relation to suppression. This being the case, we shall deal only with some general, or preliminary, matters in this chapter, while in chapter five we shall have to do more with the details of the arguments involved.

I. Minor Uses of the Term Suppression

Some second-blessing holiness people talk of the "old man of sin," or the carnal mind, being kept under, or suppressed, while we are saved, or regenerated, but not sanctified wholly. The use of suppression in connection with this presanctified state is not the usual sense in which the word is employed.

Another minor use of the term suppression is in relation to the post-sanctified life. The natural, or legitimate, appetites are spoken of as being kept under, or suppressed, after we have been sanctified wholly. Paul, they declare, had this in mind when he spoke of keeping the body under. This is not the meaning of the term suppression as used in this or the next chapter. Further, it is more exact to say that the natural appetites must be directed or guided rather than suppressed after entire sanctification.

II. Both Eradication and Suppression Excluded

There are those who hold that man is born naturally good, and, therefore, they could not believe in either eradication or suppression of the inborn sin nature. The naturally good could not have any carnal mind to be suppressed or eradicated. Another group would not go this far, but they would exclude inbred sin or sin as a native inclination. They believe in sin as an act, but not as an inborn trend. Both those who hold that there is a natural tendency toward good in man and those who claim that sin exists in act only are unscriptural and illogical.

III. Eradication and Suppression Theories

Almost all Christian churches in their creedal statements hold that man is naturally sinful, that is, he is born with a sinful bent. Further, as a rule, the Christian churches claim that this sinful condition within is not eliminated when a person is saved. Then his sins are forgiven, but his fallen nature is

not destroyed. The big question is, then, when do we get rid of this carnal mind? For there can be no sin in heaven.

The Church of the Nazarene follows John Wesley's interpretation of the Bible in asserting that this sin nature can and should be eradicated instantaneously in this life.

Next, there is the growth theory, which teaches that the old man of sin is gradually expelled after justification by the constant help of the Holy Spirit. Theoretically, it takes the position that there may and sometimes does come a time in this life when this carnal mind is completely gone. However, those who hold this position never seem to reach this goal, but are rather always approaching it. This is an eradication theory, but it maintains that the eradication is gradual rather than instantaneous. In fact, all theories which make sin natural to man's present existence teach its final eradication — they all hold that no sin can finally remain in the heart of the man who has entered into the state of everlasting blessedness.

A third view stands for the gradual eradication of the sin nature and sinning, but neither the sin nature nor the sinning will be completely done away with until death. This is the general Reformed view, and it stands for eradication; but it is an eradication which does not reach its culmination until death. This view does not hesitate to fall back on some form of imputation of the righteousness of Christ as a supplement to its eradication view.

The fourth theory is the suppressionist theory in the technical sense. It holds to the instantaneous suppression of sin with the instantaneous eradication of sinning. This is brought about by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, which is a second work of grace. The sin nature is not reduced at all in this life. However, it may be kept under, or suppressed constantly, so that we live a life of victory over sin. The Keswick movement in England and the Victorious Life group in America have been the chief exponents of this position. There have been many fine Christians in these groups, and some of them have come very close to the first view which we discussed.

The fifth doctrinal position as to this sin nature is the two-nature theory. It makes no room for a second blessing. When one is saved, the Holy Spirit comes in; and from then on there is a struggle between the two natures, with the Christ-nature, or Holy Spirit, dominating the whole situation at times. With this theory, however, there is no eradication in this life. It comes at death, when our present body is shuffled off. This theory is not new, as some would have us believe. Nevertheless, it is having quite a revival today.

Conclusion

The anti-eradication views include any of the teachings which hold that the sin nature cannot be or is not eradicated in this life. Such positions are unscriptural; unpsychological; overemphasize power and service to the neglect of inner purity, or heart holiness; substitute consecration for entire sanctification; and permit imputed, reckoned, potential, or positional righteousness to take the place of imparted righteousness.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

MAIN BODY TEXT
Chapter 4
ERADICATION VERSUS SUPPRESSION

This chapter takes up the most important phase of the whole question of eradication. Since this is the case, we shall now consider several significant general or preliminary matters. In the next chapter, we shall consider in detail the specific arguments — scriptural and otherwise — which are for and against eradication.

First of all we shall briefly point out two minor uses of the term suppression. The Wesleyan or full-fledged adherent of eradicationism sometimes uses the word suppression in relation to inbred sin in the heart of the regenerated. In this pre-sanctified state, man does not commit deliberate acts of sin. He is saved, not from the presence, but from the power of the carnal mind. Thus the "old man of sin" is kept under or suppressed.

Some of those who believe in the instantaneous eradication of sin in this life use the term suppression in relation to the post-sanctified life. They connect it with that passage where Paul declares that he keeps his body under. No doubt Paul is here referring to the natural appetites of the psychological self, and means that they must be controlled, even after one has been sanctified wholly.

Those who thus employ the word believe in both eradication and suppression — eradication for the carnal mind or the "old man" and suppression for the natural appetites of man. Such use of suppression is confusing, since it has already come to be definitely associated with another situation. Further, there is a more exact way to describe this post-sanctified condition. Why not say that the natural appetites must be directed or guided after one has been entirely sanctified? This is actually what has to be done.

Next we shall elaborate two theories as to man's nature which make no room for either eradication or suppression. First, someone has set forth the thesis that man is naturally good. This means, of course, that he is free from the sin nature and the acts of sin. This is explained by the claim that every man has God within him. This divinity which is immanent in man's personality is described as disinterested will or the will to universal good.

Such a view of man could at best believe only in the direction of the natural and acquired traits of human beings. Salvation could be no more than this, whether it is looked upon as dependent upon grace or finite reason. Thus there would be no place in such a scheme for either the eradication or the suppression of sin, since there is really no such thing as sin.

Second, there are some today who would, no doubt, declare that there is sin in act but no condition within human nature which might be described as sinful. People in this class would be following largely in the footsteps of Zinzendorf, who limited sin to the will.

As has been said more than once, any view like this is not only unscriptural and contrary to experience — as was the case with the view that finds a positive trend toward good in man — but it is also illogical. How can there be sinning as a habit or life without sin in the nature? Or better, how can there be the fruit without the tree, or the branches without the root, or the constantly flowing water without the spring or source?

This brings us to the view of man which practically all Christians and Christian churches hold. This, at least, is the position which is stated in their creeds, though for a time many scholars rejected it because of their inability to harmonize it with the theory of evolution. This position is the belief that men are naturally sinful now, and that sinning is the outcome of such a state. This truth has been so strongly forced upon us by experience, within recent years, that even religious thinkers who are evolutionists are fitting it into their systems of philosophy.

If man is a sinner by nature, then the question arises as to how and when he can rid himself of this condition. None, so far as I know, hold that this sin nature is eliminated when one is saved. It must always come after regeneration.

The first view which we shall mention is that of the Church of the Nazarene. It is the Wesleyan position, which declares that man is freed from sin by the instantaneous eradication of the carnal mind, here and now, by the baptism with the Holy Spirit. Thus the "old man" is expelled, and Christ takes over the rule in our hearts. The freedom from conscious sinning which had already characterized the regenerated life is now made much easier. However, we must remember that it takes the same consecration and faith to keep this second blessing that it did to get it. From this viewpoint, it is a moment-by-moment affair. We should also remember that it is not something that we bring to pass, but is rather the work of God. We should ever look to Him in great thankfulness for this achievement. No glory can ever come to us because of this experience of life. All the praise and honor belong to God.

The second view which we shall mention is represented by Mudge's Growth in Holiness. It defends the gradual eradication of sin and sinning after justification by the constant help of the Holy Spirit. This process may culminate at some point in this life; and thus the individual is completely freed from sin and sinning. It is hazy, as such claims usually are, so far as to just when the sin nature and sin will be annihilated. It seems to be always approaching the goal but never arriving at it. However, in all fairness, one must admit that the objective is at least theoretically attainable by this gradual movement, sometime before death.

We are not taking the time to answer this view specifically, because it does not come under the head of suppressionists' theories in the technical meaning of this term. It is an eradication rather than a suppressionist theory, although the eradication is gradual and not instantaneous. Daniel Steele wrote a little book which specifically answers the teaching of Mudge's book. Anyone who reads the latter should, out of all fairness, read the former also.

We might pause long enough here to assert that all theories which make sin natural to man's present existence believe in final eradication. We shall discover later in this discussion that even the suppressionists believe that all sin must be eradicated before a man can get to heaven. Suppressionism will not meet the test of the next world.

The third view to which we would call your attention teaches a gradual eradication of sin and sinning by the help of grace as administered by the Holy Spirit which will never be finally achieved until the hour and article of death. This is the general Reformed view; and such men as Warfield and Hodge give excellent presentations of it. They do not hesitate to use the term eradicate; and they believe that, as the sin nature is little by little done away with, our sinning will become less. However, they so overemphasize the fact that we do not completely get rid of sin and sinning in this life that they blind one to the idea that any real progress is made in this life. This makes death take on a more important place in the scheme of eradication than they seem at times to desire.

Anyway, their view, like the growth theory, from one viewpoint is an eradicationist claim. Please do not misunderstand us in thus describing their contention. It does not bar the tendency in their writings along this line to fall back on some form of imputation, which is often mixed up with the strictly suppressionist arguments. It should also be said here that all of the suppressionist theories stem from Calvinism and the general Reform position rather than from Arminianism. Wesleyanism, on the other hand, rests on an Arminian foundation.

The fourth theory is committed to the instantaneous suppression of sin with the consequent instantaneous eradication of sinning which is momentary, continuous, and permanent. By permanent we do not mean that grace cannot be lost; but it need not be lost, and is not merely temporary. It does, nevertheless, require continuous surrender and faith in order for it to be perpetuated in one's experience. Further, of course, this instantaneous experience is a second blessing.

We must also always bear in mind that the suppressed sin nature is not reduced in the least during this life. It must await death before it can be eradicated in any degree. It is along this line that Warfield criticizes this view. He thinks that his claim that sin and sinning are both gradually eliminated — the one with the other — is much more logical than to hold that all sinning is destroyed while the sin nature is untouched, so far as being lessened is concerned. For him, the destruction of each is completed at death.

Those who are in this fourth group constitute the suppressionists, if one is speaking exactly. There are other organizations which are related to them; but they alone, in the technical sense, belong in this category. The Keswick associates in England have been, for something like seventy years, the leaders in this thought. The Victorious Life movement in America — a later development — holds the same position theologically. Neither of these movements is denominational in character.

Rev. W. E. Boardman joined Rev. R. Pearsall Smith in 1873 in London, where the latter was beginning a "Higher Life" campaign. This activity took on great proportions, not only in England but also on the continent. The Keswick movement was one of the results of this work. It has maintained itself down to the present time with more zeal and influence than the Victorious Life movement has in America. Mr. Smith, as well as Mr. Boardman, was an American; and both men received their

start as they came in touch with the regular or Wesleyan holiness movement in America. However, from the very first, they deviated somewhat from the Wesleyan teaching as to eradication.

There is a Keswick Week held each year in England, when messages are given which emphasize the deeper life in accordance with Keswick teaching. The messages of each convention are published in a book. The 1947 volume defines the Keswick message as "victory over sin through submission to the sovereignty of Christ and the infilling of the Holy Spirit." It is fair to say also that there are many deeply spiritual people who are loyal to the message of Keswick and make a real contribution to the kingdom of God.

The fifth doctrinal position which we would define is related to the Keswick and Victorious Life groups but cannot be classed as true suppressionism in the technical sense of this term. Nevertheless, it has a Calvinistic slant which relates it to suppressionism. It is the two-nature theory, and may be stated thus: With conversion, the Holy Spirit comes in and makes possible an intermittent counteraction or domination of the sin nature, with the consequent intermittent prevention of sinning. When the Holy Spirit is given in conversion, man becomes a two-nature creature — possessor of a carnal mind and of the mind of Christ.

This view, of course, makes no place for a second blessing. Neither does it provide in any way for the eradication of the "old man of sin." This can take place only in the next world, after the physical body has been disposed of. In this teaching, however, there is the possibility that at times the Adamic nature can be counteracted and sinning be excluded. The Christ nature rises up and dominates the old nature temporarily, and the outward life thereby manifests righteous living.

This movement, although it has connections with the past, is having quite a revival today. Its only value seems to be that it emphasizes sinlessness as a theoretical possibility for the Christian occasionally. We say theoretical because those who champion this notion have so much to say about the saved sinning that they almost hide or cover up their claim that it is possible to reach temporary or intermittent sinlessness.

It is difficult to describe this two-nature theory, because it is quite a hodgepodge or conglomeration of Calvinistic attempts to solve the problem of salvation. We have aimed to give only its chief characteristics.

The sixth tenet, which is foundational for some, is that both our justification and our sanctification are positional only. Through Christ we have a holy standing. His holiness is imputed to us or we are reckoned as free from sin through Him. This is ours through faith. The Plymouth Brethren might be thought of as best representing this type of belief. There is no emphasis with them on the second blessing. Holiness comes when we are regenerated, that is, the kind of holiness which they believe in — holiness that is imputed only. This group came into existence during the earlier part of the nineteenth century. They depended wholly upon the fact that Christ's righteousness stood between them and all judgment or danger if they only believed on Him or accepted that which He had done for them.

The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth views, which we have just outlined, are interrelated. They overlap at several points and, because of this fact, cannot be clearly and fully differentiated.

What is wrong with the theories of salvation which deny the eradication of the sin principle in this life? In the first place, they are unscriptural. They deviate from the truth as laid down in the Bible. This fact is all-important. It is not what any man says or believes; it is what God's final Word declares that determines the matter. This consideration will require too much space for the limits of the present chapter. Besides, we are interested now in giving only a general survey of the shortcomings of these views. In the next chapter they will be discussed in detail.

This type of unscriptural teachings is also unpsychological. Suppression, as many of its proponents declare, is a form of repression. Since the coming of Freudianism into the psychological picture, repression has had a questionable standing with almost all psychologists. It is dangerous to hold down or keep under this sinful nature. To do so will cause it to carry on a traitorous or treacherous life in the subconscious realm. This will result in several types of unhealthy personality states. A recognition of this much truth in Freudianism does not mean that it is swallowed whole.

The two-natures theory may get away partly from the repression scheme; but, insofar as it does this, it jumps from the frying pan into the fire. It escapes from suppression or repression only by bringing into the foreground a terrible struggle between the sinful nature and the Christ nature. Thus we are faced with a divided self — a self that lacks any kind of integration, good or bad. This is another psychological situation which tends to lead to various mental maladies. Thus these doctrines which deny eradication in this life, for the most part, alternate between repression on the one hand and a divided self on the other. Both results are psychologically bad.

There is another very grave difficulty with these contentions. It is their emphasis upon the body as sinful. Such a procedure is both unscriptural — as we hope to show later — and unpsychological. Sin is a psychical-ethical something and does not reside in the body itself. There is no way by means of which such a conclusion can be established. The Biblical exegetes, the moralists, or the psychologists will not support such a position. This will be dealt with in detail in the next discussion.

These suppressionists and semi-suppressionists place the chief emphasis upon power and service. These are essential to the Christian life, but they are by-products and not primary. Purity or holiness is inner and causative — has to do with character in and of itself, while power and service are effects. To center on the latter and ignore the former is to put the cart before the horse, and ultimately means that all three — purity, power, and service — are eliminated.

Consecration cannot take the place of sanctification. There is no possible means whereby the term sanctification can be reduced merely to consecration if a fair exegesis of God's Word is presented. Only a few days ago we had occasion to read a B.D. thesis written by one who was graduating from a school with Calvinistic leanings. The subject of this monograph was "The Holiness of God in the Old Testament." He was dealing with the subject exegetically and not theologically. He definitely and openly stated that the holiness of God had an ethical element in it, and that God, even in the Old Testament, required more than consecration of those men who were declared holy.

The last wrong conception which is involved in all of these suppressionist schools of thought is that which hinges on such terms as imputation, reckoning, potential, positional, and standing. It leads to an overemphasis upon grace and faith and to a neglect of right living. Such a course inevitably results in antinomianism in some form. It is only fair to say, in concluding this discussion, that many of the adherents of these views live above their theology.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

Chapter 5
ERADICATION VERSUS SUPPRESSION
(Continued)

OUTLINE

Introduction

The suppressionist view and almost all other anti-eradicationist theories emphasize the idea that the body is sinful. Such a claim logically bars eradication until death, or until the destruction of the present body.

I. Hollenback's Claim as to the Sinfulness of the Body

In his book *True Holiness*, Roy L. Hollenback asserts that the chief error of the holiness people is that they completely separate inbred sin, or the carnal mind, from the fleshly body. Then he goes on to say that such a position is a pure invention and does not have the slightest foundation in the Word of God. According to him, the Bible undoubtedly teaches that the body is inherently sinful. He makes this claim the foundation of his anti-eradicationism. If it is shown to be false, then his two-nature notion does not have anything to stand on.

II. The Body Is Not Inherently Sinful

Several authorities are cited that were never connected in any way with the holiness movement and, therefore, could not be said to be prejudiced in favor of our view.

A. B. Bruce, in his *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity* in spite of his Calvinistic background, asserts that Paul holds to an ethical and not a metaphysical dualism. The former is the Hebrew position, while the latter is the Greek. Paul, he says, follows the Hebrew concept and not the Greek. All of this means that when Paul talks about the flesh and the spirit he refers to two ethical principles and not to a physical body as over against a metaphysical spirit, or entity.

G. B. Stevens, in his *New Testament Theology*, discusses this question and concludes by saying that Paul by no means regards the body as essentially sinful, and adds that the term *sarx* in the Greek does not mean this. Reinhold Niebuhr states that *sarx* means the principle of sin rather than the body; and Millar Burrows declares that Paul does not teach that the body, as such, is evil. Burrows also states that the New Testament uses "flesh" to designate man's lower nature as over against his higher nature.

Thayer's Greek Lexicon tells us that *sarx* when opposed to the spirit has an ethical sense and includes whatever in the soul is weak, low, debased, and tends to ungodliness and vice. This statement certainly does not support the claim that the flesh, or *sarx*, always refers to the body. William Sanday, in his great commentary on Romans, takes issue with those who say that Paul taught that the body is inherently sinful. In fact, he states that one of Paul's key passages proves the opposite. H. C. Sheldon, in his New Testament Theology, closes his lengthy discussion of this problem by giving seven reasons why he prefers the interpretation that the body is not inherently sinful.

Thus, we have given the conclusions of seven outstanding authorities as to the sinfulness of the body; and all of them agree that it is not the teaching of Paul or of the New Testament as a whole.

III. First John 1:8

Those who are opposed to holiness of heart and life, or eradication, often bring up I John 1:8. This verse reads as follows: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." First of all, I cannot see how anyone can rule out eradication, or a holy heart, on the basis of this verse if he will only read it in its context. In harmony with this thought, one excellent authority says that there is a way out of the difficulty which this verse seems to present if it is interpreted in the light of its context. Thus dealt with, it becomes the second of three false claims of the opponents with whom John was dealing. The first error is the belief that one can commune with God while living in sin; the second is a general denial of sin in principle — we have no sin; and the third is a particular denial of one's actual sins. Thus the second erroneous teaching is that which is set forth in I John 1:8. It has to do, then, only with those who deny that they have a sin nature to be cleansed, and not with the impossibility of being cleansed.

IV. Christ's Summary of the law

The Lord's great injunction is to love God with all of our hearts and our neighbors as ourselves. This, as O. A. Curtis indicates in his book *The Christian Faith*, is not just an ideal for which we are to strive in this life, as some hold; it is rather a goal of perfection which the Christian can attain to here and now. The Master undoubtedly intended that it should be this. "Every Christian deed is Christian, every Christian thought is Christian, every Christian feeling is Christian, precisely to the extent that it expresses this supreme love."

Conclusion

There are many scriptural terms which describe what can happen to the sin nature in this life which could not mean anything less than eradication. Here are some of them: crucify, crucified, mortify, destroy, abolish, cleanse, purify, and purge. Freedom from sin, or Christian perfection, is clearly implied by these Biblical words.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

MAIN BODY TEXT
Chapter 5
ERADICATION VERSUS SUPPRESSION
(Continued)

One of the most important problems connected with the debate between suppression and eradication is the relation of the body to sin. Those who argue for suppression, or in some other way deny the possibility of eradication in this life, almost invariably make the body sinful. Such a claim logically bars eradication until the present body has been destroyed by death.

R. L. Hollenback, in his book True Holiness, writes thus of sin and the body: "Among the several gross errors in the established doctrine of the holiness people there is one which we believe to be foundational, and parent to many others. It is the teaching that inbred sin is a principle entirely separate from the fleshly body. They call this principle or entity by many names, some of which are scriptural in origin, and others not. 'Carnality,' 'the old man,' 'the carnal mind,' 'the Adamic nature,' 'the body of sin,' 'inbred sin,' 'indwelling sin,' 'root sin,' are some of the names used. None of these would be misleading if applied in the right way. They affirm that the words, 'body' and 'flesh,' particularly when found in Romans and Galatians, do not refer to our corporeal body, but to that separate principle designated by the above names. They see no connection between this 'body of sin' and man's physical body; which they hold is neutral and incapable of being sinful.

"It may startle some of the readers when I say that this separate entity which they call 'carnality' is another pure invention. It is without the slightest foundation in the Word of God. We have heard many of the holiness preachers use such literalism in referring to it as to call it a 'beast,' a 'snake in the heart,' 'a devilish hyena,' 'the devil's child,' and other things of like nature. But by whatever names they call it in their literalization, the fact still remains that this entity is purely a creature of their own imagination. They affirm that this monster lives in the same heart with the Spirit's life (the Spirit's life, mark you, without the Spirit!!) in the born-again soul.

"With exception of two places, the word flesh is from the same word in the original every place it is found in the New Testament; and always refers to the physical body. (*sarx* is the Greek word.) The two places where another word is used is where reference is made to the flesh of animals, and the word used is *kreas*.

"Likewise the word BODY is from the same word every place but two in the New Testament. (*soma* in the Greek.) Only in Acts 19: 12 and Eph. 3:6 is any other word used. By what line of reasoning can anybody say this word means our mortal body in most places, and means a principle within our hearts in other places? Human language could not plainer state anything than it does that our mortal bodies are sinful, as careful reading of the following references will clearly show: Rom. 7:5, 7:18, 8:3, 1 Cor. 9:27."

We have quoted at some length from this writer because the position here outlined is representative of most of the anti-eradicationists. Like him, they regard the claim that there is a sinful nature in man which is psychical and nonphysical as both unscriptural and ridiculous. These teachers who are so sure that the body is to be identified with sin cannot imagine how anyone could believe otherwise.

Please notice that Hollenback makes his claim that the body is inherently sinful foundational to his anti-eradicationism. This means that, if this position is proved unscriptural, Hollenback has no case. Let this be kept in mind as we proceed with this discussion.

Next we shall give what some prominent Bible scholars have to say about this matter. All of them are men who are definitely outside of the holiness movement and, therefore, could not be prejudiced in favor of entire sanctification as attainable in this life.

A. B. Bruce, in his *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, goes into this question carefully and fully. And, although Calvinistic in background, he does not give any sanction to the contention outlined above. He starts out by admitting that the idea of a sinful body is fully in harmony with Greek philosophy, but he definitely denies that Paul patterns after Plato or Plato's followers. He gives us these significant words: "The theory that matter or flesh is essentially evil is decidedly unHebrew. The dualistic conception of man as composed of two natures, flesh and spirit, standing in necessary and permanent antagonism to each other, is not to be found in the Old Testament Scriptures. It is true, indeed, that between the close of the Hebrew canon and the New Testament era the leaven of Hellenistic philosophy was at work in Hebrew thought, producing in course of time a considerable modification in Jewish ideas on various subjects; and it is a perfectly fair and legitimate hypothesis that traces of such influence are recognizable in the Pauline doctrine of the *sarx*. But the presumption is certainly not in favor of this hypothesis. It is rather all the other way; for throughout his writings St. Paul appears a Hebrew of the Hebrews. His intellectual and spiritual affinities are with the psalmists and prophets, not with Alexandrian philosophers; and if there be any new leaven in his culture it is Rabbinical rather than Hellenistic" (p. 269).

Another quotation from the same writer on page 275 reads thus: "On these grounds it may be confidently affirmed that the metaphysical dualism of the Greeks could not possibly have commended itself to the mind of St. Paul. An ethical dualism he does teach, but he never goes beyond that. It is of course open to anyone to say that the metaphysical dualism really lies behind the ethical one, though St. Paul himself was not conscious of the fact, and that therefore radical disciples like Marcion were only following out his principles to their final consequences when they set spirit and matter, God and the world, over against each other as hostile kingdoms. But even those who take up this position are forced in candor to admit that such Gnostic or Manichean doctrine was not in all the apostle's thought." He who believes in a sinful body could get little comfort out of these quotations.

G. B. Stevens, in his *New Testament Theology*, discusses the meaning of flesh or *sarx*. The following quotation lets us know where he stands as to this controversy. "In Gal. v. 19-23, the apostle enumerates the works of the flesh, and sets them in contrast with the fruit of the Spirit. Among the former are found not only sensuous sins, such as unchastity and drunkenness, but

(chiefly) such as have no direct connection with bodily impulses, — 'enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, heresies, envyings.' Similarly in Rom. xiii. 13, 14, the avoidance of making provision for the flesh includes the renunciation, not only of 'chambering and wantonness,' but also of 'strife and jealousy.' In addressing the Corinthians the apostle designates them as carnal, because 'there is among them jealousy and strife' (I Cor. 3: 3). Moreover, he speaks (II Cor. 1:12) of a **σοφία σαρκικη**: that is, a worldly and selfish policy as opposed to the 'holiness and sincerity which come from God.' These examples appear to me to be absolutely decisive against the view that Paul associates sin inseparably with the body, or makes its essence to consist in sensuousness. In these expressions at least, *sarx* is used in a sense at once more comprehensive and more distinctly ethical than the theory supposes which makes it a name for the 'impulse of sensuousness.'

"If we consider Paul's doctrine of the body (*soma*) we shall find that he by no means regards it as essentially sinful, and this conception of it is not equivalent to the idea denoted by *sarx*."

Here we have given but a brief quotation from several pages which are devoted to this topic, but it indicates the general tenor of the author's position. Certainly, he does not contend for the view that the body is sinful.

Two modern authorities may be appealed to next. They are Reinhold Niebuhr and Millar Burrows. The former, although Calvinistic in his general theological position, denies the sinfulness of the body. He says that the Bible knows nothing of a good mind and an evil body. This is the Greek but not the Hebrew view (*Nature and Destiny of Man*, Vol. I, p. 7). He further states that *sarx* means the principle of sin rather than the body (Vol. I, p. 152).

On page 134 in his *An Outline of Biblical Theology*, Burrows declares that Paul did not teach that the body, as such, is evil. He also says that the New Testament uses "flesh" to designate man's lower nature as over against his higher nature. These two men rank among the best scholars of the day, and have no reason at all to interpret the teaching of the Bible in favor of those who believe in eradication.

Turning back to an older authority, Thayer's Greek Lexicon has this to say under the fourth definition of *sarx*: "When either expressly or tacitly opposed to "to pneuma" [**του πνευματος**], has an ethical sense and denotes mere human nature, the earthly nature of man apart from divine influence, and therefore prone to sin and opposed to God; accordingly it includes whatever in the soul is weak, low, debased, tending to ungodliness and vice."

Sanday, in his great commentary on Romans, has this to say on verse five of the seventh chapter: "**ειναι εν τη σαρκι** is the opposite of **ειναι τω πνευματι**: the one is a life which has no higher object than the gratification of the senses, the other is a life permeated by the Spirit. Although *sarx* is human nature especially on the side of its frailty, it does not follow that there is any dualism in St. Paul's conception or that he regards the body as inherently sinful. Indeed this very passage proves the contrary. It implies that it is possible to be 'in the body' without being 'in the flesh.' The body, as such, is plastic to influences of either kind: it may be worked upon by Sin through the senses, or it may be worked upon by the Spirit. In either case the motive-force comes from without. The body

itself is neutral." This quotation speaks for itself, and it certainly does not sanction the idea that the body is in and of itself sinful.

On page 213 of his *New Testament Theology*, Sheldon gives us his view of the term flesh. His words read as follows: "The reader of the Pauline epistles very soon discovers that the term flesh (*sarx*) is frequently used in a larger than the physical significance. While literally it denotes the pliable substance of a living physical organism, and thus is related to body (*soma*) as the specific to the general, in many instances it evidently incorporates the ethico-religious sense. From what point of view did the apostle attach to it this meaning? Did he proceed from the standpoint of Hellenic dualism, and thus regard the flesh in virtue of its material as intrinsically evil, from its very nature antagonistic to the spirit in man with its sense of obligation to a moral ideal? Or, did he, putting a part for the whole, intend to denote by the flesh unrenewed human nature, man viewed as dominated by the desires and passions which have their sphere of manifestation especially in the bodily members? The latter we believe to be by far the more credible interpretation."

Then Sheldon gives seven reasons for preferring this interpretation rather than the narrower meaning in the direction of Hellenic dualism. First, Paul includes sins which are not connected with the physical members or sensuous life in his catalogue of the works of the flesh. Second, the phrase "our old man" is used in such a way as to indicate that its meaning is substantially equivalent to that assigned to the flesh. Third, Christians are so referred to as to imply that they are not in the flesh. Fourth, the body can be the temple of the Holy Spirit — this could hardly be if it were inherently sinful. Fifth, Christ was sinless, and yet He possessed a human body. Sixth, Paul does not make man's sinful nature the offspring of the sensuous nature, but rather ascribes it to the trespass of Adam. Seventh and last, if Paul had believed that the body is intrinsically evil, he would have been more of an ascetic than he was. I have very briefly summarized these seven reasons which are given by Sheldon, but they suggest the breadth of the foundation upon which his conclusion rests.

There are several scripture passages which are often referred to by anti-eradicationists as sure proofs of the belief that freedom from sins and sin in this life is impossible. One of the most important of these is found in I John 1:8. Those who are opposed to holiness of heart and life are continually calling our attention to this verse. In the first place, it has never seemed to me to have the meaning they ascribe to it, if it is considered in its context. In the fifth verse we are told that God is Light, and in Him is no darkness at all. This means, of course, that He is absolutely free from sin. Then in the sixth verse we are told that we are liars if we say that we have fellowship with Him and yet walk in darkness, or commit sin. This is followed by the outstanding truth in the seventh verse, which asserts that we have fellowship with God and are cleansed from all sin if we walk in the light. In view of these verses, how can the eighth be interpreted to mean that we can never be freed from sin in this life? The only interpretation of it that makes sense with that which precedes must be that he who denies that he has sin and needs cleansing deceives himself and is a liar. The same is true as to the verse which follows the eighth. What sense is there in saying that we can be cleansed from all unrighteousness if this is something which, according to the eighth verse, cannot be attained in this life? Such a claim as to the eighth verse certainly makes the Bible a comedy of errors.

This is essentially the position of R. Newton Flew in his excellent book *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology*. His words on page 109 as to I John 1:8 are as follows: "There is no way out

of this difficulty except to expound the sentence we have no sin strictly in its context as the second of three false claims of the opponents with whom John is dealing. The first is the claim of enjoying communion with God while living in sin. That is hypocrisy. The second is a general denial of sin in principle. We have no sin. The third is a particular denial of one's actual sins. We are not to understand the 'we' as a general statement about Christians. That may be the interpretation which comes naturally enough to Englishmen who constantly hear the words in their Liturgy, but it is at variance with the context. Again and again we are told that fellowship with God means freedom from sin. The thought of I John i. 7, as Westcott says, 'is not of the forgiveness of sins only, but of the removal of sin.'

"The writer of the epistle, then, must be dealing with a specific claim put forward in the church by some who would not admit that there was any sin in them at all. At the end of the first century when Gentiles with hardly any moral sensibility were finding themselves within the Church, such a claim must have been not infrequent. There is only one way, says our writer. We must confess our sins. Then forgiveness is granted and a complete cleansing.

"Once again we hear the austere note of absolute freedom from sin as the mark of the believer. I write to you, my little children, that you may not sin. There may be a fall from this ideal standard (I. John ii. 1). But this is evidently regarded as altogether exceptional. The possibility of fulfilling the commands of God is set forth later in the epistle (I. John iii. 22).

"So, too, in parallel passages in the Fourth Gospel (John xv. 7, 8, 16), the fruit of the disciples is expected to 'remain'. The Christian in this world is to be in life altogether like his Lord.

"He that says he abides in Him (i.e. in God) ought himself to walk even as He (*ekeinos*, i.e. Christ) walked (I. John ii. 6). The whole of the Fourth Gospel is the true exegesis of this verse."

Professor O. A. Curtis in his book *The Christian Faith*, pp. 388 and 389, gives us a discussion of our Lord's injunction which indicates that Jesus' ideal for the Christian in this life is perfection. His words read as follows: "And he said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hangeth the whole law, and the prophets" (Matt. 22:37-40).

"This one passage should forever settle the entire controversy as to both the ideal and the possible achievement in the Christian life. From the Old Testament (Deut. 6:5 and Lev. 19:18) our Lord takes the two items of supreme moment, and lifts them into a Christian primacy of injunction. It has been said that our Saviour did not intend to give an actual injunction, but only to suggest a Christian ideal. But I do not understand how anyone can hold such a view; for a study of the Saviour's life will show that love toward God and love toward man were the two tests which He used in determining all religious values. And the fact is that today the Christian consciousness surely grasps the Master's words as injunction, and responds to them as such, making them the final test of life. Every Christian deed is Christian, every Christian thought is Christian, every Christian feeling is Christian, precisely to the extent that it expresses this supreme love. Ignatius clearly apprehended the whole thing when he said: 'The beginning of life is faith, and the end is love. And these two being inseparably

connected together, do perfect the man of God; while the other things which are requisite to a holy life follow after them. No man making a profession of faith ought to sin, nor one possessed of love to hate his brother. For He that said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, said also, And thy neighbor as thyself."

Our final thought will be to list a few of the terms which describe God's method of dealing with the sin nature in the human heart — some that have not already been dealt with in more detail. They are so definite and far-reaching in their meaning that they could hardly be interpreted as teaching anything less than eradication. There are the terms crucify and crucified, which signify to destroy utterly (Gal. 2:20; 5:24; 6:14). Along with these are those which are or could be translated mortify, kill, render extinct (Rom. 7:4; 8:13), destroy, annul, abolish, put an end to, annihilate (I John 3:8; Rom. 6:6), and cleanse, purify, cleanse thoroughly, purge (Acts 15:9; I Cor. 7:1; Tit. 2:14). Freedom from sin, or Christian perfection, is clearly implied by these Biblical words.

Thus the chief foundation-stone of those who reject eradication — belief in the body as sinful — is proved to be unscriptural. The passage which is most often quoted against eradication is shown to be misinterpreted; the teaching of Jesus affirms the possibility of freedom from sin; and there are many terms — especially in Paul's writings — which substantiate our belief in eradication. This summarizes the four sections of this article and indicates the weaknesses of the anti-eradicationist view.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

Chapter 6
ERADICATION VERSUS INTEGRATION

OUTLINE

Introduction

The human mind is easily taken in by the novel, the spectacular, or that which seems to be miraculous. There is a place for these things, but we should not worship at their footstool. That which is old in terminology, or in any other field, should not be discarded unless we are sure that we really gain thereby.

There are those who in their search for that which is new or different think that they have found an excellent substitute for the phrase entire sanctification in the term integration. This, as we shall see later in this paper, is not the case. If we are really eager to present something unusual in connection with this experience of entire sanctification, let us really live it. This will impress those about us more than any new terminology which we may use. There is nothing so convincing as the logic of life.

I. Integration Defined

The central thought involved in integration is unity. It "is the process by which activities of any sort become organized." Integration was first a mathematical, next a biological, and then a psychological term. It came into psychology by way of J. B. Watson's materialistic behaviorism. In every sphere it has referred to oneness, or unity; and from the standpoint of origin, it is just as materialistic as eradication. As G. W. Allport says: "Personality, for Watson, is synonymous with the integration of an individual's manual, visceral, and laryngeal habits." No doubt integration has moved away from its etymological significance, but it has certainly not outclassed eradication in this respect. In fact, it does not have as good a record in this respect as eradication.

II. Integration a Dangerous Substitute for Entire Sanctification

Integration carries with it an inadequate conception of the sin nature. It gives us the Greek, or negative, view of depravity rather than the positive, or Hebrew, conception. Sin for it is just a deprivation and not a depravation, a lack of organization, or unity. It is not something which is essentially bad in itself, but rather just an immaturity, or lack of development. Sin, therefore, consists in being unorganized, incomplete, undeveloped, or ununified. This is a rather tame view of sin, and as such lays the foundation for an inadequate view of Christ, the atonement, and every other great Christian doctrine.

Again, entire sanctification is a supernatural crisis, while integration as understood in psychology does not rise above the level of the natural or that which is gradual. Further, in entire sanctification we have integration by subtraction, or by the eradication of sin, rather than integration by addition, or development, which is certainly the usual connotation of integration.

An added argument against using integration for entire sanctification is found in the fact that the former is a psychological, scientific, descriptive, quantitative, or behavior word, while entire sanctification is a philosophical, theological, normative, value, qualitative, or conduct term.

III. Integration May Be Either Good or Bad

Integration may be about a bad or a good motive. In other words, it may come about by the pursuit of either a bad or a good goal. The contrast is not, as some clearly imply by their misuse of integration, a weak, or unintegrated, character as over against a strong, or integrated, character; it is rather a weak character as over against a strong character — which can be either bad or good. Thus an integrated person may be a devil or a person who is sanctified wholly, according to the motive around which his life has been integrated. One can resist God until he obtains the peace of death; and when he has arrived at this state, he has an integrated personality — but he is far from being entirely sanctified.

The pastor of a church in one of the larger denominations in a certain university city tells about helping a young lady to integrate her life. She had been reared in an old-fashioned Christian home, and when she finished high school she went away to the university in the city where this minister was pastor. The liberal teaching of her professors brought on a conflict in her life between her home training and that at the university. She was on the verge of a nervous breakdown, and what might easily have resulted in insanity, when she went to the pastor for advice. He told her there was nothing to her home training, and she gave it up, accepted the liberal views of her professors, and, according to him, found peace, sanity, and integration — but not entire sanctification.

Conclusion

It is one thing to be integrated, but it is quite another to be integrated around the proper criterion, or standard. The person who is sanctified wholly does possess the highest type of integration, but the former and the latter are never to be identified; for there can be integration on the level of the lowest values. Allport points out in his great book on personality that religion does give us the most comprehensive philosophy of life, but it does not give us the only philosophy of life. There are many other unifying philosophies of life.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

MAIN BODY TEXT
Chapter 6
ERADICATION VERSUS INTEGRATION

The human mind seems to be especially fascinated by that which is novel. This is proved by the fact that new religious movements, no matter how irrational or unethical they may be, always catch some people. This craving for the novel is no doubt akin to the longing for the miraculous or spectacular. Please do not misunderstand us here. There is a place for the novel and the miraculous, and even for the spectacular; but we certainly should not make a god of them. Changes should be made only after we are sure that we shall gain something thereby. The old and accepted in terminology is not to be exchanged for the new unless we are convinced that some benefit will accrue.

Often we meet those who insist that they want new ways for presenting this old truth of entire sanctification. Integration, they tell us, gives us this opportunity; it is a psychological term in good repute with the best thinkers of the day, and yet it signifies just what takes place when a person gets the second blessing. This, we shall see later, is not the case. However, let us emphasize here that the best way to get the novel and the spectacular is to live the blessing every day. If we live it, really exemplify the Sermon on the Mount and the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, we shall stand out in the community where we live. People will take note of you if the self is really dead and you are living for God and others. It was Phillips Brooks who said, "Do not ask for the power to work miracles. Ask God to make a miracle out of you." This certainly will be true of anyone who gets the blessing of entire sanctification and lives it. You will be a novelty and will not need to seek for the miraculous or the spectacular in terms of anything else.

Next we shall present a definition of integration. It is taken from the glossary of psychological terms which are given in Vaughan's text on psychology, and reads as follows: "Integration is the process by which activities of any sort become organized."

The outstanding thought in this and other definitions of integration which might be given is that of unity or co-ordination. Let us keep this fact in mind as we proceed to a consideration of the origin or etymological meaning of this word. Allport has this to say about integration: "The original significance of integration is best understood by referring to the cell theory of biology. The initial fact is that a human body contains about ten trillion cells, over nine billion of which are found in the cortex. Somehow out of this bewildering array of elements a relatively unified and stable personal life is constructed. The single cells cohere in such a way as to lose their independence of function. From the many there emerges the one; the motto implicit in integration is *e pluribus unum*."

"Even though a person's life exhibits contradictory trends, even though the unity is never complete and final, it is nevertheless obvious that the number of totally independent qualities is not very great.

Probably only a very few specific segmental reflexes remain unassociated with the complex activities of that great integrative organ, the cortex. Within this organ the links and combinations are of such profusion that every function seems joined in some way and to some degree with almost every other function." (G. W. Allport, *Personality, A Psychological Interpretation*; New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1937, p. 138; used by permission.)

Integration started out as a mathematical term. Then it passed over into biology, as this quotation from Allport indicates. After this it came into psychology first through the behaviorists, who were wholly materialistic. In a footnote Allport gives us these words: "V. M. Bechterev (*General Principles of Human Reflexology*, trans. 1932), and J. B. Watson (*Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist*, 1919), are two writers who regard personality, above all else, as an integration of separate reflex arcs. Bechterev holds that the combining of reflexes is the only guide needed, and Watson speaks of the reflex level of functioning as occurring first in infancy, followed, through virtue of integration, by the conditioned reflex level and by the habit level. Personality, for Watson, is synonymous with the integration of an individual's manual, visceral and laryngeal habits." (Allport, p. 139.)

But someone may ask why this discussion of the relation of the word integration to mathematics, biology, and behavioristic psychology. For the express purpose of pointing out the fact that integration has a decidedly materialistic origin and background. And even though it now is used in other types of psychology than the behavioristic, its etymological significance must not be ignored by those who are anxious to exchange eradication for it because of eradication's etymological grounding in that which is materialistic. Why trade a word for another one because of its materialistic background when the term for which it is traded is just as materialistic, if not more so? Still, some may urge that, as they use integration, it refers to unity on the psychological or personal level and not mechanical unity or the oneness of physical parts or cells. This we would not be at all inclined to deny. However, we would hasten to state that the meaning of eradication has moved just as far from its etymological significance as integration has. This will have to be admitted unless present-day usage is ignored altogether.

With the preliminaries over, we shall proceed to indicate the futility of attempting to replace the phrase entire sanctification with the term integration. Integration is a dangerous substitute for eradication because it implies an inadequate conception of sin. It carries with it the Greek concept of sin rather than the Hebrew. For the former, sin is just a lack; while for the latter, it is a positive something within the soul. In the first instance, sin is just a deprivation; while in the second, it is a depravation. It is easy for the integrationist to think of sin as immaturity, lack of development, "the tail of progress," or "holiness in the green," or as some would say, "Sin is just moral growing pains," which we will slough off when we become integrated in personality. This is what we are easily led into if we follow the "psychological frame of reference" instead of the Biblical or theological.

In other words, integration implies that sin is a negative principle instead of a positive principle, as Wesley and Paul taught it to be. Curtis, in his *Christian Faith*, seems to have fallen short at this point. He appears to make sin in the heart of man nothing more than a lack of organization. Entire sanctification, then, would be nothing more than the complete organization of man's moral self. As one writer, following Curtis, states it: "From the psychological frame of reference then, eradication

may be defined as that act of God which exhausts a common disarrangement of man's moral motivation, made possible through a consecration of the total person to God on the condition of faith."

Integration is the organization of the unorganized, the completion of the incomplete, the development of the undeveloped, the unifying of the ununified. Sin, therefore, consists in being unorganized, incomplete, undeveloped, or ununified. This makes sin rather tame. It is difficult to understand the death of Christ in the light of such a view, the place that the Bible gives to the terribleness of sin, and the blackness of the human heart as manifested in the deeds of men during two world wars. In this connection, it is well to remember that John Wesley and Daniel Steele after him have warned us that the first and most dangerous step toward heresy is a false or inadequate view of sin. Belief that man is born with a positive bent toward sin is the most important differentiation between Christianity and heathen religions, according to Wesley. To accept, therefore, any interpretation which belittles sin is exceedingly dangerous.

There are two other differences between integration and entire sanctification which we must mention in this connection. They follow from or at least are closely related to what we have set forth above. Entire sanctification results in an integration of personality which comes, not by growth or development, but rather by the eradication of the contrary principle of sin, with which every part of Adam's fallen race is afflicted. It is a unity which comes about by means of subtraction instead of addition. Along with this, we must remember that the organization of personality which comes about by entire sanctification is caused by a supernaturalistic crisis, a divine intervention, and not by a naturalistic process. Thank God, it is cataclysmic rather than evolutionary.

But this is by no means all that can be said against substituting integration for entire sanctification. Integration is a psychological, scientific, descriptive, or factual term rather than a theological, philosophical, normative, or value word. It is interested in behavior and not in conduct. It is amoral and, therefore, studies that which is mental, regardless of whether it is good or bad. To put it another way, integration is a quantitative and not a qualitative term. On the other hand, entire sanctification is just the opposite. As a word, it is pre-eminently theological, philosophical, normative, or qualitative in character. It is moral or ethical and is significant for character and conduct. It is never merely behavioristic in meaning. All of these differences between integration and entire sanctification indicate that it would be difficult for the former to take the place of the latter. This will be evident constantly as the discussion continues.

Unity, as we have already stated, is the central thought involved in integration. From the standpoint of integration, this oneness may be built up about either a good or a bad motive. Too many who have wanted to use it in connection with entire sanctification have incorrectly assumed that it could arise only in alliance with a good motive. This is certainly not justified. This integration must "always take place in respect to something," and this something may be either good or bad. These facts are excellently stated by Mr. J. Lowell George in the following words: "A popcorn ball may be integrated in that the popcorn particles form the unity by adhering to a sticky compound. But this is not the case with personality. For the individual, there must be an objective which will so challenge the whole being as to draw out inherent power, and develop every capacity possible, of the intellect, emotion, and will in the pursuit of the goal toward which the individual has set himself. The

goal may be evil or good, but the pursuit of the goal makes for personality integration." (J. L. George, "The Relation of Entire Sanctification to Character Development"; a thesis submitted to the Nazarene Theological Seminary faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. Used by permission; page 53.)

Mr. George substantiates his position on this point by two quotations from authorities. The first one deals with the man of strong character and reads thus: "He possesses the attitude of a master, not of a slave — a dominating, ruling, directing attitude, which uses both impulses and circumstances as amenable to his own purposes, and makes them his tool. There is a calculation, a deliberateness about him which the creature without character has not got. He may be a good man or a bad man, but he will be masterfully good or bad. He may indulge his evil impulses as the 'other fellow' does; but if so, it is with deliberation and set purpose. He may also restrain his impulses; but if so, it will not be out of a weak fear of being caught, or a dread of unpleasant consequences, but out of deliberate policy and set purpose, because he has an object in view . . . These principles may be good or bad, right or wrong. But there they are; and it is due to their presence that he is what he is, and consistently what he is." [A. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Readings in the Philosophy of Education*, New York: D. Appleton, Century Co., 1936, p. 375; used by permission.] No one can deny that we have here the picture of an integrated personality; and it is clearly brought out that this personality can be unified around either good or bad motives.

Mr. George also gives another quotation which is even more significant as a proof of the nonqualitative character of integration. Here it is: "The alternative to an integrated life that issues in integrity is not necessarily the loose and vagabond living we have been describing. A person can become powerfully unified on an ethically low level, around unworthy aims. Integrity is impossible without integration, but integration does not necessarily issue in integrity. Napoleon was not a 'good' man, but he was a potent personality with immense capacities for sustained concentration. Someone called him 'organized victory.' To an extraordinary degree he got himself together, focused his life, achieved centrality in his purpose. Psychologically speaking, he was usually all of a piece. He illustrates the puzzling differences between a strong personality and a good one." (H. E. Fosdick, *On Being a Real Person*; New York: Harper Brothers, 1943, p. 39.)

Thus we see that "public enemy number one" may be a well-integrated person. The same may be true of any notorious criminal. The devil has an integrated personality, and so does the man who has committed the unpardonable sin. Integration may come about by the organization of one's whole life around the self or the "old man of sin."

One writer discussing "A Rest for the People of God" has this to say: "God's peace comes as His gift. Try to buy God's peace and the universe says, 'Thy money perish with you.' Try to lie your way into peace by an outward profession inwardly denied and the only peace you get is the peace of spiritual death. And before you reach that point you will have to pass through the tortures of the divided personality, the sorrows of a tangled soul." The person who has obtained the "peace of death" has an integrated personality, but he is far from being wholly sanctified.

The pastor of a large church in a city where a state university is located preached on the second coming of Christ. The whole sermon was built around the plight (according to him) of a young lady

who had come to the university. She was on the verge of a nervous breakdown due to a conflict between her old-fashioned religious training at home and the liberal teaching of the university. The liberal preacher tells her story thus: "In childhood she was taught that Christ was coming 'on the clouds of heaven' 'most any day; that the world would come to an end; that the faithful would be caught up into endless bliss while the sinful would be cast into a lake of fire to burn forever. She was not allowed to go to a movie or a stage play, not permitted to dance or play a game of cards the way her friends did because, as her mother would always say, 'You would not want Christ to catch you doing any of those things when He suddenly appears in the clouds of heaven, would you?'"

"When she came to this university Mother was no longer present to restrain her. She started using her student passes to attend the excellent plays given in the university theater; she saw a few movies and even went to a dance at the union. Then it was that the emotional conditioning of childhood began to play havoc with her peace of mind. She was indeed in a fair way to lose her mind. I shall here relate the line of instruction which set her free."

The line of instruction which this liberal preacher gave this young woman constituted his sermon on the Second Coming. In it he majors on the Millerites and many extremists on the Second Coming. He tells about many who have been mistaken on the subject and even includes the Apostle Paul in that number. The upshot of his whole discussion was that Jesus would never return to this earth.

Then the preacher adds: "When I had finished telling my student friend what has been here set down, she heaved a sigh of relief and her face was alight with a beautiful smile of hope." In other words, she gave up her old-fashioned faith and accepted the modernistic view of religion and the internal struggle ceased. She became an integrated personality, and "today she is poised and radiant in her new-found freedom." This case of integration of personality is surely not akin to the experience of entire sanctification. Integration can be around either a good or a bad motive.

In line with all that has been set forth above, let us quote again from Mr. George's thesis. He has two more paragraphs which are closely related and relevant to the problem which we are considering. His words are as follows: "Integration is clearly a major criterion of successful personal living, but integration itself needs a criterion. The normal person is striving to get order and symmetry into his make-up. Human life at its best is centered around the highest ethical and spiritual goals. To fail at this is not to have a loose and vagrant personality, for the person may be well integrated psychologically, but organized around aims 'intellectually trivial and ethically sinister.'" (George, p. 55.)

Thus "we are not simply striving to gain an integrated personality, but one that is integrated in respect to the highest ideals and purposes for which God made it, and one whose integration is sustained and bolstered by the development of character — qualities consistent with the highest goals of life." (George, p. 57.)

A person who has been sanctified wholly does possess the highest type of integrated personality; for personality in this instance has been unified about the highest possible values. However, entire sanctification and integration are never to be identified; for there can be integration on the level of the lowest values.

Lest there be someone who still thinks that we have not cited sufficient authority for the position which we have taken, let us refer to what Allport has to say on this subject. In his book *Personality, a Psychological Interpretation*, he clearly points out on page 226 that, while religion gives us one of the most comprehensive philosophies of life, it does not give us the only one. On this and several succeeding pages he points out the fact that there are many other unifying philosophies of life, among them the theoretical, economic, esthetic, social, and political. Further, Allport clearly implies by his discussion that one's life might be organized or integrated around the concepts of Buddhism or any other religion, as well as Christianity.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

Chapter 7
WHAT IS ERADICATED BY ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION?

OUTLINE

Introduction

Both the Bible and John Wesley teach that something radical takes place in man when he is entirely sanctified. Something within man is completely destroyed when he obtains the second blessing. This is exactly what eradication means — the complete destruction of whatever is referred to. It seems foolish, then, to try to rule out the use of the word eradication. Why not try a more fruitful undertaking — the more careful definition of what is eradicated? There is a chance for real progress here.

I. What Is Not Eradicated?

First, man's finiteness is not eradicated. Man was finite before the fall, and he will remain so after he gets to heaven. He has never been and will never be God. Man will never be absolutely perfect. In the second place, man will never be a possessor of angelic perfection: Again, he cannot get back Adamic perfection in this life. This is just another way of saying that he can never in this life escape the physical and mental effects of the fall — physical and mental infirmities. Individual differences — natural and acquired — will still exist after we obtain this wonderful experience. There will still be some Gibeonites in Canaan after we get into that land. We shall still be human and subject to mistakes.

Daniel Steele has this to say along this line: "There are old residents of this country who are by no means favorites with me, and I cut their acquaintances as much as possible, such as, ignorance, forgetfulness, misjudgment, error, inadvertence, failure, and a large family by the name of infirmity. In fact, I have repeatedly cast my vote for their exclusion, but they insist that they have a right to remain, since no statute lies against them. They say that they are grossly wronged when confounded with an odious foreigner called sin, who slightly resembles them in external appearance, but is wholly different in moral character. I must confess that a close observation, extended through many years, demonstrates the justice of this plea. Hence I live in peace with these citizens, but do not delight in their society."

Temptation is not eradicated when we are sanctified wholly. We can still be tempted, and there is still the possibility of falling. In fact, the second blessing lays one liable to peculiarly subtle temptations. Further, a moral struggle is always within man. After we are sanctified, the battle is on the outside in the sense that the old man of sin within has been destroyed, but it is not on the outside in the sense that there is no moral struggle within.

Let us also remember that a man can be tempted without an inclination to sin; for an inclination to sin is a will to sin, as well as a suggestion to satisfy a legitimate desire in an illegitimate way. Here is the way that sin arises: There must be the suggestion of the act; the possible act must be looked at as desirable, or satisfying, in some way; it must be thought about, or attention given to it; there must be the decision, or will, to act; and finally, the doing of the act. A person becomes a sinner when he wills to act in the direction of that which is wrong, although he may never perform the deed. When we are sanctified wholly, our free will is not destroyed, and neither are our legitimate appetites eradicated. Sin arises in connection with free will and the natural appetites.

II. What Is Eradicated?

According to the Manual of the Church of the Nazarene, we are told that it is original sin, depravity, that corruption of the nature of all the offspring of Adam which inclines us to evil, and that continually, which is destroyed when we are sanctified. Many terms which are not found in the above statement have been used to describe this something which is eradicated.

According to Asbury Lowrey, the darkness of sin is dispelled; the film which sin has put upon the spiritual sight is taken away; the mists of error and perversion of evil which obstruct and weaken the moral perception are dissipated. The terms dispelled, taken away, and dissipated certainly would be synonymous with eradication. For Charles E. Brown, entire sanctification means the destruction of instinctive badness, which took the place of instinctive goodness when man fell. E. Stanley Jones describes what takes place when one is sanctified wholly in many different ways, but he most often speaks of it as the conversion of the subconscious mind, or self. However much we may differ with his view of it, we must admit that he believes definitely in a second crisis which puts a man on a much higher spiritual level than that of conversion, or the first blessing. He comes nearest to the idea of eradication when he sets forth the results of the victorious life. They are as follows: the leisured heart-release from ourselves and our problems; the power to live in spite of — ability to live above our environment; the removal of strain from our lives; power over every sin; inward unity and outward simplicity and straightforwardness; and a spiritually creative life — it is organized around love.

Olin Alfred Curtis, in *The Christian Faith*, holds that all wrong motives are completely eliminated when a person is entirely sanctified. He seems thus to come very close to eradication in his position, even though he refuses to enter into the debate between the eradicationists and the suppressionists.

Conclusion

Finally, we would define depravity, or that which is eradicated by the baptism with the Holy Spirit unto sanctification, as an inherited, positive, psychical-ethical state, condition, principle, trait, quality, tendency, bent, aptitude, or attitude, of sin which affects the whole racial nature of the transcendental self and manifests itself through or in the empirical self. This is a description of the sin nature from the traditional standpoint. From the more modern or psychological viewpoint, we would follow Curtis somewhat and think of the eradication of all wrong motives in entire sanctification. This is brought about, not just by an orientation, but by a reorientation of the motive life. This change in the empirical self results from the destruction of the carnal mind, which lies back

in the transcendental self. The cause of the complete change is God, or the supernatural; and the effect is produced instantaneously.

ERADICATION
Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By
Stephen Solomon White

MAIN BODY TEXT
Chapter 7
WHAT IS ERADICATED BY ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION?

It does not seem to us that anything can be gained by trying to find superficial reasons for rejecting the use of the word eradication. Whatever else may be said, the Wesleyan position as to entire sanctification cannot be held without admitting that something takes place in man which cannot be described in mild terms. The grace of entire sanctification is a radical work and cannot be designated with anything less than radical words. What is asserted as to Wesley's teaching must also be granted as to the Bible doctrine of entire sanctification. Its position as to entire sanctification is uncompromising, and will not permit being watered down. Entire sanctification on its negative side signifies the complete destruction of something. This is exactly what eradication means. It indicates nothing less and nothing more.

A much more fruitful field of investigation is to be found in defining what is destroyed, or eradicated. This will help to make the teaching of the holiness movement more understandable. It is the purpose of this chapter, then, to answer the question: What is eradicated by the experience of entire sanctification?

Let us begin by approaching this question negatively. What is not eradicated when the Christian is entirely sanctified? First, man's finiteness is not eradicated. Man was finite before his fall, and he will remain so after he has entered heaven and has been given a glorified body. He will not be God then, much less now. In other words, when we are sanctified wholly we do not receive a perfection which is the same as God's. Our perfection, even in heaven, will not be absolute. The old charge that some have made against the holiness people — that they claimed to be as good as God and getting better every day — always has been false.

Man's human nature is not even transformed into that which is angelic. We do not know much about angels, but we have reason to believe that in some respects they are superior to Adam before the fall. This glorious experience of entire sanctification does not transform man into an angel or give him angelic perfection.

We can go even further and declare that entire sanctification does not eradicate the effects of the fall on the human body and the human mind. This is just another way of saying that fallen man, when he has been sanctified wholly, does not regain the perfection of body and mind that Adam possessed.

This brings us to a more detailed consideration of what is not eradicated. When we are entirely sanctified we do not get rid of our physical infirmities. There will still be sickness. Some of the greatest examples of this experience of holiness that we have ever seen have been housed in bodies which were anything but well. They have suffered excruciating pain for years before God saw fit to

take them home. Then, there is weariness, to which even the youngest and healthiest of us are subject. Disease and weariness often hinder us from being at our best for God. Further, there are physical deformities which may handicap the sanctified. Any deviation from the average, with which we may be born or which we may acquire, places us in a much more difficult situation from the standpoint of society; and entire sanctification does not alter this deviation or handicap nor change the attitude of society toward it. Physical infirmities are not eradicated, although they may to some extent be overcome by spiritual development after the crisis of entire sanctification.

This second work of grace does not bring freedom from mental infirmities. Entire sanctification does not liberate us from the effects of the fall on the mind. The perfection of Adam's mind will never be ours in this life, even though love has been perfected in us. Again, individuality of opinion and perspective are not eliminated. Personal characteristics are not destroyed. Entire sanctification does not regiment us. It does not make us all agree on everything, and neither does it cause us all to be equally congenial. There will still be more natural fear in some than in others; and women will, as a rule, be more subject to modesty than men. There is not only the possibility, but also the probability, that one who has had years in sin before getting saved and sanctified will have more memories to battle with as he lives his Christian life than he who was saved and sanctified early in life. This means that those memories of evil deeds which have accumulated across the years are not eradicated when one enters into this rest which has been prepared for the people of God.

We cannot ignore, then, the fact that after we have been sanctified wholly we are still human and affected by the fall. We have this treasure of perfect love in earthen vessels which are not free from imperfections.

Dr. J. B. Chapman, in an article published in the Herald of Holiness, has this to say about the Gibeonites in Canaan:

"Rev. Bushrod Shedden Taylor, a good many years ago, wrote a little book on the Gibeonites. He thought these people typify the weaknesses and mistakes which continue with us even in the sanctified life, as carry-overs from our position in a fallen race. They do not represent sins, for which condemnation is the penalty; but they do represent errors that are humiliating and which greatly hinder both our happiness and our usefulness. We are not to think of them as inescapable, but are to be on our guard against their craftiness and deception always."

Another writer of some years ago says of the state after entire sanctification: "But afterwards there are not only the Gibeonites, who must abide with us, hewers of wood and drawers of water, but there are cities and giants which must be totally exterminated." He even goes so far as to identify the giants with acquired depravity, which he claimed was not cleansed away either in regeneration or entire sanctification. For him, one type of acquired depravity is the memories connected with evil deed — to which we referred above — which remain after we are sanctified wholly. These giants, he claims, can be exterminated completely as we progress in the sanctified life; but the same cannot be said as to the Gibeonites, which represent our infirmities.

In Christian Theology, Volume II, page 501, Dr. H. Orton Wiley gives us these significant words which have a bearing on the discussion before us: "To argue, therefore, that Christian perfection will

destroy or eradicate essential elements of human nature, or that a man or woman may not enjoy perfection of spirit while these elements remain, is to misrepresent entirely the nature of this experience. what Christian experience does is to give grace to regulate these tendencies, affections and passions and bring them into subjection to the higher laws of human nature." Surely finiteness, human nature, and the infirmities of human nature due to the fall are not extirpated when one is sanctified; but they can and should be gradually improved upon as we grow in grace after entire sanctification. I remember hearing Dr. Chapman preach that mistakes should be fewer in number as we develop in the sanctified life, although we never can get to the place in this life where we can eliminate them altogether.

This whole field of infirmity as over against sin is important, and should be better understood by our preachers and laymen. Infirmities are involuntary, or unintentional, deviations from the perfect law of God due to a physical and mental condition which has resulted from the fall. This situation will be with us until we get our glorified bodies in the other world. In other words, we can never hope to reach a place in this life where every decision and act will be all that it should be from God's standpoint, because we possess a body which is not wholly free from disease and a judgment which is imperfect. This means that our infirmities are indissolubly bound up with our physical and mental deficiencies. If infirmities are understood as they should be, they do not break one's communion with God. That is, if one realizes as he should that their outcome is mistakes and not sins, they do not bring condemnation and thus destroy our communion with God. Of course, if one incorrectly thinks of them as sins, they will undermine his confidence in God and bring on guilt with its consequent absence of fellowship. For the Christian, infirmities which are unconscious are covered by the Blood without any specific act of faith on his part.

As over against infirmities, let us describe sins. They are voluntary transgressions of the known law of God. They grow out of the moral and spiritual self, and always incur guilt. They break one's communion with God; and not one of them is consistent with the blessing of regeneration — much less with entire sanctification. Sins must be repented of, and the Blood must be trusted for the removal of the condemnation which they entail. Sins can be avoided, even by the regenerate.

Since a clear-cut line of demarcation between the body and the soul cannot be drawn by anyone in this life, it behooves you and me to be careful in our judgment as to what is infirmity and what is sin in the other person. God knows the difference and will help you and me to avoid sinning, but man cannot be sure as to the distinction in the life of his neighbor or friend.

We close this section with a quotation from Daniel Steele:

"There are old residents of this country who are by no means favorites with me, and I cut their acquaintances as much as possible, such as ignorance, forgetfulness, misjudgment, error, inadvertence, failure, and a large family by the name of infirmity. In fact I have repeatedly cast my vote for their exclusion, but they insist that they have a right to remain, since no statute lies against them. They say that they are grossly wronged when confounded with an odious foreigner called sin, who slightly resembles them in external appearance, but is wholly different in moral character. I must confess that a close observation, extended through many years, demonstrates the justice of this plea. Hence I live in peace with these old citizens, but do not delight in their society."

There is another field of limitation for the entirely sanctified which we must now consider. This is temptation. Entire sanctification does not place us beyond temptation and the possibility of backsliding. Wesley and the leaders of the holiness movement have emphasized and re-emphasized the fact that entire sanctification does not free us from temptation. This truth has been called to our attention so many times that it is difficult to see how anyone could fail to admit it. Further, if we can be tempted, there can be moral struggle after we get the blessing of holiness. In fact, there is a sense in which the moral struggle may be fiercer after sanctification than before. Entire sanctification lays one liable to peculiarly subtle temptations. Temptation and all moral struggle are within the man, and not outside of him. It is internal, and in the very nature of the case cannot be external. There has been a lot of misunderstanding at this point because so often we have said that when we are sanctified the battle is on the outside. This is true in one sense, but untrue in another. The fight is on the outside in the sense that one powerful internal factor, the carnal mind, has been eradicated. It is not true in the sense that the moral struggle itself takes place outside of man. The moral struggle has to do with the will and choice of man and is, therefore, decidedly internal.

Another fact which we must always remember is that man can be tempted and still be free from the inclination to sin. The two are not identical. An inclination to sin is the will to sin, and not merely the suggestion to satisfy a desire in an illegitimate way. Before there can be the decision to act (and there must be the decision to act before there can be deliberate action), there must be the suggestion of the act; then there must be the thinking about the act or the giving of attention to it. But first the act must be looked upon as desirable or satisfying before one can be induced to think on it or give attention to it. The psychology of advertising puts it this way: Catch the attention, hold the attention, fix the impression, and then produce the response, or get the signature on the dotted line. This is an excellent description of the nature of temptation: the attention is caught and held; then the impression is fixed, or the decision is made; and finally, there is the response, or overt act. This implies that there can be a definite case of temptation without any decision to act. There can be interest in the act — and even somewhat prolonged consideration of it — without the decision to realize it. Free will, or the capacity to sin, is not eliminated when one is entirely sanctified. Neither are the natural and legitimate appetites or desires destroyed. They are still present and thus provide an avenue through which temptation may arise. There may be normal desire, and there can be a suggestion that this natural desire be satisfied in an illegitimate way. This is temptation; but it does not become sin — although the desire may become very intense and suggestion all but overpowering — until there is the sanction of the suggestion by the will. There must be very careful discrimination at this point.

Let us turn now to the positive side of the question before us. We shall see that it is much more difficult to outline specifically than the negative aspect. It is no longer what is not eradicated, but rather what is eradicated. The Manual of the Church of the Nazarene has this to say about what is done away with when we are baptized with the Holy Spirit:

"We believe that original sin, or depravity, is that corruption of the nature of all of the offspring of Adam by reason of which every one is very far gone from original righteousness or the pure state of our first parents at the time of their creation, is averse to God, is without spiritual life, and is inclined to evil, and that continually. We further believe that original sin continues to exist with the new life of the regenerate, until eradicated by the baptism with the Holy Spirit" (1952 Manual of the

Church of the Nazarene, page 27). Here we are told that it is original sin, depravity, that corruption of the nature of all the offspring of Adam which inclines us all to evil, and that continually, that is destroyed when we are sanctified.

Let us next list as many as possible of the names of this something which is eradicated when we are wholly sanctified. Someone may try to tell us they are just words and do not tell us anything; but such is not the case. These names have been applied to that which is eliminated by the second blessing because they do have a certain descriptive value. They indicate to some extent the nature of that which is eradicated. It has been called a concupiscence, an incentive to sin, the inclination to sin, the bias toward sin, the bent toward sin, an inborn perversity, the hidden enemy in the heart, a moral perversion, the root of bitterness, a wrongness in human nature, the carnal mind, the old man of sin, "the sin which doth so easily beset us," the racial sin, inbred sin, a lawless wild beast in the heart of man, endemic evil in the heart of man, the Freudian Id, the radical evil in man, a hereditary sinful inclination, the abnormality in the native drives which are found in man — sex, food, etc., the evil state which results from the destruction of the moral or incidental image in man through the fall, a sinful disposition, the ego-urge or unsundered self, the spirit of antichrist in the heart, enmity against God, an innate corruption of the innermost nature of man, an evil root which bears like branches and like fruit, a trio of sinful tendencies — self-will, pride, and idolatry, unbelief and heart-idolatry, a natural propensity to sin, the stony heart, the body of sin, the sin that dwelleth in me, an evil heart of unbelief, lawlessness, a hateful intruder, a sinful power, a sinful master, the law of sin and death, filthiness of the flesh and the spirit, the Adamic nature, a proneness to wander from the path of right.

We shall continue the discussion by presenting several more detailed views as to what is eradicated when a person is made perfect in love. Lowrey outlines what takes place in this case as follows: (1) the darkness of sin is dispelled; (2) the film which sin has put upon the spiritual sight is taken away; (3) the mists of error and perversion of evil which obstruct and weaken the moral perception are dissipated. Notice the strong terms which he uses — dispelled, taken away, dissipated. They certainly would be synonymous with eradication.

According to Charles Ewing Brown in *The Meaning of Sanctification*, when man sinned, he fell from the high level of instinctive goodness. This deprivation brought on a depravation. This instinct to goodness which was shattered by the fall of the race through Adam is what we ordinarily speak of as the image of God in man. The image of God in man, or this instinct to goodness, is restored when a Christian is entirely sanctified. Entire sanctification, then, really means the destruction of instinctive badness which took the place of instinctive goodness because of the fall. The view can easily be interpreted in terms of eradication and is so described by its author.

E. Stanley Jones defines the sin nature in the terms selfishness, the unsundered self, the ego-urge, and locates it in the instincts. The chief instincts are self, sex, and herd. They are to be found in the subconscious self, and have been polluted by the stream of racial tendencies which have poured into them for many centuries. When we are saved, the conscious self is converted; and when we are sanctified, the subconscious self is converted. He also describes it thus: the conscious mind is surrendered to God in conversion, while the subconscious mind is surrendered to Him in entire sanctification. He also speaks of the subconscious self being cleansed through the second crisis or

sublimated by it. He is not consistent in his statement of what happens when a person is made perfect in love. This is due to the fact that he uses too many terms of different meaning to describe what takes place. He is clear and definite in one thing, however, and that is that there is a second work of grace. Further, as we have already indicated in one chapter of this book, instinct is not a term which is used in the study of human psychology today. And even if one substitutes the word drive, which is most nearly akin to what instinct was used for in the past, he would find that it describes — as instinct once did — a conscious state and not a subconscious condition. We know nothing about a drive except as it functions consciously. Nevertheless, whatever one may offer in criticism of Dr. Jones's theory, he must admit that it is an interesting and worthwhile attempt to explain what actually occurs when a Christian is entirely sanctified. We certainly need more efforts along this line.

Before leaving Dr. Jones's view we must take note of the results of the victorious life as he sets them forth. They are as follows: the leisured heart-release from ourselves and our problems; the power to live in spite of — ability to live above our environment; the removal of strain from our lives; power over every sin; inward unity and outward simplicity and straightforwardness; and a spiritually creative life — it is organized around love. Here we see that the self and the environment are eliminated, as far as being the final or determining factors in our lives. Also, the strain is taken out of our lives; acts of sin cease. Here are three negative factors in entire sanctification for him. They would be on the side of eradication, although they are not stated exactly in that form. Of course, he has positive results too; but we are not discussing them here.

According to Olin Alfred Curtis in *The Christian Faith*, we get the motive of loyalty to Christ when we are saved; and when we are sanctified, the motive of loyalty is transformed into the motive of pure love. The holy person acts not from duty but from love. He does what he does because he loves to do it. This love within the heart is so positively active that all wrong motives cease to have any existence — they are exhausted. Now, although Curtis refused to take sides with the suppressionist or the eradicationist, it seems that he is much nearer the latter than the former. Wrong motives, for him, are completely eliminated when a person is entirely sanctified. This means that they are destroyed or eradicated. Still, we must admit that his view of the sin nature is too negative. He clearly analyzes it as an inorganic state; and the second blessing is undoubtedly for him nothing more than passing from an inorganic, or negative, condition to an organic, or positive, condition. This is certainly not Pauline. Sin, for Paul, is a positive principle or state.

This brings us to the concluding section of this discussion. From the traditional standpoint, we would define depravity, or that which is eradicated by the baptism with the Holy Spirit unto sanctification, as an inherited, positive, psychical-ethical state, condition, principle, trait, quality, tendency, bent, aptitude, or attitude, of sin which affects the whole racial nature of the transcendental self and manifests itself through or in the empirical self. What is usually discussed as the carnal mind is its activities or revelations in the empirical self. These, of course, disappear when the inbred sin in the transcendental self is extirpated.

In defining that which is eradicated we must be careful not to describe it as a mere lack or something negative; as a mere unorganized or ununified condition; as either wholly conscious or subconscious; as altogether empirical or transcendental; as a psychical-ethical entity; or as a material

thing. That which is eradicated is a positive badness; an organized anarchy; a condition which is both conscious and subconscious, transcendental and empirical.

How are we going to define the nature of this inbred sin from the psychological standpoint? We are inclined to follow Curtis and find the explanation in the realm of motives. Curtis really got the cue for his position from Daniel Steele, whom he knew and greatly admired. Steele's sermon on perfect love which casts out all fear laid the foundation for Curtis' theory. In the unsaved state, man is wholly under the domination of the motive of fear. When he is saved, a new motive comes into his personality and dominates it. However, there is still a conflict within because the motive of fear still remains in the heart. When we are sanctified, this motive of fear is eliminated and love takes full charge within the personality. It is easy to see the resemblance of Curtis' view to this one.

This eradication of the wrong motives is brought about not just by an orientation but by a reorientation of the motive life. This change in the empirical self results from the destruction of the carnal mind, which lies back in the transcendental self. The cause of the complete change is God, or the supernatural; and the effect is produced instantaneously. G. W. Allport, in *Personality, a Psychological Interpretation*, makes room for all of this in his chapter entitled "The Transformation of Motives." Here he begins with the functional autonomy of motives, his special theory of the transformation of motives, and then closes the chapter with a discussion of "Sudden Reorientation: Trauma." This lays the foundation for an approach to the problem before us such as we have indicated. The chief emphasis here is on what is eradicated; and clearly, from the standpoint of this analysis, it would be wrong motives.