PAUL'S CHARGE TO TIMOTHY

“I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry.”

2 Tim. 4: 1-5.
Maintains Senior High School, Junior College, Business School, Departments of Bible, Music-Instrumental and Voice, Home Economics, etc. All Work standardized and accredited. Living Conditions Unsurpassed. Good, clean well-furnished rooms with all modern comforts and conveniences. An abundance of well-prepared wholesome food attractively served. Strong faculty of experienced teachers—graduates of the big colleges and universities of the South.

Five fine modern buildings in first class condition. New science building just completed. The teaching of the Bible and the moral and spiritual training of students are made paramount. No hobbies, speculations, human opinions taught or tolerated—just the pure unadulterated word of God.

Expenses are as low as we can make them and pay our debts. Enrollment increased from 135 to 471 in past few years. Write for beautiful picture bulletin and catalogue.
The Bible
N. B. Hardean

Since its inspired and immortal truths were penned amid the quiet hills of Palestine, hundreds of years ago, the Bible has challenged the attention of the noblest souls of earth and of the greatest thinkers of all time. It has counted its friends by multiplied thousands, and millions of the best men and women of all ages have been willing to die rather than to deny its wonderful story. It has also had bitter enemies and relentless foes. There have ever been those who would gladly banish it from the face of the earth. The reason for this is possibly two-fold. First, there are those who think so highly of their own standards and opinions that whatever does not meet their approval should be wholly discarded. Second, many there are who love darkness rather than light and they abhor the idea of having to appear before the judgment seat of Christ and give an account of their ungodly lives.

Elijah's Challenge

Elijah challenged the prophets of Baal to call down fire from heaven as a test of the true God. He was willing to risk all on his proposition. The God who answered by fire was to be the recognized God. Let those of us who believe the Bible put to the test those who reject it. And now the proposition: The Bible is either the Word of God or it is the work of man. If it is the work of man, then man, with the experience of centuries and his boasted progress, ought to be able to write a better book or else admit he has degenerated. The Grecian, Roman, or Elizabethan period failed to produce a volume from any man or set of men comparable to that by Inspiration given. Let the enemies of the Bible bear in mind that it is the product of a single race whose opportunities were wholly unfavorable for literary work. The few who had a part in it were sons of sires whose backs had bowed to the rays of an Egyptian sun and who had moved at the crack of a whip. They had wandered in a great and terrible wilderness and finally entered the land of Palestine—a country shut off from the rest of the world by natural barriers. In this land they had no libraries to consult, no universities to attend, no rapid ships to carry them to distant centers of civilization, no telegraph lines to bring them news from every corner of the earth.

Limited indeed were their sources of information and yet they dealt with every problem that confronts mankind from the creation of the world to a life beyond the grave. They spake and wrote as they were moved by inspiration. Let him who denies this account for this superior volume and give to us one that will prove a better lamp to our feet and a brighter light to our path. With the advantages twenty centuries have brought, the enemies ought to do this. Only one thing is lacking—their attics are not sufficiently furnished.

Objections

Men object to the Word of God on the ground that it contains mysteries. Were this otherwise, man would be equal to its author. There are things in the Bible we may never understand, and especially is this true regarding the reason for things. There are in this Book seeming discrepancies even things that look like contradictions. There are things God is said to have done and commanded to be done, that if they are right I cannot, according to our standards, explain satisfactorily to our objectors or even to myself. But I believe all such were right, because I recognize the fact that I am wholly unable to understand all the ways of God. There is good and ample reason for all He says and does whether such be recorded in the Bible or in nature. He does everything in full view and with reference to all things else in the whole universe, in all time and eternity. If we could take all of this within our visual plane, we might see the reason for all He does. God Himself is necessarily a mystery to us. The wisest way of a parent is often a mystery to his own child. Were this otherwise, parental guidance would be unnecessary. Like children who trust in their parents, Christians walk by Faith. God is infinite; we are finite. He governs the universe; we are unable to govern a nation, state, city and many times not even ourselves. Isn’t it rather strange that man who lives in such a limited sphere and for such a few years should demand a reason for what God does, and if such reason cannot be found, he then looks wise and denies that God is. “The foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.” God’s thoughts are not our thoughts, neither are our ways His ways. As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are God’s ways higher than ours.

“All nature is but art unknown to thee.

Every chance direction, which thou canst not see;
All discord, harmony not understood;
All partial evil, universal good;
And spite of pride, in erring reason’s spite,
One truth is clear, Whatever is, is right.”

Nature’s God

I have recently read a letter from an avowed Atheist who rejoices that he has at last gotten rid of every vestige of faith in any book purporting to come from God. He has turned from the God of the Bible to that of nature, and with such gladly communes. The God of the Bible ordered men, women, infant and suckling to be slain and, to this Atheist, such a character is wholly unworthy of adoration and respect. Men of this type love to talk about the discrepancies, contradictions and horrid inhumanities of the Bible. It is nearly always useless to discuss matters with them. They assume an air of superior intelligence. An old time epidemic of yellow fever, cholera or smallpox would reach their case much quicker than an argument. The fact that earthquakes, cyclones, fires and floods frequently wipe out cities and destroy men and women, infants and sucklings, camels and asses, does not seem to impress the Atheist as to the character of nature’s God.

The natural realm is filled with mysteries, discrepancies and apparent contradictions. Let him who recognizes no other God try his hand on some of the passages in his Bible. No doubt but earthquakes, cyclones and other occurrences in nature that destroy humanity and civilization’s boasted works are necessary even though no reason for such can be seen. “Whatever is, is right.” Atheists never stop to explain many unexplainable things in nature. They are so much better at finding fault; better at destruction than construction. This is easy work for any one and sometimes even church members are guilty.

Sober Reflection

Doubtless those who are so disposed to find fault with God’s word, in their better moments, will agree that in the great body of the Book, there are rules, laws, admonitions and prohibitions laid down for human guidance and instruction which are so sound, safe and reasonable that no sort of criticism can detract from them. They

(Continued on Page 7)
THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN

Through the substantial support of some loyal friends I am able to offer this magazine to the religious public. The magazine is my own. There is no company or corporation back of it. The only backing it has received or will receive above the volume of subscriptions we hope to accumulate is the backing of individuals who are friends, not of the editor only but of the cause the magazine has espoused. We merely want the readers to understand this point, but with it one more i.e., the appearance of the Gospel Guardian does not mean the birth of another journalistic beggar. It will not beg its way. We hope to make it pay its way.

The name of the magazine suggests its mission and policy. It is controversial-doctrinal to the core. Paul said to his young protege, "0, Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee". The gospel needs guarding. It is the state of current religious thought and the needs of the cause with which my own life and labors have been identified that have called forth this magazine and that is the sole cause for its existence. It has been more than one hundred years since Stone and Campbell and their co-adjutors brought their plea for the complete return to the New Testament to this continent. During this time, though the triumphs of this plea have been signal, there have been many defections from it and its steady progress and highest success have been periodically retarded. But for the fact that the eminent men connected with this plea kept the church of the past generation or two thoroughly indoctrinated, and that by controversy, the plea would have become absorbed in the constant drift of things and lost from view.

We are overlooking the fact that the present generation has not had the advantages of the thorough indoctrination the former generation had under the "giants of those days". The whole ground of the restoration plea needs to be reviewed and restated. In binding the precepts of the law upon Israel's posterity Moses said: "And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and thou shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thy house, and upon thy gates". We have ceased to do for the gospel and for our children what Israel did for the law of Moses and their children.

Under the present trend it is not impossible that the church may be a lost institution among the denominations of the world. Our preachers are becoming mere pastors, presidents of Ministerial Associations, stage performers and star actors at worldly clubs, and when they resign as preacher for the church it is not infrequent that we hear of the local pastors holding a banquet in their honor and expressing regrets at their departure. When a gospel preacher has done his duty, pastors of denominational churches might hold a jubilee over his going, but not a banquet in his honor.

Schools have been tempted to abandon their original purpose to vie with the standards of worldly schools. To a certain extent such standards must in our day be maintained but not to the point of sacrificing or even of compromising the original aims of the Christian school. Loyal to these aims they may be a great factor in the dissemination of truth; unfaithful to these aims through their influence they may sweep the church into another wholesale digres-

The full and free discussion of the great fundamentals of the gospel is peculiarly timely now, when so many errors and isms are so rife. There has been a generation of younger Christians since these issues were made the common theme of every gospel pulpit. Now the canned sermons of Chappell and other denominational pulpiteers are more common from some of our own pulpits than the gospel of Paul.

While the range of subjects to be treated in this magazine will embrace the entire field of faith, doctrine, worship, work and growth of the church, yet special attention will be given to some particular errors, such as Premillennialism. To be specific we desire the publishers of the Word and Work, at Louisville, Ky., to know that we are set for the defence of the truth against the errors that periodical propagates. We shall meet them on the issues drawn and everything of major importance appearing in it will receive due and proper attention. While doing that, as a sideline, we shall attend to apologists and neutrals who carry water on both shoulders and as often as they appear we aim to see to it that they either take one bucket off or spill them both.

There is an essential agreement between the writers whose names appear on this staff in all matters of fundamental importance. They represent age and youth. There is not a side-stepper, neutral, compromiser or soft-pedaler among them. Their names are known for soundness. Of course, there are many others like them, some serving other papers. We do not seek to monopolize such talent, and would not if we could. The Gospel Guardian does not enter the field as a competitor with other papers. The Firm Foundation, Gospel Advocate, Christian Leader and Christian Worker serve their fields and territories adequately. There is no opposition to any of them in the slightest degree, but rather cooperation. I was reared under the influence of the Firm Foundation and its editor. If we disagree on anything of doctrinal importance, faith, worship or practice, I do not know what it is. I have served the gospel Advocate in the capacity of editor and am indebted to its publisher. I have no issue to draw with that great paper. And for the publishers of the Christian Leader and the Christian Worker I have only good will and good wishes.

My magazine has a field of its own. It was conceived and is now published in the conviction that its definite policy and purpose justifies its existence. I shall strive with all my strength to make it merit the confidence of those who have made it possible. That it may be further received with a generous welcome and a liberal support by all who are jealous and zealous of the doctrinal purity of the church and who believe in the defence of the truth against all errors and isms is the fervent prayer and ardent hope of the editor.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.
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THE COMMON GROUND OF FELLOWSHIP

For several months some brethren who ordinarily experience no difficulty in expressing themselves with clarity have been laboring to make themselves "understood" on the millennial-belief questions. A late issue of the Harding College Bulletin carries a reprint of J. N. Armstrong's article in the Firm Foundation of April 30 bearing the caption "For A Good Understanding", in which Brother Armstrong makes laborious effort, after several previous attempts, to make himself understood. When men of ability have so much difficulty in explaining their views there must be something wrong with what they are trying to say or do. The real trouble seems to be that we all understood these brethren fairly well at first.

The reprint of the Armstrong article in the Harding Bulletin was not repeated to when it appeared in the Firm Foundation. Some of us felt at the time that some things in it demanded an answer but the papers (Firm Foundation, Gospel Advocate and Christian Leader) had all been so generous in giving me space that I did not feel the inclination to demand more. Now, that Brother Armstrong has again made his article current, renewing all of the matters involved in it, by reprinting it in Harding College Bulletin, giving it wider circulation and the sanction of the school, I feel not only at liberty but under obligation to reply to it. It was not my desire to renew the matter at this time but Brother Armstrong, not being satisfied to let the matter rest, has done so himself.

The Record

He complains that he has "been made the target of certain brethren through the columns of our papers". Now, "for good understanding" let us remember the record, and keep it straight. It was F. B. Srygley who requested the presidents of the colleges to state their positions and policies on these questions in order that brethren might know what schools they might consistently support. A statement from L. L. Brigance, representing Freed-Hardeman College, was forthcoming. Later, E. H. Ijams, of David Lipscomb College and J. F. Cox of Abilene Christian College made statements that required no explanations to understand. Much later, Brother Armstrong, visibly irked by the pressure and with misgivings and apologies wrote a long article in which he defended R. H. Boll and launched a broadside at "certain brethren" who have actively opposed the Boll theories. He charged them with being "equally responsible for the breach" and made numerous challenging statements which he should have known "certain brethren" would never let go by uncalled. He has since written several articles trying to explain the things he said in the first article. N. B. Hardeman said that he could state his position on these questions on a postcard in six lines but it has required more than that many months for Brother Armstrong to explain his views and he is not through with it yet.

He complains that he has been made a "target" and demurs at severe criticisms, the severest he says have been mine. But Brother Armstrong did not hesitate to refer to us as "popes", "dictators", "partymakers", "creedwriters" and along with Brother Boll to brand us as "a creed-bound human sect". Yet he complains at the severity of criticism! People who live in glass houses (even if they be colleges) should not throw stones.

Recession

Receding from the somewhat stubborn attitude of his first article, Brother Armstrong finally tells us just what he thinks he believes and does not believe, a sort of a guess so, maybe. He apparently does not accept the major theories of premillennialism, that fleshly Israel will be nationally restored; that the literal throne of David will be re-established in Jerusalem; that the kingdom of Dan. 2:44 was postponed; that Christ will establish a world kingdom and reign on the earth for one thousand years. He believes that Christ is on the throne of David now in heaven; that the only kingdom Christ will ever have begun on Pentecost and that Christ is now reigning in the only sense in which he will ever reign. He tells us now that this is what he believes. But these are the things which he also told us in his first article that he did not teach nor allow taught one way or the other, pro or con, in Harding College. He evidently does not believe them with conviction or else regards them along with others as "unimportant". Why has he not taught the truth on these questions to the young preachers who have come as a trust under his tutelage? And if he believes these things, as stated, why did he not say so plainly in his first statement and avoid the embarrassment of being "made a target of certain brethren"? And why has he insisted in saying so many unnecessary things in decence of that group who teach the opposite of what he says he believes, and identically what he says he does not believe, but so disparagingly of those who have defended the truth against their errors? He said in his first article that he holds and has held for thirty years "about the same position held by Dr. T. W. Brents" who believed in a future thousand years reign of Christ on earth. How can Brother Armstrong believe that or even "about" that and at the same time believe according to his latest statement? Our only conclusion from the premises is that Brother Armstrong has taken a forced position, one that he never would have taken if the pressure had not become so great. He has staged a complete retreat from his original article without admitting the mistakes he made.

Inconsistencies

We have previously pointed out fifteen or twenty inconsistent and conflicting statements in Brother Armstrong's labored explanations, statements that were exactly opposite and in direct contradiction, one of the other. He has in his later articles wisely ignored these things and has talked about something else.

He said, for another instance, that "no man has the right to enter the sacred precincts of another man's conscience" to tell him "what he may or may not believe and teach". He now says that "those who cause divisions contrary to the doctrine of Christ are wrong and should be disciplined". We wonder how to do it if no man has the right to say what another may or may not teach? We are willing to wait for Brother Armstrong to tell us if he will not keep us waiting as long as he did to tell us what he believes.

He even now admits that Brother Boll and the Louisville brethren have "caused division" and "are wrong"-but he does not want them disciplined. He just wants "good fellowship" with them and "good understanding" with the rest of us! Why?

He argued that every man has the "unquestioned" right to teach what he believes "within the sacred precincts of his own conscience" without "interference"-but he fired young Ernest Wright because of "faulty teaching", so the telegram to Brother Showalter read. That seems to be interfering somewhat with this young man's "unquestioned" rights. Now, we do not blame Brother Armstrong for firing Wright; he ought to have fired him before he did. We are simply pointing out the inconsistency of his theory and his practice in the premises. He knew all of the time that Wright was an avowed premillennialist but his "faulty
teaching” did not get him fired until Brother Armstrong became the “target of certain brethren”. Personally, with no respect at all for Wright’s “faulty teaching” I yet have more respect for the young man in his error than I have for the course the president of Harding College pursued in the episode.

Censure

Brother Armstrong “believes” that for those of the Boll party “who have gone clear out of the bounds of reason and truth” like Dr. Woods and others “there is just censure due”. But for R. H. Boll, the head man of the defection and the instigator of all trouble, from whom the others have received their inspiration, he has only the mild criticism that “he attaches excessive importance” to his theory! That is not near all R. H. Boll has done. For him to lead young men into such a mess of human speculation, and forsake them when they fall under “just censure” to bear the brunt of the criticism and the blame for the fruits of his own teaching, may be called meekness, but I have a truer name for it. It spells a color. And for Brother Armstrong to condemn them but condone Boll is either color blindness or a tinge of the same streak.

He says that these “extreme brethren” should be approached in love and not in harshness”; and reminds us that “a soft answer turneth away wrath”. True, but Paul said, “them that sin rebuke before all that others may fear”. He rebuked Elymas somewhat harshly when he persisted in perverting the right way of the Lord. Brethren Lipscomb, Sewell and Elam approached Brother Boll in paternal kindness to save him from his course. It did not work. We believe Paul’s method is in order. If it does not turn Brother Boll from his follies it may save many from his errors.

There is a time for soft answers but there is no place for soft preachers. They are a misfit in the line of defence that must be formed today against “certain men who have crept in privily” to corrupt the pure minds of innocent people from the simplicity that is in Christ.

Common Ground

On this point Brother Armstrong says: “There is enough common ground between us and R. H. Boll to make us one in Christ.” The same may be said of the digressive brethren. But where is the common ground? We occupy it; let them come and stand with us on it. But we cannot be “one in Christ” when they leave the common ground. We occupy the same common ground of unity that was occupied when R. H. Boll began his doctrinal excursions. He left it; let him return to it, and make satisfactory amends for the division and disfellowship that exists in Louisville between his party and the church there, and we will be “one in Christ”. Shall we act as a sort of a caddy for R. H. Boll and follow him around on his excursions with common ground luggage wherever he may wish to lead us? That is not my conception of the New Testament exordium to “follow after love”. Brother Armstrong’s attitude would leave Brother Boll to theorize the church into all of his errors.

He cites H. Leo Boles as being a mutually acceptable witness and quotes him as saying in the Boll-Boles Discussion, “Brother Boll and I hold many things in common—enough to fellowship each other as brethren.” What of that? I said as much in the “heat of oral debate” with Chas. M. Neal but Brother Neal did not yield to my persuasion and neither has Brother Boll yielded to the strong entreaties of Brother Boles. At the time Brother Boles made that statement he was, to say the least, doing the very thing that Brother Boles made that statement he was, to say the least, doing the very thing that Brother Armstrong and others who share his views say should not be done—he was debating the issue.

Since H. Leo Boles is yet among us, and is considerably on the east side of his “dotage” (as they are wont to say when Brother Srygley makes an argument which they cannot answer) why not have him, according to Brother Armstrong’s accepted standard, “state his own position” and “explain his own language”? He can probably do so better than either of us from the present point of view. I, therefore, refer the reader to the very able statement of H. Leo Boles in this magazine, page 5. I accept Brother Boles as an “acceptable witness”. Will Brother Armstrong accept him? If he does, he will have to recall every article he has written and cancel the Harding College Bulletin that contains the one under review. Will he print Brother Boles’ article in the next number of his college Bulletin?

Personalities

The discussion of these principles has not been a personal matter with me at all, nor shall I permit it to become such, though the effort has been made and is being made to reduce it to personalities. With me it is a matter that involves the defence of the truth, regardless of the character of the men represented, pious or impious. It represents an issue that must be met with decision. Generalizing on the “Kingdom of the Heavens” and on “Good Fellowship” and “Good Understanding” without saying anything specific or defending the New Testament basis for fellowship may serve to palliate some and assure others but neither is the treatment the present case demands.

The campaign of calumny that has been and is being waged by enemies, joined in by some brethren of whom we might expect better things, is regrettable in extreme but God being my Helper I shall not be deterred by any such thing. Whatever any of them think they can make of such, or gain by it, they are welcome to. None of these things shall move me in my set determination to do right and to rectify all that is not right. Meanwhile, let the issue only be met and the truth defended.

F. E. W., Jr.

Off To A Good Start

We bring five thousand copies of the Gospel Guardian from the press with this issue, two thirds of them actual subscribers. We confidently expect the next issue to be well on the way toward ten thousand. If you signed a subscription blank, send your dollar. If you have not signed a blank, send us your name and a dollar anyway. We have no agents and rely on our friends to extend our circulation.

That Norris Propaganda

Special attention is directed to the complete exposure John Dickey has made of J. Frank Norris on pages 26 and 27 of this magazine. These facts should have been given to the public long before now. The statements of Brother Dickey are the unvarnished facts. Not one time did Norris make the manuscripts of the debate available to me. His asserted offers were never cat ried out. They were made to print, not to execute. The most conservative thing that I can say of the Norris statements in the preface of his book and in his paper is that they are utterly false. There is a stronger word for it but I will not use it. Brother Dickey has rendered the cause a service and has done me a personal favor in his exhaustive statement of facts. I could wish that it might be reprinted and be given a circulation that would extend from Fort Worth to Detroit.
"Unfulfilled Prophecy" is the title of a book which contains a discussion between H. Leo Boles and R. H. Boll on prophetic themes; the discussion was first published in the Gospel Advocate in 1927 and put in book form in 1928. The propositions discussed were the "Restoration of Fleshy Israel to Palestine", "The Kingdom of God Established on Pentecost", "The Thousand Years Reign of Christ", "Christ on David's Throne", and "The Coming of Christ Premillennial and Imminent". R. H. Boll affirmed the "Restoration of Fleshy Israel to Palestine"; that "Christ would reign a Thousand Years on Earth" and that "The Coming of Christ is Premillennial and Imminent". He denied that "The Kingdom of God was set up on Pentecost" and "That Christ is now on David's Throne".

At the time this discussion was had the situation had not become so acute as it has now become. R. H. Boll and others who believed as he did were preaching for churches in meetings and in station work for churches which were not in sympathy with those speculative theories. The situation has grown so intense since this discussion that Brother Boll and others who are in sympathy with his theories cannot preach for churches that are opposed to those views; neither can one who opposes the theories propagated by Brother Boll and his sympathizers preach for churches in sympathy with Brother Boll. The situation in Louisville, Ky., between the churches in sympathy with Brother Boll and the old Campbell Street church (now Holdeman Avenue) and others opposed to his theories, is similar to the relation between the Jews and the Samaritans during the earthly ministry of Christ-they simply have no dealings with each other. Such conditions now prevail in other sections of the country. Obviously the cause of this condition is the pressing of these theories. The issues involve more and are far-reaching than was at first realized. The propagators of this speculation have gone to further extremes than it was ever dreamed they would go.

In this discussion referred to, Brother Boll said that these prophetic subjects which were under discussion "do not, however, affect any outward act of religious practice, any act of obedience in work or worship; in fact, they do not refer directly to the present, but have reference to 'the things that are to come', of which the Holy Spirit speaks." (Unfulfilled Prophecy, Page 8.) At that time those who held to these speculative theories claimed that Christians could do all the work the Lord requires of them to do without knowing or believing in the speculative theories which were being discussed; he conceded that Christians could worship God acceptably without believing the propositions which he affirmed or without denying the propositions which he denied. Evidently, some of those who now hold to these theories have changed as they are contending now that a belief in these theories is essential to Christian growth and development, and even essential to salvation.

It is not known how many of these speculative teachers believe the essentiality of these theories to salvation as many will not express themselves as to how much they believe of the theories, or how important they consider these theories. But the leaders of this movement, including Brother Boll himself, evidently believe that they are important enough to justify pressing them upon churches even to the dividing asunder the body of Christ, for in the face of widespread disruption in the church, they have not relented, but rather intensified their efforts to extend their theories. To some these theories take position in the plan of salvation and the development of the Christian life with equal rank of faith, repentance and baptism. It is not here claimed that one part of God's word is any more important than any other part of His word, but it is emphatically denied that these theories of so-called "unfulfilled prophecy" are to be placed in equal rank with the word of God. Any and every attempt to place them on a par with the word of God is an insult to God and a crime against Heaven.

At the time the discussion was held on "Unfulfilled Prophecy" it was thought that the discussion would help maintain peace in the brotherhood and harmony with the people of God. Brother Boll himself said, "Might we not hope that this discussion may itself be a means to help brethren everywhere to study, weigh, and discuss these teachings without allowing them to disturb their harmony and love and Christian fellowship?" (Unfulfilled Prophecy, Page 33). Brother Boll was urged at that time to express himself fully, clearly, accurately, and specifically on every point; he was urged to keep nothing back; he had ample time and opportunity to express himself clearly on every point and make himself clear as to what he believed and taught on these speculative theories. The discussion was fraternal; each regarded the other as a brother in the Lord searching for the truth; each expressed confidence in the other as a brother in the Lord and enjoyed fellowship with each other in Christ. Conditions have changed in the brotherhood generally since this discussion, due to the extremes to which the leaders of this movement have gone. They have gone beyond the boundary not only of truth, but of reason and brotherly love. They have exalted these theories to a level with the word of God. They have gone out from the faithful brethren in the Lord. Some of them have, gone to the extreme of fellowshipping the denominations and affiliating with denominational preachers who blaspheme the church of our Lord. It is not fair to the present situation to quote me in 1927 from the book, "Unfulfilled Prophecy", which expressed the attitude then and applied these quotations to the extremities to which these brethren who have so far departed from the faith, have gone in exalting their theories.

The language used in that book could perhaps be applied to some of these brethren now, who do not press these theories to the division of the church and who are not aligned with the contingency doing so, but it cannot apply to those who are wedded like Ephramp of old to their idols and who have suffered division to come rather than recede from their theories. A discussion of these questions now, must, as a matter of fact, be held in light of the issue now-not then. Later developments reveal the character of the movement even from incipience and justifies the attitude of such men as F. W. Smith and M. C. Kurfees, who were criticized for their attitude on the issue.

The New Testament teaches clearly and emphatically how to regard those who have departed from the faith or those who have corrupted the teachings of Christ. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned ; and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech, they beguile the hearts of the innocent." (Rom. 16:17, 18) This is not difficult to understand. It belongs to every child of God and every Christian should help to carry out this injunction of the Holy Spirit. The peace and harmony of the church of our Lord demand that this Scripture be obeyed by every child of God.
Christianity was born and has triumphed in the heat of controversy. It claims and demonstrates divine origin. It treats all opposition as rebellion against God, and every manifestation of “Anti-Christ” as a huge and destructive lie. It spurns all offers of compromise or fellowship with rival religions. He that exalts himself against its perfect and exhaustive principles of truth is called a “son of perdition” and is denied the salvation that can be found only in Christ. This sure and dogmatic attitude precipitated a conflict that loosed tidal waves of persecution and drenched the earth with blood.

Jesus, the Christ, is called “the author and perfecter of our faith.” He came down from Heaven with the expressed purpose of doing the will of God. He propagated no opinions of his own. He was the mouthpiece of supreme authority. “For I spake not from myself; but the Father that sent me, He hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life eternal; the things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak.” (John 12:49-50)

Jesus, the Invincible Polemic

There could be no compromise of this perfect revelation of truth out of consideration for any conflicting system of doctrine or philosophy, however respectable it might be. The stage was all set for bitter and ceaseless conflict until error was banished and the will of God held undisputed sway. Jesus, the Apostle of God, to wrest a world of humanity from the dominion of Satan, must be a strong contender, an invincible polemic. As a matter of fact He was the greatest fighter and the most successful debater the world ever saw.

The first great conflict was with the devil himself, the commander-in-chief of the forces of evil. A compromise would have been a victory for the devil. The truth of God would have been crushed to earth to rise no more. Without the aid of even one angel, and he had legions of them at his command, Jesus emerged from that contest in sole possession of the field. The devil left him. The only weapon

Jesus used was the Word of God. He repelled three major attacks with an “it is written”. Jesus entertained supreme respect for the written word of God, something that many of his professors followers sadly lack.

The War with Tradition and Hypocrisy

The fight was not over when the devil left Jesus “for a season”. He was deeply entrenched in the organized religion of the day. It was organized rebellion against God in the sheep’s clothing of piety. They paid the Almighty a lip devotion while they worshipped tradition and taught “as their doctrines the precepts of men”. Jesus was not deceived, as the people were, by the long faces and long robes of Pharisaism. He clearly discerned the trail of the serpent beneath it all and was unimpressed by sad faces and street corner prayers. He quickly joined issue, and started a fight to the finish, with the lovers of money, power and popular applause, whose highest ambition was a position of influence in an earthly kingdom ruled over by a speculative Messiah.

They quickly and instinctively recognized Jesus as the enemy of their cherished ambitions. They were jealous of his influence over the people. The war was on with no thought of compromise on either side. The enemies of the truth used traditional weapons and used them skilfully. At first they hoped that it would be effective to ignore Him. His spreading fame put an end to that. He was active and persistent in a most tantalizing way. He clearly held them in contempt and was getting it over to the people. That the people might have a clear right of way to fellowship with God, their leaders must be utterly discredited. They tried ridicule. He came from Nazareth. His family was poor. He did not enjoy traditional training. He was not orthodox. In fact he was just a plain nobody. His company was bad. He associated with publicans and sinners. This line of attack failed. Something must be done to stop this young prophet. They put forth their shrewdest to meet him in debate. He made fools of them. It came to the point where they did not dare to ask him even a question. He carried the war to the courts of the temple and branded them

“blind guides”, “hypocrites”, “strainers of gnats and swallowers of camels,” “whited sepulchres”, “serpents”, “fool - spring of vipers”, “fools” and “sons of hell”. There was one weapon left and they used it. They said “Let’s kill him,” and they did. They mocked him and scourged Him and crucified Him.

Contending for the Faith

The triumph of falsehood was brief. A guarded and sealed tomb could not hold Him. He arose from the dead. Seated at the right hand of God with all authority, He began His reign. Chosen and inspired ambassadors in Jerusalem launched a world wide campaign to bring all nations into captivity to the law of Christ.

The law of the Kingdom of Heaven is found in the “Apostles’ doctrine”. The Holy Spirit came to guide them into “all truth”. The truth that they preached, defended and died for we now have in the New Testament. It is “the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints” and Christians are commanded to “contend earnestly” for it.

Politics is a game of compromise and party platforms are constantly changing. There is room for a broad tolerance in the realm of opinion. But it is not so with faith. Faith must believe what God says and do what He commands. Faith must not go beyond what is written.

When Judaizers sought to bind the customs of Moses on the Church, Paul and Barnabas resisted them. When the matter was carried to the Apostles in Jerusalem, they severely censured the schismatics and curtly disposed of them by saying, “We gave no such commandment.”

Paul warned the Galatians that the gospel that he preached came to him “through revelation of Jesus Christ”. Trouble makers who were perverting it were rushing in where angels feared to tread. They were guilty of a sin that would curse the angels. He resisted them, rebuking them sharply.

Paul refused to give place to men of influence even for an hour “that
the truth of the gospel might continue with you”. When he saw that even Peter and Barnabas on one occasion “walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel” he resisted them to the face and reproved them before the whole church.

Issues Not Settled by Prayer

There is a place in the life of the Christian for prayer. But doctrinal issues are not settled by prayer. A schismatic might be talking so volubly to God that it might be in order to tell him to hush and let God talk awhile. Doctrinal matters are settled by the written word of God, not by an impression that some mystic receives in answer to prayer.

A prominent feature of the Christian’s armor is “the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God”. False doctrine is the chief means that Satan uses in deceiving men and keeping them from obeying the truth. It is the duty of the disciples of Christ to meet it and expose it.

Sectarianism with its false doctrines, in and out of the church, today, presents a challenge to the defenders of the faith. As distinct as that which paganism, Judaism and philosophy presented to the early disciples. We should meet our challenge with the same courage they did theirs. We are set for the propagation and defense of the Gospel. . . . . . . .

(The Bible-Cont’d)

stand in such adamantine strength as to be impervious to every weapon that quibblers may employ.

I do not want to be among that number who scoff at the Bible and its religion for this is the world’s last hope and I know I’ll need its comfort and consolation in the time of trouble and in the hour of death.

“When ranting round in pleasure’s ring,
Religion may be blinded,
Or if she gie a random string,
It may be little minded;
But when on life we’re tempest driven,
A conscience but a canker,
A correspondence fixed wi’ heaven
Is sure a noble anchor.”

Christians need greater faith in God’s word. In all matters of doctrine and practice its statements should be final. We need to subscribe anew to “The Bible and the Bible alone”, and to “Where it speaks, we speak; where it is silent, we are silent”. The adoption of such sentiments will bring about and maintain that unity for which we sigh.

**Sword Sweeps**

C. E. W.

Paul says “There is one body,” which is the church. “Orthodox” preachers condone partyism and keep prating about one church being as good as another. They shout that “it makes no difference what church you join,” but whisper “just so you don’t join the Campbellite’s”. Yet the poor “Campbellites” preach and practice only what anybody can read in the New Testament. Last year I held a meeting in a Texas town and baptized about three dozen penitent believers. Did the denominations rejoice? They did not. Although it was announced a year in advance that I would be back on a certain date, I found that the Baptists and Methodists had each arranged for a meeting at the same time. They pray publicly for the Lord to bless and help each other, but have not asked Him to do anything for me. Possibly they inwardly groan: “O Lord, if you can’t help us, for goodness sake don’t help that bear”. The trick did not work this time as my crowds are as large as theirs combined. Possibly they have overcome the pious hypocrisy that “one church is as good as another” and fair-minded “outsiders” think they should have given us the right of way without opposition. And I have noticed a good many Methodists and Baptists in our audiences. On their own principles why should they be jealous of our successes?

Sam Norris, militant Baptist preacher, has made some fervid prohibition speeches in Texas. Like Frank Norris, whom he consciously imitates, Sam is fervidly perspirational. One of his chief arguments against whiskey is that it “damns the soul”. Not long ago Sam made a big radio speech and put it in tract form. He thinks he proved that a child of God is eternally and unconditionally saved. Once saved he cannot do anything to damn his soul. Whiskey then cannot damn the soul of a true Baptist. It may make a fool out of him, wreck his home, his body and his morals, but it cannot damn his soul. If we can’t have prohibition maybe we ought to pass a law to keep whiskey away from the hands and stomachs of everybody but Baptists. Sam is right on whiskey but wrong on doctrine. Paul in writing to Christians says, “For if ye live after the flesh ye must die.” (Rom. 8:13) This is obviously not physical death. If there are any Christians among the Baptists, they would do well to let whiskey alone as it is calculated to wreck their bodies and damn their souls. A drunkard cannot inherit the Kingdom of Heaven.

Dr. J. Frank Norris was so well pleased with his boasting, vaunting and browbeating over the radio and through his paper that he thought he could risk a public debate. The Fort Worth debate was disastrous both to his pride and his cause. He refused to repeat it in Dallas although an agreement to do so had already been reached. He further determined that a stenographic report of the debate should never reach the public. He has for months carried on an incessant and one-sided effort to cover up his defeat before a radio and press audience who never heard the debate. He advertises and sells a "Norris-Wallace" debate which contains only his own speeches. His explanation of such supreme unfairness reminds me of the colored gentleman’s definition of an alibi. “An alibi is de way you proves you was at pra’r meetin’, whah you wasn’t and dat you wasn’t at a crap game whah you was”.

When I was a boy, we had a neighbor who owned a parrot. This parrot was noted for bad habits and ugly language. He spent much time on a wash shelf at the end of the porch. He amused himself by pouncing down on any unfortunate chicken or duck who happened to walk under the shelf. He screeched and squawked with glee at their fright and discomfort. One day a big gander walked under the shelf. The parrot hopped down on him and got thoroughly picked. He was a pretty sad looking mess when he finally got free and regained his shelf. He looked the gander over and shrieked angrily, “You little devil, you”. Frank Norris knows his ganders from here out. He is better at ballyhoo than he is at debating. People will never learn from him, except by inference, why he cancelled the Dallas debate and why the Fort Worth debate was never published. Those who heard the debate understand it thoroughly.
The church is being submerged by a wave of sentimental stand-for-nothingism.

Popular preaching and journalism today could never rekindle the fires of Smithfield.

The spirit of this attitude would drive Jesus and Paul out of our pulpits and the Bible out of our homes.

**The Need of a Balanced Diet**

JOHN T. LEWIS

We hear a great deal these days about balancing the budget. Whenever a government, city, county, or nation cannot balance its budget it is headed for chaos and disintegration. But I am not writing about balancing the budget in governmental affairs; but the great need of a balanced diet in the pulpits and in the religious journals of our country.

Paul said to the church at Corinth: “And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ. I fed you with milk, not with meat; for ye were not yet able to bear it: Nay, not even now are ye able; for ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you jealousy and strife, are ye not carnal, and do ye not walk after the manner of men?” (1 Cor. 3:1-4) Again Paul speaking of the priesthood of Christ, says: "of whom we have many things to say, and hard of interpretation, seeing ye are become dull of hearing. For when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of solid food. For every one that partaketh of milk is without experience of the word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But solid food is for full grown men, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil. (Heb. 5:11-14) If Paul were living today he could not describe the present day conditions of the church better than he did in the above quotation from his inspired pen. This unfortunate condition exists today not in one congregation; everywhere the church is being submerged by a tidal wave of sentimental, stand-for-nothingism.

If a gospel preacher goes to a place today and thunders away against the present day evils which are stopping the flow of spirituality and opening the flood gates of sensuality and infidelity, the chances are he will be accused of making personal issues, and he be invited to leave town, without pay for his services. Or if an editor should permit a few articles dealing directly with the present day issues he will be swamped with letters telling him how he will have to run the paper or to stop it. These conditions are to a great extent controlling the spiritual food or diet that is going out from our pulpits, and through our religious papers of today. What would you think of firemen on their way to a fire who would stop to listen to every peanut on the way telling them how to fight the fire? Or what would you think of a fire chief that would stop fighting a fire to tell the curious crowd around, about the thousands of pretty buildings that were not on fire, and finally draw off his men because they were attracting too much attention to the fire? The chief of a fire department never calls his men away from a fire as long as he thinks there is a possibility of a spark rekindling the blaze. That is my idea of fighting sin, and every departure from God’s truth. The popular ideas of preaching and religious journalism today would never rekindle the fires of Smithfield; but rather lead the church back to where it was during the “dark ages”-enraged in Catholicism-with human opinion as the standard of authority in all matters of religion.

If the present attitude toward religious papers, that contend for New Testament teaching and practice, is carried to its logical conclusion it would drive the Bible out of our homes. It is a common thing to hear church members say: “We quit taking the Bible because it was always fighting. Now let us apply this theory to the New Testament. “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is become so, ye make him twofold more a son of hell than yourselves.” (Matt. 23:15) O course you would not want to hand this to your religious neighbors. It is not the spirit of Christ (?) You know we believe in “preaching the gospel in love”. “Woe unto you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whitened sepulchers, which outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly are full of dead men’s bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but inwardly ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.” (Matt. 23:27-28) Who would want to hand this kind of literature to the hypocrites in the church today? Just such teaching would drive them away from the church! “Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrine the precepts of man.” (Matt. 15:7-9) What right have we to talk about other people’s worship? So it would never do to hand the gospel according to Matthew to vain worshipers, hypocrites, and false teachers.

“The Jews therefore murmured concerning Him, because He said, I am the bread which came down out of heaven . . . “ Upon this many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. Jesus said therefore unto the twelve, Would you also go away?” (John 6:61-67) Preaching that would cause people of the world to murmur, and even drive “many disciples” away from the Lord, would certainly be out of harmony with the spirit of the age. Therefore if Jesus Christ were on earth today, in person, he would find many of the pulpits closed against Him, and if he were publishing a religious paper it would not be allowed to come into many Christian (?) homes. You know the churches today believe in having “the spirit of Christ,” and in “preaching the gospel in love.” Any casual observer knows that “the Spirit of Christ” today is quite different from what it was in the apostolic age. “But Saul, who is also called Paul, filled with the Holy Spirit, fastened his eyes on him, and said, O full of all guile and all villainy, thou son of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?” (Acts 13:9-10) It does not make any difference if the Bible does say Paul was “filled with the Holy Spirit”, any carnal minded Christian can tell you that he was not “preaching the gospel in love”. So if Paul were on earth today you certainly would not want him to hold your meeting because he would
Ananias said to Saul of Tarsus, “Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins”. (Acts 22:16) We are often told that if baptism is for the remission of sins one would have to be baptized every time he sins. But the Baptist preachers say that Saul of Tarsus was saved before he was baptized and that Acts 22:16 is addressed to the Christian. Then they are the ones who should baptize their members every time they sin, since Ananias told Saul the Christian (?) to “be baptized and wash away thy sins”, or else let them go to heaven with their sins. If what Ananias told Saul to do in Acts 22:16 is Christian duty, how often should it be done? What other Christian duty was to be done but once? Though a child of God forever does he not need forgiveness when he sins? Is Acts 22:16 the law of forgiveness? Let a Baptist preacher answer.

A balanced diet therefore is not run all the Elymases away, and that would be too bad.

Paul labored eighteen months at Corinth, on his second missionary journey, and he planted the church there. Soon after Paul left Corinth false teachers got into the church, and turned the people against Paul and his teaching. They became guilty of almost every sin that has ever been cataloged. Paul wrote them a letter, mentioning, and condemned their sins in the most withering terms. Thus he spread the whole disgraceful matter to the world. Brethren, do you think I Corinthians should be deleted from the New Testament? You know we ought not to let the world know anything about the factions, parties, and fornicators that are in the church today, and any religious paper that would publish and condemn such things is not fit to hand to our neighbors, or to go into Christian (?) homes!

A balanced diet therefore is not only to preach God’s love to the world; but also his wrath and condemnation against sin and sinners, in the church, and out.

To know God is life eternal (Jno. 17:3). Men forget God (Ter. 2:32). What is their condition? Read 2 Pet. 1:9 about the condition of the man who “hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins”.

A child of God either can or cannot sin. If he can, must his sins be forgiven or will he enter heaven with his sins? Paul says that “He is the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him” (Heb. 5:9). Eternal salvation is conditional to all. This includes the children of God. What then, will happen to children of God who do not obey Him? Jesus says, “Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away” (Jno. 15:1-6). It says he taketh away the unfruitful branch.

We are reminded that the believer “shall not come into condemnation” (Jno. 5:24). But the Lord also said that the unbeliever “shall not see life” (Jno. 3:36). If it is possible for the latter to be saved, why is it not possible for the former to be lost? Read Psalms 106:12-24. The same people that “then believed they his words” in verse 12, “believed not his word” in verse 24 Paul says in Heb. 11:29 that those who crossed the Red Sea had faith. But he also said in Heb. 4:19 that they failed to enter Canaan “because of unbelief. He further warns “brethren lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God” (Heb. 3:12). What is the condition of the believer who becomes an unbeliever?

We are told that the unbeliever—the sinner—cannot do anything that will save him. On the other hand we are told that the believer—the child of God—cannot do anything that will damn him. How then, does God judge “every man according to his works”?

Fundamentalist Baptists are Premillennialists, as are some who call themselves Christians. Paul said that he fought the Judaizers that “the truth of the gospel might continue” Gal. 2:5). The millennialism theory is the grossest type of Judaism. With them Judaism is the final religion—it is seeking perfection in the flesh. They propose to reestablish the Jewish types which were legislated away forever at the cross! They put the yoke of bondage on Christ’s free-men. They become enemies of the cross and crucify afresh the Son of God. Jesus said “preach the gospel” but in their millennium program the gospel will not be the power of God unto salvation. It is turning back the clock. It is what Paul calls the sons becoming wards again. It is going back to the Old Testament for the plan of salvation which Paul condemns by saying “for if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise”. Premillennialists are Judaizers.

A balanced diet therefore is not run all the Elymases away, and that would be too bad.

Paul labored eighteen months at Corinth, on his second missionary journey, and he planted the church there. Soon after Paul left Corinth false teachers got into the church, and turned the people against Paul and his teaching. They became guilty of almost every sin that has ever been cataloged. Paul wrote them a letter, mentioning, and condemned their sins in the most withering terms. Thus he spread the whole disgraceful matter to the world. Brethren, do you think I Corinthians should be deleted from the New Testament? You know we ought not to let the world know anything about the factions, parties, and fornicators that are in the church today, and any religious paper that would publish and condemn such things is not fit to hand to our neighbors, or to go into Christian (?) homes!

A balanced diet therefore is not only to preach God’s love to the world; but also his wrath and condemnation against sin and sinners, in the church, and out.
THE BLIGHT OF BOLLISM

The Deadly Results That Have Followed The Speculative Movement.

E. G. CREA Y

The history of mankind reveals that it is human to err. To become dissatisfied with God’s way has been the tendency of the race from the beginning. The children of Israel wanted to be like the nations around them. They perverted God’s law; factions among them, and the final rift in the kingdom, was the result. It was because of dissatisfaction-unwillingness to abide in God’s way.

Because men were not satisfied with the New Testament as a guide in matters of church work and worship, the tide of digression broke in upon the churches of Christ a number of years ago and we have as a result the Disciples Church, or so-called Christian church. All departures come gradually. The ancient church did not apostatize over night—the apostasy reached its climax after many years of drifting. It was a development.

Premillennialism has come into the church, with its system of doctrines, by gradual development. It had its inception among denominational bodies several years ago. Many radical, fanatical cults have been formed in direct result. I well remember when the thing had its inception among us in these parts. Slowly and stealthily it has developed into a definite party movement within the churches of Christ. Many good brethren, believing it to be a harmless theory, did not take it seriously, assumed a rather passive attitude toward it, and while we slept it took deep root in places where its leaders have been received and encouraged by unsuspecting brethren over a period of years.

A new party, a new denomination, has now arrived—the “Premillennial Church of Christ”! Since the crisis is here, should we not know who may be depended upon to defend the church against its further advances?

The doctrine of Premillennialism has been established in many places and it must be exposed until the church knows the error of it, and the dangers in it. The neutrals and the liberals must also be made manifest and take the consequences of their attitudes in this fight.

The tactics of the chief exponents of the millennial theories among us condemn the movement. With that much talked of “sweet spirit”, with shrewd schemes that some of us who have suffered from it know about, with “smooth words and fair speech”, some fine people have been misled. It is distinctly a deceptive movement. More so than the digression that came years ago over innovations in the work and worship of the church. F. W. Smith said that “playing an organ and patronizing a missionary society are just skin eruptions” as compared with this materialistic premillennial system of doctrine which strikes at all the fundamentals of the gospel.

Certain men are pressing the claims of this system to the division of every church they can reach. Their conniving with known enemies of the church, such as Frank Norris and John Rice, reveals the real heart of the movement among us. Though R. H. Boll in a recent issue of his paper sought to disclaim responsibility for some things that have happened in Texas and elsewhere, his effort to do so falls flat.

He with E. L. Jorgenson and other leaders of the Louisville party were stage performers at the Neal-Wallace debate at Winchester, Kentucky. Though they stayed with Brother Neal through that discussion, and helped him all they could, they forsook him at Chattanooga. The Word and Work has commended Frank Mullins for his defense of Premillennialism in the debate with J. L. Hines at Dallas. It was Mullins and Woods who joined with Frank Norris and the Fort Worth Baptists in the Norris-Wallace debate. In Frank Norris’ paper appears an article from Charles M. Neal commending Norris “highly” for his “great” work, and he calls him “Dear Brother Norris!” The Boll-Jorgenson magazine is devoted to the propagation of Premillennialism, the result of which has been division in the church that was united on these questions. It is as impossible for R. H. Boll to shift the responsibility of these things from himself to another as it was for Pilate to wash his hands of the blood of Jesus who stood before him as the victim of his treachery. He cannot escape the responsibility for the reaping that has come from his own sowing. “By their fruits ye shall know them.”

But the disastrous work of these brethren is withheld from the pages of Word and Work. They do not tell of the work of division wrought by O. E. Phillips at Lexington, Oklahoma; of the factions of Woods and Mullins and Blansett in Dallas; of the defection of Earl Smith at Abilene; or of Neal’s “love feast” with J. Frank Norris. All of these things are omitted—only that which reads favorably is admitted into the columns of the Word and Work.

May I ask the editor of Word and Work, as one of his Kentucky neighbors, why they keep their readers in ignorance of these facts? And why make it appear that the “Word and Work brethren” are martyrs, and are being persecuted, when these facts are brought out? And why the repeated claim that the Word and Work doctrine is not “a ground of division” and should not be made a test of fellowship when only division and disfellowship have been its fruits? It is too well known that E. L. Jorgenson and Don Carlos Janes were the aggressive leaders in making this doctrine the test of fellowship in the Highland Church of Louisville, Kentucky, a few years ago. Through D. H. Friend it has been a test at Horse Cave, Kentucky. Their talk of fellowship and of brotherly love sounds sweet and soothing but when their “test of fellowship” claim is tested, another spirit is revealed.

For years I have lived and labored in the immediate territory where the Boll movement was launched, and where it has done its deadliest work. I know whereof I speak in these matters. The same deadly results will follow this movement and its preachers, wherever it finds impetus and wherever they may preach. I cannot aid them in their work, nor by silence sanction it, nor by neutrality encourage it, but must “cry aloud and spare not”. Had this been done by all from the beginning the church would have been spared the division that has blighted the Cause of Christ in this section, and in other places locally. Though “the days are evil”, it is not too late to “redeem the time” if preachers, elders, schools, and papers will present a solid line of battle and follow a united course of action. And this is my prayer.
BAPTISTS AND THE KINGDOM

Old positions Abandoned—Premillennialism borrowed from Advents and other materialists.

WILL M. THOMPSON

It shall be my purpose in this article to state clearly the position occupied until recently by Baptist on the “Kingdom Question”.

I have conducted fifty-two religious debates, most of which have been with the Baptists. Having met Primitive Baptists, Missionary Baptists and Free-Will Baptists, the outstanding leaders of each denomination have been my opponents. I therefore know their position on the establishment of the Kingdom of Christ.

Contradictory Kingdom Positions

With but one or two exceptions, they have all maintained the same position, i.e., that the reign of Christ began during his personal ministry. They have “wabbled” all the way from the Mount in which Christ ordained the twelve to the Ascension of our Lord. They have used such prophesies as Daniel 2:44 and Isaiah 2:2-3 in endeavoring to uphold their theory. They have used such passages in the New Testament as Matthew 3:1-2, Luke 16:16, Matthew 11:11-12, Matthew 26:29-31, Hebrews 1:1-2 with various other quotations I could give. Their position, however, has never been in harmony with Baptist historians, such as Vedder, Jones, Orchard et al. These historians have taught that the church or kingdom of Christ was established on the first Pentecost after Christ arose from the dead.

Ben M. Bogard I consider the outstanding defender of Baptist Doctrine. Six times I have met him in joint debate, and only in the last discussion did he waiver on the “kingdom question” from former positions taken with me in debate. In reply to an argument made by me from Daniel 7:13, he took the position that that prophecy would have its fulfillment at the second coming of Christ, and, in order to bolster up his position, he dropped back to verses 9 and 10. In reply to this, I showed that Daniel had more than one vision, per verse 13, and that one of the visions pertained to the judgment and another to the establishment of the kingdom. I further pressed Mr. Bogard and showed that he had taken the Advent or Materialistic position. He made no reply.

Not until lately have any Baptists of ability taken the Premillennial position in debates. J. Frank Norris and John R. Rice are the only men of outstanding ability among Baptists that I know of who have had the courage to attempt to defend this materialistic position in public discussion, and they are as easily handled on the question as the Baptists are on any other position that they take. And, on most all positions taken, they are wrong.

Objections to Premillennialism

My objections to the Premillennial Reign of Christ on earth are as follows:

1. It makes the Kingdom of Christ a material institution instead of a spiritual institution.

2. The Apostle Peter in the 2nd Chapter of Acts of the Apostles, clearly states that God raised Christ from the dead to sit on David’s throne. (Verses 29-31) This Premillennial Baptist position of Norris and others denies the position of the Apostle Peter and declares that 1900 years have passed and Christ is not yet on David’s throne. It is a very inconsistent position that will thus force a man to such an absurdity. The idea of God raising Christ from the dead for the outstanding purpose of giving him David’s throne and then withholding it from him for 1900 years and better, in order to let him occupy it for 1,000 literal years on earth, is an inconsistent position indeed. In Psalms 89:34-37, God promises that David’s throne shall be established in heaven. There is no promise in all the Book Divine that David’s Throne will ever be established or re-established on earth. Yet in the face of these plain statements and God’s oath, they do not hesitate to assume to presume and presume to assume the very position that they should prove.

3. If there be no kingdom established at this time, there are no converted people at this time. In Matthew 18:3, Jesus taught that his kingdom would be composed of converted people. If his kingdom has not been established, then there is not one converted person on earth today. If there be no conversion now, there is no salvation now, and this reduces the false theory to another absurdity, i.e., universal condemnation. In Acts 3:19 Peter says, “Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out.” If there be no conversion, there is no remission or blotting out of sins; therefore, no repentance. This false theory dethrones our Lord and destroys the very principles for which he and his disciples have faithfully stood. Yet there are those who prefer to label this ridiculous and absurd doctrine as “harmless guesses”.

4. They pervert the speech made by James in Acts, 15th Chapter, where he quotes from the Prophet Amos to show its fulfillment in the establishment of the Kingdom of Christ and the bringing into that kingdom of the Gentile nation. They stretch this prophecy out beyond the Second Coming of Christ, which is either a willful or ignorant perversion of the Word of God. There is not a prophecy that pertains to the establishment of the Kingdom of Christ but that has its fulfillment in the Gospel Age.

Not Expecting to Go to Palestine from Here

The Apostle Paul in Ephesians 4 teaches us that we should not be children tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive. (Verse 14).

Our faith should be rooted and grounded, our hope should be steadfast and sure, and we should be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear.

Personally, false theories shall not swerve me nor move me from the truth of him in whom I have placed my trust. I am as confident that God reigns through Jesus Christ over his people today as I am that he reigned over his people in the long ago through David, and this is what the scripture teaches.

I am not looking for a materialistic reign of the Christ on earth. I am not expecting him to sit on the literal throne of David. Neither do I expect to go to Palestine after my departure from this life, but I look forward with the eye of expectancy and with a heart of desire to a better country, that is an heavenly one. At my Lord’s second coming, I expect to meet him in the air and do not anticipate a return to earthly material things, but an entrance into the everlasting home in heaven above.
N nature as in matters spiritual the bad has appeared among that good. Possibly the problem of evil will never be perfectly understood by us mortals, but this we know; sin is at the bottom of all things inimical to our material and spiritual progress.

The parable of the tares in Matt. 13 has its basis in an almost inconceivable expression of human depravity, with reference to which McGarvey says, “It has been doubted by some whether such an act of enmity as sowing a neighbor’s field with tares was ever perpetrated; ... But Trench in his work on the parables, adduces one instance in India, and one in Ireland; and Alford, in his Commentary, mentions one that occurred in a field of his own in England. It is likely that the practice was somewhat common in the days of Christ.”

We are by no means left in darkness as to the application of this parable. Jesus explains that the sowers are Christ and the devil; that the seed are the children of each. Luke (8:11) says, “The seed is the word of God.” By metonymy the product (the chil-
dren) is put for the seed that produced it. The conclusion therefore is that the word of God, and the word of the devil —truth and error, constitute the seed sown in the hearts of men, producing, figuratively speaking, the wheat and the tares “in his field”—viz. the owner’s field. (Matt. 13:24)

**Sinister Movements**

**THERE** is a striking likeness between the meaning of the word “emis-sary”, and the manner teachers of error employ in the promulgation of sinister movements. Emissary means, “An agent employed to advance, in a covert manner, the interests of his employers; one sent out by any power out into the open with his theories, but covertly and insidiously injects his error into the veins of those whose full confidence he has, and whose unsuspecting hearts become a field for the exploitation of false doctrines. How unlike, in method, are the work and teaching of Christ: “The high priest therefore asked Jesus of His disciples, and of His teaching. Jesus answered him, I have spoken openly to the world; I ever taught in synagogues, and in the temple, where all the Jews come together; and in secret spake I nothing. Why askest thou me? Ask them that have heard me, what I spake unto them; behold, these know the things which I said.” (Jno. 18:19-21) The great Apostle Paul says, “For the king knoweth of these things, unto whom also I speak freely; for I am persuaded that none of these things is hidden from him: for this hath not been done in a corner.” (Acts 26:26) Is it out of place here to apply the language of Jesus in Jno. 3:20, 21, to those who, though morally above reproach, refuse to bring their teaching out into the full light of frank investiga-tion?

All the above statements and implications are strikingly enforced in view of the fact that in the parable the “enemy” sought the time to sow his “tares” while the owner of the field was asleep. He did not come in the daytime; did not want the farmer to know what he was doing. He did not want to be hindered in his diabolical deed. His purposes were best served by sowing the seed secretly. The fact that he desired to keep his work a secret, to sow the seed under cover of darkness, is an indication of dishonesty; unwilling that his schemes and motives be known. Neither could the results of this under-cover movement be immediately discernible, for the seed sown must have time to germinate and grow.

**Pious Depravity**

**THERE** is a deadly parallel between the parable of the tares and the statement in Prov. 6:19 where the Scripture declares that God hates him “that soweth discord among brethren.” The parallel is in the word Soweth. Jesus says, “Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling, for it must needs be that the occasions come; but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh!” (Matt. 18:7) Commenting on this passage McGarvey says, of the offences, “Not because it is the will of God that they should come, but because the depravity of men make them inevitable ... no man should look for the day when there will be no offences, but each should see to it that he is not the cause of them.” The fact that a man is exceedingly pious, and devoted to living an irre-proachable moral life, is no guarantee that he may not yet commit the sin which Solomon (Prov. 6:16-19) declares is the worst of them all—viz. sowing discord among brethren. So far as the record goes those people at Corinth (1 Cor. 1:10; 3:1-4) whom Paul describes as “carnal”, were not in that connection charged with anything but division in the body of Christ. So depravity may just as easily apply to a man morally above reproach, yet who causes division among the people of God. This is a point we need to digest. Every religious movement has been built around some man whose piety and moral character were above reproach; such characters have been a greater menace to unity among religious people than any other could possibly be, for they capitalize on their influence over others.

We are not left to our own discretion as to our duty toward those who sow tares among the Lord’s people. Hear Paul, “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned; and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent.” (Rom. 16:17, 18) In teaching doctrine contrary to that which we learned we are not serving Christ, any more than is the Methodist preacher who teaches and practices infant baptism, even though he may be noted for devotion and piety; the whole matter turns on whether the doctrine one teaches is scriptural or not. Paul speaks of men who through false teaching on the resurrec-tion overturned the faith of some (2 Tim. 2:18); what will the effect of that teaching (Neal, in Neal-Wallace Debate) which affirms that there will be two future resurrections, and two future judgments; the Bible always
The Place and Power of God's Word in Preaching and Practice

Oscar Smith

"I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel; which is not another gospel only there be some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:6) Again: "0 Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee, turning away from the profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith." (1 Tim. 6:20-21)

Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the apostles preached the gospel in every section of the civilized world, even before the close of the first century. To the church at Rome Paul wrote: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation." (Rom. 1:16) The gospel is not a power, nor one of the powers, but the power of God unto salvation. All conversions of the New Testament resulted from preaching the Word. You may begin with the conversion of the three thousand on Pentecost, and go with the apostles to the uttermost parts of the earth, and in every community where men were saved from their sins, the gospel was first preached. Paul charged the evangelist Timothy to "preach the word; be ur-...
NEUTRALITY DOWN TO DATE

BE W ARE of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. This was the timely warning of Jesus to His disciples. In stupid credulity the disciples thought the Master referred to loaves of bread, and they said among themselves, “We took no bread”. Their Teacher rebuked their lack of perception. “How is it that ye do not perceive that I spake not to you concerning bread?” When the meaning of His words penetrated their unapt minds “then understood they that He bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees”. It was a pure doctrine decree, not a pure food law, which the Lord prescribed.

Ancient Materialism

The Pharisees and Sadducees represented the two major sects, or parties, among the Jews. Though they were themselves within the Jewish fold, our family, Jesus nevertheless attacked their errors, debated with them—his own Jewish brethren—and instructed the disciples to do the same.

The errors of the Pharisees and Sadducees lay chiefly in their hypocrisy, class distinctions, and human traditions. It is the equivalent of parties in religion today of which the modern human creed is an exact counterpart. Among their traditions was the presumption that the Messiah would inaugurate an earthly kingdom, rather than a spiritual one. So thoroughly were they steeped in this tradition that they rejected the Christ, the inevitable end of such an error. Had Jesus acquiesced to their program of things, bade His disciples maintain a neutral attitude toward the materialism of their Jewish “brethren”, the story of His life would have to be rewritten. He exposed them. The result was, they rejected the Christ, the inevitable end of such an error. Had Jesus made it necessary that they should be free from even a taint of the doctrine of materialism—the worldly kingdom idea. Their own realization of its dangers carried with it, in the third place, the obligation to warn others of such destructive heresy.

The disciples could have protested: “These Pharisees are our Jewish brethren. They are in Jehovah’s family. Some of them even belong to our Sanhedrin. And are they not pious and sincere? Why should we cast them out? After all, their ‘foolish notions’ are only ‘harmless guesses.’ : But the Lord branded their traditions as false doctrine today is just as fatal. Silence constitutes criminal negligence.

The disciples could have said: “Our brethren, the Pharisees and Sadducees, have a right to their interpretations. No man has the right to invade the sacred precincts of their consciences to tell them what they may believe and what they may or may not teach. We cannot bind our views upon them”. Could any ultra-liberal, modern Methodist boast that? Had the Lord and His disciples taken such a neutral, worldly, unconverted view, they could have taught nothing at all on the nature of His kingdom, lest they cross the “interpretations” of their Pharisee brethren and thereby become “equally responsible for the breach” resulting.

The disciples could have said: “We do not believe the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees but we cannot disfellowship them for exercising their God-given right to teach their convictions”. But on the same principle would not the disciples be obligated to teach against the doctrine they did not believe? Does not the rule work both ways, and therefore destroy neutrality and compromise? The result is that truth clashes with error, and disfellowship is automatic. “For what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? or what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever?”

Instructed Attitude

In the warning of this text Jesus plainly orders the attitude of His disciples toward false teaching. They were, in the first place, to personally beware of it. Their task, in the second place, of propagating the principles of the kingdom of heaven through the first years of its existence on the earth, made it necessary that they should be free from even a taint of the doctrine of materialism—the worldly kingdom idea. Their own realization of its dangers carried with it, in the third place, the obligation to warn others of such destructive heresy.

Withstanding Error

When certain erring brethren went out from the Jerusalem church (Acts 15) and taught their errors in the church at Antioch, Paul and Barnabas did not advise that “they be left alone, ignored, and not crossed, for they are brethren”. Their course was just the opposite; they “had no small dissension and questioning among them”. Likely these Judaizers at Antioch felt that they were not accountable to any man, and certainly not to Paul and Silas. But the Apostles at Jerusalem did not hesitate to quench the heresy at Antioch and the heretics were marked. And Paul never failed, in all of his epistles to expose Judaism in all of its forms and brand the Judaizers.

If we are to judge their attitude by their arguments, some brethren now would disagree with Paul’s clash with Peter and the controversy that ensued. “But when Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned. For before that certain came from James, he ate with the Gentiles; but when they came he drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas before them all, If thou being a Jew livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?”

Ignorance on vital issues is criminal neglect. Silence is cowardice.

A neutral attitude toward error is a symptom of an organic trouble.

The fruits that identify heresy are visible.

JACK MEYER
Paul thus convicted Peter of three things before them: first, of error; second, of dissimulation; third, of inconsistency. Was that a good spirit in Paul? Should he not have corrected Peter privately? Not when his error was public and involved the church. Peter’s waverings had caused others, even Barnabas, to waver. When error is publicly taught it must be publicly reproved. Paul withstood Peter openly and to his face. Some of the good spirited brethren apparently oppose some of their brethren privately and to their backs. We believe the course of Paul to be the right and honorable way of dealing with errors among the brethren.

Symptoms of Heresy

The command of this text, is the pattern for our attitude toward all error today-without and within. To adopt the policy of exposing error in the world but not to oppose errors in the church is surely a new form of "local option". But it has been generally observed that those brethren who tolerate error in the church are not clear and positive in their preaching against errors among denominationalists or anywhere. It seems to be an symptom of an organic trouble.

The fact that some have attempted to reduce opposition to error to opposition to men should not cause us to allow the defense of the truth against error today-without and within. To "preach the word" and "exhort" would be as reprehensible as to preach in earnestness and love—but to refuse to "reprove and rebuke" the defense of the truth against error is visibly done. Every succeeding generation must be indoctrinated. The child today must be taught the same lessons that were taught to us when we were children.

Some get excited about what to preach to the young people. Why not try Acts, the Second Chapter, the conversion of the eunuch, of Paul, and the whole story of Acts of Apostles? It is vital that they know these truths. Just because grandfather heard sermons on these facts before we were born, is no reason they should not be preached now. It is another reason why they should be preached now.

Report of a recent meeting runs like this: "Brother A preached the gospel in the love of the truth, and did more to break down that feeling of animosity than any who have been here. There is a better feeling in Pumpkin-ville than ever before". No doubt Billy Sunday or Gypsy Smith could leave a better feeling than Paul. Perhaps Brother A preached the truth on the subjects he used. One can preach on love, peace, joy, and longsuffering and never tell a sinners what to do to be saved. As a rule the emphasizing of baptism for the remission of sins does not break down a feeling of animosity very fast. At least it did not have such an effect in the days of the Apostles. Let us have a number of meetings wherein the book of Acts is really preached without compromise and let the feeling of animosity take care of itself.

The world today is being dangerously exposed to false teachers. It is necessary that we hold fast the truth that we have learned, and that we contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. Our duty in this respect is clear. Many preachers these days are more interested in the study of homiletics than in preaching sound doctrine. We need to go out into the world and tell the people what the Book says, not what is said about the Book. The Bible does not need organizing and arranging so much as it needs preaching.

God has given us, through Christ and His Apostles, a perfect guide. We should carefully remember that it is not the mere hating of this guide, but faithful adherence to it in all of its requirements that will justify us before God. "Not the hearers of the law", Paul says, "are justified before God, but the doers of the law". (Rom. 2:13)

The world has been filled with hostile armies and unfriendly castes. One of the objects of the establishment of the church was to correct this evil. The church was built for enlightenment and salvation of the world. To the church is given the task of preaching the gospel which is God's power to save. "Go ye", said Jesus to His Apostles, and through them to the church, "and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." They did go. The opposition of priests and philosophers, and kings and princes did not deter them. They went everywhere preaching the word and their success is without parallel.

In the days of Campbell, Stone, and after, the church had the spirit that characterized the Apostles. But later a compromise was effected. The Christian church came into existence. Today, in our own ranks the church is becoming carnalized and secularized. In many places it is "pastorized". Some men have no hesitation in letting the town know that they are "pastors" and that they have "charge" of the church.

The world is still filled with doctrines, opinions, and commandments of men. Affected personal piety will not bring salvation to the hearts of men. A gospel must be preached. We need faithful, practical presentations of the truth. Let us press the battle.
Amazing discoveries in literature reveal that documents necessary to give plausibility to Catholic claims were forged. Catholic historians make fatal admissions.

O. C. LAMBERT

It is easier to separate authorized Catholic literature from unauthorized than with any other religious body, for the reason that no book can be printed by Catholic printers nor sold by Catholic book sellers without the <i>imprimatur</i> (Latin for “Let it be printed”) of a bishop, an archbishop, or a cardinal. And in order to escape the charge of unfairness I shall quote altogether from such authorized literature. Nothing will be left out by this policy for Catholic authors are as volatile on the shortcomings of the Catholic Church as Protestants, and sometimes more so, a surprising fact. Almost everything that was ever alleged against Catholicism can be found in Catholic books of highest authority, admitting them with hardly a blush. Historical criticism has done amazing things for Catholic literature as we shall see. They now admit that during the whole history, they have “invented” and “forged” whatever documents were necessary in giving plausibility to their claims.

Unreliability of Early Literature

You will see from the following quotations that when the bishops of Rome began to aspire temporal sovereignty, documents were forged in support of their usurpations. When they needed a line of Popes they invented-it. This was done whenever it was desired to force some innovation on the credulous public.

“In the middle ages it was long believed that the first Christian emperor made a solemn ‘Edict of Donation’, conferring on Pope, Sylvester I., the city of Rome, the imperial palaces there, and the ‘provinces, places, and cities of all Italy, and the Western regions’. This donation was long ago recognized as a forgery; Muratori assigns its invention to the eighth century.” (Catholic Dictionary, 772)

“Here (1459) we see the first dawn of historical criticism. Laurentius Val-la and Nicolas of Cusa had already pointed out the spurious character of the so-called ‘Donation of Constantine’, and of other documents accepted in the middle ages, and the new epoch of historical literature was soon to begin.” (Catholic Dictionary, 165)

“And even though it must be admitted that the popes benefited by the forgeries, their good faith is beyond question.” (Catholic Encyclopedia, V., 778)

No author is assigned to whom we may affix the stigma but the only reasonable conclusion is that the one who benefited by it is the author. This all reflects disastrously on the claim of papal infallibility even if they were not the authors. According to these statements, all the popes for seven hundred years used these forgeries.

A companion work to the “Donation of Constantine” is the “Liber Pontificalis” or Book of the Popes. It forms the basis for the claim to a line of popes all the way back to Peter. Of the first five hundred years of this boasted chain we read:

“A great many of the biographies of Anastasius II (496) are full of errors and historically untenable.” (Catholic Encyclopedia, IX., 224)

This admission sweeps away the first fifty popes!

Of “Acts of the Martyrs”, another important work in the development of Catholicism Catholic Dictionary, page 9, says:

“In other cases the original Acts have been interpolated in such a manner that it is hard to distinguish the basis of historical fact from the structure of legend and fable which has been raised upon it.”

Lives of the Saints Are Fables

“It is a poor Catholic that leaves devotions entirely alone, and a rare one. He may not feel inclined to enlist in favor of this or that particular saint, but he usually has a rosary hidden away somewhere in his vest-pocket and a scapular around his neck, or in his pocket, as a last extreme. If he scourcs this, then the chances are that he is a Catholic only in name, for the tree of faith is such a fertile one that it rarely fails to yield fruit and flowers of exquisite fragrance.”

“Of course the lives of all the saints are not history in the strictest sense of the word. But what has that to do with the communion of saints? If simplicity and naivety have woven around some names an unlikely tale, a fable or a myth, it requires some effort to see how that could effect their standing with God, or their disposition to help us in our needs.”

“Devotions are not based on historical facts, although in certain facts, events or happenings, real or alleged, they may have been furnished with occasions for coming into existence. The authenticity of these facts is not guaranteed by the doctrinal authority of the church, but she may, and does, approve the devotions that spring therefrom. Independently of the truth of private and individual revelations, visions and miracles, which she investigates as to their probability, she makes sure that there is nothing contrary to the deposit of faith and morals, and then she gives these devotions the stamp of her approval as a security to the faithful who wish to practice them.” (Explanations of Catholic Morals, 115, 116)

It is not, then, strange to read from the pen of a Catholic, writing in the Catholic World, October 1925, on the subject, “W H I T E W A S H I N G S A N T S AND HEROES”, that the lives of the saints are “very good poetry but very poor history”, and he calls these stories “tissues of fables”. For centuries Catholics were taught that “St. James”, “St. Mark”, and “St. Clement” wrote the liturgies, or books of ceremonies of the Catholic Church, but now they admit that, “It is, however, absolutely impossible to suppose that the liturgies, as we have them came from those whose names they bear.” (Catholic Dictionary, 522) And again, “there was no written liturgy in the first three centuries.” (Ibid., 523)

Of another work that has exerted an untold influence in the Catholic Church, the “Apostolic Constitutions”, we learn:

“They profess to contain the words of the Apostles written down by St. Clememt of Rome...”

“The spurious character of the book was soon evident to Catholic scholars, such as Baronius, Bellarmine, and Peta-vius, who were at one, at least on the main points, with Protestants like Daille and Blondel.”

“Pearson assigns the work as it stands, to the middle of the fifth century”. (Catholic Dictionary, 43)

From the fifth century to the age of the Catholic scholars mentioned is about eleven hundred years, during which time the infallible (?) Catholic Church and more than one hundred and fifty infallible (?) popes used the forgery to further their claims, and still use it!
"Apostolic Canons", another foundation stone in the Catholic structure was another instance of Catholic forgery.

"A tradition (accepted because unexamined) long prevailed that these Canons were dictated by the apostles themselves to St. Clement of Rome who committed them to writing. . . The latest German researches tend to the conclusion that, as a collection, that the first fifty canons cannot be dated earlier than the middle of the fourth, and the remainder must be assigned to the sixth century." (Catholic Dict. 41)

When the Normans invaded England, we are told how they established their titles.

"The monks had to manufacture charters, utterly false as to form, but true as to substance, or they would have been ousted from their possessions." (Catholic Dictionary, 338)

All the bishops of Rome, beginning with Symmachus (498) have supported their claims by forgeries. This we learn from Catholic Encyclopedia, V., 778 ; IX., 224, and General Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law, page 34. This includes thirty "Saint" popes !

Not alone in ancient times but in the nineteenth century Catholic historians have "whitewashed" their history.

"It is true that in the latter half of the nineteenth century certain Catholic writers tried to whitewash Alexander VI., viz., Bernacchi, Chantrel, Lenetti, Nemeel, Ollivier and others. But it is not fair to style them dishonest, for a Catholic naturally feels called upon to defend the honor of the Pope, as any true man feels bound to defend his "S$r"'s good name." (Question Box, 433, 434)

The following is the present law concerning telling the truth, according to Catholic authority:

"When impertinent pepole, either maliciously or stupidly, endeavor to wrest these secrets from us, we are perfectly justified in using mental reservation to meet their rude and ill-bred questioning . . . Mental reservation is allowable only when we are driven into a corner by capacious questions about a matter which we have a grave reason and a right to keep secret, and where we have no other escape." (Question Box, 433, 434)

Mental reservation means that one is authorized to tell an untruth to protect the Catholic Church.

Concerning Their Bible

Pope Sixtus V. about 1590 A. D., decided to rewrite the Vulgate or Latin Bible which he did but his successor, Clement VIII recalled his Bible and published another in its place. Bellarmine, who had been excommunicated by Sixtus V. and his works placed on the list of forbidden books, but who was made the chief adviser of Clement VIII., collaborated to place a lie in the preface of the Vulgate, which it still contains.

"Sixtus V., though unskilled in this branch of criticism, had introduced alterations of his own, all for the worse. He had gone so far as to have an impression of the vitiated edition printed and partially distributed, together with the proposed Bull enforcing its use. He died, however, before the actual promulgation, and his immediate successors proceeded at once to remove the blunder and call in the defective impressions. The difficulty was as to how to substitute a more correct edition without affixing a stigma to the name of Sixtus, and Bellartnine proposed that the new edition should continue in the name of Sixtus, with a prefatory explanation that, on account of aliqua vitia vel typographorum vel aliquid (typographical errors) which had crept in, Sixtus had himself resolved that a new impression should be undertaken. The suggestion was accepted, and Bellarmine wrote the preface, still affixed to the Clementine edition ever since in use. . . It cannot be impugned without casting a slur on the character of his fellow commissioners, and of Clement VIII. who with full knowledge of the facts gave his sanction to Bellarmine's Preface being affixed to the new edition." (Catholic Encyclopedia, II., 412).

Judging from the foregoing, I could not possibly credit any Catholic document in their favor, but it is an established rule of testimony that any statement which a witness may make that is not in his favor, possesses a high degree of credibility.

Completeness in Christ

Thaddeus S. Hutson

And ye are complete in Him, which is the head of all principalities and power." (Col. 2 :10) This statement is coupled to the admonition: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ". And again, "And he is the head of the body, the Church, the first born from the dead that in all things He might have the preeminence". (Col. 1 :18)

The church of Christ is a divine institution, and Christ and none other, is its divine head. In the New Testament it is called the Kingdom of Heaven, Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom of God's dear Son. It is "the called out" from the mass of mankind, as the "little stone cut out of the mountain", but scattered into small congregations or churches. These local assemblies are not branches of the church, but are representatives. Each contains all the others do, and all that the whole does. Every element necessary to the existence of the Church as a whole, is found in each congregation. If only one congregation were left in the world, all would be seen in it, that may be seen in many or all congregations necessary to its existence, its work and worship. All have the same faith, the same Lord, and the same baptism. All have the same ordinances and the same worship, and in all essential teaching, they speak the same thing. The same Spirit dwells in all, and hence all should be united in one body. Though independent they are still connected by all that is common to all. They have the same grades or orders of officials. All are coequal. There are no metropolitan or provincial churches or bishops. What changes have been made have been made by the pride, ambition, ignorance or the folly of men. That which is peculiar to Judaism, has no place in the church, past, present or future. The Church of Christ is not a continuance of the Jewish theocracy, but is of a distinct, separate, and different dispensation. We are not to go back to a dead institution, to an abrogated law, nor are we looking forward to its restitution. We are complete in Christ, and that is enough for the Christian.

Our hope is a "BETTER HOPE", (Heb. 7:10) Christ is made surety of a "BETTER TESTAMENT". (Heb. 7:22) established on BETTER PROMISES. (Heb. 8:6) Christians desire a "BETTER COUNTRY" (than Asia Minor) that is a heavenly, (Heb. 11:16)

Our leader is Christ. Our law is the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. Our Jordan is mortality. Our Red Sea is our baptism into Jesus Christ. Our wilderness is in this life, Our Canaan is heaven and immortal glory. No side roads lead to that happy destiny.
Experience is a decided asset in preaching; it is one of the fundamentals to a well rounded preacher. But that is no reason young preachers should be condemned in wholesale. By their fruits they should be known, not despised because of their youth. There is a definite place for the young preacher. Even the busy Paul had time, took time, to encourage young preachers. He knew that in them the destiny of Christianity lay; hence his letters of advice to inexperienced preachers. And we who are aspiring to be Timothys today must know that such is not only a privilege but a serious responsibility; it entails a close study of two books: A Guidebook for Young Preachers, Vol. I, II; written by Prof. Paul, student under the Holy Spirit; old edition, not to be revised.

I. PURITY OF TODAY'S TIMOTHY

Does a preacher have to be different from other Christians? Though we all know he is not to wear different clothes, and is not to be considered a better brand of clay, yet every Timothy owes it to himself, to his brethren, and to God to be different from other Christians. Because he is a leader, because he is in the limelight more, he must live a more exacting life, must walk even more circumspectly than otherwise is necessary. A Guidebook admonishes him to be an example, not of the unbelievers, but of the believers! He is the salt of the world and of the church too! And it is a sad day when Timothy loses his saltiness; he not only destroys his brother for whom Christ died but himself is good for nothing but to be trodden under the foot of man. “Take heed unto thyself . . . Keep thyself pure.” A polluted life makes but a clanging cymbal of a mighty orator; a man can be a Timothy without the tongues of angels, but not without a clean life! Without looking back to say “Good-bye” every Timothy must fix a great uncrossable gulf between himself and the world. Oil and water, purity and worldliness, Timothy and Demas are incompatible companions; they neither walk, nor stand, nor sit together. They are hopelessly irreconcilable; any compromise is on the part of Purity; never has Worldliness been known to give an inch.

II. TIMOTHY'S PREACHING

For Timothy of to-day to live above reproach in his personal life is fundamental. But it is possible for a man to be right in the heart, but weak in the head. Weak, first, in being destitute of tact. One will burst forth in a fiery damming, but unsympathetic sermon; and any criticism of that type of preaching, thinks he, can only come from the fearful of heart. Weakness of the head not only manifests itself in such “stalwart loyalty,” but has the opposite expression too. When a weak head shows itself in a yellow backbone or a rubber spine, the latter is worse than the former! He is either cowardly or “wissy-washy” or both! He is afraid unflinchingly to preach the whole truth that he may court the populace; he cannot be depended on in doctrine, but is a policy server! In emphasizing tact he deserts truth. He makes the matter subservient to the method. The building burns while he debates the proper intonation of voice with which to call, Fire!

Moreover, Timothy’s preaching will severely let alone genealogies, speculations, vain jangling, false science. One that is young does not know enough to discuss them competently; an older man ought to have more sense than to indulge them. Hence, Timothy will preach hard, mercilessly, against those silly things, but always of course in the spirit of meekness. As Brother Boles well says, “Contend for the faith in the spirit of the faith.”

A Guidebook for Young Preachers urges Timothy to “hold fast the form of sound words.” Lest the language of Ashdod beset Timothy, let him compare his speech with that of the Guidebook. Let him not talk of “taking charge of the work at Miletville,” but let him speak as the oracles speak! But when Paul commanded Timothy to hold fast the form of sound words, he had more in mind than mere words. He meant the sketch, the plan, the outline, of the Christian building; he meant what we call the “plan of salvation.” As the Jews had a law of induction into Judaism; as the tabernacle had to be built exactly “according to the pattern”; so there is a fitly framed building to-day! Let no man therefore deride a “plan of salvation” as being legalistic; rather, let him repent and hold fast the form of it.

Young Timothy will consider fully his relations to his elders. He will “rebuke not” an older man; he knows gray hairs are always to be respected. Yet Paul would not want him unduly repressed by unreasonable men; hence, “Let no man despise thy youth.” What is his duty, then? Why, to preach the whole word of God, knowing it is a precious treasure committed unto him! But he will speak, not as a conceited smart-aleck, not even as a young preacher, but as the mouthpiece of the aged Paul.

III. RED FLAGS

Though Paul considered Timothy well grounded “from a youth up,” still he thought it necessary to warn him and us to-day: “Flee youthful lusts!” One of the fatal lusts of youth is an inordinate desire for publicity. The news department of papers is sometimes prostituted to such a selfish, inglorious service. Though there are many humble reports, and we love to read them, yet among some surely there is a contest to make the biggest splash! (Incidentally, this self-pushing device is not confined to adolescence.) After all, why should the preacher do the reporting? It should be done; the brotherhood is interested; but it is with poor grace that a preacher writes, “I held, the brethren said, the best meeting ever conducted in Plugtilt.” If the brethren think so, let them report it; let the elders report the news! Keep the actors backstage! Then the readers will open the news department with more credence and with real relief; mutual ministerial back scratching and self-back scratching will be omitted. Let others speak of the good works. A young preacher should want to advance, but he does not have to be a high pressured salesman.
A lust peculiar to some pampered boy preachers is egotism, a very ready susceptibility to Sister Jones’ flattering and airy compliments. Why, the cheapest thing in the world is air, and blowouts are costly! Says Sister Blohi, “You’re going to pass them all,” (she says it to every new preacher—and she means it, poor soul! And the young ambitious evangelist wants to believe it, and has little trouble persuading himself. A young preacher walked up to Brother Creacy after service with: “I guess you’ve heard of me; my name is...” Flowers to him and to many of us young preachers do more good at our funerals. While we are alive we just naturally stop and smell them; the surprising odor of black pepper, instead of pollen’s fragrance, from a rose has the happy faculty of bringing us to our senses. Paul did not “mush” over even such a fine prospect as Timothy.

IV. STIR THE FIRE

Prof. Paul’s allusion to a dying fire, “Stir the gift that is in thee,” is certainly forceful! Arouse the embers, make them hot! The Timothy of today enjoys natural gifts, talents of body and mind, that he cannot neglect. He must really study, not to show himself, but (1) to be approved of God, (2) to be an unshamed preacher, and (3) to divide the word rightly. He must “give attention to reading,” extensive reading, but not just sermon books. How unworthy a growing preacher, how neglectful of his gift, when he parrot-like repeats others’ sermons. (Especially the superficial, preach-quick sermons of denominational authors.) There is no real study, no real manhood in such! Let him learn from others, but let him stir the fire that is in him, that God put in him; if through downright laziness he allows it to cool and die, God will reckon! Let him “exercise,” really exert himself “unto godliness.” Make sure, not only of regular appointments at the dinner table, but at his study table too (W. E. B.). Let him read religious books and magazines, but not exclusively. The well balanced preacher is informed on a wide range of subjects. He is a specialist in religion, but he knows the thinking of the hill-billy and the university professor.

Theologians teach that God cannot be heard by the unsaved but when one is saved by the direct operation of the Spirit he cannot keep from hearing God, nor can he be lost eternally. If this be true there would be left only a discarded Bible and man as a mere machine with no volition of his own.

If the unsaved cannot hear the Word, then the Word is of no use to him. If the saved cannot be lost then the Word is of no good to him. If the unsaved cannot hear the Word, then it is no use to preach it to him or for him to go where it is preached. And if the saved cannot be lost, likewise, there is no use for him to hear or obey the Word of God. So the Word of God could be destroyed and no loss would come either to the sinner or to the saint according to that theology.

Let us examine this old theology of direct converting power by the Holy Scriptures. Jesus said, “Go preach the Gospel to every creature”; and “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved”. (Mk. 16:15-16) Then one is not saved before he believes. Since faith comes by hearing the Word of God (Rom. 10:17) one must hear the Word before he believes and must believe before he is saved. Therefore, the sinner must hear the Word before he is saved. John said of the Words and Works of Jesus, “These things are written that ye might believe” (Jno. 20:30-31). Then an unsaved man can hear and believe the Word of God. Peter said that the Gentiles by his mouth should hear the word of the Gospel and believe. (Acts 15:7) They were to be saved by the words spoken by the mouth of a man (Acts 11:14) and they had to hear before they were saved, and in order to be saved. On the day of Pentecost the people heard the Word before they had remission of sins (Acts 2:37-38) All saved people have remission of sins. So unsaved people heard the Word. These are a few of the many plain passages showing that unsaved people hear the Word.

If the theory be true, that the unsaved cannot hear the Word, there would never have been any use for preachers or preaching. But since the Lord sent preachers to preach to the unsaved, any theology that teaches salvation without it, is opposed to God, and is wrong.

WHY should such an advocate of theology preach? If the unsaved cannot hear it and the saved cannot be lost, the Word of God is not for either of them. But some have said that it is good for “time salvation”. Then the Word of God is of no eternal good, as the theory goes. Did the Apostles write to the churches and people only for time salvation? Peter said, “If ye do these things ye shall never fall, for this shall be richly an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ” on the condition that the things that he wrote should be done. Doing what the Word says then, is not for time salvation but for eternal salvation.

The result of such theology has been to destroy any feeling of responsibility on the part of either the saved or the unsaved. It has encouraged many to live in the pleasures of sin, leaving it with God to class them with the elect or non-elect at His will. Such a theory destroys missionary work, for sensible people will not preach the Word to those who cannot hear it. No new fields of civilization could be opened up by teaching, and the light of the truth could never reach a benighted soul. There could be no incentive for the unsaved to fear the Lord but only to rebel against and mock the God who arbitrarily withholds the Spirit from one while He sends it to another. The theory in all of its consequences is demoralizing and degenerating. It is destructive of all moral and spiritual conduct. Wreck and ruin would follow if this theology should be practiced. The Word would be driven from the home, the world and the church, and out of the hearts of people and confusion would abound. No one could know whether God had accepted and saved him or not. If such theory should be believed and practiced, heathenism would abound and civilization would be lost. The Lord keep us from such theology, and turn our hearts to the Word, so that we may do what He commands, and “enter by the gates into the City”.

AN OLD THEOLOGY
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A few years ago a group of sectarian “laymen” published a book which they called “Rethinking Missions.” It created a big stir within the ranks of missionary enthusiasts of the denominational bodies. Some of the criticisms were severe, and some of the discoveries set forth in the publication were startling to the people most concerned. What good may come of such a survey I am not prepared to predict. In fact, I am not interested because the whole system of denominational missionary work is devoid of New Testament authority and sanction.

Recently within our own ranks there has been considerable written and spoken along the line of “rethinking missions”, as applied to the activities of churches of Christ which profess to be satisfied to work within the limitations of New Testament precept and example. Certainly everything that has been said or written in this recent discussion has not been above criticism, though for the most part I am compelled to believe the writers and speakers have been sincere in their expressions, favorable or unfavorable to present methods. Surely all such discussions should contribute something valuable and constructive.

If “Rethinking Missions” is profitable as a special subject why should not “Rethinking Religion” in its entirety be profitable as a general subject? Taking stock in the business world is profitable as a general subject? “Rethinking Religion” in its entirety was written by the Holy Spirit for the express purpose of keeping us rethinking our religion. These books teem with exhortations to such rethinking. Nothing should be taken for granted in the religion of the Lord Jesus except that He is infallible, His word cannot fail, neither can His way be improved upon; and that you and I must keep everlastingly watchful lest we become swallowed up in the wiles of the Devil. To the Corinthians Paul wrote; “Try your own selves, whether ye are in the faith; prove your own selves.” But these were the people he called the church of God at Corinth. Yet they were urged to rethink their religion.

Shall we take for granted that we are faithful Christians merely because our names are on a church roll somewhere? Is soundness in the faith positively assured because we are regular in attendance at meetings, contribute of our means, and say our prayers? Ceremonial religion is not enough; Bible reading is not enough; prayer saying is not sufficient. We must make a vital place in our lives for the religion of our Master and not be satisfied to have it as merely a part of the impediments to carry around as convenient to possess yet not indispensable to our being.

The Problem of Organizations

We are taking too much for granted these days. Because some church is doing it, or some preacher of reputation is sanctioning it, or some graduates of a Christian College are introducing it wherever they go, does not make it right. After all we are creatures of one track minds generally. It is easy for me to decide that the thing I am most interested in is by far the most important thing in the world. Or the way I do it is the very best and only correct way. So one tells us that the Orphan Home work is the most important thing for churches to be engaged in today. Sometimes we hear that the hope of the church of tomorrow is the Christian College. Then again the churches are going to die, and that right speedily, if we do not do more for the young people. But these radical utterances are not true. Men talk at length and with heat about the “Young People Problem”. Certainly if we talk enough about the problem of the young people they will see that we are not disappointed and will become a problem.

A few years ago a good friend of mine conceived the idea of arranging a special gathering of groups from the various “Young People’s Meetings” in a certain section of the country. These groups were to arrange to visit a certain well known point of interest on the same day and were to be met by a delegation of the Chamber of Commerce and bands. The cars containing these delegates were to be decorated with banners setting forth the particular churches thus represented.

No so many moons ago a certain group of churches sent their elders and appointed representatives to a meeting that was called to decide upon a cooperation of this group of churches in a given work that is within the sphere of Gospel obligation. Out of this meeting there came a central committee that was to handle funds and direct work and workers of this group of churches. Was not the work a worthy one? Surely! Couldn’t I endorse the work? Enthusiastically. But, the way it was to be done and the organization thus brought into existence! Rethinking our religion would have helped here.

Safeguard Against Digression

One thinks Orphan Home work is the most important thing.

Another thinks the Christian College is the hope of the church.

Some who preach thirty minute oratorical masterpieces think that the one pioneer method of exposing error should be repudiated and a new method of preaching adopted.
A MONG the numerous complexes which have recently developed in the public mind there must be listed the elusive but nevertheless distinctly accruing Young People’s Complex. It should be said, though, that this complex is one of adulthood toward the young more than one on the part of the young people themselves. Finding inspiration in the young people’s societies of the sectarian world a considerable portion of the religious public has become, within recent years, very young-people-minded. First, a class consciousness in regard to young people has been created. Then there has been encouraged the notion that this group requires a distinct program—and this program is made to sustain major contacts with social interest. Thus the church is virtually made to “take over” the young people. This is the Young People’s Complex.

**Objectionable Features**

1. First, the entire procedure is utterly unscientific in that it establishes its purported class of youth only by exaggerating minor differences and ignoring major unities, thus creating a distinction out of proportion to any real difference. Of course youth differs from maturity, even as middle life differs from age; but in these human groups the points of unity overbalance minor differences—the groups are more alike than different. The idea is therefore unscientific.

2. It engenders a sectarianism based on age. And sectarianism is always wrong. (I Cor. 1:10; Eph. 4:3) Any spirit which tends to rob Christian young people of the consciousness of an inseparable relationship to the entire body of the church is essentially evil and should be avoided.

3. It encourages worldliness. Almost without exception adult leaders incorporate into young people’s activities a major proportion of frivolity and boisterousness. Naturally these young persons will be disposed to carry along this spirit into later years. I am thoroughly convinced that much of the irreverence and luncheon-club type of religion observable today is traceable to this influence.

**Collateral Considerations**

1. The young person possesses the faculty of conscience and the urge to do right. Further, the Christian young person has experienced conversion and has had conscience and judgment enlightened by the gospel. Such person is to be “placed upon his own”, not “taken over”. Expecting young people to go about in ecclesiastical “walkers”, not to say rompers, is contrary to the principles of sound training. Let the young people learn to walk alone.

2. Young persons have their parents. The statement that young people should learn to walk alone will elicit the remark that young people need direction. Exactly so; and for that reason the Almighty made them a part of a biological and ecclesiastical order in which they are subject to their parents. Just in proportion as any church presumes to take over its young people, it fosters and encourages a species of ecclesiastical sovietism vitiating both the integrity of Christian parenthood and the liberty of young people. Furthermore, any agency taking over young people will regulate them just about as Will Hays regulated the movies. Instead of taking young people away from the influence of their homes, we need to encourage a better relationship between parent and child.

3. Any program for the young people should be certain to include such elements as will accentuate in their minds the inseparable relation between Christian young people and the church itself, that will re-enforce conscience, enlighten the moral judgment, encourage respect for the home, and promote independent activity and development in the things of Christian character. The young people are our most priceless possession now and our brightest prophecy for tomorrow. By all means any attention they receive should be such as will encourage their full development in Christian character. This the young people’s complex cannot do.

**Eliminating Class Consciousness**

In our own congregation we have a numerous representation of young people. Studious effort has been made to give these persons appropriate attention; but equally studious effort has been made to have any attention offered them to be such as would not supersede the home or mitigate against wholesome individual independence. Accordingly constant effort has been made to have them think of themselves simply as members of the body of Christ and to bear in mind their duty to conduct themselves at all times as Christians. If today there is any class consciousness among them it is at a minimum. And although occasionally they may have a social function on even as middle life differs from age; but in these human groups the points of unity overbalance minor differences—the groups are more alike than different. The idea is therefore unscientific.
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When Paul was on his way from As-
sos to Jerusalem he stopped at Mile-
tus and called to him the elders, or pres-
bys, of the church at Ephesus. His
farewell address to them, recorded in
Acts 20: 17-38, ought to be a most thrill-
ing article to churches everywhere and
for all time. It contains most joyful
encouragement and most fearful warn-
ing. He did not have thedeacons, if
there were any, or any other members
of the church at Ephesus to hear him.
“He was hastening, if it were possible
for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of
Pentecost”; and, as it was not possible
for him then to go to Ephesus to preach
to the church, he delivered this mes-
sage to the elders who were responsible
for the growth and development of the
church.

The Overseer’s Obligation

The term “overseer” is descriptive
of the office of the elders, and it ought
to enable any normal person to see the
responsibility placed upon them, as
well as the attitude he should sustain
toward them. An overseer is to look
after work and workmen; it is his
obligation, in superintending, to have
those whom he oversees to do what
they are supposed to do, consequently
one of the important qualifications of
the elder is that he is to be “apt to
teach”. The ideal for the congrega-
tion is perfect, so the work of the over-
seers in leading and urging them on
by precept and example is of inestim-
able importance. Paul wrote to Tim-
othy: “Let the elders that rule well be
counted worthy of double honor, es-
specially those who labor in the word
and in the teaching”. (1 Tim. 5:17)
One is not fit to oversee or rule those
who are obeying the word of God, un-
less he strives to know the word and
show its power in his own life. “Re-
member them that had the rule over
you, men that spake unto you the word
of God; and considering the issue of
their life, imitate their faith.” (Heb.
13:7) “Obey them that have the rule
over you, and submit to them: for
they watch in behalf of your souls, as
they that shall give account; that they
can do this with joy and not with grief:
for this were unprofitable for you.”
(Heb. 13:17)

Peter, a fellow elder, filled with the
Holy Spirit, as Paul was, gave the same
instruction: “Tend the flock of God
which is among you, exercising the
oversight, . . . making yourselves
samples to the flock.” (1 Peter 5:2,3)
Christ after his resurrection, and after
Peter had pledged his love for him,
said: “Feed my lambs”, “Tend my
sheep”, “Feed my sheep”. Paul said
to the elders from Ephesus: “Take
heed unto yourselves, and to all the
flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath
made you bishops, to feed the church
of the Lord which he purchased with
his own blood.” (Acts 26:28) The eld-
ers had a great responsibility. They
were to oversee a flock purchased, not
with corruptible silver and gold, but
with the precious blood of the Son of
God. What a price! No wonder the
apostle told the elders to “take heed
unto themselves”, for they had a task
-feeding the church of the Lord, pur-
chased with his own blood-that could
not be accomplished in a careless, in-
different, slovenly way.

The Warning Concerning Wolves

The work of the elders, watching in
behalf of the souls of the blood-bought
and requiring obedience and submission
on their part, justified the fearful warn-
ing which Paul gave them: “I know
that after my departing grievous
wolves shall enter in among you, not
sparing the flock; and from among your
own selves shall men arise, speaking
pervasive things, to draw away the dis-
ciples after them.” (Acts 20:29,30)
It was undoubtedly an inexpressible
shock for Paul to foresee wolves among
the elders, who would do the very op-
posite of what the elders were to do; they
would be more concerned about
themselves than they would be of the
Lord.

There is an immeasurable contrast
between the overseers who are to feed
the flock and wolves that destroy the
flock; and the mixture of wolves with
the overseers is a horrible tragedy for
the flock or church of God. Calamity
indescribable confronts a congregation
that has elders who are to serve the
Lord by teaching and admonishing the
church to render real service to God,
mixed with some whose pride, egotism
and impudence prompt them to prevail
upon the congregation to follow them
instead of the Lord. Hundreds of
years have passed since this warning,
and, with all the distressing things that
have happened to the churches, many
do not have the regard for the word of
God on this subject that they should.

Elders and Deacons

There are congregations that are
under elders and deacons, all the men-
tioning of which will be found on the
blank page of the Bible, or in the verses
demanding sprinkling, pouring and in-
fant baptism. There are some that
have meetings of elders and deacons
and as much overseeing is done by the
deacons as by the overseers. Some-
times an elder crossed with other elders
can constrain the deacons to unite with
him and constitute a majority to over-
ride the elders. A stranger would
not be able to make any distinc-
tion between the officials; and, if he
were told that some were elders and
some deacons, he would probably be
confused that there were different
names for those that did the same serv-
ice. There are, also, congregations
that have members who do not care
to be elders; they want to over-
see the overseers or bishops, dic-
tate to them, and rule those who are
supposed to rule the congregation.
There are also congregations that do
not want elders to rule and, if they have
the courage to rule, accuse them of
“lording it over them”; consequently
some of them can control church af-
fairs by a majority vote.

Deacons are worth while; so are the
members; but the elders, only, are
described as rulers whom deacons and
other members are to obey. All of
these departures from scripture make
provision for the destruction of congre-
gations. The elders are the rulers of
a congregation; not rulers ruled by some
of the congregation; but rulers who
should be ruled, as all the members
are, by the Lord Jesus Christ. They
should be alert to do their duty, feed
the flock, guard it against wolves and
prevail upon it to contend earnestly for
the faith once for all delivered to the
saints.
THE EVIL SPIRIT OF TOLERANCE

The attitude of Christ and the Apostles was one of implacable intolerance toward Error.

YATER TANT

John Calvin was only twenty-six years of age when he wrote his famous Institutes which have shaped the destiny of Presbyterianism for three hundred years. Athanasius was not yet thirty when he turned the tide of all church history by the promulgation of the Athanasian creed. Martin Luther was only thirty-two when he nailed his ninety-five theses to the massive door of Wittenberg church, sounding the first note in the swan song of medieval Catholicism. These men are but typical of scores of other young men who have shaped the history of the church, and of the world, by refusing to be controlled by the traditions of the past and the spirit of their age. They have been willing to face single-handed and unaided the accumulated traditions of the centuries and the unanimous opposition of the age in which they lived.

The Spirit of Our Age

During the last few decades our age has developed an attitude in religion that, if unopposed, will most surely destroy the uniqueness of Christianity. That is the spirit of tolerance. In the schoolrooms, from the pulpit and lecture platforms, in the magazines and newspapers, over the radio, and in a thousand subtle and powerful ways it has been impressed upon this generation that the one unforgivable social fault, the one thing that, per se, stamps a man as both uncultured and unchristian-unfit for the society and fellowship of civilized folk-is intolerance in religion.

It should hardly be necessary to say that the spirit of religious tolerance is the very antithesis of the spirit of Christianity. The attitude of Christ and the apostles was always one of implacable intolerance toward all forms of error in religion. Whether that error was found among friends or foes seemed to make not the slightest difference, the result was always the same; error was exposed and condemned. From this procedure the New Testament does not reveal a single departure. And as long as that attitude was maintained the early church remained pure in her doctrine; her converts were fully converted; her members were fully taught. Error could, and did, spring up; but it was always local and spasmodic. Before it could make any serious inroad among the churches it was exposed and stamped out by inspired men. But even before the close of the first century the deadly leaven of "religious tolerance" began to work. Compromises began to be made with the Roman government, the Judaizers, and the pagan religions. The result was a freakish synthesis of Christianity, Roman imperialism, Judaism, and paganism, known in history as Catholicism. This religious monstrosity arose because the church compromised and began to practice "religious tolerance".

In the unfolding drama of the ages the spirit of the age had won its first great victory over the spirit of Christianity.

The Present Conflict

The church of Christ today faces a crisis in many ways similar to that faced at the close of the first century. Then, she had fought her way up from obscurity to a place of prominence in the affairs of the world. She had become too powerful to fight-too large to ignore. Today, she has, in a measure, duplicated the feat. Then, the powers of the age sued for compromise. Today, the denominational world has flooded the land with the plea for "religious tolerance". Then, the church turned from the spirit of Christianity, and compromised with the spirit of the age. Today, there are rapidly increasing signs that the same fatal mistake may be in the offing.

One of the most alarming omens of danger today is the attitude that is being taken toward error by many preachers of the church of Christ. Perhaps they have not yet reached the extent of tolerating error among sectarian, but they do condone error, and apologize for those who teach it among the churches of Christ. An outstanding example is the recent disturbance over premillennialism. Several preachers in the church of Christ, professing not to believe the millennial doctrine, have, nevertheless, given their influence toward creating an attitude of tolerance among the churches for those who do believe the doctrine, and who are threatening to disrupt the church with it. They have spoken much of "love" and "liberty in Christ". In turn, those who believe and teach the doctrine have taken the next logical step, and are tolerant toward error among denominationalists. Some of them are fellowshipping and working hand in hand with certain denominational parties. Viewed as a whole the work of both the millennialists and their apologists seems to present a rather nauseous array of misdirected talent.

This comparatively recent occurrence serves but to emphasize the fact that toleration of religious error has no logical stopping place. We must either tolerate all error, or refuse to tolerate any error. Those who refuse to tolerate error among denominationalists, but do tolerate it among brethren, are not only sadly lacking in logic, but are essentially unchristian in their attitude. The mere fact that one chose to be his disciple did not seem to the Lord sufficient warrant for permitting that one to teach false doctrine; on the contrary it seemed all the more imperative that his error should be exposed and corrected.

The Young Preacher's Opportunity

In this conflict between the spirit of the age and the spirit of Christianity which, while it has been fierce in the past, will undoubtedly be fiercer still in the future, the young preacher of today has an unprecedented opportunity for service. The very nature of the conflict decrees that the issue must be settled by the younger men. The veterans of the cross can, and certainly will, do all within their power to resist the advances of the spirit of the age into the church; but the course of the fight is pitched over too long a period of time; these veterans will be gone before the issue is decided. The thing for the younger preacher to realize is that essentially it is his fight; he is the one who in coming years must stem the tide of digression and see that the church does not suffer at the hands of maudlin-minded, misguided, men (either in it or out of it) who would bring us into bondage to the false dogma of "religious tolerance".

The crying need of our day is for preachers who will not be misled by the puerile propaganda of those who have lost their fighting spirit and who are sadly infected with the spirit of the age. We must keep the church militant.
THE SIGNS THAT FOLLOWED

Modern pretenders to miraculous powers do not demonstrate their powers by healing maniacs. There is no such thing as an unknown tongue. The experiences of these pretenders with snakes are not repeated. Furnish the poison to the one who claims it will not hurt him. Divine healing was not done on the installment plan.

W. CURTIS PORTER

THE religious world today is rapidly embracing the doctrine of miraculous signs. Not so long ago very few religious bodies claimed power to work miracles, but it proved a “drawing power” for multitudes who attended their services for the sake of the “show”, and denominations that staged no such demonstrations found themselves handicapped in their efforts to compete with those who did. Consequently the doctrine of present day miracles has been adopted by others, and in some cases new denominations have been established with this doctrine as the foundation of their existence. So a study of “the signs that followed” believers in the days of the apostles is not at all out of order at this time.

In Mark 16:17, 18, after recording the language of the Son of God in giving the great commission, Mark gives the words of Jesus regarding a promise of certain signs. The Lord’s words are these: “And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; and if you drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt you; you shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” Certainly this would have been the case since he was speaking to them; the second person would have been used. But we find these pronouns used in the third person. After all there is nothing to be gained by insisting that only the apostles are included in this promise, for we well know that signs followed many who were not apostles. However, they followed them only during the time required for the proclamations of the gospel to all the world. That is the time specified in the promise, and as they preached everywhere the signs followed them; the promise did not reach beyond that time. And the cessation of signs at the time the gospel reached every creature under heaven would not mean the cessation of the conditions of faith and baptism as revealed in the preceding verses. Faith and baptism are conditions of the gospel—they are a part of the word—but signs were no part of the word, for the word was confirmed by the signs that followed. So let us make a distinction between the word and the signs that confirmed the word.

But now for a study of those signs. Five distinct signs are mentioned: 1. They shall cast out devils. 2. They shall speak with new tongues. 3. They shall take up serpents. 4. If they drink anything deadly, it shall not hurt them. 5. They shall heal the sick. Let us then note these in the order given.

1. THEY SHALL CAST OUT DEVILS

In the days of the Lord on the earth and in the days of the apostles men were possessed with demons, or evil spirits. Demon possession revealed itself in various ways, but always as a physical affliction. We certainly could not say that disease was an evil spirit, for things are ascribed to the spirits that took charge of men which cannot be ascribed to a disease. However, the affliction of some nature always followed demon possession. Usually the person so possessed became a raving maniac. Of such we read in Luke 17: 14-21. A child who had an evil spirit had become a “‘lunatic, and sore vexed’. Often he would fall into the fire, or into water. Or the man who dwelt among the tombs is a notable example. He was often bound with chains to keep him under control, but the power of evil possession would break the chains. But when the devils were cast out, the people who saw him were astonished because the former victim was found at the feet of Jesus “clothed, and in his right mind”. And so it was with demon possession. But Jesus promised his apostles and other believers that they would cast out devils. It had been done by Jesus during his personal ministry; it had been done by the apostles also under their first commission (Mat. 10:8): “it was to be done during their work of preaching the gospel to all the world. And this sign surely followed them. “There came also a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folks, and them which were vexed with unclean spirits: and they healed every one.” (Acts 5 :16) And handkerchiefs from the body of Paul caused evil spirits to go out of men. (Acts 19 :12) The maid possessed with the spirit of divination who brought her masters much gain by soothsaying might be taken as a special example of the exercise of this power. (Acts 16)

Whether this same demon possession exists in the world today has long been a question among Bible students. We know that men have much of the devil in them; that their spirits are evil because of the wicked lives they live; but it may be that “evil spirits” do not possess men now as they did in the days of Christ and his apostles. But if they do, we would certainly find them among the raving maniacs of today. And as so many religious people are claiming that this sign follows them why not demonstrate that power by healing the maniacs in our insane asylums? That is the place to allow this sign to follow. There were no failures.
made while men were working under this promise; Luke says "they healed every one". (Acts 5:16). But it is an evident fact that no such sign is following any one today. Modern pretenders to miraculous powers cannot cast out devils. The nearest they can approach it would be to cast some of their preachers out of the pulpit.

2. THEY SHALL SPEAK WITH NEW TONGUES

This promise began to be fulfilled on the day of Pentecost when the apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit "and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance". (Acts 2:4) Other examples we have in Acts 10:46; 19:6. The word "tongues" simply means "languages". On the day of Pentecost men said: "How hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born"? (Acts 2:8) Verse 6 declares they were confounded "because that every man heard them speak in his own language". So the gift of speaking in "new tongues" meant they could speak in other languages that they had not learned. And men marveled because they could understand them. The jabbering that people do today and claim as this sign is as far from the real thing as is possible for a thing to be. They think that they have a gift of an "unknown tongue"; hence they can't tell you what it is they say. And you, of course, cannot understand it because it is an unknown tongue. Thus they are able to deceive honest people into accepting their outlandish claims. If it is an unknown tongue, God doesn't expect us to understand it, men reason, and so will just accept it as a reality and let it go at that. But use your judgment just a little here. Can there be such thing as an unknown tongue? Remember, now, that a tongue is a language. Can there be an unknown language? It might be "unknown" to me; it might be so to you, or to all living in the world at this time; but if it is a language, it must have been known by someone. So, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as an unknown tongue. And when the expression occurs in our King James Version the word "unknown" is in italic letters. Read the fourteenth chapter of first Corinthians and see for yourself. But likely modern pretenders think this word was placed in italic letters in order to emphasize it. At least that is the part about that they try to emphasize. Yet it was used by the translators to show that no word is found in the original text for it; it is a supplied word. A statement made by Paul shows there to be no such thing, strictly speaking, as an unknown tongue. He said: "There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification." (1 Cor. 14:10)

The gift of tongues enabled the possessor to speak in the language of people he had never learned. The apostles and others could go to foreign countries and preach the gospel to them without having to spend years in learning a new language. But no such sign follows anyone today. Springfield, Missouri, where I formerly lived, is world headquarters for the Pentecostal people who are among so-called "miracle workers"; yet they have their Bible School there to train their missionaries in the use of foreign languages. What is wrong with their sign?

3. THEY SHALL TAKE UP SERPENTS

When Paul was shipwrecked at the Island of Melita he did this very thing. While making a fire "there came a viper out of the heat, and fastened on his hand". (Acts 28:3) Although it was a very poisonous serpent, and the people of the island expected him to fall dead suddenly, Paul "felt no harm". (Verses 4-6) What a contrast that is with the efforts that people make in handling snakes today! At Tuscumbia, Alabama, a few years ago a modern sign-worker allowed a rattle snake to bite him in proof of his faith and power, but he was soon a corpse. At Leachville, Arkansas, a few years ago I knew a woman who did the same thing. She did not die, but she came so near it that I am convinced she will not try it again. And then you read of Albert Teester of North Carolina who last year endeavored to prove his faith by allowing a snake to sink its fangs into his arm. He claimed it wouldn't bite him, but it did; then he said it wouldn't hurt him, but his arm became swollen till it burst, and he was at the point of death for several days. Did any of these have this sign following? Does the fact that some of them survived the bite of the serpent prove they had the power promised by the Lord? Absolutely not! Jesus indicated that serpents would not harm those who had the power promised. And when Paul was bitten his hand did not even swell; but Teester's did. Any man today who has allowed his faith to overcome his judgment and allow a poisonous serpent to bite him is satisfied with one trial. I have never heard of the man who makes a second effort to prove his faith.

4. THEY MAY DRINK DEADLY POISON

Jesus said if they did so, "it would not hurt them". Carbolic acid, for instance, would not harm the man who drank it. I'll furnish the poison, if some one will furnish the man to drink it. That will be in harmony with the Bible for Jesus said to the church at Ephesus: "Thou hast tried them that say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." (Rev. 2:2) Here is my authority to try men today who make such claims. The way to try them is to have them deliver the goods. I am ready for the trial as authorized by our Lord in this text. Oh, no, it did not say "if they drink any deadly thing by accident, it shall not harm them". Men can't hide behind that position. I knew a man in Sacramento, California, a Latter Day Saint, who disbelieved in using doctors, who took some Black Leaf 40 by accident. It had the same effect as if he had taken it intentionally; he called, not the elders of the church, but the doctor.

5. THEY SHALL HEAL THE SICK

This one point would furnish enough material for a whole series of articles, and I can but touch it briefly here. The blind, the deaf, the dumb, the lame, the diseased of every nature were healed as this sign followed believers. But healing was never done on the weekly, or the monthly, installment plan. It required no long drawn-out services continued over a long period of time to accomplish healing. All cases, like the lame man at the beautiful gate of the temple, were healed instantly and perfectly. (Read Acts 3:1-16) They were totally unlike the cases of modern times. No healing by miracle is being done today. Not long ago Aimee Semple-McPherson-Hutton engaged C. C. Smith, the Atheist, in a discussion in Cincinnati, Ohio. As proof that healing is being done today she cited the case of Joe, the handy man at Angelus Temple, in Los Angeles, California. He had been miraculously cured, she claimed, of a drug habit. But I made a “tour” through Angelus Temple and discovered that Joe, the handy man, goes about the temple on a cork leg! I wonder why that wasn’t healed along with the drug habit.

These signs were all given to “confirm the word”. (Mark 16:20) That work has been accomplished. (Heb. 2:1-4) They were given in part and were to cease at the perfect, or complete, revelation of the will of God. (1 Cor. 13:8-10)
IT has been many months since the debate between Dr. Norris and Brother Wallace. Most everybody was under the impression that a book was to be published containing the speeches delivered by the two speakers. Stenographers were there, it was announced during the debate sessions that the book would be published; before the debate was over, advertisements were carried in several papers announcing the fact that the book was to be delivered just as the speeches were delivered from the platform; up until this hour a sale is being conducted and books are being sold and given away bearing the title, "The Norris-Wallace Debate." But those who have received the book have found that it is not the "Norris-Wallace" debate at all, but that it is a book purporting to give the speeches of Dr. Norris only. It does not even do this. The book contains much material that Dr. Norris never used in the debate and leaves out much material that was used by him, which, if published, would be detrimental to his cause.

Dr. Norris has told through the press and over the radio that Brother Wallace refused to have his side of the debate published. The cover page has this item; "Read the debate that so thoroughly annihilated his opponent that he refused to have his side published": But let's see whether the facts bear out the statement or not. So much has been said by him and nothing has heretofore been said in reply that many brethren feel that possibly there was some truth to the statement. This article is written to refute his charges and to show that Dr. Norris is the man who refused to have the book published.

Refuses to Deliver Transcript

To begin with, Dr. Norris wired Brother Wallace on Sunday after the debate closed telling him the contract had been let and the debate had been transcribed and that only one copy of the transcription was made, and asked Brother Wallace to come to Ft. Worth to make the necessary corrections of his manuscript at once as the printers were under contract to deliver by a certain time. (And may I say here that I am in position to deliver all telegrams and letters from which I make quotations). It is worthy of notice by those who have had any experience with transcriptions, that Dr. Norris claims that the notes were transcribed between Wednesday night and Sunday. He also required haste upon the part of Brother Wallace, implying it was just a small task, whereas the Oliphant-Rice debate that was held the early part of this year has not been completed and the last report I had was that John Rice was through with just half of his work. This shows at least, that in common fairness, Brother Wallace should have had as much time as needed for his work.

Due to the fact that Dr. Norris was threatening to publish the book without submitting the transcript to Brother Wallace for his corrections and approval, Attorney Nolan Queen went before Federal Judge Atwell in Dallas and asked for an order restraining Dr. Norris from publishing the book until Brother Wallace had been given an opportunity, on fair and equal terms, to examine the manuscript. Judge Atwell cited Dr. Norris to appear the next day to show why the order should not be granted. Dr. Norris was not in Fort Worth, however, and could not be served with the citation, necessitating a delay until such time as he could be served. Before he was ever served however, and rather than deliver the transcript or appear and show why, he wrote Judge Atwell and promised that he would not publish, or attempt to publish, any part of Brother Wallace's speeches. Bear in mind that it was not possible to keep him from publishing his part of the debate. As this action upon the part of Dr. Norris terminated the cause for a restraining order, or a permanent injunction, the case became moot and was closed. But Dr. Norris has said much about Brother Wallace's being unable to get an injunction. If that be so, why did Dr. Norris not publish the book? He has the manuscripts, or claims to have. He was obliged to publish both sides. He gave as his reason for not doing so, that Wallace refused to let him publish his side. Still he says Wallace could not obtain an injunction, so the Doctor could have published both sides, but didn't want to.

Brother Wallace has never seen the manuscripts. He has offered to buy them, post bond for them, or do any fair thing in order to get them for correction purposes only, and he has failed until this good hour to get them. So, when Dr. Norris boasts that Brother Wallace refuses to have his side published, he does not state the facts. Dr. Norris holds the whip hand. He only has charge of the manuscript. Why did he not publish the entire debate as he advertised he would, and as he promised he would? He has received money for the "Norris-Wallace" debate. He advertised it would be published just as delivered. He even used the mails to advertise the book, but he never delivered what he advertised he would deliver. This is a matter, however, for those who were defrauded. I never ordered one.

Propositions Accepted

Those who received the book have noticed the copies of letters he wrote to Nolan Queen in which he made certain propositions. He said in the book that these offers were declined. I have in my possession copies of the letters Mr. Queen wrote accepting the propositions, and a Post Office receipt card bearing the signature of Jane Hartwell, his secretary, showing the letter was received on Feb. 24th. Letters to Dr. Norris were sent registered with return receipt so that it would be possible to show that his letters were answered by Mr. Queen and that the answers were received by Dr. Norris.

He also published a letter in his book, dated March 6th, which he says was never answered. The facts are that Mr. Queen answered him immediately, on March 8th, again accepting his propositions. Brother Wallace postponed a meeting to go to Weatherford to examine the transcript in Nolan Queen's office per this proposition, and waited...
several days for Dr. Norris to send his man to Weatherford with the transcript to work with Brother Wallace on corrections, as he had said in his letters that he would do. But to the surprise of all connected with the proceedings, Mr. Queen received the letter from Norris published in the book, dated March 26th, calling off all plans and saying in the letter that Brother Wallace had refused all his offers! It is not so, I have all the correspondence and it is available to those who are interested in seeing it.

**Bogard and Norris Conbine**

ANOTHER thing has come to our attention. When Ben M. Bogard made the boast in his paper about Brother G. C. Brewer not debating with Dr. Norris in Memphis, he said he had read every line of the debate as it came from the stenographers. Well, now isn't that something! He certainly enjoyed a privilege that Brother Wallace has never enjoyed. Brother Wallace was never permitted to see his own speeches. He is not the one that prohibited the publication of the speeches. His only demand was that they should be presented to him for correction and approval before publication, and this Dr. Norris refused to do. He violated his promise to Judge Atwell in quoting (misquoting) Brother Wallace on almost every page of the book he did publish. He had written Judge Atwell he would publish no part of Brother Wallace's speeches. I wonder how Judge Atwell would regard the status of the matter if his attention were called to the fact that Norris had violated the agreement that led the Judge to dismiss the case for cause! And I am bold to make the assertion that if Brother Wallace should write Dr. Norris today to go ahead and publish the debate without Brother Wallace correcting his speeches, and agree at the same time to pay him a bonus for so doing, Dr. Norris would refuse. Dr. J. Frank Norris is the last man on earth that wants the book published as delivered. Many of us doubt that Wallace's speeches were ever transcribed--if indeed they were ever correctly taken, and if Norris defeated Wallace as Bogard says-why did Norris back out of the Dallas debate after Wallace and the Dallas brethren had accepted his challenge? Does anybody believe the flimsy excuse Dr. Norris made?

**Acceptance of Later Offers Ignored**

IN the letter Dr. Norris wrote calling off all propositions, claiming they had been rejected, he offered to let Brother Wallace have the manuscript if he would pay the stenographer. Mr. Queen immediately wrote him asking what the charges would be. That letter has never been answered. To make sure, Mr. Queen again wrote on April 29th asking what the cost would be and to this day that letter has never been answered. So it is easy to see where the blame is to be placed, and to see that Dr. Norris does not intend to release the manuscript at any price. His letters were intended for publication in his book only-he never intended to carry out his offers.

**His Speeches Padded**

I stated that we had reasons to believe that Dr. Norris used much material in his book that was never used in the debate, and left out much that was said. The following observations will prove this statement. Those who attended the debate remember that the afternoon and night sessions of the first day were of three hours duration each. Dr. Norris opened the debate with a speech of one and one-half hours. It takes forty-five pages in the book to record this speech of the afternoon. At the night service, the same time was used, but it takes just thirty pages to record the speech. Why fifteen pages less? For the reasons I have already stated. The second afternoon the time was divided differently. The first speaker used forty-five minutes, followed by his opponent, who used the same amount of time, and then the affirmative used thirty minutes followed by the negative. Each speaker, therefore, used one hour and fifteen minutes. Brother Wallace was in the affirmative on the design of baptism. His speech is not recorded, but Dr. Norris' negative speech is given. But he was not satisfied with the effort he had made on the speech the night before, so he took most of the time on that proposition, and it takes sixteen and one-half pages in the book to record his speech on that and only eight pages are used to record what he had to say in denial of Brother Wallace's affirmation. In the book, twenty-two pages are therefore used to record what he had to say in forty-five minutes, but when it comes to recording what he had to say in his second speech of thirty minutes, it takes just nine pages to record it. Again, WHY? On the night of the second day the same order prevailed and the same proposition was continued. As the book is produced it shows -that what Dr. Norris said in forty-five minutes is printed on fifteen pages and it takes twenty pages to record what he had to say in thirty minutes.
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OF course there will never be another debate with Dr. Norris. Not because of his superior ability as a debater, but because of his conduct during and since the debate closed. He violated every rule of honorable controversy as to time, presentation of arguments, and even of common courtesy and decency. On the last night of the debate, in a fit of anger, he threatened to call a hundred men out of the audience to throw a man out of the building who said or did something that was displeasing to him. He was the host to this great audience of people. He is the pastor of that great church. And yet would have a mob of blood-thirsty cohorts resort to violence in order to satisfy and appease his anger aroused because of the terrible defeat at the hands of Brother Wallace.

NO, the speeches of Brother Wallace will never be seen by Brother Wallace, and I repeat, there is not enough money in Christendom to get Dr. J. Frank Norris to release them for publication.
THE SCRIPTURAL ATTITUDE TOWARD DEBATES

Respect for Divine authority is involved when truth and error clash. Look well to the issue before opposing a debate. See if it has a scriptural side.

P. W. STONESTREET

MUCH has been said of late in some of our papers about debates and debating, not all of which has been consistent with truth or even with the practice of the author of such articles. Such a clash has evidently been due to an effort to make choice between the expediency of debates with respect to the issue in debate. For some strange reason brethren have opposed debates over the millennial-kingdom-David’s Throne theory who have never been known to oppose debates before, which, to say the least, is most significant. But whenever there is a scriptural side to an issue there is a scriptural cause for a debate, so far as the issue is concerned. And whenever representative teachers agree upon propositions and rules and accept an invitation from a local congregation to thus engage in that most effective method of teaching, such a debate is scriptural so far as the responsibilities of that local church extend. Opposition on the part of others to such a debate, therefore, strikes at such exercise of the autonomy of the local church and creates an issue in which that local church is quite as much concerned as are the spokesmen engaged in debate.

Arbitrary Rules

The rules by which debaters may be scripturally governed are any set of rules they may agree upon that are in harmony with the Scriptures, no difference whether they do or do not provide for addressing opponents in the second person. Of course if debaters agree in advance not to address their likes and dislikes of the teachers who happen to be written and generally adopted. Just as legal technicalities carried to the extreme often defeat justice in the courts, so may certain provisions and restrictions in rules for debate serve to conceal rather than reveal truth. For example, the restriction against the affirmative asking the negative questions. Another is the much pressed claim that a debater is not responsible for the consequentialities of a doctrine. While that claim is true to a certain extent, it is not true that a debater is not responsible for his attitude toward the consequentialities of the doctrine he teaches, especially when those consequentialities are contradictory. Emphasizing the consequentialities of a doctrine, therefore, is justified in order that a debater and all who stand with him should make their practice conform to the doctrine or else drop the doctrine.

For instance, when a debater teaches a theory that denies that the tabernacle of David has been set up “that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called” on the one hand and also teaches that the Gentiles may seek after the Lord on the other hand, there is something radically wrong with that debater’s attitude toward the consequentialities of his own doctrine, for which he is certainly responsible. For the truth that the tabernacle of David has been set up, see Acts 15:14-17. Tabernacle is spiritualized of course, being a figurative allusion to the church. God has a right to spiritualize words and He does spiritualize them when Inspiration uses them in a spiritual sense, applying them to the spiritual realm. It is man’s duty to recognize what God has spiritualized.) The truth is certainly safe when debaters adopt the rules followed by Christ and his apostles, which had no such provisions and restrictions; and while debaters have much latitude on the rules they may adopt, they should be rules which would in no way impede a fair investigation.

Unscriptural Attitudes

For one to oppose publicly debates in which the truth of God is defended and rank speculation exposed, and thus discredit the truth with one’s influence among people who do not carefully weigh the evidence and whose highest conception of the issue is governed by their likes and dislikes of the teachers of the respective doctrines, is to have an unscriptural attitude toward debates, because its estimate of the truth of God is too low; and if that happens to be one who also engages in debate, such an attitude is both unscriptural and inconsistent and betrays ulterior motives, even ambitious designs. This writer has nothing personal against any teacher of any theory, and for this very reason he is not disqualified to register his disapproval of such an unscriptural attitude.

Brethren who take sides with respect to personnel and who have no convictions on the issue, even when fundamentals involving the faith of the gospel are at stake, as in recent debates, and who plead the same right to engage preachers on one side of the issue that other brethren have to engage preachers on the other side to preach, overlook the fact that if they are as neutral as they talk, they are divinely obligated to yield charitably to their brethren who have conviction, with whom it is a matter of conscience because of the far-reaching and vital issue involved. “Conscience, I say, not thine own, but the other’s.” (I Cor. 1029) If such brethren are not as neutral as they talk, but are actually in sympathy with the much feared theory that denies that Christ is on David’s throne (a distinctly fundamental question), then let them say so, and they will not be expected to yield. Their own conscience will then be involved. A third alternative is consistent for all who conclude that both sides are guessing They are first logically obligated to prove it and then oppose both sides, or else be slackers in the army of the Lord.

Another unscriptural attitude toward false doctrine is the unscriptural sentiment against debating with brethren, it is based on a false conception of brotherly love, the words hate and love, although opposites, are thus confused. There is no controversy, I trust, over the degree of love that Christians should have for one another, but the issue is simply over the scriptural manifestation of that love. Just as love would commend scriptural doctrine, so would the same love oppose unscriptural doctrine. This principle is true and is a manifestation of brotherly love because it properly estimates divine authority. No sentiment that underestimates the authority of God is true
New Testament brotherly love, however pleasant it may be to brethren, because the New Testament authorizes no such sentiment. The ramifying aspects and dire consequences of the millennial - Kingdom - David's Throne theory are so far-reaching as to touch every fundamental, and the fact that brethren have embraced it makes debating it even more necessary. Did not debaters have to start with brethren? -Paul and Peter with their Judaizing brethren, Campbell with his Presbyterian brethren, later with his Baptist brethren--then ourselves with Digestive brethren, before they became separate, and now with the millennial Seers brethren among us?

Let no one conclude that any one has a scriptural right to engage in debate with the intention of injuring opponents or those who stand with opponents. The issue is over the doctrine—not the devotees to the doctrine. Hence, opposition to debating with brethren indicates an unscriptural conception of the purpose in debates on the part of those who oppose them. Such brethren even violate their own edict, for when they audibly oppose debating with brethren, they are in that act, in principle, debating with brethren. They should realize and never forget that to correct people in error is to do those people good.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

O. A. COLLEY

THE Holy Spirit is with God and "The Logos"-Jesus. There is a sense therefore, in which the Spirit has striven with man since his creation. But this article is not to cover that feature of the Holy Spirit's work. "The dispensation of the Spirit" means "the dealing out in portions; distribution"; and further carries the idea of "relaxing the laws or canons in special cases". (See Webster) So, we shall not ask what the Spirit did in creation or how he did it; neither shall we inquire, at this time, how he inspired the prophets. But this article is not to cover that feature of the Holy Spirit's work. There is a great difference in them forever. (c) The world could not receive him. This measure of the Spirit was not distributed his work in our age special cases. (See Webster) So, we inquire, at this time, how he inspired the prophets. But after He went to the Father, the Spirit was to be "in them". (b) When this divine Helper (the Holy Spirit) should come to them (the Apostles) he was to abide, with them forever. (c) The world could not receive him.

T HIS last statement has been used by a few Baptist preachers in debate on the direct operation of the Spirit for proof that if the sinner received the Word of God before baptism assuming that the Spirit was in the Word, he would already be a child of God before baptism for the "world cannot receive" the Spirit. But this measure of the Spirit was never designed to make a Christian. It was miraculous in its nature depending not upon the act of man to obtain it, but upon the prayer of Jesus, "I will pray the Father and he will send another comforter". The only reason that such gospel perverters as Bogard, Ballard, Key can do any good for their false theory of a "direct operation of the Spirit" in debate with that passage is that the people in general do not understand the right division of the Spirit's work. There is a great difference in receiving the Spirit and receiving the reproof, or the convincing power of the Spirit.

Such men also try to show that Cornelius received the Spirit before he was baptized and link that instance with the statement "whom the world cannot receive". Their conclusion is that Cornelius was a child of God before and without baptism because he received the Holy Spirit. But the miracle of the Holy Spirit falling upon Cornelius and his house was special, not general and did not effect conversion, then or now.

WHEN the Holy Spirit should come upon the Apostles He was to (a) comfort them, (b) guide them into all truth, (c) and through them, "convict the world of sin, or righteousness and of the judgment," this is plainly taught in John 16:5-16. Sinners were convicted concerning their sins, on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-38) by what the Holy Spirit, through the Apostles, preached to them. Pricked in their hearts, by the reproofs of the Spirit, they asked these Apostles, "what shall we do"? They were told to "repent and be baptized" for the remission of their sins and "you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit". They were never comforted by the Spirit until they obeyed the Spirit's teaching. This is sufficient to show that the baptism of the Spirit—a miracle was never given to convert men; but to qualify them for a special work and when that work was completed, it was not repeated. The work of the Spirit, in conviction and conversion, works now, just as it did then, through the word of God that the Apostles were empowered by the Spirit to speak and to write. He was to guide them "into all truth". There is not a single truth that is necessary for the world or the church to know today that cannot be found in the New Testament.
The name of Coniah is an abbreviation of Jeconiah and the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah. (Jer. 22:24) Coniah was also called Jehoachin. (2 Chron. 36:8; Jer. 24:1) Coniah was, only eighteen years old when he began to reign as king over Judah and “he reigned three months and ten days in Jerusalem; and did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah”. (2 Chron. 36:9) Coniah was the last king to rule in Judah that had Jehovah’s approval as king. After Coniah was taken captive Zedekiah was set up as king over Judah by the king of Babylon and afterwards made blind and carried into captivity. (2 Chron. 36:9-16) Coniah belonged to the lineage of David and was therefore of the seed of David. (Matt. 1:6-12) A woe or decree was pronounced against Jehoiakim, the father of Coniah. (Jer. 36:30) A stronger decree or woe was pronounced against Coniah, the son of Jehoiakim, by Jeremiah. Here is what the Jehovah decreed through the prophet: “Is this man Coniah a despised broken vessel? Is he a vessel wherein none delighteth? Wherefore are they cast out, he and his seed and are cast into a land which they know not? 0 earth, earth, earth, O earth, earth, earth, earth! Can he that serveth not the LORD prosper? Is he that is helped unto his bowels, and I will establish his days? He shall not see the sepulcher of his fathers, nor shall dwell in a house of comfort: he shall be as a vessel wherein is no pleasure. Jps is with the doctrine of premillennialism, it is destructive or despised and a broken vessel or idol wherein is no pleasure. The doctrine of premillennialism is not of God; it is materialistic in nature, and antagonistic to the spiritual nature of Christ’s Kingdom.

If Christ is not now seated and ruling upon the throne of David now at the right hand of the Father in heaven, He never will be. Samuel said, “When thy days are fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, that proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for his name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever.” (2 Sam. 7:12-13) This everlasting throne upon which the seed of David ‘was to be established forever was to take place while David was sleeping with the fathers. Let us hear what Peter said on Pentecost: “Brethren, I may say unto you freely of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us unto this day. Being therefore a Prophet, and knowing that God has sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne; he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was he left unto Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus did God raise up, whereby we all are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear. For David ascended not into the heavens, but he saith himself ‘The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies the footstool of my feet’” (Acts 2:29-35) Peter declared that David’s tomb was still with them at the time and Christ was at the right hand of the Father seated upon David’s throne.

Jesus-The Seed of Coniah

Matthew in his lineage places Jesus as belonging to the lineage of Coniah. (Matt. 1:11) But some one is ready to say that Joseph was only the legal father of Jesus and therefore not of the natural seed of Coniah. Bear in mind, please, that Jeremiah did not say anything about either natural or legal seed but did say that no one of the seed should rule or sit upon the throne of David. The prophecy of Jeremiah covers the case whether natural or legal seed. It matters not whether one contends for the legal or natural, the statement in Jeremiah precludes any one of the seed of Coniah sitting on the throne of David. By reading what Moses and Jesus have said upon the legal seed one cannot help but conclude that the legal seed in Old Testament times became as much an heir as the natural. (Deut. 25:5-10; Matt. 22:24) In fact the purpose of the legal seed was to keep up the lineage.

The Earthly Throne Of David Became Extinct

With Coniah. Christ Cannot Occupy David’s Throne In Jerusalem.

J. B. NELSON

Shealtiel (or Salathiel) is given as the son of Coniah in Matt. 1:12. Both Luke and Matthew trace the lineage of Christ back through Shealtiel and Zerubbabel. (Matt. 1:11-14; Lk. 3:27) It matters not whether one takes the position that Luke’s account is that of Mary and Matthew’s that of Joseph, the legal father, since both place Shealtiel in the lineage of both Mary and Joseph and Shealtiel being the son of Coniah, the decree of Jeremiah covers both the legal and natural. Whenever the premillennialists get Jer. 22:28-30 out, which declares that no man of the seed of Coniah (whether legal or natural) shall sit upon the throne of David on earth ruling in Judah, I am ready to show they are wrong from other scriptures or acknowledge that premillennialism is right. Jeremiah said that Coniah “was a despised, broken vessel wherein was no pleasure”. So it is with the doctrine of premillennialism, it is destructive or despised and a broken vessel or idol wherein is no pleasure. The doctrine of premillennialism is not of God; it is materialistic in nature, and antagonistic to the spiritual nature of Christ’s Kingdom.

It is certain that Jesus will never be re-incarnated, or live again in the flesh. “Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh; even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more”. (2 Cor. 5:16) Christ came once in the flesh. (Jno. 1:14)

What can be clearer than the above statement, that Christ is not to be known ag a in the flesh. Again the Apostle Paul speaks concerning the lineage of Jesus: “For it is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah; as to which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priests”. (Heb. 7:14) Again the Apostle states: “Now if He were on earth He would not be a priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according to the law”. (Heb. 7:5) The Prophet Zechariah in prophesying concerning the reign of Jesus said: “He shall be a priest upon his throne”. (Zechariah 6:13) If He is to be a Priest on His throne, and He cannot be a priest on earth, and His throne in Heaven (Psalms 89:35-37) it is evident that Jesus had to go to Heaven where David’s throne had been exalted, to become both King and Priest at the same time, and that while David was sleeping with the fathers. It seems to me if one desires to know the truth regarding the lineage of Jesus and His reign, that the above should suffice.
The grandest message ever given to the world since the angels announced the birth of Christ is the promise that He will come again. More than one-fifth of the New Testament is directly concerned with this blessed theme. There are more than three hundred distinct references in the Word that tell of His coming. Divide your New Testament into verses, and one in twenty-five has to do with this blessed hope of the Christian. The Word of God is filled with many great and precious promises, but what promise could bring greater hope or give greater joy than the promise that the Lord will come to reward the faithful?

Since the day the Lord ascended and the angels announced to the Apostles that "this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven". (Acts 1:11) believers in Christ have looked forward to His coming again. And from that good day until now, men have tried vainly to determine the year and the day of His return. But since that time until our very day every man who has set the day, or fixed the date, has found to his own disgrace that he was only a false prophet deceiving and being deceived.

**When Christ Will Not Come**

1. He will not come until complete restitution has been accomplished and all that was spoken by the prophets has been fulfilled. "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you, whom the heaven must receive (retain) until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began". (Acts 3:20-21) Now, who can decide when all has been fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets? No man unaided by inspiration can know. Hence, no man knows the day nor the hour, not even the angels, neither the Son, but the Father only. (Matt. 24:36)

2. He will not come until the wickedness of the earth has become so great that Christians cannot save the world. "As were the days of Noah, so shall be the coming of the Son of man". (Matt. 24:37) The ancient world was not destroyed until there were only eight souls worthy of salvation. God told Abraham that He would not destroy Sodom so long as ten righteous persons could be found. God did not destroy the Jewish nation until they had so completely forgotten Him that He saw that there was no use to wait longer. Jesus said to the disciples, "Ye are the salt of the earth". Salt is that which saves and preserves. Christians are the salt of the earth. As long as there are enough Christians on earth to save it God will not destroy it. "Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on earth"? (Luke 18:8)

3. He will not come until the Man of Sin has finished his time. "Let no man beguile you in any wise: for it will not be, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition. . . . Remember ye not, that, when I was with you, I told you these things? . . . And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and bring to naught by the manifestation of His coming". (2 Thess. 2:3-8)

4. Our attitude should be that of patience. "Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, being patient over it, until it receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient; establish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord is at hand". (Jas. 5:7-8)

5. Our attitude should be that of proclamation. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and dring this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come". (1 Cor. 11:23-26)

6. Our attitude should be that of a godly desire. "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness. Looking for and hasting unto (desiring) the coming of the day of God". (2 Pet. 3:11-12)

These exhortations scattered through the pages of the New Testament with the commanding word "Watch" are but so many taps on the shoulder by the finger of God, calling us to a life of purity and faithfulness, looking for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.
The XV Amendment to the Constitution of the United States became effective on March 30, 1870. It provides: “The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.” After the passage of said amendment, many of the people of the Southern states were denominated “Nullificationists”, because they did not believe in and refused to observe said amendment. We heard much criticism of Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York, and by some he was declared a “Nullificationist”, because he did not believe in the enforcement of the XVIII Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The fact that some people throughout the United States have repeatedly refused to believe in the justness of the two amendments above mentioned, or to lend their aid to the enforcement thereof, is not an argument for the repeal of either of said amendments.

The great trouble with the religious world is that many of them are, with respect to the laws of Jesus Christ “Nullificationists”. The Jews as a nation refuse to believe in or accept Jesus Christ as their Savior, or to believe in his divinity, or respect his laws, or even recognize that his kingdom has come and is now in force. Other religious bodies say they believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, but because some of the conditions of becoming citizens of his government, and commandments of his kingdom, do not meet with their approval they attempt to nullify them. The mode of entering the kingdom of Christ is definitely stated. (Matthew 28:19-20, etc.; Acts 2:38) Notwithstanding the above mode’s being affirmatively stated and demonstrated as a condition for entrance into the kingdom of Christ, many persons and religious bodies attempt to nullify the same, by teaching that men and women can be saved, (a) without baptism; (b) that their sins will be pardoned before baptism; (c) that they can be saved out of the church or kingdom of Christ, (d) that they can be saved just as well in one religious body as another; in substance that the ways and commandments of Jesus Christ may be set aside or nullified, and men and women be saved according to their own will and wishes. God refused to save Cornelius without strict compliance with the law of Christ though he was a devout and very religious man. (Acts, 10th Chapter)

The law of marriage, though the most sacred institution ever given to men and women, has been repeatedly nullified, not only by people who do not profess Christianity, but by professed Christians as well. Learned men, that is, well educated men, though lacking wisdom, are now advocating companionate marriage, which is nothing short of fornication and adultery and strikes at the very foundation of God’s law and civilization. However, the advocates of companionate marriage are no worse than religious bodies and members of religious bodies, who tolerate divorce and subsequent marriage to another, when divorced upon grounds other than adultery. Jesus regarded the matter so important and sacred that it is written as a part of the constitution upon which his government is founded:

It was said also, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement; but I say unto you, that every one that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress; and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery. Matt. 5:31-32.

And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery. Matt. 19:9.

And he said unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery. Matt. 10:11-12.

Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery. Luke 16:18.

Members of the church of Christ publicly proclaim that they stand for the Bible and the New Testament upon the subject of marriage and divorce, and yet their position in most instances is only theoretical. Congregations are backward when it comes to making an application of the laws of God and Jesus Christ upon the subject, because nearly every family has some member who has attempted to nullify God’s law on the subject, and to attempt to enforce the law on the subject, is to bring down upon the actor the condemnation of many members of a congregation. When members of a congregation of the church of Christ, live in rebellion to God’s law because of an adulterous marriage, refuse to repent, separate, and make proper confession for their sins, they should be treated as strangers, and fellowship, social or otherwise be discontinued, because their conduct, to men and women who understand the teachings of God’s Word, is as though they were living in open adultery, without ever going through any form of marriage under the civil law. When Christians take such people into their homes, or affiliate with them, socially, they are to that extent “nullifying” the laws of God and Jesus Christ on the subject of marriage.

But as it is, I wrote unto you not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous,, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no, not to eat. 1 Cor. 5:11.

Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly and not after the tradition which they received of us. 2 Thess. 3:6.

And if any man obeyeth not our word by this epistle, note that man, that ye have no company with him, to the end that he may be ashamed. 2 Thess. 3:14.

The greatest question that any professed Christian can propound to himself is “Am I a Nullificationist with respect to any of the laws and commandments of Jesus Christ?”
Jesus Christ is described in the Scriptures as having occupied three positions including his present position at the right hand of God. 1. In the beginning with God. (John 1 :1) 2. In the world, made flesh. (John 1 :14) 3. At the Right Hand of God in Heaven. (Heb. 10:12-13)

Concerning His glory and power in the beginning, Paul has this to say: “Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped.” (Phil. 2 :5-6)

The next verse describes the position that Christ assumed to effect our redemption—“But emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.” (Phil. 2 :7) And, in the next verse, His present position of exaltation is set forth. “Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.” (Phil. 2 :9-1 1) Thus the Bible describes and defines (1) The creative position of Christ; (2) The humiliation of Christ; (3) The exaltation of Christ.

The exaltation of Jesus was as complete and entire as was his humiliation. Surely, he entered into glory and power commensurate with the humiliation he suffered to attain it. Yet there are those who teach that Christ has not been completely exalted but that he will be at the time of his Second Coming. Nothing can be added to the present position of Jesus Christ at God’s right hand. Observe the following particulars in which the completeness of his exaltation consists.

1. His Mission of Redemption Complete. Jesus himself declared that he accomplished the work in redemption that God gave him to do—“I glorified thee on earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do.” (John 17 :4) This included the power and authority to give eternal life. (John 17:2) Then he prayed the Father to restore the glory which he had possessed in the beginning with God. (John 17:5) Has that prayer been answered?

2. His Revelation is Complete. The redemptive mission of Jesus was not only to offer himself as a sacrifice for man, but also to make known the will of God to man. “For the words which thou gavest me I have given unto them.” (John 17:8) This work of revelation Jesus promised would be completed by the preaching of the apostles under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. “Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth.” (Jno. 16:13) Jude declares that “the faith” was “once for all delivered unto the saints.”

3. His Glory Is Complete. Christ came into this world to glorify the Father (John 17:4) and he ascended into heaven to be glorified with the Father. (John 17:5; 17:11) He suffered and entered into His glory. (Luke 24:25) The Holy Spirit did not come until Christ was glorified “For the spirit it was not yet given for Christ was not yet glorified.” (Jno. 7 :39) The Spirit came on the first Pentecost after His ascension to the right hand of God. “Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit he hath poured forth this which ye now see and hear.” (Acts 2 :35) Therefore Christ’s ascension to God’s right hand meant his glorification. The glory with God for which Christ prayed was the glory “which I had before the world was.” (Jno. 17 :5) God raised Christ from the dead and gave him glory. (1 Peter 1 :21)

4. His Authority Complete. Christ announced to the apostles before his ascension into heaven that “All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth.” Upon this fact was predicated the execution of the Great Commission and the pronouncement of the terms of pardon by the apostles. Because Christ has not exercised his authority by physical force through a temporal kingdom today, as when he made the announcement, “some doubt”. Nevertheless, Peter declares that he “is on the right hand of God having gone into heaven; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him.” (1 Pet. 3:22)

Paul challenges those who deny the complete glorification and exaltation of the Lord to add anything to his present position—“which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead and made him to sit at his own right hand in the heavenly places.” (Eph. 1 :20) The position granted Christ then and which he will occupy until “His enemies are made the footstool of his feet” (Heb. 10:12-13)—at the time of his coming when death “which is the last enemy to be subjected” (1 Cor. 15 :23-26) will be completely abolished, is described by Paul as being supreme to (1) all rule, (2) all authority, (3) all power, (4) all dominion, and (5) every name that is named. Then as if in exact contemplation of such doctrines as “Premillennialism” which deny that the glory and authority of Christ is at present complete, Paul adds to the above statement of Christ’s present position the fact that it is impossible to excel it “not only in this world but also in that which is to come”.

To deny the supremacy of Christ at God’s right hand is to deny the fundamental fact of the Gospel upon which the mediatorial reign, priesthood, and majesty of our Redeemer depends.
News from the Front:

The Gospel Guardian will review the news from time to time, a kind of running commentary upon what is happening upon the gospel fronts.

There is much to encourage Christians in the religious news, particularly the establishment of many new congregations. Of course, the deaths which occur among the churches are not recorded. There is nobody to tell the story. If there was one faithful Christian left to mourn the passing of a congregation, that one would make a strong effort to save it.

Visible Results:

Additions are running about normal, as compared with recent years. Comprehensive statistics are not available, but that may not be as important as some might think. After all, real spiritual progress is difficult to measure. “The kingdom cometh not with observation,” and the permanent growth of it in a given community may be slow and not always visible to the naked eye.

Surface Religion:

The large number of restorations being reported may indicate good preaching during the meeting, but it denotes poor preaching, or neglect somewhere along the line, between meetings. Still, if the members need to be restored, it is better for them to be so. If they were kept stored with good teaching, including reproof, rebuke, and correction in righteousness, there would not be much restoring to be done.

Expansion:

More mission meetings have been reported this year than in many. It is reaching the proportions of a trend. There are more preachers doing “local work,” and local work without missionary efforts is apt to go to seed. Slavish dependence upon the preacher, and the selfish monopolization of his time are faults which cannot be condoned. Preaching the gospel in near-by communities affords the churches and preachers an opportunity to redeem themselves and redeem their time and redeem more people from destruction.

Good for Both:

It gives the preacher the opportunity that every preacher worthy of the name desires—to preach the gospel to more people. It gives the congregation healthful, spiritual exercise, in going with the preacher and supporting his efforts. Unused talent in the church is often utilized in helping to carry on the work at these mission points until a congregation is established. In every way, such efforts develop the home church.

Should Not Make One Sea-Sick to Talk Missions:

There is no justifiable distinction between home and foreign missions. And what is mission work but gospel work? Such distinctions are artificial. It would be better to get these imaginary fence lines out of our minds.

Godspeed:

The announcement of the Bible Chair work which is being established at the Texas A & M College, with R. B. Sweet in charge, is interesting. Most of our religious schools are crowded. But regardless of what conditions may be in these schools or any argument that may be made the fact remains that that many children of Christian parents are going to attend the State schools. It is fine to be able to carry the means of providing Bible teaching to them, if they are interested enough to avail themselves of it. A Bible Chair is a happy combination in theory. It is to be hoped that it will prove so in practice at College Station.

How To Do It:

News reports often reveal more than the one reporting realizes or intends. A woman recently reported a meeting and praised the preacher most warmly. “He preach-
No Agents or Other Nuisances:

For this work, every church virtually has its own field and opportunity before it. At least, this is true in the South. No promotion work will be needed. Nobody need go among the churches to stir up interest. It is up to each congregation to save the colored people in its own community.

Gone But Not Forgotten:

There is a sad note in the news because of the passing of two veteran gospel preachers: R. N. Moody, Albertville, Ala., recently passed away at a ripe old age. He is best remembered to many readers as the author of the book, "Eunice Lloyd." H. L. Calhoun, whose voice has probably been heard by more people over the radio than any of our preachers, died suddenly, Sept. 4, of a heart attack, after having preached at his regular noon hour on the previous day. His years with Central Church, Nashville, Tenn., during which he broadcast daily at noon, and from 5 to 6 P. M. on Sundays, constitute a great monument of gospel labor.

Some congregations need a good stiff shot of common sense, remarks a splendid young preacher who has common sense. They are professional sermon samplers. They want to taste the sermons of every preacher in the brotherhood whom they can get to come mostly at his own expense to "try out" for the place. Such congregations are conceited in their delusions of grandeur. They would remind one of old king Ahasuerus trying to select Vashti's successor! We have heard of one church that tried out some twenty preachers without reaching a decision. The cure for that practice is for preachers to quit preaching sample sermons.

Non-Controversial:

The Truthseeker published at Searcy, Arkansas, is carrying on quite a controversy with their brethren against controversy between brethren. They have much to say about manifesting a good spirit, but imply some ugly things against certain of their brethren. That is true to form. Those brethren who parade a sweet spirit are nearly always capable of saying the hardest things at all. Of-the Truthseeker, O. C. Lambert says: "If these brethren are right in their attitude then it follows that Gideon, Micaiah, Elijah, John the Baptist, Jesus and Paul, and every other Bible hero were a disgrace to religion with their "uncompromising attitude" and their many disputes. They cannot hand a religious paper to their friends if it contains controversy between brethren! I wonder how they could afford to hand out a new Testament which is subject to the same objection. Paul's withstanding Peter to his face must wound the tender sensibilities of these sweet-spirited brethren!" The whole tone of the Truthseeker invites criticism and will provoke controversy. They need not complain when they get it. They are asking for it.

"Glory to God Alone":

This was the slogan of the great Eucharistic congress of the Roman Catholics in Cleveland, yet the first parade of robed priests and cardinals pictured Cardinal Hayes standing in a slowly moving limousine with upraised hands blessing the people in the name of Pope Pius, and then a mad scramble of the people to kiss the ring on his hand, an honor (?) won by a stenographer. Where was the "glory to God alone"?

Brother Boles Speaks for Himself:

Some sympathizers with the speculators have sought to make capital of the gestures toward unity made by H. Leo Boles in the Boll-Boles discussion in the Gospel Advocate several years ago. It seems to be a habit with these brethren to misrepresent the writings of men. They specialize in that art. Lipscomb, Sewell, Campbell and others are not living to correct these misrepresenters, but B r o t h e r Boles speaks for himself. Read his timely article on page 5, in the editorial section. This article should be followed, in our opinion, in the Gospel Advocate, the Firm Foundation, the Christian Leader, the "Truthseeker" and the Harding College Bulletin.

Christian Hymns:

Why use a songbook published by a group whose teaching divides the church, and who use the proceeds from the sale of the book to foster the party spirit and spread their speculative teaching. When you buy the book entitled "Great Songs Of The Church" you make a financial contribution toward the dissemination of error. Many songs in the book favor the unscriptural theories of its publishers. Why not sever connections with error? Why furnish this party in the church its source of revenue? Churches that do so become particeps crimini in their divisive work. CHRISTIAN HYMNS is published by the Gospel Advocate, a concern that has stood for the truth, and fought its battles, for several generations. As a hymnal it is unsurpassed. Four hundred songs. A beautiful book. The latest thing in neat, up to date printing, and the last word in book-binding and durability, so its publisher says. The book is edited and compiled by L. 0. Sanderson and C. M. Pullias. There is no better musician, singer, and judge of good music in the brotherhood than Sanderson and the scripturalness of every song was passed upon by C. M. Pullias. That is enough said. Congregations in need of a scriptural hymnal should order this book from the Gospel Advocate Company, Nashville, Tennessee.

Send Your Dollar:

If you have signed a subscription blank to the Gospel Guardian which is unpaid receiving the magazine is an invitation for you to send the dollar. Do it the day you get the magazine and avoid the possibility of forgetting or neglect.

Three Thousand Minus:

From Detroit the following report on the great Norris crowds is made by Leslie L. Spear: "I went out to the big tent the other night to hear him. He has a tent that will seat seven or eight thousand and about three hundred were there".

A Long Reach:

The following letter from New Zealand is too good not to print. Dear Brother Wallace:

I have just finished reading the "Neal-Wallace Discussion on the Thousand Years Reign of Christ." I suppose it will be "old stuff" to you by now; and you and I are totally unacquainted. But I want to express my joyous satisfaction in your contribution to the said debate. I know nothing of your paper either. I take the "Christian Standard," whose editor and I were classmates at Bethany College, but the "Gospel Advocate" is unknown to this far-off country. But I do know that your position in regard to the millenarian frenzy is, as I understand God's Word, entirely correct. Possibly, of course, this predisposed me in your favour. But, however that may be, now that I have finished the book, I feel you had a great victory. It is time these earnest and
misguided people were taken in hand. As you say so powerfully, they have already done great harm. We have them here in Australia and New Zealand also, and among our own brethren. But it is heartening to know that some who once held the theory of an earthly millennium have returned to the actual Word. Such efforts as yours at Winchester etc. only need to be known better and the feebleness of the millenarian idea will become obvious. I for one feel that you deserve whole-sale thanks. I congratulate you on your victory. A pat on the back will not hurt you whether you need it not; and although I have to reach a long way here's one from me.

Your brother in Christ Jesus,

A. G. Sanders.

during the Depression:

A six months average of the Sunday contributions Of the Thayer Street church, Akron, was $772.78 per month, an average of $175 per Sunday contribution. Their highest contribution during this period was $804.40 and their lowest $708.70. The remarkable thing is, there were no pledges, no signed cards, nothing except emphasizing the duty of giving on the first day of the week. A pledge is not wrong and has served well—but a church like this does not need cards to induce them to give. The congregation has only about two hundred fifty members, all of the laboring class, workers in the Akron rubber factories, not a wealthy member in the church. They put to shame many large, prosperous churches. John C. Graham is the preacher for this church, loved and respected by the church and the people generally, has done and is doing a wonderful work with the Thoyer Street church. May his and their kind increase.

Accommodated

Under the title “Will Someone Examine This Parallel And Answer The Argument” Dr. E. V. Woods, the Dallas dentist, evidently thinks he has pulled something unanswerable. For the information of some who may not know it, Dr. Woods is the one who played Benedict Arnold at the Fort Worth debate and sided with Norris and the Baptists instead of standing with his brethren for the truth. His conduct was so contemptible that he deserves no recognition but some of his sophistry needs puncturing.

He tells us that he left Methodism in order to take the Word of God as a whole. R. H. Boll assigns the same reason for having left the Roman Catholics. Effective schooling they have had, indeed, one with the Methodists and the other with the Catholics! Churches of Christ should all sit up and take notice of these two especially qualified men and let them teach us all something that we have never been able to learn from such men as Alexander Campbell, to say nothing of Paul.

The parallel the Doctor wants “examined”, which he thinks, of course, cannot be answered is Acts 2:38 alongside with Rev. 20. In the Neal and Norris debates and elsewhere we have repeatedly set out that Rev. 20:1-6 is an inadequate proof-text for the Premillennialists and the evidence entirely too meagre for the construction of an earthly millennial theory. The argument has been capitulated as follows:

1. It does not mention the second coming of Christ (2) It does not mention a reign on the earth; (3) it does not mention a bodily resurrection; (4) it does not mention us; (5) it does not mention Christ on earth; (6) it does not mention any single distinctive point of the millennial theory. Upon this the latter is the only baptism Christ will stay a thousand years when he comes (or two of several things. Does he stand with, Norris on Acts 2:38 also?

Fifth: If “you and your children and all that are afar off” includes “us” then “we” are mentioned and therefore more than “only those present” were “included”.

Sixth: If water is the element of baptism then Acts 2:38 is water for as a matter of fact when it mentions baptism it mentions everything baptism is! Even the doctor should be able to see that.

Seventh: It does not have to mention a birth, that being figurative and only an illustration of what baptism does.

The doctor is showing the effects of his running with J. Frank Norris. He had better quit his bad company before it is too late. His entire article is just another sample of the straw-grabbing extremes to which these theory-blinded brethren will go to save their Rev. 20 idol.

Neither the text nor the context of Rev. 19 and 20 teach the earthly millennial theory or a single thing the millennialists are obligated to prove. This point was fully covered in the debates with Neal and Norris. The former is in print. Doctor Woods has added nothing to what Neal attempted to do with the arguments, though doubtless he thinks he has done a better job. Being a mere reiteration of the arguments which have already been exploded it is unnecessary to prolong this article just to play with a Dallas dentist.

The very word “Pre-millennialism” is music to the ears of these brethren. But it is in fact a synonym for error. “Pre” means before (Christ comes before); “millennial” means a thousand years (he will stay a thousand years when he comes); and “ism” just means that it’s not so.

The doctor had better stayed with the Methodists than to take up with J. Frank Norris and John Rice Baptists.
The Voice of the Pioneers on Instrumental Music and Societies

By JOHN T. LEWIS

A complete exposure of the two major innovations in the worship and work of the church from the writings of the pioneers, with additional comments and arguments by the author. Brother Lewis has utterly annihilated the erroneous claims of the music and society brethren that the "pioneers" favored, or did not oppose, instrumental music and organized societies in the worship and work of the church.

A Library in One Volume

A concise but complete collation of testimony and compilation of evidence on the two subjects equal to "Shepherd's Handbook on Baptism." Not many students have access to the sources of material contained in this book. Its wealth of information is not within the reach of the average preacher with limited library. The book is the product of long and tedious research—a delving into musty volumes of the sermons and writings of the pioneers. It is a library of many books in one volume on two important, living, vital issues.

Every preacher, elder, teacher, and student, should have this book and it is within your reach. Price $2.00, 184 pages, bound in cloth, stamped in gold.

ORDER FROM

GOSPEL GUARDIAN

P. O. Box 1078
Oklahoma City, Okla.

---

Announcement!

of Special Interest to

ELDERS Who Sponsor Bible School Work ---

And Mothers of Children of Primary Age

Beginning October 1, the Gospel Advocate Company is publishing the first-year series of Graded Bible Lessons. These lessons, which have been prepared by Miss Louise G. Thompson, B.S., David Lipscomb College, a specialist in child education, will greatly assist in the spiritual development of the child.

Fully illustrated lesson papers for each Sunday in the year. A set of mounted pictures for the teacher. All illustrations are lithographed in four colors.

Printed in attractive, legible type. The mechanical make-up of this graded Bible series is of the highest quality. Each year a new year will be added to the graded series to enable the child student to be supplied with the proper graded lessons.

THE NEW GRADED SERIES WILL BE OFF THE PRESS

OCTOBER FIRST

* GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY •

NASHVILLE, TENN.
CHRISTIAN HYMNS

- A hymnal containing the most select songs of the greatest writers, carefully chosen from all the outstanding publishers. Contains no "jazzy" or sectarian songs. Only spiritual hymns of the highest type are used in CHRISTIAN HYMNS. Every song has its music and every verse is in its place. Designed to meet the needs of the churches of Christ, CHRISTIAN HYMNS is destined to become the leader in gospel hymnals.

GOSPEL ADVOCATE CO.
Nashville, Tennessee

Over 10,000 Copies Sold Since May 1st

The NEAL-WALLACE DISCUSSION
on the
MILLENNIUM
held at
WINCHESTER, KY.
January 2-6, 1933

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.
June 6-9, 1933

PROPOSITION: "The Bible Clearly Teaches That After the Second Coming of Christ and Before the Final Resurrection and Judgment There Will Be an Age or Dispensation of One Thousand Years During Which Christ Will Reign on the Earth."

The only oral debate on the issues of modern Premillennialism in print. A full discussion of the following live questions:

1. Will Christ Reign on the Earth a Thousand Years After His Second Coming?
2. Is There a Future Millennium?
3. Does Christ Occupy David's Throne Now?
4. Will National Israel Be Restored to Palestine?
5. Will Jerusalem Become the Capital of a World Kingdom?
6. Are the Old Testament Prophecies Concerning Fleshly Israel "Unfulfilled Prophecy"?
7. Was the Kingdom of Daniel 2: 44 Set Up on Pentecost or Was It Postponed?
8. Is the Second Coming of Christ Imminent-Impending?
9. Are the Theories of Premillennialism Vital to Christianity?
10. Are the Consequences of These Theories Destructive of the Gospel?

A 350-Page Book

Price $2.00

P. O. BOX 1078
Gospel Guardian
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.