

# The Gospel Witness

Volume 66, No. 2

130 Gerrard Street East, April 9, 1987

Whole Number 2710

## THE CAPITAL PUNISHMENT DEBATE

*The issue of capital punishment is to be debated on Parliament Hill this month, but it has begun already in the newspapers and on radio and TV.*

*For many Canadians the crucial question is always, Does the Bible speak on this issue? Martin Luther said, "My conscience is captive to the Word of God." That should be the position of every Christian church member and every Christian minister, but in these times the inerrancy and authority of the Scripture is also being debated. If we refuse the absolute authority of the Word of God, then when it is time to decide on a major issue such as capital punishment we have no final statement to guide us, nothing but*

*human reasoning and emotional argumentation.*

*Some religious leaders in Canada are speaking out against capital punishment and seeking to influence the public in general and Members of Parliament in particular to vote against it. Are they doing this because they know and believe what the Bible teaches on the subject or because they reject the Word of God? How many church members really know what the Bible teaches on this subject?*

*Here is a superb essay by Professor Peter Gentry, doctoral candidate and faculty member of the Toronto Baptist Seminary and Bible College, which you will find crystal clear. I urge you to read it.*

— Rev. N. H. Street

### Capital Punishment:

## REASONING FROM THE SCRIPTURES

*by Professor Peter Gentry, M.A., Ph.D. (Cand.)*

All of us that are aware of current events in Canadian life and politics will at once realize the importance and relevance of the issue of capital punishment. Doubtless many Christians, and others as well, already entertain strong convictions on the subject. Before jumping into the fray, however, it is appropriate to consider afresh the grounds for our position lest confusion in our thinking mar our testimony and deprive us of our zeal to promote justice in the state. It is obligatory for Christians, who recognize the Sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ — a man blazing with grace and truth — and who confess Him as Lord and Saviour, to reflect His Glory.

We do this by clarifying the Biblical imperatives and eliminating everything that fails to accommodate His Word of Grace and Truth.

Central to the question of capital punishment is the Biblical teaching and hence the Christian confession that Jesus is Lord of Life. As Ruler and Sovereign in the affairs of men, He controls the cavalcade of history. He is Lord because He created Life (Colossians 1:16). He is Lord because He governs Life and He sustains Life (Colossians 1:17, Hebrews 1:3). The Bible says,

*Yet for us there is but one God, the Father, from whom are all things, and we exist for Him, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we exist through Him.* (1 Corinthians 8:6, NASB)

He is Lord of Life because through His death and resurrection He has met Death — the greatest enemy of Life — and completely conquered it (Ephesians 1:19b-22). In a multitude of ways, ancient Israel acknowledged Her God (who called Himself Yahweh or Jehovah) as the Lord of Life. For example, the laws of sacrifice taught this Lordship by forbidding the people to eat blood (Leviticus 7:22-27, 17:10-14). The God of Israel and the Christian Saviour are one and the same Lord. We perceive this, for instance, when Paul quotes Joel 2:32 in Romans 10:13. We acknowledge God as Lord of Life when we recognize His authority to give it and to take it away.

#### COVENANT WITH NOAH

We find the basic directive from the Lord of Life concerning capital punishment in the covenant with Noah (Genesis 6:18, 8:21-9:17). The essential stipulations of that covenant deserve full quotation:

*Then God blessed Noah and his sons, saying to them, "Be fruitful and increase in number and fill the earth. The fear and dread of you will fall upon all the beasts of the earth and all the birds of the air, upon every creature that moves along the ground, and upon all the fish of the sea; they are given into your hands. Everything that lives and moves will be food for you. Just as I gave you the green plants, I now give you everything.*

*But you must not eat meat that has its lifeblood still in it. And for your lifeblood I will surely demand an accounting. I will demand an accounting from every animal. And from each man, too, I will demand an accounting for the life of his fellow man.*

*"Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God has God made man.*

*As for you, be fruitful and increase in number, multiply on the earth and increase upon it."* (Genesis 9:1-7, NIV)

This central passage repays serious study and deserves most of our attention to the subject. The term covenant appears eight times in the Noah narrative (Genesis 6:18, 9:9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17), so we must explain its meaning. This is important because it defines the form and nature of the Biblical

## The Gospel Witness

DR. T. T. SHIELDS — FOUNDER & FIRST EDITOR (1922-1955)  
DR. H. C. SLADE (1955-1974) DR. E. T. GURR (1975-1981)  
DR. J. R. BOYD (1981-1982)

Published bi-weekly (22 issues per year) on Thursday for the propagation of the Evangelical principles of the Protestant Reformation and in defence of the faith once delivered to the Saints.

\$10.00 per year, Postpaid to any address. 50¢ per single copy. Sterling Countries £10 payable to Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, 55 Bishopsgate, London, EC2N 3NN, England.

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ"—Rom. 1-16

EDITORS: Rev. N. Street; Olive Clark, Ph.D.

MANAGING EDITOR: Rev. W. P. Bauman, B.A., M.Div.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Rev. George B. Fletcher, D.D.  
Rev. J. F. Holliday, D.D.

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto — Canada

M5A 3T4

Telephone (416) 925-3263

Second class mail registration number 1465

teaching in this text. A covenant, then, is a commitment on the part of one party toward another or on the part of two parties toward each other, to fulfill certain promises. It differs from a contract in that the former is personal (based on gratitude, hope, trust) and is not impersonal (legalistic). If only one party makes a commitment, it is called a "unilateral covenant"; if the agreement requires both parties to fulfill their obligations, it is called a "bilateral or parity covenant."<sup>1</sup>

The covenant that God made with Noah and his descendants, and with all living creatures, is a unilateral covenant. The Lord gives an unconditional promise that never again will He destroy all living creatures by means of a flood. He will maintain the course of the seasons as long as the earth endures (Genesis 8:22). The covenant furnishes mankind with an assurance that history will not terminate until the consummation of all things.

#### CONTENT OF THE COVENANT

A few observations on the content of the covenant are now in order. First, the Lord of Life commands men and women to fill the earth through reproduction and adds meat to the former vegetarian diet. God then affirms the sanctity of life in general by forbidding mankind to eat meat with its life, that is its blood, still in it. He further asserts the sanctity of human life in particular by imposing the death penalty on both creatures and mankind for the crime of shedding human blood. These instructions are not casual options; they are covenantal obligations and God holds man accountable for their fulfilment. The Hebrew Text expresses them as imperatives, or else as affirmations of accountability before the Court of Heaven.

Second, the covenant spells out the ground or reason for the death penalty: mankind is created in the divine image (Genesis 9:6). All humanity, even in its fallen state, retains something of the divine image and is therefore of inestimable value and worth. As Francis Schaeffer says, there is no such thing as a life not worthy to be lived.<sup>2</sup>

Third, God delegates to mankind the responsibility to administer the death penalty and thus ordains the means to accomplish it. The Bible says, "By man shall his blood be shed" (Genesis 9:6, NIV). The Hebrew term *'adam*, translated "man", is generic in all its occurrences in verse six and means "mankind". The generic use of "man" prevents, on the one hand, a person from taking the law into his own hands — as an individual — and on the other hand, it clearly exempts the state from the crime of murder.

Fourth, the stipulation in verse five specifies that the penalty applies to animals as well as human offenders. This is a unique Israelite detail in what is otherwise a very common law, for most ancient Near Eastern law codes recognize the sanctity of human life.<sup>3</sup> Certain incidental laws in the book of Exodus, in the Sinai Covenant, illustrate the point by requiring that an ox which gores a human being be stoned (Exodus 21:28).<sup>4</sup> Not too long ago, a rabid fox discovered in North York was relentlessly hunted and shot. Yet murderers may sometimes be released on parole after ten years, only to repeat their violent crimes. Here is schizophrenic thinking indeed!

Finally, and most importantly, the covenant with Noah is universal in scope and remains valid today. Several considerations combine to prove this. First, the covenant was made with Noah, with his descendants, and with all living creatures (Genesis 9:8-11). Hence all of humanity is included, for Scripture teaches that all the nations trace their origin from Noah's sons (Genesis 10 and 9:18).

Second, the rainbow, the sign of the covenant, remains with us today (Genesis 9:12-16).

Third, the covenant with Noah is chronologically prior to the Mosaic Law — the Ten Commandments — at Sinai. Consequently, no one may argue that capital punishment does not apply to us today because "we are no longer under law, but under grace" (Romans 6:14).

Fourth, certain literary techniques and linguistic usages require us to see the covenant with Noah as a renewal of ordinances and principles established at creation itself and inherent in it. In terms of literary techniques, we note that key words, dominant ideas, parallel sequences of actions, and similar themes clearly link the Noah narrative to the Creation narrative in Genesis 1 and 2. In Genesis 9, Noah is set before us as a second Adam, making a new beginning.<sup>5</sup> Noah is armed with Adam's mandate (compare Genesis 1:28 and 9:1) and is reminded of its basis in the divine image (compare Genesis 1:26, 27 and 9:6). Warren Austin Gage, in his recent

book, *The Gospel of Genesis*, convincingly elaborates the parallels between Adam and Noah.<sup>6</sup>

Careful consideration of linguistic usages corroborates the link between the covenant with Noah and Creation already established by literary devices. The Hebrew language clearly distinguishes between covenant conclusion or initiation and covenant confirmation.<sup>7</sup> Covenant conclusion refers to a bond initiated between two parties where no such solemnized commitment previously existed and employs the archaic expression "to cut a covenant" (Hebrew *karat berit*, e.g. Genesis 15:18, I Samuel 18:3, 2 Kings 11:17, Jeremiah 31:31). Covenant confirmation refers to the fulfilling of an oath made previously and is conveyed by the expression "to establish a covenant" (Hebrew *heqim berit*, e.g. Genesis 9:9, 11, 17, 17:7, 19, 21, Exodus 6:4). The fact that the latter expression is the one God consistently uses in the covenant with Noah (Genesis 6:18, 9:9, 11, 17) shows that this covenant is only the fulfilling of a commitment made at the time of creation. Consequently, the sanctity of human life with its sanction in the death penalty as stipulated in the covenant with Noah is nothing else than the commitment of the Creator to His creation and the obligations which He lays on all His creatures in His role as Creator and Controller of all. He who made us, *ipso facto* (by that very fact), owns us and has the right to rule us.

#### COVENANT OF SINAI

With this foundation to the subject, we may now focus our attention on the covenant of Sinai and on Moses, the great Lawgiver. A detailed examination is impossible in the present study, but a few salient points are highly profitable.

First, and most obvious, is the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" (Exodus 20:13, Deuteronomy 5:17). In the detailed legislation that follows the Ten Commandments, this is supported by the death penalty:

*Anyone who strikes a man and kills him shall surely be put to death* (Exodus 21:12, NIV).

Discussion in recent scholarship over the meaning of the Hebrew word *ratsach*, "to kill", in the sixth commandment confirms traditional understanding.<sup>8</sup> The command refers to murder, an act of intentional and premeditated violence arising from vindictive hatred. It rejects the right of a person to take the law into his own hands out of a feeling of personal injury.<sup>9</sup> Israelite law on the sanctity of human life has two outstanding effects that Christopher J. H. Wright expresses well.

*In Israelite law life and property are never measured against each other. That is, no property offence in normal legal procedure was punishable by death. This feature of Israelite law stands in sharp contrast to many ancient law codes where certain thefts by certain people were punishable by death, and, indeed, to British law until comparatively recent times. On the other hand, theft of a*

person for gain (kidnapping) was a capital offence (Ex. 21:16; Dt. 24:7).

The other side of this principle is that if you had committed a capital offence with a mandatory death penalty, you could not get off by paying money instead. This was prohibited in Numbers 35:31-34. Again, this contrasts with ancient Near Eastern codes where capital offences could be commuted to fines. There the system in effect favoured those wealthy enough to afford to "pay" for their crimes. (Emphasis his)<sup>10</sup>

Second, it is necessary to point out the safeguards in the Law of Moses which surround the administration of capital punishment. The Law made a distinction between unpremeditated and premeditated homicide and reserved the death penalty for the latter (Numbers 35:16-25). Furthermore, every court verdict had to be based on at least two independent witnesses that were in agreement (Leviticus 5:1, Numbers 35:30, Deuteronomy 17:6, 19:15 and compare Proverbs 29:24). Moreover, the Law required that "the hands of the witnesses must be the first in putting him to death, and then the hands of all the people" (Deuteronomy 17:7 NIV). These safeguards ensured that due process of the law established guilt correctly and maintained the truth. We need comparable safeguards today, to serve the same purpose.

Third, and lastly, the basic principle of justice in Israel's Code of Law is the *lex talionis* or "law of retaliation". A brief history of the term will aid in explaining it. The Latin term *talis* means "exaction of compensation in kind," or equal retribution.<sup>11</sup> It first appears in Latin literature in the *Twelve Tables*, the earliest code of law in ancient Rome (450 B.C.). The first Christian writer to use the Latin term to refer to the law in Exodus 21:23-25 was likely Tertullian, a North African Church Father (*Against Marcion* II 18, IV 16, circa 200 A.D.). The term "talion" entered the English language around 1412 via French.<sup>12</sup> The Biblical principle is as follows:

*But if there is serious injury, you are to take life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise (Exodus 21:23-25, NIV).*

Although this law has been attacked as barbaric, scholarship has shown the ancient Israelite law to be an exalted form of justice and a major step forward in the history of jurisprudence.<sup>13</sup> Once again, Christopher J. H. Wright expresses the matter well:

*A study of the penal provisions, particularly in Deuteronomy, shows up some clear and positive principles on which Israelite punishments operated . . . The following ingredients can be seen:*

1. Retribution. *The offender was to suffer his just legal deserts which should be appropriate to the offence. That is the significance of the lex talionis (an eye for an eye, etc.) principle. It was a very limiting law, preventing excessive or vengeful punishment.*

2. Purging. *Guilt had to be "wiped away" from God's sight.*
3. Deterrence. *"All Israel shall hear and fear", i.e. be afraid to do the same (Deuteronomy 13:11, 17:13, emphasis his, references mine).*
4. Restoration. *The offender remained a brother and was not to be degraded.*
5. Compensation. *Restitution was made to the injured party - not to the state as a fine. (All five points based on Deuteronomy 19:18-20, 25:1-3 as examples).<sup>14</sup>*

#### KEYSTONE OF RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

The death penalty is the keystone of retributive justice.<sup>15</sup> Without it, men soon view crime not as a matter of right and wrong that deserves punishment, but as a disease that requires cure.<sup>16</sup> Witness the folly of Canada in calling our prisons "correctional institutions", which breed criminals rather than cure them. Carl F. H. Henry aptly comments,

*Legislation that professes to be humanitarian while it lightens the seriousness of criminal offenses is a service neither to God nor to man. The primary purpose of punishment is not the reform of the offender but the vindication of the right and the peace and safety of society. A society that finds no basis for capital punishment (other than acts of terror made possible by twentieth century technology) retains only a shadow of biblical sensitivities to the worth of human life and readily elevates the value of the survival of criminals above that of their victims. Yet a compassionate interest in the prisoner (Matthew 25:36, 43) and a spirited concern for prison conditions belongs equally to the Christian social ethic and is specially imperative in view of the corruptive influence of many modern penal institutions.<sup>17</sup>*

The legislation in the Old Testament has immense relevance for today. The best method for viewing the social relevance of ancient Israel is the paradigmatic approach that Paul alludes to (Romans 15:4, I Corinthians 10:11). "A paradigm," explains Professor C. J. H. Wright, "is something used as a model or example for other cases where a basic principle remains unchanged, though details differ."<sup>18</sup> Dr. Wright goes on to say,

*This way of looking at the social life, institutions and laws of Israel protects us from two opposite dangers. On the one hand it means that we do not think in terms of literal imitation of Israel. We cannot simply transpose the social laws of an ancient people into the modern world and try to make them work as written . . . On the other hand, the social system of Israel cannot be dismissed as relevant only within the confines of historical Israel, and as totally inapplicable to either the Christian church or the rest of mankind. If Israel was meant to be a light to the nations (cf. Isaiah 49:6), then that light must be allowed to illuminate.<sup>19</sup>*

Consequently, the basic principle of the sanctity of human life and of the death penalty as its sanction still holds true today. The Mosaic safeguards sur-

. . . continued on page 13

of this teaching in the Word of God, I call upon you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, don't poke around in the dark. Open the Word and see the light of God shining into that place of death and telling everyone who believes in Jesus, your life is *irreplaceable*. God has a place for everyone of His. He knows you. He knows you by name; He calls His sheep and you follow Him. Come in out of the dark. Come into the radiant light of Jesus Christ and find Him a resting place for your soul and for your body, forevermore. Amen.

---

## GOOD FRIDAY SERVICE

April 17, 1987 - 7:30 p.m.

Cantata

### *The Highest Place*

Beneath the Cross of Jesus  
arranged by David Clydesdale

Guest Soloists: Judy Reid and Ron Rand

---

## MISSION EMERGENCY

The 1973 Honda Civic of Pastor Vernon Allen of Buff Bay circuit of churches in Jamaica developed major engine troubles. In spite of recent expenditures of \$250.00 (Canadian) it now needs a minimum of \$1,250.00 (Canadian) to get it functioning.

I was appalled at the state of their country roads. Heavy rainfalls last year have aggravated their condition. Huge potholes are very frequent. As Brother Allen has 5 churches to minister to and all are several miles apart he is quite desperate for a robust vehicle, such as a Jeep or a Land Rover.

As there are import fees on new cars amounting to \$5,000.00 (Canadian) — and this represents a reduction for a charitable organization — the best plan seems to be to send money to him to buy a secondhand vehicle in Jamaica. Funds are being gathered at the moment by the Association of Regular Baptist Churches (Canada) designated for this project. Any contribution will be a wise missionary investment.

— Dr. G. A. Adams

---

## BIBLICAL INERRANCY

Send for extra copies of the Special Issue of March 19, 1987, Volume 66, No. 1, dealing with BIBLICAL INERRANCY. Order from *The Gospel Witness*, 130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto M5A 3T4 or telephone 925-3261. Price 50 cents per copy, 3 for \$1.00.

List of Books on Inerrancy will  
appear in our next issue.

---

## CAPITAL PUNISHMENT continued from page 4

rounding the administration of the penalty give guidance to us as well.

## NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING

The last portion of Scripture to consider is the New Testament. We shall content ourselves with only a survey of its relevant testimony. The New Testament everywhere upholds the divinely delegated authority of the state. This is clearly the testimony of Jesus before the Roman governor, Pontius Pilate:

*"Do you refuse to speak to me?" Pilate said. "Don't you realize I have power either to free you or to crucify you?" Jesus answered, "You would have no power over me if it were not given to you from above"* (John 19:10, 11, NIV).

Jesus also supported the authority of the state when He instructs us to pay our taxes (Matthew 22:15-22). In the garden of Gethsemane, Jesus rebuked Peter,

*"Put your sword back in its place," Jesus said to him, "for all who draw the sword will die by the sword"* (Matthew 26:52, NIV).

Some have exploited this statement to deny the right of the state to hold the sword. We must distinguish, however, between a directive that Jesus gave to an individual and His mandate to the state.<sup>20</sup> In the context, Jesus is denying the sword as a means of establishing His heavenly kingdom; He is not forbidding it as a legitimate function of the state.

In addition to the testimony of Jesus, the Apostle Peter confirms the authority of the state (I Peter 2:13-17) as does Paul (Titus 3:1, 2, Romans 13:1-7). Paul expressly speaks of the right of the state to employ the ultimate sanction of death in punishing evildoers:

*For he (the state) is God's servant to do you good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword for nothing. He is God's servant, an agent of wrath to bring punishment on the wrongdoer* (Romans 13:4, NIV).

We cannot take this statement about the sword in any other sense than the literal one.

The entire Word of God affirms the inviolable sanctity of human life, together with its corollary of capital punishment. As the covenant with Noah demonstrates, it is a creation ordinance. As the Law of Moses proves, it is integral to retributive justice. Moreover, Jesus affirmed that the Law, like God, is infinite, eternal and unchangeable. In addition, He sustained the binding constraints and restraints of the Ten Commandments in His famous Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7).

Two voices from our cultural heritage have a warning for Canadian society today. The first is that of Henry de Bracton, an English judge living in the thirteenth century who had a tremendous influence on British law:

*The king must not be under man but under God and under the law, because law makes the king, for there is no rex (king) where will rules, rather than lex (law).<sup>21</sup>*

To apply de Bracton's observation to ourselves, we must recognize that in a democracy king rule is replaced by people rule. We as a people must acknowledge the sovereignty of God's Law because it expresses the essential character both of our Maker and of all created reality. Majority votes, Gallop Polls, or sociological averages do not determine justice and morality. The second voice is that of Samuel Rutherford whose book *Lex Rex* appeared in 1644. This Scottish Rector argued that the king is not a law unto himself (*rex lex*) but rather, since law is king (*lex rex*), the king himself must be accountable to the Law of God.<sup>22</sup> From I Samuel 12:25 Rutherford proclaimed that certain doom awaits the society which refuses to operate this way.

#### DETERRENCE — AMNESTY

Before we conclude, two issues require some comment. One is deterrence; the other is amnesty and the cross of Christ. Beginning with the latter we may note a verse like I John 1:9,

*If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just and will forgive us our sins and purify us from all unrighteousness (NIV).*

The New Testament plainly teaches that the cross of Christ is the basis for the forgiveness of any and all sins, the sin of murder included. Further, Christ teaches all of us who are forgiven to forgive others (Matthew 18:21-35). Some would argue from these facts that we should offer clemency and amnesty to murderers, especially to those who become Christians and find forgiveness in Christ. This is hazy thinking about sin. All sin involves three parties: God, the sinner, and the person injured or wronged (this may be oneself sometimes). When someone sins, he dishonours God first of all, by violating the majesty of His Law. This is the meaning of David's cry, "Against you, you only, have I sinned" (Psalm 51:4, NIV). And when we satisfy the Law of God by pleading the merits of Christ, there is still the restitution to the injured human person. King David of Israel was an adulterer and murderer. Although God forgave him (on the grounds of repentance), David could not make restitution to the injured persons: Bathsheba had been defiled and Uriah, her husband, was dead. A special prophetic word commuted the death penalty in his particular case (2 Samuel 12:13), but let us not think that justice was ignored, or that his sin was without consequences. As a lesson to the nations, he paid the penalty in his family (2 Samuel 12:10). First, Bathsheba's baby died (2 Samuel 12:14-18). Then, in Amnon's rape of Tamar, his crime of passion was re-enacted and in Absalom's murder of Amnon, his crime of premeditated murder was revisited (2 Samuel 13).

Thus on the grounds of Christ's finished work on the cross, God may forgive any or all sin, but this does not provide restitution to the injured third party. If a man steals a large sum and later repents, God may grant full forgiveness for breaking His Law, but there must still be compensation to the victim in order to make things right. The person robbed may indeed forgive the thief, but justice still demands remuneration. In addition, to require that the thief work off his debt has rehabilitative value. Biblical jurisprudence is palpably more effective than our humanistic legal system that commits men to prison. Indeed, there can be no real rehabilitation without recognition of the demands of justice. In the case of murder, the victim does not have the liberty to offer forgiveness, so the state must satisfy the claims of justice. Zacchaeus was pardoned by Christ, but not exonerated from repaying fourfold those whom he had cheated (Luke 19:8, 9). The repentant criminal crucified with Jesus was both pardoned and promised Paradise, but not released from the Roman gibbet (Luke 23:32-43). The Apostle Paul, whose experience and expositions of divine pardon are unsurpassed, would willingly have undergone capital punishment for any crime deserving it (Acts 25:11). Capital punishment best serves the dignity and rehabilitation of the murderer. Not only may he know God's forgiveness, but he may enjoy peace, knowing that he has made full restitution for his crime.

Moreover, the sentence of death best serves the gospel because it creates conditions whereby men and women, stripped of all illusions and subterfuges, think most clearly and seriously about eternal realities. They may then respond in faith to God's offer of redemptive rescue through Jesus Christ.

*A man tormented by the guilt of murder will be a fugitive till death; let no one support him (Proverbs 28:17, NIV).*

At any rate, the entire question is settled by the fact that, while the Bible holds the state responsible for implementing the Law of God, no Scripture binds the state to recognize the grace proffered in the cross of Christ.

Finally, a word about deterrence. In my view, deterrence is a secondary question. The Scripture, not some statistical survey, is the basis for our argument in this article. Let it speak for itself.

*When the sentence for a crime is not quickly carried out, the hearts of the people are filled with schemes to do wrong (Ecclesiastes 8:11, NIV).*

According to the Bible, the imposition of the appropriate penalty has deterrent value. Logically, the death penalty at least deters a murderer from pursuing his criminal career. May God give our politicians courage to restore justice to our land and courage to the Christian community to support them.

#### END NOTES

1. For this definition I acknowledge a debt to Professor Bruce K. Waltke of Westminster Theological Seminary.
2. Francis A. Schaeffer and C. Everett Koop, M. D. *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?* Old Tappan: Fleming H. Revell, 1979, p. 107.
3. Christopher J. H. Wright. *An Eye for an Eye*. IVP, 1983, p. 164.
4. Ibid.
5. W. J. Dumbrell. *Covenant and Creation*. Nelson, 1984, pp. 27-28.
6. Warren Austin Gage. *The Gospel of Genesis*. Carpenter, 1984.
7. As demonstrated by S. McEvenue and presented in Dumbrell, op. cit. pp. 16-33.
8. Johann Jakob Stamm with M. E. Andrew. *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research*. London: SCM, 1967, pp. 98-100. Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974, pp. 420-421. Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. *Toward Old Testament Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, p. 90.
9. Childs, op. cit. p. 421.
10. Wright, op. cit. p. 164.
11. P. G. W. Glare, ed. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 1982.
12. *The Oxford English Dictionary*.
13. Shalom M. Paul. *Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law*. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, XVIII. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970, p. 76.
14. Wright, op. cit. p. 166.
15. See Robert T. Ingram, ed. *Essays on the Death Penalty*. St. Thomas Press, 1963.
16. I believe I owe this observation to C. S. Lewis, but cannot locate the reference.
17. Carl F. H. Henry. *The Christian Mindset in a Secular Society*. Portland: Multnomah Press, 1984, p. 134.
18. Wright, op. cit. p. 43.
19. Wright, op. cit. pp. 43-44.
20. See Gervas A. Carey in Ingram, op. cit. p. 113.
21. Henry de Bracton, *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard-Belknap, 1968, Vol. II, p. 33.
22. Samuel Rutherford. *Lex Rex*. Harrison, Virginia: Sprinkle Publications, 1982. Reprint of 1644 edition.

## CAMP SAUGEEN 1987

Plan now to attend Camp Saugeen 1987 as campers and workers.

#### Camp Periods:

Girls Camp — June 29 to July 10  
Junior Camp — July 13 to July 18  
Boys Camp — July 20 to July 31  
Young Adult Week-end — July 31 to August 3  
Youth Camp — August 28 to September 5

#### Work Days:

May 23, June 3-6, June 27.

## AMONG OURSELVES

We extend hearty congratulations:

To Rick and Cathie Smith (Harriston) on the birth of a son Stephen Michael on February 24, 1987.

To Mark and Lidia Fenton (Toronto) on the birth of a son Paul David, a brother for Naomi on March 8, 1987.

To Jack and Becky Geddes (Michigan) on the birth of a son Lance Edwin, a brother for Vince, Brandon and Alicia, on March 18, 1987.

### Seminary Alumni continued from page 7

followed by another walk of 7 miles back to St. Amedee. This continued for about one and a half years when some folk from Thurso (where I held a prayer meeting on Monday evenings) raised \$250 with which I was able to purchase a second-hand car, a Model A Ford. That certainly lightened the load.

During this time I had a series of evangelistic meetings with Jack Watt (30-34) who was pastoring the Courtright and Wilkesport Baptist churches. Then when Jack assumed the pastorate of St. Catharines I was asked to take over the work at Courtright and Wilkesport. That was a happy ministry and much to my liking, as many of the members and friends were farmers and I enjoyed visiting and sharing in their homes. From this country pastorate I went to the big city of Ottawa where I served in the Westboro Baptist Church. While there, the building debt was paid off, but the most significant and happy day was when

I was united in marriage to my beloved Anne. The Lord has abundantly blessed us together down to this day.

In the Fall of 1950 we moved to Hespeler (now part of Cambridge) and became pastor of the Hespeler Baptist Church. Personally, we did not want to leave the beautiful city of Ottawa and move to a small industrial town, but God was calling and we surrendered to His will. Our ministry of over twenty-five years in Hespeler was wonderfully blessed by God. Many souls were saved. The congregation kept increasing and we had to enter into three building programs to accommodate the people who came. In it all we were wonderfully assisted by the members and deacons of the church. To His name be all the praise and glory!

Since my retirement in January 1976 I have had the privilege of being interim pastor in several

churches, as well as supplying in many others.

Our Hespeler church has always been deeply concerned about the lost and we have had the privilege of seeing many "go forth" with the Gospel of salvation. Bessie Falle (30-34), a member of the church and graduate of Toronto Baptist Seminary spent thirty years as a missionary in the Chad, Africa. A number of others are presently serving in various fields and in our own country.

In 1969 The Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches asked Dr. W. H. MacBain (34-39), Dr. Robert Holmes (47-48) and myself if we would investigate Colombia in South America as a mission field for our Fellowship. This resulted in opening up a field which is now served by twenty missionaries.

In closing this report I would say thank you, Toronto Baptist Seminary, for your training and impact upon my life and ministry. God bless you and continue to use you in His service.