



"You will know them by their fruits." Mt. 7:16

ERADICATION

Defined, Explained, Authenticated

By Stephen Solomon White

CONTENTS (7 of 59 pages selected)

- 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?

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

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.

We would define depravity, or that which is eradicated by the baptism of Fire 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.



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 of Fire 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.....



<http://www.enterhisrest.org/>