

W E HOWELL, 8:15 A.M.

The topic this morning is The Master Teacher. Not so much in the current use of that term as in its application to what it means to one who has been blessed with the spiritual gift of teaching. Since teaching is a spiritual give we are justified in expecting the appearance in the teacher's life and in the quality of his work, highly spiritual characteristics. More than that, we are justified in claiming from Him who bestows this great grace upon us a full measure of spiritual power in the life and the bearing of spiritual fruits in the service that the teacher gives. Yesterday we noted a little some qualities that make the teacher apt or fit in his work. It is not sufficient that a man, in order to be an effective teacher, should merely have the gift of teaching conferred upon him, but the use which he makes of that gift, the trading he does upon the talent is really what counts, so far as the effectiveness of his service is concerned and the fruitage that that service brings.

Now in the fifth chapter of Hebrews I want to note a few thoughts this morning. I have long claimed a part of the fifth chapter of Hebrews as the teacher's chapter. Now I claim it all as the teacher's chapter. I don't mean exclusively, of course, but as setting out those qualities and experiences which it seems to me it is the high privilege of the teacher to have.

In the fourth chapter and fifteenth verse, leading up a little bit to the fifth chapter, we have that statement which we all so greatly value and quote so much: "For we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Then the fifth chapter begins delineating the qualities of the high priest. Now recently in reading in the book Education, I got rather a new idea from this chapter, to which I wish to call attention, where this fifteenth verse of the fourth chapter is quoted. It is on page 78, under the chapter The Master Teacher, or rather the Master Teacher under the general chapter, The Teacher Sent from God.

"He who seeks to transform humanity, must himself understand humanity. Only through sympathy, faith, and love, can men be reached and uplifted. Here Christ stands revealed as the Master Teacher. Of all that ever dwelt on the earth, He alone has perfect understanding of the human soul. " Our understanding of that soul, then, will depend upon the connection we have with the Master Teacher, and the light that shines upon our own vision and our own experience. Then it goes on, "We have not an high priest (Master Teacher, for it presents here the teacher) We have not a master teacher that can not be touched with the feeling of our infirmities." Not only our personal individual infirmity, but our infirmity as teachers, our infirmities in appropriating and trading upon the gift of teaching. He is touched with the feeling of our infirmity because of the teacher's experience that looms large in him. But he hath been tempted like as we are. Then reading on in the fifth chapter with that

thought in mind, beginning with the first verse and substituting the idea of Master Teacher for High Priest. I do not believe that this in any sense misappropriates this language. "For every Master Teacher taken from among men is ordained" for what purpose? for man. In what things? In the things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sin. This is referring to whom? The Master Teacher, the one chosen from among men, who can have compassion on what class? Compassion on the ignorant. What a high quality for the teacher to cultivate, compassion on the ignorant. On them that are where? Out of the way. Another marked quality in the teacher. Those who are reckless, those who do not pursue the course that they ought to as students under our instruction, compassion on them that are out of the way. Why does the Master Teacher exercise those qualities? For that he himself also is compassed with infirmities. Put that together with the statement that the great master teacher, the Head of us all, is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, how then ought we to be touched with the infirmities of those with whom we deal? And by reason hereof he ought to do what? He ought as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins. Now in the service of the high priest chosen from among men, he must make an offering for sins himself, because he is among the class of sinners to whom pertains the grace of Christ. So the teacher, as he pursues his work, must draw from heaven first that experience of forgiveness of sin and acceptance of fresh power daily in order that he may be an acceptable teacher in pointing those under his instruction to the same source to draw ~~from~~ upon

that same power. And no man taketh this honor to himself, but he that is called of God, as also was Aaron. Here we touch upon the divine call as such, the divine call of the priest, the divine call of the teacher, the divine unction of the high priest, the divine unction for the teacher who is master in his profession. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest -- to be made a Master Teacher. No teacher will glorify himself because of his standing or his rank or his calling. But he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee. Then in the seventh verse, speaking now evidently of the Master Teacher Christ, Who in the days of his flesh when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared. The example for the teacher who has the real heart burden for others under his care. Though he were a Son, and that the Son of God, yet learned he obedience how? By the things which he suffered. The element of suffering that must come into the experience of the teacher to perfect him as such. And being made perfect, he became the author of salvation unto all them that obey him.

Now coming down to the twelfth verse, Paul reasons like this: For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that ~~se~~ one teach you again ~~which-be-the~~ -- not yet "which be," but that one teach you again the first principles of the oracles of God. Direct object here. Teach you again the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For everyone that useth milk is

unskilful in his word of righteousness, for he is a babe, that is, not developed. Now this language is very strong. I don't want to misapply it, but as we have studied on this question from the very first day on, and I have carried it in my teaching experience long, the effect of it has been upon my heart to make me feel that I ^{would} need to go back to the first principles of what makes up an efficient teacher in the service of God. That I would need to review what those qualifications are, and the sources on which the teacher may draw, what spirit should characterize his work, and how to become really a true representative of the Master Teacher in the work he has given me to do as one whom he wants to use for the salvation of others.

And the last verse, But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, as it expresses it here, mature, those who by reason of use, that is, by experience, have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. That is the experience that my soul longs for in a much fuller degree. I feel like a child in the face of the great truth that is raised up in that word. I feel as if I were just taking my primer lesson when I look out on the ~~great~~ vast ocean of truth that yet lies before me. And I want to say, brethren, that it humbles my spirit, my heart, when I consider how very little I really know of Christ in the full meaning of the truth that is available to me to know. I feel unworthy of being a teacher, of occupying a high and holy office like that sacred office that it is, but I know, as was brought out yesterday, that my strength lies in drinking deeply of the grace of God that he offers me so freely and in a more vigorous and more faithful and persistent

exercise of my mental faculties, and my sense, as suggested here, to discern good and evil, and to discern truth and to bring it out, and above all, to have those principles of truth embodied in my own life so that they may be a concrete illustration of what truth is, for you remember it was said of Jesus that what he taught he was, and what he ~~taught-he-was~~ was he taught. There was no conflict between the two. Perfect harmony between what he said and what he did, between all he taught and all he did. In fact the most effective kind of teaching is that kind that is lived.

I will not take more time this morning, for I want the time to be yours. - -

Professor Prescott continued his study of yesterday.

There was one feature of the discussion that I did not get to yesterday. Without taking time for a general review, I will say only this, that there is this close connection between God's providences in history and the fundamental ideas of the gospel in the manifestation of the character of God in the person of His Son. I would like to call attention to a turning point in history that I think is of great importance and has a wide bearing, and that is the crisis that came in the 4th year of Jehoiakim and its effect upon history, and therefore its effect upon our study of this.

Let us read the following scriptures. Jer. 36:1-3:

"And it came to pass, in the fourth year of Jehdakim, the son of Josiah king of Judah, that this word came unto Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Take thee a roël of a book, and writer therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee against Israel, and against Judah, and against all the nations, from the day I spake unto thee, from the days of Josiah, even unto this day. It may be that the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I purpose to do unto them; that they may return every man from his evil way; that I may forgive their iniquity and their sin."

This was God's last effort to save Judah. His last effort was to sum up all the warnings that had been given and put them in writing and make a supreme effort to make a halt to their iniquity that he might be able to forgive the ir sin instead of punishing their sin.

9th and 10th verses: "And it came to pass in the fifth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah, in the ninth month, that

they proclaimed a fast before the Lord to all the people in Jerusalem and to all the people that came from the cities of Judah unto Jerusalem. Then read Baruch in the book the words of Jeremiah in the house of the Lord, in the chamber of Gemariah the son of Shaphan the scribe, in the higher court, at the entry of the new gate of the Lord's house, in the ears of all the people."

First came God's command to Jeremiah to have the warnings written out; then they were read to the people.

Verses 15, 16: "And they said unto him, Sit down now, and read it in our ears. So Baruch read it in their ears. Now it came to pass, when they had heard all the words, they were afraid, both one and other, and said unto Baruch, We will surely tell the king of all these words."

Verse 21: "So the king sent Jehudi to fetch the roll: and he took it out of Elishama the scribe's chamber: and Jehudi read it in the ears of the king, and in the ears of all the princes which stood beside the king."

Just notice how this reading was to the people, the king and the princes. What was the result of it?

Verses 23-25: "And it came to pass, that when Jehudi had read three or four leaves, he cut it with the penknife, and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed in the fire that was on the hearth. Yet they were not afraid, nor rent their garments, neither the king, nor any of his servants that heard all these words. Nevertheless Elnathan, and Dehiah, and Gemariah, had made intercession to the king that he would not burn the roll; but he would not hear them."

Now what happened as the result of that?

Jer. 25:1: "The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehdakim the son of Josiah king of Judah, that was the first year of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon."

The fourth year of ~~Jehdakim~~ Jehoiakim was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar. In the fourth year the roll was written, in the fifth year it was called to the attention of the people and the princes and the king himself, and the king, as representative of the nation, cut the roll in pieces and cast it into the fire. He absolutely rejected the counsel of the Lord. That was in the fifth year of Jehoiakim, and the fifth year of Jehoiakim would be the second year of Nebuchadnezzar.

Now Daniel 2:1: "In the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, wherewith his spirit was troubled, and his sleep brake from him." Then we have the dream of the second chapter and the interpretation. What is the significance of all this?--A final effort on the part of God to save His people from the Babylonish captivity and their dispersion. That effort was officially rejected by the king in the fifth year of Jehoiakim, and that fifth year was the second year of Nebuchadnezzar. When that final counsel of God was thus officially rejected--and we might say that God was insulted by the king, for His word was cast into the fire and burned--then came this dream that God gave Nebuchadnezzar and this interpretation of the dream. And then what followed?

At this very time a part of the captives were down in Babylon, but the utter destruction of Jerusalem had not been accomplished. Then comes the ~~ix~~ dream and the interpretation concerning the kingdoms that were to follow. Take these with the statement in Jer. 25:9:

"Behold, I will send and take all the families of the north, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about, and will utterly destroy them, and make them an astonishment, and an hissing, and perpetual desolations."

We read in the first verse of Daniel 1, "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it. And the Lord gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand."

The giving of God's people into the hand of Babylon was the beginning of that long period during which God's people were under foreign rulers, and that the ~~xxxxx~~ turning point. You take the history of Egypt. Egypt was not allowed to prevail against Judah although it is significant, I think, that at the time when Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem, Jerusalem was a vassal of Egypt. But that was the end of these efforts.

Assyria never was permitted to overthrow Judah. Assyria overthrew the northern kingdom more than a hundred years before Babylon prevailed over Judah, but Assyria was not able to prevail over Judah. Take that signal victory in the crisis in the reign of Hezekiah, when God, through His prophet, announced what would happen, and then fulfilled His word in the case of the Assyrian hosts, and Assyria was never able to conquer Judah. But you come to the fourth and fifth years of Jehoiakim, and you come to a turning point; and from that time forward God's people were under foreign rulers. That changes the whole situation, the whole outlook. Then we have those kingdoms to deal with, and we begin that line of kingdoms that mark

especially the history ~~xxx~~ of the development of God's work. It is Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, Rome Pagan, Rome Papal, and the United States; and you have that line right down through. The United States of America is the first government from the time of Babylon that has not used its civil power to enforce a religion upon the people. God gave his people into the hands of Babylon, and they have been under foreign powers ever since. This long period of time began with God giving his people into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. It closes with the giving of his people into the hands of modern Babylon for that long period of time during which they were oppressed. The United States appears on the scene as the last government, and this government is an exception to the whole line, in not using civil power to enforce a religion upon the people. But when that government perverts the true Christian principle under which it was founded and turns about and oppresses the people of God, that brings an end to the whole line of history.

What principle is involved?--the rejection of God's counsel by His prophets led those people to ~~xxx~~ where God turned them over to be chastised by civil powers. He permitted it, and he has permitted it during these long centuries. At the close of this controversy, a power appears on the stage of action, founded on a divine principle, the first one in this whole line of history founded upon this principle,--that the civil power should not be used to bind the conscience, to enforce religion.

Efforts have been made, of course, to bring this government into line. When those efforts prevail, and this government is brought into line with the other powers, there is an end of the controversy, and that is what gives me the greatest significance of this government in

is laid down in the 10th chapter of Isaiah. Speaking of Assyria, he says Assyria is the rod of his anger, "and the staff in their hand is mine indignation." That same principle applies to the other powers. He complains that Babylon, when given power over his people, used that power cruelly.

J. N. ANDERSON: Where do we find that?

(Several references were given in reply to this question, such as Jer. 51:24, 25, 50:17, and 51:44, also the 34th verse.)

W. W. PRESCOTT: Take the third chapter of Daniel. That certainly was persecution against the Jews because of their faith.

J. N. ANDERSON: Yes, those three men.

W. W. PRESCOTT: But that was representative. Now as to Medo-Persia and Grecia, I do not place so much stress upon those. They occupy a subordinate place altogether. In the second chapter of Daniel, all that is said about those two is one short verse. It is Babylon and Babylon, Jerusalem and Jerusalem. That is where the stress is. Just think of the space that is given to those right down through to the end. Medo-Persia and Grecia are simply connecting kingdoms.

J. N. ANDERSON: I was trying to get at the philosophy of the history of these events. Wouldn't we have to say that the philosophy really is this, that Babylon, in a large measure, as an ~~earthly~~ earthly kingdom, and Medo-Persia and Greece, so far from persecuting God's ~~kingdom~~ people, they rather built up the kingdom of God. The Medo-Persians restored them to Jerusalem. Alexander gave them great liberties in Alexandria, and in Jerusalem and Palestine. Those are the facts of history.

W.W.PRESCOTT: When you come to the question of tracing God's purposes and his plans, then I look to the Bible for the guide; and as I take this whole picture in, it is a picture of this controversy between two opposing forces,--~~xxxxxx~~ the god of this world and the God of heaven; and the God of heaven is represented by His Son, through whom he carries on this whole affair. Take the picture in the Bible, and you certainly must see that Medo-Persia and Grecia are subordinate. It is the first and the fourth kingdoms that occupy the space. You find it in the third chapter of Daniel, in the 7th, the 8th, 11th and 12th chapters,--and you find it again in Revelation the same way,--that he attempted to establish his kingdom on earth with Babylon as his capital. When that kingdom was overthrown by Medo-Persia, because that kingdom rejected the counsel of God and the threefold message, then these religious ideas do not come down through Medo-Persia and Grecia, but from Babylon to Rome by way of Pergamos. Medo-Persia had a hatred of idolatry, while idolatry is the thing that stands out in Babylon. That is true in both ancient and modern Babylon. That is the visible expression of setting up one in the place of God, putting up one in the place of Christ.

Those principles are the principles I look to. God gave his people into the hands of Babylon. They were under those powers. They were not what they were before. The shekina glory was never restored. They were never free from temporal rulers from that time on.

W.E.HOWELL: I want to ask this question, Professor Prescott: In speaking of the children of God being under different rulers from the fall of Jerusalem down to our own time, do you mean by that under

their rulership in religion, or in the matter of both religion and civil matters?

W. W. PRESCOTT: Both, I think. They are under the will of the powers. That was a new experience for them.

W. E. HOWELL: There was a question asked here yesterday that it seems to me is worthy of discussion, for I believe it is in the minds of all of us. It was this: What is the distinction between sacred and secular history? We have it said in connection with the schools of the prophets that sacred history was one of their lines of study. And I believe that the viewpoint that our teachers want to get of history is the Bible viewpoint, the viewpoint that will make the teaching most effective to the gospel work. That is what we are ~~now~~ aiming at in our work. We want to get a view of our history teaching that will make it more beneficial for our distinctive denominational needs. I have heard heads of our college departments ~~the past~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~, four or five years ~~ago~~ indicate that they had a burden right along that line,--to make our history work function more fully for denominational purposes than it seemed to them it had been doing. That is the kind of light I think we are searching after. I want to read just a few sentences here that have a bearing on it, and ask you to give a little thought to this matter from the viewpoint of our own teaching.

* We have this statement under "The School of the Prophets," that in the records of sacred history were traced the footsteps of Jehovah. If we use sacred history in a restricted sense, in the sense that is presented in the Scriptures, where there is direct dealings with God's people, I think it would be easy to agree that that would be within the scope of sacred history.

In the chapter on history and prophecy, there is this further.

It reads as follows:

"The Bible is the most ancient and the most comprehensive history that men possess. It came fresh from the fountain of eternal truth, and throughout the ages a divine hand has preserved its purity. It lights up the far-distant past, where human research in vain seeks to penetrate. In God's word only do we behold the power that laid the foundation of the earth, and that stretched out the heavens. Here only do we find an authentic account of the origin of nations. Here only is given a history of our race unsullied by human pride or prejudice.

"In the annals of human history the growth of nations, the rise and fall of empires, appear as dependent on the will and prowess of man. The shaping of events seems, to a great degree, to be determined by his power, ambition, or caprice. But in the word of God the curtain is drawn aside, and we behold, behind, above, and through all the play and counter-play of human interests and power and passions, the agencies of the all-merciful One, silently, patiently working out the counsel of His own will.

"The Bible reveals the true philosophy of history."

There are some thoughts there that have a bearing upon this question, and I thought the question asked yesterday was a very pertinent one. ~~xxxxx~~ In our teaching and pursuit of the study of history, to what extent shall we distinguish between sacred and secular history. If God's will is being worked out, and has been worked out in the past in the history of human passions and power and caprices, it certainly is a most fascinating study to discover that relationship between God's people and the people of the world.

Allow me this one more suggestion: ~~xxxxxxx~~ That any thought I have had about God's relation to the events of the world as recorded in any kind of history, I find the same practical difficulties in the matter as I find in discovering God's relationship to all the phenomena of nature about us, and to many other things that come under the range of Christian study. There is certainly a marked relationship between the Creator and the laws and principles of mathematics, and I have heard some of our mathematics teachers bring out some most impressive lessons in connection with the higher mathematics and others which give one added apprehension and comprehension of what God is and how He works.

But to attempt to do that in every demonstration of Geography is an experience that is beyond any compass of mine or any other teacher that I have found. I am not saying that it is not there, but to discover it is a very fascinating search. And as we search with that in mind, we find more than we thought we could. How can we discover the true philosophy of history? The statement here is that the Bible reveals it. It certainly means this much, that we must keep the Bible pretty close to our historical studies if we are going to trace it right through and get the superlative benefit from that study.

W.R.FRENCH: The philosophy of history is a very large subject. I do not believe it has come from the compass of any one ~~man's~~ man's conception. To my mind it is a great deal like the blind men who want to see the elephant. There are certain general principles upon which we agree. There are certain general principles that must govern us in tracing the hand of God in history.

We must remember that while the footsteps of God are traced in history, the footsteps of Satan are also traced there. Before Christ came to this world, God had a kingdom in this world. I will give you the relations that govern ~~me~~ me in tracing the hand of God in ancient history. God had a kingdom in this world. He dealt only with those kingdoms that were related in some way to His kingdom. Babylon comes into notice when she is related to Israel. Medo-Persia Grecia and Rome are noticed in the Bible in sacred history when they came into touch with His people and performed some phase of work toward His kingdom, either for its advancement or the punishment of his people.

But now since Isaael has been overthrown we have no literal earthly kingdom of God in this world. He has chosen no one nation to be His nation. The church is his nation in the Christian dispensation. Then I must trace the hand ~~of~~ of God in history as related to His church. And the nations that influence the giving of the gospel either helping or hindering it, are the ones that I must study in my correlation of the study of history and the Bible.

Today those nations that have been closed to the gospel are open. God has miraculously opened their doors for the preaching of the gospel.

QUESTION: What kept them closed?

FRENCH: Why, the other power, of course. There is a great con-

troversty between Christ and Satan, and we must recognize that in every part of history. The difficulty in understanding this has been clearly illustrated here among us. Most of our discussion since we have been here has been over this one point. We do not know whether the correct date is 1793 or 1798, 533 or 538. If we could clearly discriminate in all those details, we could be in a unanimity of opinion. In some general facts we thoroughly agree, just like some of those men who went to see the elephant. We all know that history and Bible must be correlated, but how are we to discern the footsteps of God in history?

C. M. SORENSON: This is the crux of the whole matter; and the Bible gives us the philosophy, and history gives us the outworking of it. There was an old Greek philosopher who said, "History is philosophy teaching by example." And that is what we must do with history.

The economic interpreter of history takes economic facts all through human progress and stresses those. The politician will do the same thing, and so it is with different classes of men. We get the Christian philosophy of history. That is revealed to us in the Bible. These other men have partial philosophies,--and we sometimes get a partial philosophy, too.

Now there are two lines of power operating. Imperialism has two types of motives behind it. Most of the men ~~that~~ who bring it about do so because of the greater profits on investments. Imperialism in the British Empire is largely on the economic basis. Great Britain has the capacity to see that the more the missionary goes into ~~the~~ her heathen possessions, the more coal oil she sells, and the more knives, forks and spoons she has to manufacture and sell, and so they favor what might be called "the by-products of missions." They favor

missions, not as such, but for the civilizing uplift that missionaries give to the natives. That is working out God's purpose.

If a man catches that thing from the Bible once, he can ~~make~~ deal with all these multitudinous facts of history and can organize them. The truest philosophy we have is given by revelation, and I think that the great philosopher Paul gave God's philosophy of history in Acts 17:26-28: "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times ~~before~~ before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us."

The extension of opportunities for individuals to seek after God and find Him is the purpose of God. ~~xxxx~~ We know that if Germany had won the war, practically every mission land on earth would have been closed except to missionaries made in Germany, for the German empire had one policy, and that was to allow only German missionaries in its territory. They must be made in Germany so as to serve as a tool through which Germany could work.

But most of the missionaries come from the United States, and so I can very distinctly see the hand of God in mission extension in the way the world conflict has turned out. I expected it would turn out that way when it started, just because of the way Germany has acted in shutting out missionaries from the lands she has controled.

we read that

In Gen. 1:28, God said to His people, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." That is, he was to be master of affairs. So when we harnessed up steam we ~~h~~ fulfilled a part of God's command. I think it is a pity that men did not discover anaesthetics long ago. They had butchery instead of surgery in past ages. Men might just as well have discovered that ages and ages ago.

God turned it all over to man and said, Just as fast as you can make use of these things you have my permission to do so.

VOICE: How do you explain the fact that God did not bring it out before he did?

C. M. SORENSON: Because the devil had his agencies, too. The Greeks were just about to view nature in its reality instead of speculating about it. They were just about to engage in experimental science when those terrible wars came, and they fell into superstition and astrology. The devil cut^{it} off. There are two forces at work. Now we have anaesthetics and we have the microscope. God would have been pleased to have men using these things all through the ages. What was the trouble through the Dark Ages? The Catholic Church encouraged downright baseness, and civilizing influences could not break through because of the ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ superstition.

But the scientists today miss the point in the whole thing. They let their science drag them down into groveling materialism, and they worship at the feet of materialism instead of thanking God for the improved conditions of today.

That has been the main outline of my philosophy.

H. O. OLSON: The statement was quoted from the Bible that God set bounds to these nations, and later a statement was made that the devil outwits Him.

C. M. SORENSON: I did not mean that God set bounds in which everything was compelled to go, because God deals with us as free agents. God allowed Germany in previous decades to come into possession of territory, but they showed themselves unworthy of the opportunity. God's purpose and man's decision join together to bring about the culmination. If men see fit to reject God's call, they do that at their own peril. I am not a fatalist. I teach moral responsibility.